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# 1 Introduction

This is the email report of [AT121][803].

* **[AT121][803][R18 SON/MDT] RACH enhancement (Huawei)**

Discussion on proposal 5 in R2-2301923

Intended outcome: Report in R2-2302069

Deadline: 23:23 Athens local, Thursday March 2nd

Companies providing input to this email discussion are requested to leave contact information below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Name** | **Email Address** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 2 Discussion

## 2.1 Background

In the LS [1], it mentions the following:

*RAN3 believes that if RAN2 decides to support SN RA Report for EN-DC and (NG)EN-DC, the UE should report the PSCell identity outside the RACH report to help an eNB forward the report to the correct node without the need to decode the RACH report.*

During online discussions at RAN2#121, RAN2 made the following agreement:

1: To have “a list of SN RA report entries as a single NR container (i.e. NR RA-ReportList)”.

=> It is not supported in R18 that UE reports NR RACH Report to LTE cell when the UE is in standalone LTE.

This email scope is about the discussion on proposal 5 in R2-2301923 [2]:

**Proposal 5: For P3, if “a list of SN RA report entries as a NR container (i.e. NR *RA-ReportList*)” is selected, regarding how UE sets the list of PSCell identities, RAN2 to discuss the following alternatives:**

* **Alt 2a: List all PSCell identities that occur in *RA-ReportList***
* **Alt 2b: List unique PSCell identities, i.e. if a PSCell occurs more than once in *RA-ReportList*, it is recorded only once in the list of PSCell identities**

During online discusisons, one alternative is added, i.e. alt 2c, list the last PSCell identity (in *RA-ReportList*). So it is proposed to discuss these alternatives, and see if RAN2 can reach some consensuses.

## 2.2 Discussion on how UE sets the list of PSCell identities

The following alternatives are provided:

* **Alt 2a: List all PSCell identities that occur in NR *RA-ReportList***
* **Alt 2b: List unique PSCell identities, i.e. if a PSCell occurs more than once in NR *RA-ReportList*, it is recorded only once in the list of PSCell identities**
* **Alt 2c: List the last PSCell identity (in NR *RA-ReportList*)**

For Alt 2a and Alt 2b, the email rapporteur understands that LTE MN can receive the PSCell identities plus a single NR container, and then LTE MN can transfer them to the corresponding PSCells. The drawbacks may be that some unnecessary information may be transferred.

For example, if there are PSCell 1, 2 and 3 in NR *RA-ReportList*, and LTE MN transfers the NR *RA-ReportList* to PSCell 1, 2 and 3 separately. From PSCell 1 perspective, only one RA report (related to PSCell 1) is valid and the other two RA reports may be discarded.

For Alt 2c, the email rapporteur understands that LTE MN can receive the last PSCell identity plus a single NR container, and LTE MN transfers the container to that PSCell. The PSCell can decode the NR container, and then distribute the RA reports to other PSCells.

For example (the same assumption as above), if the last PSCell is PSCell 3, LTE MN only transfers the NR *RA-ReportList* to PSCell 3, and then PSCell 3 can transfer one RA report to PSCell 1 and one RA report to PSCell 2.

**Q1: Which of alternatives is preferred? Please provide your comments if any, e.g. pros/cons, new alternative, potential impacts to RAN3.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Alt 2a/2b/2c** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

The email rapporteur thinks that this discussion may need some co-ordinations between RAN2 and RAN3, because companies in RAN2 have slightly different understandings on the requirement from RAN3, and some of above alternatives may have RAN3 impacts.

**Q2: For alternatives listed in Q1, do companies agree to send a LS to RAN3 to check their preferences?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Conclusion

[To be added]
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