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# 1 Introduction

This document contains a Rapporteur-initiated offline discussion on Rel-18 Mobile IAB.

# For the Chairman’s Notes

**The following is proposed:**

**Proposal 1a: WA: The mIAB-DU and mIAB-MT can integrate at different CUs. For this purpose, OAM can be used to configure the mIAB-DU with: a) the donor CU to connect to, and b) the parameters needed to establish F1 connectivity to this donor CU.**

**To be continued:**

**Whether the information on the DU’s CU can also be configured by the MT’s CU.**

**Proposal 1b-new: During network integration, in case OAM configures the IAB-node with the information on the DU’s CU, the mIAB-MT’s UE XnAP ID is transparently passed from the mIAB-MT’s CU to the mIAB-MT via RRC, then from the co-located mIAB-DU to mIAB-DU’s CU via F1AP. The NCGI of the mIAB-MT’s serving cell is passed from the mIAB-node to the mIAB-Du’s CU via F1AP.**

**To be continued:**

**How to pass the UE XnAP ID and NCGI in case the DU’s CU is configured by other means than OAM, if agreed.**

**Proposal 3a: For CU-triggered DU migration, a class-1 procedure is used by the source mIAB-DU’s CU to trigger the F1 Setup procedure. For CU- and OAM-triggered DU migration, a separate class-1 procedure is used by the source mIAB-DU to report the outcome of the F1-Setup procedure to its CU.**

**Proposal 4: The IAB-node may provide to the source DU’s CU a mapping between the source DU’s activated cells and the target DU’s activated cells so that the target DU’s CU can perform blind handover for the connected UEs.**

**To be continued: whether such mapping information is needed for all activated cells.**

**Proposal 6: The DU’s CU can initiate the Xn TM Management Procedure pertaining to an mIAB-MT even though it has never had an RRC connection with this IAB-MT.**

**Proposal 7a: The mIAB-DU’s NCGI is configured by OAM, and it may be reconfigured by the donor CU via F1 based on a list of NCGIs that has been configured on this donor CU by OAM or by preconfiguration. This should not affect the existing procedure of configuring NCGI of cells served by a stationary DU via OAM.**

**Proposal 7b: RAN3 to send an LS to SA5 and include proposal 6a as RAN3 agreement, and ask SA5 to provide feedback, if any.**

**To be continued:**

**Whether any interaction between IAB-node and OAM needs to be captured on St2.**

# 2 Discussion

AI 13.2

### Issue 1: mIAB-node integration: MT and DU can integrate to separate CUs

After Monday’s offline, we converged on:

**Proposal 1a: WA: The mIAB-DU and mIAB-MT can integrate at different CUs. This is based on the assumption that OAM indicates the DU’s CU to the mIAB-node.**

**Q1a: Any comments on this draft proposal:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **Ericsson** | Rewording:  **Proposal 1a: WA: The mIAB-DU and mIAB-MT can integrate at different CUs. This is based on the assumption that OAM configures at the mIAB-DU the donor CU for the mIAB-DU to connect to, and the parameters needed for the mIAB-DU to establish F1 connectivity to this donor CU.** |
| Nokia | Agree with Ericsson text |
| CATT | Agree with Ericsson rewording. |
| ZTE | Agree. Ok with Ericsson’s rewording. |
| MITRE | Agree with the proposal. We suggest following modification to the text: **Proposal 1a: WA: The mIAB-DU and mIAB-MT can integrate at different CUs. This is based on the assumption that OAM configures the mIAB-DU with: a) the donor CU to connect to, and b) the parameters needed to establish F1 connectivity to this donor CU.** |
| Lenovo | Agree with Ericsson’s or MITRE’s rewording. |
| Huawei | Prefer the following rewording, because it is also possible that the mIAB-MT’s CU provide the F1 terminating CU’s information to the IAB-node, if it is configured such information.  **Proposal 1a:**  **WA: The mIAB-DU and mIAB-MT can integrate at different CUs.** |
| Samsung | In general, we share the similar view as HW. This proposal does not preclude the possibility that the mIAB-MT’s CU makes the decision on terminating IAB-DU towards a different CU. Based on this, we can have:  **Proposal 1a: The mIAB-DU and mIAB-MT can integrate at different CUs.**   * **WA: This can be based on the assumption that OAM configures at the mIAB-DU the donor CU for the mIAB-DU to connect to, and the parameters needed for the mIAB-DU to establish F1 connectivity to this donor CU.** * **WA: This can be also based on the assumption that the IAB-MT’s CU makes decision** |
| Xiaomi | We share similar views as HW and SS, SS’ rewording is fine to us. |
|  |  |

For further converged on a proposal prototype:

**Proposal 1b: WA: During network integration, the MT’s gNB-ID and MT’s UE XnAP ID can be passed to the DU’s CU via F1AP.**

Some companies felt that it would be beneficial capturing that the UE XnAP ID is passed transparently. For this, we need to also capture that RRC is used as well.

Further, for SA2’s request to enhance the UE’s ULI, we agreed in prior a meeting that the MT’s NCGI needs to be passed from MT’s CU to DU’s CU. It is therefore sufficient to just pass the MT’s NCGI, which contains the gNB-ID. In case the DU’s CU needs to know the explicit MT’s gNB-ID to determine the Xn-C connection, it can derive it based on TS 38.300:

|  |
| --- |
| 15.3.4 Xn-C TNL address discovery …  The NG-RAN node may determine the gNB ID length of the candidate gNB based on, e.g.OAM configuration or UE reporting in ANR function. If the NG-RAN node is not able to make this determination, it may include the NR cell identifier in the UPLINK RAN CONFIGURATION TRANSFER message to the AMF. The AMF may, if supported, determine the target gNB ID by matching the NR cell identifier with a gNB ID of a gNB it connects to. |

We end up with the following draft proposal:

**Proposal 1b-new: During network integration, the mIAB-MT’s UE XnAP ID is transparently passed from the mIAB-MT’s CU to the mIAB-DU’s CU via the IAB-node using RRC and F1AP. The MT’s NCGI is passed to the mIAB-MT’s CU via F1AP.**

**Q1b: Any comments on this draft proposal:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **Ericsson** | OK |
| Nokia | We do not understand the last sentence. What is MT’s NCGI? Is it the NCGI of the IAB-MT’s serving(or parent) cell? But MT’s CU already know it during RRC, and does not need to use F1AP to know it. Is it mIAB-**DU**’s CU which requires to know the IAB-MT’s serving cell’s NCGI?  Reword it a little bit to make it clear:  **Proposal 1b-new: During network integration, the mIAB-MT’s UE XnAP ID is transparently passed from the mIAB-MT’s CU to the mIAB-MT via RRC, then from the co-located mIAB-DU to mIAB-DU’s CU via F1AP. The mIAB-MT’s NCGI is passed to the mIAB-DU’s CU via F1AP.** |
| CATT | Suggest following rewording to the last sentence:  **The NCGI of IAB-MT’s serving cell is passed from the mIAB-node to the mIAB-DU’s CU via F1AP.** |
| ZTE | There is no precedent of information transfer between the two CUs via UE transparently. And we still think using BAP address is a better choice. If BAP address is included in TMM request message to identify the MT, there would be no need to transfer MT ID from MT’s CU to MT via RRC. And currently BAP address is already included in the F1 setup request message from the target logical DU to the DU’s CU. In this way, only NCGI of MT’s serving cell needs to be passed to DU’s CU via F1AP. |
| MITRE | Agree with the Nokia text. |
| Lenovo | As my understanding, for the MT’s NCGI used for UE’s ULI, it can be sent to mIAB-DU’s CU ONLY after mIAB-DU has migrated to the target CU and the mIAB-MT’s CU has been aware of the mIAB-DU’s CU. However, in the very beginning state of network integration, how can mIAB-MT’s CU know the mIAB-DU’s CU during the network integration stage in case OAM directly indicates the target CU for mIAB-DU to the mIAB-node?  So, I prefer to keep using MT’s gNB-ID here, and include both mIAB-MT’s UE XnAP ID and MT’s gNB-ID in RRC and F1AP messages. |
| Huawei | Disagree.  The NCGI of IAB-MT is for the additional ULI report, during the integration, there is no UE attached, no reason to include the NCGI in the F1AP.  So, if the mIAB-MT and mIAB-DU connects to different CUs during the integration, it is worth to discuss how can the mIAB-DU’s CU know the gNB ID of the mIAB-MT’s CU and the mIAB-MT’s UE XnAP ID allocated by the mIAB-MT’s CU.  the RRC+F1AP signaling is a possible way, but we’d like to offer another option:  **The mIAB-MT’s CU is configured by OAM with the information on the proper F1 terminating CU to serve the mIAB-DU, there is Xn interface between the two CUs, and the mIAB-MT’s CU provide the mIAB-MT’s UE XnAP ID to the mIAB-DU’s CU via XnAP signaling.**  We prefer to clarify the issues and continue to discuss the two solutions in next meeting. So, our suggestion is:  **Proposal 1b-new: If mIAB-MT and mIAB-DU connects to different donor CUs during network integration, RAN3 to discuss how to transfer the gNB ID of the mIAB-MT’s CU, and the mIAB-MT’s UE XnAP ID allocated by the mIAB-MT’s CU ~~is transparently passed from the mIAB-MT’s CU~~ to the mIAB-DU’s CU, with the following two options:**   1. **via the IAB-node using RRC and F1AP** 2. **Via the XnAP signaling** |
| Samsung | We tend to share the similar view as HW. Even under OAM based solution, the IAB-MT XnAP ID can be provided via the XnAP. In this sense, we prefer to HW’s proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Agree with HW and Samsung.  We have concerns on the reliability for transferring the information via RRC and F1AP over Uu, XnAP signalling is better. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Summary on Q1:**

**On P1a: There was principal agreement together with some rewording proposals. Huawei, Samsung and Xiaomi wer not happy with the second sentence since it precludes that the MT’s CU provides the information for the CU for the DU to connect to. While this would certainly not be in line with RAN3 agreements on DU migration, we do not have to preclude this option for the time being. The 2nd sentence can still be kept with a little rewording, i.e., OAM can be used.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 1a: WA: The mIAB-DU and mIAB-MT can integrate at different CUs. For this purpose, OAM can be used to configure the mIAB-DU with: a) the donor CU to connect to, and b) the parameters needed to establish F1 connectivity to this donor CU.**  **To be continued:**  **Whether the information on the DU’s CU can also be configured by the MT’s CU.** |

**On P1b:**

**There is some support for the initial proposal. Nokia and CATT provide some rewording. ZTE proposes to use BAP instead of XnAP ID. No other company supports this proposal. Huawei, Samsung and Xiaomi would also like to consider the solution where the configuration of the DU’s CU is provided by the MT’s CU. Again, we do not have to preclude this scenario. We therefore restrict the proposal to the scenario where this configuration is provided by OAM.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 1b-new: During network integration, in case OAM configures the IAB-node with the information on the DU’s CU, the mIAB-MT’s UE XnAP ID is transparently passed from the mIAB-MT’s CU to the mIAB-MT via RRC, then from the co-located mIAB-DU to mIAB-DU’s CU via F1AP. The NCGI of the mIAB-MT’s serving cell is passed from the mIAB-node to the mIAB-Du’s CU via F1AP.**  **To be continued:**  **How to pass the UE XnAP ID and NCGI in case the DU’s CU is configured by other means than OAM, if agreed.** |

### Issue 3: F1AP transport of F1-Setup Trigger and F1-Setup Outcome

We identified that two separate class-1 procedures are needed.

* One class-1 procedure is used to trigger F1-Setup (CU🡪IAB-node),
* A separate class-1 procedure is needed to report the successful outcome of the F1-Setup (IAB-node🡪CU).

It is necessary to have two separate procedures for this purpose since the first procedure is only needed in case F1-Setup if triggered by the source-DU’s CU. This first procedure is not needed in case the F1-Setup is indicated to the IAB-node via OAM. We should capture this in a proposal:

**Proposal 3a: One class-1 procedure is used by the source mIAB-DU’s CU to trigger the F1-Setup procedure, and another class-1 procedure is used by the mIAB-DU to report the outcome of the F1-Setup procedure to its CU.**

**Q3a: Any comments on this draft proposal:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **Ericsson** | OK, but rewording:  **Proposal 3a: One class-1 procedure is used by the source mIAB-DU’s CU to trigger the F1-Setup procedure, and, for OAM-configured triggering of F1 setup, another class-1 procedure is used by the mIAB-DU to report the outcome of the F1-Setup procedure to its CU.** |
| Nokia | In both cases, the source DU’s CU need to know the outcome of the F1 setup. For Ericsson text, does the response of the 1st class-1 procedure indicate the outcome of the F1 setup? If so, agree with the modification. |
| CATT | Agree. |
| ZTE | As stated by rapporteur, the first procedure is only needed in case F1-Setup is triggered by the source-DU’s CU. And the second procedure to report the outcome of F1 setup is needed no matter whether the F1 setup is triggered by OAM or DU’s source CU. So Ericsson’s rewording is misleading and we suggest the following rewording:  **Proposal 3a: One class-1 procedure is used by the source mIAB-DU’s CU to trigger the F1-Setup procedure, and another class-1 procedure is used by the mIAB-DU to report the outcome of the F1-Setup procedure to source mIAB-DU’s CU.** |
| MITRE | We understand this as follows: the first procedure is conditional if the F1-setup is not based on the OAM configuration. The second procedure is applicable to both source mIAB-DU’s CU based and OAM based F1-setup. Can add this clarity to the original text.  **Proposal 3a: One class-1 procedure is used by the source mIAB-DU’s CU to trigger the F1-Setup procedure (does not apply to the OAM based F1-Setup case). Another class-1 procedure is used by the mIAB-DU to report the outcome of the F1-Setup procedure to its CU (applies to both cases).** |
| Lenovo | Agree with rewording from Ericsson, and the response of first class-1 procedure can be used to indicate the F1 setup completion. |
| Huawei | For the source CU triggering, a new class 1 procedure should be introduced, this allows the IAB-DU report the outcome of the new F1 setup for the target logical DU.  For the OAM based triggering of new F1 setup, the IAB-DU only need to report the outcome to the source F1 terminating CU. No response from the source F1 terminating CU is expected. So class 2 procedure seems enough.  So, our suggestion based on Ericsson’s version is:  **Proposal 3a: One class-1 procedure is used by the source mIAB-DU’s CU to trigger the F1-Setup procedure, and, for OAM-configured triggering of F1 setup, another class-~~1~~2 procedure is used by the mIAB-DU to report the outcome of the F1-Setup procedure to its CU.** |
| Samsung | Agree the original version is OK.  For triggering of F1 setup, we think a class-1 procedure is needed. While the F1 setup outcome may be derived lately depending on the F1 setup procedure and the configurations to the IAB-DU. Thus, it is better to use a separate procedure for the F1 setup outcome indication.  Moreover, since both procedures occur over the air interface, class-1 procedure is a better choice. |
| Xiaomi | The original wording from moderator is ok, the two class 1 procedures are used for different purposes, it’s clear for us. |
|  |  |

**Summary on Q3a:**

**To clarify:**

**For CU-triggered DU migration, a class-1 procedure is used by the source mIAB-DU’s CU to trigger the F1 Setup procedure.**

**For CU- and OAM-triggered DU migration, a separate class-1 procedure is used by the source mIAB-DU to report the outcome of the F1-Setup procedure to its CU.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 3a: For CU-triggered DU migration, a class-1 procedure is used by the source mIAB-DU’s CU to trigger the F1 Setup procedure. For CU- and OAM-triggered DU migration, a separate class-1 procedure is used by the source mIAB-DU to report the outcome of the F1-Setup procedure to its CU.** |

We did not converge if existing or new procedures should be used for this purpose. In case we use existing procedures, those would be the gNB-CU Configuration Update and gNB-DU Configuration Update procedures. We could try to narrow down the down in the following manner.

**Proposal 3b: RAN3 to decide if the** **gNB-CU Configuration Update and gNB-DU Configuration Update procedures are used for this purpose or if new procedures are introduced for this purpose.**

**Q3b: Any comments on this draft proposal:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **Ericsson** | **OK** |
| Nokia | Ok |
| CATT | OK. |
| ZTE | Ok |
| MITRE | Agree |
| Lenovo | Ok |
| Huawei | Fine to keep FFS on whether using new procedure or reuse existing ones. But, the gNB-DU configuration update procedure is not suitable, since we only need a class 2 procedure to report the outcome of the new F1 setup. |
| Samsung | OK |
| Xiaomi | Agree |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Summary on Q3b:**

**There seems to be convergence on this proposal:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 3b: RAN3 to decide if the** **gNB-CU Configuration Update and gNB-DU Configuration Update procedures are used for this purpose or if new procedures are introduced for this purpose.** |

We may want to add the following in the Chair notes:

**Proposal 3c: Add to Chair notes:**

**“To be continued:**

**Proponents of using the existing procedures should identify a precedence where an existing procedure is used to pass information that is no related to at least one of the end points of the procedure.**

**Proponents of introducing new procedures should discuss the technical benefits, if any, of using new over existing procedures in the present scenario.”**

**Q3c: Any comments on this draft proposal:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **Ericsson** | Makes sense, but is such a detailed TBC needed? |
| CATT | The first note does not make sense.  Regarding the feature on passing information for one end point to another end point, we think there is no difference between the two options, because passing F1 setup information for the target DU or indicating the F1 setup completion towards the target DU’s CU is anyway needed between the source DU’s CU and the source DU no matter which way to use. Therefore, it’s not clear why the new procedure takes priority over reusing the existing procedure on that point. |
| ZTE | Ok |
| MITRE | There are already many cases where transparent containers are used to carry additional IEs. E.g. RRCSetupComplete carries NAS payload. |
| Lenovo | Ok. |
| Huawei | The purpose of gNB-CU configuration and gNB-DU configuration clearly stated that the purpose is to update application level configuration on the F1 interface. Not just “related to at least one endpoint”  Prefer the version shown in the offline session, with some rewording:  **Proponents of using the existing procedures should identify a precedence where an existing procedure in the F1 interface is used to pass information that is not related to this F1 interface.** |
| Samsung | We may not need spend time to discuss this since we anyway need further discussion based on P3b |
| Xiaomi | ok |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Summary on Q3c:**

**Not much support. Let’s not pursue this.**

### Issue 4: DU migration: Do we need mapping from source to target cell IDs?

We converged that the source-DU’s CU needs to know the mapping between the source-DU’s cells and the target-DU’s cells so that it can initiate blind UE handover. Based on the discussion, this mapping may be needed, e.g., in case the cells reflect separate sectors of the DU, or in case only a subset of the cells are special cells.

**Proposal 4: The IAB-node to provide to the source DU’s CU the mapping between the source DU’s activated cells and the target DU’s activated cells.**

**Q4: Any comments on this draft proposal:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **Ericsson** | We are not against, but this needs some further discussion. The interplay with the baseline solution is unclear. Also, do we expect that an mIAB nide will really have more than one cell? |
| Nokia | Agree.  R16/17 IAB can have more than 1 cell. This should be the same for R18. |
| CATT | Agree.  And during the offline discussion, companies agreed this mapping indication can be used as an implicit indication for F1 setup completion, so we suggest following update:  **Proposal 4: The IAB-node to provide to the source DU’s CU the mapping between the source DU’s activated cells and the target DU’s activated cells. The mapping information implicitly indicates F1-setup completion to the source DU’s CU.** |
| ZTE | Yes, this may be beneficial to determine the target cell for UE HO. |
| MITRE | Agree with Ericsson position. Not clear it is always practical to provide one to one mapping. |
| Lenovo | Agree, but this is only an optimization to the legacy baseline procedure. |
| Huawei | Agree with Nokia. Prefer the original version from the moderator. |
| Samsung | Agree with the original version. |
| Xiaomi | Agree with the original version. |
|  |  |

**Summary on Q4:**

**While there was good support during the F2F discussion, some companies seem to get wary. The DU may certainly support multiple cells. However, it is not clear if such mapping information is needed for all the activated cells, or, e.g., only those that are used as special cells by connected UEs. Therefore, we should keep it FFS if mapping information is needed for all activated cells. We should further include the purpose for the inclusion of this mapping information, i.e., for blind handover.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 4: The IAB-node may provide to the source DU’s CU a mapping between the source DU’s activated cells and the target DU’s activated cells so that the target DU’s CU can perform blind handover for the connected UEs.**  **To be continued: whether such mapping information is needed for all activated cells.** |

### Issue 6: Generation of F1-terminating CU’s UE XnAP ID.

We converged on the following open issue from last meeting:

|  |
| --- |
| **To be continued:**  **Discuss whether the mIAB-DU’s CU is allowed to generate an XnAP UE ID for an mIAB-MT even if it has never terminated the RRC connection of the mIAB-MT.** |

**Proposal 6: The DU’s CU can initiate the Xn TM Management Procedure pertaining to an mIAB-MT even though it has never had an RRC connection with this IAB-MT.**

**Q6: Any comments on this draft proposal:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **Ericsson** | **OK** |
| Nokia | Ok |
| CATT | OK |
| ZTE | OK |
| MITRE | OK |
| Lenovo | Ok. |
| Huawei | OK |
| Samsung | OK |
| Xiaomi | Ok |
|  |  |

**Summary on Q6:**

**Full support.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 6: The DU’s CU can initiate the Xn TM Management Procedure pertaining to an mIAB-MT even though it has never had an RRC connection with this IAB-MT.** |

**AI 13.3**

### Issue 7: NCGI reconfiguration

On NCGI reconfiguration, we converged on the following two draft proposals:

**Proposal 6a: The donor CU can reconfigure the mobile IAB-DU’s NCGI in F1 Setup Response based on a list of NCGIs configured on this donor CU via OAM or preconfigured. This should not affect the existing procedure of configuring NCGI of cells served by a stationary DU via OAM.**

**Proposal 6b: RAN3 to send an LS to SA5 and include proposal 6a as RAN3 agreement, and ask SA5 to provide feedback, if any.**

The LS will not be drafted until we have officially agreed on P6b in the online session.

**Q7: Any comments on this draft proposal:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **Ericsson** | If R3 is really going to go for this, we should discuss and describe in stage2 the interplay with the OAM-based approach for assigning the NCGIs to the mIAB.  R3 and S5 should also clarify whether the OAM needs to be aware that the NCGI has been overwritten. |
| Nokia | Current proposal does not include the NCGI configuration via OAM. Suggest change P6a to  **Proposal 6a: The mIAB-DU’s NCGI is configured by OAM, and it may be reconfigured by t~~T~~he donor CU ~~can reconfigure the mobile IAB-DU’s NCGI~~ in F1 Setup Response based on a list of NCGIs configured on this donor CU via OAM or preconfigured. This should not affect the existing procedure of configuring NCGI of cells served by a stationary DU via OAM.** |
| CATT | Ok with the P6a and P6b. We don’t need to discuss the interaction between OAM and donor-CU on NCGI assignment to mIAB-node before receiving feedback from SA5. |
| ZTE | We should not restrict the new NCGI is reconfigured via F1 setup response message, i.e. other F1AP messages may also be used for this purpose. For example, if new cells are activated via the GNB-DU CONFIGURATION UPDATE ACKNOWLEDGE or GNB-CU CONFIGURATION UPDATE message, the donor CU can reconfigure NCGI for the newly activated cells via these messages as well. So we suggest the following rewording:  **Proposal 6a: The donor CU can reconfigure the mobile IAB-DU’s NCGI via F1 based on a list of NCGIs configured on this donor CU via OAM or preconfiguration. This should not affect the existing procedure of configuring NCGI of cells served by a stationary DU via OAM.** |
| MITRE | Agree with the proposals P6a and P6b. |
| Lenovo | OK for P6a and P6b. |
| Huawei | P6a: prefer Nokia’s version. |
| Samsung | OK with Nokia’s version on P6a, and find to send LS. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with Nokia’s version. |
|  |  |

**Summary on Q7:**

**The seems to be good support for the spirit of the initial proposals. The rewording by Nokia is technically correct and can be captured. Ericsson believes that interplay between OAM and IAB-node needs to be captured on ST2. CATT believes that this can be done based on SA5’s feedback. We can make this a “to be continued”. ZTE would like to extend the reconfiguration to other messages than F1 Setup Response since the CU may decide to activate cells at a later point in time. This is technically correct.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 7a: The mIAB-DU’s NCGI is configured by OAM, and it may be reconfigured by the donor CU via F1 based on a list of NCGIs that has been configured on this donor CU by OAM or by preconfiguration. This should not affect the existing procedure of configuring NCGI of cells served by a stationary DU via OAM.**  **Proposal 7b: RAN3 to send an LS to SA5 and include proposal 6a as RAN3 agreement, and ask SA5 to provide feedback, if any.**  **To be continued:**  **Whether any interaction between IAB-node and OAM needs to be captured on St2.** |
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