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# 1 Introduction

This is discussion document for the email:

* [AT113-e][220][DCCA] Stage-2, Fast Scell activation and early measurements (Nokia)

Scope:

* + - Discuss corrections under 6.8.x marked for this discussion to see which CRs could be agreeable
    - Some (or even all) CRs may be merged together if seen needed

Intended outcome:

* + - Discussion summary in R2-2101966 (by email rapporteur).
    - Agreeable CRs (if any)

Deadline for providing comments, for rapporteur inputs, conclusions and CR finalization:

* + - Initial deadline (for companies' feedback): 1st week Thu, UTC 0900
    - Initial deadline (for rapporteur's summary in R2-2101966): 1st week Fri, UTC 09:00
    - Deadline for CR finalization: 2nd week Thu, UTC 1000

where following documents are to be treated:

### 6.8.1 General and Stage-2 Corrections

By Email [220] (1+2)

Stage-2 corrections:

[R2-2101400](file:///C:\Users\terhentt\Documents\Tdocs\RAN2\RAN2_113-e\R2-2101400.zip) CR on support of NR-DC within the same gNB-DU ZTE Corporation, Sanechips CR Rel-16 37.340 16.4.0 0246 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

[R2-2101479](file:///C:\Users\terhentt\Documents\Tdocs\RAN2\RAN2_113-e\R2-2101479.zip) Corrections on UL power sharing Huawei, HiSilicon, ZTE Corporation (rapporteur) CR Rel-16 37.340 16.4.0 0248 - F NR\_newRAT-Core, LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

[R2-2101728](file:///C:\Users\terhentt\Documents\Tdocs\RAN2\RAN2_113-e\R2-2101728.zip) Corrections on UL power sharing vivo CR Rel-16 37.340 16.4.0 0250 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

### 6.8.2 Fast Scell activation

By email [220] (1)

TCI state corrections:

[R2-2101747](file:///C:\Users\terhentt\Documents\Tdocs\RAN2\RAN2_113-e\R2-2101747.zip) Correction on tci-PresentInDCI ASUSTeK CR Rel-16 38.331 16.3.1 2436 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

* Revised in [R2-2101942](file:///C:\Users\terhentt\Documents\Tdocs\RAN2\RAN2_113-e\R2-2101942.zip)

[R2-2101942](file:///C:\Users\terhentt\Documents\Tdocs\RAN2\RAN2_113-e\R2-2101942.zip) Correction on tci-PresentInDCI ASUSTeK CR Rel-16 38.331 16.3.1 2436 1 F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core [R2-2101747](file:///C:\Users\terhentt\Documents\Tdocs\RAN2\RAN2_113-e\R2-2101747.zip)

By Email [220] (3)

*Miscellaneous EMR corrections:*

[R2-2101570](file:///C:\Users\terhentt\Documents\Tdocs\RAN2\RAN2_113-e\R2-2101570.zip) Clarification on sCellState configuration upon SCell modification ZTE Corporation, Sanechips CR Rel-16 38.331 16.3.1 2422 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

*(moved from 6.8.3)*

[R2-2100303](file:///C:\Users\terhentt\Documents\Tdocs\RAN2\RAN2_113-e\R2-2100303.zip) Corrections on condition of idle-inactive measurement configuration update OPPO CR Rel-16 38.331 16.3.1 2318 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

[R2-2100304](file:///C:\Users\terhentt\Documents\Tdocs\RAN2\RAN2_113-e\R2-2100304.zip) Clarification on carrier frequency in MeasIdleConfigSIB OPPO CR Rel-16 38.331 16.3.1 2319 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

By Email [220] (3)

*BWP-related corrections:*

[R2-2100305](file:///C:\Users\terhentt\Documents\Tdocs\RAN2\RAN2_113-e\R2-2100305.zip) Clarification on UE behaviour due to entering dormant BWP OPPO CR Rel-16 38.321 16.3.0 1011 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

[R2-2101500](file:///C:\Users\terhentt\Documents\Tdocs\RAN2\RAN2_113-e\R2-2101500.zip) Correction on BWP operation Samsung CR Rel-16 38.321 16.3.0 1036 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

[R2-2101017](file:///C:\Users\terhentt\Documents\Tdocs\RAN2\RAN2_113-e\R2-2101017.zip) Correction on first active uplink BWP vivo CR Rel-16 38.331 16.3.1 2375 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

# 2 Discussion

## 2.1 UL power sharing stage-2 updates

By Email [220] (1+2)

Stage-2 corrections:

[R2-2101400](file:///C:\Users\terhentt\Documents\Tdocs\RAN2\RAN2_113-e\R2-2101400.zip) CR on support of NR-DC within the same gNB-DU ZTE Corporation, Sanechips CR Rel-16 37.340 16.4.0 0246 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

In the above paper it is proposed to clarify in stage 2 spec, that NR-DC can also be supported between different cells within the same DU:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Need for CR | Comments |
| Nokia | Neutral | Intention seems tob e good and we agree with the technical aspects. So we are fine to agree on the CR but as there is no interoperability problems foreseen is the category correct to be F? |
| Qualcomm | Intention is fine, but CR needs modifications | From spec view, we identify below issues of the CR:   * In general, 37.340 does not and should not care about disaggregated RAN. In fact, Note 2 of 4.1.1 makes that very point. * The new Note 3 proposed in the CR is out of place: the section is about common MR-DC principles. The new Note 3 may be true but is not a common principle because whether you can have options 7/4 in same node is not strictly the business of 37.340. Thus, we think the new Note 3 is not necessary. * The real problem comes in the section 4.1.3.3 because the legacy “in addition” phrase should never have mentioned gNB-DUs. * Finally, we don’t agree with the “reaons for change“ in cover sheet: the reason to change spec should not because CA may not be possible intra-DU (so you need DC). It is just that DC can work irrespective of network configuration, and current text is unnecessarily restrictive.   Based on above concerns, we propose below changes the CR:  1) “Reason for change” in cover page:  • It is sufficient to state that “NR-DC can work under two cells under same gNB-DU”. No need to mention CA may not be possible itra-DU.  2) Section 4.1  • Remove new Note 3  3) Section 4.1.3.3  • Remove the proposed change, and add one more statement at the end of the paragraph: “In addition, NR-DC may also be used when the UE is connected to a single gNB, acting as both MN and SN, and configuring both MCG and SCG” |
| vivo | Yes | We think the use case is valid, and the clarification is thus needed. If it is going to have some changes, then we prefer the clarifications proposed by Qualcomm to be added in Section 4.1.3.3. |
| Samsung | No, but | Our understanding is that the current specifiation does not limit the network implementation as usual. Moreover, the concerned scenario would be transparet to UE. However, if the majority want to clarify this, then we are fine with this. |
| ZTE | Yes | Proponent.  We think this scenario should be supported by network implementation, thus it is better to make it clear in spec, so people won’t consider it as an invalid case. We can update the CR based on the received comments (for phase II discussion).  Regarding the category of CR, the previous description in TS 37.340 does not seem to support this scenario, so we think it is appropriate to use Cat F for correction. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | See comments | We understand the intent to allow network configuring a UE with intra-DU cells working as NR-DC instead of NR CA. However, we feel the issue should be discussed and confirmed in RAN3, considering there is no impact on RAN2 stage3 specifications, but there may be limitation on CU-DU interface, e.g. F1AP. So it would be safer to let RAN3 confirm first. |
| Ericsson | No | We agree with Samsung and Huawei that from RAN2 point of view this is a network implementation option, with no impact on UE. Thus we think there is no need to mention this special case in the specifications. From UE point of view, as the CR also points out, “it is transparent to UE whether the cells configured for NR-DC are deployed in the same DU or not”, so UEs are not affected. |
| OPPO | No | Agree with Ericsson. |
| CATT | Netural | We are wondering whether the refered case “for a given band combination, some UEs may only support NR-DC operation, but not support NR CA for the same BC (e.g. FR1+FR2)”exist. |
| Apple | Neutral | We also understand this has no UE impact, but ok to go with majority. |
| Futurewei | No | Agree with the comments from companies above. CU/DU is transparent to UE at RAN. It should be discussed and determined in RAN3. |
| MediaTek | Neutral | Intetion is fine but also not eseential. Anyway, no UE imapct. |
| ZTE (37.340 rapporteur) | Yes, with QC suggestions | I guess the comments from Qualcomm make sense.  We could fix the Reason for Change in the cover page and also live without Note3 in section 4.1.  But in particular I support the proposal for the alternative change in section 4.1.3.3, copied below:  NG-RAN supports NR-NR Dual Connectivity (NR-DC), in which a UE is connected to one gNB that acts as a MN and another gNB that acts as a SN. In addition, NR-DC can also be used when a UE is connected to a single gNB, acting both as a MN and as a SN, and configuring both MCG and SCG~~two gNB-DUs, one serving the MCG and the other serving the SCG, connected to the same gNB-CU, acting both as a MN and as a SN~~.  This would remove the only reference to the disaggregated case, which was not supposed to be described in 37.340 (as Note 2 of 4.1.1 says, and as Qualcomm pointed out). When adding the description for NR-DC, the current wording - referring to the disaggregated case - was introduced to cover the single gNB case. But the way it was done, not covering the same gNB-DU case, created the inconsistency that this CR aims to remove.  So I would definitely support to go for the Qualcomm suggested text, which is how this should have been covered from the very beginning and which would now solve two problems at once (remove the inconsistency mentioned in the CR and remove any description for the disaggregated case). |

**Summary:** Yes(3), Maybe(5), No(4). Most copmanies seemed to consider that this has no UE impact as this is transparent to UE being a one network implementation option. One company was not sure if this behaviour is actually allowed by RAN3. From email rapporteur viewpoint as this behaviour is not going to be captured in stage-3 it might be better to ensure that there is no debate this use case is possible by NW implementation.

**Proposal:** Capture support for NR-DC within same DU. Discuss the wording based on last comment from ZTE.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Nokia | We are OK to have CR with changes as expressed by ZTE (last comment) as it is not so clear currently whether NR-DC within same DU is possible. |
| Qualcomm | We agree the CR with modification (ZTE’s last comment) |
|  |  |
|  |  |

[R2-2101479](file:///C:\Users\terhentt\Documents\Tdocs\RAN2\RAN2_113-e\R2-2101479.zip) Corrections on UL power sharing Huawei, HiSilicon, ZTE Corporation (rapporteur) CR Rel-16 37.340 16.4.0 0248 - F NR\_newRAT-Core, LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

[R2-2101728](file:///C:\Users\terhentt\Documents\Tdocs\RAN2\RAN2_113-e\R2-2101728.zip) Corrections on UL power sharing vivo CR Rel-16 37.340 16.4.0 0250 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

Two above papers Want to ensure that all MR-DC arcthitecture options are covered by stage-2 power sharing. :

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Need for CR | Comments |
| Nokia | Yes | We think it is good to ensure stage-2 is covering all architecture options. We have preference to Huawei style of capturing the changes as in our view it is easier to read and understand. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | We also prefer Huawei’s version. |
| Vivo | Yes | We support CR 1728, and the reasons are:   1. **power control and power sharing have different meaning in RAN1 spec.** According to TS 38.213, dynamic power sharing can be find for all MR-DC strucuture, while it is failed to find any semi-static power sharing descriptions for (NG)EN-DC and NE-DC but only for NR-DC. For (NG)EN-DC and NE-DC, it is stated in TS 38.213 that if dynamic power sharing is not configured, then power control is performed per CG independtly based on the corresponding configured max power which is splited from the max power of the UE. From this context, power control and power sharing have different meaning. We can understand that from RAN2 perspective, independent power control per CG based on split power can be regarded as a kind of power sharing to some extent (that is, share the total power of the UE). However, it is not consistent with RAN1 spec perfectly and may cause some confusion.   **NR-DC semi-static power sharing:** For NR-DC semi-static power sharing, the following is stated in TS 38.213, which means the max power per CG is not via configuration totally, but given by [8-3, TS 38.101-3] andmay exceed the configured one of MCG or SCG in this case.  *“otherwise, the UE determines a power for the transmission on MCG or the SCG overlapping with slot , as described in [8-3, TS 38.101-3] and in Clauses 7.1 through 7.5 without considering or , respectively”*  In short, dynamic PS is supported for all MR-DC structure, while semi-static PS is only supported for NR-DC. And for NR-DC semi-static power sharing, the max power per CG is not only depended on configuration. |
| Samsung | Yes | R2-2101479 seems better. |
| ZTE | Yes | Proponent of R2-2101479.  In addition, the corresponding Rel-15 CR (R2-2101478) is discussed under offline[001], better to make sure they are handled consistently.  [R2-2101478](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_113-e\Docs\R2-2101478.zip) Corrections on UL power sharing Huawei, HiSilicon, ZTE Corpoation (rapporteur) CR Rel-15 37.340 15.11.0 0247 - F NR\_newRAT-Core |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Proponent of R2-2101479  In response to vivo’s comment, it is true in RAN1 spec the name of semi-static power control of EN-DC and NE-DC is not explictly indicated, however the handling is the same which is the max power is splitted statically via RRC configuration. Since the stage 2 specification is used to give an overview of the functionalities, we feel it would be enough to have a generic description without enumerating all details. |
| Ericsson | Yes, with comment | We agree we to cover all architecture options in the stage-2 description. We prefer the formulation in R2-2101479, but we could clarify that semi-static is supported only for NR-DC. |
| OPPO | No stronge view | I wonder if it is a noremal case that stage 2 spec refers to stage 3 sepc before?  I also wonder if SUO (single uplink operation) should also be mentioned for (NG)EN-DC and NE-DC for power sharing description?? |
| CATT | Yes | we are wondering whether the semi-static PS applied to (NG)EN-DC and NR-DC case. If it is true, we think R2-2101728 is better. |
| Apple | Yes | We prefer the version in R2-2101479 |
| Futurewei | Yes | Prefer the changes suggested by R2-2101479 |
| MediaTek | No strong view | It is fine to have high level description fro power sharing and we prefer Huawei’s version. |

**Summary:** R2-2101728 (2), R2-2101479 (9). Basically all the companies agreed to capture all architecture options in the NR DC power control stage-2 description.

**Proposal:** Proceed with R2-2101479 as baseline. Consider whether we need some additional updates e.g. semi-static is supported only for NR-DC.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Nokia | We are fine with R2-2101479 as such but OK to discuss any additional updates |
| Qualcomm | Agree to take R2-2101479 as baseline. We can further discuss its wording in phase 2. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 2.2 Fast SCell activation

### 2.2.1 TCI state corrections

By email [220] (1)

TCI state corrections:

[R2-2101747](file:///C:\Users\terhentt\Documents\Tdocs\RAN2\RAN2_113-e\R2-2101747.zip) Correction on tci-PresentInDCI ASUSTeK CR Rel-16 38.331 16.3.1 2436 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

* Revised in [R2-2101942](file:///C:\Users\terhentt\Documents\Tdocs\RAN2\RAN2_113-e\R2-2101942.zip)

[R2-2101942](file:///C:\Users\terhentt\Documents\Tdocs\RAN2\RAN2_113-e\R2-2101942.zip) Correction on tci-PresentInDCI ASUSTeK CR Rel-16 38.331 16.3.1 2436 1 F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core [R2-2101747](file:///C:\Users\terhentt\Documents\Tdocs\RAN2\RAN2_113-e\R2-2101747.zip)

The paper indicates that According to TS 38.331, in case of cross carrier scheduling, the network sets tci-PresentInDCI field to enabled for the ControlResourceSet used for cross carrier scheduling in the scheduling cell, whose constraint was introduced in Rel-15.

But in Rel-16 MR-DC above constraint was removed with the introdcution of enableDefaultBeamForCSS and the network is allowed to set tci-PresentInDCI field to disabled in the concerned case if enableDefaultBeamForCSS is configured. Therefore it is proposed to remove the constraint in TS 38.331 to avoid contradiction or confusion.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Need for CR | Comments |
| Nokia | Yes | This seems to be valid observations and good to correct to avoid IOT problems in future. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Same understanding as Nokia |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes but | The sentence proposed to be removed is still true that when enableDefaultBeamForCCS is not confgured for the scheduled cell. Therefore, we should add an extra condition instead of removing the whole sentence. |
| Ericsson | Yes, with comment | Agree with Huawei and there is a typo in the cover sheet, it should be *enableDefaultBeamForCCS* |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| ASUSTeK | Yes (Proponent) | Though we think it would be simpler to remove the concerned sentence, we would be fine with Huawei‘s edit as well. We would update the typo in the cover sheet after the TP is settled. |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes with comment | Simialr view as Huawei. We prefer to keep original sentence and add additional clarification that this constrain only applicable while “if *enableDefaultBeamForCSS* is not configured” |

**Summary:** Yes (all), Many companies support Huawei changes.

**Proposal:** Agree on the R2-21011942 with changes proposed by Huawei and coversheet typo noted by Ericsson. Also MediaTek update seems appropriate.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Nokia | We are OK to have CR with changes from Huawei, Ericsson and Mediatek |
| Qualcomm | Agree change suggested by MediaTek |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### 2.2.1 Miscellaneous EMR corrections

By Email [220] (3)

*Miscellaneous EMR corrections:*

[R2-2101570](file:///C:\Users\terhentt\Documents\Tdocs\RAN2\RAN2_113-e\R2-2101570.zip) Clarification on sCellState configuration upon SCell modification ZTE Corporation, Sanechips CR Rel-16 38.331 16.3.1 2422 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

*(moved from 6.8.3)*

The CR states: In Rel-16, SCell can be directly activated upon SCell configuration (i.e. including sCellState in RRCReconfiguration message) in case of SCell addition, reconfiguration with sync, and resuming an RRC connection. However, in the current procedure text in section 5.3.5.5.9, upon SCell modification, the UE shall check whether the sCellState is included only in case of configuration of SCG SCells in RRC resume, but not for other cases where sCellState may be included in the SCell configuration as well, e.g. MCG SCells in RRC resume and SCells in reconfiguration with sync

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Need for CR | Comments |
| Nokia | Yes | CR has valid observations and proposed corrrection seems tob e corrrct. Best to agree to avoid any debate in future which cases are supported for direct activation. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | We agree the issues and CR |
| vivo | Yes | We agree the CR. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes | Proponent |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes and | The issue is actually worse than what the "consequence if not approved" says: the specification without the change means that the Rel-16 UE in a Rel-15 network will not deactivate SCells at reconfiguration wit sync, while the network thinks they are deactivated. This can cause unnecessary UE power consumption and perhaps even functional issues. |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes | We agree this CR. |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| ASUSTeK | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes, but need some modification | The current change in CR R2-2101570 is not complete, since it do not cover the EN-DC or NR-DC PSCell change case. |
| Apple | Yes | Correction is needed |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |

**Summary:** Yes (all), CR coversheet is proposed to reflect consequences in more detailed way as

**Proposal:** Agree on the R2-2101570 CR with possible changes based on Huawei and CATT comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Nokia | We are OK to have CR as such. We are not sure about Huawei and CATT comments. But fine to consider those as well. |
| Qualcomm | Yes, and we don’t see need to further discuss Huawei and CATT’s comments:   * For Huawei’s comment, we don’t understand as well, and Huawei seemsed to point to a wrong “consequence if not approved“. We don’t see any issue of the current one:   *“The UE can not directly activate MCG SCells in RRC resume and SCells in reconfiguration with sync upon SCell modification.”*   * For CATT’s cmment, we don’t agree. In cover page, it has indicated:   Impacted 5G architecture options:  NR SA, NR-DC, (NG)EN-DC  And this CR is aligned with RAN2 agreement. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

[R2-2100303](file:///C:\\Users\\terhentt\\Documents\\Tdocs\\RAN2\\RAN2_113-e\\R2-2100303.zip) Corrections on condition of idle-inactive measurement configuration update OPPO CR Rel-16 38.331 16.3.1 2318 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

CR states: If the RRCRelease message with/without suspendConfig was received in response to an RRCResumeRequest or an RRCResumeRequest1, the measIdleConfig IE can be also included in the RRCRelease message. In this case, the UE may also need to update the idle measurement configuration according to the SIB11/4 immediately. But idle measurement configuration update is missing for the case of “from RRC\_INACTIVE to RRC\_INACTIVE/RRC\_IDLE”.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Need for CR | Comments |
| Nokia | Possibly | Intention seems to be OK but we are not sure if change would cover also RRC\_INACTIVE -> RRC\_INACTIVE case as that probably cannot be considered as “entering“ state when one is already in corresponding state. Secondly we wonder if there is need to change anything as UE will monitoring SIB changes during the access procedure and thus second bullet (one below the proposed change) would triggert he procedure as well. |
| Qualcomm | No | We agree with Nokia that 2nd bullet has covered the cases of RRC\_INACTIVE ->RRC\_INACTIVE and RRC\_INACTIVE ->RRC\_IDLE. |
| vivo | Yes | For the case “from RRC\_INACTIVE to RRC\_INACTIVE/RRC\_IDLE”, it is possible for the UE to receive the idle/inactive measurement configuration in RRCRelease message, and we understand this case is not covered by the second bullet, that is, *upon update of system information (SIB4, or SIB11), e.g. due to intra-RAT cell (re)selection;*  We wonder if the CR is not agreed, whether it will enforce the NW or the UE behaviour when idle/inactive measurement configuration in received in RRCRelease message in this case. |
| Samsung | No | We have some sympathy with the intention. However, it will work as Nokia pointed out. |
| ZTE | Yes | We think the intention is correct, and the modification looks clear and correct.  We’d better not rely on the second bullet to hint that “INACTIVE to INACTIVE/IDLE is supported, the readability is poor. And when people read the first bullet, they may get confused on whether “INACTIVE to INACTIVE/IDLE” is really supported or not.  But there is a typo in the CR, “RRC-INACTIVE“ should be changed to “RRC\_INACTIVE“. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes, because (unlike what Nokia commented) | The UE in RRC\_INACTIVE sending RNA update can receive an RRCRelease with measIdleConfig and measIdleCarrierListNR which is different from the previous UE configuation, in this case the UE must apply the configuration procedure even if SIB is still the same, e.g to get SSB information for newly added NR carriers.  Agree that a correction is needed but the wording is unclear, it makes no sense to "enter RRC\_INACTIVE from RRC\_INACTIVE, we need to find anther wording. |
| Ericsson | Yes | We agree the intention, it is better to make it clear, even if it may work also with current second bullet as pointed out by Nokia. In that sense we can regard this a minor clarification without interoperability issues, and it could be covered in the rapporteur CR.  Regarding the wording, we are fine to keep current formulation in the CR, since also the current description in 5.3.8.3 mentions:  „… transit a UE in RRC\_INACTIVE back to RRC\_INACTIVE when the UE tries to resume; …“  And in the procedural text mentions:  2> enter RRC\_INACTIVE and perform cell selection as specified in TS 38.304 [20]; |
| LG | No | We also understan1d the intention of this CR, but we agree with Nokia that the second bullet includes the case of state change from RRC\_INACTIVE, as the UE performs cell selection upon receiving *RRCRelease* msg.  By the way, an editorial change seems to be needed in the sentence – “RRC-INACTIVE“ should be “RRC\_INACTIVE“. |
| OPPO | Yes | @huawei:  In RRC resume procedure, there are 2 step procduer and 3 step procedure. In 2 step proceure, the UE may entere RRC\_INACTIVE/IDLE from RRC\_INACTIVE, e.g. periodical RNA update.  In 2 step RRC resume procedure, the netowrk may configure early measurment configuration in RRCRelease message. However the case is missing in the text in section :5.7.8.1 Measurement configuration.  @Nokia, QC, Samsung, LG:  The below bullets are define the occasion to update the configuration. The first bullet is for the case that UE get the part configuration from RRCReleaseand update to get the whole configuration. The second bullet is for the case when system update in serving cell or cell reselection. They are for different cases.  If you think „from RRC\_INACTIVE to RRC\_INACTIVE/IDLE“ can be omiited and relay on second bullet, i think the first bullet can also be removed and the second bullet should also be revised to cover all cases.  ===========  The UE initiates this procedure while T331 is running and one of the following conditions is met:  1> upon selecting a cell when entering RRC\_IDLE or RRC-INACTIVE from RRC\_CONNECTED or RRC-INACTIVE; or  1> upon update of system information (*SIB4*, or *SIB11*), e.g. due to intra-RAT cell (re)selection; |
| ASUSTeK | Yes | We agree with Ericsson. And it should be “RRC\_INACTIVE“. |
| CATT | Yes | Share the similar view with ZTE. |
| Apple | Yes | Same views as Ericsson |
| Futurewei | Yes | Agree on the views from ZTE, Huawei and Ericsson. |
| MediaTek | Maybe | Intention is fine but see no strong need to have it. We don’t think UE will have wrong implementation. If majorties prefer to have it, it may just merge with DCCA Rapporteur’s CR. |

**Summary:** Yes (9), No (3), Maybe (2). Generally most companies (even some saying No) think proposed UE behaviour is correct and intended. There are some comments that maybe existing bullet already ensures this behaviour but rapporteur (and most companies) considers that it would be best to ensure there is no ambiquity in the case UE intitiates procedure from RRC\_INACTIVE.

Regarding wording in the CR it is not clear whether entering RRC\_INACTIVE covers also the case RRC\_INACTIVE to RRC\_INACTIVE. It seems we have this sort of wording already in other locations (e.g. update of system information. It seems quite many companies considers this to be the case.

**Proposal:**  Agree on the change in R2-2100303 and as it seems this is considered by companies editorial (no change to UE behaviour) it is proposed to capture this in rapporteur CR

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Qualcomm | We agree it can be included in rapporteur CR |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

.

[R2-2100304](file:///C:\Users\terhentt\Documents\Tdocs\RAN2\RAN2_113-e\R2-2100304.zip) Clarification on carrier frequency in MeasIdleConfigSIB OPPO CR Rel-16 38.331 16.3.1 2319 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

CR states: In RAN2#107 meeting, RAN2 make a agreement as below and common understanding is that only async SSB is configured in SIB11. But the spec is not clear.

The legacy SSB measurement configurations in NR SIB2/4 and LTE SIB24 are reused for NR early measurements performed in frequencies which are candidates of cell selection/reselection, i.e. not introduce new measurement configurations in NR/LTE SIB for these SSBs.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Need for CR | Comments |
| Nokia | No | This seems tob e purely editorial (thus category wrong) and thus we do not really see need fort he CR.. |
| Qualcomm | No | We don’t agree with the change. The proposed statement is a wrong understanding: SSB in sync raster can also be included in new SIB (SIB11), if this SSB is not for cell reselection purpose (i.e. SSB in non-overlapping carrier can also be in sync raster). |
| vivo | No | Agree with Qualcomm. |
| Samsung | No | Same view as Nokia. |
| ZTE | No | Same view as Qualcomm. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | Same view as Qualcomm. |
| Ericsson | No | Same view as Qualcomm. |
| LG | No | Same understanding with Qualcom. |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| ASUSTeK | No |  |
| CATT | No | Same view as Qualcomm. |
| Apple | No | The restriction on only using non-sync raster is not correct |
| Futurewei | No |  |
| MediaTek | No |  |

**Summary:** No (13), Yes (1). And many companies agree with Qualcomm that actual change is incorrect „The proposed statement is a wrong understanding: SSB in sync raster can also be included in new SIB (SIB11), if this SSB is not for cell reselection purpose (i.e. SSB in non-overlapping carrier can also be in sync raster).“

**Proposal: Not agree R2-2100304**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### 2.2.1 BWP related corrections

By Email [220] (3)

*BWP-related corrections:*

[R2-2100305](file:///C:\\Users\\terhentt\\Documents\\Tdocs\\RAN2\\RAN2_113-e\\R2-2100305.zip) Clarification on UE behaviour due to entering dormant BWP OPPO CR Rel-16 38.321 16.3.0 1011 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

CR states: When entering dormant BWP, the UE stay the current UL BWP, but stop some UL behaviour. But the current spec has misleading word. “a BWP” here only means DL dormant BWP, and “the BWP” is also mean “a BWP”. However, when entering dormant BWP, the UE stop UL behaviour one the current active UL BWP.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Need for CR | Comments |
| Nokia | No | We do not identify ambiquity in the existing text and thus see no need fort he change.. |
| Qualcomm | No | We think the current spec is clear: „A BWP is activated“ means a pair of BWP of UL and DL.  In addition, the reason for change seems to also have issue: it is only for FDD system. RAN2 has agreed:   * RAN2 confirm that, for TDD, the first non-dormant UL BWP is the UL BWP with the same ID as the first non-dormant DL BWP (no change to today, wrt BWP switching). |
| vivo | No | The current spec is clear enough to us. And we agree with QC that the setence “if a BWP is activated and the active DL BWP for the Serving Cell is dormant BWP“ means a activated BWP shall include the DL BWP and UL BWP pair. |
| Samsung | No | The current spec is already clear since we don’t touch the UL BWP when DL BWP is switched to dormant BWP. There would be no problem with the fact that “The BWP” indicates the UL BWP. |
| ZTE | No |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | We understand the intention is to differentiate the UL BWP and DL BWP, however it is in this way from Rel-15, e.g. for deactivated BWP, and seems no misunderstanding. |
| Ericsson | No | We don’t see an issue with the current wording. |
| LG | No | We have same understanding with QC and vivo. The text was specified considering with both downlink and uplink BWP. |
| OPPO | Yes | @QC  For FDD case, the DL BWP id and UP BWP id will not be paired and linked. |
| ASUSTeK | No |  |
| CATT | No |  |
| Apple | No | The spec intends for both UL and DL BWPs |
| Futurewei | No |  |
| MediaTek | No |  |

**Summary:** No (13), Yes(1)

**Proposal: Not agree R2-2100305**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

[R2-2101500](file:///C:\Users\terhentt\Documents\Tdocs\RAN2\RAN2_113-e\R2-2101500.zip) Correction on BWP operation Samsung CR Rel-16 38.321 16.3.0 1036 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

CR states: According to the current specification, UE does not monitor the PDCCH for the BWP if a BWP is activated and the active DL BWP for the Serving Cell is dormant BWP.

However, for dormant BWP, UE should monitor the PDCCH for the BWP to leave dormant BWP based on instruction from PDCCH as specified in TS 38.213.

Moreover, whether to monitor the PDCCH for the BWP would not be specified as shown in the procedural text for activated BWP or deactivated BWP.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Need for CR | Comments |
| Nokia | Possibly | If we understand correctly Samsung is saying that the cross carrier scheduling for the dormant BWP should be allowed to activate another BWP through DCI. However, is the BWP switch is regarded as „PDCCH monitoring for the BWP“?  Secondly , if the change would be agreed, what should the UE do if NW indicates a DL assignment for the dormant BWP through X-scheduling? |
| Qualcomm | No | The deleted statement is for cross-scheduling case, which has RAN2 agreement:   * UE will not monitor the PDCCH for the Scell (i.e. for cross-carrier scheduling) when the scheduled SCell is in dormancy.   In additon, as propoent mentioned, how the UE performs PDCCH monitoring to leave dormant BWP is specifed in 38.213. Thus, we don‘t think the concerned statement will cause confusion. |
| vivo | No | We don’t think “Not monitor the PDCCH for the dormant BWP“ means the UE should not monitor the PDCCH for BWP switching. |
| Samsung | Yes (Proponent) | We are not considering the cross-scheduling case since the network cannot cross-schedule UE and it is very clear for UE to be unable to monitor PDCCH for cross-scheduling on dormant BWP due to the absence of PDCCH-config for dormant DL BWP.  Our intention is that UE should monitor PDCCH indicating the dormancy of a dormant DL BWP of a Scell(or a Scell group) to leave dormant BWP according to 38.213. How could UE leave dormant BWP based on PDCCH indication if UE does not monitor PDCCH for the dormant BWP??  We need to note that for BWP, we don’t specify cross-scheduling behavior (i.e. we have no action such as “monitor the PDCCH for the BWP“ unlike Scell as follows:  Section 5.15 in 38.321.  For each activated Serving Cell configured with a BWP, the MAC entity shall:  1> if a BWP is activated and the active DL BWP for the Serving Cell is not the dormant BWP:  2> transmit on UL-SCH on the BWP;  2> transmit on RACH on the BWP, if PRACH occasions are configured;  2> monitor the PDCCH on the BWP;  ...  1> if a BWP is activated and the active DL BWP for the Serving Cell is dormant BWP:  2> stop the *bwp-InactivityTimer* of this Serving Cell, if running.  2> not monitor the PDCCH on the BWP;  2> not monitor the PDCCH for the BWP;  ...  1> if a BWP is deactivated:  2> not transmit on UL-SCH on the BWP;  2> not transmit on RACH on the BWP;  2> not monitor the PDCCH on the BWP;  ...  Section 5.9 in 38.321  The MAC entity shall for each configured SCell:  1> if an SCell is configured with *sCellState* set to *activated* upon SCell configuration, or an SCell Activation/Deactivation MAC CE is received activating the SCell:  2> if the SCell was deactivated prior to receiving this SCell Activation/Deactivation MAC CE; or  2> if the SCell is configured with *sCellState* set to *activated* upon SCell configuration:  3> if *firstActiveDownlinkBWP-Id* is not set to dormant BWP:  4> activate the SCell according to the timing defined in TS 38.213 [6] for MAC CE activation and according to the timing defined in TS 38.133 [11] for direct SCell activation; i.e. apply normal SCell operation including:  5> SRS transmissions on the SCell;  5> CSI reporting for the SCell;  5> PDCCH monitoring on the SCell;  5> PDCCH monitoring for the SCell;  5> PUCCH transmissions on the SCell, if configured.  ...  1> if the SCell is deactivated:  2> not transmit SRS on the SCell;  2> not report CSI for the SCell;  2> not transmit on UL-SCH on the SCell;  2> not transmit on RACH on the SCell;  2> not monitor the PDCCH on the SCell;  2> not monitor the PDCCH for the SCell;  2> not transmit PUCCH on the SCell.  If we want to specify cross-scheduling behavior for the BWP, then we think that we should add “monitor the PDCCH for the BWP“ to the activated BWP description and add““not monitor the PDCCH for the BWP“ to the deactivated BWP description. However, our understanding is that these were not added intentionally because it would not be correct in case of legacy BWP switching indicating target BWP. |
| ZTE | No | Tend to agree with Qualcomm that the deleted sentence is referring to cross-carrier scheduling case. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes, but | We agree with Qualcomm the sentence is for cross-carrier scheduling in the first place. However:  - in 5.9, when the SCell is deactivated, the way cross -carrier scheduling is addressed is to specify that the UE shall not monitor PDCCH "for the SCell", so we think it is better to use the same wording  - it could in fact be misunderstood as applying to the DCI on SpCell not for scheduling but to switch to non-dormant BWP.  This could be addressed with one of the following two alternatives:  Alt 1. 2> not monitor the PDCCH for ~~the BWP~~cross-carrier schedulling of the serving cell;  Alt 2. 2> not monitor the PDCCH for the ~~BWPs~~erving cell, except the DCI indicating dormant BWP to non-dormant BWP switching; |
| Ericsson | No | We agree with Qualcomm that the sentence is referring to cross-carrier scheduling. We don’t think that BWP switch is regarded as "PDCCH monitoring for the BWP". The DCI concerns the PCell, and just points to the SCell BWP switching in that case. |
| LG | No | The intention of the sentence is to prevent PDCCH monitoring for cross-carrier scheduling. We think this sentence is correct and the change is not needed. |
| OPPO | No | Share the same view with QC. |
| ASUSTeK | No | We agree with Qualcomm and Ericsson. It is clear from PHY spec that only **PDCCH for PCell** could indicate dormancy. Therefore the existing MAC spec is correct and the change is not needed. |
| CATT | No | We agree with Qualcomm that the deleted statement is for cross-scheduling case and this is the agreement in RAN2. |
| Apple | No | We think 38.213 is clear. But if companies think a change is needed, then something like what Huawei mentioned can be considered. |
| Futurewei | Yes, but | Has sympathy on the motivation of the change. But if companies agree the motivation, it would be better to make the change clear that for dormant BWP, the UE does not monitoring the PDCCH not on the dormant BWP for the cross carrier scheduling. It is not including the DCI for activation of the dormant BWP. Consider something like:  2> not monitor the other PDCCH for ~~the BWP~~cross-carrier schedulling with the BWP |
| MediaTek | Maybe | We also understnad the text is refer to cross-carrier scheudling and we would NOT bind the BWP switch with „PDCCH monitoring for the BWP“.  However, we also agree with Samsung that the „not monitor the PDCCH for the BWP“ does not appear in deactivate BWP, where it is clear that cross-carrier scheudling is not allowed either. Indeed, there is some room to improve this if majorities prefer. Maybe Huawei wording could be considered.  In summary, we don’t see strong need to have it as no UE implemeantion will misuderstand this. |

**Summary:** No (9), Yes (3), Maybe (2). Quite many companies think nothing is needed as they consider that BWP switch is not regarded as "PDCCH monitoring for the BWP". There were some support to ensure that BWP switch is not outruled by modifyin the sentence e.g. by “2> not monitor the PDCCH for the BWPcross-carrier schedulling of the serving cell;“. All the companies anyway seem to agree that BWP switch is allowed tob e received from another carrier. As the majority seem to think this is obvious already it is proposed merely to capture in the chairman minutes that this is allowed.l

**Proposal:** Capture in chairman minutes that BWP switch is allowed to be sent from another carrier

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Qualcomm | The wording of RAN2 understanding suggested by Rapporteur seems to be too general. We suggest below wording change based on Huawei’s Alt-1:  “RAN2 understand that in dormant BWP, the UE does not monitor the PDCCH for the cross-carrier schedulling of the serving cell“  Although we don’t see strong need, if majority agree, we are fine to capture Huawei’s Alt-1 in SPEC in rapporteur CR as text enhancement. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

[R2-2101017](file:///C:\Users\terhentt\Documents\Tdocs\RAN2\RAN2_113-e\R2-2101017.zip) Correction on first active uplink BWP vivo CR Rel-16 38.331 16.3.1 2375 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

CR states: The field description of firstActiveUplinkBWP-Id states that “If configured for an SCell, this field contains the ID of the uplink bandwidth part to be used upon MAC-activation of an SCell.”.

However, according to the TS 38.321, if an SCell is configured with sCellState set to activated upon SCell configuration, the MAC entity shall activate the DL BWP and UL BWP indicated by firstActiveDownlinkBWP-Id and firstActiveUplinkBWP-Id respectively. It means firstActiveUplinkBWP-Id also indicate the UL BWP to be used upon activation of an SCell via RRC configuration.

Given above, the current description of firstActiveUplinkBWP-Id is not right..

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Need for CR | Comments |
| Nokia | Yes | It is also our understanding that *firstActivbeXXXBWP-Id* is supposed to be used for direct Scell activation |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Same understanding as Nokia |
| vivo | Yes | Agree with that *firstActivbeXXXBWP-Id* can be used upon direct Scell activation via RRC. |
| Samsung | Yes | Agree. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes but | The change is ok but this is editorial, should not go in a separate CR. |
| Ericsson | Yes | Agree with the change. Since it is a minor clarification without interoperability issues, this could be added to rapporteur CR. |
| LG | Yes | firstActiveDownlinkBWP-Id and firstActiveUplinkBWP-Id can be used not only upon MAC activation but also upon direct SCell activation via RRC. |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| ASUSTeK | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes | Same understanding as Nokia |
| Apple | Yes | Agree with Nokia |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes | But seems a minor clarification and should put in DCCA Rapp’s CR. |

**Summary:** All the companies support the change. Several companies propose to capture this in rapporteur CR as this is rather minor CR.

**Proposal:** Capture proposed change from R2-2101017 in rapporteur CR

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Qualcomm | Yes |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 3 Conclusion

* Initial deadline (for rapporteur’s summary in R2-2101966): 1st week Fri, UTC 09:00

# 4 Contact Information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Email |
| Nokia | [jarkko.t.koskela@nokia.com](mailto:jarkko.t.koskela@nokia.com) |
| Qualcomm | [chengp@qti.qualcomm.com](mailto:chengp@qti.qualcomm.com) |
| vivo | [wenjuan.pu@vivo.com](mailto:wenjuan.pu@vivo.com) |
| Samsung | [s\_dg.kim@samsung.com](mailto:s_dg.kim@samsung.com) |
| ZTE | [liu.jing30@zte.com.cn](mailto:liu.jing30@zte.com.cn) |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [wangrui46@huawei.com](mailto:wangrui46@huawei.com) |
| Ericsson | [stefan.wager@ericsson.com](mailto:stefan.wager@ericsson.com) |
| LG | [aidoy.lee@lge.com](mailto:aidoy.lee@lge.com) |
| OPPO | wangshukun@oppo.com |
| ASUSTeK | [Erica\_Huang@asus.com](mailto:Erica_Huang@asus.com) |
| CATT | liangjing@catt.cn |
| Futurewei | Jialinzou88@yahoo.com |
| ZTE (37.340 rapporteur) | [sergio.parolari@zte.com.cn](mailto:sergio.parolari@zte.com.cn) |