3GPP TSG-RAN WG2 NR ASN.1 Ad-Hoc electronic R2-2xxxxxx

Online, April 20-22, 2022

Source: RAN2 Chairman (MediaTek)

Title: Agenda

# 1 Opening of the meeting

**This e-Meeting**

- This e-Meeting follows 3GPP principles for e-Meetings.

- RAN2 NR ASN.1 Ad-hoc electronic can approve and send LS outs, within the scope of the agenda of the ad-hoc.

- Decisions at RAN2 NR ASN.1 Ad-hoc electronic will be ratified at RAN2 118-e (by approval of notes from the Ad-hoc). CRs will not be agreed at this ad-hoc (can be endorsed, or agreed-in-principle), and need to be resubmitted to RAN2 118-e for final agreement.

## 1.1 Call for IPR

|  |
| --- |
| The attention of the delegates of this Working Group is drawn to the fact that **3GPP Individual Members have the obligation** under the IPR Policies of their respective Organizational Partners **to inform their respective Organizational Partners of Essential IPRs** they become aware of. The delegates were asked to take note that they were hereby invited:* to investigate whether their organization or any other organization owns IPRs which were, or were likely to become Essential in respect of the work of 3GPP.
* to notify their respective Organizational Partners of all potential IPRs, e.g., for ETSI, by means of the IPR Statement and the Licensing declaration forms (https://www.etsi.org/images/files/IPR/etsi-ipr-form.doc)
 |

NOTE: IPRs may be declared to the Director-General or Chairman of the SDO, but not to the RAN WG2 Chairman.

## 1.2 Network usage conditions

1/ To avoid email system overload, please don’t attach files and documents to emails e.g. for offline email discussions, but instead use files placed on the ftp server instead. Inbox/Drafts folder is used for AT-meeting offline discussions.

## 1.3 Other

|  |
| --- |
| In accordance with the Working Procedures it is reaffirmed that: (i) compliance with all applicable antitrust and competition laws is required; (ii) timely submissions of work items in advance of TSG or WG meetings are important to allow for full and fair consideration of such matters; and (iii) the chairman will conduct the meeting with strict impartiality and in the interests of 3GPP |

Note on (i): In case of question please contact your legal counsel.

Note on (ii): WIDs don’t need to be submitted to the RAN2 meeting and will typically not be discussed here either.

# 2 Organizational

The intended contents of this subclause is to gather instructions and references to useful information. Can submit procedural / organizational input. RAN2 Handbook: Latest revision in R2-2202103 where the subclause of ASN.1 review has not been updated for Rel-17, and in details is applicable to Rel-16, however procedure wise, ASN.1 review for Rel-17 is similar to Rel-16. Updated information provided also in the email discussion [Post117-e][901][NR17] NR ASN1 review (Ericsson).

[R2-2204300](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204300.zip) Agenda for RAN2 NR ASN.1 Ad-Hoc electronic Chairman agenda

* Endorsed

# 3 NR UE capabilities

The intention is to have possibility to send LS out to ask questions to other WG on UE capabilities or UE features, if needed in order to complete Rel-17 NR UE capabilities. The contents of this Agenda Item depends on and is settled in the email discussion [Post117-e][903][NR17] NR UE capabilties (Intel). No other input is invited.

[R2-2204304](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204304.zip) Release-17 UE capabilities based on R1 and R4 feature lists (TS38.306) Intel Corporation draftCR Rel-17 38.306 17.0.0 NR\_MBS-Core, NR\_IAB\_enh-Core, NR\_IIOT\_URLLC\_enh-Core, NR\_UE\_pow\_sav\_enh-Core, NR\_NTN\_solutions-Core, NR\_pos\_enh-Core, NR\_redcap-Core, NR\_SL\_enh-Core, NR\_feMIMO-Core, NR\_cov\_enh-Core, NR\_DL1024QAM\_FR1, NR\_HST\_FR2, NR\_HST\_FR1\_enh, NR\_BCS4-Core, NR\_FR2\_FWA\_Bn257\_Bn258-Core, NR\_SAR\_PC2\_interB\_SUL\_2BUL, NR\_MG\_enh-Core, NR\_ext\_to\_71GHz-Core, NG\_RAN\_PRN\_enh-Core, NR\_QoE-Core, NR\_ENDC\_SON\_MDT\_enh-Core, NR\_SL\_relay-Core, NR\_SmallData\_INACTIVE, LTE\_NR\_MUSIM-Core, NR\_RF\_FR1\_enh, NR\_UDC-Core, TEI17, LTE\_NR\_DC\_enh2-Core, NR\_slice-Core, NR\_RF\_FR2\_req\_enh2-Core

* noted

[R2-2204305](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204305.zip) Release-17 UE capabilities based on R1 and R4 feature lists (TS38.331) Intel Corporation draftCR Rel-17 38.331 17.0.0 NR\_MBS-Core, NR\_IAB\_enh-Core, NR\_IIOT\_URLLC\_enh-Core, NR\_UE\_pow\_sav\_enh-Core, NR\_NTN\_solutions-Core, NR\_pos\_enh-Core, NR\_redcap-Core, NR\_SL\_enh-Core, NR\_feMIMO-Core, NR\_cov\_enh-Core, NR\_DL1024QAM\_FR1, NR\_HST\_FR2, NR\_HST\_FR1\_enh, NR\_BCS4-Core, NR\_FR2\_FWA\_Bn257\_Bn258-Core, NR\_SAR\_PC2\_interB\_SUL\_2BUL, NR\_MG\_enh-Core, NR\_ext\_to\_71GHz-Core, NG\_RAN\_PRN\_enh-Core, NR\_QoE-Core, NR\_ENDC\_SON\_MDT\_enh-Core, NR\_SL\_relay-Core, NR\_SmallData\_INACTIVE, LTE\_NR\_MUSIM-Core, NR\_RF\_FR1\_enh, NR\_UDC-Core, TEI17, LTE\_NR\_DC\_enh2-Core, NR\_slice-Core, NR\_RF\_FR2\_req\_enh2-Core

* noted

[R2-2204306](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204306.zip) UE capabilities requiring further feedback from RAN1 or RAN4 Intel Corporation discussion Rel-17 NR\_feMIMO, NR\_ext\_to\_71GHz, NR\_IIOT\_URLLC\_enh, NR\_NTN\_solutions, NR\_pos\_enh, NR\_redcap, NR\_UE\_pow\_sav\_enh, NR\_cov\_enh, NR\_IAB\_enh, NR\_SL\_enh, NR\_MBS, NR\_DSS, LTE\_NR\_DC\_enh2, NR\_DL1024QAM\_FR1, NR\_RF\_FR1\_enh, NR\_SmallData\_INACTIVE

DISCUSSION

General

* Apple wonder if we should mention that reply is needed before eo may meeting, for ASN.1 freeze. Chair think that other groups know this.

P1

* HW agrees but think R1 people may not understand the difference between per FS vs per band per BC. Think we can point out that it is in the same place as for earlier release.

P2

* For (a) also y < 4 may be applicable.
* Ericsson think the wording may be simplified but is ok with proposal.
* Huawei think that component 2 and 3 should be optional in RRC. Intel think this e.g. depends on the note, and this can be determined after reply. Ericsson has the same view as Intel. Huawei think that in any case they would be optional and there are cases when they don’t need to be reported.

P3

* CATT think we don’t need to check with R1 as this is for pos in Inactive state which is introduced in Rel-17, so defined from Rel-17. ZTE agrees, the prereq should be the R17 cap. Intel see no harm in asking, as this is not explicit in the feature list. ZTE think we can make assumption and ask R1 to confirm.
* HW think there is a similar issue for FG 27-19. Intel think this can apply also to P3.
* Chair think P3 seems agreeable as it should be easy then for R1 to reply.
* P1, P2, P3, P4 are agreeable

[R2-2204307](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204307.zip) [Draft] Reply LS on updated Rel-17 RAN1 UE features list for NR Intel Corporation LS out Rel-17 NR\_feMIMO, NR\_ext\_to\_71GHz, NR\_IIOT\_URLLC\_enh, NR\_NTN\_solutions, NR\_pos\_enh, NR\_redcap, NR\_UE\_pow\_sav\_enh, NR\_cov\_enh, NR\_IAB\_enh, NR\_SL\_enh, NR\_MBS, NR\_DSS, LTE\_NR\_DC\_enh2, NR\_DL1024QAM\_FR1, NR\_RF\_FR1\_enh, NR\_SmallData\_INACTIVE To:RAN1

* OPPO think that the WID codes need to be checked. Intel indicate that it is the same WIs as in the original LS tp be replied.
* Huawei think offline is needed
* [ASN1AH-e][001] LS out on Rel-17 RAN1 UE features list for NR (Intel)

 Intended outcome: agreeable LS out to R1

 Deadline: CB Fri April 22

# 4 NR RRC ASN.1 Review

This Agenda Item represents the main contents and focus of this ad-hoc. The scope is: 38.331 and joint 38.331 36.331 issues: Multi-WI issues, general issues, particularly complex issues. The contents of this Agenda Item depends on and is settled in the email discussion [Post117-e][901][NR17] NR ASN1 review (Ericsson). The Rappo

rteur selects which RIL issues to treat (see the Schedule) and tdocs are invited for those issues. NOTE that WI-specific issues shall be submitted directly to R2 118-e.

Procedure

Q&A

* Chair wonder how class0 issues will be handled. Ericsson think this is not clear yet. Nokia thought that class0 should be editorial, and can even be postponed to August. Need to focus on Class 1 2 now. Intel agrees with Nokia. Apple agrees that we should deprioritize class0. QC think that WI rapporteurs should attempt to address class0 issues. Maybe WI rapporteurs can do this without centralized coord. ZTE think maybe we shouldn’t depriortize all, or should we change “important” class0 issues to class 1?
* OPPO think there are lots of issues left to R2 118-e, and there is not much time for the RRC rapporteurs. Can we have a procedure to ensure that this can be done. Huawei agrees.
* Chair think each rapporteur can have an email discussion [pre]. Chair think we can apply the late submission deadline for RRC CRs.
* Ericsson think we cannot use class 1 2 for prioritization. ZTE and QC observe that some class 0 issues > editorial. Ericsson think that if ASN.1 impacting issues among class0 then they should be re-classified.
* Ericsson think we need to have possibility to mark an issue as addressed.
* Lenovo think we need to focus on class 1 and 2. Noone has time to go through the class0 issues.
* Huawei wonder how tdoc limit will apply. Chair clarifies that max 1 tdoc per RIL issue will be allowed – by the company that registered the RIL (and not counted), but hope that companies uses this sensibly. Chair assumes that related RILs shall be addressed in a single tdoc (multi-sourced if multiple companies).
* Intel wonder if the RRC CR rapporteurs will also update the status of RILs when addressing the RIL issues in CRs. Ericsson confirms and we should keep the RRC review file up to date.
* ZTE think we can use excel sheet if we freeze the review file. Ericsson think that the CR rapporteur can use excel files etc but at some point in time we need to merge the status info back into the global review file. ZTE think that search is time consuming.
* LGE think CR rapporteur need to indicate which RIL issue is not addressed by the rapporteur, i.e. which one shall be addressed by company tdocs. LGE think we should not invite for any tdocs at all. CR rapporteur should make a summary document to discuss each issue directly. Nokia agrees with LGE.
* Lenovo think at most TP / draftCRs should be submitted.
* OPPO wonder if all issues will be handled by the CR rapporteur. OPPO think that coversheet should indicate which RILs is address.

For class 0

* + CR Rapporteurs focus on class 1 and 2, but should also implement class 0 corrections (that correct errors). Up to CR rapporteur to what extent to fix (beware that regustered class0 issues may be wrong).
	+ Mis-classified class0 issues should be re-classified (Ericsson)

Chair: AP to put this into a full proposal.

38331 ASN1 Review

Rapporteur Input

[R2-2204333](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204333.zip) Rel-17 NR ASN1 Review file Ericsson Limited discussion

[R2-2204334](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204334.zip) Rel-17 NR ASN1 RIL List Ericsson Limited discussion

feMIMO issues / LS out

[R2-2204356](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204356.zip) DRAFT LS on further questions on feMIMO RRC parameters Ericsson, Intel LS out LATE

DISCUSSION

* Ericsson assume that we can have offline.
* Nokia think Q7 is maybe not needed. Has comments on wording as well.
* ZTE think that we should ask most of these questions. For Issue1 maybe should consider to have a common resource pool. Huawei think we should avoid late changes.
* Huawei think we should avoid suggesting changes to RAN1. The issue 2 seems not clear. Nokia agrees, we should tell R1 about R2 interpretations and just ask if they are ok.
* Huawei also think we need a lot of wording changes.

*Chair: we try to avoid suggesting changes (only if needed).*

*Chair: there seems to be support to address the proposed issues, TBD issue6/P7, TBD issue 2*

* [ASN1AH-e][002] feMIMO RRC parameters LS out (Ericsson)

 Intended outcome: Agreeable LS out

 Deadline: CB Fri April 22

[R2-2204354](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204354.zip) [E010][E016]MIMIO relevant RIL OPPO discussion Rel-17

DISCUSSION

* P1: HW, NOk QC think Alt1 is ok
* Alt1 (in R2-2204354) to be adopted for IE “*mappingPattern-r17*” in ConfiguredGrantConfig and PUSCHConfig

MGenh ToAddModlist structures and identities

[R2-2204302](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204302.zip) [E033][E034] MGenh ToAddModlist structures and identities Ericsson discussion Rel-17 NR\_MG\_enh-Core

[R2-2204314](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204314.zip) [H652][H649][E033][E034] Discussion on MGE ToAddModList structures and identities Huawei, HiSilicon discussion Rel-17 NR\_MG\_enh-Core

[R2-2204329](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204329.zip) [E033][E034][H652] MGenh ToAddModlist structures and identities ZTE Corporation, Sanechips discussion Rel-17 NR\_MG\_enh-Core

DISCUSSION on the 3 tdocs above

* MTK think EP1 EP2 are not needed. Think also that HP1 is not needed, prefer to not change anything (ZTE). Intel agrees. Samsung and CATT and Nokia agrees
* Apple support EP1, think that HP1 is not needed, can have a note.
* QC have some sympathy for Ericsson proposals, think it is similar to what we do for measurements. For measurements we don’t introduce limits in R2 TS, we don’t need even a note. Vivo also support P1 from Ericsson
* LG think that if we don’t go for Ericsson proposal we need to understand how IDs are coordinated across different gap types. MTK think unique ID is assumed and it is clear from the procedure text.
* Ericsson think we will also have ID added for the legacy field. Think if we don’t change we may need more proc text. Think the legacy filed shall not be used in the addmod list.
* Vivo think there will be restrictions from basestation side.
* Huawei think that if we have unique IDs, a single toReleaseList is enough.
* MTK would be ok to attempt single list but think there is not support for this.
* Ericsson think that it is strange to add an ID to legacy field. MTK explains that legacy field is re-used by new functionality. Ericsson wonder if it is really intended that legacy field includes Rel-17 part, ID handling is not aligned with how we usually handle things.
* Apple think that we don’t need to associate the MO and the new ID for legacy gap.

*Chair: Nothing agreeable for the moment, not even clear what are the main troubling issues to resolve. Can consider further for R2 118-e.*

Merged handling of Meas Gaps and Pos gaps

[R2-2204347](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204347.zip) discussion on merged handling of Meas Gaps and Pos gaps vivo discussion Rel-17 NR\_MG\_enh-Core

*Proposal 1: The pre-MG for PosEnh can be moved into MeasGapConfig and shall use a separate gapToAddModList from that for MGenh.*

*Proposal 2: Clarify that the pre-condition to request for per-MG of PosEnh is that the measurement gaps are either not configured or the activated measurement gaps are not sufficient.*

DISCUSSION

P1

* ZTE doesn’t support separate lists, can use a single list and have a separate restrictions. Think that pos can use also legacy gap. Think R4 need to clarify whether R17 pos gaps can be used for other purpose. HW think pos gaps max number appleis only for Pos (dec by R1).
* Intel think that whether we have separate or common list only related to the max number of gaps, but this shall be decided by R4. Think that if max related all gaps, then can use single list.
* MTK think the easiest solution is to just have a single list, easier to extend if we shall extend to e.g. have priority also for Pos gaps.
* Vivo point out that Pos gaps have different behaviour, e.g. activated by MAC CE, so they need to be discriminated. Huawei agrees.
* Ericsson think we should leverage on Gap Coord work. Maybe we need to send LS to R4. Maybe an Email disc to R2 118-e.
* QC think MAC CE need to indicate ID referring to RRC configuration.

P2

* Vivo think this can be resolved as Pos WI specific items. MTK think it is somewhat wider.

*Chair: treat this is a WI specific Pos Issue*

* The pre-MG for PosEnh can be moved into MeasGapConfig and use a separate gapToAddModList from that for MGenh.

[R2-2204312](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204312.zip) [M607][Z141][H566][H567] Clarification on preconfigured positioning gap MediaTek Inc., ZTE Corporation draftCR Rel-17 38.331 17.0.0 F NR\_MG\_enh-Core, NR\_pos\_enh-Core

* Noted, main point above

[R2-2204318](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204318.zip) [H581][Z141][M607] Correction for pre-configured MG for POS Huawei, HiSilicon draftCR Rel-17 38.331 17.0.0 F NR\_pos\_enh-Core, NR\_MG\_enh-Core

Revised

[R2-2204355](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204355.zip) [H581][Z141][M607] Correction for pre-configured MG for POS Huawei, HiSilicon draftCR Rel-17 38.331 17.0.0 F NR\_pos\_enh-Core, NR\_MG\_enh-Core

* Noted partially, a main point above

[R2-2204316](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204316.zip) [H566][H567] Correction for Location Measurement Indication Huawei, HiSilicon draftCR Rel-17 38.331 17.0.0 F NR\_pos\_enh-Core, NR\_MG\_enh-Core

* Nokia: ok with the CR, but wonder whether “all MG” could be “all activated MG”
* MTK ok with the intention of the CR, but tink the last change changes the intention of the CR.

*Chair: there is some support, but the details may need to be further discussed. Treat as a Pos WI specific issue at R2 118-e.*

PUSCH-TimeDomainResourceAllocationList merging issue

[R2-2204346](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204346.zip) [E057] Coverage enhancement TDRA table Ericsson discussion NR\_cov\_enh

DISCUSSION

* MTK are ok with proposal but would like to avoid reuse of IE with same ranges, i.e. can have CE field but should not duplicate the sub-fields, can refer to IE’s instead.

[R2-2204341](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204341.zip) PDSCH-TimeDomainResourceAllocationList and PUSCH-TimeDomainResourceAllocationList merging issue (RIL: Q300, E057) Huawei, HiSilicon discussion Rel-17 NR\_ext\_to\_71GHz-Core, NR\_cov\_enh-Core

DISCUSSION

* Ericsson think that k2-r17 is not only for multiPUSCH.
* Intel think that k2 is anyway different, should add a qualifier somehow,
* Nokia would like to think a bit more
* QC agrees with the proposal to add Multi- to the lists.
* Rename k2-r17 to something else to differentiate it from k2-r16.

*Chair: There is clear interest for further clarifications on TDRA IEs and structure, but companies seems not ready for agreement. Consider for R2 118-e*

PDSCH-TimeDomainResourceAllocationList merging issue

[R2-2204301](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204301.zip) PDSCH-TimeDomainResourceAllocationList merging issue [Q300] [Q301] [Q302] Qualcomm Incorporated discussion Rel-17 NR\_ext\_to\_71GHz-Core, NR\_MBS-Core

P1

* Ericsson prefer to keep the current design.
* Huawei think we attempt to do non-critical extension. Nokia agrees. Intel MTK agrees.
* [Q300] Extend k0-r16 instead of introducing PDSCH-TimeDomainResourceAllocation-r17 Adopt changes shown in section 3.2.
* [Q302] Remove last sentence in *repetitionNumber* field description and update the conditional presence table, as shown in section 3.1.
* P2 no change needed (r16 version intended).

Extension of FeatureCombination in RICS

[R2-2204338](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204338.zip) [E126] Future extension of FeatureCombination Ericsson discussion Rel-17 NR\_MBS-Core, NR\_IAB\_enh-Core, NR\_IIOT\_URLLC\_enh-Core, NR\_UE\_pow\_sav\_enh-Core, NR\_NTN\_solutions-Core, NR\_pos\_enh-Core, NR\_redcap-Core, NR\_SL\_enh-Core, NR\_feMIMO-Core, NR\_cov\_enh-Core, NR\_DL1024QAM\_FR1, NR\_SL\_relay-Core

[R2-2204340](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204340.zip) Extension of FeatureCombination IE (RIL: E126) Huawei, HiSilicon discussion Rel-17 NR\_SmallData\_INACTIVE-Core, NR\_cov\_enh-Core, NR\_redcap-Core, NR\_slice-Core

DISCUSSION on the two docs above

* QC think we need to assign meaning to the spare values to make it work otherwise spare is associated with general RRC error handling.
* LGE think introduction of spare values was discarded and has some drawbacks. Doesn’t support to rediscuss this.
* Xiaomi agrees there is no need for extension marker, don’t support spares in SIB1, can extend critically if needed.
* Vivo agrees with LGE, but are ok with HW proposal.
* Nokia also favouring HW proposal, support better slice group encoding.
* CATT wonder if the new feature can be covered by simple indications.
* ZTE think that spare values in the SIB is not so useful.
* Intel are ok with current, have slight preference for HW rather than Ericssion.
* Chair: there is significant support to not use the extension marker.
* Agree to not use the “…”-extension marker for featureCombination IE, TBD how.

Extension of SIBs

I013: SIB1: featurePriorities - remove extension marker

I014: SIB1: SDTConfigCommonSIB – remove extension marker, new field for extension instead.

B002: SIB17: Remove extension marker from IE TRS-ResourceSet-r17

* Ericsson indicate that this is how we do things, not sure we need to treat online
* Lenovo think they are different, B002 is about a list element, but the first two ones we may not need to remove. Nokia Huawei agree.
* Intel thought that for SIB1 we should be extra careful to not add extension markers. QC agrees.
* Agree to remove extension marker (for all three cases)

[R2-2204349](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204349.zip) [N011][N016] SIB extensions Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell discussion Rel-17 TEI17

DISCUSSION

P4

* Intel think we should not group them. HSFN may be useful for general case, not just eDRX. QC agrees.
* Chair we don’t do this then

P6

* Xiaomi think this is just for TRS, and think 2 segments is enough. Think can be discussed in May if needed.
* Nokia think it would be easy to keep larger size and would like to avoid extension further.
* Intel are ok with 64.ZTE are also ok.
* P1: Group the RedCap-related fields in SIB1 under the same SEQUENCE and remove optionality bits from ENUMERATED whose other value is equal to field behaviour on absence, with the intention NOT to change functionality.
* P3: Remove inner optionality bit of *uac-BarringInfo-v1700*, i.e. remove OPTIONAL from *uac-BarringInfoSetList-v1700*, move the Cond MINT to the outer field and add "Need R" to the "if absent" part of the condition.
* P6: Align with other cases of segmentation and Allow up to 64 segments for the SIB17.
* the fields *hyperSFN-r17* and *eDRX-Allowed-r17* not to be grouped.

*Chair: can consider further SIB1 size optimizations in R2 118-e*

General use of extension marker

[R2-2204336](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204336.zip) [E108] General use of extension markers in RRC Ericsson discussion Rel-17 NR\_MBS-Core, NR\_IAB\_enh-Core, NR\_IIOT\_URLLC\_enh-Core, NR\_UE\_pow\_sav\_enh-Core, NR\_NTN\_solutions-Core, NR\_pos\_enh-Core, NR\_redcap-Core, NR\_SL\_enh-Core, NR\_feMIMO-Core, NR\_cov\_enh-Core, NR\_DL1024QAM\_FR1

* noted

[R2-2204342](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204342.zip) [E108] Usage of extension markers Huawei, HiSilicon discussion Rel-17 NR\_MBS-Core, LTE\_NR\_DC\_enh2-Core, LTE\_NR\_MUSIM-Core, NR\_IAB\_enh-Core, NR\_IIOT\_URLLC\_enh-Core, NR\_SmallData\_INACTIVE-Core, NR\_SL\_relay-Core, NR\_slice-Core, NR\_UE\_pow\_sav\_enh-Core, NR\_NTN\_solutions-Core, NR\_pos\_enh-Core, NR\_redcap-Core, NR\_ENDC\_SON\_MDT\_enh-Core, NR\_QoE-Core, NR\_SL\_enh-Core, NG\_RAN\_PRN\_enh-Core, NR\_feMIMO-Core, NR\_cov\_enh-Core, NR\_ext\_to\_71GHz-Core, NR\_MG\_enh-Core

* noted

DISCUSSION on the two docs above

* Apple wonder if there is already an extension marker we don’t need to add one, right? HW agrees.
* Huawei think that if we do extension, we don’t need to extend in parent field but in the subIEs to be extended.
* Oppo agree in general with HW but think we need to assess case by case. Oppo think that several of the examples in the Ericsson paper are the result of explicit agreements.
* Vivo think HW proposal is good, think case by case we need to add or sometimes remove extension marker.
* Nokia wonder if we can really do this by May. MTK agrees and think this can be driven by RILs, think that an email discussion cannot complete by May.
* Vivo think RIL issues can be marked general
* Intel think we are sacrificing size for readability, but maybe ok, think we can do as much as wel can by email for may.
* Huawei think we could focus on the case when we use a previously unused extension marker for Rel-17.
* Apple think we limit to DL
* Email, see how far we get, can discuss to add or remove extension markers, can also discuss usage of extension marker (if there is some applicable case with possible alternative). Focus on DL

Setup Release

[R2-2204343](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204343.zip) [E007] Usage of SetupRelease Huawei, HiSilicon discussion Rel-17 NR\_MBS-Core, LTE\_NR\_DC\_enh2-Core, LTE\_NR\_MUSIM-Core, NR\_IAB\_enh-Core, NR\_IIOT\_URLLC\_enh-Core, NR\_SmallData\_INACTIVE-Core, NR\_SL\_relay-Core, NR\_slice-Core, NR\_UE\_pow\_sav\_enh-Core, NR\_NTN\_solutions-Core, NR\_pos\_enh-Core, NR\_redcap-Core, NR\_ENDC\_SON\_MDT\_enh-Core, NR\_QoE-Core, NR\_SL\_enh-Core, NG\_RAN\_PRN\_enh-Core, NR\_feMIMO-Core, NR\_cov\_enh-Core, NR\_ext\_to\_71GHz-Core, NR\_MG\_enh-Core

DISCUSSION

* Ericsson think that releasing by setuprelase adds complexity from network point of view so we shouldn’t use it for very small IEs, need to be considered case by case.
* Intel wonder if the intention is to not use set modify release? HW reply that this is not related.
* QC think “non-trivial” is confusing, think it is difficult to hav e such guideline.
* Nokia agrees with proposal from HW, but think indeed a guideline is difficult.

*Chair: seems difficult to agree on a specific guideline*

* noted

[R2-2204335](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204335.zip) RIL E007, Set Modify Release structure Ericsson Limited discussion

DISCUSSION

P1

* MTK think that this is more complex than indicated here, think that local full configuration also requires some procedure text, e.g. how to treat IEs .. think this requires more work. Think this can be done if/when needed, for specific case. Nokia agrees
* Huawei think that this may introduce more need for procedure text, but are ok to use for some specific case.
* Intel has some sympathy and see some use case, think that it just combines two messages into one, but but we then introduce a second way to do something. QC agrees with Intel, but think proponent should provide a draft CR to illuminate the impact.

P2

* MTK disagree, think there is no reason for delta signalling for most cases. Nokia agrees

*Chair: P2 is not agreeable, P1: Can attempt specific CR for specific case(s)*

* Noted

I043: ServingCellConfig: additionalPCIList-r17, big field: use setuprelease with need code M to allow delta config.

* Nokia agrees, think we should group Mimo fields together (additional sequence sub-grouping).
* RIL proposal seems agreeable (but maybe more restructure is needed)

Delta signalling other

[R2-2204303](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204303.zip) [RIL I005] Need code for IIOT time reference information in DL Information transfer Intel Corporation discussion Rel-17 38.331 NR\_IIOT\_URLLC\_enh-Core

* these fields should be treated as one-shot fields and should use Need N

X605, I041 Delta sign

[R2-2204339](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204339.zip) Delta signalling issues (RIL: I005, E007, X605, I041, I043) Huawei, HiSilicon discussion Rel-17 NR\_feMIMO-Core, NR\_IIOT\_URLLC\_enh-Core, NR\_NTN\_enh-Core

* xiaomi suggested need M bec the size is 32 bits
* QC think we need setuprelease, QC think we need to separate between “disabled” and “not configured”. HW think also setup rel could be ok. Intel think maybe we can use setuprelease.
* CATT support need R, think this helps sign oh and think we should be consistent between UL and DL
* Apple support the proposal.
* For downlinkHARQ-FeedbackDisabled-r17 and uplinkHARQ-mode-r17 fields use setup release.

IMPORTS to RRC module

[R2-2204322](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204322.zip) [E124][E125] Discussion on the IMPORT into NR RRC module Huawei, HiSilicon draftCR Rel-17 38.331 17.0.0 F NR\_SL\_relay-Core

* Noted

[R2-2204337](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204337.zip) [E124][E125] Imports of PC5 info into the RRC module Ericsson discussion Rel-17 NR\_MBS-Core, NR\_IAB\_enh-Core, NR\_IIOT\_URLLC\_enh-Core, NR\_UE\_pow\_sav\_enh-Core, NR\_NTN\_solutions-Core, NR\_pos\_enh-Core, NR\_redcap-Core, NR\_SL\_enh-Core, NR\_feMIMO-Core, NR\_cov\_enh-Core, NR\_DL1024QAM\_FR1

* Noted

DISCUSSION on the two tdocs above

* QC think that in principle should not import to main module, and support P2.
* OPPO not sure about P2, whether it is for NE only, Rel17 only or also Rel16. Seems SL specific.
* MTK agrees with OPPO on P2. Agrees with the intention of not importing, think we should avoid double definition in general and octet string may be cleaner.
* Nokia prefer the HW proposal, and think that we can import in the opposite direction. Nokia are positive to P2 but hasn’t checked all consequences.
* Apple agree with MTK but support the HW solution.
* QC HW support to import in the other direction.
* Ericsson point out that the reason for octet string is that this is a Rel-16 IE. Nokia are stil concerned about size. Ericsson think this is just one list (per IE).

*Chair: P1, Nokia want to address the size, we can make agreement now and revisit if needed*

*Chair: P2 need to be discussed further, for R2 118-e*

* The fields *BandCombinationListSL-NonRelayDiscovery-r17* and *BandCombinationListSL-RelayDiscovery-r17* are defined as OCTET STRING and the imports of BandCombinationParametersSidelinkNR-r16 from the RRC module is deleted.

Need Codes and optional fields for PC5

[R2-2204321](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204321.zip) [H634] Correction for the need code and conditions for optional fields in PC5 RRC message Huawei, HiSilicon draftCR Rel-17 38.331 17.0.0 F NR\_SL\_relay-Core, NR\_SL\_enh-Core

* Lenovo think indeed need codes are used, so it seems useful to have clarifications, but maybe this should be for Rel-16. OPPO agrees, think something should be introduced for Rel-16, need time to check.
* HW agree that we should correct for Rel-16.
* QC support to do this.
* MTK agree in general, but need to check.
* Intel think that we should add PC5 to title rather than remove
* SS wonder if applicable to LTE. Oppo think that LTE only have sbcch. No impact on
* Ericsson would like to consider a new section for PC5
* Will update general text for need code and conditions for optional fields for PC5, likely from R16, treat further at next meeting (not urgent, can even treat in Q3)

Introduction of new IE sections

I016: pci-arfcn-r17 is used in mutiple places, Proposal to define an IE.

* Lenovo think there is already an IE specified, in MBS neighbor cell list.
* Nokia point out that we have NR arfcn and EUTRA arfcn. Ericsson think we should then do the same for LTE. Nokia agreed.
* Samsung wonder if the location will remain or move to global IEs.
* Agreed (for NE and LTE), and shall take into acct the already defined IE and NR/EUTRA difference

[R2-2204319](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204319.zip) [H585] Correction for new IE for TimeAlignmentTimer Huawei, HiSilicon draftCR Rel-17 38.331 17.0.0 F NR\_SmallData\_INACTIVE-Core, NR\_pos\_enh-Core

* Nokia are ok with this, but not urgent, can also do in Q3
* Intel think that for any R15 and R16 changes they should go into rapporteur CRs. Ericsson are ok with rapporteur CR.
* Agreeable, R15R16 Changes in Rapporteur CR updates.

[R2-2204352](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204352.zip) [N108] Shotgun coding in L1 parameters Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell discussion Rel-17 TEI17

DISCUSSION

P1

* HW wonder if the IE would be extendable, Nokia think yes. HW agrees
* Apple think that if we start grouping extensions may become more complex. Extensions in the next release may be needed in multiple places rather than in one etc ..
* QC support the intention, but think we need to comment on specific CR

*Chair: there seems to be some support but need detailed proposal to decide.*

* noted

H008 General on Need codes

[R2-2204344](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204344.zip) [H008][E010] Various questions about fields in extension addition groups Huawei, HiSilicon discussion Rel-17 NR\_MBS-Core, LTE\_NR\_DC\_enh2-Core, LTE\_NR\_MUSIM-Core, NR\_IAB\_enh-Core, NR\_IIOT\_URLLC\_enh-Core, NR\_SmallData\_INACTIVE-Core, NR\_SL\_relay-Core, NR\_slice-Core, NR\_UE\_pow\_sav\_enh-Core, NR\_NTN\_solutions-Core, NR\_pos\_enh-Core, NR\_redcap-Core, NR\_ENDC\_SON\_MDT\_enh-Core, NR\_QoE-Core, NR\_SL\_enh-Core, NG\_RAN\_PRN\_enh-Core, NR\_feMIMO-Core, NR\_cov\_enh-Core, NR\_ext\_to\_71GHz-Core, NR\_MG\_enh-Core

DISCUSSION

P1

* intel understands no for P1. Nokia agrees this should be avoided. MTK agrees, here it should be optional BOOLEAN. QC think it depend whether two or three code points are needed. Agree it should not be mandatory.
* Chair: P1 seems obvious, the example here is a bug.

P2

* Ericsson think this is case specific.
* All fields at the top level within [[ ]] shall be optional.

N104 General on Need codes

[R2-2204350](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204350.zip) [N104] Using Need S and Need R Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell discussion Rel-17 TEI17

* Intel think we should better use wording is not configured rather than absent we don’t need to use need S.
* Intel agrees that we should avoid Need S if possible. MTK wonder if a new principle is suggested. Intel think this is just general. Ericsson agrees with Intel.
* HW think the first example may be more correct as is, and may be incorrect if changed.
* QC think that feature knowledge is needed to understand properly.
* MTK think we can change need codes after freeze if needed, e.g. Need S with text can likely be changed in the e.g. Need R if applicable. Think P2 P3 are good. QC agrees P2 P3 are good.

*Chair: there seems to be general agreement to attempt to use need codes rather than text, but for the details it seems each case need to be reviewed (likely in the context of the WI).*

* P2: Use Need R (instead of Need S) for fields whose absence simply means a configuration is released.
* 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.

[R2-2204345](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204345.zip) [N104] Need R vs. Need S Huawei, HiSilicon discussion Rel-17 NR\_MBS-Core, LTE\_NR\_DC\_enh2-Core, LTE\_NR\_MUSIM-Core, NR\_IAB\_enh-Core, NR\_IIOT\_URLLC\_enh-Core, NR\_SmallData\_INACTIVE-Core, NR\_SL\_relay-Core, NR\_slice-Core, NR\_UE\_pow\_sav\_enh-Core, NR\_NTN\_solutions-Core, NR\_pos\_enh-Core, NR\_redcap-Core, NR\_ENDC\_SON\_MDT\_enh-Core, NR\_QoE-Core, NR\_SL\_enh-Core, NG\_RAN\_PRN\_enh-Core, NR\_feMIMO-Core, NR\_cov\_enh-Core, NR\_ext\_to\_71GHz-Core, NR\_MG\_enh-Core

* Already covered
* Noted

V160 6.5 Existing SI modification indication, Proposed to clarify that this is not for eDRX

* vivo think that as there is a new SI modification indication.
* Lenovo think there is already procedure text for this, and we don’t need to duplicate this.
* Apple, HW think this is redcap specific.

*Chair: seems it is difficult to treat now, can discuss at next meeting in redcap session. A number of comments that this may not be needed.*

F002 feMIMO/DCenh complex issue

*ServingCellConfig: tciInfo*

 *[Description]: in DC enhancement, RAN2 agreed to perform BFD on the PSCell after SCG is deactivation if the network configures it. In addition, as shown in the field description, the UE shall use the previously activated TCI states for PDCCH as RS for BFD, if no RS if configured. However, in feMIMO, TRP of non-serving cell can be used. This means that the previously activated TCI states for PDCCH can come from non-PSCell. In this case, we think that the UE will not perform BFD .*

 *[Proposed Change]: if bfd-and-RLM is configured and no RS is configured in RadioLinkMonitoringConfig for BFD, the UE shall use the previously activated TCI states for PDCCH on the PSCell as RS for BFD. For example:*

 *tci-Info*

 *…*

 *If configured for the PSCell when the SCG is indicated as deactivated in the containing message:
…
- if bfd-and-RLM is configured and no RS is configured in RadioLinkMonitoringConfig for RLM, respectively for BFD, the UE shall use the indicated TCI states for PDCCH on the PSCell as RS for RLM, respectively for BFD.*

 *When this field is absent for the PSCell and the SCG is being deactivated:
…..
- if bfd-and-RLM is configured and no RS is configured in RadioLinkMonitoringConfig for RLM, respectively for BFD, the UE shall use the previously activated TCI states for PDCCH on the PSCell as RS for RLM, respectively for BFD.*

I034 New version of field vs NCE of existing field

*PDCCH-Config: monitoringCapabilityConfig-r17*

 *[Description]: This is done as a critical extension. An NCE with just r17monitoringcapability would have been sufficient as the original field is also optional*

 *[Proposed Change]: Define as an NCE with just r17monitoringcapability*

V167 Use of spare bit

*[Description]: Spare bit in RRCSetupRequest*

 *[Proposed Change]: The spare bit in RRCSetupRequest was reserved for future use. The current specification doesn’t specify the value for this spare bit, i.e. UE could set either 0 or 1 for this bit. In case we want to use this spare bit in future, but the gNB cannot be aware the Release of the UE during RRC set up. So the gNB has no idea whether needs to decode this bit.*

 *While in Rel-17 RedCap, this spare bit is also reserved, but there is still no default value definition for this bit. Considering there is early identification in RedCap, i.e. NW could identify the UE type during RRC setup, which is mandatory for RedCap UEs, in this case, a default value (e.g. value 0) for this spare bit could be set for RedCap UEs, while the other value (e.g. value 1) could be used in future for other UEs.*

 *Thus, the proposed change is to set a default value for RedCap UEs. Details could be found in the contribution R2-22xxxx.*

 *[Comments]: Rapp: From 38331 8.4: “A transmitter compliant with this version of the specification shall set spare bits to zero.“. Rapporteur understands there is nothing needed in Rel-17*

B102 OPTIONAL vs Mandatory

*[Description]: If ReconfigurationWithSync including sl-PathSwitchConfig is configured to a remote UE, UE will perform path switching to a relay UE and start Txxx rather than T304. Therefore, in this case, T304 is not needed. Thus, T304 should be changed from ‘mandatory’ to ‘optional’*

 *[Proposed Change]: OPTIONAL should be added for t304*

B100 Usage of SIB1 vs other SIB

[R2-2204328](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204328.zip) [B100] Usage of SIB1 or other SIB12 ZTE, Sanechips discussion Rel-17

H020 Suffix v1700 or r17

*ConfiguredGrantConfig: noOfHARQ-ProcessesExt-r17*

*[Description]: This extends an existing field, so the suffix should be v1700*

 *[Proposed Change]: Change the suffix to v1700.*

NTN

[R2-2204313](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204313.zip) [RIL C214]Discussion and TP on the configuration of ntn-Config CATT discussion Rel-17 38.331 NR\_NTN\_solutions-Core

SL relay – SIB request

[R2-2204320](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204320.zip) [H629] Correction for SI request for posSIB for SL remote UE Huawei, HiSilicon draftCR Rel-17 38.331 17.0.0 F NR\_pos\_enh-Core, NR\_SL\_relay-Core Revised

[R2-2204348](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204348.zip) [H629] Correction for SI request for posSIB for SL remote UE Huawei, HiSilicon draftCR Rel-17 38.331 17.0.0 F NR\_pos\_enh-Core, NR\_SL\_relay-Core [R2-2204320](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204320.zip)

[R2-2204327](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204327.zip) [Z670] Correction on remote UE SIB request ZTE, Sanechips discussion Rel-17

SL relay – SL DRX etc

[R2-2204308](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204308.zip) [H675] Correction on relay link DRX configuration Huawei, HiSilicon CR Rel-17 38.331 17.0.0 2971 - F NR\_SL\_enh-Core, NR\_SL\_relay-Core

[R2-2204331](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204331.zip) [H675,Z676]CR on sidelink UE information for eSL and SL relay ZTE Corporation, Sanechips draftCR Rel-17 38.331 17.0.0 NR\_SL\_enh-Core

SL relay – SL Discovery resource

[R2-2204323](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204323.zip) [V380] On the applicability of power-saving resource allocation to NR SL discovery vivo discussion NR\_SL\_enh-Core, NR\_SL\_relay-Core

[R2-2204309](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204309.zip) [V380] Correction on SL discovery transmission resource pool configuration Huawei, HiSilicon CR Rel-17 38.331 17.0.0 2972 - F NR\_SL\_enh-Core, NR\_SL\_relay-Core

Pos and SDT

[R2-2204317](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204317.zip) [H572] Correction for beam consolidation for TA validation in INACTIVE Huawei, HiSilicon draftCR Rel-17 38.331 17.0.0 F NR\_SmallData\_INACTIVE-Core, NR\_pos\_enh-Core

SL relay – others

[R2-2204326](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204326.zip) [Z657] [Z658] [Z659] Correction on the Sidelink discovery transmission ZTE, Sanechips draftCR Rel-17 38.331 17.0.0 NR\_SL\_relay-Core

[R2-2204315](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204315.zip) [RIL C122]Conditions of RemoteUEInformationSidelink Transmission CATT discussion Rel-17 38.331 NR\_SL\_relay-Core

[R2-2204332](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204332.zip) [Z684]Correction on Destination ID list ZTE Corporation, Sanechips draftCR Rel-17 38.331 17.0.0 NR\_SL\_relay-Core

IAB

[R2-2204324](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204324.zip) [Z630]Correction on configuration of availability indication per RB set group in 38.331 ZTE, Sanechips draftCR Rel-17 38.331 17.0.0 NR\_IAB\_enh-Core

[R2-2204325](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204325.zip) [Z629][Z631][Z632]Correction on F1-C transfer in IAB CP-UP separation in 38.331 ZTE, Sanechips draftCR Rel-17 38.331 17.0.0 NR\_IAB\_enh-Core

Redcap

[R2-2204353](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204353.zip) [FW001] RRC correction for RedCap Futurewei Technologies discussion Rel-17 NR\_redcap-Core

36331 ASN1 review

Rapporteur Input

[R2-2204310](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204310.zip) ASN.1 Review File (LTE) Samsung Electronics draftCR Rel-17 36.331 17.0.0 F TEI17 Late

Revised

R2-2204357 ASN.1 Review File (LTE) Samsung Electronics draftCR  Rel-17     36.331     17.0.0      F       TEI17       Late

* Noted

[R2-2204311](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204311.zip) LTE Rel-17 ASN.1 Review, Class 0 issues Samsung Electronics report Rel-17 Late

* Noted, Class0 issues handled by WI RRC rapporteur, except for TEI which is handled by TS rapporteur.

H201 Extension LoggedEventTriggerConfig-r17:

*whether to add the extension marker for future extension. Plus, it seems no need to define EventType-r17 i.e. CHOICE structure of EventType-r17 can be directly implemented in LoggedEventTriggerConfig-r17.*

* We don’t introduce the extension marker

B001 Extension SIB32: SatelliteInfo-r17:

*Extension marker should not be used in list elements if they are broadcast in SIB since it costs approx. 3 bytes overhead per list element. Further extensions should be introduced using parallel lists.*

DISCUSSION

* Huawei agrees, should be possible to extend outside the list. QC agrees. Lenovo confirms.
* Agree to remove extension marker (inside the list)

H008, H009, Global IEs:

*Proposal to Define the global IE for offsetThresholdTA-r17 and sr-ProhibitTimerExt-r17: they have the same value range in eMTC and NB-IoT.*

DISCUSSION

* ZTE has different view for sr-ProhibitTimerExt-r17 as the value range could be different. HW think that extension should be the same, as it is a multiple of RTT.
* QC agrees with ZTE, and we don’t need the import hassle (for both).
* Nokia think that type can be the same even though the filed is named differently.
* Keep as it is (no change), for both

H110 Group IE

*Define measParameters-v1700 in UE-Capability-NB-v1700-IEs, and move the fields connModeMeasIntraFreq-r17 and connModeMeasInterFreq-r17 to measParameters-r17. [Comments]*

 *[Lenovo] Agree but suffix of measParameters-r17 / MeasParameters-NB-r17 should be “-v1700”. Huawei-v19: Disagree with Leneovo. There is no previous version of measParameters. [Lenovo-v20] There is a previous version meas-Parameters-r16 / Meas-Parameters-NB-r16.*

DISCUSSION

* Huawei agrees with Lenovo, should be v1700. R16 seems to not follow ASN1 rules, should maybe have a R16 rapporteur CR (remove dash).
* QC doesn’t see a major issue with the current TS. HW think the grouping refers to a section in 306, and it need to be logical.
* Ericsson think this is a good change that is needed in many cases for NR RRC as well (in many locations). Ericsson may provide a piece of instruction text for RRC CR rapporteurs, to indicate what to look for, the goal to have a logical grouping. Nokia has N016 which is relevant to this.
* Agreed, but change to -v1700

B002 Need Code ConnMeasConfig-NB-r17: s-MeasureInter-r17

*[Description]: Need code s-MeasureInter-r17 is set to Need OP but in the description the UE behaviour when the field is absent is missing.*

 *[Proposed Change]: Replace “Need OP” with “Need OR”.*

 *[Comments]: Huawei0v19: Disagree. Should be OP and behaviour in absence (use value of s-MeasureIntra) specified in filed description*

DISCUSSION

* Huawei think that in NB-IoT/eMTC the multicarrier concept makes NB-IoT case somewhat special, and need more flexibility.
* QC ZTE think this shall be discussed in the WI session.
* To be decided in WI session.

H010 Need Code

*[Description]: sr-ProhibitTimerExt-r17 is defined as OPTIONAL Need OP. It should be Need OR to allow deconfiguration*

 *[Proposed Change]: Change need OP to Need OR*

H011 Need Code PhysicalConfigDedicated: pusch-ConfigDedicated-v1700 and pucch-ConfigDedicated-v1700

*[Description]: the two parameters should be NEED ON*

 *[Proposed Change]: Change to NEED ON*

H018 Need Code sr-ProhibitTimerExt-r17

*[Description]: Should be Need OR to allow deconfiguration*

 *[Proposed Change]: Change to Need OR*

H105 Need code nrs-PowerRatio-r17

*[Description]: Need code is missing*

 *[Proposed Change]: Add Need OR – see H106*

*Chair: Need codes issues for WI spec session*

Late: E806 SIB Scheduling

*[Description]: To address the "SIB24" issue RAN2 added two new scheduling lists, one that can schedule SIBs in the SI-messages scheduled by the legacy list, and one that can schedule SIBs in new SI messages. Currently the newly added SIBs (from TEI[MINT] and IoT NTN) can be scheduled in both the legacy and the new lists, but that may cause issues. It is better to restrict the ASN.1 so that the newly added SIBs in Rel-17 are only scheduled using the new lists.
This topic was discussed at RAN2#112-e based on the paper R2-2009950, but no conclusion was reached then. We will provide a Tdoc to discuss this topic and propose the following change and propose to continue adding new SIBs only in the new lists as a general approach.*

*[Proposed Change]: Remove "sibType30-v1700, sibType31-v1700, sibType32-v1700" from SIB-Type (without suffix).*

DISCUSSION

* Lenovo wonder what the issue is if we allow to schedule in any of the lists. Think network can use the old list if there are no issues in the network. Ericsson indicate that there was two different additions.
* QC agrees with Lenovo, think we need to look at the signaling again. Intention to keep in both.
* Ericsson think that a) the original list is in any case broken b) we can have one less case to test.
* Huawei think that the agreement was that we allow both variants. Need to check.

*Chair: No decision, just initial collection of comments. Tdoc needed for May, Significant confusion.*

Withdrawn

R2-2204330 [Z606] Discussion on SDAP for NR MBS ZTE, Sanechips discussion Rel-17 Withdrawn

[R2-2204351](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cmtk65284%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CTSGR2_118%5CDocs%5CR2-2204351.zip) [N108] Shotgun coding in L1 parameters Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell discussion Rel-17 TEI17 Withdrawn

# 5 Other

Any other business, if needed, restricted to finalization of Rel-17 of RAN2 CP protocols.