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# 1 Introduction

This document is the report of the following email discussion:

* [AT118-e][017][NR1516] Connection Control II (Huawei)

Scope: Treat R2-2204920, R2-2204921, R2-2206145, R2-2206146, R2-2204917, R2-2204918, R2-2204919, R2-2205251, R2-2205252, R2-2205617, R2-2205624

Ph1 Determine agreeable parts, Ph2 for agreeable parts agree CRs (offline agreement, CB online only if necessary).

Intended outcome: Report, Agreed CRs

Deadline: Schedule 1

A **first round** with **Deadline for comments W1 Thursday May 12th 1200 UTC** to settle scope what is agreeable etc

A Final round with **Final deadline W2 Wednesday May 18th 1200 UTC** to settle details / agree CRs etc.

# 2 Contact Points

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | Email Address |
| Samsung | June Hwang | June77.hwang@samsung.com |
| ZTE | Mengjie Zhang | zhang.mengjie@zte.com.cn |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Jun Chen | jun.chen@huawei.com |
| Nokia |  | amaanat.ali@nokia.com |
| Qualcomm inc. | Mouaffac | [mambriss@qti.qualcomm.com](mailto:mambriss@qti.qualcomm.com) |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Discussion

## 3.1 CHO related discussions

**CHO related papers**

[1] R2-2204920 Correction on the RRC reestablishment in CHO Huawei, HiSilicon CR Rel-16 38.331 16.8.0 3018 - F NR\_Mob\_enh-Core

[2] R2-2204921 Correction on the RRC reestablishment in CHO Huawei, HiSilicon CR Rel-17 38.331 17.0.0 3019 - A NR\_Mob\_enh-Core

R2-2205850 CHO configuration with SCG release Qualcomm Incorporated CR Rel-16 38.331 16.8.0 3120 - F NR\_Mob\_enh-Core

=> Revised in R2-2206145

[3] R2-2206145 CHO configuration with SCG release Qualcomm Incorporated CR Rel-16 38.331 16.8.0 3120 1 F NR\_Mob\_enh-Core

R2-2205858 CHO configuration with SCG release Qualcomm Incorporated CR Rel-16 36.331 16.8.0 4809 - F LTE\_feMob-Core

=> Revised in R2-2206146

[4] R2-2206146 CHO configuration with SCG release Qualcomm Incorporated CR Rel-16 36.331 16.8.0 4809 1 F LTE\_feMob-Core

[1] and [2] are about corrections to CHO, and the reasons are as below:

* For CHO recovery, the UE can try CHO candidate cell and do the CHO handover if possible. The feature CHO recovery is only valid for CHO, but not CPC. However, the current spec only checks *conditionalReconfiguration* for CHO recovery, which covers both CHO and CPC cases.

In the CRs [1][2], for CHO recovery, it is clarified the UE only checks conditionalReconfiguration for CHO.

**Question 1: Do companies agree with [1] and [2]?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Samsung | No for [1], yes for [2] | For [1] R16, this type of recovery using CHO is only possible with attemptCondReconfig field, and network will configure only UE has CHO conditional Reconfiguration not for CPC conditional Reconfiguration because only one between CHO/CPC can be configured in R16. So, always this procedure is executed for UE with condReconfig for CHO.  For [2], this issue is correct. If coexistence between CHO and CPC in R17 is agreed (currently this is working assumption), the motivation seems correct. |
| ZTE | No | We think there is no big issue even if the UE has CPC configuration during RRC re-establishment. Anyway the UE will not select CPC candidate cell for CHO based recovery. And the UE will perform MR-DC release (including CPC release) after the cell selection specified in section 5.3.7.3.  But if majority thinks some change is needed, we prefer to change “1> if UE is not configured with conditionalReconfiguration” to “1> if UE is not configured with attemptCondReconfig”. Anyway the CHO based recovery is only available when the attemptCondReconfig is configured. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Proponent |
| Nokia | Neutral | We agree there is some room for misinterpretation and are fine to support the changes starting Rel-17 i.e. okay for [2] with updates but maybe we can leave Rel-16 as it is. |
| Qualcomm Inc | No strong view | It’s good to have this clarification |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

[3] and [4] are about CHO configuration with SCG release. In R16, RAN3 agreed on the scenario where the SCG is released upon CHO execution, however the scenario does not seem to be supported. The CRs [3][4] are to introduce support for the scenario where a UE operating in MR-DC releases the SCG configuration upon CHO execution.

**Question 2: Do companies agree with [3] and [4]?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Samsung | Yes for both | seems ok to have this for the clarification |
| ZTE | No | If MR-DC is configured for the UE, the candidate node should include MR-DC release (e.g. set mrdc-SecondaryCellGroupConfig to release) in the generated RRC reconfiguration message for CHO. The UE just needs to apply the RRC reconfiguration message upon CHO execution and perform everything included in the RRC reconfiguration accordingly. So no need to additionally specify MR-DC release upon CHO execution. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | The current specifications define that conditionalReconfiguration-r16 cannot contain the configuration for target SCG for CHO, but it does not require the UE to remove SCG autonomously when doing CHO. The MN can include mrdc-SecondaryCellGroupConfig set to release to instruct the UE to release the SCG, so we fail to see the need for the proposed change.  In addition, the proposed changed could reduce flexibility for Rel-17. |
| Nokia | Yes | Okay to have the clarification as this may cause misunderstanding otherwise |
| Qualcomm Inc | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 3.2 DAPS related discussions

**DAPS related papers**

[5] R2-2204917 Discussion on RLC re-establishment issue upon DAPS fallback Huawei, HiSilicon discussion Rel-16 NR\_Mob\_enh-Core

[6] R2-2204918 Correction on UE behaviours for DAPS fallback\_Alt1 Huawei, HiSilicon CR Rel-16 38.331 16.8.0 3016 - F NR\_Mob\_enh-Core

[7] R2-2204919 Correction on UE behaviours for DAPS fallback\_Alt2 Huawei, HiSilicon CR Rel-16 38.331 16.8.0 3017 - F NR\_Mob\_enh-Core

[5] is about an issue during DAPS fallback procedure, and the contribution includes background, issues and some possible solutions. [6] and [7] are CRs for some solutions.

**Question 3: Do companies agree with the following observation in [5]?**

**Observation: It is hard for the source gNB to handle the SRBs (including RLC state) from when the DAPS HO command is sent to when failure information message is sent.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Samsung | No | In our view, the current spec is Alt 2 with modification as follows:  Alt 2: after successfully receiving DAPS HO command, the UE stops any SRB data transmission to the source cell group (including ~~PHY/MAC~~/RLC/PDCP transmission or re-transmission). Suspending SRB means that all RLC/PDCP transmission for the SRB is not performed. Thus, SRB data transmission is stopped. PHY/MAC transmission is not directly coupled with radio bearer, since MAC multiplexes all data from configured logical channels. Thus we do not have a particular PHY/MAC data for an SRB. |
| ZTE | Yes | We have some sympathy with Huawei that HAQR/RLC data re-transmission may include SRB data re-transmission, which may cause the RLC status misalignment between the UE and the NW upon DAPS fallback. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Proponent. Firstly, we share the similar view with Samsung that “Suspending SRB means that all RLC/PDCP transmission for the SRB is not performed. Thus, SRB data transmission is stopped.”. Secondly, the UE RLC may perform the following (1) and (2) at the same time, OR, (2) happens shortly after (1):   * (1) UE RLC receives “Suspend SRB for the source” * (2) UE RLC (re-)transmits some SRB data (like measurement reports)   In this case, the above observation is valid because the source gNB has to consider the DAPS fallback. |
| Nokia | No | In 38.331, it states that the UE suspends the SRB for the source cell upon the reception of daps handover command, e.g.,  1> If any DAPS bearer is configured:  ....  2> suspend SRBs for the source cell group;  This means also that the UE should stop the re-transmission of the SRB data to the source cell as the SRB was suspended. So Alt2 is already supported in the specs. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Question 4: for Q3, if the issue is confirmed, which of solutions do you prefer? E.g. Alt 1, Alt 2, Alt 3 (in [5]), and others if any.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Preferred solution | Comments |
| Samsung | N/A | We don’t think CR is needed. |
| ZTE | Alt.1 | We think Alt.1 is simpler. And the NW implementation can handle the old re-transmitted RRC message to the source. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt 1 | We prefer Alt 1. Alt 3 is more complex than Alt 1, but we are open for Alt 3.  For Alt 2, our concern is that UE RLC behaviours have not been clearly defined in specs, and then it is hard for the UE RLC to precisely follow “the Suspending SRB order” from RRC. |
| Nokia | Alt 2 | Already this is supported by specifications and no need to change. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 3.3 IAB related discussions

**IAB related papers**

[8] R2-2205251 Corrections on BAP entity release in MR DC release procedure in TS 38.331 Huawei, HiSilicon CR Rel-16 38.331 16.8.0 3060 - F NR\_IAB-Core

[9] R2-2205252 Corrections on BAP entity release in MR DC release procedure in TS 38.331 Huawei, HiSilicon CR Rel-17 38.331 17.0.0 3061 - A NR\_IAB\_enh-Core

[10] R2-2205617 Correction to RRC reestablishment for IAB Google Inc. CR Rel-16 38.331 16.8.0 3104 - F NR\_IAB-Core

[11] R2-2205624 Correction to RRC reestablishment for IAB Google Inc. CR Rel-17 38.331 17.0.0 3105 - A NR\_IAB-Core

[8] and [9] are about an issue for IAB, and it is observed that the spec 38.331 does not clarify whether the IAB-MT releases the BAP entity even if the last and only configured bap-Config is released. The CRs [8][9] add the operation and the condition to release the BAP entity in IAB-MT’s MR DC release procedures

**Question 5: Do companies agree with [8] and [9]?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Samsung | Yes | Seems correct. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Proponent. The intention is to add the missed “release the BAP entity” operation. |
| Nokia | Yes | We are okay with this |
| Qualcomm Inc | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

[10] and [11] are about an issue for IAB, and the reasons are as below:

* If the IAB-MT is configured with the conditionalReconfiguration, the IAB-MT does not suspend BH RLC channels upon initiating the RRC reestablishment procedure. Upon initiating the RRC reestablishment procedure, the IAB-MT should suspend the BH RLC channels irrespective of whether the IAB-MT is configured with the conditionalReconfiguration.

In the CRs [10][11], it is clarified that if the IAB-MT is configured with the conditionalReconfiguration, the IAB-MT suspends BH RLC channels upon initiating the RRC reestablishment procedure.

**Question 6: Do companies agree with [10] and [11]?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Samsung | No for [1], Yes for [2] | This problem is only applicable to R17 since CHO as a RRE (failure recovery solution) is introduced only in R17, not R17. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | CHO is not supported by R16 IAB officially. For R17 CR, it should be discussed in IAB session under RRC RIL issues. There seems some related/similar issue treated there. |
| Nokia | No for [1], Yes for [2] | Not sure this is essential. Double checking is needed on understanding whether IAB in Rel-16 supports CHO config? No explicit exclude is there, but we think in practice it won’t be needed, as there are limited measurements performance related capabilities agreed for Rel-16 IAB, but maybe theoretically it is fine. So agree with Samsung that [1] is not needed. is not needed. Change is more useful for Rel-17.  It seems there is a misalignment in the CR cover page which states the change is to cover the case when IAB-Mt is NOT configured with conditionalReconfiguration, while the change is opposite (proposes to suspend the BH RLC channels when the UE IS configured with conditionalReconfiguration) |
| Qualcomm Inc | No for [1], Yes for [2] | Same as Samsung |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 4 Conclusion

TBD.