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# 1 Brief scope of the Conditional PSCell Change

This document is to discuss the open issues for TS 38.331 CR capturing agreements for CPC. The issue of terminology was raised during the email discussion 108#67. Any other stage 3 issues requiring discussion/ wider company opinion can be included in other section of this document.

# 2 Terminology for capturing CPC

During email discussion 108#67, all companies agree to reuse the IE defined for CHO even for CPC. The field name of the IE could be changed to reflect that the IE is used for both CHO and CPC.

The draft CR for TS 38.331 uses the terminology option 1 while [R2-2001163] proposes a terminology option 2. “csc” in option 2 stands for “Conditional SPCell Change”.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Option 1(used in draft CR) | Option 2 [R2-2001163] |
| * conditionalReconfiguration
* condConfigToRemoveList
* condConfigToAddModList
* CondConfigId
* condTriggerConfig
* eventAN
 | * csc-Config
* csc-CandidateToReleaseList
* csc-CandidateToAddModList
* csc-CandidateId
* eventTriggerConfigCSC
* eventAN-CSC
 |

**Question 1: Could company provide their preference for the terminology for capturing of CPC in TS38.331?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **company** | **Preferred terminology option** | **comment** |
| Samsung | Option 2 | We think the name should reflect that conditions cannot be specified for any kind of reconfiguration but only for SPCell change. Furthermore, we think that the names should reflect that entries added/ released concern SPCell candidates. Finally, we prefer to add tags like CPC at the end (as in LTE) |
| Ericsson | Option 1 | Option 2 is unclear regarding what the abbreviation means and it relies on specific name while reconfiguration is more generic and in line with current naming rules for mobility |
| ITRI | Option 1 | The abbreviation “csc” in Option 2 is not clear enough. If reflecting only Conditional HO and Conditional PSCell Change is the purpose, using “condSPCellC” could be clearer.By contrast, Option 1 has no unclear terminology and retains generalization possibility. |
| ZTE | Option 1 | Agree with Ericsson and ITRI. The terminology used in option 1 is clearer. |
| Apple | Option 1 | Option 1 is clearer. “csc” in Option 2 may bring up difficulties in reading spec. |
| vivo | Option 1 | Option 1 is the most straightforward. In Option 2, The abbreviation “csc” is not clear. |
| CATT | Option 1 | We would like generic naming. |

# 3 Any other issue for discussion

Tdoc R2-2001163 [1] includes the following stage 3 related proposals:

Proposal 8 Clarify that network includes reconfigurationWithSync/ mobilityControlInfo in the container comprising the conditional SPCell configuraton

Proposal 9 On the radio interface, do not introduce signalling to distinguish whether candidate concerns PCell or PSCell (as not required). Distinguish PCell or PSCell candidates within the variables in order to simplify the procedural specification.

Proposal 10 RAN2 is requested to review the text proposal included in the TDoc and endorse it for inclusion in the Running CR to NR RRC. In order to keep specifications aligned, the similar changes should be done for the LTE RRC CR.

**Question 2: Could company provide their preference for the terminology for capturing of CPC in TS38.331?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **company** | **Agreeable proposals** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson |  | Proposal 8: We don’t think reconfigurationWithSync/ mobilityControlInfo are included at PSCell change. It is just a reconfiguration message without reconfigurationWithSync/ mobilityControlInfo.Proposal 9: We don’t think they need to be distinguished. The network ensures the correct cells are configured for the different cases. |
| ITRI |  | We share the same view with Ericsson. Different from PCell change, reconfigurationWithSync/ mobilityControlInfo need not be included in the reconfiguration message of PSCell change. Moreover, whether the configuration is for PCell or PSCell candidates can be ensured by network. |
| ZTE |  | We share the same view with Ericsson. We prefer to have a unified structure for both CHO and CPC (i.e. not distinguish PCell and PSCell candidates in the conditionalReconfiguration container).An example for the structure of conditionalReconfiguration container is shown as follows:conditionalReconfiguration container:-> RRC reconfiguration message generated by MN--> MRDC-SecondaryCellGroupConfig--->nr-SCG (CONTAINING RRCReconfiguration generated by SN)In this way, the UE just needs to apply the reconfiguration in the stored container upon satisfying the associated triggering conditions no matter which operation is configured. |
| Apple |  | 1) We agree with the intention of Proposal 8 since 38.331 defines that “ReconfWithSync” is mandatory present in case of SpCell change. However, it also makes sense to not mention it at all but only referring it is a RRCReconfiguration message.2) Agree with Ericsson. |
| vivo |  | We have the similar understanding as Ericsson and ZTE. The unified structure for both CHO and CPC should be used.  |
| CATT |  | We agree with above company comments that unified structure for both CHO and CPC to be used. This principle was used in the draft 38.331 CR. |

# 3 Conclusions
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