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# 1 Introduction

This is the report for the following email discussion:

[Post113-e][234][eDCCA] CPAC procedures (CATT)

Scope: Continue discussion on CPAC procedures, including P1-4 from R2-2101970 and CPAC/CHO coexistence. Attempt to provide Stage-2 signalling flows for CPAC procedures.

Intended outcome: Discussion report + Stage-2 TP

Deadline: Long- 26th March 2021 @ 1100 UTC

Rapporteur plans to have an intermediate deadline on the discussion of solutions (phase 1). This is to understand solutions and identify any issue associated with the solutions(s).

Phase 1 deadline: 5th March 2021 @ 1100 UTC

Phase 2 deadline: 26th March 2021 @ 1100 UTC

# 2 Discussion

**2.1 Phase 1: Discussion of solutions for SN initiated inter-SN CPC**

At RAN2\_112-e meeting, the following agreement was made on SN initiated inter-SN CPC.

**Proposal 1: Option 1 should be used for the generation of conditional reconfiguration for SN initiated inter-SN conditional PSCell change.**

**Option 1: The MN generates CPC. The source SN sets the execution condition and communicates it to the MN. The MN generates the conditional reconfiguration message including the execution condition(s) provided by the source SN and RRCReconfiguration provided by the candidate PSCell(s).**

As discussed in [1], Figure 1 is an illustration of signaling flow for SN initiated Inter-SN CPC based on Option 1. The figure follows the steps used in a conventional SN initiated SN change procedure as shown in Figure 10.5.1-2 of TS37.340. Note that Figure 1 shows the signaling flow up to the signaling of the conditional configuration for SN initiated Inter-SN CPC to the UE. Signaling upon the execution of CPC is not shown in the figure as the main focus of this discussion is on the generation of conditional reconfiguration for SN initiated Inter-SN CPC.

In this solution, the MN generates a CPC configuration, i.e., the IE *ConditionalReconfiguration* as an MN configuration based on reconfiguration per target candidate (denoted RRCReconfiguration\*\* in Figure 1) and the execution condition per candidate cell. RRCReconfiguration\*\* per target candidate is provided by each target candidate cell in response to a conditional SN Addition Request. The execution condition per candidate cell is provided by the S-SN in the conditional SN Change Required.



**Figure 1: Configuration of SN-initiated inter-SN CPC based on agreement.**

**Steps 1:** Based on e.g. RRC measurement report received from the UE, source SN decides to initiate the CPC procedure. Source SN determines the set of target SNs for the CPC procedure,. The source SN initiates the conditional SN change procedure by sending SgNB Change Required message which contains target SN information, and measurement results related to the target SN. For each candidate target PSCell frequency, source SN determines the CPC execution condition. In the SN Change Required message, source SN provides information relevant to CPC configuration to the MN. In addition to the content of conventional SN Change Required message, CPC execution condition for each candidate target PSCell frequency is included in the SN Change Required message.

**Steps 2:** MN initiates the SN Addition procedure with the set of target SNs indicated in SN Change Required. As a base line, the content of SN addition Request is similar to the conventional SN Addition Request message (how the conditionality of the request is indicated is FFS).

**Step 3:**  The target SN determines the target PSCell and generates RRCReconfiguration\*\* for the selected candidate PSCell and provides it to the MN in SN addition request acknowledgement message. FFS on inclusion of multiple candidate cell configurations.

**Step 4:**  The MN generates an RRCReconfiguration to be provided to the UE including CPC configuration (as an MN configuration), mapping the execution condition configuration to an RRCReconfiguration\*\* provided by the target SN for candidate PSCell.

**Step 5:** the UE provides RRCReconfigurationComplete message to the MN upon reception of RRCReconfiguration message (to confirm the reception of the CPC configuration).

The preparation of execution condition for SN initiated Inter-SN CPC was further discussed in the last meeting, RAN2\_113-e [R2-2101970]. As shown in Figure 1, the source SN provides the execution condition for the target candidate cells(s). The target SN may not accept all the candidate cells which the source SN has provided execution conditions. The MN generates the conditional reconfiguration (in step 4 of Figure 1) by mapping the execution condition(s) and an RRCReconfiguration\*\* provided by the target SN for candidate PSCell.

An issue was identified during last meeting discussion that **the source SN may need to update its configuration depending on the accepted candidate cells by the target SN**. The source SN may have configured the measurements taking into account the execution condition for CPC candidate target cells. However, as the target SN may have only accepted some cells for CPC configuration, there may have some measurement configurations (configured by the source SN) which are no longer is required. For example, if the source SN has configured measurement gaps for measuring a candidate target cell and that cell is not accepted by the target SN for CPC, there remains some unrequired measurement configurations of source SN. Whether this is an issue which needed a standardised solution should be discussed. The severity of the issue depends on frequency of this happening. Also it should consider the UE behaviour in case there is an unrequired measurement configuration.

If this issue to be resolved, there are two solutions which can be considered.

**Solution 1:** The network updates the source SN configuration after step 4 (in Figure 1). In Step 4, the RRC Reconfiguration including the conditional configuration for CPC is sent to the UE. Upon reception of the conditional reconfiguration for CPC, the UE can start evaluating the CPC execution. The source SN prepares the execution condition for CPC without assistant information from the MN or target SN. Signalling flow shown in Figure 1 is applicable for solution 1. The source SN can update its configuration anytime (business as usual) and update the measurement configuration for the UE after step 4, if required.

**Solution 2:** The updated source SN configuration is transmitted to the UE together with conditional configuration for CPC. Referring to Figure 1, after Step 3, the MN provides information on the accepted candidate cells by the target SN to the source SN. Based on the information received from the MN, the source SN updates the source SN configuration and sends it to the MN. The MN generates the conditional reconfiguration for CPC in the same way as in solution 1. The MN generates the final RRC Reconfiguration message to the UE including the conditional reconfiguration for CPC, MN configuration, if required and the updated source SN configuration. Figure 2 illustrates the signalling flow for solution 2.



**Figure 2: the procedure update required for solution 2.**

In Phase 1, rapporteur would like to form a common understanding of the procedure for SN initiated Inter-SN CPC and identify any issue which should be resolved. In order to form an interactive technical discussion (e.g. similar to face-to-face offline discussions), rapporteur welcomes the company opinions on the procedure, the identified issues and solutions in open/ flexible format. The company comments can be included in the below table and reply to a comment/question raised by another company can also be included. At the end of Phase 1, rapporteur aims to provide a list of identified issues.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue** | **Company comment** |
| measId(s) in SCG MeasConfig but not in CPC configuration | **Ericsson**: In Solution 1 the UE may end up configured with measId(s) in SCG MeasConfig associated to PSCell(s) not selected by a target candidate gNodeB i.e. they would not be in the CPC configuration. Maybe this is not a major issue, we can simply define that the UE ignores these measId(s) and not be required to perform measurements accordingly as they are not in CPC and as they are anyway deleted upon suspend/release and successful execution.  In Solution 2 this would not be a problem, as the UE only receives measId(s) in SCG MeasConfig that matches what the target candidate gNodeB(s) have selected. This makes solution 2 slightly better in that perspective, with the cost of an additional network procedure.  Sam> We think this is not a very significant issue. I.e. UE may just briefly have some CPAC related measId configured that are not used by any CPAC candidate that is configured. By step 6, S-SN becomes aware of not accepted candidates and then it can simply remove any reportConfig & measID that are not used in any CPAC configuration. I.e. we think we should not complicate operations, neither by a modified message sequence as in fig2 nor by UE autonomous removal |
| Measurement gap configuration outdated | **Ericsson**: In solution 2 this is not an issue as the MN receives the indication of the accepted frequencies / cells from target candidate gNodeBs and knows which measId(s) per frequency/cell to configure the UE with in SCG MeasConfig, and the required measurement gaps. We could check with RAN3 if they think Solution 2 brings issues in terms of latency and signaling.  However, in solution 1, the UE would first receive a measurement gap that is outdated (perhaps for measuring more frequencies than needed) to almost immediately get an updated version, which is not very nice as two sub-sequence RRC procedures will be triggered (increases signaling) and a gap re-configuration is triggered almost immediately after the UE has setup its first gap configuration.  In a way, it is quite bad that solution 1 leads to the UE to be configured with a wrong configuration to then immediately be re-configured. It is not easy to foresee how often this will happen.  So, if companies insist to have a single network procedure, like in Solution 1, something in between is anyway needed e.g. MN sends the update to S-SN from T-SN about accepted target candidates (cells/frequency) and waits before configuring the UE, at least for some time, to avoid the unnecessary double RRC procedures.  Sam> See our previous remark |
| When to send SgNB Change Confirm message in response to SgNB Change Required (Step 1 in Figure 1) | **[CATT]** As per the legacy procedure, Reception of the SgNB Change Confirm message triggers the source SN to stop providing user data to the UE and, if applicable, to start data forwarding. For CPC, the source SgNB will only stop data transmission to the UE upon the CPC execution. Therefore, we need to discuss when to send the SgNB Change Confirm message to the S-SN, 1) after Step 5 in Figure 1 2) after execution of CPC. |
| which messages can be used for step 4/5 in solution 2 | **[CATT]** solution 2, step 4/5 should be performed prior to transmitting RRCReconfiguration message (step 6) to the UE. however for legacy procedure, SgNB Change Confirm message is transmitted to the S-SN after successful allocation of target SN resources, i.e. after receiving RRCReconfigurationComplete message (step7). We need to discuss which message can be used for step 4/5 in solution 2. And we don’t think the SgNB Change Confirm message can be used for step 4 as suggested by Ericsson. We think SgNB Modification Request can be used for step4, and SgNB Modification Request Acknowledge can be used for step5, |
| Solution 2/ Figure 2 | **[Nokia]** We were encouraged to use flexible and open format of the discussion, so we have inserted several comments already above. However, few remarks also here:  If steps 4 and 5 in Figure 2 are performed anyway (in this example, to update the source SN’s config) then we wonder why there is still a need to send the execution conditions already in Step 1? Due to the possibility the target SN may not prepare cells from the list provided by the source SN and to avoid sending unnecessarily large number of execution conditions, some of which will stay unused, we suggest the execution conditions are sent in Step 5, when the source SN has been informed which cells were accepted and prepared by the target SN**.** |
| Solution 1 | **[Nokia]** It is not clear how Solution 1 solves the problem since the source SN cannot know which PSCells the target SN has finally selected without getting the assistance information from MN. Moreover, providing an updated measurement configuration from the source SN would cause additional signaling. |
| Blind preparation | **[Nokia]** The source PSCell may trigger a blind preparation of target PSCells. In this case, the source SN does not have even measurement to identify the relevant target PSCell candidates. In this case, the source SN shall be informed about the prepared candidate cells to provide the corresponding CPC execution condition as performed in step 4 and 5 of Figure 2. |
| Whether step 4/5 in solution 2 is optional or mandatory? | **[ZTE]** We wonder whether step 4/5 in solution 2 is a mandatory procedure or not? If it’s mandatory, then the execution condition transferred in step1 seems not needed. However, considering the Xn/X2 signalling overhead and transmission latency, we think step 4/5 in solution 2 should be triggered optionally, e.g. in case the target SN selects other candidate PSCells whose execution condition is not provided in step1. Then the MN can initiate the step 4 to request the updated execution condition and meas configuration (if needed). |
| Whether the source configuration update procedure is triggered by the MN or the source SN? | **[ZTE]** Regardingwhich messages can be used for step 4/5 in solution 2, we think the detailed signalling can be discussed in RAN3. But perhaps RAN2 can firstly discuss which node can trigger the source configuration update procedure？If the MN can directly trigger the procedure, then we can consider CATT’s solution (SgNB Modification Request can be used for step4, and SgNB Modification Request Acknowledge can be used for step5). While if it’s up to the SN trigger the update procedure, we can consider to use SgNB Change Confirm (or maybe other Xn/X2 message) in step 4, and then the source SN initiates the SN modification procedure. |
| Whether MN can decide to exclude not accepted cells from source SN configuration | **[LG]** question for the issue:  Before choosing the solution between #1 and #2, we wonder if MN can decide to exclude the cells which are not accepted by the target SN from the source SN configuration. That is, MN sends source SN the updated source SN configuration. Even though RAN2 agreed that MN is not allowed to alter the content of the configuration from the PSCell, it may need to be considered again for this issue. If MN can update the source SN configuration according to the target SN configuration, 2 signalling, step 4 and step 5 in solution #2 can be reduced by 1, i.e. just send updated source SN configuration from MN to the source SN. |
| Candidate generation & conditions | **[Samsung]** We think that S-SN decides the candidates as it determines the condition for each. T-SN may of course not accept some of the candidates suggested by S-SN, but it cannot come up with alternative candidates as suggested by Nokia.  We furthermore think that baseline is that conditions are per candidate, alike in R16. Anything else (e.g. same condition for all candidates on same frequency) seems an optimization/ enhancement  We assumed this was sufficiently clear, but given remarks from Nokia, it seems beneficial to confirm |
| Need for per candidate information | **[Samsung]** We think that a key issue is to identify the inter node information that is per candidate. We assume its clear execution conditions and target configurations are per candidate. However, in previous discussions R2 also considered further information that may depend on the candidate   * Capability coordination info i.e. configuration restrictions exchanged by MN to T-SN e.g. allowedBCs may depend on the candidates * Radio bearer configuration i.e. the amount of SCG resources may differ between candidates on different frequencies and this may affect the DRBs that MN wishes to offload   Correspondingly, there may be a need to transfer per candidate information within SN Addition Request. If confirmed, we need to discuss how to transfer the per candidate information (RRC INM, XnAP) |
| Regarding Solutions 1 and 2, Figures 1 and 2 | **[Qualcomm]** On the issue of forwarding by MN of prepared PSCells received from target SNs to source SN, we think Solution 2, Figure 2, is the correct procedure for CPC, because it would result in the correct measurement gap configuration in CPC configuration provided to the UE, though it comes with additional signaling and delay.  It seems to us that there are two cases to consider: (1) when per-UE measurement gap is configured for the UE, (2) when per-FR measurement gap is configured for the UE. UE indicates through its capabilities whether it supports separate measurement gap configurations for FR1 and FR2, i.e., per-FR measurement gaps.  (1) Per-UE gap is configured for the UE.  In this case, MN decides the gap configuration. Thus, MN does not need to forward the prepared PSCells to source SN and the procedure in Figure 1 applies. After receiving the prepared PSCells from the target SNs, MN determines and provides the gap configuration in CPC configuration message to the UE. MN only includes measIDs corresponding to the prepared PSCells in the CPC configuration message.  (2) Per-FR gap is configured for the UE.  Sub-case (a): EN-DC, NGEN-DC.  In this case, MN decides the gap configuration for FR1, while the SN decides the gap configuration for FR2. Thus, MN should forward the prepared PSCells to the source SN in a message (e.g., SN Change Confirm) and the procedure in Figure 2 applies. Source SN then provides the measurement configuration including FR2 gap configuration to the MN in a message (e.g., SN Modification Required) for the MN to include in CPC configuration message.  Sub-case (b): NR-DC.  In this case, MN decides both the FR1 and FR2 gap configurations. Thus, this case is handled the same way as Case (1) above when per-UE gap is configured.  In summary, Solution 2, Figure 2, is in general the correct procedure, and Solution 1, Figure 1, applies in certain cases.  We also agree with Nokia that in the procedure of Solution 2, Figure 2, there seems to be no need to provide the execution conditions by source SN to MN in SN Change Required. |
| When to send SgNB Change Confirm message in response to SgNB Change Required | **[Qualcomm]** CATT observed that according to the legacy procedure, reception of SN Change Confirm message triggers source SN to stop providing user data to the UE and, if applicable, to start data forwarding.  We think that SN Change Confirm should be used in Step 4 of the procedure of Figure 2, since it is the response message to SN Change Required that requests preparation of CPC. In the specifications we can however indicate that, in case of CPC the source SN does not stop providing user data to the UE upon receiving SN Change Confirm. |
| When to send SgNB Change Confirm message in response to SgNB Change Required (Step 1 in Figure 1) | **[Lenovo]** we think the SN change confirm can be sent after MN getting the responses from target SNs as Ericsson and Nokia indicated. Reception of the SN Change Confirm message triggers the source SN to stop providing user data to the UE and, if applicable, to start data forwarding. However, the legacy does not stop the source SN to communicate RRC configuration related Xn message with MN after receiving the SN Change Confirm as long as the UE context is not released.  In our view, after receiving SN Change Confirm message, if SN wants to modify/update some previous CPC related RRC configuration, SN can still trigger it per e.g. SN modification required message to MN. |
| which messages can be used for step 4/5 in solution 2 | **[Lenovo]** As explained above, we think step 4 can be done per SN Change Confirm, then no need of step 5. |
| CPAC replace | **[Lenovo]** related to the above two comments, we think it is the CPAC replace issue in general we are discussing here. In solution 1 and 2, at the end, it is about source SN modify/replace the previously given CPC configuration. However, there are other scenarios too, e.g. target SN might want to trigger CPAC replace based on the received measurement or due to some CPAC resources change at target SN, and in case target SN triggers CPC replace, shall the source SN be informed if it’s SN initiated CPC? At the end, if we want to support CPAC replace procedure, we might want to take more scenarios into account and design a framework that can work for all scenarios (not only the source SN triggered CPC replace as in solution 1 and 2). |

Summary of Phase 1: identified issues with regards to solutions discussed

Candidate generation & execution conditions

Issue 1: Whether the execution condition is provided by the source SN per candidate cell alike in Rel-16 or not.

Issue 2: Blind preparation: whether it is possible for the source SN to trigger inter-SN CPC blindly. The source PSCell may trigger a blind preparation of target PSCells without measurements.

Issue 3: T-SN may not accept some of the candidates suggested by S-SN. Can the T-SN come up with alternative candidates?

Source SN configuration update

Issue 4: whether the source SN would need to update its configuration depending on the accepted candidate cells by the target SN. Configuration parameters (identified so far) to consider: measId(s) in SCG MeasConfig, Measurement gap configuration (per UE gap, per FR gap). Does the update of the source SN configuration requires always or only in some scenario? How significant the problem and which option to use for source SN configuration update?

Solution 1 details

Issue 5: When to send SgNB Change Confirm message in response to SgNB Change Required (Step 1 in Figure 1)

Solution 2 details

Issue 6: which messages can be used for step 4/5 in solution 2. Whether the source configuration update procedure is triggered by the MN or the source SN in solution 2

Issue 7: when to send execution condition to the MN in solution 2 (in step 1 or step 5 in figure 2)

Issue 8: Whether step 4/5 in solution 2 is optional or mandatory

Issue 9: Whether MN can decide to exclude not accepted cells from source SN configuration, i.e. the MN modifies the SN configuration provided by the source SN

Inter-node message content

Issue 10: what per candidate information is transmitted in SN addition Request (e.g. execution condition, target configuration, capability coordination info, radio bearer configuration, etc)

Conditional configuration update by the target SN

Issue 11: update of the conditional configuration by the target SN.

**2.2 Phase 2 discussion**

### 2.2.1 Procedure for SN initiated inter-SN CPC

**Candidate generation & execution conditions**

***Issue 1: Whether the execution condition is provided by the source SN per candidate cell alike in Rel-16 or not.***

The source SN sets the execution condition and communicates it to the MN. There are at least two different opinions on how the execution condition is set by the source SN.

a) Source SN provides the candidate cells and it sets the execution condition per candidate cell (in step 1 of Figure 1 and 2). The target SN may only accept some of the candidate cells suggested by the source SN. The target SN decides on candidate cells for which measurements were provided for.

b) Source SN provides measurements for candidate cells and execution condition for each frequency on which to configure a candidate cell (in step 1 of Figure 1 and 2). In this case, execution condition is provided per frequency but it is not specific to a particular candidate cell. The target SN decides on candidate cells for which measurements were provided for.

**Question 1: Companies are requested to comment on how the execution condition is set by the source SN.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | a)/ b) | Comment |
| Nokia | b) if Solution 1 (Figure 1) is to be supported  Ericsson: We don’t think solution 1 works as, even in that case, T-SN may not accept all frequencies requested by the S-SN. | To have the execution condition prepared per cell, it cannot happen in Step 1 of Figure 1. At this stage the exact set of cells to be prepared is not known (no decision taken by target SN). Thus, if solution from Figure 1 is to be supported, we prefer a common condition, to be shared among several potentially prepared cells (could be per frequency, as stated in b). |
| Samsung | a) | We think option a) is baseline  SN change required: In option a) a condition is signalled per candidate while in option b) there can be fewer conditions e.g. one per frequency |
| Ericsson | Solution a) is ok, but we see no reason to forbid measurements to be provided. | Setting per cell is fine, but that still requires S-SN to provide measurements to MN that provides measurements to the T-SN so it can make the decision.  It is important to highlight that the T-SN may decide not to configure all requested cells and/or frequency candidates by S-SN, so that there needs to be a way to handle the non-accepted cells / frequencies in the MN, and the associated execution conditions for these non-accepted cells/ frequencies. The problem is the same, regardless if conditions are set per cell or frequency. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | a) | S-SN decides candidate T-SN, and provides candidate PSCells list and the corresponding execution condition associated to each candidate PSCell.  Candidate T-SN admit all/some/none PSCells from the candidates PSCells list provided by S-SN. |
| Lenovo and Motorola Mobility | a) | a) should be taken as the baseline.  For the issue raised by Nokia, “the exact set of cells to be prepared is not known”, we understand it as a common issue for both (a) and (b), since the frequencies to be prepared is not known neither. |
| Futurewei | a) | With the existing R16 principle, the source SN initiates the CPC based on the S-SN configured per cell measurement report on the target SN. The S-SN has sufficient information to determine the candidate cells at the T-SN(s) and determine the corresponding execution condition per candidate cell. The S-SN sends all the candidate cells(IDs) with associated execution condition in the CPC request to the MN. The MN can simply forward the S-SN request to the T-SN. The T-SN based on the local information to decide which candidate to be confirmed. The T-SN send back all the confirmed candidates with associated configuration and execution condition to the MN, The MN includes the target confirmed candidates’ configurations and execution conditions in CPC configuration message and sends to the UE.  Since the T-SN(s) don’t have global measurement information, it can only confirm or reject any S-SN suggested candidate based on the local information. Even the S-SN measurement is forwarded to the T-SN by MN, it doesn’t help the T-SN to decide the candidates and execution conditions differently from S-SN perspective.  There is no clear benefit and need to develop new procedure with major changes from R16 principle. |
| Intel | a) | If the measurement result is provided by the S-SN (*CG-Config > candidateCellInfoListSN*), this will be tossed to the T-SN via *CG-ConfigInfo*, based on which the T-SN will decide PSCell. This is the legacy SN-initiated inter-SN change behavior. Here, T-SN can decide candidate PSCells based on this measurement result.  We think that the execution conditions from S-SN can be provided per candidate cell in that list (*candidateCellInfoListSN*). If the execution conditions and S-SN’s *MeasConfig* for those execution conditions can be provided outside of the container of *CG-Config > scg-CellGroupConfig* from the S-SN*,* then MN can update execution conditions or the related *MeasConfig* based on decision from T-SN when putting together in its *RRCReconfiguration*, and there seems no need to consider additional steps 4/5 in Figure 4. |
| ZTE | Both a) and b) can be considered | Since the measurement results provided in candidateCellInfoListSN can be set per cell or per frequency, the corresponding execution condition can also be set per cell or per frequency, to align with the measurements provided by the source SN. |
| Qualcomm | Option a) | We think Rel-16 principle should be followed. CG-Config IE in SN Change Required needs to be enhanced to include the execution condition for each candidate PSCell. |
| vivo | Option a) | We agree Rel-16 should be taken as the baseline. We also think S-SN should determine the candidate T-SNs, and send the candidate with the execution conditions to the MN. And MN should request to the T-SNs. After confirming from T-SN, MN will send the configuration the UE. |
| CMCC | a) with modifications | Since one candidate PSCell is selected per SCG, the execution condition needs to be set per cell specifically.  We share the similar view with Ericsson that it is not reasonable to forbid measurement results to be provided. The measurement results related to the target SN may also be included in the SgNB Change Required provided by the S-SN as the legacy. |
| CATT | a) | Considering the environment of each cell is different, so the execution condition of each cell should be different. So we prefer to the option of the execution condition should be provided by per cell not per frequency. |
| Apple | a) | We also feel a) should be taken as baseline. |

**Summary on Issue 1**

* Option a): 11/13
* Option b): 1/13
* Option a) and b): 1/13

From the discussions it is quite clear that great majority (11/13) prefer option a).1 company prefers to option b), 1 company thinks both option a) and option b) can be considered.

* The supporter for option a) thinks R16 principle should be followed, so the execution condition should be set per candidate cell.
* Some companies think the measurement results of the candidate cell shouldn’t be forbidden to the target SN, considering it is legacy procedure, nothing need to specify.
* Another issue mentioned during the discussion is that the target SN may choose target PSCell outside the candidate cells suggested by the source SN. It is related to one issue that will be discussed later.

So we make the proposal as following:

**Proposal 1 Source SN provides the candidate cells and it sets the execution condition per candidate cell.**

***Issue 2: Blind preparation: whether it is possible for the source SN to trigger inter-SN CPC blindly.***

It needs to discuss whether SN initiated inter-SN change can be triggered blindly by the source SN. In this case, the source SN does not even have measurements to identify the relevant target PSCell candidates. It is not clear whether it is possible for the source SN to request a target SN for inter-SN CPC without measurement.

**Question 2: Companies are requested to comment on whether it is possible for the source SN to trigger inter-SN PSCell change blindly and should this scenario be considered for SN initiated inter-SN CPC.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Blind SN initiated inter-SN CPC is supported or not | Comment |
| Nokia | Supported | There are other reasons than just measurement-based, to trigger the PSCell change. Thus, we should leave this autonomy to target SN. We are obviously not against forwarding the measurement results when they are available and relevant, but the final decision which cell to prepare should be up to the target SN. This should not be confined by any list prepared by MN or source SN. |
| Samsung | Not sure | We think that for blind change is currently not supported for regular/ conventional inter-SN PSCell change and see no real need for CPC to support more.  If it comes for free and for both regular and conditional PSCell change, we are fine |
| Ericsson | Supported | We don’t think we need to discuss network implementation here. What would be the impact in any specification of deciding this here? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Supported | From specification perspective, blind SN change is supported since R15. We see no need to exclude blind CPAC, especially there seems no spec impact to support blind CPAC. |
| Lenovo and Motorola Mobility | Supported with comment | We don’t see much specification impact if we support blind CPC. We can revisit if critical issue is raised. |
| Futurewei | Not clear the need | It is not clear the use case for blind CPC initiation. If the “blind” means not based on the S-SN configured measurement, what would be the trigger of S-SN initiated CPC? We are open to support the blind S-SN initiated CPC if a use case can be identified. |
| Intel | Not sure | Such blind preparation can be made possible (*CG-Config > candidateCellInfoListSN* is optional) from specification point of view, but it is not clear why the S-SN requests CPC when it requests SN change, given that there is no measurements to supply at all.  We think the scenario itself should be clarified first. |
| ZTE | Supported | The current spec does not forbid the blind PSCell change. It can be up to the NW implementation. |
| Qualcomm | Not supported | It is not clear on what basis the source SN selects the candidate PSCells if there are no measurements. The legacy (non-conditional) procedure also does not support this. |
| vivo | No sure | We assume blind preparation has no spec impact, it that true?  Besides, we would like to check the use case first as mentioned by Intel and Qualcomm. Thanks. |
| CMCC | Supported | This is already supported by the current specification. We don’t see the reason to forbid blind CPAC. |
| CATT | see comments | We also do not see a clear use cases for blind CPC initiation. However, it is perhaps true that no need for any restriction in the spec, as that is network behavior. That being said we think the design of SN initiated inter-SN CPC‎ does not need any particular enhancement for ‘blind’ triggering. |
| Apple | No strong view | Though we don’t see a strong need to have blind configuration, we don’t hold a strong view on this. |

**Summary on Issue 2**

Views from companies are

* support (6/13)
* not sure or not supported (7/13)

There seems to be no clear majority.

The opponents think the user case for SN to trigger inter-SN CPC blindly is unclear. The supporting companies seem to assume that there is not restriction/extra requirement from specification point of view, as that is only a network implementation choice. Therefore a common ground seems to be that no restriction or specification impact is introduced for blind preparation, which is as the following.

**Proposal 2 No extra restriction and thus no specification impact are introduced to allow the source SN to trigger inter-SN CPC blindly‎.**

***Issue 3: Target SN may not accept some of the candidates suggested by the Source SN. Can the Target SN come up with alternative candidates?***

If the source SN has suggested candidate cells, can the target SN comes up with alternative candidate cells? Similarly, if the source SN has provided execution condition per frequency, can the target SN come up with a candidate cell on a different frequency where the execution condition is not provided by the source SN?

**Question 3: Companies are requested to comment on whether it is possible for the target SN to come up with alternative candidate cells other than what suggested by the source SN.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Alternative candidate cells possible/ not possible | Comment |
| Nokia | Possible | If the execution conditions are prepared later, after the decision taken by the target SN which cells to prepare, there is no problem if the target SN comes up with different cells than initially requested by the source SN. Source SN is not aware of all factors that may impact the decision whether certain cell can become a PSCell candidate (such as load, admission control). This is known to the target SN and target SN should be allowed to provide alternative candidates. Then for such new candidates the condition is either prepared by the source SN after being asked by the MN (Solution 2/Figure 2) or the common execution condition (as discussed in Question 1) is associated. |
| Samsung | No | We think we should stick to agreement that S-SN decides conditions (there are no T-SN configured measurements yet on which conditions can be based). Hence, we think T-SN can only configure alternative candidates if:   1. S-SN provides execution conditions that are suitable the T-SN initiated candidate e.g. a frequency specific condition 2. S-SN provides measurements for the cell (i.e. meaning S-SN provides measurements for cells it did not selected as candidate), or we introduce support for blind CPC by T-SN   We however see no need to support this option |
| Ericsson | Possible | The S-SN provides measurements per cell in a frequency in the RRC container, in the *candidateCellInfoListSN:*  CG-Config-IEs ::= SEQUENCE {  […]  candidateCellInfoListSN OCTET STRING (CONTAINING MeasResultList2NR) OPTIONAL,  […]  }  Even though it is not likely that the T-SN will select a different cell and/or frequency not in that list, we see no reason to prevent that implementation.  If not all target cells and/or frequency candidates are accepted; or, if a new cell / frequency (not requested by S-SN) is added by the T-SN, the MN anyway sends the results from T-SN to S-SN, so the S-SN provides/ updates the SCG MeasConfig and/or the execution conditions per candidate cell/ frequency. In solution 2 this is already built in but works in solution 1 in case we allow an opportunistic approach where MN may wait for these updates before re-configuring the UE with CPC. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | RAN2 already agreed S-SN decides execution condition. And if the execution condition is per candidate PSCell, i.e. S-SN decides execution condition and corresponding PSCell, the only thing T-SN can do is to admit all/some/none PSCell from the ones provided by S-SN. If T-SN is allowed to choose different PSCell, then coordination on SN measurement configuration between T-SN and S-SN is needed, which complicates the procedure with no clear benefits. |
| Lenovo and Motorola Mobility | Yes with comment | If T-SN is provided with measurements of other cells, T-SN can also suggest to prepare other candidate cells.  On the other hand, we are not sure the T-SN suggested candidate cells should be provided in the SgNB addition Request Acknowledge message (step 3 in Figure 1 and 2). It seems more clean to do it via e.g. T-SN triggered SN modification required to modify the current CPC configuration. Since MN/S-SN shall confirm whether to prepare those cells as T-SN suggested.  We also consider this relevant to question 10. |
| Futurewei | No | The T-SN/candidate cell can only reject a candidate, but it doesn’t have sufficient information to suggest an alternative candidate. It is the decision of the S-SN to conduct a CPC and which cell could be a candidate. A T-SN cannot make a CPC decision for S-SN.  Even S-SN measurement is forwarded to the T-SN, based on the same data already used by S-SN, we don’t see T-SN can add different candidates from S-SN’s perspective.  Deliver the S-SN measurement to T-SN via MN increases the complexity and backhaul resource consumption. We don’t see the benefit worth the effort. |
| Intel | Possible | We also see no reason to prevent that possibility. If T-SN selects candidate PSCells other than what is provided via *CG-ConfigInfo > candidateCellInfoListSN*, T-SN should be able to supply the corresponding execution condition as well to the MN. |
| ZTE | Possible | Usually the T-SN will select the candidate PSCell from candidateCellInfoListSN provided by the S-SN, but it is also possible that the T-SN wants to configure other cell/frequency due to some reason (e.g. load balance).  Besides, the S-SN may just provide execution condition(s) for some cell/frequency in candidateCellInfoListSN (i.e. not all cell/frequency have the matching execution condition). In such cases, the T-SN may select some candidate PSCell without the pre-configured execution condition. And we see no reason to restrict the NW implementation above.  Solution 2 can be considered in the cases above, to make the S-SN provide new execution condition for the new added candidate PSCell. |
| Qualcomm | Not possible | It is not clear why it should be allowed for target SN to come up with alternative candidate cells that is not in the set of candidate cells suggested by source SN. |
| vivo | Not possible | Our understanding is that RAN2 has already agreed that S-SN should decide the conditions. In this way, T-SN can choose to accept or reject the candidate. We would like to check the use case that in which the T-SN could come up with alternative candidate cells other than what suggested by the source SN. |
| CMCC | Possible | The measurement result is one of the main factors for S-SN selecting candidate cells. For some reason, it is possible that the target SN rejects the addition request or has other candidate cells. We don’t see the reason for forbidding this implementation.  To have alternative candidate cells selected by T-SN, it is important to enable the S-SN to decide execution conditions associated with these alternative candidate cells. In solution 2, step 4/5 can be used to solve this problem. Further discussions should be performed in solution 1, |
| CATT | No | If T-SN chooses other cells due to load balance but without measurement results, it cannot guarantee the chosen cells can be accessible which may lead to PSCell change/addition failure.  Further, once the provided candidate PSCells with heavy load, the candidate SN can reject then SN addition request.  In order not to make the whole procedure too complicated we do not think this needed. |
| Apple | No | If the T-SN chooses another cell other than the configured ones from S-SN, looks like another round of signaling exchange would be needed, which leads to long latency. |

**Summary on Issue 3**

Views from companies are

* No: 7/13
* Possible: 6/13

There seems to be no clear majority.

The ‘No’ camp thinks that the user case for the target SN to come up with another candidate cells is unclear. Besides, they think that it is against the RAN2 agreement that source SN decides the execution condition, and it makes the procedure more complicated to configure the execution condition for the alternative candidate cells determined by the target SN. The ‘Possible’ camp however mentions that source cell may not have all the information such as load, etc.. Some companies think the solution 2 can be used to solve the issue of the execution condition for the alternative candidate cells determined by the target SN.

It seems more discussions are needed.

**Proposal 3 FFS whether it is possible for the target SN to come up with alternative candidate cells other than what suggested by the ‎source SN. ‎**

**Source SN configuration update**

***Issue 4: whether the source SN would need to update its configuration depending on the accepted candidate cells by the target SN.***

So far measId(s) in SCG MeasConfig and Measurement gap configuration (per UE gap, per FR gap) are identified as the parameters which may require updating based on the accepted candidate cells by the target SN.

The UE may end up configured with measId(s) in SCG MeasConfig associated to PSCell(s) not selected by a target candidate gNodeB i.e. they would not be in the CPC configuration. However this may not been seen as a major issue, considering that the UE could be requested to ignore these measId(s) and not be required to perform measurements accordingly as they are not in CPC.

Measurement gap configuration could be per UE gap or per FR gap. In some scenarios, the MN decides on the measurement gap configuration. In some other scenarios, the MN and source SN decide on the measurements gap configuration to the UE. If the MN has decided on the measurement gaps for the UE (e.g. per-UE gap, NR-DC), there is no requirement for updating the source SN configuration based on the accepted candidate cells by the target SN. If the source SN has configured measurement gaps (e.g. (NG)EN-DC) for measuring a candidate target cell and that cell is not accepted by the target SN for CPC, there remains some unrequired measurement configurations of source SN. In this case, measurement gap configuration by the source SN may need to be updated based on the accepted candidate cells by the target SN.

**Question 4: Companies are requested to comment on whether the source SN would need to update its configuration depending on the accepted candidate cells by the target SN always? If the source SN configuration update based on the accepted candidate cells by the target SN is required in some scenarios, please state which scenarios require the source SN configuration update.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Source SN configuration update required always/ in some scenarios  - which parameters need update | Comment |
| Nokia | Measurement configuration, such as measurement gaps. | The need for such reconfiguration could be identified when the MN contacts the source SN upon the response from the target SN, when it is known which cells have been prepared. Then it would be the right time to prepare corresponding execution conditions and reconfigure the source SN config. |
| Samsung | No strong need, can be done after CPAC configuration and left up to network implementation | We think that T-SN rejection may cause UE to have a configuration that is merely sub-optimal i.e. not really causing problems. Moreover, we assume that rejection is not a very frequent case, so no strong need to optimise the handling  We acknowledge that UE may temporarily be configured with some measId’s with CPC related reportConfig that are not used in any CondReconfig. I.e. some hanging configuration. We think these would not cause any problems but S-SN can cleanup if desired  For gaps, situation is similar i.e. if UE ends up with candidates on fewer frequencies, (S-SN generated) gap configuration may not be entirely optimal.  Note that if T-SN rejects candidates, there may anyhow be a need for S-SN to take further action e.g. add other candidates.. So a subsequent cleanup does not necessarily imply in additional Reconfiguration messages |
| Ericsson | SCG MeasConfig for the measIDs and gap configuration | In some cases the S-SN needs to update the SCG configuration. However, the solution could be that the MN can decide to wait for a new SCG configuration before configuring the UE or it could configure the UE anyway, until a possibly new SCG configuration is updated (these two possibilities could be captured in stage-2).  If both possibilities are supported, we need to define the measId(s) in SCG MeasConfig not linked to CPC candidates are not required to be measured. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | None | We would like to first clarify the scenario under-discussion here. It is assumed there are measurement IDs to be configured only for CPC (linked to certain candidate PSCell), and in case the candidate PSCell is not admitted by T-SN, then the measurement performed for the measurement IDs has no use.  If this is the issue, we are not sure if it is a common case, because the non-conditional CPC can also be used by NW which relies on the measurement configuration and reporting. And even if UE performs some useless measurement, it is temporary anyway (only before CPC execution), which seems not a big issue worth introducing a new measurement coordination procedure between S-SN and T-SN.  The more important thing is it should allow T-SN to generate (delta) PSCell configuration based on the source PSCell configuration like in legacy way, there may be multiple candidate PSCell/T-SN preparation running in parallel, so that the source PSCell configuration should not be updated after it is sent to some other T-SN already. |
| Lenovo and Motorola Mobility | SCG MeasConfig for the measIDs and gap configuration | We believe it should be supported from spec point of view for the SN to update the e.g. measurement config considering the accepted candidate cells. In reality, it’s upon implementation to decide whether the update is necessary or not. |
| Futurewei | Don’t see the need to update the configuration upon T-SN confirmed the final candidate cell(s). | See our answer to question 1. The MN can have the CPC configuration message including the T-SN determined final candidate cells with associated configuration and execution condition. The MN will also notify the S-SN the final CPC candidates being configurated to the UE. The S-SN will update the CPC measurement configuration only for the CPC candidates later on. |
| Intel | First, | We think we should look for possibilities where this additional communication between MN and S-SN can be avoided. One possibility could be that execution conditions from S-SN and S-SN’s *MeasConfig* for those execution conditions is provided outside of the container of *CG-Config > scg-CellGroupConfig*, so that the MN can update execution conditions or the related *MeasConfig* based on decision from T-SN.  But we are not sure whether this would work for measurement gap configuration. |
| ZTE | No strong need | For the measId(s) with CPC related reportConfig that are not linked with the selected candidate PSCell, the S-SN can clean up them in the subsequent CPAC configuration/modification procedure or source SN configuration update procedure. Or it can be up to the UE implementation to handle such measurements (e.g. the UE can simply ignore them. Or even if the UE performs such measurements, it seems there is no big issue since the UE anyway will remove such measurement configuration upon successful completion of CPAC execution).  For the measurement gap, we see no direct relationship between whether to update the measurement gap and whether the cell is selected as a candidate cell. Even if the cell is not accepted, the measurement related to that cell/frequency can be still continued due to other reasons (e.g. normal RRM purpose). So it seems no need to specially initiate a S-SN modification procedure to update the measurement gap depending on the accepted candidate cells by the T-SN. Anyway the S-SN can update the gap in the subsequent CPAC configuration/modification procedure or source SN configuration update procedure, if needed. |
| Qualcomm | Source SN configuration update is required in some scenarios (please see comments) | The part of the source SCG configuration that needs to be updated in some scenarios is the measurement gap configuration. The scenarios are discussed below.  As mentioned above, there are two cases to consider. The case that applies is determined by the network (MN) taking into account the capabilities signalled by the UE on support for per-UE or per-FR measurement gaps.  (1) Per-UE gap is configured for the UE  In this case, MN decides the gap configuration.  - After receiving the prepared PSCells from the target SNs, MN determines and provides the gap configuration in CPC configuration message to the UE.  - MN only includes measIDs corresponding to the prepared PSCells in the CPC configuration message.  - Source SN configuration update is not needed.  (2) Per-FR gap is configured for the UE  Sub-case (a): EN-DC, NGEN-DC  In this case, MN decides the gap configuration for FR1, while the SN decides the gap configuration for FR2.  - MN should forward the prepared PSCells to the source SN in a message (e.g., SN Change Confirm).  - Source SN configuration update is needed.  - Upon receiving the prepared PSCells from MN, source SN updates and provides the measurement configuration including FR2 gap configuration to the MN in a message (e.g., SN Modification Required) for MN to include in CPC configuration message transmitted to the UE.  Sub-case (b): NR-DC  In this case, MN decides both the FR1 and FR2 gap configurations. Thus, this case is handled the same way as Case (1) above when per-UE gap is configured.  We think that the gaps in the measurement configuration that correspond to candidate PSCells that are **not prepared** by the target SNs will impact UE throughput performance. Therefore, it is useful to update the source SCG measurement gap configuration with prepared PSCells information from target SNs, and then provide the CPC configuration to UE. |
| vivo | Possible | We understand network could update the measurement configuration after CPAC anyway based on current procedure. But it may have some performance impact if measurement gap is not needed according to the response from the T-SN. Thus, in order to have performance enhancement, we think it should be possible to support S-SN need to update its configuration depends on the accepted candidate cells by the T-SN. |
| CMCC | Maybe | In the general scenario, there is no strong need for the S-SN to always update the configurations upon the response from the T-SN. But, in the scenario regarding to the Question 3, this should be supported for alternative candidate cells selected by T-SN. |
| CATT | None | 1st: The probability that the source SN has to update its measurement gap is quite low.  The S-SN can configure measurement gap only when it is (NG)EN-DC and the S-SN is working on FR2. Otherwise, the measurement gap can be updated by MN when needed.  Besides, although the T-SN may choose one cell not need gap, the measurement gap is probably also needed by the normal RRM measurements.  2nd: Even the measurement gap or MeasIDs are not cancelled by the S-SN, there is no impact on CPAC in addition to some unnecessary measurements or gap wastes. Moreover, the NW can further reconfigure the measurement in the subsequent configuration procedure, if needed.  3rd: As pointed by HW, since the T-SN is allowed to generate (delta) PSCell configuration based on the source PSCell configuration, there may be multiple candidate PSCell/T-SN preparation running in parallel, if source PSCell configuration is updated after it is sent to some other T-SN already, it need to the update of the other T-SN configuration which will lead to lots of signalling overhead |
| Apple | Possible | From spec point of view, the feasibility of updating the measurement configuration should be provided. |

**Summary on Issue 4**

Views from companies are

* No need to update the measurement configuration of the source SN: 5/13
* Possible or may need to update the measurement configuration of the source SN: 8/13

The 2nd camp above raises the following scenarios:

* gap configuration: gap may not be needed according to the response from the target SN,
* measID related with CPC that are not linked with the selected candidate PSCells should be released, and
* the target SN chooses one target PSCell which is outside of the cell list provided by the source SN.

The “no need” camp mainly thinks:

* Gap configuration can be used for other RRM measurements.
* UE doesn’t need to measure measID that are not linked in CPC by any candidate
* Delta configuration, there may be multiple candidate PSCell/target SN preparation running or configured in parallel, source SN configuration update will lead to the update for other configured/preparing candidate target SN.

In order to decide whether source SN configuration need to be updated based on the accepted candidate cells by the target SN, RAN2 may first discuss the scenarios mentioned above.

**Proposal 4 RAN 2 discuss and determine whether/which of the following are valid/necessary scenarios for the source SN configuration update based on the accepted candidate cells by the target SN before the CPAC configuration is sent to UE ‎**

* gap is not needed according to the response from the target SN
* measID related with CPC that are not linked with the selected candidate PSCells.
* The target SN determines alternative candidate cells other than what suggested by the ‎source SN (subject to previous FFS) ‎

The severity of the issue discussed in question 4 depends on frequency of this happening. Thus whether a standardised solution is required to solve the issue identified in question 5 should be discussed taken into account the frequency of the problem, scenarios, the UE behaviour, etc. There are at least three different solutions to use for removal of the unrequired measurement configuration of source SN based on the accepted candidate cells by the target SN:

a) Remove by source SN Reconfiguration after CPAC configuration/execution.

b) Update of source SN configuration and transmit the updated SN configuration together with conditional configuration . i.e. Introduce additional nested sub-procedure, as in solution 2

c) UE autonomous removal

**Question 5:** **Companies are requested to comment on which solution is acceptable for removal of the unrequired measurement configuration of the source SN depending on the accepted candidate cells by the target SN.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | a)/b)/c) | Comment |
| Nokia | b) | We should not allow for UE autonomous removal of the configuration (i.e. option c). Not clear when option a) happens. Is it about configuration or execution of CPAC? Seems it may lead to another reconfiguration to fix the inappropriate measurement configuration (redundant reconfiguration)? |
| Samsung | a) | See previous  We think R17 CPAC is sufficiently complex already, so we prefer to avoid introducing additional complexity as in option b).  We note that we also have to address several modification cases (e.g. modifications affecting the CPAC candidates), so limited time for further enhancements. |
| Ericsson | None of these solutions are needed | CPC related measConfig will anyway be deleted upon successful execution, as in CHO (and under other scenarios such as suspend, handover, etc.).  The only thing we need is that the UE does not have to measure measId(s) that are not linked in CPC by a candidate. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | None | As commented for Q4, we do not see the need to introduce some complex coordination in network side, i.e. b), which will also increase extra delay of CPC preparation. And for a) and c), they seems not work.  For a), we understand UE will anyway apply target PSCell configuration after CPC execution.  For c), UE should not just autonomously release all measurement IDs not linked to CPC configuration, because they may be used for non-conditional mobility management. |
| Lenovo and Motorola Mobility | a) with comment | Not sure how to interpret “unrequired measurement”, if it’s about telling the UE to stop some measurements before CPC execution, then a) is probably needed. |
| Futurewei | c) | Have the similar view as Ericsson, the UE only conducts the measurement for the measID(s) associated with the target (T-SN) configured CPC candidate(s). The UE does not perform the measurement for the CPC measID(s) linked to cells not configured as the candidates.  We presume this is the solution c. |
| Intel |  | Agree with Ericsson. The UE can be specified not to perform measurements that are not linked with any candidate PSCell configuration. |
| ZTE | a), if it means that it can be up to the NW implementation | It can be up to the NW implementation, e.g. S-SN removes the unrequired measurement configuration in the subsequent RRC message for CPAC configuration/modification or source SN configuration update. |
| Qualcomm | Option b) | As mentioned in our response to Question 4, update of source SN configuration, i.e., Option b), based on prepared PSCells is needed in certain scenarios only. |
| vivo |  | We assume the measConfig will be removed upon CPAC completion. And network could update the configuration by removing the unrequired measurement configuration of the S-SN. Thus, we are not sure what’s more should be specified. |
| CMCC |  | We agree that the unrequired measurement configuration can be resolved up to UE/NW implementation. For example, S-SN removes the unrequired measurement configuration following the current SN modification procedure or UE stop performing measurement for measID(s) not linked to CPC configuration |
| CATT | None , or a) depends on the NW implementation | As our comments on Q4, no need to introduce further coordinates between S-SN and T-SN.  As for a) it can work, but whether to remove the unrequired measurement configuration by source SN Reconfiguration after CPAC configuration/execution is NW implementation. |
| Apple | 1. Or b) | c) requires additional UE handling, which is not preferred. |

**Summary on Question 5**

Views from companies are

* solution a: 5/13
* solution b: 3/13
* solution c: 1/13
* None: 6/13

Companies that prefer solution a) mainly think that it up to the NW implementation. Supporters of solution b) think some certain scenarios are needed based on prepared PSCells chosen by the target SN.

Companies that prefer ‘None’ mainly think that whether to update the measurement configuration of the source SN depend on the NW implementation, or see no need to update the measurement configuration of the source SN.

Based on the detailed comments from the companies, there seems to be 5 companies that explicitly agree that this is up to network implementation, which means no extra specification effort. Furthermore, there are 3 companies that think that the only requirement is that UE does not have to measure measId(s) that are not linked ‎in CPC by a candidate‎.

Based on these we can check if the following is agreeable as the baseline.

**Proposal 5 Baseline is no specification impact is needed for removal of the unrequired measurement configuration of the source SN depending on the accepted candidate ‎cells by the target SN. FFS whether/how to specify that UE does not have to measure measId(s) that are not linked ‎in CPC by a candidate.**

**Procedure details**

***Issue 5: When to send SgNB Change Confirm message in response to SgNB Change Required (Step 1 in Figure 1)***

At RAN2\_112-e meeting, the following agreement was made on SN initiated inter-SN CPC.

**Proposal 1: Option 1 should be used for the generation of conditional reconfiguration for SN initiated inter-SN conditional PSCell change.**

**Option 1: The MN generates CPC. The source SN sets the execution condition and communicates it to the MN. The MN generates the conditional reconfiguration message including the execution condition(s) provided by the source SN and RRCReconfiguration provided by the candidate PSCell(s).**

As discussed in R2-2010734, Figure 3 is an illustration of signaling flow for SN initiated Inter-SN CPC based on the above agreement. The figure follows the steps used in a conventional SN initiated SN change procedure as shown in Figure 10.5.1-2 of TS37.340.

The MN generates a CPC configuration, i.e., the IE *ConditionalReconfiguration* as an MN configuration based on reconfiguration per target candidate (denoted RRCReconfiguration\*\* in Figure 3) and the execution condition per candidate cell. RRCReconfiguration\*\* per target candidate is provided by each target candidate cell in response to a conditional SN Addition Request. The execution condition per candidate cell is provided by the Source SN in the conditional SN Change Required.



**Figure 3: Configuration of SN-initiated inter-SN CPC based on agreement.**

Figure 3 doesn’t show the SgNB Change Confirm message in response to SgNB Change required message in step 1. As per the legacy procedure, Reception of the SgNB Change Confirm message triggers the source SN to stop providing user data to the UE and, if applicable, to start data forwarding. For CPC, the source SgNB will only stop data transmission to the UE upon the CPC execution. When to send SgNB Change Confirm message should be discussed for inter-SN CPC. There are three options to consider:

Option 1: SgNB Change Confirm message is transmitted after CPC execution. This option follows the steps used in conventional SN initiated inter-SN PSCell change procedure. Reception of the SgNB Change Confirmation message triggers the source SN to stop data transmission to the UE.

Option 2: SgNB Change Confirm message is transmitted after step 5. In this option, the reception of SgNB Change Confirmation message does not trigger the source SN to stop data transmission to the UE. Therefore, a new indication should be added in SgNB Change Confirmation message to indicate that data transmission to the UE should not be stopped. Also another message from the MN to the source SN is required upon the execution of CPC to inform the source SN to stop data transmission to the UE.

Option 3: SgNB Change Confirm message is transmitted after step 3. Similar to option 2, the reception of SgNB Change Confirmation message does not trigger the source SN to stop data transmission to the UE. Therefore, a new indication should be added in SgNB Change Confirmation message to indicate that data transmission to the UE should not be stopped. Also another message from the MN to the source SN is required upon the execution of CPC to inform the source SN to stop data transmission to the UE.

**Question 6: Companies are requested to comment on which option is acceptable for transmitting SgNB Change Confirm message in response to SN Change Required in Step 1.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | a)/b)/c) | Comment |
| Nokia | Option 2, Option 3 | Both Option 3 (step 3a) and Option 2 (step 5a) are acceptable options for transmitting “SgNB Change Confirm”. If Option 3 (step 3a) is adopted, then step 4 of Fig. 4 indicating the accepted candidate cell information from MN to source SN can be combined with “SgNB Change Confirm”.  Step 6a (Option 2/3) could be a useful message as well, as it allows to inform the source SN when to stop transmission and initiate the data forwarding. However, step 6a (Option 1) may be a bit too late for SN Change Confirm and the question (to RAN3) remains how long in the procedure the source SN can wait for such confirmation? |
| Samsung | 1. but | We see no real need to do something different compared to conventional SN initiated inter-SN PSCell change.  We however also think RAN3 typically handles issues related to data forwarding and prefer to leave it to them |
| Ericsson | Option 2) and Option 3), but we also need 2/3 for indicating execution! | Option 2) should be supported in case the S-SN can include in the SN Change Required for CPC the SCG MeasConfig and the execution conditions, and the T-SN candidate accepts all requested candidate cells and/or frequencies (depending how S-SN sets the conditions, if per cell and/or frequency).  That means the MN can first configure the UE with CPC to then receive the RRCReconfigurationComplete including an SCG RRCReconfigurationComplete to be provided to the S-SN in the SN Change Confirm. There is no need to indicate that data transmission is NOT stopped, the S-SN is aware this is for CPC and not legacy.  Option 3) should also be supported in case the S-SN can include in the SN Change Required for CPC the SCG MeasConfig and the execution conditions, and the T-SN candidate does NOT accept all requested candidate cells and/or frequencies (depending how S-SN sets the conditions, if per cell and/or frequency). In that case the MN incudes accepted candidates in the SN Change Confirm to the S-SN before it re-configures the UE (to avoid double RRC signalling), so the S-SN triggers an SN Modification Required with the updated SCG measConfig and execution conditions. Upon reception, the MN generates CPC, configures the UE, receives an RRCReconfigurationComplete including an SCG RRCReconfigurationComplete that is provided from MN to S-SN in the SN Modification Confirm.  Option 2/3) Upon execution the MN needs to indicate that to the S-SN, to some extent as in legacy, so the data forwarding is prepared and S-SN stops data transmissions. The exact message can be agreed in RAN3. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option2 | From RAN3 perspective, SN change is a class1 procedure, there should be a confirm message within certain time period, otherwise the S-SN would consider it as a failure case, so option 1 is not suitable. Between option 2 and option3, since S-SN may include non-conditional reconfiguration in step 3, then option2 is preferred so that the non-conditional reconfiguration complete message to S-SN can be included in step 5a. Should also check with RAN3. |
| Lenovo and Motorola Mobility | Option 2) | First of all, we believe it is needed to inform S-SN about the prepared PSCells before CPC execution and it can be done via SN change confirm message. Option2 or Option 3.  Comparing Option 2 or Option 3, it makes more sense to inform the S-SN after UE acknowledges the successful reception of the conditional configuration. |
| Futurewei | Option 2 and Option 2/3 | Option 2 is sufficient. It can serve multiple purpose: indicate CPC configuration to UE is successful, update S-SN the T-SN confirmed candidates. The Option 2 includes the function of Option 3 – Option 3 is not needed.  Option 2/3 is needed upon CPC execution is triggered for early preparing the S-SN (stop TX, data forwarding) and the T-SN. |
| Intel | Option 2 (step 5a) | Option 2 should be the baseline. The SN CHG CNFM is not just about data forwarding. The purpose is to let the S-SN know that SN change is successfully configured to the UE. And given that S-SN is the one who requests CPC, the S-SN can decide whether to perform early or late data forwarding.  Upon execution, the *ULInformationTransferMRDC* from the UE can be forwarded to the S-SN via RRC TRANSFER as we did in Rel-16. |
| ZTE | Option 2/3 | We think both option 2 and option 3 can be considered.  All step 3a (used for transmitting candidate PSCell IDs selected by the T-SN to the S-SN in some cases, e.g. T-SN selects another candidate cells), step 5a (used for confirming that the UE received the non-conditional SCG configuration if such configuration is sent together with CPC configuration) and step 6a (used for informing S-SN to stop data transmission to the UE) may be required for SN-initiated CPC procedure.  However, regarding which Xn/X2 message can be used for such steps and which/whether some indication should be included in the SgNB change confirm message, we think they can be left to RAN3 discussion. |
| Qualcomm | Option 3 | We think that SN Change Confirm is the response message to SN Change Required that requests preparation of CPC; hence, it should be transmitted when CPC preparation is completed on the network side.  Regarding the message required to inform source SN to stop transmitting data to the UE upon CPC execution, we prefer that this issue be discussed separately when CPC execution including data forwarding aspects is discussed in detail. |
| Vivo | Option 2 and Option 3 | We think an indication is needed to inform S-SN when to stop transmission and initiate the data forwarding by SN change confirmation.  Anyway, RAN3 should be involved to check which message could be used for which steps, and whether this indication should be included in the SN change confirmation message. |
| CMCC | Option 2 | The acknowledge of UE successfully receiving configurations from the S-SN should be forwarded to S-SN upon the reception of *RRCReconfigurationComplete*. It is up to NW implement that S-SN will not stop data transmission upon the reception of the confirm. Which message is employed should be checked by RAN3. |
| CATT | Depends RAN3 | Considering it is related to data forwarding which is RAN3 scope, so we prefer to leave the problem to RAN3. |
| Apple | Option 2 |  |

**Summary on Issue 5**

Views from companies are

* Option 1: 1/13
* Option 2: 6/13
* Option 3: 1/13
* Option 2 and 3 both acceptable: 4/13

From the views it seems 10 companies think Option 2 acceptable. Some of them pointed out that the step 6a (i.e., marked as Option 2/3 indicating it is a common step) is needed.

Besides, 5 companies see a need to check with RAN3, either on detailed signalling or the issue overall.

Therefore it seems a potential common ground is to have Option 2 (including step 6a) as baseline, which inform this understanding to RAN3.

**Proposal 6 Option 2 is taken as baseline, i.e., SgNB Change Confirm message is transmitted after reception of RRCReconfigurationComplete in response of the CPAC configuration. The reception of SgNB Change ‎Confirmation message does not trigger the source SN to stop data transmission to the UE. Also another message from the MN to the source SN is required upon the execution of ‎CPC to inform the source SN to stop data transmission to the UE. ‎ RAN2 informs this agreement to RAN3.**

**Solution 2 details**

If option b) is considered for Question 5 above, the details of solution 2 should be discussed. There are a number of points to be discussed about the solution 2.



**Figure 4: the procedure update required for solution 2.**

***Issue 6: which messages can be used for step 4/5 in solution 2. Whether the source configuration update procedure is triggered by the MN or the source SN in solution 2***

Solution 2 requires introducing an additional nested sub-procedure in step 4 and 5. Even though what messages are to be used for inter-node signalling is within the scope of RAN3, RAN2 agreed to discuss the detail procedure for SN initiated Inter-SN CPC. The use of inter-node sub-procedure may depend on whether the source configuration update procedure is triggered by the MN or the source SN in solution 2.

**Question 7: Companies are requested to comment on which messages can be used for step 4/5 in solution 2. And whether the source configuration update procedure is triggered by the MN or the source SN in solution 2.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Inter-node messages for step4/5 | Comment |
| Nokia |  | RAN3 to decide about the messages to be used. Note that step 4 can be combined with “SgNB Change Confirm” if Option 3 (step 3a) of Fig. 3 is adopted.  SN configuration update should be triggered (if needed) when source SN receives the message in step 4 and knows which cells have been prepared. |
| Samsung | NA | We prefer to leave this to RAN3. We are fine do discuss what RAN2 contents would be included  4: None  5: A single CG-ConfigInfo: only including a non-conditional SCG reconfiguration, replacing the non-conditional SCG reconfiguration in 1)  Although MN initiated modification might be used, given that MN does provide input regarding what SN should change, it seems more like two one-step messages i.e. 5 is not like accept/ reject of 4  BTW: We assume that in this solution there is a need for a further message facilitating data forwarding e.g. alike shown in the previous sequence |
| Ericsson | SN Change Confirm in 4,  SN Modification Required in 5.  Then, SN Modification Confirm is missing in step 8. | Message 4 with the accepted candidates can be the SN Change Confirm, but RAN3 can make a final decision.  Then, message 5 is clearly an SN Modification Required as that needs to include an SCG MeasConfig and the execution conditions.  However, message 8 is missing (probably an SN Modification Confirm). |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | NA | As we commented for Q4, we understand the source SN configuration should not be changed, since the candidate PSCell configuration may be generated by other T-SN based on the source SN configuration received in step 2. |
| Lenovo and Motorola Mobility | Step4: SN change confirm  Step5: SN modification required | If solution 2 is agreed, then we think SN change confirm and SN modification required messages shall be used. |
| Futurewei | Don’t see a need of solution 2 | Adding steps 4, 5 will increase the delay of CPC configuration and increase complexity. Following the option 2 in question 6, the function of steps 4, 5 can be conducted after step 7. |
| Intel | First, | As commented above, we think we should look for possibilities where this additional communication between MN and S-SN (i.e. steps 4 and 5) can be avoided.  Currently there is no nested procedure initiated by MN during the SN-initiated SN change procedure. Given a limited time, asking to specify such nested procedure could be a big burden to RAN3. |
| ZTE |  | It can be up to RAN3 to decide which message(s) can be used.  If solution 2 is agreed, we think the source SN can trigger the SN modification procedure to update the source configuration when the source SN knows the selected PSCell information from step 4, but FFS whether SN change confirm or other Xn/X2 message is used in step 4. |
| Qualcomm | Step 4: SN Change Confirm  Step 5: SN Modification Required | In our point of view, as described in our response to Question 4, since in certain scenarios there seems to be no need for source SN configuration to be updated, the source configuration update procedure should be triggered by the MN in solution 2. |
| Vivo | Step4: SN change confirm  Step5: SN modification required | We think SN change confirm and SN modification required message could be used. Further check with RAN3 is needed. |
| CMCC |  | The messages in current specification should be reused to reduce the workload. As stated in Question 6, the SN change confirm message is employed to indicate the successful allocation of target SN resources. For the S-SN reconfiguration trigged by MN, step 4 can use SGNB MODIFICATION REQUEST and step 5 use the SGNB MODIFICATION REQUEST ACKNOWLEDGE in response.  But it is up to RAN3 for the final decision, especially for the nested procedure. |
| CATT | NA | See comment on Q4, since it doesn’t affect the CPAC configuration for UE, so it is not a needed procedure. |
| Apple | Step4: SN change confirm  Step5: SN modification required |  |

**Summary on Question 7**

* Depends on RAN3: 4/13
* Step 4/5 are not needed: 4/13
* Step 4 is SN change confirm) and step 5 is SN modification required: 4/13

There is no clear majority.

As this issue is solution 2 specific and there is no converged view, no conclusion is made at this stage. More discussions seem needed.

***Issue 7: Whether step 4/5 in solution 2 is optional or mandatory***

***Issue 8: when to send execution condition to the MN in solution 2 (in step 1 or step 5 in figure 4)***

Under Issue 4, we discuss scenarios where update of source SN configuration based on the accepted candidate cells by the target SN may be needed. The main parameter identified for update is the measurement gap configuration by the source SN. In some scenarios, source SN configuration update based on the accepted candidate cells by the target SN may not be required. Hence, step4/5 in solution 2 may be considered to be an optional.

One company raised the issue that the source SN could provide the execution condition to the MN in step 5 (in Figure 4) in solution 2 together with the updated source SN configuration. If the step 4/5 in solution 2 is to be considered an optional depending on the scenario, the source SN should provide the execution condition to the MN in step 1.

**Question 8: Companies are requested to comment on whether step 4/5 in solution 2 is optional or mandatory and** **when to send execution condition to the MN in solution 2 (in step 1 or step 5 in figure 4).**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | step4/5 optional/mandatory | When to send execution condition (step1/step5) | Comment |
| Nokia | mandatory | Step5 | For solution 2 to work, we need to have steps 4 and 5 introduced (to obtain the execution conditions and reconfigure the source SN conf.). Execution conditions should be also provided to the MN when it is known which cells have been prepared. |
| Samsung |  |  | As indicated, we prefer to limit complexity and hence not to introduce this solution. Making these steps optional introduces further options, which makes things worse/ increasing complexity. E.g. if conditions can be placed in 5, least complex option is to always be there i.e. with step 4/ 5 mandatory (S-SN needs to know where to place conditions before knowing if some candidates will be rejected) |
| Ericsson | Optional? |  | We don’t want that to be complicated with too many options, but we would prefer not to limit network implementation e.g. the SN Change Required has already the possibility to include the CG-Config (which is the same container that would possibly be included in SN Modification Required), so we don’t think we need to forbid that in specifications. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | NA |  | As we commented for Q4, we understand the source SN configuration should not be changed, since the candidate PSCell configuration may be generated by other T-SN based on the source SN configuration received in step 2.  Even if the non-conditional SN reconfiguration update is to be supported from specification perspective, it may not happen in the most cases. Therefore we should not mandate step 4/5. |
| Lenovo and Motorola Mobility | Step 4: Mandatory  Step 5: Optional? |  | We understand step 4 and 5 are the main idea of solution 2. If solution 2 is adopted, then step 4 as SN Modification Confirm message is necessary.  Whether step 5 is needed depends on whether step 1 will carry the execution condition. If step 1 carries the execution condition, then step 5 is needed in case of any update. Otherwise, if step 1 does not carry execution condition, then step 5 is mandatory. |
| Futurewei | Not needed |  | Candidates and per candidate measurement configuration and execution condition should be sent at step 1 from the S-SN to the MN. |
| Intel |  |  | Please see above. |
| ZTE | Optional |  | The S-SN anyway can provide the execution condition via the SN Change Required message. In case the T-SN accepts all candidate cells whose execution conditions have been provided in step 1, then it seems no need to trigger step 4/5. However, if the T-SN selects some candidate cells whose execution conditions are not provided in step 1, then step 4/5 may be needed to provide the new execution conditions for the candidate cells. So we prefer to have the implementation flexibility. |
| Qualcomm | Optional | Step 1 | In view of our response to Question 4, Steps 4 and 5 should be optional since it depends on the scenario where source SN configuration needs to be updated.  Also, as mentioned above by the rapporteur, since Steps 4 and 5 should be optional, it seems simpler for source SN to provide the execution conditions to MN in Step 1. |
| vivo | Optional? |  | We understand step 4 and 5 could be optional. Whether it is needed depends on whether new execution condition could be provided in addition to the execution conditions in Step 1. |
| CMCC | Optional |  | As we stated before, in the scenario regarding to the Question 3, alternative candidate cells outside the list from the S-SN could be selected by T-SN. Step 4/5 should be supported to provide conditions for these alternative cells. |
| CATT | NA |  | See comment on Q4, since it doesn’t affect the CPAC configuration for UE, so it is not a needed procedure. |
| Apple | Optional |  |  |

**Summary on Question 8**

* step4 and step5 are mandatory: 1/13
* not support step4/5 (Solution 2): 5/13
* step4 and setp5 are optional: 6/13
* step 4 is mandatory and step 5 is optional: 1/13

There is no clear majority.

As this issue is solution 2 specific and there is no converged view, no conclusion is made at this stage. More discussions seem needed.

**Inter-node message content**

***Issue 9: inter-node message content***

So far we have not discussed the detail of inter-node message content for SN initiated inter-SN CPC from RAN2 point of view. Step 1 to 3 in Figure 1 and 2 are common to both solution 1 and 2. As the starting point, we could discuss what additional parameters are required to realise SN initiated Inter-SN CPC in step 1 (SN Change required), 2 (SN Addition Request) and 3 (SN Addition Request Acknowledge) of Figure 1. Please note that this discussion is to gather RAN2 point of view (e.g. execution condition, target configuration, capability coordination info, radio bearer configuration, etc)

**Question 9: Companies are requested to comment on message content required for step 1, 2 and 3 in Figure 1 to realise SN initiated inter-SN CPC from RAN2 point of view.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Nokia | In step 1 the execution conditions if solution 1 from Figure 1 is pursued.  Configured bearers and candidate’s measurement results in step 1, 2.  In Step 3 RRC containers with prepared candidate cells + the cell IDs, so that the MN does not have to decode the configurations. |
| Samsung | We think that a key issue is to identify, for each of the inter-node messages, the RRC info/ parameters that need to be signalled and for which a value per UE (**PU**) is sufficient and for which it should e.g. be possible to multiple values e.g. one per individual candidate (**PC**).  For target configurations, it seems clear that a configuration is signalled per candidate. For execution conditions, Q1/3 somewhat address the question whether to have a value per candidate or per frequency. However, in previous discussions R2 also considered further RRC parameters for which per candidate signalling may be required:   1. Capability coordination info i.e. configuration restrictions exchanged by MN to T-SN e.g. allowedBCs may differ depending on the band of the individual candidate 2. Radio bearer configuration i.e. the amount of SCG resources may differ between candidates on different frequencies and this may affect the DRBs that MN wishes to offload   We think this exercise will assist identifying any further stage 2 aspects like a) and b) that need to be concluded. For baseline approach (solution 1), below a starting point is provided.  1 SNChangeReq: execution conditions (PC), measurements of cells (PU), Non-conditional SCG reconfig (PU), Current SCG config (PU), Current selectedBC (PU)  2 SNAdditionReq: selected candidates (PC), measurements of cells (PU), configuration restrictions (for capability coordination, PC), DRBs to establish (PC?), Current SCG config (PU), Current selectedBC (PU)  3 SNAdditionReqAck: admitted candidates (PC), target RRC config (PC), selectedBC (PC), established DRBs (PC?), |
| Ericsson | In most messages legacy info should be supported, but in addition, the SN Change Required and the SN Addition Request need an indication that the procedure is conditional.  Whether step 1 includes execution conditions and the SCG measConfig for CPC, depends if Solution 1 or 2 is adopted. In any case, measurements are included, as in legacy, so that the T-SN candidate can decide the exact candidate cells and frequencies are accepted. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We share the similar view as Samsung we should first discuss if the inter-node RRC message is per-UE, or per candidate PSCell per-UE, or per candidate T-SN per-UE for step 1, 2, 3.  In case more than one T-SNs(with multiple PSCell in one T-SN) are prepared, if the inter-node RRC message is per candidate PSCell, then multiple RAN3 messages for one UE will be running in parallel, which seems quite complex. So we prefer to design inter-node RRC message in per candidate T-SN per-UE way to avoid more RAN3 involvement on the same issue. Note RAN3 already agreed Prepare multiple PSCells in one CPAC procedure.  In this case, the following information should be included in the inter-node RRC message:  In step 1: reuse legacy CGConfig to include candidate PSCell list and execution conditions.  In step 2: reuse legacy CGConfigInfo to include candidate PSCell list and execution conditions.  In step 3: a new inter-node RRC message should be specified to include a list of legacy CGConfig, with each CGConfig including one candidate PSCell configuration.  We assume the UE capability coordination, measurement configuration coordination and so on are performed in legacy (non-conditional) way using legacy CGConfig and CGConfigInfo. |
| Lenovo and Motorola Mobility | Similar view as Ericsson. |
| Futurewei | Step 1 SgNBChangeReq message includes: candidate cell IDs, execution condition associated with each candidate cell, measurement configuration with all the candidate cells.  Step 2 SgNBAdditionReq to T-SN includes: S-SN suggested candidate cell IDs, execution condition associated with each candidate cell,  Step 3 SgNBAdditionReqAck (T-SN to MN) includes: confirmed candidate cell IDs with associated configurations + execution condition |
| Intel | Step 1: within *CG-Config,* (1) *candidateCellInfoListSN*; (2) execution conditions for each candidate cell in that *candidateCellInfoListSN* list; and (3) *MeasConfig* for these execution conditions. (2) and (3) are provided outside of *CG-Config > scg-CellGroupConfig*.  Step 2: within *CG-ConfigInfo*, *candidateCellInfoListSN*. (i.e. the same as legacy). But the SN ADD REQ message will include an indicator for CPC.  Step 3: within *CG-Config*, (1) selected candidate PSCell configurations; (2) execution conditions for candidate cells if selected outside of *candidateCellInfoListSN*. If these two are provided outside of *CG-Config > scg-CellGroupConfig*, then MN can put together candidate PSCell configurations and execution conditions in its *RRCReconfiguration* considering execution conditions from S-SN. |
| ZTE | We also think that most inter-node RRC messages legacy info should be supported.  Besides, an indication for the maximum number of candidate PSCells that can be configured/selected by the T-SN needs to be indicated in the SN Change Required and the SN Addition Request (or the corresponding inter-node RRC message), to ensure the candidate PSCells configured by each candidate T-SN do not exceed the UE capability. |
| Qualcomm | The more important and relevant RAN2 parameters to be included are as follows:  **SN Change Required:**   * For each target SN, candidate target PSCells in the candidate cell info list for target SN to consider configuring. * For each target SN, CPC execution condition for each candidate target PSCell. * Source SCG configuration, including radio bearer configuration.   **SN Addition Request:**   * Candidate target PSCells in the candidate cell info list for target SN to consider configuring. * Source SCG configuration, including radio bearer configuration. * Capability coordination information including UE capabilities, allowed band combination list, transmission power coordination. * MCG radio bearer configuration.   **SN Addition Request Acknowledge:**   * Prepared target PSCells. * For each prepared target PSCell, associated target SCG configuration, including radio bearer configuration. |
| CMCC | Legacy content should be reused as much as possible. In step 1 and 2, per candidate execution condition is mandatory and per candidate *Measconfig* is optional. In step 3, the accepted cell list is provided along with the per cell configuration. |
| CATT | In addition to the legacy contents within the inter-node RRC message, the following contents still need to be added for CPAC:  Step1: the PCI and/ or the frequency information of the candidate cell and its execution condition within the CG-Config, an indication of CPAC which may be added within the inter-node RRC message but outside the CG-Config.  Step2: an indication of CPAC which may be added within the inter-node RRC message but outside the CG-Config.  Step3: the PCI of the candidate PSCell to which the RRC Reconfiguration message applies |
| Apple | Similar view as Ericsson. |

**Summary on Issue 9**

* Legacy content should be reused: 10/12
* Indication for CPC should be added in step 1/2/3: 3/12
* Execution condition per candidate cell in step 1: 11/12
* Accepted cell list should be provided in step 3: 7/12

Majority of companies think that the legacy content should be reused as baseline. Besides, they seem to think that the execution condition per candidate cell should be included in step 1, and the accepted cell list should be provided in step 3.

**Proposal 7 The message contents required for step 1, 2 and 3 are：**

* **SN Change Required:**
  + - The legacy content as baseline
    - Execution condition per candidate cell,
    - FFS whether an indication for CPC should be added.
* **SN Addition Request** :
  + - The legacy content of as baseline,
    - FFS whether the indication for CPC should be added.
* **SN Addition Request Acknowledge:**
* The legacy content as baseline ,
* FFS whether accepted cell list should be added.

**Conditional configuration update by the target SN**

***Issue 10: update of the conditional configuration by the target SN.***

This issue was raised during phase 1 of the discussion. As usual, the target SN should be able to update the configuration provided for candidate cells. The solution developed for initial conditional configuration for inter-SN CPC should also be able to use for update of the conditional configuration by the network. If this is not the case and additional requirements are identified for update of conditional configuration, please state below.

**Question 10: If any identified, additional requirements (compared to initial conditional configuration procedure for inter-SN CPC) for update of conditional configuration by the target SN can be commented below.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Nokia | As far as we know, the topic of modification/update of the conditional reconfiguration, triggered by the target SN, is already discussed in RAN3. Thus, no need to focus on it in RAN2 for the time being. |
| Samsung | We think there is a need to support several other modification cases, alike for CHO. We think these are best discussed after the framework for initial configuration is sufficiently solid  Cancellation: It should be possible for S-SN, MN and T-SN to initiate cancellation of a configured CPAC candidate  Modification: It should be possible or MN and S-SN to update MCG and SCG configuration respectively. This may affect the RRC configuration of CPAC candidates, as generated by T-SN |
| Ericsson | Before discussing update we need to discuss a cancelling use case. That should be supported, though the exact procedure is a RAN3 topic.  When it comes to a modification procedure, that is not necessarily the same as the cancelling (followed by a new addition), that needs to be also discussed in RAN3 (as they also discussed that for CHO). |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | If the cancellation/replace is per T-SN, it could be done by RAN3 message which is under-discussion in RAN3. We could wait for RAN3 input and then identify RAN2 impact on RRC reconfiguration message. |
| Lenovo and Motorola Mobility | The exact mechanism, e.g. cancellation procedure or modification procedure can be further discussed. On the other hand, we believe it would be good to aim at a principle that can work for both S-SN triggered and T-SN triggered cancellation/modification:   * If we want to use SN modification procedure for S-SN to update the conditional configuration, then we should also use SN modification procedure for T-SN to update the conditional configuration.   If we believe cancellation procedure can be used for T-SN to cancel certain prepared PSCells, then **we should also discuss the application of cancellation procedure for S-SN triggered case**, which is not addressed in this email discussion. E.g. the source SN might cancel some prepared PSCells due to measurement result. |
| Futurewei | Following RAN3 resolution. |
| Intel | We also think that we can leave this to RAN3 at this moment. |
| ZTE | Similar to CHO, both the source node and the target node (i.e. S-SN, MN, T-SN) can trigger the modification/cancellation procedure for all CPAC cases. The detailed procedure/signalling can be discussed in RAN3. |
| Qualcomm | Do not see the need for any additional requirements. |
| vivo | We have not identified additional requirements. |
| CMCC | It’s up to RAN3 and we focus on the initial configuration for now. |
| CATT | We think this is within the scope of RAN3, we just need to align with RAN3’s decision. |
| Apple | Also feel this is in RAN3 scope. |

**Summary on Issue 10**

* Up to RAN3: 9/13
* Further consider the cancellation procedure and modification/update procedure initiated by S-SN/MN/T-SN: 4/13
* No identified additional requirements: 2/13

Among the views, a great majority (9/13) think this is for RAN3 to discuss. And besides the scenario of update of the conditional configuration by the target SN, the cancellation procedure and modification procedure initiated by S-SN/MN also be mentioned, for which the Rapporteur think it should also be up to RAN3 discussion.

**Proposal 8 It is RAN3 discussion scope for the update and cancellation procedure ‎of conditional configuration initiated by the target SN, source SN and MN. ‎**

### 2.2.2 Coexistence of CHO an CPAC

Configuration of CHO and CPC simultaneously was not supported in rel-16 specification and it was left to network implementation (e.g. OAM) to avoid the CHO and CPC coexistence scenario. The objective was to have only one of CHO or CPAC to be active for a UE at a given time. OAM can make sure only one conditional procedure (CHO vs CPAC) is active at a time.

In the last meeting, it was argued [R2-2101313] if such a restriction is needed in the first place. The need to apply CHO does not rule out the need for CPAC, as one is related to mobility robustness and the other is related to reducing the latency of DC setup. Therefore, it was suggested in [R2-2101313] to consider the support of both CHO and CPAC simultaneously.

**Question 11: Companies are requested to comment on whether to consider the simultaneous support of CHO and CPAC in this WI scope.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Support/ not support | Comment |
| Nokia | Yes | As pointed out above, these two solutions can actually bring different benefits and address separate problems. They can be configured and initiated by different nodes, not necessarily in a fully coordinated manner. Thus, some means for their coexistence should be developed. Alternatively, more predictable way of coordinating whether CPC or CHO is used, should be introduced. |
| Samsung | Can consider | If time allows, we are open to consider some simultaneous configurations. We however think we should focus on improving mobility robustness i.e. primarily consider simultaneous configuration for CHO and (MN and SN initiated) CPC |
| Ericsson | We can get back to this later | We think we should first finish CPAC, then we can talk about optimization and cross-feature interaction. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Postpone | We share the same view as Ericsson, we should first focus on CPAC and then consider possible optimizations. |
| Lenovo and Motorola Mobility | Yes with comment | It can be supported if the specification impact is limited. E.g. in case of simultaneous CHO and CPAC, CHO shall be treated as higher priority. |
| Futurewei | Consider later | Maybe consider after R17. |
| Intel | Can consider but | Agree with Ericsson. |
| ZTE | Yes | We can consider it if time allows. |
| Qualcomm | Support | Simultaneous CHO and CPC is already possible in Rel-16 if OAM configuration specifically disallowing it is not in place, since MN is not aware of the CPC procedure. Enabling simultaneous support of CHO and CPAC also seems natural in certain mobility scenarios where UE should change MN (PCell) and SN (PSCell) in close succession to maintain MR-DC coverage. |
| Vivo | Yes | CHO is beneficial to mobility robustness while the CPAC is beneficial to reducing the latency of DC setup. We could consider the optimization on coexistence of CHO and CPAC. Meanwhile, there is not too much work based on our assessment. |
| CMCC | Yes | Agree with Samsung. |
| CATT | Yes | Consider if time allows after finishing CPAC. |
| Apple | Postpone | Decision could be made after the main work is done. |

**Summary on Question 11**

* Yes for CHO and CPAC in the current WI: 8/13
* Can consider but postponed after CPAC: 5/13

Among the views, almost all companies are positive to consider simultaneous support CHO and CPAC‎, they think the CHO and CPAC can bring different benefits and address separate problems, and optimization on coexistence of CHO and CPAC can further lead to network performance improvement. Some of the companies think this can be postpone but not so urgent to discuss at this stage.

**Proposal 9 Baseline is that CHO and CPAC can be supported simultaneously. Details can be discussed in a later stage when time allows.**

If simultaneous CHO and CPAC are supported, there are different scenarios where the combination of CHO and CPAC configuration could be considered at the same time.

Scenario 1: the CHO and CPAC configuration are independent and the UE monitors the triggering conditions for the CHO and CPAC independently.

Scenario 2: A CHO configuration that contains an associated CPAC configuration.

**Question 12: Companies are requested to comment which scenarios to be considered for simultaneous support of CHO and CPAC.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | scenario | Comment |
| Nokia | Scenario 1 (1st priority) and Scenario 2 (2nd priority) | If both (CHO and CPAC) are allowed, the UE should be free to monitor and trigger CPC irrespective of whether the CHO evaluations. However, Scenario 2 is also a realistic use case, so should be studied as a second priority (if both are not doable simultaneously). |
| Samsung | 1) | We think that triggers for CHO and CPC can be independent events  We assume scenario 2 concerns a case of CHO with the RRC reconfiguration incuded in condRRCConfig not only including change of PCell but also a reconfiguration of SCG (added or modification) with both being performed upon CHO execution. Adding SCG reconfiguration for conventional HO will increase latency for the HO procedure, which seems undesirable. As CHO is typically configured somewhat earlier, the additional latency seems somewhat less of a concern. However, we think this is more of a *nice to have* kind of enhancement |
| Ericsson | Scenario 2 needs to be clarified. | Scenario 2, from network perspective, is CHO operating with MR-DC i.e. a target MN candidate can add an SCG. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Postpone | As we commented in Q11, it seems premature to consider this now. Could discuss it after CPAC is finished. |
| Lenovo and Motorola Mobility | Scenario 1 | In our understanding, CHO and CPAC can be treated as separate operation. RAN2 only needs to define if CHO/CPAC is executed, what will happen to the other operation. |
| Futurewei | Scenario 1 | We think only scenario 1 is doable.  If it is the right understand, Scenario 2 suggests the source MN to configure the CPAC of the target MN. Since CHO will have multiple candidates, configuring the associated CPAC is to configure the CPAC candidates for each of the CHO candidates. Configuring candidates of the candidates is not reliable. It is better the let target MN to configure its CPAC after the CHO is completed. |
| ZTE | Scenario 1 (1st priority) and Scenario 2 (2nd priority) | We think both scenarios can be considered, but can prioritize scenario 1 if time is limited.  For scenario 2, we think there are two cases can be considered:  2-1: a CHO configuration including both PCell change and PSCell addition/change, i.e. CHO with MR-DC (but the execution condition may be associated with both PCell and PSCell frequencies).  2-2: a CHO configuration including a cascaded CPA/CPC configuration. The UE starts the CPA/CPC evaluation only upon completion of handover to the target PCell. |
| Qualcomm | Both scenarios 1 and 2 |  |
| vivo | Both are OK | We think both scenarios could be considered. In scenario 1, UE monitors the triggering conditions for the CHO and CPAC independently. In scenario 2, CHO could work with DC. |
| CMCC | Scenario 1 and 2 | For scenario 2, we agree with the cases interpreted by ZTE and think the combination can provide performance enhancement. |
| CATT | Scenario 1 with high priority | Both scenario can be considered if time allows, but we think scenario 1 is simple, thus should be firstly considered. |
| Apple | Scenario 1 is prioritized |  |

**Summary on Question 12**

* Scenario 1) only: 3/13
* Scenario 1) and 2): 7/13
  + 4 companies think scenario 1) is with 1st priority
* None: 1/13
* Scenario 2 need to be clarified: 1/13

From the views majority seems to support consider both scenarios but put scenario 1 with higher priority. Although this is not urgent topic based on previous discussions, to have a common understanding on the prioritized scenario seems to be meaningful.

**Proposal 10 The following scenarios can be considered for simultaneous CHO and CAPC, and the 1st scenario is with higher priority**

* Scenario 1: the CHO and CPAC configuration are independent and the UE monitors the triggering conditions for the CHO and CPAC independently.
* Scenario 2: A CHO configuration that contains an associated CPAC configuration.

# 5 Conclusion

The discussions are arranged in two phases, for which the main points are summarized in the following. From phase 1 we have one observation that tries to confirm companies have generally aligned their views regarding high level understanding of solution 1 and 2. In phase 2 we have several proposals and FFSs regarding the detailed solutions/procedures, based on the discussions.

**Summary Phase 1**

**Observation 1 Rapporteur understands that companies agree from high level the general description of solution 1 and 2, as well as that the listed issues for these options can be further discussed.**

* **High level description of solution 1 and 2**

Solution 1: If the source SN needs to update its configuration based on the candidate cells accepted by the target SN, it may only update the configuration after the CPAC configuration is sent to UE by the MN

The source SN prepares the execution condition for all candidate PSCells without assistant information from the MN or target SN. And the source SN provides the candidate PSCell list and the corresponding execution condition associated to each candidate PSCell to MN. Then MN send a request including the candidate PSCells list provided by the source SN to the target SN. The target SN admit/some/none PSCells from the PSCells list provided by the source SN, and then provide the corresponding RRC Reconfiguration for each of candidate PSCells selected by the target SN to MN. Then MN generates the CPC configuration and sends it to UE via the final RRC Reconfiguration including the CPC configuration. The source SN can update its configuration anytime (business as usual) and update the measurement configuration for the UE after MN send the CPC configuration to UE, if required.

Solution 2: If the source SN needs to update its configuration based on the candidate cells accepted by the target SN (and that may require feedback from the target SN which is forwarded by the MN to the source SN), it may update the configuration, together with the CPAC configuration that is sent to UE by MN

After MN received the candidate PSCells determined by the target SN, the MN provides information on the accepted candidate cells by the target SN to the source SN. Based on the information received from the MN, the source SN updates the source SN configuration and sends it to the MN. The MN generates the conditional reconfiguration for CPC and the final RRC Reconfiguration message to the UE including the conditional reconfiguration for CPC, MN configuration, if required and the updated source SN configuration.

* **Several issues are listed for further understand these solutions**

Candidate generation & execution conditions

Issue 1: Whether the execution condition is provided by the source SN per candidate cell alike in Rel-16 or not.

Issue 2: Blind preparation: whether it is possible for the source SN to trigger inter-SN CPC blindly. The source PSCell may trigger a blind preparation of target PSCells without measurements.

Issue 3: T-SN may not accept some of the candidates suggested by S-SN. Can the T-SN come up with alternative candidates?

Source SN configuration update

Issue 4: whether the source SN would need to update its configuration depending on the accepted candidate cells by the target SN. Configuration parameters (identified so far) to consider: measId(s) in SCG MeasConfig, Measurement gap configuration (per UE gap, per FR gap). Does the update of the source SN configuration requires always or only in some scenario? How significant the problem and which option to use for source SN configuration update?

Solution 1 details

Issue 5: When to send SgNB Change Confirm message in response to SgNB Change Required (Step 1 in Figure 1)

Solution 2 details

Issue 6: which messages can be used for step 4/5 in solution 2. Whether the source configuration update procedure is triggered by the MN or the source SN in solution 2

Issue 7: when to send execution condition to the MN in solution 2 (in step 1 or step 5 in figure 2)

Issue 8: Whether step 4/5 in solution 2 is optional or mandatory

Issue 9: Whether MN can decide to exclude not accepted cells from source SN configuration, i.e. the MN modifies the SN configuration provided by the source SN

Inter-node message content

Issue 10: what per candidate information is transmitted in SN addition Request (e.g. execution condition, target configuration, capability coordination info, radio bearer configuration, etc)

Conditional configuration update by the target SN

Issue 11: update of the conditional configuration by the target SN.

**Summary Phase 2**

The issues above have been discussed in phase 2.

**Candidate generation & execution conditions**

**Proposal 1 Source SN provides the candidate cells and it sets the execution condition per candidate cell.**

**Proposal 2 No extra restriction and thus no specification impact are introduced to allow the source SN to trigger inter-SN CPC blindly‎.**

**Proposal 3 FFS whether it is possible for the target SN to come up with alternative candidate cells other than what suggested by the ‎source SN. ‎**

**Source SN configuration update**

**Proposal 4 RAN 2 discuss and determine whether/which of the following are valid/necessary scenarios for the source SN configuration update based on the accepted candidate cells by the target SN before the CPAC configuration is sent to UE ‎**

* gap is not needed according to the response from the target SN
* measID related with CPC that are not linked with the selected candidate PSCells.
* The target SN determines alternative candidate cells other than what suggested by the ‎source SN (subject to previous FFS) ‎

**Proposal 5 Baseline is no specification impact is needed for removal of the unrequired measurement configuration of the source SN depending on the accepted candidate ‎cells by the target SN. FFS whether/how to specify that UE does not have to measure measId(s) that are not linked ‎in CPC by a candidate.**

**Procedure details, solution 1**

**Proposal 6 Option 2 is taken as baseline, i.e., SgNB Change Confirm message is transmitted after reception of RRCReconfigurationComplete in response of the CPAC configuration. The reception of SgNB Change ‎Confirmation message does not trigger the source SN to stop data transmission to the UE. Also another message from the MN to the source SN is required upon the execution of ‎CPC to inform the source SN to stop data transmission to the UE. ‎ RAN2 informs this agreement to RAN3.**

**Procedure details, solution 2**

No proposal is made, as no clear majority is observed from the views.

**Inter-node message content**

**Proposal 7 The message contents required for step 1, 2 and 3 are：**

* **SN Change Required:**
  + - The legacy content as baseline
    - Execution condition per candidate cell,
    - FFS whether an indication for CPC should be added.
* **SN Addition Request** :
  + - The legacy content of as baseline,
    - FFS whether the indication for CPC should be added.
* **SN Addition Request Acknowledge:**
* The legacy content as baseline ,
* FFS whether accepted cell list should be added.

**Conditional configuration update by the target SN**

**Proposal 8 It is RAN3 discussion scope for the update and cancellation procedure ‎of conditional configuration initiated by the target SN, source SN and MN.**

**Coexistence of CHO an CPAC**

**Proposal 9 Baseline is that CHO and CPAC can be supported simultaneously. Details can be discussed in a later stage when time allows.**

**Proposal 10 The following scenarios can be considered for simultaneous CHO and CAPC, and the 1st scenario is with higher priority**

* Scenario 1: the CHO and CPAC configuration are independent and the UE monitors the triggering conditions for the CHO and CPAC independently.
* Scenario 2: A CHO configuration that contains an associated CPAC configuration.
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