3GPP TSG-RAN WG2 Meeting #109e R2-200xxxx

eMeeting, 24th – 28th, February 2020

Agenda Item: 5.4.1.1

Source: MediaTek Inc.

**Title: Report of [AT109e][004][NR15] Potential Easies I**

Document for: Discussion and decision

# 1 Introduction

This is report for the following e-mail discussion.

* [AT109e][004][NR15] Potential Easies I (Mediatek, vivo, Huawei, ASUS)

 Scope: Treat R2-2000681, R2-2000359, R2-2001179, R2-2001178, R2-2001590. In case email discussion gets unexpectedly long, it can be split.

 Intended outcome: Agreed CRs

 Deadline: Feb 27 1200 CET

# 2 Discussion on RRC Connection Control CRs

## 2.1 R2-2001590 - Correction on NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet (ASUSTeK)

Companies are invited to provide comments on the CR in the tile.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with the intent of the CR?** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Yes | We are fine with the CR |
| Intel | Needs correction, otherwise the CR is not accurae | **This is only applicable if the CSI-RS is not used for tracking, if it is used for tracking then the UE assumes a single CSI-RS port for all the RS.****The following change is suggested*****repetition***Indicates whether repetition is on/off. If the field is set to *off* or if the field is absent, the UE may not assume that the NZP-CSI-RS resources within the resource set are transmitted with the same downlink spatial domain transmission filter (see TS 38.214 [19], clauses 5.2.2.3.1 and 5.1.6.1.2). If the field is absent and the NZP-CSI-RS resources within the resource set are not used for tracking where *trs-Info* is not confitgured, the UE may not assume that the NZP-CSI-RS resources within the resource set are transmitted with same NrofPorts in every symbol (see TS 38.214 [19], clauses 5.2.2.3.1 and 5.1.6.1.2). Can only be configured for CSI-RS resource sets which are associated with *CSI-ReportConfig* with report of L1 RSRP or "no report". |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 2.2 R2-2001178 - Correction to RRC reconfiguration complete for NR-DC (Huawei, HiSilicon)

Companies are invited to provide comments on the CR in the tile.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with the intent of the CR?** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Partially | The word “store” is not needed. And I think text becomes easier to read with (..) added:3> include in the *nr-SCG-Response* the *RRCReconfigurationComplete* message (constructed while performing the RRC reconfiguration according to 5.3.5.3 for the *RRCReconfiguration* message included in *nr-SCG)*;Further, since this is just a clarification and do not change NW/UE behaviour, this CR should be included in the Rapporteur’s CR. |
| Intel | May be | While we don’t see this as an essential correction, we are OK with Ericsson suggestion to include it in the rapporteur CR. We also agree with Ericsson comment that it is not essential to model it as “stored” – that is, “stored” is not needed in the two places it is used in the CR. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 2.3 R2-2001179 - Correction to DRB addition/modification for the LTE UE not in EN-DC (Huawei, HiSilicon)

Companies are invited to provide comments on the CR in the tile.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with the intent of the CR?** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Partially | The CR addresses an editorial issue and what is proposed is not critical. For this reason, we don’t see the benefit for having the CR. However, if companies want to clarify this, then the CR can be merged in the Rapporteur’s CR. |
| Intel | Yes | While we don’t see any real risk of wrong implementation with the current spec, we think it is good to correct this. We are also OK to merge in the rapporteur CR. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 2.4 R2-2000359 - Cell re-selection during RRC connection resume (Vivo)

Companies are invited to provide comments on the CR in the tile.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with the intent of the CR?** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Yes | It is an improvement, but if not treated I suggest that Håkan includes in rapporteur’s CR. The whole background for this was the fact that in NR we split establishment procedure into coming from IDLE to INACTIVE, which generated a new Resume procedure. Then, during copy paste we missed a sentence that exists in the establishment procedure in LTE and also in NR. If we do not agree with the CR, or add to Håkan’s CR, we would have something a little bit strange that could imply different behaviour while in reality the same behaviour is expected. |
| Intel | May be | We don’t see any real risk of wrong implementation with the current spec and don’t see this as essential change. We are also OK to merge in the rapporteur CR. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 2.5 R2-2000681 - Correction on reporting of uplink TX direct current (MediaTek)

Companies are invited to provide comments on the CR in the tile.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with the intent of the CR?** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Yes | The changes look fine to us. It is obvious that the existing  procedure text is incorrect |
| Intel | Yes | The changes are correct |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Conclusions

Base on the discussion in section 2, we have the following proposals:

**Proposal 1:**
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