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# Introduction

**CB: # SONMDT5\_NRU**

**- Capture the agreements in TP**

**- Discuss the open issues as above**

**- Capture agreements and open issues**

(moderator – E///)

Summary of offline disc [R3-234543](file:///C%3A%5CLuca%5CWork%5CStandard%5C3GPP%5CMeetings%5CRAN%5CR3%5CRAN3_121%5CServer%5CInbox%5CChairs_Notes%5CInbox%5CR3-234543.zip)

# For the Chairlady’s Notes

-

# Discussion

During the online discussion, the following was captured:

MLB for NR-U:

**Convert the following WA into agreement: WA: introduce an optional load metric on Radio Resource Status per NR-U Channel in XnAP RESOURCE STATUS UPDATE message and in F1AP RESOURCE STATUS UPDATE message.**

**There is no need to transfer the UL EDT in resource status update message via F1 interface.**

MRO for NR-U:

**Continue the discussion on RLF MRO report optimization:**

* **actual UL EDT**
* **actual minimum UL EDT**
* **lowest detected power**

**Downlink LBT issue during HO exaction, whether the failure needs to be distinguished.**

Based on the online discussion, and regarding the “MLB for NR-U” the following is proposed:

**Proposal 1: Introduce an optional load metric on Radio Resource Status per NR-U Channel in XnAP RESOURCE STATUS UPDATE message and in F1AP RESOURCE STATUS UPDATE message.**

**Proposal 2: Agree on TP for XnAP BL CR in R3-234544.**

**Proposal 3: Agree on TP for F1AP BL CR in R3-234545.**

With respect to the following open point captured during the online:

**Continue the discussion on RLF MRO report optimization:**

* **actual UL EDT**
* **actual minimum UL EDT**
* **lowest detected power**

the moderator proposes to indicate whether it is beneficial to include in RLF report an information related to EDT UL for the purpose of distinguish between RLF reports impacted by LBT, including the case when the RLF report does not indicates that consistent LBT failure was detected.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | Yes, it is beneficial |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

With respect to the following open point captured during the online:

**Downlink LBT issue during HO exaction, whether the failure needs to be distinguished.**

It is proposed to continue the discussion as follows:

1. agree (and clarify) the use case under discussion, i.e., agree (if possible) that, if the target node suffers from DL LBT issues during an handover execution, and the handover fails, it is beneficial for the source node to receive an information that allows the source node to decide whether to use the RLF report related to the handover failure for MRO purpose or not.
2. (assuming the use case is agreed) continue the discussion to understand whether and how the use case can be solved, e.g.,:
	1. investigate whether it is sufficient that target node provides to source node a generic indication (e.g., “DL LBT failures were present at the time of handover execution”), to achieve the purpose
	2. investigate whether the target node should provide a more precise indication to source node (e.g., “DL LBT failures were present after receiving Msg3”)
	3. check with other WGs (e.g., RAN4 and/or RAN2) whether a UE can provide some information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | The use case is validWe should at least check with RAN4 whether UE-based solution is feasible. We have not explored this option yet. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Conclusions