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# Introduction

In this document company views on the following tdocs are collected:

* [AT114-e][021][NR16] RRC I (ZTE)

 Scope: Treat R2-2105516, R2-2105179, R2-2104920, R2-2105925, R2-2105926, R2-2105896, R2-2105186, R2-2105421, R2-2106281, R2-2105964, R2-2105965, R2-2105394,

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

 Intended outcome: Report and Agreed CRs.

 Deadline: Schedule A

# Contact details

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Contact name | Contact email |
| ZTE (rapporteur) | Eswar Vutukuri | eswar.vutukuri@zte.com.cn |
| Ericsson | Antonino Orsino | antonino.orsino@ericsson.com |
|  |  |  |

# Handling of T310 and T312

In R2-2105516 it is proposed to:

1. Add “stop T310 for the SCG, if running;” in the initiation of SCG failure information procedure as specified in 5.7.3.2.

2. Add “stop T312 for the SCG, if running;” in the initiation of SCG failure information procedure as specified in 5.7.3.2.

3. Add “upon the expiry of T312 in corresponding SpCell” as an additional stopping criterion of T310 in 7.1.1.

The rapporteur would like to point out the following:

* related discussion happened at R2#113bis-e (see offline [005] report in R2-2104633) where the following was noted in chairman’s notes:

|  |
| --- |
| ***R2#113-bis agreement****Upon initiating SCG failure information procedure, if T310/T312 for the PSCell expires before the SCG link is recovered, UE does not trigger another SCG failure information procedure* |

* Related CRs were also submitted to this meeting in R2-2106190 and R2-2106191 (companies are encouraged to also note the discussion in the offline [005] at this meeting hence whilst answering the question below.

Based on the above companies are invited to answer the following:

|  |
| --- |
| Q 1: Considering the above aspects, do you agree with the changes proposed in R2-2105516? |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments if any |
| Ericsson | Disagree | This was already discussed in RAN2#108 and the outcome was that nothing is broken. We prefer to stick to that decision since no problem in the field have been observed so far.From chairman note of RAN2#108 (Reno):[R2-1915352](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_108/Docs/%0DR2-1915352.zip) Stop timer T310 in SCGFailureInformation Ericsson CR Rel-15 38.331 15.7.0 1366 - F NR\_newRAT-Core- Huawei think nothing is broken. Samsung agrees and think the only side effect would be that the UE may send SCG failure a second time, but there is no problem. - LG think this is not needed. - MTK think the CR makes sense but is not important. * Not pursued
 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# SNPN corrections

In R2-2105179, it is proposed to:

1. Add SNPN to the field description of *uac-BarringForCommon, UAC-BarringPerPLMN-List, CellIdentity.*
2. For the *UAC-BarringPerPLMN-List/uac-AccessCategory1-SelectionAssistanceInfo/uac-AC1-SelectAssistInfo,* clarified that *“*the 1st entry in the list corresponds to the first PLMN or SNPN across the *plmn-IdentityList* and *npn-IdentityInfoList*, the 2nd entry in the list corresponds to the second PLMN or SNPN across the *plmn-IdentityList* and *npn-IdentityInfoList* and so on.”

*Note:* this wording of the modification is also aligned with that in the field description of Plmn-IdentityIndex in the UAC-BarringPerPLMN-List

|  |
| --- |
| ***UAC-BarringPerPLMN-List* field descriptions** |
| ***plmn-IdentityIndex***Index of the PLMN or SNPN across the *plmn-IdentityList* and *npn-IdentityInfoList* fields included in SIB1. |

Based on the above companies are invited to answer the following:

|  |
| --- |
| Q 2: Do companies agree with the changes proposed in R2-2105179? |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments if any |
|  |  |  |

# Correction on reportSlotOffsetList

In R2-2104920 it is proposed to remove the text limiting the applicability of reportSlotOffsetList only to DCI format 0\_0 in the field description of *reportSlotOffsetList.*

|  |
| --- |
| Q 3: Do companies agree with the changes proposed in R2-2104920? |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments if any |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Changes for NR-U

In R2-2105925 it is proposed to add references to tables 6.3.3.2-3 (38.211) in the field description of msg1-SubcarrierSpacing. Further, since L1151 and L571 are introduced in the shared spectrum, reference to Table 6.3.3.1-2 is also be added.

|  |
| --- |
| Q 4: Do companies agree with the changes proposed in R2-2105925? |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments if any |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

In R2-2105926 it is proposed to remove the “If ssb-PositionQCL is configured” from the field description of ssb-PositionsInBurst in servingCellConfigCommon, since this part of description is related to unlicensed spectrum where this field is always configured.

|  |
| --- |
| Q 5: Do companies agree with the changes proposed in R2-2105926? |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments if any |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

In R2-2105896 and in R2-2105186, the main proposal is to extend the number of cells for search space switching trigger configuration. So, first we will discuss if companies are okay to extend the number of cells as proposed in these.

As noted in R2-2105896, current 38.331 only allows for switching trigger configuration of 4 elements, while RAN1’s intention was to allow 16 elements. Considering that this an NBC change, the first question is whether companies want to align this ambiguity in Rel-16 as proposed by the proponents.

|  |
| --- |
| Q 6: Are companies okay to accept the NBC change to align the RAN2 specs to the RAN1 intention to have up to 16 elements for switching trigger? |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments if any |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

The next question is whether we need a new UE capability for this:

|  |
| --- |
| Q 7: Do we need to define a new UE capability to extend the list size? Yes (define new capability)/No(don’t define new capability)/No-changes (disagree with change – see Q6) |
| Company | Yes / No / No- changes | Comments if any |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Finally, we will collect general views on the changes proposed in R2-2105896 and in R2-2105186 any comments on the actual changes so that a CR can be created in case there is willingness to agree such change.

|  |
| --- |
| Q 8: Assuming we go ahead with the change, do companies have any comments to the actual changes proposed in R2-2105896 and R2-2105186?  |
| Company | Detailed comments on changes proposed in R2-2105896 and R2-2105186 |
|  |  |

# CGI reporting for SNPN

In R2-2106281 it is mentioned that in case of NPN-only cell, the *cellReservedForOtherUse* included in SIB1 is set to “true” and the PLMN Identities in the *plmn-IdentityInfoList* in SIB1 shall be considered as invalid. However, according to the current CGI reporting procedure, the UE reports the *plmn-IdentityInfoList* regardless of the value of the *cellReservedForOtherUse* for the concerned cell. As a result, the gNB cannot identify whether the *plmn-IdentityInfoList* received in the CGI reporting is valid (in case of non-NPN-only cell) or not (in case of NPN-only cell), and is consequently unable to judge correctly whether the concerned cell is an NPN-only cell.

In R2-2105421, it was first proposed to confirm that UE not supporting nr-CGI-Reporting-NPN shall report the obtained PLMN-IdentityInfoList IE from the indicated NR cell as part of CGI reporting procedure irrespective of the value of cellReservedForOtherUse IE.

|  |
| --- |
| Q 9: Do companies agree that UE not supporting nr-CGI-Reporting-NPN shall report the obtained PLMN-IdentityInfoList IE from the indicated NR cell as part of CGI reporting procedure irrespective of the value of cellReservedForOtherUse IE?  |
| Company | Agree / Disagree  | Comments if any |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Meanwhile the second proposal in R2-2105421 is that “UE supporting nr-CGI-Reporting-NPN reports the cellReservedForOtherUse IE as part of CGI reporting procedure if the concerned cell is NPN-only cell”

|  |
| --- |
| Q 10: Do companies agree that UE supporting nr-CGI-Reporting-NPN reports the cellReservedForOtherUse IE as part of CGI reporting procedure if the concerned cell is NPN-only cell?  |
| Company | Agree / Disagree  | Comments if any |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Then, to solve the above issue, in R2-2105421, it suggested that RAN2 should discuss whether additional capability bit is needed or not, and two solutions from the UE capability perspective are proposed in R2-2106281:

Solution A:

- Introduce a new UE capability that indicates that the UE supports to report the cellReservedForOtherUse.

- UE with this new capability reports the cellReservedForOtherUse in CGI reporting procedure.

Solution B:

- Introduce a new UE capability that indicates that the UE supports not to report the plmn-IdentityInfoList in case of NPN-only cell.

- UE with this new capability does not report the plmn-IdentityInfoList in case of NPN-only cell in CGI reporting procedure.

|  |
| --- |
| Q 11: Do companies agree with the above solutions, if so, which one?  |
| Company | Solution A / Solution B /None (no changes) | Comments if any |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Q 12: Assuming we go ahead with the change, do companies have any comments to the actual changes proposed in R2-2105421 and/or R2-2106281?  |
| Company | Detailed comments on changes proposed in R2-2105421 and/or R2-2106281 |
|  |  |

# New posSI scheduling

In R2-2105964, the issue with SI start offset requirements are discussed and in R2-2105965 it is proposed to add a new field to provide the configurable start position of the SI and update the SI acquisition procedure to take the field into account while calculating the offset.

|  |
| --- |
| Q 13: Do companies agree with the changes proposed in R2-2105965? |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments if any |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Introduction of ssb-PositionQCL-Common and ssb-PositionQCL in inter-node messages

In R2-2105394, the following proposals are made:

**Proposal 1: RAN2 is kindly asked to introduce ssb-PositionQCL-Common in MeasTiming in MeasurementTimingConfiguration.**

• It is conditionally present, in the same way as the ssb-PositionQCL-Common in SIB2, SIB4 and MeasObjectNR.

• The TP in the Appendix can be considered.

**Proposal 2: RAN2 is kindly asked to send LS to RAN3 for updating description of ssb-PositionsInBurst (SSB Positions In Burst) and introducing ssb-PositionQCL in“Served Cell Information NR”, “Served NR Cell Information” and “Served Cell Information”.**

• The description of “SSB Positions In Burst” (ssb-PositionsInBurst) should be updated to be aligned with ssb-PositionsInBurst in ServingCellConfigCommon in Rel-16 TS 38.331.

• ssb-PositionQCL is conditionally present, in the same way as the ssb-PositionQCL in ServingCellConfigCommon.

|  |
| --- |
| Q 14: Do companies agree to introduce ssb-PositionQCL-Common in MeasTiming in MeasurementTimingConfiguration and if yes, do you agree that it should be conditionally present (similar to ssb-PositionQCL-Common in SIB2, SIB4 and MeasObjectNR)? |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments if any |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Q 15: Based on the above is an LS to RAN3 needed? |
| Company | LS needed /LS not needed | Comments if any (e.g. on the detailed contents of such LS) |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Conclusions and proposals

TBD
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