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# 1 Introduction

This document is to kick off the following email discussion:

* [AT121][403][POS] Network control for MG activation/deactivation UL MAC CE (Ericsson)

Scope: Discuss the proposals in R2-2301303, R2-2301829, and R2-2301828 and conclude on the expected behaviour.

Intended outcome: Report and agreeable CR if necessary

Deadline: Wednesday 2023-03-01 1900 EET

# 2 Contact Information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Contact: Name (E-mail) |
| CATT | Jianxiang Li(lijianxiang@catt.cn) |
| Samsung | June Hwang (june77.hwang@samsung.com) |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 3 Discussions

## 3.1 Motivation of CRs

* The feature UL MAC CE is optional for gNB
* UL MAC CE is implemented fully but not partially (i.e NW if implements would implement both the decoding and necessary action to act on the MAC CE)
* The MAC subheader associated with the content generated by MAC layer does not have an L field as opposed to data generated by upper layers which are indicated with the L field. Hence, there is a risk of packet discard when UE sends content which NW does not understand.

Do company agree to the RRC CR as provided in the RRC CR in R2-2301304 to provide the configuration for UL MAC CE?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| ZTE | No | As clearly stated at the session, there are 3 options on the table:   1. assume the network always supports it, (2) assume the network can decode the MAC PDU anyway, (3) the network may be unable to decode the MAC PDU and an RRC indication is needed.   We suggest to go with (1) to avoid any misunderstanding and NBC change |
| Samsung | Yes | We think this is rather curing the broken principle not NBC case. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Do company agree to the MAC CR as provided in R2-2301828?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| CATT | Yes with comments | #1.  TS 38.331 CRxx is missed  TS 37.355 CR  #2.  If the UE is configured with pre-configured measurement gap and the parameter *posMG-Request* in TS 38.331[5] is indicated as” allowed” |
| ZTE | No | Same as Q1 |
| Samsung | Yes with comments | As indicated by CATT, the sentence should be modified. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

LPP

Motivation for LPP CR is to align with RRC signaling of UE capability for this feature where it is optional for UE to support UL MAC CE. But in LPP capability it says AND

|  |
| --- |
| ***mg-ActivationRequest***  This field, if present, indicates that the target device supports low latency measurement gap activation request for DL-PRS measurements. The UE can include this field only if the UE supports *mg-ActivationRequestPRS-Meas* **and** *mg-ActivationCommPRS-Meas* defined in TS 38.331 [35]. |

Do company agree to the LPP CR as provided in R2-2301829?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| CATT | Yes with comments | #1. Update the cover sheet below  Other specs X Other core specifications TS/TR ... CR ... |
| Qualcomm | No | The current LPP text is in agreement with RAN1 feature list in R1-2212895 for FG 27-10a.  A location server needs to know whether the target device supports the "Low latency MG activation request". If the target device does not support the "MG activation request", an LMF may have to activate pre-configured MGs.  The CR changes the "MG activation request" capability into a "MG pre-configuration" capability. It is then unclear how the location server should know whether the target device supports the "MG activation request".  If the motivation for the LPP CR is to align with RRC signaling of UE capability for this feature, then a new capability for pre-configured MGs needs to be added and the pre-requisites in LPP capability removed. |
| ZTE | No | Separate UE capability needs to be known by LMF, i,e. LMF needs to know whether UE supports the UL MAC CE or not, then LMF can decide to trigger LMF initiated MG request. We agree with QC that the current text is inline with R1’s feature list. No change is needed |
| Samsung | See the comments. | Motivation seems ok to us. However, as QC commented, the change seems to remove the existing functional capability. Then, it is better to make a new signaling to capture what is wanted. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |