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# 1 Introduction

This contribution is aimed at reporting the discussion and results of the following offline discussion:

* [AT121bis-e][008][NR17] RRC MUSIM Corrections (vivo)

      Scope: Treat R2-2303262, R2-2303661, R2-2303770, R2-2303771, R2-2303831, R2-2303876, R2-2303195  
Ph1: Determine agreeable parts, identify online CB if any. Ph2: For agreeable parts, if any, reflect these in agreeable CRs.

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

      Deadline: Schedule 1

A **first round** with **Deadline W1 Thursday April 20th 1200 UTC** to settle scope what is agreeable etc

A Final round with **Final deadline W2 Tuesday April 25th 1000 UTC (EOM)** to settle details / agree CRs etc.

The discussion scope is to gather companies’ views on the contributions [1]-[7].

# 2 Participants

To facilitate this offline discussion among the delegates, would you please fill in your name and the email address in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Delegate name | E-mail address |
| Boubacar Kimba | kimba@vivo.com |
| Yumin Wu | wuyumin@xiaomi.com |
| Ericsson | lian.araujo@ericsson.com |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | rama.kumar@huawei.com |
| ZTE | Li.wenting@zte.com.cn |

# 3 Discussion

## 3.1 Handling of MUSIM scheduling gap(s) during handover

In the previous meeting, RAN2 discussed how to handle MUSIM gap(s) during handover but no decision was made as per below:

[R2-2301711](file:///C:\\Users\\johan\\OneDrive\\Dokument\\3GPP\\tsg_ran\\WG2_RL2\\RAN2\\Docs\\R2-2301711.zip" \o "C:UsersjohanOneDriveDokument3GPPtsg_ranWG2_RL2RAN2DocsR2-2301711.zip) Further Clarification on the MUSIM Scheduling Gap Handling During Handover ZTE Corporation, Sanechips discussion Rel-17 LTE\_NR\_MUSIM-Core

- Apple wonder under what circumstances the network need to accept.

- Samsung think the UE will always transmit preference in the new cell and the base-station will reconfigure the UE.

- ZTE think that if the gap is ongoing, the source should forward the configuration.

- Samsung think the network will reconfigure.

- Intel think we need to think about the UE behaviour.

Chair: can think about how/if to clarify UE behaviour for this case for next meeting

* Postponed.

This issue has been discussed in contributions [1~5] with the following proposals :

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tdoc No. | Relevant Proposals |
| R2-2303831 [1] | Proposal: Confirm that if the latest received musim-GapConfig is set to setup but musim-AperiodicGap is absent during the RRC reconfiguration procedure with or without HO, the UE still applies previously configured aperiodic MUSIM gap (if any) before its period is over. No specification change is needed. |
| R2-2303876 [2] | Proposal 2: Ran2 to discuss the below options for the UE side MUSIM Gap processing before the UE receiving the new MUSIM gap configuration at the new cell.   * Option 1: Keep the original MUSIM gap configuration. * Option 2: Reconfigure the MUSIM gap based on the new cell’s SFN/FN. Target. * Option 3: Release all of the Configured MUSIM Gaps.   Proposal 2a: Option 1 and option 3 can be taken as the start point. |
| R2-2303661 [3] | 1. RAN2 to select between two options on how to handle aperiodic gaps during handover:  * solve it by NW implementation e.g. MUSIM-GapConfig is released by target node upon handover; * change Need code of musim-AperiodicGap from N to R; |
| R2-2303262 [4] | Proposal 1: No spec change is needed for MUSIM gap handling during sync HO.  Proposal 2: No spec change is needed for MUSIM gap handling during async HO. |
| R2-2303195 [5] | Proposal: Aperiodic gap configuration handling during handover can be left to NW and UE implementation. No specification changes needed for this scenario. |

From companies’ contributions proposals above, there are different options to handle the MUSIM gap during handover (which include sync and async handover) as summarized below.

* **Option 1**: Left to NW and UE implementation. No specification change is needed.
* **Option 2**: Keep the original MUSIM gap configuration.
* **Option 3**: Reconfigure the MUSIM gap based on the new cell’s SFN/FN.
* **Option 4**: Release all of the Configured MUSIM Gaps.
* **Option 5**: Change Need code of musim-AperiodicGap from N to R.
* **Option 6**: other (please specify)

Thus, companies are invited to provide their preference on which option(s) to consider to address MUSIM gap handling during handover.

**Q1: Which option do you prefer to address MUSIM gap handling during handover?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option** | **Detailed comments** |
| vivo | Option 1 | Option 1 is simple and does require any new changes to current specification |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 | We think that the network implementation based solution is able to provide a proper configuration during handover. |
| Ericsson | Option 1, but | We think option 1 is sufficient, but if majority would prefer to pursue a change, we think option 5 is the simplest. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Option 1 | NW implementation (as mentioned in R2-2303661) can address the issue. |
| ZTE | We can follow the majorities (e.g. option 1) but we think at least a note shall be added | According to the current spec, the UE may configure the Gap that are not aligned with the network side during the async handover. Besides, according to the submitted papers, the network may also release the MUSIM-GapConfig if the target node can’t configure the not-started aperiodic Gap, or if there is potential collision between the handover procedure and MUSIM gaps.  So some clarification would be needed to note/solve these issues.  We think at lease a note shall be added to the MUSIM Gap configuration (e.g. 38.331 5.3.5.9a)  Note: Network may release the MUSIM-GapConfig upon handover, e.g. when the target gNB and the source gNB are unsynchronous. |

## 3.2 Corrections on CHO execution while T346g is running

It was agreed in RAN2#119bis meeting to add the following NOTE in clause 5.3.7.2: “NOTE: It is up to UE implementation whether to initiate the procedure while T346g is running.”.

The contribution in [6] thinks that the same situation as re-establishment can also happens on CHO case and proposes to add a NOTE:“ It is up to UE implementation whether to execute the CHO procedure while T346g is running.” From the rappporteur‘s understanding, the same situation can happen on many cases, such as CAPC etc. If the change proposed above is agreed, there will be many cases that also require the same changes.

|  |
| --- |
| 5.3.5.13.5 Conditional reconfiguration execution The UE shall:  1> if more than one triggered cell exists:  2> select one of the triggered cells as the selected cell for conditional reconfiguration execution;  1> else:  2> consider the triggered cell as the selected cell for conditional reconfiguration execution;  1> for the selected cell of conditional reconfiguration execution:  2> apply the stored *condRRCReconfig* of the selected cell and perform the actions as specified in 5.3.5.3;  NOTE: If multiple NR cells are triggered in conditional reconfiguration execution, it is up to UE implementation which one to select, e.g. the UE considers beams and beam quality to select one of the triggered cells for execution.  NOTE: It is up to UE implementation whether to execute the CHO procedure while T346g is running. |

**Q2: Do companies agree the change proposed above by R2-2303771 [7]?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Detailed comments** |
| vivo | No | This seems some optimization. We do not think anything is broken without these changes |
| Xiaomi |  | No strong preference. We can follow the majority view, as the same issue was resolved in RAN2#119bis meeting. |
| Ericsson | No | Agree with Vivo. Also for regular HO case we did not agree to any change, so we do not think we should deviate from this for CHO. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | No | Agree with Vivo |
| ZTE |  | No strong preference. We can follow the majority view |

# 5 Conclusion

This offline discussion report is summarized with final proposals as follows:

To be added
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