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# 1 Introduction

This document provides the report from the following discussion:

* [AT119bis-e][012][NR17] MINT (Ericsson)

Scope: Treat R2-2209305, R2-2210657, R2-2210658. Determine agreeable parts, Based on agreeable parts, progress CRs

Intended outcome: Report, Agreed-in-principle CRs.

Deadline: In time for CB W2 Mon (if CB is needed)

These papers are treated:

[R2-2209305](file:///C:\Users\mtk65284\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2_RL2\TSGR2_119bis-e\Docs\R2-2209305.zip) Reply LS on system information extensions for minimization of service interruption (MINT) (C1-225386; contact: Ericsson) CT1 LS in Rel-17 MINT To:RAN2 Cc:SA2

[R2-2210657](file:///C:\Users\mtk65284\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2_RL2\TSGR2_119bis-e\Docs\R2-2210657.zip) Correction to disasterRoamingFromAnyPLMN Ericsson, Lenovo CR Rel-17 36.331 17.2.0 4878 - F TEI17

[R2-2210658](file:///C:\Users\mtk65284\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2_RL2\TSGR2_119bis-e\Docs\R2-2210658.zip) Correction to disasterRoamingFromAnyPLMN Ericsson, Lenovo CR Rel-17 38.331 17.2.0 3557 - F TEI17

**Deadline round 1**: Please provide input by **Thursday 06:00 UTC**.

# 2 Contact information

Respondents are requested to provide their contact information in this table:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | E-mail |
| Ericsson | Mattias Bergström | mattias.a.bergstrom@ericsson.com |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yang Zhao | zhaoyang@huawei.com |
| OPPO | Qianxi Lu | qianxi.lu@oppo.com |
| Nokia | Gyuri Wolfner | gyorgy.wolfner@nokia.com |
| vivo | Boubacar Kimba | kimba@vivo.com |
| Lenovo | Hyung-Nam Choi | hchoi5@lenovo.com |
| Vodafone | Alexey Kulakov | Alexey.kulakov1@vodafone.com |
| Apple | Yuqin Chen | yuqin\_chen@apple.com |

# 3 Discussion

In the LS in [R2-2209305](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_119bis-e/Docs/R2-2209305.zip), CT1 writes:

|  |
| --- |
| **1. Overall Description:**  CT1 would like to thank RAN2 for LS R2-2206480.  CT1 would like to inform RAN2 that CT1 agreed attached CR updating definition of the "disaster related indication" for the RAN sharing scenario.  In order to avoid inconsistency between TS 23.122 and TS 38.331, CT1 would like to ask RAN2 to consider replacing description of *disasterRoamingFromAnyPLMN* in TS 38.331 with a reference to the definition of the "disaster related indication" in TS 23.122.  **2. Actions:**  **To RAN2 group.**  **ACTION:** CT1 would like to ask RAN2 to consider replacing description of *disasterRoamingFromAnyPLMN* in TS 38.331 with a reference to the definition of the "disaster related indication" in TS 23.122. |

In response to this LS, the following two CRs are provided

[R2-2210657](file:///C:\Users\mtk65284\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2_RL2\TSGR2_119bis-e\Docs\R2-2210657.zip) Correction to disasterRoamingFromAnyPLMN Ericsson, Lenovo CR Rel-17 36.331 17.2.0 4878 - F TEI17

[R2-2210658](file:///C:\Users\mtk65284\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2_RL2\TSGR2_119bis-e\Docs\R2-2210658.zip) Correction to disasterRoamingFromAnyPLMN Ericsson, Lenovo CR Rel-17 38.331 17.2.0 3557 - F TEI17

The rapporteur notes:

* as indicated on the cover-page: the CRs needs to be lifted to the latest version of the spec
* some of the added text has red font which should be black

Assuming the proponent addresses this when submitting the final versions to RAN2#120, can the CRs be in-principle-agreed? If your reply is “No” please explain why or what changes you find necessary for the CRs to be agreeable.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes / No | Comments |
| Ericsson | Yes | We want to highlight that the name of the new field is “disasterRelatedIndication” as also used in CT1 specifications. It is perhaps not a very descriptive name, but this is the term CT1 have used and there is benefit in using the same name also in RAN2 specifications to make sure the reader sees the connection.  Changing the field name is backwards compatible as the encoded bits do not change. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Vodafone | yes |  |
| Apple | Yes |  |

Any other comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Lenovo | Should check which title to use in the CR. Current CR title “Correction to single-bit approach for MINT [MINT]” is not aligned with the one used for Tdoc allocation. We suggest to use the one from Tdoc allocation as it better reflects the actual changes in the CRs.  Furthermore, a redundant dot in the concerned sentences with red font color needs to be removed.  Companies may think of sending a reply LS to CT1 once the CRs have been finally agreed in RAN2#120. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 4 Conclusion

Based on the discussion in the previous sections we propose the following:

[Proposal 1 A Proposal with automatic numbering. Assign this type by pressing Alt-P. A list of all Proposals can be found in the Conclusion section.](#_Toc509923397)