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# 1 Introduction

This document contains the Phase 2 summary of documents from agenda item 6.16 “Release with Redirect”.

* [AT113-e][028][TEI16] Miscellaneous I (Apple)

 Scope: R2-2101434, R2-2101346, R2-2101170, R2-2101656, R2-2100872, R2-2101356, R2-2101357, R2-2101358, R2-2101359, R2-2100979, R2-2101289, R2-2101290, R2-2101291, R2-2101292, R2-2101657,

 Phase 1, determine agreeable parts, Phase 2, for agreeable parts Work on CRs.

 Intended outcome: Report and Agreed CRs if any is agreeable.

 Deadline: Schedule A (can come back Thu Feb 4 is needed)

# 2 Contact Points

Respondents to the email discussion are kindly asked to fill in the following table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | Email Address |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Phase 2 Discussion

Following conclusions were made in offline#028 phase 1.

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 4-1: Confirm to support the release with redirection in response to a ResumeRequest for both with/without anchor change cases.****Proposal 4-1a: The inter-node signalling and procedure impact are up to NW implementation or leave to RAN3 discussion.** **Proposal 4-2: Discuss the 38.331, 38.306, 38.300 CRs based on R2-2101290, R2-2101291, R2-2101292 to reflect RAN2 agreements in phase 2.** |

The revised CRs have been uploaded in the draft folder (PATH: Phase II -> 04\_Release with Redirect).

##### **PH2-Q1: Do you agree with the revised 38.300 CR?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree? (Yes or No) | Comments |
| Ericsson | Yes, see comments | In our understanding, the proposals 4-1 and 4-1a leaves some ambiguity or contradiction what to do with 38300 CR. The CR version we provided covers only the “with anchor change” case, with a note that the “without anchor change” is not supported in this release. We could agree the CR (as it covers the current situation, and is our preference) or we could drop the CR (not our preference). |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

##### **PH2-Q2: Do you agree with the revised 38.306 CR?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree? (Yes or No) | Comments |
| Ericsson | Yes (proponent) |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

##### **PH2-Q3: Do you agree with the revised 38.331 CR?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree? (Yes or No) | Comments |
| Ericsson | Yes (proponent) |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 4 Annex – Phase 1 Discussion

R2-2101289 Release with Redirect in 2 steps Ericsson discussion Rel-16 TEI16

[R2-2101290](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_113-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2101290.zip) Release with Redirect in 2 steps Ericsson CR Rel-16 38.331 16.3.1 2402 - F TEI16

[R2-2101291](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_113-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2101291.zip) Release with Redirect in 2 steps Ericsson CR Rel-16 38.306 16.3.0 0503 - F TEI16

[R2-2101292](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_113-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2101292.zip) Release with Redirect in 2 steps Ericsson CR Rel-16 38.300 16.4.0 0338 - F TEI16

[R2-2101657](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_113-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2101657.zip) Release with redirection in 2 steps release Huawei, HiSilicon discussion Rel-16 TEI16

In RAN2#112e this was discussed in [R2-2009849](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_112-e/Docs/R2-2009849.zip) and [AT112-e][029][NR TEI16] Misc Corrections II ([R2-2011176](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_112-e/Docs/R2-2011176.zip)), and the following has been agreed:

* [029] will support release with redirection in response to a ResumeRequest for both with/without anchor change cases.
* [029] For anchor change scenario, the current gNB is responsible for determining the redirection.
* [029] Discussion on detail mechanism and CRs is postponed to next meeting.

About the case without UE context relocation, R2-2101289 propose not to support it in R16, but R2-2101657 propose to support it and provide the detailed mechanism.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| TDoc | Proposals |
| R2-2101289 | [Proposal 1: Agree on the Text Proposals to TS 38.300.](#_Toc61504334)[Proposal 2 : Confirm that the case without UE context relocation is not supported in Rel-16.](#_Toc61504335)Proposal 3: Agree CRs to 38.300, 38.331 and 38.306. |
| R2-2101657 | Proposal 1: Add new cause in *RETREEVE UE CONTEXT REQUESET* message to indicate anchor gNB that the new serving gNB intends to redirect this UE and the anchor gNB is responsible for determining whether to perform anchor switch.Proposal 2: In non-anchor-change scenario, the new serving gNB determines redirect configuration and sends it to the anchor gNB along with RETRIEVE UE CONTEXT REQUSET message.Proposal 3: If Proposal 1 and Proposal 2 are agreed, send LS to RAN3 to inform them.Proposal 4: Agree the Text Proposals to TS 38.300. |

#### **Q9: Do you support case without UE context relocation?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support | Proponent of R2-2101657.After receiving the *RRCResumeRequest* message from UE, if the load of the new serving gNB is too heavy or it couldn’t support this resume cause, the new serving gNB could decide release and redirect this UE. Then, it requests UE context from the last serving gNB. After UE context is moved to the last serving gNB and Path switch is made, the new serving gNB2 will be anchor gNB. RRC release message including redirection information could be created by gNB2 and be send to UE. After receiving release message with redirect information, UE will perform cell selection and camp on a new cell, and then UE’s NAS will trigger RRC resume procedure again. In this case, anchor gNB switch has to be performed twice to finish the NAS trigger RRC resume and it is not optimal from signalling point of view. |
| Ericsson | Can accept | Our view was to not impact other groups with a late TEI16 issue. But if other companies are fine, we are also fine to support R2-2101657. |
| Nokia | No, this is RAN3 area | In our view this is RAN3 discussion. We would rather keep the mandate to what we discussed in last meeting and not add additional content at late stage. |
| MediaTek | No strong view | Can I first clarify that whether there is UE behavior change on supporting of UE context relocation or not? Assuming no.  |
| QCOM | Support  | Support context relocation and **let RAN3 to decide** whether they can do the necessary work.  |
| CATT | See comments | It should depends on RAN3 discussion due to it will impact the inter-node message |
| Intel | Check with RAN3 | Without context relocation impacts RAN3 and should be checked with RAN3. |
| Apple | No strong view | It should be discussed in RAN3.  |
| Samsung | Can accept | We agree this option has RAN3 impacts and would be more for RAN3 to conclude (but it seems they already accepted) |
| ZTE | 1. Support case without UE context relocation
2. Do not support the proposals in R2-2101657
 | It is not clear why the case without UE context relocation can not be supported. We understand it can be left to NW implementation, and it can be transparent to UE.* [029] will support release with redirection in response to a ResumeRequest for both with/without anchor change cases.
* [029] For anchor change scenario, the current gNB is responsible for determining the redirection.
* [029] Discussion on detail mechanism and CRs is postponed to next meeting.

At the last meeting the agreement was only that in case of anchor relocation, the redirection decision is done by the new serving gNB. So, in case of no anchor relocation, if we leave this decision to the anchor gNB, then there will be no RAN3 impact. |
| vivo | No strong view | No strong view, but we think it is in the scope of RAN3. |
| Spreadtrum | No strong view | It should be discussed in RAN3.  |
| OPPO |  | Same view as majorities that it’s in the RAN3 scope |

#### **Conclusions (Release with Redirect):**

All companies think the case without UE context relocation is transparent to UE, and should be discussed in RAN3 or up to NW implementation.

The rapporteur think we can have the RAN2 CRs to reflect the agreements made in last RAN2 meeting, i.e. support release with redirection in response to a ResumeRequest for both with/without anchor change cases. About the inter-node signalling and procedure impact, it could leave RAN3 to discuss and decide whether to standardize it or not.

**Proposal 4-1: Confirm to support the release with redirection in response to a ResumeRequest for both with/without anchor change cases.**

**Proposal 4-1a: The inter-node signalling and procedure impact are up to NW implementation or leave to RAN3 discussion.**

**Proposal 4-2: Discuss the 38.331, 38.306, 38.300 CRs based on R2-2101290, R2-2101291, R2-2101292 to reflect RAN2 agreements in phase 2.**