3GPP TSG-RAN WG2 #116bis-e R2-220xxxx

eMeeting, 17th – 25th January, 2022

Agenda Item: 8.24.1

Source: MediaTek Inc.

**Title: Summary of [AT116bis-e][041][NR17] HO with PSCell (MediaTek)**

Document for: Discussion and decision

# 1 Introduction

This is report of the following e-mail discussion:

* [AT116bis-e][041][NR17] HO with PSCell (MediaTek)

Scope: Treat R2-2200124, R2-2201673 (late), make a reply LS.

Intended outcome: Approved LS out

Deadline: Friday W1

**Comment deadline:** Thursday Week 1, 1200 UTC

# 2 Discussion

In [1], RAN4 asked RAN2 what should be the timing reference cell for SMTC of target NR PSCel in NR SA handover to EN-DC.

RAN4 has discussed the requirement for HO with PSCell from NR-SA to EN-DC. If SMTC of target NR PSCell is configured by source NR PCell in *RRCConnectionReconfiguration* of *targetRAT-MessageContainer*, it is unclear whether UE shall follow the SMTC window based on the reference timing of target E-UTRA PCell or not.

RAN2 actually already discussed this in last meeting and a draft reply LS is provided in R2-2201673 [2] to simply reply the RAN2 agreement. Companies are invited to check whether you are okay to send the reply LS and any comment on the content in R2-2201673 (copied below for reference).

**-----------------------------------------------------------------------------**

RAN2 would like to thank RAN4 for the LS on HO with PSCell from NR SA to EN-DC (R4-2120298). RAN2 has already discussed the SMTC timing reference issue in RAN2#116 and concluded as

* **[010] RAN2 confirms that UE applies the PSCell SMTC configuration based on the timing reference of target EUTRA PCell for the case of NR SA to EN-DC HO with PSCell addition (if explicit SMTC configuration is present in** RRCConnectionReconfiguration**).**

So, the timing reference cell is E-UTRA PCell in the concerned scenario.

**-----------------------------------------------------------------------------**

**Question 1: Do companies agree to send reply LS as in R2-2201673? Is there any comment on the content ?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agreed or not** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Agree | This has been already discussed and agreed in the last meeting. We think that adding the agreements from last meeting in the LS would be enough without having to discuss this once again. |
| ZTE | Agree | Agree with Ericsson. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |  |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| NEC | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree | Same view as Ericsson. |
| Intel | Agree |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Summary:

# 3 Conclusions

Base on the discussion in section 2, we propose the following:

**Proposal 1:**
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