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# Introduction

This document is intended to address User Plane-related RILs and detailed issues remaining from Phase 1 discussion, as per the following scope:

**[AT118-e][104][NTN] UP corrections (InterDigital)**

* Updated scope:
	1. Continue the discussion on the functional aspects, based on [R2-2206194](file:///C%3A%5CData%5C3GPP%5CRAN2%5CInbox%5CR2-2206194.zip); discuss the LS to RAN1 on msg3 repetition
	2. treat UP related RILs “for discussion” (M411, M412, O358, X605, X610, X604, V307, Z550, Z351, I036, V308, O354) (also further confirm the UP related  PropAgree/PropReject RILs)
* **Updated intended outcome:**
	1. **Summary of the offline discussion on the functional aspects and LS content, with:**
		+ **List of proposals for agreement (if any)**
		+ **List of proposals that require online discussions**
		+ **List of proposals that should not be pursued (if any)**
	2. **Summary of the offline discussion on the detailed (e.g. RIL related) issues**

Please note the following deadlines:

* Deadline2 (for companies' feedback on detailed aspects): **Monday 2022-05-16 20:00 UTC**
* Deadline2 (for rapporteur's summary in R2-2206212): Monday 2022-05-16 22:00 UTC

Please also note the following chair guidance:

* Proposals marked "for agreement" in R2-2206212 not challenged until **Tuesday 2022-05-17 10:00 UTC** will be declared as agreed via email by the session chair (for the rest the discussion might continue online).

This discussion document focuses on Part 2) of the updated scope, i.e. the detailed issues.

# User Plane RILs

Several RILs have been flagged by RRC CR Rapporteur as relevant to User Plane discussion. The following section lists identified issues still open for discussion, as well as confirming RRC CR Rapporteur’s proposed resolutions are acceptable for remaining UP-related RILs.

## RILs flagged for discussion

### Need Codes: M411, M412, X605, X604

The following RILs discuss need codes for several parameters relevant to User Plane:

**[RIL]**: M411 **[Delegate]**: MediaTek (Abhishek Roy) **[WI]**: NR\_NTN\_enh-Core **[Class]**:1 **[Status]**: ToDo **[TDoc]**: None

**[Current status]:** May meeting discussion

**[Description]**: ‘Need M’s should be ‘Need R’. Otherwise, there is no way to release the configuration

**[Proposed Change]**: Change “M” to “R” for repK-r17, nrofHARQ-ProcessesExt-r17, harq-ProcID-Offset-v17, harq-ProcID-Offset2-v1700,

**[RRC CR rapp comments]**: UP discussion as Need code now is as in previous release same field. Also, RepK is not NTN parameter.

**[RIL]**: M412 **[Delegate]**: MediaTek (Abhishek Roy) **[WI]**: NR\_NTN\_enh-Core **[Class]**:1 **[Status]**: ToDo **[TDoc]**: none

**[Current status]:** May meeting discussion

**[Description]**: Need S should be Need R and the highlighted text should be removed. When the field is absent, there is no configuration (or the existing configuration is released), and the behaviour in this case will be covered in the MAC 38.321 spec. There is no need to specify behaviour when the field is absent using Need S within the RRC spec. In my understanding, Need S with special instructions should only be used when a special value should be applied if the field is absent (e.g., use a specific value, or a value from another parameter etc.)

**[Proposed Change]**: Change “S” to “R”

**[RIL]**: X605 **[Delegate]**: Xiaomi (Xiaowei) **[WI]**: NR\_NTN\_enh-Core **[Class]**:1 **[Status]**: ToDo **[TDoc]**: None

**[Current status]:** May discussion

**[Description]**: Need R is changed to Need M

**[Proposed Change]**: The need code for uplinkHARQ-Mode is Need M, which is to support delta configuration. We suggest to align UL and DL configuration, i.e. to support delta configuration for DL. Thus, we suggest to change the Need R to Need M.

**[RIL]**: X604 **[Delegate]**: Xiaomi (Xiaowei) **[WI]**: NR\_NTN\_enh-Core **[Class]**:1 **[Status]**: ToDo **[TDoc]**: None

**[Current status]:** Prop Agree

**[Description]**: The need code should be Need M instead of Need N

**[Proposed Change]**: If Need code N is used for discardTimerExt2, it will be one-shot configuration. Then it is against the intention to use SetupRelease type, which is used for supporting delta configuration using need M to explicitly release stored configuration. Thus, we suggest to change Need N to Need M.

**[Delegate comments]:** Huawei (Lili) v18: No, it should be Cond DRB2, like discardTimerExt-r16.

**Question 1) Please indicate all the below modifications you: A) support; and B) do not support. If you object to a modification, please describe why this is not acceptable.**

***repK-r17*: ‘Need M’ is changed to ‘Need R’**

***nrofHARQ-ProcessesExt-r17*: ‘Need M’ is changed to ‘Need R’**

***harq-ProcID-Offset-v17*: ‘Need M’ is changed to ‘Need R’**

***harq-ProcID-Offset2-v1700*: ‘Need M’ is changed to ‘Need R’**

***allowedHARQ-mode*: ‘Need S’ is changed to ‘Need R’**

1. ***uplinkHARQ-Mode*: ‘Need R’ is changed to ‘Need M’**

***discardTimerExt2*: ‘Need N’ is changed to ‘Need M’**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Modifications supported**  | **Modifications NOT supported**  | **Additional Comments**  |
| OPPO | 1. 2) 4) 6)
 | 3) 5) 7) | For 3), this is related to V308, if V308 is agreed, we don’t need to discuss this issue.For 5), this issue has been discussed before during MAC running CR, and we have agreed to capture UE behaviour in case *allowedHARQ-mode* is absent in RRC spec. so we should keep the need code as “Need S” .For 7), we agree with Huawei’s comments that it should be Cond DRB2 |
| Xiaomi | 1. 2) 3) 4) 6) 7)
 | 5) | 1)2)3)4) their size is quite small, only 3-4 bits, it is ok not to use delta configurationFor 5) The absent behaviour is better be clarified. For 6) X605 has been agreed in NR ASN.1 review AdHoc meeting:* For downlinkHARQ-FeedbackDisabled-r17 and uplinkHARQ-mode-r17 fields use setup release.

For 7) it is not just for DRB but also for SRB |
| vivo |  | 3) | For 3), share OPPO’s view. This change depends on the conclusion to V308 in 2.1.5: if it is finally agreed that the extension to harq-ProcID-Offset itself is not needed, this change makes no sense; otherwise, this change is fine.  |
| Intel | 1) 2) 4) 6) | 3) 5) 7) | agree with Oppo |
| Qualcomm | 1), 2), 3), 4), 7) | 5) | Agree with Xiaomi for 5) and 6) and 7). For 5), the absence behaviour is defined in MAC, we can also add reference “as specified in TS 38.321”.For 7), the impact of long RTT is felt for SRBs too. There is no need to restrict it to only DRB. |
| Lenovo | 1) 2) 4) 6) 7) | 3) 5) | Agree with OPPO for 3).For 5) the absence behaviour should be defined. |
| LG | 1) 2) 4) 6) | 3) 5) 7) | agree with Oppo |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 1) 2) 4) 6)  | 3) 5) 7) | For 7), we are also fine to not restrict it to only DRB if that is majority view. |
| ZTE | 1)2)4)5)6)7) | 3) | Agree with Oppo on 3)For 5), I think it just follows the principle agreed in ad-hoc meeting:* P3: Use Need R (instead of Need S) for fields for which there are some conditions when network does or does not include the field.

The absence of this parameter is the same as not configuring the parameter thus it shall be fine to use need R. But we can still keep the specified behavior in the field description with the need code need R. Please note for *kmac* and  *cellSpecificKoffset*, we specified in the field description that in case absence value ‘zero’ is used but the need code now is also need R instead of need S. Here we just use the same principle. |
| Samsung | 1,2,4,6 | 3, 5, 7 | For 5, if Need S is used here, better to align all similar parameters with Need SFor 7, as discardTimer is only configured for DRB, discardTimerExt2 may also be configured for DRB only. |
| Nokia | 1,2,4,6 | 3,5,7 | Similar view as OPPO. |
| Ericsson | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 | 6, 7 | 6 the *uplinkHARQ-Mode* is already Need M, if I041 is not agreed.7 Shall be “Cond DRB2” |

**Rapporteur Summary**

Out of 12 responding companies, the following table presents a summary of responses to the above question:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | ***Supported modifications?*** |
| Mod 1 | Mod 2 | Mod 3 | Mod 4 | Mod 5 | Mod 6 | Mod 7 |
| Support | 11 | 11 | 3 | 11 | 2 | 9 | 4 |
| Do not support | - | - | 9 | - | 9 | 1 | 7 |

The following comments are noted:

* Option 1:
	+ Size is small, so okay not to use delta config.
* Option 2:
	+ Size is small, so okay not to use delta config.
* Option 3:
	+ (7) Related to V308 – if agreed we don’t need this discussion
		- Otherwise change is okay
	+ Size is small, so okay not to use delta config.
* Option 4:
	+ Size is small, so okay not to use delta config.
* Option 5:
	+ (4) Already agreed to capture UE behaviour in case allowedHARQ-mode is absent in RRC spec, should stay “Need S”
		- Absence behaviour defined in MAC, can also add reference “as specified in TS 38.321”
	+ (3) Absent behaviour should be clarified.
	+ If agreed, better to align similar parameters with ‘Need S’
	+ The absence of this parameter is the same as not configuring the parameter thus it shall be fine to use need R
* Option 6:
	+ (2) Already agreed in NR ASN.1 Review AdHoc
	+ uplinkHARQ-Mode is already Need M, if I041 is not agreed.
* Option 7:
	+ (5) Should be Cond DRB2
	+ (2) Not just for DRB, but also SRB.
		- Okay if majority view
		- As DiscardTimer is only configured for DRB, discardTimerExt2 may also be configured for DRB only.

Apart from Modification 7, in general there seems to be consensus or large majority support on the way forward. Based on this, the following is proposed:

**Proposal 1: The following need code modifications are adopted:**

***repK-r17:* ‘Need M’ is changed to ‘Need R’ (consensus)**

***nrofHARQ-ProcessesExt-r17:* ‘Need M’ is changed to ‘Need R’ (consensus)**

***harq-ProcID-Offset2-v1700:* ‘Need M’ is changed to ‘Need R’ (consensus)**

* ***uplinkHARQ-Mode:* ‘Need R’ is changed to ‘Need M’ (9/10)**

**Proposal 2: The following need code modifications are rejected:**

***harq-ProcID-Offset-v17*: ‘Need M’ is changed to ‘Need R’ (9/12)**

***allowedHARQ-mode*: ‘Need S’ is changed to ‘Need R’ (9/11)**

**Proposal 3: RAN2 to discuss whether ‘Need N’ is changed to ‘Need M’ for *discardTimerExt2* (7/11)**

### ta-Report: V307, Z351

The following RILs address the location and field description of *ta-Report*:

**[RIL]**: V307 **[Delegate]**: vivo (Xiao) **[WI]**: NR\_NTN\_enh-Core **[Class]**:2 **[Status]**: ToDo **[TDoc]**: None

**[Current status]:** Prop Agree

**[Description]**: Change the location of the field ta-Report-r17 and revise the field description.

**[Proposed Change]**: The ta-Report-r17 should also be able to be configured in the dedicated signalling for the HO case as agreed before, but now this is unable to be achieved since the field is directly put in the SIB19. Also, the TA reporting during the RACH triggered by RRC resusme should also depend on this field included in SIB19, but this case is now missing in the Spec. The proposed solution is to move the ta-Report-r17 into the IE “NTN-Config”, and add the revised field description as follows: ta-Report When this field is included in SIB19, it indicates whether UE specific TA reporting is enabled during initial access, RRC connection reestablishment and RRC resume When this field is included in DowlinkConfigCommon within dedicated signalling, it indicates whether UE specific TA reporting is enabled during handover (see TS 38.321 [3], clause x.x.x)..

**[RIL]**: Z351 **[Delegate]**: ZTE (Zhihong) **[WI]**: NR\_NTN\_enh-Core **[Class]**:1 **[Status]**: ToDo **[TDoc]**: None

**[Current status]:** Prop Reject

**[Description]**: This filed is also used to indicate for TA report in resume or reestablishment/Handover cases.

**[Proposed Change]**: add ‘, RRC resume, reestablishment and handover’ after initial access. Or in another option replace ‘during initial access ’ with ‘as defined in subclause 5.4.X’ and refer to TS 38.321

**[RRC CR rapp comments]:** V307 is implemented instead

Based on current RIL status, V307 has been listed as ‘Prop Agee’. As indicated by RRC CR Rapporteur, the changes in V307 should satisfy the issues raised in Z351, so Z351 is not needed.

**Question 2) Please confirm the following:**

**Do you agree with the proposed changes in V307 (i.e. V307 confirmed as Prop Agree)?**

**Do the changes in V307 address the issue raised in Z351 (i.e. Z351 confirmed as Prop Reject)?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Confirm V307? (Yes/No)** | **Reject Z351? (Yes/No)** | **Additional Comments**  |
| OPPO | Yes | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | See comment | Yes | “it indicates whether UE specific TA reporting is enabled during initial access, RRC connection reestablishment and RRC resume”, We are wondering whether initial access includes RRC resume. |
| vivo | Yes | Yes | Same view as RRC Rapp. Note also that in ASN.1 review ad-hoc meeting, it was agreed that *ntn-Config* is moved into the *ServingCellConfigCommon* (not in *DownlinkConfigCommon* anymore). So, the wording of the change proposed in V307 should be slightly adjusted as follows:“*When this field is included in SIB19, it indicates whether UE specific TA reporting is enabled during initial access, RRC connection reestablishment and RRC resume When this field is included in ~~DowlinkConfigCommon~~ServingCellConfigCommon within dedicated signalling, it indicates whether UE specific TA reporting is enabled during handover (see TS 38.321 [3], clause x.x.x)*”.  |
| Intel | Yes | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes | Yes | Agree with vivo |
| Lenovo | Yes | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Yes | According to the latest agreement of *[104][NTN]-second*, field description can be revised as:*“When this field is included in SIB19, it indicates whether UE specific TA reporting is enabled during RRC connection establishment~~initial access~~, RRC connection reestablishment and RRC connection resume. When this field is included in ~~DowlinkConfigCommon~~ServingCellConfigCommon within dedicated signalling, it indicates whether UE specific TA reporting is enabled during handover (see TS 38.321 [3], clause x.x.x)”*  |
| ZTE | Yes | Yes | Better to align with the latest agreements as suggested by Huawei |
| Samsung | Yes | Yes | Agree with Huawei’s comment |
| Nokia | Yes | Yes | Fine to Huawei’s rewording. |
| Ericsson | Yes | Yes |  |
| InterDigital | Yes | Yes | Okay with rewording |

**Rapporteur Summary**

Out of 13 responding companies, the following table presents a summary of responses to the above question:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No |
| V307 is ‘Prop Agree’ | 12 | - |
| Z351 is ‘Prop Reject’ | 13 | - |

An additional 1 company did not indicate an explicit Yes/No response to 1), however have provided comments which are included below.

The following comments are noted:

* V307:
	+ Initial access may include connection resume.
	+ Update field description with latest agreements:
		- (7) When this field is included in ~~DowlinkConfigCommon~~ ServingCellConfigCommon within dedicated signalling,
		- (5) it indicates whether UE specific TA reporting is enabled during RRC connection establishment ~~initial access~~, RRC connection reestablishment and RRC connection resume.

There is consensus that V307 is confirmed as Prop Agree, which covers the issue raised in Z351 (confirmed as Prop Reject). Rapporteur also suggests that based on wide support, the modification by Huawei is adopted to update this RIL with the latest RAN2 agreements.

**Proposal 4: V307 is confirmed as ‘Prop Agree’ and Z351 is confirmed as ‘Prop Reject’. To reflect latest RAN2 agreements the field description is updated to: “*When this field is included in SIB19, it indicates whether UE specific TA reporting is enabled during RRC connection establishment ~~initial access~~, RRC connection reestablishment and RRC connection resume. When this field is included in ~~DowlinkConfigCommon~~ServingCellConfigCommon within dedicated signalling, it indicates whether UE specific TA reporting is enabled during handover (see TS 38.321 [3], clause x.x.x)*” (consensus)**

### discardTimerExt and discardTimerExt2: Z550, I036

The following RIL addresses details related to discardTimerExt2:

**[RIL]**: Z550 **[Delegate]**: ZTE (Zhihong) **[WI]**: NR\_NTN\_enh-Core **[Class]**:1 **[Status]**: ToDo **[TDoc]**: None

**[Current status]:** May meeting discussion

**[Description]**: No discardTimerExt2 is specified in 38.323, shall be discardTimer without extension mark

**[Proposed Change]**: update discardTimerExt2 to discardTimer in the filed description

**[RRC CR rapp comments]:** 38.323 needs to updated then. Otherwise there is no new value supported

As listed by RIL Z550, discardTimerExt2 is not currently specified in 38.323. Unless this is introduced, there is no new value supported, and *discardTimerExt2* to changed to *discardTimer* in the RRC filed description.

**Question 3) What is your preferred Option regarding Z550?**

**Option 1: update *discardTimerExt2* to *discardTimer* in the field description (i.e. Z550 is updated to Prop Agree).**

**Option 2: specify *discardTimerExt2* in TS 38.323 (i.e. Z550 is updated to Prop Reject)**

**Option 3: Other, please describe.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred Option?** | **Additional Comments**  |
| OPPO | Option 1 |  |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 | Prefer not to have discardTimerExt2 in 38.323 |
| vivo | Option 1 | This follows the same way as when the discardTimerExt was introduced. |
| Intel | Option 1 | In 38.323, there is only one *discardTimer* and in RRC spec, multiple candidate lengths can be configured. |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 |  |
| Apple | Option 1 |  |
| Lenovo | Option 1 |  |
| LG | Option 1 | Even if discardTimerExt is introduced in IIOT, RAN2 did not capture the text for discardTimerExt in PDCP spec. This is because the discardTimerExt indicates the duration of the discardTimer. Thus, no further clarification in PDCP spec is needed for discardTimerExt2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 1 |  |
| ZTE | Option 1 | If it is clearly specified in RRC specs that UE uses discardTimerExt2 to set discardTimer of TS 38323, then no need to introduce new helper variable in 38323. This is the same principle used when discardTimerExt is introduced. |
| Samsung | Option 1 |  |
| Nokia | Option 1 |  |
| Ericsson | Option 1 |  |
| InterDigital | Option 1 |  |

**Rapporteur Summary**

Out of 14 responding companies, the following table presents a summary of responses to the above question:

|  |
| --- |
| ***Preferred Option regarding Z550?*** |
| Option 1 | Option 2 | Option 3 |
| 14 | - | - |

The following comments are noted:

* Prefer not to have DiscardTimerExt2 in 38.323
	+ (3) Follows the same way as when discardTimerExt was introduced.
	+ In 38.323, there is only one *discardTimer* and in RRC multiple candidate lengths can be configured.
	+ If clearly specified in RRC, then no need to introduce in 38.323

Based on consensus support, the following is proposed:

**Proposal 5: Z550 is confirmed as Prop Agree. (consensus)**

As well, the following RIL addresses details related to discardTimerExt:

**[RIL]**: I036 **[Delegate]**: Intel (Sudeep) **[WI]**: NR\_NTN\_enh-Core **[Class]**:1 **[Status]**: ToDo **[TDoc]**: None

**[Current status]:** Prop Agree

**[Description]**: No need for ignoring discardTimerExt as this is optional and can be released

**[Proposed Change]**: Remove the reference to discardTimerExt

This RIL is currently listed as ‘Prop Agree’. RAN2 is asked to confirm this status.

**Question 4) Do you agree to remove the reference to *discardTimerExt* (i.e. I036 is confirmed as Prop Agree)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional Comments**  |
| OPPO | Disagree | In case discardTimerExt is not released, it needs to be ignored. |
| Xiaomi | Disagree | Although it is Prop Agree, but the CR rapporteur doesn’t take this change, but rather change to “If this field is present, the field *discardTimer* is ignored and *~~discardTimerExt~~* ~~is used instead~~.”. The reason is that there is no harm to keep discardTimerExt, and it can handle the situation that network falsely configure both discardTimerExt and discardTimerExt2. |
| Vivo | Agree |  |
| Intel | Agree | A sensible network implementation will not configure both discardTimerExt and discardTimerExt2. |
| Qualcomm | Disagree | Remove redundancy “*discardTimerExt2* is used instead”. Our suggestion is following:***discardTimerExt2***Value in ms of *discardTimerExt2* specified in TS 38.323 [5]. Value *ms2000* corresponds to 2000 ms. If this field is present, the field *discardTimer*  and *discardTimerExt* are ignored. |
| Apple | Disagree | Agree with QC’s suggestion |
| Lenovo | Disagree | And Qualcomm’s suggestion is more clear to us. |
| LG | Disagree | Considering that a PDCP entity shall be configured with one discardTimer duration in the spec, we want to keep it. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree | This is handled by gNB implementation. Extra UE behavior of ignoring *discardTimerExt* is not needed. |
| ZTE | Disagree | Fine with QC’s modification. |
| Samsung | Agree | Agree with the current correction by rapporteur |
| Nokia | Disagree | Fine to keep the *discardTimerExt* in the description. |
| Ericsson | Disagree |  |
| InterDigital | Disagree | Agree with QC suggestion |

**Rapporteur Summary**

Out of 14 responding companies, the following table presents a summary of responses to the above question:

|  |
| --- |
| ***I036 is confirmed as Prop Agree?*** |
| Agree | Disagree |
| 4 | 10 |

The following comments are noted:

* Agree:
	+ (2) Sensible NW implementation will not configure both/handled by gNB implementation
* Disagree:
	+ (5) Suggested to revides as:
		- *discardTimerExt2*: Value in ms of discardTimerExt2 specified in TS 38.323 [5]. Value ms2000 corresponds to 2000 ms. If this field is present, the field discardTimer and discardTimerExt are ignored.
	+ it can handle the situation that network falsely configure both discardTimerExt and discardTimerExt2.
	+ If discardTimerExt is not released, it needs to be ignored
	+ Would like to keep since PDCP entity will be configured with one discardTimer duration in the spec.

Based on majority support, it is proposed to confirm I036 as Prop Reject. However, there seems some support for the modified wording suggestion by Qualcomm. Rapporteur suggests this be discussed by RAN2 in Online session:

**Proposal 6a: I036 is confirmed as Prop Reject. (10/14)**

**Proposal 6b: The field description of *discardTimerExt2* is revised to “*Value in ms of discardTimerExt2 specified in TS 38.323 [5]. Value ms2000 corresponds to 2000 ms. If this field is present, the field discardTimer and discardTimerExt are ignored.*”**

### TimingAdvanceSR: O358

The following RIL addresses inclusion of the field and field description of *TimingAdvanceSR*, used for Timing Advance Reporting in TS 38.321:

**[RIL]**: O358 **[Delegate]**: OPPO (Haitao) **[WI]**: NR\_NTN\_enh-Core **[Class]**:2 **[Status]**: ToDo **[TDoc]**: R2-2204717

**[Current status]:** May meeting discussion

**[Description]**: The field and field description of *TimingAdvanceSR* is missing in the spec.

**[Proposed Change]**: add the corresponding field and description. We’ll have a contribution on this.

The referenced contribution proposes to include a new field *timeAdvanceSR* and associated field description in *MAC-CellGroupConfig*. This is in line with handling of *offsetThresholdTA*, the other field used to control TA reporting. R2-2205958 also proposes to introduce a new field *timingAdvanceSR* and associated field description. However, it is further proposed this new field, as well as *offsetThresholdTA* be captured in a new IE *tar-config* within *MAC-CellGroupConfig* as this is more future-proof and in-line with configuration of legacy reporting procedures such as buffer status and power headroom reporting.

Companies are encouraged to refer to both R2-2204717 and R2-2205958 for corresponding text proposals.

**Question 5) What is your preferred Option regarding O358?**

**Option 1: Introduce new field *timeAdvanceSR* in *MAC-CellGroupConfig*.**

**Option 2: Introduce a new IE *tar-Config* within *MAC-CellGroupConfig* to contain parameters used for configuration of Timing Advance Reporting (i.e. *offsetThresholdTA* and new field *timingAdvanceSR*).**

**Option 3: Other, please describe.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred Option?** | **Additional Comments**  |
| OPPO | Option 1 /2 | Both option 1 and option 2 are ok for us. |
| Xiaomi | Option 1/2 | Put together may be more neat |
| vivo | Option 1/2 | No strong view, either way works.  |
| Intel | option 1 |  |
| Qualcomm | Option 2 | Better to group |
| Lenovo | Option 1 or 2 |  |
| LG |  | In 104 discussion, majority is not to use the explicit configuration on SR for TAR MAC CE. Thus, we do not need to specify it. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 1 /2 | No strong view |
| ZTE | Option 1 or 2 | Both can work |
| Samsung | Option 2 | Prefer option 2 |
| Nokia | Can be decided later. | Agree with LG. It depends on how to handle of SR configuration for TA report MAC CE as discussed in email discussion [104] for Phase2 function.If Option1 (explicit configuration for TA MAC CE) is agreed, then no need to specify it.* Option 1) Explicit configuration for TAR MAC CE, timingAdvanceSR is not needed as presence of configuration controls whether SR is triggered.
 |
| Ericsson | 1 or 2 |  |
| InterDigital | 2 | I think there is come confusion. The explicit configuration is different from *timingAdvanceSR*, which is used to enable/disable the SR (not provide the SR configuration). Although what Nokia comments is true, the referenced Option 1 has 2/18 companies supporting it.  |

**Rapporteur Summary**

Out of 13 responding companies, the following table presents a summary of responses to the above question:

|  |
| --- |
| ***Preferred Option regarding O358?*** |
| Option 1 | Option 2 | Option 3 |
| 8 | 10 | - |

An additional 2 companies did not indicate an explicit Option response, however have provided comments which are included below.

The following comments are noted:

* General:
	+ (4) Both work/no strong view
	+ Can combine
	+ (2) Majority from [104] say not to use explicit configuration.
		- If Option 1 from this question in Phase 2 functional is agreed, no need to specify.
		- The explicit configuration is different from timingAdvanceSR, which is used to enable/disable the SR (not provide the SR configuration).
* Option 2:
	+ Better to group

Most companies seem to think that both options can work, with a small majority preferring Option 2. Based on this, the following is proposed:

**Proposal 7: The text proposal in R2-2205958 is agreed as baseline and included in the TS 38.331 Rapporteur’s CR. (10/13)**

### General: X610, V308, O354

The following RIL addresses additional clarification in field description of *sr-ProhibitTimer*:

**[RIL]**: X610 **[Delegate]**: Xiaomi (Xiaowei) **[WI]**: NR\_NTN\_enh-Core **[Class]**:1 **[Status]**: ToDo **[TDoc]**: None

**[Current status]:** Prop Reject

**[Description]**: should clarify in field description that if sr-ProhibitTimerExt is configured, UE shall ignore sr-ProhibitTimer.

**[Proposed Change]**: sr-ProhibitTimerExt-r17 is introduced. We need to clarify that if sr-ProhibitTimerExt-r17 is configured, UE shall ignore sr-ProhibitTimer. We suggest to add the following text to the description field: if sr-ProhibitTimerExt-r17 is configured, UE shall ignore sr-ProhibitTimer (without suffix).

**[RRC CR rapp comments]**: sr-ProhibitTimer is optional parameter so no need to describe it should be ignored.

Current status of this RIL is ‘Prop Reject’ as *sr-ProhibitTimer* is already an optional parameter. UP is asked to confirm this status.

**Question 6) Do you agree the further clarification that if *sr-ProhibitTimerExt* is configured, UE shall ignore *sr-ProhibitTimer***. **is not needed? (i.e. X610 is confirmed as Prop Reject)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional Comments**  |
| OPPO | Agree | Note that the need code for *sr-ProhibitTimer* is “Need S”. According to the field description, when the field is absent, the UE applies the value 0. If sr-ProhibitTimerExt-r17 is configured, without the proposed clarification, no matter *sr-ProhibitTimer* is present or not, the UE would have two configured values for *sr-ProhibitTimer*, i.e. one via *sr-ProhibitTimer* and the other via sr-ProhibitTimerExt-r17. We think the proposed change is needed.[Xiaomi] I thnk OPPO mean to disagree Q6, as Q6 use negative in the question |
| Xiaomi | No | The need code of sr-ProhibitTimer (without suffix) is need S, if the field is absent, it doesn’t mean it is not configured, but instead UE will use default value ‘0’ for sr-ProhibitTimer. Thus, we need to clarify that if sr-ProhibitTimerExt-r17 is configured, UE shall ignore sr-ProhibitTimer (without suffix). |
| Intel | Disagree | agree with Xiaomi |
| Qualcomm | Disagree | Agree with Xiaomi. |
| Apple | Disagree |  |
| Lenovo | Disagree | Agree with Xiaomi |
| LG | No strong view | Since the similar text is captured in RRC, i.e., If this field is present, the field discardTimer is ignored and discardTimerExt is used instead, we are ok with the proposed change. However, we can follow the majority. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Disagree | Agree with Xiaomi |
| ZTE | Disagree | Agree with Xiaomi |
| Samsung | Disagree | Agree with Xiaomi, the clarification is needed. |
| Nokia | Disagree |  |
| Ericsson | Disagree |  |
| InterDigital | Disagree |  |

**Rapporteur Summary**

Out of 13 responding companies, the following table presents a summary of responses to the above question:

|  |
| --- |
| ***X610 is confirmed as ‘Prop Reject’?*** |
| Agree | Disagree | No strong view |
| - | 12 | 1 |

NOTE: Rapporteur has changed the response from OPPO to ‘Disagree’ based on comment.

The following comments are noted:

* Disagree:
	+ (8) need code of sr-ProhibitTimer (without suffix) is need S, if the field is absent, it doesn’t mean it is not configured, but instead UE will use default value ‘0’ for sr-ProhibitTimer.
* Okay to go with majority

There seems consensus support (with the modification to OPPO’s response based on comment) to reverse the proposed way forward for X610. Based on this, the following is proposed:

**Proposal 8: X610 is confirmed as Prop Agree. (consensus)**

The following RIL addresses extension of *harq-ProcID-Offset-v17*:

**[RIL]**: V308 **[Delegate]**: vivo (Xiao) **[WI]**: NR\_NTN\_enh-Core **[Class]**:2 **[Status]**: ToDo **[TDoc]**: None

**[Current status]:** May meeting discussion

**[Description]**: Removal of the unexpected extension of harq-ProcID-Offset-v17

**[Proposed Change]**: The original field harq-ProcID-Offset is used specifically for the unlicensed spectrum as indicated in the field description. However, the extension of the HARQ process number is introduced for NTN only. Since it is unlikely for the NTN to be deployed in the unlicensed environment, nor is there any agreement to support such HARQ process number extension to NR-U in TN, this extension is unexpected and should be removed.

**[RRC CR rapp comments]:** need to check/discuss if this really is an issue

Based on RRC CR Rapporteur’s comments, UP is to clarify whether this is an issue, and if so, whether the proposed change is sufficient.

**Question 7a) Do you agree that the issue described in V308 is valid, and to be addressed in Rel-17 NTN?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional Comments**  |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Intel | agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree | But harq-ProcID-Offset2-v1700 is still needed. |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Lenovo | Agree |  |
| LG | Agree | Since the unlicensed environment would not be deployed to NTN, harq-ProcID-Offset is not needed for NTN. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree |  |
| Ericsson | Disagree | It does not hurt to have it, if for some reason NR-U UEs can implement 32 HARQ processes in the future. 32 HARQ processes may not be limited to NTN. |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |

**Rapporteur Summary**

Out of 14 responding companies, the following table presents a summary of responses to the above question:

|  |
| --- |
| ***Issue described in V308 is valid?*** |
| Agree | Disagree |
| 13 | 1 |

The following comments are noted:

* harq-ProcID-Offset2-v1700 is still needed.
* Since the unlicensed environment would not be deployed to NTN, harq-ProcID-Offset is not needed for NTN.
	+ It does not hurt to have as 32 HARQ processes may not be limited to NTN and could be used by NR-U UE in the future.

This summary is jointly treated with Question 7b).

**Question 7b) If ‘Agree’ to Question 7a), do you agree that the proposed change in V308 addresses the issue? (i.e. V308 is confirmed as ‘Prop Agree’)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional Comments**  |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Intel | agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree |  |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Lenovo | Agree |  |
| LG | Agree |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |

**Rapporteur Summary**

Out of 13 responding companies, the following table presents a summary of responses to the above question:

|  |
| --- |
| ***Confirm V308 as ‘Prop Agree’?*** |
| Agree | Disagree |
| 13 | - |

There is near consensus support that this is an issue which is to corrected, and consensus among responding companies that this issue is addressed by V308. Based on this, the following is proposed:

**Proposal 9: V308 is confirmed as Prop Agree. (consensus)**

The following RIL addresses alignment of harq-ProcessNumberSizeDCI-0-2-v1700 with RAN1 specification:

**[RIL]**: O354 **[Delegate]**: OPPO (Haitao) **[WI]**: NR\_NTN\_enh-Core **[Class]**:2 **[Status]**: ToDo **[TDoc]**: R2-2204719

**[Current status]:** May meeting discussion

**[Description]**: according to RAN1 spec, harq-ProcessNumberSizeDCI-0-2-v1700 should include 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 bits

**[Proposed Change]**: change to INTEGER (0..5), We will submit a contribution on this.

The corresponding contribution proposes the respective change to *PUSCH-Config* (companies are encouraged to refer to R2-2204719). UP is asked to confirm whether this change is acceptable.

**Question 8) Do you agree to update harq-ProcessNumberSizeDCI-0-2-v1700 to INTEGER (0..5) as described in R2-2204719?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional Comments**  |
| OPPO | Agree | According to RAN1 spec, harq-ProcessNumberSizeDCI-0-2-v1700 should include 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 bits. RRC spec should align with RAN1 spec. |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Intel | agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree but | But for 0 to 4, existing field can be used.If INTEGER(0..5) is used, this must be “-r1700”.Harq-ProcessNumberSizeDCI-0-2-r16 INTEGER (0..4) OPTIONAL, -- Need R |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Lenovo | Agree |  |
| LG  | Agree |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | See comments | Similar view with QC. 0 to 4 have been covered by the legacy IE and can be used.But we are fine if majority agree to update to INTEGER (0..5). |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree |  |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |

**Rapporteur Summary**

Out of 13 responding companies, the following table presents a summary of responses to the above question:

|  |
| --- |
| ***Update harq-ProcessNumberSizeDCI-0-2-v1700 to INTEGER (0..5)?*** |
| Agree | Disagree |
| 12 | - |

An additional 1 company did not indicate an explicit Agree/Disagree response, however have provided comments which are included below.

The following comments are noted:

* Should align with RAN1 spec
* (2) But for 0 to 4, existing field can be used.

Based on consensus support, the following is proposed:

**Proposal 10: The text proposal from R2-2204719 is agreed as baseline and included in the TS 38.331 Rapporteur’s CR. (consensus)**

## User Plane RILs: For confirmation

In addition to the RILs in Section 2.1 listed for discussion, a number of other RILs relevant to User Plane have been assigned the following status:

**Prop Agree:**

H021, V309, H022, X603, V312, S602, H033, O352, M409, O353, H034, Q303, X606, X607, V316, B008, X608, X609, V317

**Prop Reject:**

H020

RRC CR Rapporteur has requested that User Plane confirm the status of the above RILs. Please refer to documents ‘RIL List v207\_NTN\_RAN2118\_V00’ in Phase 2 folder of [Offline-101][NTN] for description/proposed change of each issue.

**Question 9) If you object to the status of one or more of the above RIL (s), please: 1) Indicate which RIL status is unacceptable; 2) Provide technical justification why the RIL status is unacceptable; and 3) Suggest an alternative acceptable solution (if available).**

**Note: If a company does not comment on a RIL status, it is assumed the status is correct/confirmed.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Additional Comments**  |
| Ericsson | X603: We did not introduce any limits like this for all other cases that are only forMCG in NTN. No need for this, and it may impact future support of DC. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Rapporteur Summary**

Only RIL X603 is challenged via the following comment:

* X603: We did not introduce any limits like this for all other cases that are only forMCG in NTN. No need for this, and it may impact future support of DC.

All other above RILs are assumed confirmed.

**Proposal 11a: RAN2 confirms RIL status of the following: H021, V309, H022, V312, S602, H033, O352, M409, O353, H034, Q303, X606, X607, V316, B008, X608, X609, V317,** **H020. (consensus)**

**Proposal 11b: RAN2 to further discuss the RIL status of X603.**

# Other detailed UP aspects: Phase 1 corrections

## Corrections to be agreed

**Correction 1**: Unclear description on Active Time triggered by SR transmission

The following clarification to 5.7 DRX procedure was discussed in Phase 1:

|  |
| --- |
| 5.7 Discontinuous Reception (DRX)…When DRX is configured, the Active Time for Serving Cells in a DRX group includes the time while:...- a Scheduling Request is sent on PUCCH and is pending (as described in clause 5.4.4 or 5.22.15). If this Serving Cell is part of a non-terrestrial network, the Active Time is started after the Scheduling Request transmission that is performed when the *SR\_COUNTER* is 0 for all the SR configurations with pending SR(s) plus the UE-gNB RTT; or |

Input to Phase 1 discussion is summarized below:

* Correction 1:
	+ CATT thinks this is unnecessary, and current text is clear
	+ Vivo (proponent) thinks this is needed, since in current spec there is no other place using “first” without specifying from which moment “first” is counted

Rapporteur understanding is that above clarification is valid. Considering this was only challenged by one company and no technical issue was brought up, it is suggested that the above text proposal be adopted.

**Correction 5:** Reconfiguration of *offsetThresholdTA* to disable TA reporting

In Phase 1 discussion, the following clarification to the third TAR triggering condition was discussed:

|  |
| --- |
| 5.4.8 Timing Advance Reporting…A Timing Advance report (TAR) may be triggered if any of the following events occur:*…*- upon configuration or reconfiguration of *offsetThresholdTA* by upper layers which is not used to disable the TA report function, if the UE has not previously reported Timing Advance value to current Serving Cell during this connection; |

Input to Phase 1 discussion is summarized below:

* Correction 5:
	+ CATT and Huawei think this is unnecessary, and current text is clear. Huawei further notes that UE reporting upon reconfiguration of *offsetThresholdTA* will not happen
	+ ZTE (proponent) thinks the correction is needed to clarify that if NW releases event triggered TA config

In comment to Question 6) in R2-2206207 Phase 2: functional aspects of [AT118-e][104], it is clarified that the intention is to clarify that in case UE is reconfigured to release the configuration UE shall not trigger TA report. Rapporteur thinks that this correction is valid and this language is already used for a similar condition in power headroom reporting. It is suggested that the above text proposal be adopted.

**Correction 7:** Alignment of MAC and RRC on use of HARQ mode

In Phase 1 a text proposal was discussed correcting several instanced where usage of “HARQ mode” in MAC spec is not consistent with other RRC fields.

Input to Phase 1 discussion is summarized below:

* Correction 7:
	+ QC notes that “if the corresponding HARQ process in this Serving Cell is configured with uplinkHARQ-Mode equal to HARQmodeA:” is unclear as uplinkHARQ-Mode is bit string.

Based on consensus support to Question 3) in R2-2206207 Phase 2: functional aspects of [AT118-e][104], it seems the challenged part of the original text proposal to 5.7 is no longer relevant. Rapporteur suggests however that the following clarifications to 5.4.3.1 and 5.7 are valid and be adopted.

|  |
| --- |
| 5.4.3.1 Logical Channel Prioritization…- *allowedHARQ-mode* which sets the allowed *uplinkHARQ-mode* for transmission.…2> *allowedHARQ-mode*, if configured, includes the *uplinkHARQ-mode* for the HARQ process associated to the UL grant. |

|  |
| --- |
| 5.7 Discontinuous Reception (DRX)…- *uplinkHARQ-Mode* (optional): the configuration to set *HARQmodeA* or *HARQmodeB* per UL HARQ process. |

**Question 10) Do you agree to adopt text proposals from Correction 1, 5, and 7 above? If ‘Disagree’ to one or more corrections, please: 1) provide technical justification why this is not acceptable; and 2) provide an alternate acceptable wording (if available).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional Comments**  |
| OPPO | Disagree with 5 | For 5, we are ok to add “which is not used to disable the TA report function”, but we see no need to add “during this connection” since RRC connection is invisible to MAC.  |
| Xiaomi | Disagree with 1Disagree with 5 | For 1, we think it is clear. Or we can simply have the follow change:a Scheduling Request is sent on PUCCH and is pending (as described in clause 5.4.4). If this Serving Cell is part of a non-terrestrial network, the Active Time is started after the first Scheduling Request transmission while it is pending plus the UE-gNB RTTFor 5, UE has already triggered TA report when configured with TA reports and will not trigger TA report at de-config since it has reported TA before. |
| vivo | Agree with comments | For 1, it is a bit surprising to us that some companies argue using the word “first” w/o detailing in which scope it applies is already clear. For example, can this “first” mean the “first” one since the UE enters RRC\_CONNECTED, or mean the “first” one since the UE is power on? Of course, a clarification is needed to avoid any misunderstanding for practical implementation. The alternative Xiaomi proposed above does not make much sense, as it is still unclear which specific SR transmission this so called “first” SR transmission refers to. For 5, same comments as OPPO. |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| LG  | Disagree for P5 | For 5, we share view as OPPO |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Disagree with 5 | As we indicated in the first round, no need to discuss correction 5. The word “reconfiguration” can just be removed as UE reporting TA upon reconfiguration of *offsetThresholdTA* will not happen:* If the UE has previously reported TA (e.g. during RACH), obviously UE will not report TA during reconfiguration;
* If the UE has not previously reported TA (e.g. during RACH), UE will report TA during configuration of *offsetThresholdTA*. In this case, UE will not report TA during reconfiguration either.

Otherwise, can we find a case where TA report is triggered by reconfiguration of *offsetThresholdTA* ? |
| ZTE | Agree and | As for 5 we are fine to move the “during this connection” as suggested by Oppo. But it is better to clarify that release configuration case it is possible that before de-configruation UE still awaiting UL resource thus no TA has been generated or reported. This is the same principle we used for PHR. |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Disagree for P5 | Similar view as Xiaomi. |
| Sequans | Disagree with P5 | Same view as Xiaomi/Oppo(not needed and connection is not defined in MAC) |
| Ericsson | Agree, except 5 | 5 Is not needed |
| InterDigital | Disagree with 5 | Same view as OPPO |

**Rapporteur Summary**

Out of 12 responding companies, the following table presents a summary of responses to the above question:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Agree | Disagree |
| Correction 1 | 11 | 1 |
| Correction 5 | 4 | 8 |
| Correction 7 | 12 | - |

NOTE: IF a company has indicated “*disagree with X*”, it is assumed that other corrections are agreeable.

The following comments are noted:

* Correction 1:
	+ Correction already clear
	+ A clarification is needed to avoid any misunderstanding for practical implementation
* Correction 5:
	+ (6) Want to remove “during this connection”
		- better to clarify that release configuration case it is possible that before de-configruation UE still awaiting UL resource thus no TA has been generated or reported.
	+ (2) UE will not trigger TA report at de-config since it has reported TA before (during config)
	+ Can just remove the word “reconfiguration”
	+ Not needed.

There seems to be consensus or near consensus support for adopting Corrections 1 and 7. Company input to Correction 5 is split, however may be acceptable if “during this connection” is removed. Based on this, the following is proposed:

**Proposal 12: Correction 1 (11/12) and Correction 7 (consensus) in R2-2206212 are agreed as baseline and included in the TS 38.321 Rapporteur CR.**

**Proposal 13: “during this connection” is removed from Correction 5 in R2-2206212. The modified Correction 5 is agreed as baseline and included in the TS 38.321 Rapporteur CR.**

## Corrections to be rejected

**Correction 2:** Clarification on TA reporting when multiple TARs are triggered and pending at once

In Phase 1 discussion, the following clarifying NOTE was provided for the case of more than one TAR MAC CE pending transmission:

|  |
| --- |
| 5.4.8 Timing Advance Reporting…NOTE: UL-SCH resources are considered available if the MAC entity has been configured with, receives, or determines an uplink grant. If the MAC entity has determined at a given point in time that UL-SCH resources are available, this need not imply that UL-SCH resources are available for use at that point in time.NOTE X: The TAR MAC CE is generated based on the latest UE-gNB RTT available. |

Input to Phase 1 discussion is summarized below:

* Correction 2:
	+ ASUSTeK notes that the TAR MAC CE should be generated based on the latest “Timing Advance value”, not UE-gNB RTT
		- Vivo (proponent) is okay with this change
	+ ZTE notes that since UE only generates the TAR when there are UL resources available, it is guaranteed UE will report the latest TA.

Rapporteur thinks that this correction (with update from ASUSTeK) is technically correct, however it seems this may be considered a corner case and not strictly necessary. It is therefore proposed that the above correction be rejected.

**Correction 4:** Inclusion of UE-gNB RTT definition in RRC specification

In Phase 1 discussion, it was proposed to include UE-gNB RTT definition in RRC specification to support HARQ RTT Timer extension in RRC:

|  |
| --- |
| 3.1 Definitions…**Uu Relay RLC channel**: An RLC channel between L2 U2N Relay UE and gNB, which is used to transport packets over Uu for L2 UE-to-Network relay**.****UE-gNB RTT:** For non-terrestrial networks, the sum of the UE's Timing Advance value (see TS 38.211 [16] clause 4.3.1) and *kmac* provided in *NTN-Config*.**UE Inactive AS Context**: UE Inactive AS Context is stored when the connection is suspended and restored when the connection is resumed. It includes information as defined in clause 5.3.8.3. |

Input to Phase 1 discussion is summarized as follows:

* Correction 4:
	+ Ericsson does not support this change and thinks there is no need to take MAC timer that is set with information available to MAC and handle it in RRC especially since UE-gNB RTT is changing all the time.

Based on consensus support to Question 3) in R2-2206207 Phase 2: functional aspects of [AT118-e][104], HARQ RTT Timer extension is fully performed in MAC, and the original text proposal no longer relevant.

**Question 11) Do you agree to reject text proposals from Correction 2 and 4 above? If ‘Disagree’ to rejecting one or more corrections, please provide technical justification why this is change is needed.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional Comments**  |
| ASUSTeK | Disagree for 2 | Though the UE would generate a TAR when there are UL resources available, it is still not clear which TA value is reported from the current spec text. For example, when the variation between current TA and the last reported TA achieves offsetThresholdTA, the UE is expected to report current TA to the network. However, the “current TA” when the UE has available UL resources for TAR may be different from the TA when triggering the TAR. And the “current TA” when the UE has available UL resources may not fulfill the offsetThresholdTA. It's not clear the UE reports which "current TA" (the latest TA or the TA triggering TA report) without this NOTE. Since the time duration between triggering and reporting may be long for the UE not configured to triggered SR for TAR, the ambiguity may not be a corner case. |
| OPPO | Agree with 4Disagree with 2 | With correction 2, UE behaviour is more clear. |
| Xiaomi | Agree with 4 and 2 |  |
| vivo | Disagree with 2 | Similar view as ASUSTek. As the proponent, we are OK to add this NOTE incorporating ASUSTek’s clarification made in ph-1. |
| Apple | Disagree with 2 | We also think that correction 2 will clarify UE behavior |
| LG | Disagree with 2 |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Disagree with 2 | Adding a NOTE to clarify is a better choice. For the wording “latest UE-gNB RTT available”, it seems not very clear. Can be revised as:*NOTE X: The TAR MAC CE is generated based on the latest ~~UE-gNB RTT~~ TA value up to (and including) ~~available~~ when the MAC PDU is assembled.*Note that, similar wording is used for BSR in current specs:“*All BSRs triggered prior to MAC PDU assembly shall be cancelled when a MAC PDU is transmitted and this PDU includes a Long, Extended Long, Short, or Extended Short BSR MAC CE which contains buffer status up to (and including) the last event that triggered a BSR prior to the MAC PDU assembly.*” |
| Samsung | Agree with 4 | We are fine to add a NOTE for 2. |
| Nokia | Disagree with 2 | Fine to add a note for 2. |
| Sequans | Agree with 4 | For 2) we can go with the majority view. |
| Ericsson | Agree with both |  |
| InterDigital | Agree with 4 | Same view as Samsung. |

**Rapporteur Summary**

Out of 10 responding companies, the following table presents a summary of responses to the above question:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Agree | Disagree |
| Correction 2 | 2 | 7 |
| Correction 4 | 12 | - |

NOTE: If a company has indicated “*disagree with X*”, it is assumed that other correction is agreeable.

The following comments are noted:

* Correction 2:
	+ (3) Behaviour more clear
	+ (3) Fine to add NOTE
	+ (2) it is still not clear which TA value is reported from the current spec text.
		- Since the time duration between triggering and reporting may be long for the UE not configured to triggered SR for TAR, the ambiguity may not be a corner case.
	+ Okay to go with majority
	+ Can revise wording of NOTE similar to BSR

There seems to be consensus or large majority support on the way forward for Correction 2 and Correction 4. Rapporteur thinks wording suggestion to Correction 2 from Huawei is clearer, and suggests that this be taken as baseline.

**Proposal 14: The following NOTE is added to ‘5.4.8 Timing Advance’ in TS 38.321:**

**“*NOTE X: The TAR MAC CE is generated based on the latest TA value up to (and including) when the MAC PDU is assembled.”***

# Conclusions

Based on company input, the following is proposed:

## For email agreement

**Proposal 1: The following need code modifications are adopted:**

***repK-r17:* ‘Need M’ is changed to ‘Need R’ (consensus)**

***nrofHARQ-ProcessesExt-r17:* ‘Need M’ is changed to ‘Need R’ (consensus)**

***harq-ProcID-Offset2-v1700:* ‘Need M’ is changed to ‘Need R’ (consensus)**

* ***uplinkHARQ-Mode:* ‘Need R’ is changed to ‘Need M’ (9/10)**

**Proposal 2: The following need code modifications are rejected:**

***harq-ProcID-Offset-v17*: ‘Need M’ is changed to ‘Need R’ (9/12)**

***allowedHARQ-mode*: ‘Need S’ is changed to ‘Need R’ (9/11)**

**Proposal 4: V307 is confirmed as ‘Prop Agree’ and Z351 is confirmed as ‘Prop Reject’. To reflect latest RAN2 agreements the field description is updated to: “*When this field is included in SIB19, it indicates whether UE specific TA reporting is enabled during RRC connection establishment ~~initial access~~, RRC connection reestablishment and RRC connection resume. When this field is included in ~~DowlinkConfigCommon~~ServingCellConfigCommon within dedicated signalling, it indicates whether UE specific TA reporting is enabled during handover (see TS 38.321 [3], clause x.x.x)*” (consensus)**

**Proposal 5: Z550 is confirmed as Prop Agree. (consensus)**

**Proposal 6a: I036 is confirmed as Prop Reject. (10/14)**

**Proposal 7: The text proposal in R2-2205958 is agreed as baseline and included in the TS 38.331 Rapporteur’s CR. (10/13)**

**Proposal 8: X610 is confirmed as Prop Agree. (consensus)**

**Proposal 9: V308 is confirmed as Prop Agree. (consensus)**

**Proposal 10: The text proposal from R2-2204719 is agreed as baseline and included in the TS 38.331 Rapporteur’s CR. (consensus)**

**Proposal 11a: RAN2 confirms RIL status of the following: H021, V309, H022, V312, S602, H033, O352, M409, O353, H034, Q303, X606, X607, V316, B008, X608, X609, V317,** **H020. (consensus)**

**Proposal 12: Correction 1 (11/12) and Correction 7 (consensus) in R2-2206212 are agreed as baseline and included in the TS 38.321 Rapporteur CR.**

**Proposal 14: The following NOTE is added to ‘5.4.8 Timing Advance’ in TS 38.321:**

**“*NOTE X: The TAR MAC CE is generated based on the latest TA value up to (and including) when the MAC PDU is assembled.”***

## For online discussion

**Proposal 3: RAN2 to discuss whether ‘Need N’ is changed to ‘Need M’ for *discardTimerExt2* (7/11)**

**Proposal 6b: The field description of *discardTimerExt2* is revised to “*Value in ms of discardTimerExt2 specified in TS 38.323 [5]. Value ms2000 corresponds to 2000 ms. If this field is present, the field discardTimer and discardTimerExt are ignored.*”**

**Proposal 11b: RAN2 to further discuss the RIL status of X603.**

**Proposal 13: “during this connection” is removed from Correction 5 in R2-2206212. The modified Correction 5 is agreed as baseline and included in the TS 38.321 Rapporteur CR.**
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