**3GPP TSG-RAN WG4 Meeting # 100-e R4-211XXXX**

**Electronic Meeting, 16th – 27th August, 2021**

**Agenda item:** 6.1.9.3, 6.1.2.3, 6.1.2.4, 6.1.4.2, 6.1.4.3, 6.1.10.3, 6.3

**Source:** Moderator (Apple)

**Title:** Email discussion summary for [100-e][205] NR\_RRM\_maintenance\_R16

**Document for:** Information

# Introduction

Rel-16 NR RRM maintenance (general)

Rel-16 NR IAB RRM maintenance

Rel-16 MR-DC RRM maintenance

Rel-16 TEI: RRM requirements

R16 UE feature list (RRM aspects)

1) Include all R16 NR RRM maintenance not expplicitly mentioned in other threads (NR eMob, Power saving, HST, FR1 RF, FR2 RF, 2 step RACH)  
2) R15 NR WI draft CRs R4-2111899, R4-2111900, R4-2112953, R4-2112955, R4-2114442, R4-2114443, R4-2114444 are moved to threads 201/202  
3) Feature list: R4-2112261

# Topic #1: On direct SCell activation

*Main technical topic overview. The structure can be done based on sub-agenda basis.*

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [**R4-2112078**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2112078.zip) | Apple | Proposal 1: Measurement period threshold value for requirement branching in NR FR1 should be:   * **Case 1: Activation delay for an SCell which was a deactivated SCell prior to e.g. HO and now target for the direct SCell activation.**   + **Reuse requirements in 8.3.2** * **Case 2: Other cells (i.e. cells which were not deactivated SCell prior to being target SCell in the direct activation)**   + **If the SCell is known and belongs to FR1, TCSI\_Reporting is specified in clause 8.3.2 and Tactivation\_time is defined as:**     - **TFirstSSB+ 5ms, if the measurement period is equal to or smaller than [1280]ms.**     - **TFirstSSB\_MAX + Trs + 5ms, if measurement period is larger than [1280]ms.** |
| [**R4-2114010**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2114010.zip) | Nokia | 1. Revert the change related to baseline SCell activation delay in section 8.3.2 made in RAN4#99. 2. Define direct activation delay requirements for a direct activated cell not having been measured using measCycleScell 3. Increase the measurement period threshold used for Tactivation\_time for direct NR FR1 SCell activation from 1280ms. 4. RAN4 to define the measurement period threshold equal 5 seconds. 5. RAN4 to agree on option 5. |

## Open issues summary

*Before e-Meeting, moderators shall summarize list of open issues, candidate options and possible WF (if applicable) based on companies’ contributions.*

### Sub-topic 1-1

**Issue 1-1: for the known target cell in FR1, whether to define different requirements for the following two cases:**

1. **the SCell being direct activated has been measured using measCycleSCell**
2. **the SCell being direct activated has NOT been measured using measCycleSCell**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: yes (Apple, Nokia)
  + Option 2: no (Huawei)
* Recommended WF
  + Apple and Nokia proposed option 1. Option 2 is not proposed but implicitly reflected in Huawei’s CR. Discussion is needed.

**Issue 1-2: if option 1 in issue 1-1 is agreed, what’s the condition for allowing additional time for AGC for case 1, i.e. the SCell being direct activated has been measured using measCycleSCell?**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Reuse legacy SCell activation requirements as defined in 8.3.2 (Apple, Nokia)
  + Option 2: no (Huawei)
* Recommended WF
  + Apple and Nokia proposed option 1. Option 2 is not proposed but implicitly reflected in Huawei’s CR. Discussion is needed.

**Issue 1-3: if option 1 in issue 1-1 is agreed, what’s the condition for allowing additional time for AGC for case 2, i.e. the SCell being direct activated has NOT been measured using measCycleSCell?**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: follow agreement in RAN4#98-e-bis (Apple)
    - If the SCell is known and belongs to FR1, TCSI\_Reporting is specified in clause 8.3.2 and Tactivation\_time is defined as:
      * TFirstSSB+ 5ms, if the measurement period is equal to or smaller than [1280]ms.
      * TFirstSSB\_MAX + Trs + 5ms, if measurement period is larger than [1280]ms.
  + Option 2: change [1280]ms to 2400ms to align with normal SCell activation (Huawei)
    - If the SCell is known and belongs to FR1, TCSI\_Reporting is specified in clause 8.3.2 and Tactivation\_time is defined as:
      * TFirstSSB+ 5ms, if the measurement period is equal to or smaller than 2400ms.
      * TFirstSSB\_MAX + Trs + 5ms, if measurement period is larger than 2400ms.
  + Option 3 change [1280]ms to 5s (Nokia)
    - If the SCell is known and belongs to FR1, TCSI\_Reporting is specified in clause 8.3.2 and Tactivation\_time is defined as:
      * TFirstSSB+ 5ms, if the measurement period is equal to or smaller than 5s.
      * TFirstSSB\_MAX + Trs + 5ms, if measurement period is larger than 5s.
* Recommended WF
  + Discussion is needed.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

Sub topic 1-1: remaining issue on the direct SCell activation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | **Issue 1-1**  Support Option 2. We are not sure whether Case 1 is a typical case in the real network. Typically, if an SCell has such a large coverage that it can be overlapped by both source and target PCells, then it should be configured as a PCell instead.  **Issue 1-2**  No need to have this discussion.  **Issue 1-3**  Firstly, even if Option 1 in Issue 1-1 is not agreed, we still need to discuss the requirement for Case 2. And we support Option 2 to align with the updated Rel-15 spec. |
| Ericsson | Issue 1-1:  We support Option 1.  Issue 1-2:  We support Option 1.  Issue 1-3:  We support Option 2 (align to 2400ms i.e. to SCell activation baseline). |
| Qualcomm | **Issue 1-1 ~ I-3**  We don’t have a strong opinion on the issues, but slightly prefer Option 2 to all three issues just from spec readability perspective. And as 2400ms was already adopted for the condition of FR1 known SCell AGC, we do not see much point in considering smaller values for essentially the same criterion, if we’re not missing something here. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*For close-to-finalize WIs and maintenance work, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For ongoing WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| [**R4-2112079**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2112079.zip)CR on direct SCell activation (R16) | MTK: pending on the Open issue discussion |
| Ericsson: We would like to see [2400]ms instead. |
|  |
| [**R4-2114011**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2114011.zip) **Draft CR for Direct SCell activation delay** | MTK: pending on the Open issue discussion |
| Ericsson: We would like to see [2400]ms instead. |
|  |
| [**R4-2114267**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2114267.zip)  CR on direct SCell activation requirements | MTK: pending on the Open issue discussion |
|  |
|  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic #1** | *Tentative agreements:*  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provides recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update*

*Note: The tdoc decisions shall be provided in Section 3 and this table is optional in case moderators would like to provide additional information.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

# Topic #2: scheduling restriction applicability for FR1 and FR1+FR2 inter-band CA

*Main technical topic overview. The structure can be done based on sub-agenda basis.*

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [**R4-2112121**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2112121.zip) | Apple | ***Proposal 1: RAN4 to introduce applicability of scheduling availability requirement for FR1 inter-band CA such that the scheduling availability requirements for FR1 inter-band CA are not applicable if the network configures simultaneous UL/DL between two FR1 bands but the UE does not have the capability of supporting simultaneousRxTxInterBandCA.***  ***Proposal 2: RAN4 to introduce applicability of scheduling availability requirement for FR1+FR2 inter-band CA such that the scheduling availability requirements for FR1+FR2 CA are not applicable if the network configures simultaneous UL/DL between FR1 and FR2 bands but the UE does not have the capability of supporting simultaneousRxTxInterBandCA*** ***on this band combination.*** |

## Open issues summary

*Before e-Meeting, moderators shall summarize list of open issues, candidate options and possible WF (if applicable) based on companies’ contributions.*

### Sub-topic 2-1

**Proposal 1: RAN4 to introduce applicability of scheduling availability requirement for FR1 inter-band CA such that the scheduling availability requirements for FR1 inter-band CA are not applicable if the network configures simultaneous UL/DL between two FR1 bands but the UE does not have the capability of supporting simultaneousRxTxInterBandCA.**

**Proposal 2: RAN4 to introduce applicability of scheduling availability requirement for FR1+FR2 inter-band CA such that the scheduling availability requirements for FR1+FR2 CA are not applicable if the network configures simultaneous UL/DL between FR1 and FR2 bands but the UE does not have the capability of supporting simultaneousRxTxInterBandCA on this band combination.**

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### **Open issues**

**Subtopic 2-1: scheduling restriction applicability for FR1 and FR1+FR2 inter-band CA**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | It is not clear by saying “the scheduling applicability requirement is not applicable, do”, because one may assume that UE still has to transmit UL signal even if it collides with symbols for DL measurement. We prefer to have sentence like  All requirements in x.y.z, … assume the network will not configure simultaneous UL/DL between two FR1 bands if the UE does not indicate the supporting of simultaneousRxTxInterBandCA |
| Ericsson | We are fine with introducing scheduling restriction on inter-band CA for FR1 and FR1 with FR2 for the case where the UE does not have the capability of supporting simultaneousRxTxInterBandCA. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*Major close to finalize WIs and Rel-15 maintenance, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For Rel-16 on-going WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| [**R4-2112122**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2112122.zip)  Draft CR on scheduling restriction applicability for FR1 and FR1+FR2 inter-band CA R16 | MTK: As commented in sub-topic 2-1. |
| Ericsson: OK |
|  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic#1** | *Tentative agreements:*  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator can provide summary of 2nd round here. Note that recommended decisions on tdocs should be provided in the section titled ”Recommendations for Tdocs”.*

# Topic #3: Void

# Topic #4: measurement requirements for relaxed carriers and non-relaxed carriers

*Main technical topic overview. The structure can be done based on sub-agenda basis.*

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [**R4-2113826**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2113826.zip) | Huawei | **Proposal1: When Srxlev ≤ SnonIntraSearchP or Squal ≤ SnonIntraSearchQ, measurements for UE fulfilling low mobility or not-at-cell edge criteria UE are specified as Ncarrier\_Relax \* Trelax + Ncarrier\_Non\_relax \* Tnon-Relax**  **where**  **Trelax is the relaxed measurement requirements specified in clause 4.2.2.10 and 4.2.2.11 in TS38.133,**  **Tnon-Relax is the normal measurement requirements specified in clause 4.2.2.4 and 4.2.2.5 in TS38.133,**  **Ncarrier\_Relax is the total number of configured inter-frequency/inter-RAT carriers required to meet relaxed measurement requirements (i.e., non-EMR carriers and EMR carriers while T331 is not running).**  **Ncarrier\_Relax is the total number of configured inter-frequency/inter-RAT carriers required to meet non relaxed measurement requirements (i.e., EMR carriers while T331 is running).** |

## Open issues summary

*Before e-Meeting, moderators shall summarize list of open issues, candidate options and possible WF (if applicable) based on companies’ contributions.*

### Sub-topic 3-1

**Proposal: When Srxlev ≤ SnonIntraSearchP or Squal ≤ SnonIntraSearchQ, measurements for UE fulfilling low mobility or not-at-cell edge criteria UE are specified as Ncarrier\_Relax \* Trelax + Ncarrier\_Non\_relax \* Tnon-Relax**

**where**

**Trelax is the relaxed measurement requirements specified in clause 4.2.2.10 and 4.2.2.11 in TS38.133,**

**Tnon-Relax is the normal measurement requirements specified in clause 4.2.2.4 and 4.2.2.5 in TS38.133,**

**Ncarrier\_Relax is the total number of configured inter-frequency/inter-RAT carriers required to meet relaxed measurement requirements (i.e., non-EMR carriers and EMR carriers while T331 is not running).**

**Ncarrier\_Relax is the total number of configured inter-frequency/inter-RAT carriers required to meet non relaxed measurement requirements (i.e., EMR carriers while T331 is running).**

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### **Open issues**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | One comment to the proposal about the definition for **Ncarrier\_Relax**. If T331 timer already expired, UE should be allowed to even not to measure any non-overlapping EMR carriers. Then, why should we still need to count the EMR carriers in **Ncarrier\_Relax**? Suggest to revise the definition like   * **(i.e., non-EMR carriers and non-overlapping EMR carriers while T331 is not running)** |
| Ericsson | The current requirements are clear and cover all cases involving EMR and non-EMR carriers. The interworking between EMR and non-EMR carriers in relaxed mode was discussed also in release 16 which led to current requirements based on EMR timer. Our view is that current requirements are complete and should be kept as they as. In addition, the power saving gain when UE is in relaxed mode on one carrier but in non-relaxed mode on other carriers is questionable. We don't think there is much power saving gain in this case. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*Major close to finalize WIs and Rel-15 maintenance, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For Rel-16 on-going WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| [**R4-2113827**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2113827.zip)  Correction on measurement requiements in relaxed measurement | MTK: same comment as sub-topic 3-1 |
| Ericsson: We do not think there is much power saving gain in this case, and hence do not see the CR as necessary. |
|  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic#1** | *Tentative agreements:*  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator can provide summary of 2nd round here. Note that recommended decisions on tdocs should be provided in the section titled ”Recommendations for Tdocs”.*

# Topic #5: DAPS handover

*Main technical topic overview. The structure can be done based on sub-agenda basis.*

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [**R4-2113515**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2113515.zip) | Ericsson | **Proposal 1 : Prior to random access procedure autonomous interruption is done in communication towards the target cell as necessary to enable the UE to have sufficient switching time, and after the random access procedure autonomous interruption is done in communication towards source cell as necessary to allow the UE to have sufficient switching time.** |
| [**R4-2113813**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2113813.zip) | Huawei | ***Observation 1: For DAPS handover, the UE is not required to perform PDCCH/PDSCH reception or uplink transmission on target cell before starting RACH procedure.***  ***Observation 2: For PRACH transmission on target cell, no additional interruption is needed when the target cell downlink timing is earlier than the source cell downlink timing.***  ***Observation 3: For PRACH transmission on target cell, an interruption of up to 6us due to DL-to-UL or UL-to-DL switching may be needed when the target cell downlink timing is later than the source cell downlink timing.***  ***Observation 4: For option 2, the UE is required to perform timing comparison between source cell and target cell, which would introduce additional complexity into UE implementation.***  ***Proposal 1: The clarification on DL-to-UL and UL-to-DL switching time for intra-band DAPS handover can be defined as follows:***   * ***Note 2: For DAPS handover on a TDD band, after starting RACH procedure, a UE is not required to transmit in the uplink to any of source and target cells earlier than NRX-TX after the end of the last received downlink symbol from any of source and target cells in the same TDD band where NRX-TX=25600Tc.*** * ***Note 3: For DAPS handover on a TDD band, after starting RACH procedure, a UE is not required to receive in the downlink from any of source and target cells earlier than NTX-RX after the end of the last transmitted uplink symbol to any of source and target cells in the same TDD band where NTX-RX=25600Tc.*** |

## Open issues summary

*Before e-Meeting, moderators shall summarize list of open issues, candidate options and possible WF (if applicable) based on companies’ contributions.*

### Sub-topic 1-1

**Issue 5-1: how to handle impact from TDD UL-DL and DL-UL switching for intra-band TDD case:**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Huawei): The clarification on DL-to-UL and UL-to-DL switching time for intra-band DAPS handover can be defined as follows:
    - Note 2: For DAPS handover on a TDD band, after starting RACH procedure, a UE is not required to transmit in the uplink to any of source and target cells earlier than NRX-TX after the end of the last received downlink symbol from any of source and target cells in the same TDD band where NRX-TX=25600Tc.
    - Note 3: For DAPS handover on a TDD band, after starting RACH procedure, a UE is not required to receive in the downlink from any of source and target cells earlier than NTX-RX after the end of the last transmitted uplink symbol to any of source and target cells in the same TDD band where NTX-RX=25600Tc.
  + Option 2 (Ericsson): prior to random access procedure autonomous interruption is done in communication towards the target cell as necessary to enable the UE to have sufficient switching time, and after the random access procedure autonomous interruption is done in communication towards source cell as necessary to allow the UE to have sufficient switching time:

**Table: Mitigation of constraints for DL to UL switching**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * Scenario | Mitigation action |
| Early target, late source, prior to start of random access | Not applicable (no target transmission) |
| Late target, early source, prior to start of random access | Skip last part of target DL |
| Early target, late source, after start of random access | Skip last part of source reception |
| Late target, early source, after start of random access | Skip first part of source transmission |

**Table: Mitigation of constraints for UL to DL switching**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scenario | Mitigation action |
| Early target, late source, prior to start of random access | Skip first part of target DL |
| Late target, early source, prior to start of random access | Not applicable (no target transmission) |
| Early target, late source, after start of random access | Skip last part of source transmission |
| Late target, early source, , after start of random access | Skip first part of source reception |

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

Sub topic 5-1: how to handle impact from TDD UL-DL and DL-UL switching for intra-band TDD case:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Support Option 1.  We prefer to follow the same logic as TS38.211, i.e., what comes early has a higher priority and only the later one might be dropped.  Option 2 seems too complicated for UE implementation. |
| Ericsson | We support Option 2.  Regarding Option 1, the observations are technically correct, but we do not agree with leaving it open for the UE implementation to do whatever it wants when the N\_RX\_TX, N\_TX\_RX minimum time of 13 µs = 25600 Tc cannot be met. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*For close-to-finalize WIs and maintenance work, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For ongoing WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| **[R4-2113516](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2113516.zip) CR on TS38.133 for dual active protocol stack handover** | MTK: As commented in Issue 5-, this approach is not preferred. |
| Company B |
|  |
| **[R4-2113814](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2113814.zip) Correction to DAPS handover requirements R16** | MTK: Suggest to follow the terminology in TS38.211, i.e., NRX-TX is only 25600, while NRX-TXTc is the in the unit of second.   |  | | --- | | Note 2: For DAPS handover on a TDD band, after starting RACH procedure, a UE is not required to transmit in the uplink to any of source and target cells earlier than NRX-TXTcafter the end of the last received downlink symbol from any of source and target cells in the same TDD band where NRX-TX=25600~~Tc~~.  Note 3: For DAPS handover on a TDD band, after starting RACH procedure, a UE is not required to receive in the downlink from any of source and target cells earlier than NTX-RXTc after the end of the last transmitted uplink symbol to any of source and target cells in the same TDD band where NTX-RX=25600~~Tc~~. | |
| Ericsson: Please see our comment to Issue 5-1. The CR is not agreeable to us. |
|  |
|  |  |
|  |
|  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic #1** | *Tentative agreements:*  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provides recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update*

*Note: The tdoc decisions shall be provided in Section 3 and this table is optional in case moderators would like to provide additional information.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

# Topic #6: Miscellaneous CR

*Main technical topic overview. The structure can be done based on sub-agenda basis.*

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*Major close to finalize WIs and Rel-15 maintenance, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For Rel-16 on-going WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Title** | **Comments collection** |
| **[R4-2111961](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2111961.zip)** | Draft CR on UE power saving requirements | Ericsson: OK |
|  |
| **[R4-2111963](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2111963.zip)** | Draft CR on cell reselection test case for UE Power saving | Ericsson: OK |
|  |
| **[R4-2111965](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2111965.zip)** | Draft CR on cell reselection test case for HST in FR1 | Ericsson: OK |
|  |
| **[R4-2112513](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2112513.zip)** | Draft CR on measurement delay requirements for Rel-16 HST requirements | Ericsson: Correction looks ok. For the consistency, we suggest to use 'SMTC period' instead of 'SMTC periodicity' and 'SMTC' in Notes 2 and 3 in Table 9.2.5.2-5.   |  | | --- | | NOTE 2: M2 = 1.5 if SMTC periodicity > 40 ms, otherwise M2=1  NOTE 3: Y=3 when SMTC <= 40ms, Y=5 when SMTC > 40ms | |
|  |
| **[R4-2113266](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2113266.zip)** | Draft CR to TS 38.133 on RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_INACTIVE state mobility | Ericsson: OK |
|  |
| **[R4-2113855](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2113855.zip)** | draft CR to TS38.133[R16] Updating the introduction of EN-DC Interruption | Ericsson: OK |
|  |
| **[R4-2113884](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2113884.zip)** | [draft CR] maintenance for conditional PSCell change | Ericsson: OK |
|  |
| **[R4-2114013](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2114013.zip)** | Draft CR for Idle Mode measurements of inter-RAT CA candidate cells for early reporting (TC#3) | Anritsu: We appreciate taking into account of our previous comments on the table structure to the CR (R4-2111277) at #99-e topic group 212. However there were other comments on Noc before and it seems that those values are still kept. It is appreciated if the intention to maintain those values is explained. We would like to extract the previous comments as follows.  b) In several tables Cell 2 Noc/15kHz is stated twice, once with a fixed value of -98dBm/15kHz and again with band-dependent values, which is a contradiction. To meet the test purpose, it is probably not necessary to use band-dependent values. One fixed value may be OK, and is much simpler.  c) It is not clear why Cell 1 needs different Noc values of -98dBm/15kHz during T1, T2, T5 and -102dBm/15kHz during T3, T4. Could this be simplified to a constant -98dBm/15kHz during T1..T5?  d) The derived parameters need to be re-evaluated when issues a) b) and c) are resolved. |
| Ericsson: OK |
| **[R4-2114149](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2114149.zip)** | Correction to test cases of inter-RAT cell re-selection with relaxed measurement criterion R16 | MTK: A suggestion as follows. For LTE, we also need to use RRCConnectionRequest instead of RRCSetupRequest   |  | | --- | | A.6.1.2.3.3 Test Requirements The cell reselection delay to a lower priority E-UTRAN cell with UE fulfilling low mobility criterion is defined as the time from the beginning of time period T1, to the moment when the UE camps on cell 2, and starts to send preambles on the PRACH for sending the *~~RRCSetupRequest~~* *RRCConnectionRequest* message to perform a Tracking Area Update procedure on cell 2. | |
| Ericsson: OK |
| **[R4-2114431](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2114431.zip)** | Side conditions in IAB-MT RRC connection mobility requirements in TS 38.174 |  |
|  |
| **[R4-2114432](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2114432.zip)** | Correction to IAB-MT RRM tests in TS 38.174 |  |
|  |
| **[R4-2114441](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2114441.zip)** | Missing n259 RRM performance requirements in Rel-17 |  |
|  |
| **[R4-2113443](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2113443.zip)** | Draft CR on 38.171 requirements for support of A-GNSS (R16) | Ericsson: OK |
|  |
| **[R4-2113444](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2113444.zip)** | Draft CR on 36.171 requirements for support of A-GNSS (R17)  Note: this is not identical to **R4-2113443** |  |
|  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic#1** | *Tentative agreements:*  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator can provide summary of 2nd round here. Note that recommended decisions on tdocs should be provided in the section titled ”Recommendations for Tdocs”.*

# Recommendations for Tdocs

## 1st round

**New tdocs**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Title** | **Source** | **Comments** |
| WF on … | YYY |  |
| LS on … | ZZZ | To: RAN\_X; Cc: RAN\_Y |
|  |  |  |

**Existing tdocs**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation** | **Comments** |
| R4-210xxxx | CR on … | XXX | Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

1. Please include the summary of recommendations for all tdocs across all sub-topics incl. existing and new tdocs.
2. For the Recommendation column please include one of the following:
   1. CRs/TPs: Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued
   2. Other documents: Agreeable, Revised, Noted
3. For new LS documents, please include information on To/Cc WGs in the comments column
4. Do not include hyper-links in the documents

## 2nd round

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation** | **Comments** |
| R4-210xxxx | CR on … | XXX | Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued |  |
| R4-210xxxx | WF on … | YYY | Agreeable, Revised, Noted |  |
| R4-210xxxx | LS on … | ZZZ | Agreeable, Revised, Noted |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

1. Please include the summary of recommendations for all tdocs across all sub-topics.
2. For the Recommendation column please include one of the following:
   1. CRs/TPs: Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued
   2. Other documents: Agreeable, Revised, Noted
3. Do not include hyper-links in the documents

# Annex

Contact information

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Name** | **Email address** |
| Anritsu corporation | Osamu Yamashita | Osamu.Yamashita[at]anritsu.com |
| MTK | Ato Yu | Ato.yu[at]mediate.com |
| Ericsson | Joakim Axmon | joakim.axmon[at]ericsson.com |
| Qualcomm (for Topic#1) | CH Park | [chparkqc@qti.qualcomm.com](mailto:chparkqc@qti.qualcomm.com) |

Note:

1. Please add your contact information in above table once you make comments on this email thread.
2. If multiple delegates from the same company make comments on single email thread, please add you name as suffix after company name when make comments i.e. Company A (XX, XX)