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# 1 Brief scope of the paper

This document aims at collecting companies’ views regarding the open issues for Conditional Handover (CHO) and Conditional PSCell Change (CPC), in line with the following guidance:

* [AT110-e][209][MOB] CHO and CPC issues (Nokia)

Scope:

* + - Discuss the contributions [R2-2005344](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2005344.zip), [R2-2005682](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2005682.zip), [R2-2005681](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2005681.zip), [R2-2005380](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2005380.zip), [R2-2005456](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2005456.zip) in AI 6.9.2 and the contributions [R2-2005345](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2005345.zip), [R2-2005381](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2005381.zip), [R2-2005279](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2005279.zip) in AI 6.9.3
		- Determine what (if anything) can be agreed based on the handled contributions

      Intended outcome:

* + - Discussion summary in [R2-2005754](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2005754.zip) (by email rapporteur).

      Deadline for providing comments and for rapporteur inputs:

* + - Deadline for companies' feedback:  Friday 2020-06-05 10:00 UTC
		- Deadline for rapporteur's summary (in [R2-2005754](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2005754.zip)):  Monday 2020-06-08 16:00 UTC

# 2 Open issues for CHO

## 2.1 On when to stop evaluating the execution conditions

The authors of [1] and [4][5] re-discuss the topic that has been considered at RAN2-109bis, namely the UE’s actions regarding when to stop the evaluation of execution conditions. In [1] it is proposed to change the CHO-related text in TS 38.300 and say the evaluation is stopped when ‘handover is triggered’, not when ‘the execution condition is met’, as currently captured. The authors of [4] modify the same part of the text by adding ’or HO command is received’. It is worth checking whether companies see a need for introducing such change(s) in Stage 2 specification.

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 1: Do you see a need for changing the text in 9.2.3.4.1 of TS 38.300, in line with that is proposed in [1] or [4]?** |
| **Company** | **YES/NO** | **Motivation** |
| Ericsson | No | In our view this is not important and meeting time should not be spent on it. The only intuitive way to solve this is to stop CHO upon CHO execution and/or HO execution. |
| OPPO | Yes | We are ok with the change from [4]. |
| NEC | Yes | To complete the issue, can change to include the case of receiving legacy HO command. Either way is fine but suggest using the same way for CPC case discussed in Q4. |

## 2.2 CHO and fast MCG recovery

The authors of [2] consider another topic which was deemed complete after RAN2-109bis. The co-existence of fast MCG recovery and CHO. It is proposed to introduce an explicit indication from the NW which recovery mechanism the UE shall use in case both fast MCG recovery and CHO recovery were configured while the UE encounters an RLF. In addition, it is proposed to agree the UE can still use CHO in cell reselection happening after failed MCG recovery (Proposal 2 in [2]). It seems the topic was concluded at RAN2-109bis and companies believed no new aspects of this coexistence need to be covered in the standard in Rel-16. However, if that is not the case, please express your view and motivation why the topic shall be reopened.

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 2: Do you see a need to still specify something with respect to fast MCG recovery and CHO coexistence in Rel-16? E.g. the indication from the NW which recovery mechanism the UE shall use in case both fast MCG recovery and CHO recovery is configured while the UE encounters an RLF [2]?** |
| **Company** | **YES/NO** | **Motivation** |
| Ericsson | No | The only reason we have not agreed to forbid this corner case was because the impact in the spec would be minimal. If that is re-open we would propose to rather add a restriction to disable this dual configuration. |
| OPPO | No | Current spec already implies that UE will perform fast MCG recovery in this case. |
| NEC | No | when the MCG failure is detected and the UE is configured with fast recovery, the UE shall trigger fast MCG recovery.  |

## 2.3 CHO in MR-DC operation

The authors of [3] discuss the coexistence of CHO and MR-DC operation. RAN2 has already agreed that ‘*’CHO (MCG) can work together with MR-DC, i.e. receive CHO when MR-DC is configured, and receive SCG addition when CHO condition is configured.*’’ RAN2 has also agreed ‘’*...not to preclude SCG configuration in RRC Reconfiguration with conditional reconfiguration. Limit to cases without RAN3 impact*.’’. In [3] it is further claimed that a solution in Rel-16 is needed to decrease unreliability and signalling overhead due to the possibility to include SCG config in RRC Reconfiguration with CHO. As a result, it is proposed to release the SN upon CHO execution., which would be always done based on the indication in the target cell’s configuration. In addition, [3] proposes that the UE even informs the SN that it is about to be released by the UE. Companies are asked to express their opinion whether such changes are need in Rel-16.

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 3: Do you agree the SN shall be released by the UE upon CHO execution? Shall the UE inform the SN prior to such release, as suggested in [3]?** |
| **Company** | **YES/NO** | **Motivation** |
| Ericsson | No | We see no need to change the previous agreements. Network behaviour would take care of the release if needed. We see no reason to add restrictions. We made very clear we did not see the need for further RAN3 work, but we should not set their agenda in RAN3.Is the goodbye message back again? Interesting. We wonder why can’t we do as in legacy. |
| OPPO |  | We are not sure if RAN2 can conclude this without involving RAN3. |
| NEC | No | unless RAN2 receives some negative feedback for the LS from RAN3, we do not see any need to re-discuss the issue. |

# 3 Open issues for CPC

## 3.1 CPC evaluation and CPC config in PSCell Change command

Some of the remaining open issues for CPC are discussed in [6]. First identified gap is whether the UE shall stop evaluating CPC execution conditions once a PSCell change is triggered (i.e. not once the execution condition is met). This proposal in [6] is closely associated to what has been proposed in [1] for CHO.

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 4: Do you agree with the changes proposed in [5], to modify the TS 37.340 by stating the UE stops evaluating the execution conditions once ‘PSCell change is triggered’, instead of once ‘the execution condition is met’?** |
| **Company** | **YES/NO** | **Motivation** |
| OPPO | No  | We proposed to add something like “ or PSCell change command is received”. |
| NEC |  | No strong view. An alternative way may be to change to “once the execution condition is met or legacy PSCell change is triggered”.We suggest using the same way as CHO case discussed in Q1. |

Another topic tackled in [6] is whether a CPC configuration can be allowed in the legacy PSCell change command. The authors of [6] propose to make it forbidden and insert a corresponding change into the field description of *conditionalReconfiguration*. What is RAN2 view on that?

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 5: Can CPC configuration be provided in legacy PSCell change command? Do you agree with the change in [6] to capture the associated behaviour in the field description?** |
| **Company** | **YES/NO** | **Motivation** |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| NEC | Yes | agree with the proposal, i.e. not to allow the CPC configuration in legacy PSCell change command. The proposed change to the field description is also fine. |

## 3.2 On CPC configurations upon PCell change

The authors of [7] elaborate on security aspects after PCell change if the UE was also prepared with CPC. One can assume that when PCell changes then CPC configurations are not valid, as the key for SN is derived from MN’s key (which might have changed during PCell change). The authors of [7] suggest to leave it up to the NW whether to release the CPC configurations in case of PCell change if the same *sk-counter* is used. This is a broader topic of what the UE should do with CPC configurations during PCell change.

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 6: Should the NW be allowed to configure whether the UE releases the CPC configurations upon PCell change (e.g. when security key does not change)?** |
| **Company** | **YES/NO** | **Motivation** |
| OPPO | No | We should follow the same way as CHO, i.e. releasing CHO after successful PCell HO. |
| NEC | Yes? | Q6, which is slightly different from the proposal in [7], is a bit confusing.. E.g. is “configure whether the UE releases …” to mean “configure to release..”? probably, so. Then, our understanding is as follows.The scenario in question is only the intra-MN HO (PCell change) without SN change (even without PSCell change) in NR-DC. Otherwise, security key (either KgNB and/or S-KgNB) must be changed, or stored CPC config is not valid due to PSCell change (regardless of S-KgNB change).Then in the corresponding scenario, it can be up to network (SN) to release the CPC configuration when necessary e.g. due to security key change. |

## 3.3 CPC completion to SN when SRB3 is used

The authors of [8] discuss the topic which has been partially concluded at RAN2-109bis, i.e. whether there is any complete message sent to the MN once the UE executes CPC which was configured via SRB3. The authors of [8] propose to send this notification to SN, instead of MN which is claimed to reduce the transition latency and also get network prepared for the CPC failure handling. Do companies see a need for such functionality?

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 7: In case of SRB3, should the UE send a CPC complete message to the source PSCell (SN) upon CPC execution?** |
| **Company** | **YES/NO** | **Motivation** |
| OPPO | No | We have concluded not to have any bye-message. |
| NEC | No | We do not see valid argument in [8].When SRB3 is used, the UE sends the CPC complete to target PSCell and that is sufficient. Any other thing or enhancement seems not needed. |

# 4 Conclusions

Based on the views expressed in the previous sections, we propose the following:
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