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# 1 Introduction

The following document summarizes the following email discussion:

* [AT121bis-e][002][NR1516] RRC 1 (Ericsson)

Scope: Treat [R2-2303635](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2303635.zip), [R2-2303636](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2303636.zip), [R2-2303282](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2303282.zip), [R2-2303283](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2303283.zip), [R2-2303284](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2303284.zip), [R2-2303285](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2303285.zip), [R2-2302881](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2302881.zip), [R2-2302882](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2302882.zip), [R2-2304093](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2304093.zip), [R2-2304094](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2304094.zip), [R2-2304095](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2304095.zip)  
Ph1: Determine agreeable parts. Ph2: For agreeable parts, if any, reflect these in agreeable CRs.

Intended outcome: Report, If applicable: In-Principle-Agreed CRs

Deadline: Schedule 1

Discussions with Deadline Schedule 1:

A first round with **Deadline W1 Thursday April 21th 1200 UTC** to settle scope what is agreeable etc

A Final round with Final deadline W2 Wednesday April 26th 1000 UTC (EOM) to settle details / agree CRs etc.

Companies are invited to fill in contact details.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Contact details** |
| Ericsson | hakan.l.palm@ericsson.com |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 2 Discussion

## 2.1 SIB and PosSIB mappings to SI message

high level decision done at previous meeting – Discussion on CRs was postponed

[R2-2303635](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2303635.zip) SIB and PosSIB mappings to SI message Ericsson, MediaTek Inc. CR Rel-16 38.331 16.12.0 3895 1 F NR\_newRAT-Core, NR\_pos-Core [R2-2301452](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2301452.zip)

[R2-2303636](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2303636.zip) SIB and PosSIB mappings to SI message Ericsson, MediaTek Inc. CR Rel-17 38.331 17.4.0 3894 1 F NR\_newRAT-Core, NR\_pos-Core [R2-2301451](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2301451.zip)

**Q1. Do companies agree with the intention and need of the CRs above?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson (proponent) | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Q2. If “yes” on Q2.1, please provide detailed comments on the CR.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson (proponent) | Rel-17 CR should be Cat A (error at tdoc allocation, CR cover page is correct). |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 2.2 drb-ContinueROHC

[R2-2303282](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2303282.zip) Clarification on drb-ContinueROHC ZTE Corporation, Sanechips discussion Rel-15 NR\_newRAT-Core

In this contribution, the followong proposals and observations are made:  
**Observation 1:** Based on current specification, when drb-ContinueROHC field is included, the UE shall continue ROHC during PDCP re-establishment, otherwise, the UE shall reset ROHC.  
**Observation 2:** If drb-ContinueROHC was signalled before, but the network does not include the parent Need M IE pdcp-Config in follow up RRC message, the UE behaviors are different.  
**Observation 3:** Based on the definition of Need N, the UE does not store the Need N field.  
**Observation 4:** There are other examples in 38.331 that when parent Need M IE is not included, its child Need N field will be treated as “not present”.  
**Proposal 1:** RAN2 confirms that during PDCP re-establishment, when pdcp-Config is not included and Need M works, the child Need N IE drb-ContinueROHC is treated as “not present” and the UE shall reset ROHC protocol (i.e. the UE does not store the drb-ContinueROHC field for future use).

[R2-2303283](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2303283.zip) Clarification on handling of Need N fields ZTE Corporation, Sanechips CR Rel-15 38.331 15.21.0 4002 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

[R2-2303284](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2303284.zip) Clarification on handling of Need N fields ZTE Corporation, Sanechips CR Rel-16 38.331 16.12.0 4003 - A NR\_newRAT-Core

[R2-2303285](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2303285.zip) Clarification on handling of Need N fields ZTE Corporation, Sanechips CR Rel-17 38.331 17.4.0 4004 - A NR\_newRAT-Core

**Q3. Do companies agree with P1 in** [R2-2303282](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2303282.zip)**?**

**Proposal 1:** RAN2 confirms that during PDCP re-establishment, when pdcp-Config is not included and Need M works, the child Need N IE drb-ContinueROHC is treated as “not present” and the UE shall reset ROHC protocol (i.e. the UE does not store the drb-ContinueROHC field for future use).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Yes | It is clear that Need N field is one-shot and not memorized by UE. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Q4. Do companies agree with the intention and need of the CRs above?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Maybe | A CR is not essentially needed, since already clear (see above). If anyway RAN2 thinks this need clarification in Guidelines, see below for comments.  The change should be captured in a 38331 Rapp CR of non-controversial changes. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Q5. If “yes” on Q3, please provide detailed comments on the CRs.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Ok to add new Need N field in example, but simplify the text e.g. as  - if *field1* in *RRCMessage-IEs* is absent, UE does not modify or take any action on child fields configured within *field1* (regardless of their need codes); |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 2.3 RLC-Config

[R2-2302881](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2302881.zip) Correction on Need code of IE RLC-Config Intel Corporation CR Rel-16 38.331 16.12.0 3969 - F NR\_IIOT-Core

[R2-2302882](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2302882.zip) Correction on Need code of IE RLC-Config Intel Corporation CR Rel-17 38.331 17.4.0 3970 - F NR\_IIOT-Core, NR\_NTN\_solutions-Core

**Q6. Do companies agree with the intention and need of the CRs above?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Yes | We agree the Need N should have been Need R, and are fine to change to this. One could expect that networks always include t-StatusProhibit-v1610 when a value from this range is used (since not clear that UE keeps the value, if rlc-Config-v1610 is included). |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Q7. If “yes” on Q3, please provide detailed comments on the CR.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | See above. If change from Need N to Need R is not acceptable in RAN2, we should describe the expected nw workaround as above (networks always include t-StatusProhibit-v1610 when a value from this range is used). Then, change to Need M or Need R does not matter. t-StatusProhibit-v1610 can be released thanks to the Need R on rlc-Config-v1610. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 2.4 Coreset0 for PSCell

[R2-2304093](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2304093.zip) Clarification on presence of Coreset0 for PSCell Ericsson CR Rel-15 38.331 15.21.0 4054 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

[R2-2304094](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2304094.zip) Clarification on presence of Coreset0 for PSCell Ericsson CR Rel-16 38.331 16.12.0 4055 - A NR\_newRAT-Core

[R2-2304095](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121/Docs//R2-2304095.zip) Clarification on presence of Coreset0 for PSCell Ericsson CR Rel-17 38.331 17.4.0 4056 - A NR\_newRAT-Core

**Q8. Do companies agree with the intention and need of the CRs above?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson (proposent) | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Q9. If “yes” on Q3, please provide detailed comments on the CR.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Summary: TBD

.

1. TBD

# Conclusion

The following is proposed as outcome of this email discussion.

[Proposal 1 TBD](#_Toc132639938)

# Appendix