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# 1 Introduction

This is to gather the company views on the open issues of CPC listed in conclusion of section of R2-2000901.

* [AT109e][215][NR MOB] Finalization of CPC and discussing remaining open issues (CATT)

Scope:

* + - Agreeing on the proposals as per [R2-2000901](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109_e/Docs/R2-2000901.zip) (as much as possible).
    - Discuss open items as per [R2-2000901](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109_e/Docs/R2-2000901.zip) to seek companies feedback on open issues for CPC.

      Intended outcome:

* + - Proposals with consensus that can be incorporated (if needed) in the running CR(s) (aim to agree to those over email)
    - List of remaining open issues that need to be pursued in next meeting (if any).
    - Issues that should no longer be pursued

      Deadline for providing comments:

* + - Companies input: Thursday, Feb. 27th 3:00 CET
    - Rapporteur proposals: Friday, Feb. 28th 12:00 CET
    - Comments on proposals’ wording, Monday March 2nd by 17:00 CET

# 2 Open issues for discussion

In R2-2000901, it was considered that the following agreements can easily be agreed.

**Agreements proposed to be agreed in this meeting (easy agreements)**

S1\_1: While executing CPC procedure, the UE continues to receive RRC reconfiguration from the MN. However, the UE should finalise the ongoing CPC execution before processing the RRC message received from the MN (same as in the conventional PSCell change). i.e. legacy behaviour and no specific UE requirement.

S1\_2: As in legacy PSCell change, the UE sends *RRCReconfigurationComplete* to the MN at execution of CPC when no SRB3 is configured and the MN informs the SN. i.e the complete message to MN includes an embedded complete message to the SN.

S1\_4. Upon RLF on PCell during the execution of Conditional PScell change for intra-SN change without MN involvement, the UE supports the Rel-16 MR-DC procedures, i.e. performs connection re-establishment procedure without any fast MCG link recovery,

S3\_11. UE checks the validity of conditional PSCell change execution criteria configuration immediately on receiving the conditional PSCell change RRC Reconfiguration message, either embedded in the MN RRC message over SRB1 or received over SRB3 (same as CHO).

S3\_12. Introduce no specification changes regarding compliance checking of embedded Reconfiguration message containing configuration of conditional PSCell candidate (same as for CHO).

**Question 1: Is the above list of proposals agreeable?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agreeable proposals | Not agreeable proposals | Comments |
| OPPO | All proposals |  |  |
| Samsung | Agree on S1\_1, S1\_2, S1\_4, S3\_11, S3\_12 |  |  |
| ZTE | S1\_4, S3\_11, S3\_12 | S1\_1, S1\_2 | For S1\_1, we think the main issue is that it is not clear whether the RRC reconfiguration received in MN side can be used to process SN change or MN change with SN change, in which case it is not clear which configuration should be used as the baseline of delta configuration for SN side. Since only the CPC without MN involved will be considered in Rel-16, we assume the MN may trigger SN change or MN involved SN change as well, in which case the MN will assume the CPC has not been executed. If the UE finalizes the ongoing CPC execution first and then process the RRC message received from the MN, the delta configuration based on the old SCG configuration may become invalid. Therefore, we prefer that the UE stop the on-going CPC execution and roll-back to the old SCG configuration.  For S1\_2, considering two RRCReconfigurationComplete messages for SN shall be transmitted upon reception of RRCReconfiguration message from MN and execution of CPC in case SRB3 is not configured, we prefer that the second RRCReconfigurationComplete message for SN (i.e. transmitted upon execution of CPC) can be encapsulated in ULInformationTransferMRDC in SRB1, instead of using RRCReconfigurationComplete in SRB1 ( i.e. RRCReconfigurationComplete in MN side can only be sent if there is a RRCReconfiguration message sent from MN to UE). |
| Ericsson | The proposals seem fine. |  | A question related to S1\_1is if the UE receives an RRC message during the CPC execution, it will also take some time before it has decoded it (per existing requirements). It will therefore really be a corner case where the UE receives the new RRC message and manages to decode it, before the CPC execution has finished. The issue brought up by ZTE would exist in legacy also, no need to specify CPC more than legacy- |
| Nokia | All proposals are OK |  |  |

**Open items proposed to be further discussed in this meeting**

There are number of open issues identified for discussion in this meeting [R2-2000901]. I try to gather company opinions on each of the discussion point aiming to conclude or find a way forward to the open issues.

S1\_3: Discuss message formatting for *RRCReconfigurationComplete* to the MN at configuration of CPC when no SRB3 is configured.

* Option 1: the complete message to MN includes an embedded complete message to the SN.
* Option 2: the complete message to MN does not include an embedded complete message to the SN.

**Question 2: Which message formatting is to be used for *RRCReconfigurationComplete* to the MN at configuration of CPC when no SRB3 configured?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option 1 or Option 2 | Comments |
| OPPO | Option 1 | SN needs to receive the compete message. |
| Samsung | Option 2 | We have the following reasons:  We assume option 1 would require UE to performs compliance check immediately upon receipt (i.e. seems odd to return embedded message without doing compliance check). I.e. this seems not consistent with the intention to not introduce specification changes regarding actual moment of compliance checking (i.e. to leave up to UE implementation)  • The response provided upon configuration is merely a general confirmation i.e. an embedded message would not add anything compared to MN indicating via Xx to SN that the SCG reconfiguration was successful  • Some argued that it is important for MN to be aware that configuration of conditional PSCell change was successful. We are not sure this is needed, but even if, we think that addition of an embedded message would also not really increase MN awareness  • Not transferring an embedded message upon configuration (but only upon execution) aligns with what we do for CHO |
| ZTE | Option 1 | As CHO, the UE shall reply the RRCReconfigurationComplete to the source node (i.e. the SN) upon reception of RRCReconfiguration regardless of whether SRB3 is used or not. |
| Ericsson | Option 1 | We have agreed that the UE should send a Complete message upon configuration of CHO. The same should be done for CPC. The last bullet by Samsung is not correct. |
| Nokia | Option 1 | Agree with ZTE. That should not depend on whether SRB3 is used or not. |

S1\_5: Discuss how to handle the simultaneous CHO and CPC configurations.

Option 1: Leave it up to the network implementation (OAM) to ensure there is no simultaneous CHO and CPC configurations (majority opinion from the email discussion 108#67).

Option 2: Let RAN3 to consider a simple per UE based solution to ensure there is no simultaneous CHO and CPC configurations.

Option 3: Specify UE behaviour such that the UE should prioritise CHO over CPC configuration at the UE.

**Question 3: Which option to be used for handling the simultaneous CHO and CPC configurations?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option 1,2 or 3 | Comments |
| OPPO | Option 1 | Both CHO and CPC are configured by the network and we think network implementation should ensure they are not configured together. |
| Samsung | Option 1 |  |
| ZTE | Option 1 | We think it can be left to the network implementation. |
| Ericsson | Option 3 | Option 1 is not possible without RAN3 updates as highlighted by some companies in contributions (MN and SN may not be aware of what the other one is doing respectively). Considering this, we prefer option 3. |
| Nokia | Option 2 | It is not as easy as OPPO claims, as CHO and CPC may be configured by different nodes and without a mutual coordination. It cannot be always handled by the NW. Leaving this issue to OAM will result in very static configurations – either the UEs will have CHO or CPC, for a large area and without any means to configure that with per UE granularity. This is why we believe RAN3 could specify inter-node coordination for this purpose, without any impact on Uu signalling. Please consider what we have submitted in [R2-2001007](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109_e/Docs/R2-2001007.zip). |

S2\_6: Reconfirm the use of SCG failure information upon declaring SCG failure in the procedure of the conditional PSCell change.

S2\_7. When the conditional PSCell configuration received over SRB3 is invalid, UE initiates SCG failure information procedure to report to the MN about the SN change failure due to invalid configuration (legacy procedure).

S2\_8). When the conditional PSCell configuration received over SRB1 is invalid, i.e. UE cannot comply with the embedded PSCell configuration for intra-SN Change, UE performs connection re-establishment procedure or actions upon going to RRC\_IDLE (legacy procedure).

S2\_9. Like CHO, UE shall follow the below procedures for handling the T310 and T304 timers during conditional PSCell addition/change procedure for EN-DC, NGEN-DC, NR-DC cases:

* UE shall not stop MN T310 or SN T310 and shall not start T304 when it receives configuration of a CPC-intra-SN
* The timer T310 (SN only in case of SN Change) is stopped and timer T304-like is started when the UE begins execution of a CPC-intra-SN.

**Question 4: Are proposals S2\_6 to S2\_9 agreeable?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agreeable proposals | Not agreeable proposals | Comments |
| OPPO | All except S2\_8 |  | For S2\_8, for the case where the CPC configuration is for intra-SN change without MN involvement (since we only focus on this case in Rel-16), if UE cannot comply with only the CPC configuration part, we wonder whether triggering re-establishment is a good way. It seems UE can initiate SCG failure information, like the SRB3 case. |
| Samsung | all |  |  |
| ZTE | All proposals |  |  |
| Ericsson | All |  | The proposals seem fine. |
| Nokia | All seems OK |  |  |

**Open items can be discussed later**

The following list of proposals was discussed by one company or the issue was raised for the first time. Therefore these proposals were listed as for further discussion after the e-meeting, i.e email discussion after the meeting. I would like to check the company opinion on which proposals are agreeable in this meeting, to be further discussed in an email discussion after the meeting(for Rel-16), to be postponed to future release.

S3\_10: The UE shall inform the MN when CPC execution condition is fulfilled and the UE starts executing CPC, irrespective whether SRB3 is configured or not.

S3\_13: a threshold parameter is added to determine PCell quality and CPC is performed only when the PCell quality is above the configured threshold.

S3\_14: After sending SCG failure information, the UE stop evaluating the measId associated with the CPC.

S3\_15: When CPC-intra-SN is configured, if the UE is failed to access a candidate PSCell, the UE need not suspend SCG transmission for all SRBs and DRB, and reset SCG MAC.

S3\_16: During the CPC-intra-SN execution on a candidate PSCell, the UE continues the measurement configured for CPC-intra-SN target selection and execution.

S3\_17: If access to one target PSCell failed and there is another qualified target PSCell for the UE to perform CPC right way, the UE need not report the failure information of the first failed target PSCell.

S3\_18: For CPAC failure report, the SCG failure information message including the ID(s) of CPC execution failed cell(s).

S3\_19: If there is no SRB3, the UE sends an RRC message via SRB1 to inform the SN of CPC execution, and the RRC message doesn’t need to set transaction Id for responding to MN e.g. *ULInformationTransferMRDC*.

**Question 5: From the above list of proposals, which proposals are agreeable in this meeting, which proposals to be further discussed for Rel-16 (email discussion after the meeting) and which proposals to be postponed to future release?**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agreeable proposals in this meeting | Proposal to be further discussed for Rel-16 | Proposals to be postponed to future release | Comments |
| OPPO | S3\_14 | S3\_10, S3\_15, S3\_18, S3\_19 | S3\_13 | S3\_10, we are ok for the SRB1 case, but not sure UE needs to inform the MN for the SRB3 case.  S3\_16, not agree. UE should stop CPC evaluation when executing CPC-intra-SN.  S3\_17, not agree. Should align with CHO on selecting only one candidate. |
| Samsung | Nothing |  |  |  |
| ZTE | S3\_14, S3\_19 | S3\_10, S3\_18 | S3\_13, S3\_15, S3\_16, S3\_17 | We prefer to reuse the legacy SCG failure information procedure in case of CPC failure in Rel-16. And some optimization for the procedure (e.g. S3\_18) can be considered in Rel-16 if time is allowed. But other optimization should be considered in the later release, if needed. |
| Ericsson | S3\_14 | S3\_15 | S3\_10, S3\_13, S3\_16, S3\_17, S3\_18, S3\_19 | S3\_10 doesn’t fulfil the criteria of “no MN involvement”. Needs to be discussed in rel-17.  S3\_15 not clear. Should work the same as for the legacy case.  S3\_13, S3\_16, S3\_17, S3\_18 optimizations for future release.  S3\_19 probably not an issue. |
| Nokia | S3\_10 | S3\_10 (if not agreed now)  S3\_18 | S3\_13  S3\_14  S3\_15  S3\_16  S3\_17  S3\_19 | S3\_10: essential for avoiding any reconfigurations from the MN when CPC is executed. Shall be agreed still in Rel-16, either now or ‘next meeting’.  S3\_18: The content of SCG Failure Information, specifically for indicating CPC failure, can be further discussed. |