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# 1 Introduction

This document captures the discussions and conclusions of the following email discussions as per the session chair guidance.

\* [AT113-e][**803**][NR/R17 SON/MDT]  Editorial corrections of 38.331and 36.331 CR (CATT)

 -     The discussion including R2-2100186, R2-2100188, R2-2100190, R2-2101847, R2-2101848, R2-2101938,R2-2101939.

-     Every change in these documents should be addressed with clear conclusion (i.e., either agreed or not pursued)

-     All the agreed changes will be merged into one CR.

      Intended outcome: Agreeable CR

      Deadline: Thursday 28/01/2021

Two-phase discussions are planned, i.e.,

* **Phase 1** (Kick off of 1st phase – Jan. 26th, UTC 23:59pm): Companies are invited to share their comments if any on the changes proposed in the listed CRs. After Phase 1 the moderator will provide a update to the draft report, as well as merged draft CRs for review.
* **Phase 2** (Kick off of 2nd phase- Jan. 28th, UTC 23:59pm): Companies are invited to provide their comments if any on the updated report and the merged draft CRs.

The remainder of this document is organized as the following. The discussions are in Section 2 and the conclusions are summaried in Section 3.

The participants are invited to leave their contact in the table below for earlier discussions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company name  | Participtiant’s name / Email address |
| CATT | Erlin Zeng / erlin.zeng@catt.cn |
| ZTE | Zhihong Qiu /qiu.zhihong@zte.com.cn |
| OPPO | Jiangsheng Fan/fanjiangsheng@oppo.com |
| Huawei | Jun Chen, jun.chen@huawei.com |
| Ericsson | Pradeepa Ramachandra/pradeepa.ramachandra@ericsson.com |
| Nokia | malgorzata.tomala@nokia.com |

# 2 Discussion

## 2.1 R2-2100186‎ Miscellaneous corrections to TS 36.331 on SON and MDT

**Phase 1**

In this document the following changes are proposed to TS 36.331

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Change “i.e. RLF” to “i.e. MCG-RLF” in 5.3.11.3.
2. Change “last radio link or handover failure” to “last radio link failure or handover failure” in 5.6.5.3.
3. Add the case of setting *visitedCellId* to the physical cell identity and carrier frequency of the current cell in 5.6.5.3.
4. Change “*InDeviceCoexDetected*” to “*inDeviceCoexDetected*” in 5.6.8.2.
5. Change “*carrierFrequency*” to “*carrierFreq*” in 5.6.8.2.
 |

Companies are invited to share their comments in the following table to the changes that are NOT agreeable or require updates. If no any comment received for a change, it means the change is agreeable to all.

**Table 1**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company Name | Which changes are not agreeable or requires updates | Comments if a change is not agreeable or requires updates |
| ZTE | 1,2 | Without change of 1 and 2, the text is still clear. |
| Ericsson | 1 | There is no term like ‘MCG-RLF’ in the entire spec. Therefore, we prefer to keep the spec as is. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | 1 | Changing to MCG-RLF would impact also stage 2  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary from Phase 1 discussions**

Summary

3 companies think change 1 from R2-2100186‎ is not needed, and 1 company thinks change 2 is not needed.

Proposed conclusion

**Proposal 1 Handling of R2-2100186:**

* **Change 1 and 2 are not pursued, and**
* **Change 3, 4 and 5 are agreed.**

## 2.2 R2-2100188‎ Miscellaneous Corrections for SON and MDT in 38.331‎

**Phase 1**

In this document the following changes are proposed to TS 38.331

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Change “bearerg” to “bearer”.2. Delete the sentence “The UE may discard the radio link failure information, i.e. release the UE variable VarRLF-Report, 48 hours after the radio link failure is detected” in clause 5.3.10.3.3. Add the the missing description of *sensor-LocationInfo* in clause 5.10.3.5*.*4. Change “sensor-MeasurementInformation” to italic.5. Change “*wlan-Namelist*” and “*sensor-Namelist*” to “*wlan-NameList*” and “*sensor-NameList*”.6. Add “failure” follow “last radio link”.7. Add “or the physical cell identity and carrier frequency” to identify *visitedCellId.*8. Change “*ra-InformationCommon-r16*” to “*ra-InformationCommon*”.9. Delete the “(” before *rsrp-ThresholdSSB* in *dlRSRPAboveThreshold* description.10. Delete the description of field *ul-DelayValueConfig included* in IE *EventTriggerConfig* field descriptions.11. Change “*msgA-DataScramblingIndex*” to “*msgA-dataScramblingIdentity*”. |

Companies are invited to share their comments in the following table to the changes that are NOT agreeable ‎or require updates. If no any comment received for a change, it means the change is agreeable to all. ‎

**Table 2**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company Name | Which changes are not agreeable or requires updates | Comments if a change is not agreeable or requires updates |
| ZTE | 3 and 11 | We prefer to reference the setting of locationInfo to 5.3.3.7 instead of duplicating the description in 5.10.3.511 shall be discussed in 2step RA WID |
| OPPO | 3 and 11 | We share the similar view with ZTE for the third change, in our paper R2-2101848, we cover this issue in more desirable way.For change 11, we don’t find the relationship with SON&MDT session, so maybe not needed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 3 and 11 | For 3rd change, we share the same view as ZTE.For 11th change, it is changing ASN.1 for 2-step RA functionality, so it is suggested to discuss it in relevant session (e.g. 2-step RA or legacy). |
| Ericsson | 3 and 11 |  |
| Nokia | 3 and 11 | For 2 – there is no need to repeat the description, also ASN.1 is self-explenatory |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary from Phase 1 discussions**

Summary

5 companies think change 3 and 11 from R2-2100188‎ ‎ are not needed.

Proposed conclusion

**Proposal 2 Handling of R2-2100188‎:**

* **Change 3 and 11 are not pursued, and**
* **The other changes except for 3 and 11 are agreed.**

## 2.3 R2-2100190‎ Correction on RLF Report for Re-connection

**Phase 1**

In this document the following changes are proposed to TS 38.331

|  |
| --- |
| 1) Move the action of setting re-connected cell related information out of the branch of “set the content of *RRCSetupComplete* message as follows”;2) Take “cross-RAT RLF reporting” out of the condition of “UE supports RLF report for inter-RAT MRO NR”;3) The relationship of the two conditions (NR rlf available or LTE rlf available) to set the *rlf-InfoAvailable* should be “or”; |

Companies are invited to share their comments in the following table to the changes that are NOT agreeable ‎or require updates. If no any comment received for a change, it means the change is agreeable to all. ‎

**Table 2**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company Name | Which changes are not agreeable or requires updates | Comments if a change is not agreeable or requires updates |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |   |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary from Phase 1 discussions**

Summary

No comments received on any of the changes from R2-2100190‎.

Proposed conclusion

**Proposal 3 Handling of R2-2100190‎‎: All the changes proposed in R2-2100190 are agreed.**

## 2.4 R2-2101847‎‎ Corrections for SON&MDT Logging Capability ‎

**Phase 1**

In this document the following changes are proposed to TS 38.331

|  |
| --- |
| Add capability reference along with the corresponding SON&MDT optional features. ‎ |

Companies are invited to share their comments in the following table to the changes that are NOT agreeable ‎or require updates. If no any comment received for a change, it means the change is agreeable to all. ‎

**Table 2**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company Name | Which changes are not agreeable or requires updates | Comments if a change is not agreeable or requires updates |
| ZTE | Seem unnecessary | Current specs is clear. |
| CATT | seems not needed |  |
| OPPO |  | For some cases, we give the reference to 38.306 in 38.331 spec, in this CR, we just want to follow the way we have already, anyway these are quite small changes, no harm for the spec. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Seem unnecessary |  |
| Ericsson | Not needed | Current spec is clear and most of the changes proposed are not present in LTE either. If this CR is agreed, then companies might end up submitting similar CRs for all the past LTE specifications. As this is not adding any technical change, this CR is not needed.  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary from Phase 1 discussions**

Summary

5 companies think the change from R2-2101847‎ is not needed‎.

Proposed conclusion

**Proposal 4 Handling of R2-2101847‎‎‎: Not pursed.**

## 2.5 R2-2101848‎‎‎ Miscellaneous Corrections for SON&MDT ‎

**Phase 1**

In this document the following changes are proposed to TS 38.331

|  |
| --- |
| 1. In subclause 5.3.3.7, change ‘if the RPLMN is not equal to plmn-identity’ to ‘if the RPLMN is not equal to *plmn-identity*’.
2. In subclause 5.3.5.9, use field name instead of the definition name for BT/WLAN/Sensor measurements.
3. In subclause 5.3.7.4, change ‘handover failure’ to ‘reconfiguration with sync failure’.
4. In subclause 5.3.10.5, refer to 5.3.3.7 when setting *locationInfo*.
5. In subclause 5.5a.3.2, delete ‘detail’.
6. In subclause 5.7.3.3, change ‘*synchReconfigFailureSCG*’ to ‘*synchReconfigFailureSCG*’ and change ‘.’ to ‘;’.
7. In subclause 5.7.3.5, the same changes with previous one.
8. In subclause 5.7.10.4, add reference when setting selected PLMN and remove the ‘-*r16*’ from ‘*ra-InformationCommon-r16’*.
9. In subclause 7.4, change ‘The UE variable *VarConnEstFailReport* includes the connection establishment failure and connection resume failure information’ to ‘The UE variable *VarConnEstFailReport* includes the connection establishment failure and/or connection resume failure information’.
 |

Companies are invited to share their comments in the following table to the changes that are NOT agreeable ‎or require updates. If no any comment received for a change, it means the change is agreeable to all. ‎

**Table 2**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company Name | Which changes are not agreeable or requires updates | Comments if a change is not agreeable or requires updates |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary from Phase 1 discussions**

Summary

No comments received on any of the changes from R2-2101848‎.

Proposed conclusion

**Proposal 5 Handling of R2-2101848‎‎‎: All the changes proposed in R2-2101848‎ are agreed.**

## 2.6 R2-2101938‎‎‎‎ Corrections for Cross-RAT RLF Report ‎

**Phase 1**

In this document the following changes are proposed to TS 38.331

|  |
| --- |
| In sub-clause 5.7.10.3, add the description for *failedPCellId-EUTRA* when setting *eutra-RLF-Report* in *RLF-Report*. |

Companies are invited to share their comments in the following table to the changes that are NOT agreeable ‎or require updates. If no any comment received for a change, it means the change is agreeable to all. ‎

**Table 2**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company Name | Which changes are not agreeable or requires updates | Comments if a change is not agreeable or requires updates |
| ZTE | The CR is not needed. | This is handled in first online session. |
| OPPO |  | If other companies also confirm that this change is covered by other discussion(Maybe online/email), we’re fine to avoid the duplicated discussion. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The CR is not needed. | In the first online session, there was the following agreement. In 0858, the 4th change is same as 1938, so the 1938 CR is not needed.R2-2100858 Corrections on RLF Report Apple CR Rel-16 38.331 16.3.1 2358 - F NR\_SON\_MDT-Core=> The second and third changes are agreed and will be merged into the big CR provided by email discussion 801. |
| Ericsson | Not needed | Already included as per agreement quoted by Huawei. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary from Phase 1 discussions**

Summary

3 companies think the change from R2-2101938 is not needed.

Proposed conclusion

**Proposal 6 Handling of R2-2101938 ‎‎‎‎: Not pursed.**

## 2.7 R2-2101939 Corrections for Sensor

**Phase 1**

In this document the following changes are proposed to TS 38.331

|  |
| --- |
| In sub-clause 5.3.5.9, Sensor should be taken into accout for NOTE 2.‎ |

Companies are invited to share their comments in the following table to the changes that are NOT agreeable ‎or require updates. If no any comment received for a change, it means the change is agreeable to all. ‎

**Table 2**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company Name | Which changes are not agreeable or requires updates | Comments if a change is not agreeable or requires updates |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary from Phase 1 discussions**

Summary

No comments received on any of the changes from R2-2101939 ‎.

Proposed conclusion

**Proposal 7 Handling of R2-2101939 ‎‎‎: Changes proposed in R2-2101939 are agreed.**

# 3 Conclusion

This document captures the discussions and conclusions from email discussion #803 in R2-113-e. The conclusions are summarized in the following.

tbd