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# 1 Introduction

The following document summarizes the following email discussion:

* [AT121bis-e][002][NR1516] RRC 1 (Ericsson)

Scope: Treat [R2-2303635](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2303635.zip), [R2-2303636](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2303636.zip), [R2-2303282](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2303282.zip), [R2-2303283](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2303283.zip), [R2-2303284](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2303284.zip), [R2-2303285](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2303285.zip), [R2-2302881](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2302881.zip), [R2-2302882](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2302882.zip), [R2-2304093](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2304093.zip), [R2-2304094](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2304094.zip), [R2-2304095](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2304095.zip)  
Ph1: Determine agreeable parts. Ph2: For agreeable parts, if any, reflect these in agreeable CRs.

Intended outcome: Report, If applicable: In-Principle-Agreed CRs

Deadline: Schedule 1

Discussions with Deadline Schedule 1:

A first round with **Deadline W1 Thursday April 21th 1200 UTC** to settle scope what is agreeable etc

A Final round with Final deadline W2 Wednesday April 26th 1000 UTC (EOM) to settle details / agree CRs etc.

Companies are invited to fill in contact details.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Contact details** |
| Ericsson | hakan.l.palm@ericsson.com |
| Qualcomm Inc | [mambriss@qti.qualcomm.com](mailto:mambriss@qti.qualcomm.com) |
|  |  |

# 2 Discussion

## 2.1 SIB and PosSIB mappings to SI message

high level decision done at previous meeting – Discussion on CRs was postponed

[R2-2303635](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2303635.zip) SIB and PosSIB mappings to SI message Ericsson, MediaTek Inc. CR Rel-16 38.331 16.12.0 3895 1 F NR\_newRAT-Core, NR\_pos-Core [R2-2301452](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2301452.zip)

[R2-2303636](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2303636.zip) SIB and PosSIB mappings to SI message Ericsson, MediaTek Inc. CR Rel-17 38.331 17.4.0 3894 1 F NR\_newRAT-Core, NR\_pos-Core [R2-2301451](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2301451.zip)

**Q1. Do companies agree with the intention and need of the CRs above?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson (proponent) | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm Inc | Yes | Changes are aligned with our understanding. |
|  |  |  |

**Q2. If “yes” on Q2.1, please provide detailed comments on the CR.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson (proponent) | Rel-17 CR should be Cat A (error at tdoc allocation, CR cover page is correct). |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 2.2 drb-ContinueROHC

[R2-2303282](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2303282.zip) Clarification on drb-ContinueROHC ZTE Corporation, Sanechips discussion Rel-15 NR\_newRAT-Core

In this contribution, the followong proposals and observations are made:  
**Observation 1:** Based on current specification, when drb-ContinueROHC field is included, the UE shall continue ROHC during PDCP re-establishment, otherwise, the UE shall reset ROHC.  
**Observation 2:** If drb-ContinueROHC was signalled before, but the network does not include the parent Need M IE pdcp-Config in follow up RRC message, the UE behaviors are different.  
**Observation 3:** Based on the definition of Need N, the UE does not store the Need N field.  
**Observation 4:** There are other examples in 38.331 that when parent Need M IE is not included, its child Need N field will be treated as “not present”.  
**Proposal 1:** RAN2 confirms that during PDCP re-establishment, when pdcp-Config is not included and Need M works, the child Need N IE drb-ContinueROHC is treated as “not present” and the UE shall reset ROHC protocol (i.e. the UE does not store the drb-ContinueROHC field for future use).

[R2-2303283](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2303283.zip) Clarification on handling of Need N fields ZTE Corporation, Sanechips CR Rel-15 38.331 15.21.0 4002 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

[R2-2303284](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2303284.zip) Clarification on handling of Need N fields ZTE Corporation, Sanechips CR Rel-16 38.331 16.12.0 4003 - A NR\_newRAT-Core

[R2-2303285](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2303285.zip) Clarification on handling of Need N fields ZTE Corporation, Sanechips CR Rel-17 38.331 17.4.0 4004 - A NR\_newRAT-Core

**Q3. Do companies agree with P1 in** [R2-2303282](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2303282.zip)**?**

**Proposal 1:** RAN2 confirms that during PDCP re-establishment, when pdcp-Config is not included and Need M works, the child Need N IE drb-ContinueROHC is treated as “not present” and the UE shall reset ROHC protocol (i.e. the UE does not store the drb-ContinueROHC field for future use).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Yes | It is clear that Need N field is one-shot and not memorized by UE. |
| Qualcomm Inc | No | it’s a clear violation to the 38.331 spec section 6.1.2  ***For downlink RRC message and sidelink PC5 RRC messages, the need codes, conditions and ASN.1 defaults specified for a particular (child) field only apply in case the (parent) field including the particular field is present. Thus, if the parent is absent the UE shall not release the field unless the absence of the parent field implies that.***  Since the Parent IE (pdcp-Config) is not present to consider the Need Code of the Child IE, nor the absence of the parent IE does imply the release (as it’s a Need M), therefore considering the Child IE and its Need Code by releasing it, is considered against the behaviour described above in the spec. |
|  |  |  |

**Q4. Do companies agree with the intention and need of the CRs above?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Maybe | A CR is not essentially needed, since already clear (see above). If anyway RAN2 thinks this need clarification in Guidelines, see below for comments.  The change should be captured in a 38331 Rapp CR of non-controversial changes. |
| Qualcomm | No | . |
|  |  |  |

**Q5. If “yes” on Q3, please provide detailed comments on the CRs.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Ok to add new Need N field in example, but simplify the text e.g. as  - if *field1* in *RRCMessage-IEs* is absent, UE does not modify or take any action on child fields configured within *field1* (regardless of their need codes); |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 2.3 RLC-Config

[R2-2302881](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2302881.zip) Correction on Need code of IE RLC-Config Intel Corporation CR Rel-16 38.331 16.12.0 3969 - F NR\_IIOT-Core

[R2-2302882](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2302882.zip) Correction on Need code of IE RLC-Config Intel Corporation CR Rel-17 38.331 17.4.0 3970 - F NR\_IIOT-Core, NR\_NTN\_solutions-Core

**Q6. Do companies agree with the intention and need of the CRs above?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Yes | We agree the Need N should have been Need R, and are fine to change to this. One could expect that networks always include t-StatusProhibit-v1610 when a value from this range is used (since not clear that UE keeps the value, if rlc-Config-v1610 is included). |
| Qualcomm Inc | Yes | CR seems aligned with the previous agreement |
|  |  |  |

**Q7. If “yes” on Q3, please provide detailed comments on the CR.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | See above. If change from Need N to Need R is not acceptable in RAN2, we should describe the expected nw workaround as above (networks always include t-StatusProhibit-v1610 when a value from this range is used). Then, change to Need M or Need R does not matter. t-StatusProhibit-v1610 can be released thanks to the Need R on rlc-Config-v1610. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 2.4 Coreset0 for PSCell

[R2-2304093](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2304093.zip) Clarification on presence of Coreset0 for PSCell Ericsson CR Rel-15 38.331 15.21.0 4054 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

[R2-2304094](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2304094.zip) Clarification on presence of Coreset0 for PSCell Ericsson CR Rel-16 38.331 16.12.0 4055 - A NR\_newRAT-Core

[R2-2304095](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2304095.zip) Clarification on presence of Coreset0 for PSCell Ericsson CR Rel-17 38.331 17.4.0 4056 - A NR\_newRAT-Core

**Q8. Do companies agree with the intention and need of the CRs above?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson (proposent) | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm Inc | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |

**Q9. If “yes” on Q3, please provide detailed comments on the CR.**

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

Summary: TBD

.

1. TBD

# Conclusion

The following is proposed as outcome of this email discussion.

[Proposal 1 TBD](#_Toc132639938)

# Appendix