3GPP TSG-RAN WG2 #116bis-e R2-22xxxxx

Electronic meeting, 16th – 25th January 2022

Agenda Item: 8.4.2.2

Source: Ericsson

Title: [Post116bis-e][076][eIAB] 38331 (Ericsson)

Document for: Discussion, Decision

# Introduction

This contribution is to collect the open issues related to the running RRC CR on IAB:

* [Post116bis-e][076][eIAB] 38331 (Ericsson)

Scope: Updated running CR taking into account agreements of R2-116bis-e. Best effort review. Endorsement if possible. Capture TS related Open Issues, not captured elsewhere and suggest how to treat.

Intended outcome: Updated Running CR, reviewed, baseline for next meeting. TS related Open issue with suggestion how to treat.

Deadline: Short.

# Open issue list

The following table includes the list of open issues related to the running RRC CR on IAB. Companies are invited to provide their inputs (if any).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Issue Number** | **Company** | **Description** | **Suggested way forward from Rapporteur** |
| #Issue1 | Rapporteur | In the current running CR implementation, the BAP address configured to the IAB-MT by the target CU is conveyed in the bap-config configured for the SCG in mrdc-SecondaryCellGroup.  RAN2 should discuss if other fields (besides the bap-address) in the bap-config can be included, when bap-config is configured for the SCG in mrdc-SecondaryCellGroup. | Given the comment received in the running CR, the following is proposed:  **Proposal to be discussed next meeting:** RAN2 to assume that other fields (besides the *bap-address*) in the *bap-config* may be included by the network implementation, when *bap-config* is configured for the SCG in *mrdc-SecondaryCellGroup*. |
| #Issue2? | Huawei, HiSilicon | Not sure the FFS on capability should be considered as RRC open issue. | No strong view. We have anyhow FFS captured last meeting that need to be resolved. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

# 3 Companies views (if any) on the above issues

Companies are invited in this section to provide their views (if any) on the above issues:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Issue Number** | **Company** | **Company´s view** |
| #Issue2 | Intel | For FFS on UE caps, we think they are more suitable to be captured in [079].  The changes for UE capabilities will need to be moved (OK to leave it here for now) to a separate UE cap RRC draft CR, rather than in RRC running CR (for configuration). This was agreed in RAN2 already so it be merged into a mega CR on UE capability.  [Rapporteur]: OK, we can keep them in the running CR for reference for the future capability merging. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Given the above discussion, the following is proposed for discussion:

1. RAN2 to assume that other fields (besides the *bap-address*) in the *bap-config* may be included by the network implementation, when *bap-config* is configured for the SCG in *mrdc-SecondaryCellGroup.*

# Conclusion

Based on the discussion in the previous sections we propose the following:

[Proposal 1 RAN2 to assume that other fields (besides the *bap-address*) in the *bap-config* may be included by the network implementation, when *bap-config* is configured for the SCG in *mrdc-SecondaryCellGroup.*](#_Toc94260120)