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# 1 Introduction

This document is the report of the following email discussion:

* [AT114-e][018][NR16] MAC III (Nokia)

Scope: Treat R2-2104724, R2-2105231, R2-2105865, R2-2105232, R2-2105749, R2-2106031, R2-2106321, R2-2105851

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

Intended outcome: Report and Agreed CRs.

Deadline: Schedule A

# 2 Contact Points

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | Email Address |
| Nokia (Rapporteur) | Chunli Wu | Chunli.wu@nokia-sbell.com |
| Qualcomm | Linhai He | linhaihe@qti.qualcomm.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Discussion

NR-U

[R2-2104724](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_114-e\Docs\R2-2104724.zip) LS on SCell activation requirements for NR-U (R4-2105699; contact: Nokia) RAN4 LS in Rel-16 NR\_unlic-Core To:RAN2

Moved here

[R2-2105231](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_114-e\Docs\R2-2105231.zip) Analysis on SCell activation/deactivation requirements for NR-U Huawei, HiSilicon discussion Rel-16 NR\_unlic-Core

No action is required from the RAN4 LS R2-2104724, which also stated in the contribution R2-2105231 “Proposal 1: The RAN4 LS on SCell activation requirements for NR-U has no explicit impacts to RAN2 specs.” Rapporteur propose to note the LS.

**Question 1**: Do companies agree there is no impact to RAN2 from the RAN4 LS and the LS can be noted?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answers to Question 1 | | |
| Company | Yes/No | Technical Arguments |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 1**: TBD.

**Proposal 1**: TBD.

The following proposal is proposed in R2-2105231 for *sCellDeactivationTimer* handling in MAC:

**“Proposal 2: If an SCell Activation/Deactivation MAC CE is received deactivating the SCell configured with shared spectrum channel access, UE may stop the *sCellDeactivationTimer* associated with the SCell after the HARQ feedback for the SCell deactivation MAC CE is successfully transmitted. ”**

**Question 2**: Do companies think the change proposed in proposal 2 in R2-2105231 is needed?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answers to Question 2 | | |
| Company | Yes/No | Technical Arguments |
| Qualcomm | No | The problem described in the paper could happen in theory but it should be a rare event. Even if LBT failure persists for a very long time, it is likely that RLF will be triggered. Lastly, the proposed solution itself is not completely fault proof either, e.g. in the case where there is persistent HARQ feedback failure. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 2**: TBD.

**Proposal 2**: TBD.

[R2-2105865](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_114-e\Docs\R2-2105865.zip) Clarification on prioritization of retransmission over initial transmission for HARQ PID selection in NR-U Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell CR Rel-16 38.321 16.4.0 1115 - F NR\_unlic-Core

R2-2105865 proposed to clarify that the UE shall prioritize retransmissions before initial transmissions is only applicable to HARQ PID selection but not for intra-UE prioritization for multiple UL grants, since there has been some different understandings in the context of I-IoT discussions:

|  |
| --- |
| For configured uplink grants configured with *cg-RetransmissionTimer*, the UE implementation selects an HARQ Process ID among the HARQ process IDs available for the configured grant configuration. For HARQ Process ID selection, the UE shall prioritize retransmissions before initial transmissions. The UE shall toggle the NDI in the CG-UCI for new transmissions and not toggle the NDI in the CG-UCI in retransmissions. |

**Question 3**: Do companies agree with the issue and if yes, are the suggested changes fine or does the text need to be improved / corrected ?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answers to Question 3 | | |
| Company | Yes/No | Technical Arguments |
| Qualcomm | No | We do not think the reasons for change is correct. The agreement was for grant selection. Moreover, we do not think there is HARQ PID selection for retransmission. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 3**: TBD.

**Proposal 3**: TBD.

Secondary DRX

[R2-2105232](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_114-e\Docs\R2-2105232.zip) Clarification on secondary DRX group Samsung CR Rel-16 38.321 16.4.0 1104 - F TEI16

R2-2105232 proposed to remove “associated” drx-onDurationTimer and specify in MAC “secondary DRX group is not configured, when DCP monitoring is configured”. Note that the restriction has already captured in RRC:

|  |
| --- |
| ***drx-ConfigSecondaryGroup***  Used to configure DRX related parameters for the second DRX group as specified in TS 38.321 [3]. The network does not configure secondary DRX group with DCP simultaneously nor secondary DRX group with a dormant BWP simultaneously. |

**Question 4**: Do companies agree with the issue and if yes, are the suggested changes fine or does the text need to be improved / corrected ?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answers to Question 4 | | |
| Company | Yes/No | Technical Arguments |
| Qualcomm | No | We do not think #1 change is correct. Each DCP occasion has an associated on duration timer, which is the first instance of on duration timer after a DCP. That's why "associated" is used in the current text.  We do not think #2 change is not necessary. This restriction is already captured in the field description of drx-ConfigSecondaryGroup in 331. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 4**: TBD.

**Proposal 4**: TBD.

eLCID

[R2-2105749](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_114-e\Docs\R2-2105749.zip) Clarification on MAC PDU assembly with eLCID Huawei, HiSilicon discussion Rel-16 NR\_IAB-Core

[R2-2106031](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_114-e\Docs\R2-2106031.zip) Clarification to transmission of padding and padding BSR with eLCID in IAB Ericsson, Apple CR Rel-16 38.321 16.4.0 1116 - F NR\_IAB-Core

[R2-2106321](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_114-e\Docs\R2-2106321.zip) CR for not transmitting only padding and padding BSR with eLCID Samsung, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, Qualcomm, LG, ZTE, MediaTek, Intel CR Rel-16 38.321 16.4.0 1118 - F NR\_IAB-Core

It has been agreed in the previous meeting to clarify this in MAC. Different styles are proposed in the above 3 contribution/CRs.

**Question 5**: Which of the changes proposed in the above TDocs do companies support?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answers to Question 5 | | |
| Company | R2-2105749  /R2-2106031  /R2-2106321 | Technical Arguments |
| Qualcomm | R2-2106321 | We are fine with the TP in R2-2105749 too. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 5**: TBD.

**Proposal 5**: TBD.

2-Step RACH

[R2-2105851](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_114-e\Docs\R2-2105851.zip) Correction to 38.321 on msga-TransMax selection for 2-step RACH ZTE, Sanechips CR Rel-16 38.321 16.4.0 1112 - F NR\_2step\_RACH-Core

R2-2105851 proposed to change the rach-ConfigDedicated to cfra-TwoStep-r16 for the application of the msgA-TransMax in subclause 5.1.1a to correct the behaviour for HO:

|  |
| --- |
| 1> if *RA\_TYPE* is set to *2-stepRA*:  2> set *PREAMBLE\_POWER\_RAMPING\_STEP* to *msgA-PreamblePowerRampingStep*;  2> set *SCALING\_FACTOR\_BI* to 1;  2> apply *preambleTransMax* included in the *RACH-ConfigGenericTwoStepRA*;  2> if the Random Access procedure was initiated for handover; and  2> if *cfra-TwoStep* is configured for the selected carrier:  3> if *msgA-TransMax* is configured in the *cfra-TwoStep;*  4> apply *msgA-TransMax* configured in the *cfra-TwoStep*.  2> else if *msgA-TransMax* is included in the *RACH-ConfigCommonTwoStepRA*:  3> apply *msgA-TransMax* included in the *RACH-ConfigCommonTwoStepRA*. |

**Question 6**: Do companies agree with the issue and if yes, are the suggested changes fine or does the text need to be improved / corrected ?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answers to Question 6 | | |
| Company | Yes/No | Technical Arguments |
| Qualcomm | Yes | We think the reasons for change are correct, and we are fine with the TP. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 6**: TBD.

**Proposal 6**: TBD.

# 4 Conclusion

TBD.