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# Introduction

This contribution lists all the open issues that needs to be addressed for the closure of the WI in Rel17.

* **[Post116bis-e][833][SON/MDT] SON related open issue list (Ericsson)**

- Figure out the open issue list on running stage-3 CRs for SON. Open Issues should be defined for aspects that need to be**closed, important to make already agreed functionality work in a reasonable way**. Not yet agreed optimizations that may not be needed shall not be listed as Open Issues List

- Intended outcome: report with agreed open issues list

Deadline:08:00 UTC, Friday, January 28th

In the following document, the rapporteur has distinguished open issues that are more critical for the completion of the WI and for the running CR implementation (in Section 2), from other open issues that can be treated with lower priority and that can be seen as optimizations (in Section 3).

For the below list of open issues, the latest email discussion post RAN2#116-e available in [37] and the summary of contributions submitted to RAN2#116bis-e in [38] are taken as baseline.

Below are the agreements reached in RAN2#116bis-e:

|  |
| --- |
| From RAN2#116bis-e:  Agreements  1 In case the UE experiences an RLF in a cell after being configured with CHO configuration in that cell (i.e., RLF in source while having CHO config), the UE shall log in the RLF-Report, the already agreed timeSinceCHOReconfig which represents in this case the time elapsed between the RLF in that cell and the latest received CHO configuration while connected to that cell.  2 The following granularities are adopted for the timers timeConnSourceDAPSFailure, timeSinceCHOReconfig, timeBetweenEvents:  a. timeConnSourceDAPSFailure: milliseconds  b. timeSinceCHOReconfig: hundreds of ms  c. timeBetweenEvents: milliseconds  3 Related to how to set the timeSinceFailure: keep the specification as-is (time since last failure).  4 For the inclusion of RA-InformationCommon in the SHR: RA-InformationCommon is included in SHR when T304 is above the threshold.  Observation 1 It is not possible for the network to identify that the SHR and RLF report are generated for the same HO.  5 The UP interruption time at HO is evaluated at PDCP layer without considering duplicates.  6 The UE is responsible for performing the user plane interruption time measurements at the HO i.e., inline with the agreement from RAN2#115 meeting.  Agreements  1 For the 2-step RA, the UE reports the payload size without considering the padding.  2 For the 2-step RA, the UE reports the payload size per RA procedure.  3 The UE includes intendedSIBs, ssbsForSI-Acquisition in the RA report also for a successfully completed on-demand SI procedure.  4 The UE includes the PCell ID in the RA-Report, if the RA procedure is performed in an SCell of the MCG.  5 The UE includes the PSCell ID in the RA-Report, if the RA procedure is performed in an SCell of the SCG. |

# Main open issues

## CHO/DAPS related

### Issue#1: Format of implementation in the running CR

In [2], it is is proposed to use the timer timeConnSourceDAPSFailure is included in RLF report in case of RLF occurs in source cell after fallback in DAPS HO scenario. Rapporteur notes that in the current running CR [7], the time between the DAPS HO execution and the radio ink failure in the source cell after the fallback to the source cell is already captured by the timeConnFailure, see below:

|  |
| --- |
| **From TS 38.331 Running CR [7]:**  1> else if the failure is detected due to radio link failure as described in 5.3.10.3, set the fields in *VarRLF-report* as follows:  2> set the *connectionFailureType* to *rlf*;  2> set the *rlf-Cause* to the trigger for detecting radio link failure in accordance with clause 5.3.10.4;  2> set the *nrFailedPCellId* in *failedPCellId* to the global cell identity and the tracking area code, if available, and otherwise to the physical cell identity and carrier frequency of the PCell where radio link failure is detected;  2> if an *RRCReconfiguration* message including the *reconfigurationWithSync* was received before the connection failure:  3> if the last *RRCReconfiguration* message including the *reconfigurationWithSync* concerned an intra NR handover:  4> include the *nrPreviousCell* in *previousPCellId* and set it to the global cell identity and the tracking area code of the PCell where the last executed *RRCReconfiguration* message including *reconfigurationWithSync* was received;  4> if the last executed *RRCReconfiguration* message including *reconfigurationWithSync* was concerning a DAPS handover:  5> set *lastHOType* to *daps*;  4> else if the last executed *RRCReconfiguration* message including *reconfigurationWithSync* was concerning a conditional handover:  5> set *lastHOType* to *cho*;  4> set the *timeConnFailure* to the elapsed time since the execution of the last *RRCReconfiguration* message including the *reconfigurationWithSync*; |

Given the above, it seems that the usage of timeConnSourceDAPSFailure is unnecessary in this case. Note also that if it is agreed to use the timeConnSourceDAPSFailure in this case, then additional procedural text should be added to deprecate the use of timeConnFailure when there is an RLF after the fallback. It would be good to have a clear agreement in RAN2 about whether the existing implementation is fine or not:

1. RAN2 to discuss whether the time elapsed between the DAPS HO initialization and the RLF in the source cell after fallback is represented by the timeConnFailure (as in the current running CR) or via the timeConnSourceDAPSFailure (which according to running CR is just used in case of RLF in source while performing DAPS HO).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
| Huawei | We agree to put P1 as an open issue, and we have more analysis as below:  In the current CR, the timeConnSourceDAPSFailure is described in case: RLF happens in source cell and then HOF happens in target cell. However, it is FFS in case: HOF happens in target cell and then RLF happens in source cell. | Comment has been captured in the above proposal. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

The following topics have been brought up by various companies in the RAN2-116#887.5 email discussions. All of them are related to the way in which the RAN2 agreements have been implemented in the existing running CR.

1. RAN2 to discuss whether there is any issue for the following topics related to CHO/DAPS, and whether those should be addressed in the next revision of running CR:
   1. Whether the latest changes in the running CR captures modeling of the UE actions in the case of consecutive failures.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
| Huawei | As we commented in the report R2-2200005, we think how to define “consecutive” should be clarified. For example, for the scenario:  The UE firstly performs CHO and then failed  And then the UE performs CHO recovery and failed again  If the time between the 1st and 2nd bullets is small, they should be considered as “consecutive”, and then the current CR has problems (the current CR defines that the UE shall clear the 1st RLF report and then log new RLF report instead).  If the time is long, they should be considered as separate RLF reports, so the legacy UE behaviorus on RLF report applies. | We disagree with the understanding that in case of consecutive failure the 1st RLF report is discarded. The running CR is as follows in Section 5.3.5.8.3:   |  | | --- | | 2> else:  3> revert back to the UE configuration used in the source PCell;  3> if the associated T304 was not initiated as per the cell selection procedure performed in subclause 5.3.7.3:  4> store the handover failure information in *VarRLF-Report* as described in the subclause 5.3.10.5; |   Hence if the expired T304 was initiated as part of the cell selection procedure (i.e. when CHO candidate cell is selected for recovery), the UE does not store a new RLF-Report, rather it just appends the CHOCellID (see section 5.3.7.3) in the RLF-Report associated to the first failure.  Anyhow, we can discuss as per the above proposal if any further enhancement is needed. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Issue#2: timeUntilReconnection related

Still in [9], Oppo proposes to include the timeUntilReconnection for the latter failure in the RLF report for the consecutive CHO failure cases. Rapporteur notes that the timeUntilReconnection is used to log the time between reconnection and the connction failure (HOF or RLF) in legacy. The second CHO failure is not considered a reestablishment, so it is not clear what would be the purpose of this time in this case. The purpose of the timer timeUntilReconnection is to indicate if the reconnection cell should be treated for mobility robustness analysis or not and this decision is made by the source cell. Thus, it is more valuable if the timeUntilReconnection is the time between decalring first failure and the reconnection.

Further, note also that it was discussed in the past whether to consider the time between the failures but that was not agreed.

1. RAN2 to discuss how to handle the *timeUntilReconnection* in the RLF report for the consecutive CHO failure cases:
   1. Time from first failure to the time of reconnection
   2. Time from second failure to the time of reconnection

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
| Nokia | Since, after the CHO failure, UE does CHO recovery, UE will only go to idle after CHO recovery also fails so option b makes sense | This issue can be discussed as Ran2 has not discussed this issue before and there might be different understanding regarding what option might be most relevant from MRO point of view. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Issue#3: CHO candidate cell IDs handling

In [10] and in [18], Samsung and Qualcomm propose to remove the list of CHO candidate cells IDs in RLF Report from the running CR.

Rapporteur would like to highlight that as per the current procedural text, the UE includes the *choCandidateCellList* only when the corresponding candidate cells have not been included as part of the *measResultNeighCells.* when

3> set *choCandidateCellList* to include the global cell identity and tracking area code, if available, and otherwise to the physical cell identity and carrier frequency of each of the candidate target cells for conditional handover included in *condRRCReconfig* within *VarConditionalReconfig* at the time of the failed conditional handover, excluding the candidate target cells included in *measResulNeighCells*;

Further, this is inline with the existing RAN2 agreements.

Agreements (from RAN2#113bis):

1 Include in the RLF-report for CHO the following:

a. Configured CHO execution condition(s) (A3 and/or A5 event configuration, TTT values)

b. Fulfilled CHO execution condition(s), i.e. whether A3 and/or A5 event was fullfilled, for the cell(s) in which CHO execution was triggered.

c. Latest radio measurement results of the candidate target cells

Inclusion of a) and c) are subject to the RAN3 reply to the RAN2 LS R2-2102149.

Agreements (from RAN2#115) in 113bis are confirmed as:

1 Include in the RLF-report for CHO the following:

a. Configured CHO execution condition(s) (A3 and/or A5 event configuration, TTT values)

c. Latest radio measurement results of the candidate target cells

Thus, the CHO candidate inclusion in RLF report has already been agreed. Further, there are discussions to align the CHO candidate related information to be included in the SHR with the RLF report. Two companies want to align the ASN.1 of SHR content and the RLF report content, for example CHO configuration aspects which is included in both places. Rapporteur believes this is a good suggestion to avoid repeated IEs and thus this will be implemented in the latest running CR.

Thus, rapporteur believes the following discussion is needed.

1. Related to the inclusion of the CHO candidate cell list and CHO configuration, RAN2 to discuss whether:
   1. To keep the CHO candidate cell list and the CHO configuration only in the RLF-Report (as in the current running CR)
   2. To include the CHO candidate cell list and the CHO configuration both in the RLF-Report and SHR
   3. To exclude the CHO candidate cell list both from the RLF-Report and the SHR

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
| Qualcomm | In RAN2, we never agreed to include the candidate cell identities to the RLF report. The agreement, we made in RAN2#113-bis-emeeting was as follows:  2 Include in the RLF report for CHO the following information:  a. Indication of whether a measured neighbour cell included in the existing measResultNeighCells was a CHO candidate cell or not.  b. List of candidate cells IDs.  Inclusion of a) and b) are subject to the RAN3 reply to the RAN2 LS R2-2102149  Furthermore, in RAN2#114-emeeting, we made the following agreement as the following:  To represent the measurement results of the candidate target cells:  Reuse the measResultNeighCells in the RLF-Report, and include an indication (depending RAN3 conclusion) on whether a measured neighbour cell was configured as a CHO candidate or not.  Therefore, we first need to resolve whether we want to include the candidate cell identity in the RLF report. It is completely wrong to say that we agreed on this in RAN2.  A similar situation exist for “Configured CHO execution condition(s) (A3 and/or A5 event configuration, TTT values)”…RAN2 never agreed on this Therefore this need to be resolve first in the context of RLF report  [Response]: on this, in my understanding, RAN3 LS mentioned that “RAN3 is also discussing network-based solutions. However, RAN3 has not reached any agreement so far.” Therefore, we need to revisit and discuss this. We should avoid making UE reports bulky unnecessarily. | Comment on the exclusion of CHO list has been reflected in the above proposal.  Related to the CHO configuration, after receiving the LS reply from RAN3 , RAN2 agreed the following in RAN2#115-e:  R2-2106944 Reply LS on UE context keeping in the source cell (R3-212944; contact: Ericsson) RAN3 LS in Rel-17 NR\_ENDC\_SON\_MDT\_enh-Core To:RAN2  Agreements in 113bis are confirmed as:  1 Include in the RLF-report for CHO the following:  a. Configured CHO execution condition(s) (A3 and/or A5 event configuration, TTT values)  c. Latest radio measurement results of the candidate target cells  Try to reuse existing mechanism as much as possible.  Agreement a. can be revisited if RAN3 has further progress on it.  Hence, since we never revisited the above agreement and RAN3 has not raised any further concern in the last meetings, Rapporteur believes that at least the inclusion of CHO configuration in the RLF-Report should not be re-discussed.  [Rapp-1]:  As Ran3 has not sent any further LS on this topic and RAN2 has confirmed the previous agreement (and indicated that this agreement will be revisited only if RAN3 makes further progress on this), rapporteur believes calling it as an open issue in RAN2 is not correct. It might be an open issue in RAN3 but not an open issue in RAN2 unless we receive another LS from RAN3. |
| Nokia | This fine to discuss, but the double logging of CHO measurments is not needed. If some CHO candidate cell measurments are missing and other, non candidate cells are better, this is more valuable information for the source cell.. knowing just how bad the other candidate cells (not included in *measResultNeighCells* ) were is not adding any benefits. | Rapporteur agrees with Nokia that we should avoid any duplication. In the current running CR, the UE includes the cell identities of those candidate cells in the *choCandidateCellList* that were not included in the *measResulNeighCells*. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Issue#5: New RLF cause

In [26], Ericsson proposes to include the t312-expiry as rlf-cause in the RLF-Report **as in LTE**, and to also let the UE include the frequency whose associated T312 expired.

1. Related to T312, RAN2 to discuss the inclusion of the following information in the RLF-Report:
   1. ‘t312-expiry’ as a new rlf-cause in the RLF-Report
   2. [low] Indication of the frequency whose associated T312 expired

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
| Huawei | We see some benefits of having the new cause, but it may need more discussions on the extra frequency information.  Agree with the issue | Comment has been reflected in the above modified proposal.  Based on the comment from Huawei over reflector, option-b has been set to [low] prio (which was the original classification) |
| Qualcomm | I think the following needs to be addressed as it avoide unnecessy reporting:  When RLF happens at the source cell post successful DAPS HO, then source RLF should not be reported to the network (neither in RLF or SHR report).  [Response] I am trying to point out a scenario, where source RLF happens after successful completion of DAPS HO. Thereafter, RLF happens at the source. RLF at the target may or may not happen.  IF RLF at source and target happens after successful DAPS, then RLF report should contain information only corresponding to target RLF.  IF RLF happens at source after successful DAPS without RLF at target, SHR should not be generated.  In both of the cases, information related to source RLF is wastage of reporting, as UE cannot fall back to source after successful DAPS HO. | According to the running CR, the source RLF while DAPS is ongoing does not generate an RLF-Report, see below:   |  | | --- | | 2> if any DAPS bearer is configured, and radio link failure is not detected in the source PCell, according to subclause 5.3.10.3:  …………  3> store the handover failure information in *VarRLF-Report* as described in the subclause 5.3.10.5; |   Hence there seems to be no issue.  Related to SHR, according to P9, it may be reported in the SHR, only if the source configures that. Rapporteur proposes to discuss it in P9.  [Rapp-1]: Upon completion of the DAPS HO, the UE does not perform RLM on the source cell anymore as the UE ‘applies’ the RRCReconfiguration as received from the target cell. Thus, it is not clear what is meant by ‘RLF at source after successful DAPS’. It would be useful if a contribution is brought up explanaing such a scenario. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## SHR related

### Issue#6: Solutions to resolve the issue of SHR and RLF report being generated for the same HO

Several proposed solutions have been mentioned by companies to resolve the issue of SHR and RLF report being generated for the same HO. They are summarized in the following with the cons according to the rapporteur´s understanding.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Solution | Solution description | Cons |
| A | Indicator in the RLF-Report (SHR) indicating that the SHR (RLF-Report) has been already sent to the network for this HO | If it is assumed that a specific SHR needs to be linked to a specific RLF-Report, this solution does not guarantee such a link. |
| B | Indicator in the RLF-Report (SHR) indicating that there is an SHR (RLF-Report) associated to the same HO | Might not work for scenarios wherein SHR is sent before the RLF occurs |
| C | C-RNTI to be included in the SHR, RLF-Report | The UE has to include the C-RNTI as allocated in target cell, but this C-RNTI might be reused by the target cell. Hence there is no guarantee that an SHR and RLF-Report indicating the same C-RNTI are really associated to the UE, i.e. to the same HO event. |
| D | Timestamps in the SHR and RLF-Report to link them in time | Overhead. The SHR should always include the timestamp since at the time of SHR generation it is unknown whether an RLF will happen in the target cell |
| E | RLF-Report should be merged with the SHR if the SHR has not been sent yet at the moment of RLF-Report generation, or the SHR should be merged in the RLF-Report | It does not work if the SHR has been already sent to the network at the time of RLF. |
| F | If RLF occurs within a certain time window after the generation of the SHR, the SHR should be discarded if not yet transmitted | It does not work if the SHR has been already sent to the network at the time of RLF. |
|  |  |  |

Based on the above, rapporteur would propose to discuss the following.

1. RAN2 to consider one or more of the following solutions to address the issue of SHR and RLF report are generated for the same HO:
   1. Indicator in the RLF-Report (SHR) indicating that the SHR (RLF-Report) has been already sent to the network for this HO
   2. Indicator in the RLF-Report (SHR) indicating that there is an SHR (RLF-Report) associated to the same HO
   3. UE-ID and C-RNTI to be included in the SHR, RLF-Report
   4. Timestamps in the SHR and RLF-Report to link them in time
   5. RLF-Report should be merged with the SHR if the SHR has not been sent yet at the moment of RLF-Report generation, or the SHR should be merged in the RLF-Report.
   6. If RLF occurs within a certain time window after the generation of the SHR, the SHR should be discarded if not yet transmitted

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
| Huawei | We have the following comments regarding issue#6:  This topic has been discussed for several meetings and more and more solutions/details are added.  If we continue the discussion, more and more time will be required and it is still challenging to reach consensuses and finalize the CR.  In general, we are concerned about the cost of continuing the discussion of Issue#6. | We can give a try to see if there some majority support for one of the options. The table included above with the “cons” can be possibly used to help the progress. |
| Qualcomm | On D:  Very high overhead and this will not work if multiple handovers are initiated by the base station at the same time.  [Response] I am pointing out, including timestamps cannot solve the problem (even with huge overhead), as multiple HO can be performed in a cell same time. | Yes, this was captured in the “cons” table above. |
| ZTE | On A  Cannot work when no information can be used to link SHR and RLF. | Added to the table. |
| Nokia | None of the mentioned solutions work on their own (C-RNTI can be reallocated in the meanwhile by source, unclear how long UE should wait with SHR after HO in case RLF happends, etc). Also without major modifcations of the UE behaviour. Also, not clear what is meant by UE-ID? which ID is this? | The exact solutions or combination of the solutions can be discussed in the next phase of the email discussion.  Regarding the UE-ID, it was brought up in a contribution, but rapporteur also believes that it is not clear. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Issue#7: User plane interruption measurements in SHR

RAN2 has agreed to include the UP interruption time to be reported by the UE. However, under which scenarios does the UE perform this measurement is still an open issue. There are two camps in this regard.

1. Only at DAPS HO – This is specific to DAPS as the main target of DAPS HO is to achieve 0ms HO interruption time and therefore, this is useful for DAPS HO evaluation for the operators.
2. For all HO types- This also ensures that the operator can check the DAPS HO performance but also allows for the operators to know where to deply and whether to deploy DAPS HO as the HO interruption in normal HO can be obtained by this method.

Based on the above, rapporteur lists the following as an open issue.

1. RAN2 to discuss in which HO scenarios the UP interruption measurements should be considered:
   1. Only at DAPS HO
   2. For all HO types (ordinary HO, DAPS, CHO)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
| Huawei | Agree with the issue  In order to save the time, we suggest to directly follow RAN3 LS. |  |
| Nokia | OK for DAPS, maybe for CHO |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Issue#8: SHR trgigger configuration during source RLF but successful DAPS execution.

The SHR is generated by the UE only upon explicit configuration during a normal HO or for CHO. However, for the DAPS HO, if the UE declares RLF at the source while T304 is running and if the UE successfully completes the HO to the target cell, then it has been agreed that the UE should store the source RLF related indication in the SHR. However, it has not been discussed if the UE generates the SHR only upon explicit network configuration or always i.e., without any network configuration. There are two proposals under discussion.

1. UE shall always generate SHR due to RLF in source during DAPS HO
   1. Pros: Less configuration overhead
   2. Cons: All the rest of the SHR triggers are explicit configuration based while this scenario would be an exception
2. UE shall generate SHR due to RLF in source only if network has configured the UE to do so.
   1. Pros: Ensures that all SHR genaration triggers are explicitly configured by the network.
   2. Cons: One additional configuration.

During the previous discussions, some companies indicated that the T310 related threshold can be taken as an implicit configuration for SHR generation at the source cell. However, rapporteur would like to indicate that the T310 might not be running at the source and the UE might declare RLF in the source for maximum number of RLC retransmissions. Thus, rapporteur believes that RAN2 should discuss the problem in its entirety. Rapporteur also invites companies to take into account the discussion we had in the email discussion [37]

1. RAN2 to discuss when the UE shall generate a SHR due to RLF in the source cell during a DAPS HO:
   1. Only if it is configured to do so in the SHR configuration (i.e. in the *successHO-Config*)
   2. The UE shall always generate a SHR due to RLF in the source cell during a DAPS HO

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
| ZTE | Agree with this issue, we a to have a unified design as well as to make it this behavior under control by NW. |  |
| Nokia | a makes the most sense in order to have an uniform behaviour of SHR (i.e. generated only if configured) |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Issue#9: Other CR implementation related open issues.

One company expressed concern over the implementation of the SHR configuration in the running CR. The current running CR includes the SHR configuration in the otherConfig which can be delivered to the UE at any point in time. Some companies would like to include SHR configuration in the HO command explicitly. This can be discussed.

1. RAN2 to discuss which RRC message/configuration carries the SHR configuration.
   1. otherConfig (current implementation)
   2. RRCReconfiguration including reconfigurationWithSync

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
| Nokia | b) makes more sense |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Issue#10: PLMN ID checking for SHR reporting.

In [11], Samsung proposes the the UE should check the PLMN before sending the availability indicator in the case of SHR, as in RLF Report. Rapporteur believes this is needed to ensure no cross-PLMN SHR reporting is performed.

1. RAN2 to agree to include PLMN checking before sending the availability indicator for the SHR, as in RLF Report.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Issue#11: T312 related SHR triggering configuration

In [26], Ericsson claims that the T312 is running per measurement object according to legacy specifications, and there might be different T312 values that the UE is handling for different measurement objects. Related to the T304 value used for the SHR generation, it is proposed then to discussed whether the UE should log the SHR whenever there is at least a T312 value associated to any measurement identity above the threshold, or if only the T304 associated to the measurement identity of the target cell should be considered. Rapproteur believes this needs to be calrified in the specification as the T312 is configurable per measObject.

1. Given that the T312 is associated to the measurement identity, RAN2 to discuss whether to clarify in the specification in which cases the SHR is generated, e.g. one of the following:
   1. The UE shall log the SHR always when a T312 is running for any measurement identity configured to the UE. In this case, the UE shall indicate which frequency related measurements had triggered the timer T312.
   2. The SHR shall be generated only if the T312 associated to the measurement identity associated to the target cell is running

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
| Huawei | For P12 and P13, we think the current CR mentions the following UE behaviours:  The UE checks T312 thresholds regardless of relevant measurement id information, i.e. if any of T312 meets the threshold, SHR is logged.  So we do not think it is an issue according to the current CR. | Yes, correct it is not an issue in the current running CR. However, we wonder if it is correct that the UE generates an SHR even if the T312 expired for a frequency not associated to the target cell.  It is strange that the UE generates an SHR even if the target cell/frequency of the HO was not affected by any problem. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Similarly, it is proposed to discuss if the T312 threshold should be common to any measurement identity configured to the UE, or if it should be configured per measurement identity.

1. RAN2 to discuss whether the T312 threshold for the SHR generation should be configured per measurement identity or if that can be common for all measurement identities configured to the UE.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
| Nokia | We wondered whether threshold shouldn’t be applied to the acutal configured value of T312?  In this case, it would be scaled per meas ID? Also then option b) in P12 makes more sense | Rapporteur agrees with Nokia’s view. This issue needs to be addressed so that the specification can enable ‘correct confgiuration’ of the threshold. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## RA report related

### 2-step RA

#### Issue#12: Payload size reporting related

During RAN2#116bis-e it was agreed that for the 2-step RA, the UE reports the payload size without considering the padding. However what it remains to be addressed is whether the payload reported in the RA-Report is equivalent to the amount of UL data sent over the PUSCH resources in msgA or to the amount of UL data available in the UE buffer at the time of initiating the 2 step RA procedure. Rapporteur notes that if the first is selected, it will not be possible for the network to become aware of the overall buffer size at the time of msgA transmission and hence it cannot properly adjust the UL grant of the msgA to e.g. accommodate more data:.

1. For the 2-step RA, the payload reported by the UE in the RA-Report is equivalent to:
   1. The overall payload without padding available in the UE buffer size at the time of initiating the 2 step RA procedure.
   2. The payload without padding sent by the UE over the PUSCH resources in the msgA.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
| Nokia | Share rapporteur understanding :  the b) makes more sense, as if the network know the payload sent over the PUSCH resource, it can know which preamble type A or B was used for the transmission and therefore gNB (CU) can optimize preamble groups |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Further regarding the format of encoding the payoad size, during the RAN2#116-887.5 email discussion, there was a large support for ENUM based approach. However, Ericsson in [7] indicated that another possible alternative is to report the message size as a bit string of 8 bits, where the values mirror the BSR indexes used in the MAC specification. This would similar to what already specified in the RRC specification for the *messageSize* field used within *SL-TrafficPatternInfo*. In one company’s contribution [5], rs-MsgA-SizeGroupA based reporting of the payload size is provided. Based on this, rapporteur proposes discussing the following options.

1. RAN2 to agree on one of the following method of reporting the payload size.
   1. A 8-bit bit string in RA report, where the value of the 8-bit bitstring refers to the index of the BSR table in TS 38.321 (similar to the definition of the *messageSize* field within *SL-TrafficPatternInfo*)
   2. The payload size is reported as ENUMERATED {noPayload, sizeRange1, sizeRange2, sizeRange3, sizeRange4, sizeRange5, spare1, spare0} wherein each RANGE is known, e.g. hardcoded in the specification. FFS the values for each range
   3. Exactly following the definition of ra-MsgA-SizeGroupA [5]
   4. Simplified definition of ra-MsgA-SizeGroupA by removing some size ranges[5]

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

#### Issue#13: PUSCH resource related information

Further, some companies have indicated that the UE should include the PUSCH configuration related information as the network might not have the UE context available in its memory when the RAReport is received from the UE. Thus, companies propose the following.

* Include following PUSCH resource allocated for msgA in the RA-Report (CMCC, ZTE [4]):
  + F: the MCS index
  + G: the number of PRB per PO of the PUSCH resource
  + H: the combination of start symbol and length and PUSCH mapping type
  + I: offset of lowest PUSCH occasion in frequency domain with respect to PRB 0
  + J: the number of msgA PUSCH occasions FDMed in one time instance
* Introduce PUSCH configuration related information in 2-step RA report in granularity of per RA procedure (Huawei [5])
  + msgA-MCS (4 bits)
  + nrofPRBs-PerMsgA-PO (5 bits)
  + msgA-PUSCH-TimeDomainAllocation (4 bits)
  + frequencyStartMsgA-PUSCH (9 bits)
  + nrofMsgA-PO-FDM (2 bits)

This topic is under discussion for some time now. Therefore the following proposal is made.

1. RAN2 to discuss the inclusion of one or more of the following PUSCH resource parameters:
   1. msgA-MCS (4 bits)
   2. nrofPRBs-PerMsgA-PO (5 bits)
   3. msgA-PUSCH-TimeDomainAllocation (4 bits)
   4. frequencyStartMsgA-PUSCH (9 bits)
   5. nrofMsgA-PO-FDM (2 bits)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
| ZTE | Agree to discuss. PUSCH configuration is important for NW to know which set of resource and which parameters that is configured improperly ,so that it can make optimize accordingly. |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

#### Issue#14: When to include 2 step RA related frequency resources’ information

Concerning the topic of when the UE shall include the msgA related PRACH resource information in the RA report has been brought up by multiple companies.

* MSGA PRACH resource should be included in RA report in the case of the following conditions ( CATT- [1]):  
  1) random access procedure with only 2-step RA attempt; or  
  2) 2-step RA is switched to 4-step RA and at least one value among frequency start, FDM, and SubcarrierSpacing of the MsgA RACH occasion is different to the corresponding value of MSG1 RACH occasion
* Confirm that when setting RA resource information in RA report, UE only include the parameters of RA resource that is configured in corresponding RACH configuration and used in the RA procedure (e.g., Msg1-FDM/Msg1-FrequencyStart is included for 2stepRA if shared RO is used)( R2-2200900 – CMCC, ZTE [4]).

Based on the above, RAN2 can discuss the conditional inclusion aspects of msgA related PRACH resources.

1. RAN2 to confirm that the UE includes the RA resource related parameters (frequency start, FDM, and SubcarrierSpacing of the msgA RA resource) only under following scenarios:
   1. RA procedure involves only 2 step RA
   2. When 2 step RA to 4 step RA switching occurs, only those parameters that are different in 4 step RA resources compared to the 2 step RA resources.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### SgNB related RA report

#### Issue#17: Cross RAT RA reporting

During the Rel-17, it has been agreed that a UE in DC can report the SN related RA report to the MN. When the UE is in EN-DC, this requires changes to LTE specification and considering, the limited time, rapporteur would like to check if companies are happy to restrict the SN RA reporting to MN only for NR-DC or should this also cover EN-DC.

1. RAN2 to discuss whether the TS 36.331 modifications are introduced to handle the scenario of LTE MN fetching the list of NR RA reports.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
| Huawei | The WID has not listed any LTE specifications, so we think NR-DC can be prioritized.  For EN-DC, we have the following comments:  It is likely to be LTE impacts, and FFS how much  It may also have RAN3 impacts so that more co-ordinations/RAN3 discussions would be needed  In the past, RAN2 did not fully discuss the LTE impacts so it would need more time to check them  In general, we do not think it is an issue, i.e. it could be reviewed in the later release. | We agree that we should avoid touching LTE, given the limited amount of time. However, since there are some companies proposing it, we can quickly check if there is really support for doing that. |
| Nokia | It makes sense to focus on NR-DC first and not introduce LTE specific open issues at this point, as theye were not even dicsussed |  |
| CATT | RAN3 LS asks RAN2 to consider UE RACH report for SgNBs, therefore the scenarios should include both EN-DC and NR-DC.  For RAN3 impact, it has already been discussed and agreed to introduce the X2AP change for EN-DC case for the SgNB RA report issue in RAN3#114e meeting: “**Introduce the Access and Mobility Indication procedure to X2AP to transfer RACH Reports from eNB to en-gNB in EN-DC case**”.  Therefore, since the RAN3 has the requirement and the X2AP enhancement has been completed, it is necessary or at least need to discuss whether to introduce the cross RAT RA report in Uu-interface. | Rapporteur proposes to discuss the above proposal but also being realistic with time, rapporteur would like to highlight that we need to be realistic in handling LTE specificaiton changes as the solutions proposed here requires further discussion in RAN2. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Further, if previous proposal is agreeable, then one has to decide if a UE that reports NR RA reports to LTE needs to indicate this as a separate capability or not. Also, associated to the RA report handling between different RATs, one company proposes the following (ZTE [6]).

* Confirm that UE reports all available RA-information (LTE RA information as well as SgNB RA-report if available) to LTE node regardless if it is in DC or not.
* When reporting stored SgNB RA-report, the cell identity of stored SgNB RA-report is encoded in LTE format and put outside the SgNB RA-report container.

Based on this, the following proposals are made.

1. If it is agreed to support NR RA reporting to LTE, RAN2 to agree whether capability bit for NR RA report is needed in LTE specification
2. If it is agreed to support NR RA reporting to LTE, RAN2 confirms that UE reports all available RA-information (LTE RA information as well as SgNB RA-report if available) to LTE node regardless if it is in DC or not.
3. If it is agreed to support NR RA reporting to LTE, when reporting stored SgNB RA-report, the cell identity of stored SgNB RA-report is encoded in LTE format and put outside the SgNB RA-report container.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
| Nokia | Based on ‘20’ we don’t think these should be newly identified open issues | Rapproteur agrees with Nokia’s views. If we do not agree to change LTE spec, then we need not discuss these proposals. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Other WID related

### MRO for SN

#### Issue#18: Inclusion of RA information in SCGFailureInformation

During RAN2#116-887.5 email discussion, almost all companies agreed to include RA information associated to a SCG failure in the SCGFailureInformation. This can be finalized to complete the MRO for SN related enhancements.

1. The RA Information associated to a SCG failure (when failureType is set to randomAccessProblem or beamFailureRecoveryFailure-r16) are included in the SCGFailureInformation.
2. RAN2 to discuss the necessity of inclusion of previousPSCellID, failedPSCellID, timeSCGFailure in the SCGFailureInformation message.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
| Samsung | With connectionFailureType and RA-related info, RAN3 has also requested to consider the following information:  1) CGI of the Source PSCell: the source PSCell of the last SN change. The source PSCell could be E-UTRA cell or NR cell.  2) CGI of the Failed PSCell: the PSCell in which SCG failure is detected or the target PSCell of the failed PScell change. The Failed PSCell could be E-UTRA cell or NR cell.  3) timeSCGFailure: the time elapsed since the last PSCell change initialization until SCG failure.  Actually, RAN2 has discussed these parameters, e.g. via Report of [AT116e][820][SON/MDT] Information required by SNSCG (Huawei), in RAN2#116e.  However, we have assumed that RAN2 have not reached a conclusion exactly.  In our understanding, it is difficult for the network to implicitly identify such information, e.g. MN may not know PScell change. The intra-SN PScell change with SRB3 or MN doesn’t decode SCGConfigure from the SN. For failure just after successful SN change, the source SN already release the UE context.  Hence, we would like to shortly clarify it as one of open issues in the next meeting. | The following was agreed in RAN2#116-e:   * **[AT116e][820][SON/MDT] Information required by SNSCG (Huawei)**   Focus on summary proposal 1, 2 and 3 in R2-2110637  (1) For summary proposal 1, progress on the conditions which will trigger to log RA information.  (2) progress on summary proposal 3.  (3) just final check and confirm to agree proposal 2.  Intended outcome: Agreements  Deadline: 05:00 UTC, Friday November 5th  Agreements:  1: The UE needs to include RA information in case that failureType is set to randomAccessProblem or beamFailureRecoveryFailure-r16.  2: RA-InformationCommon-r16 is used as a baseline to indicate random-access related information set by the PSCell.  3: The parameter connectionFailureType could reuse the current failureType in SCG failure message. FFS on enhancements.  4 The condition “failureType is set to synchReconfigFailureSCG” for including RA information.  => FFS: Introduce one bit flag to indicate whether T304 is running or not in SCG failure message.  During the online session, all the proposals from the email discussion in R2-2110637 were discussed, but only the agreements above were captured. The three issues mentioned by Samsung aside were also treated in that email discussion, and were discussed online, but eventually not agreed.  Thus, Rapporteur proposes not discussing such issues again.  [Rapp-1]: Based on the long list of companies who believe that this is still an open issue in RAN2, rapporteur has added a new proposal above. |
| Qualcomm | We discussed 1) - 3), however, we never agreed that they will not be part of SCGFailureInformatio. I believe this needs to be concluded before discussing FFS. |  |
| ZTE | Agree with Samsung. Also it is agreed in RAN3#113 that “If the sufficient time has passed between the SN change and the report of SCG failure, the source SN may has released the UE context when it receives SCG Failure Information” therefore depending implementation cannot guarantee that NW can get this information. |  |
| ITRI | Agree with Samsung. The network may not be able to implicitly identify the information 1) – 3) in case e.g. the failure occurs after successful CPC without MN involvement. |  |
| Nokia | The proposal should reflect the agreement 4 of RAN2#116-e meeting, too: The condition “failureType is set to synchReconfigFailureSCG” for including RA information.  Therefore, the exact agreement should be: **The RA Information associated to an SCG failure (when failureType is set to randomAccessProblem, beamFailureRecoveryFailure-r16 or synchReconfigFailureSCG) is included in the SCGFailureInformation.** |  |
| CATT | We agree with Samsung. The first 3 parts of RAN3 LS has not been rejected and should be discussed and reach a convergence. |  |

#### Issue#19: Associated to failureType in SCGFailureInformation

Further, in the same email ddiscussion, most companies have agreed that the UE sets the failureType to randomAccessProblem if the UE initiates transmission of the SCGFailureInformationNR message to indicate the reason for declaring failure to be the random access problem from the SCG MAC even if T304 is running. This needs to be configrmed in RAN2.

1. RAN2 to confirm that the UE sets the failureType to randomAccessProblem if the UE initiates transmission of the SCGFailureInformationNR message to indicate the reason for declaring failure to be the random access problem from the SCG MAC even if T304 is running. Otherwise, if no random access problem has been detected at T304 expiry, the UE sets the failureType to synchReconfigFailureSCG.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
| Nokia | Yes, this is how the current way of specs work. So, this is kind of a conclusion, not a new proposal or open issue. | Rapporteur also has the same understanding based on the spec. Thus, the proposal is updated with ‘RAN2 to confirm that’.  The reason for including this issue is that there were different opinions during the email discussion. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Associated to the same scenario, it was also discussed about the inclusion of a 1-bit flag to indicate the running of T304 at the time of SCG failure declaration due to randomAccessProblem. With the presence of the flag, the network node receiving the SCGFailureInformation can identify whether the SCG failure w declared due to too late PSCell change (e.g., if the T304 was not running) or too early PSCell change (e.g., if T304 was running) thus helping RAN3 to resolve their issues.

1. The UE includes a 1 bit flag in the SCGFailureInformation to indicate that the T304 was running when the UE declared the SCG failure due to random access problem indication in the SCG MAC.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
| Nokia | We are not sure this is needed proposal or open issue to discuss,  RAN2 has agreed that 5 information requested by RAN3 LS are needed. RAN2 discussed to include new fields for the first 3 information (including the CGI of the Source PSCell, CGI of the Failed PSCell) to SCGFailureInformation message.  Although the UE sets failureType to randomAccessProblem while T304 is running, since the target PSCell CGI and sourcePSCell CGI are to be included within the SCGFailureInformation, the network can differentiate between a PSCell change failure and RLF in a source PSCell.  Therefore, a flag in the SCGFailureInformation to indicate a running T304 is not needed. | Rapporteur would like to highlight that RAN2 agreed to introduce those 5 information but at that time it was not agreed to include in the SCGFailureInformation message.  Based on Ericsson comments in the future meeting, it was discussed as to whether all those 5 information is necessary if the message that carries them is SCGFailureInformation and then it was not agreeable as Ericsson argued that this information is available at the network side as the UE context is always present at the next nodeat the time of reception of SCGFailureInformation (unlike RLFReport).  Thus, one needs to discuss the above 1 bit flag (proposed by ZTE) as this is the only FFS that is explicitly listed. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### MHI

#### Issue#20: PSCell MHI related capability indication

During RAN2#116-887.5 email discussion, the necessity to have an explicit capability indicator to indicate the PSCell related MHi was discussed and was part of the majority view. This needs to be finalized during Rel-17.

1. RAN2 to discuss the need to introduce an explicit capability indicator that indicates that the UE is capable of storing the PSCell related MHI.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

#### Issue#21: Number of PSCell related MHI

During RAN2#116-887.5 email discussion, companies discussed amongst 16/32/64 PSCell related MHI information but there was no clear majority support for any of the proposal. This is also something that needs to be finalized.

1. RAN2 to discuss the total number of PSCell (across all PCells) related information that should be stored by the UE in the MHI:
   1. 16 PSCells
   2. 32 PSCells
   3. 64 PSCells

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

#### Issue#22: Handling addition/release of PSCells in MHI

In [35], ZTE proposes that the UE creates a new PCell entry if upon PSCell transition while being on same PCell and the maximum PSCell number of the PCell entry has reached. On the other hand, Ericsson [34] and Huawei [17] propose that when the UE reaches the maximum number of PSCell, if it gets a new PSCell, the UE removes the oldest stored PSCell entry and stores the newly configured PSCell entry.

1. RAN2 to discuss how to handle addition/release of PSCells, e.g.
   1. The UE should create a new PCell entry if upon PSCell transition while being on same PCell and the maximum PSCell number of the PCell entry has reached.
   2. When the UE reaches the maximum number of PSCell, if it gets a new PSCell, the UE removes the oldest stored PSCell entry and stores the newly configured PSCell entry

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
| Nokia | We agree to the open issue, but think a and b may not fully work for addition/release of PSCells. Thus Ok as a generic goal, but a. or b. need to get modified | Further, modifications can be discussed in the next phase of the email discusion |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

In [17] [34] [36], Ericsson, Huawei, CATT propose to include the time spent with no PScell, besides the time duration when there are both Pcell and PScell (already captured in the running CR).

1. RAN2 to discuss the inclusion of the time spent with no PSCell in the MHI, when connected to a certain PCell.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
| Nokia | This is related to the 29, it remains open: general procedure for cells inclusion in MHI is missing/to be defined |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Additional proposals that rapporteur believes as not essential

In this section, it is collected a list of proposals related to topics that can be treated as lower priority if time allows.

## timeConnFailure related

In [9], Oppo proposes that the timeConnFailure for the first CHO failure is not needed to be recorded and that the the timeConnFailure IE corresponding to the second CHO failure is proposed to be recorded in the RLF report. Rapporteur notes that the timeConnFailure is used by the network to better understand the reason of an HOF. If the second CHO failure is instead taken into account for the timeConnFailure, then this information will be lost.

Please note that in the current procedural text, the UE does not overwrite the varRLF-Report contents upon experiencing the second failure associated to CHO and thus the timeConnFailure as stored in the RLF report is associated to the first failure which rapporteur believes to be the correct implementation.

3> revert back to the UE configuration used in the source PCell;

3> if the associated T304 was not initiated as per the cell selection procedure performed in subclause 5.3.7.3:

4> store the handover failure information in *VarRLF-Report* as described in the subclause 5.3.10.5;

Therefore, Rapporteur proposes not to discuss this again.

1. [low] RAN2 to discuss if there is the need to not record the timeConnFailure for the first CHO failure, and just record it for the second.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
| Nokia | If this is discussed, we think the easiest is to have 2 entries per several IEs |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Related to condFirstEventFulfilled and condSecondEventFulfilled

In [10], Samsung proposes that the the fields, condFirstEventFulfilled and condSecondEventFulfilled are discarded from Running CR and that the inclusion of timeBetweenEvents and firstTriggeredEvent implies that all execution condition(s) are fulfilled.

The claimed reason is that in CHO both events should be fulfilled for the target cell. Note however, that when only one of the event has been satisfied but not the other, then the UE does not include timeBetweenEvents and firstTriggeredEvent. The UE only includes either the condFirstEventFulfilled and condSecondEventFulfilled. Having said that,rapporteur sees some optimization possibilities i.e., the fields condFirstEventFulfilled and condSecondEventFulfilled are required only when timeBetweenEvents and firstTriggeredEvent are not included and thus they can be added under some conditional presence in the procedural text. Thus, rapporteur proposes the following.

1. [low]The field s condFirstEventFulfilled and condSecondEventFulfilled are included only when timeBetweenEvents and firstTriggeredEvent are not included from Running CR.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
| Nokia | We wonder if the entire section on dual even execution shouldn’t be worked out, thus maybe we could e.g. use of umbrella term 'connection failure' and making sure all possible event combinations (A3+A3, A3+A5 and A5+A5) are supported |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## CHO candidate cell IDs removal from RLF report

In [10] and in [18], Samsung and Qualcomm propose to remove the list of CHO candidate cells IDs in RLF Report from the running CR.

Rapporteur would like to highlight that as per the current procedural text, the UE includes the *choCandidateCellList* only when the corresponding candidate cells have not been included as part of the *measResultNeighCells.* when

3> set *choCandidateCellList* to include the global cell identity and tracking area code, if available, and otherwise to the physical cell identity and carrier frequency of each of the candidate target cells for conditional handover included in *condRRCReconfig* within *VarConditionalReconfig* at the time of the failed conditional handover, excluding the candidate target cells included in *measResulNeighCells*;

Further, this is inline with the existing RAN2 agreements.

Agreements (from RAN2#113bis):

1 Include in the RLF-report for CHO the following:

a. Configured CHO execution condition(s) (A3 and/or A5 event configuration, TTT values)

b. Fulfilled CHO execution condition(s), i.e. whether A3 and/or A5 event was fullfilled, for the cell(s) in which CHO execution was triggered.

c. Latest radio measurement results of the candidate target cells

Inclusion of a) and c) are subject to the RAN3 reply to the RAN2 LS R2-2102149.

Agreements (from RAN2#115) in 113bis are confirmed as:

1 Include in the RLF-report for CHO the following:

a. Configured CHO execution condition(s) (A3 and/or A5 event configuration, TTT values)

c. Latest radio measurement results of the candidate target cells

Thus, rapporteur believes that there is not need to further discuss this topic.

1. [low] RAN2 to discuss if it is needed to remove the CHO candidate cells IDs from the RLF Report in the running CR.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
| Qualcomm | In RAN2, we never agreed to include the candidate cell identities to the RLF report. The agreement, we made in RAN2#113-bis-emeeting was as follows:  2 Include in the RLF report for CHO the following information:  a. Indication of whether a measured neighbour cell included in the existing measResultNeighCells was a CHO candidate cell or not.  b. List of candidate cells IDs.  Inclusion of a) and b) are subject to the RAN3 reply to the RAN2 LS R2-2102149  Furthermore, in RAN2#114-emeeting, we made the following agreement as the following:  To represent the measurement results of the candidate target cells:  Reuse the measResultNeighCells in the RLF-Report, and include an indication (depending RAN3 conclusion) on whether a measured neighbour cell was configured as a CHO candidate or not.  Therefore, we first need to resolve whether we want to include the candidate cell identity in the RLF report. It is completely wrong to say that we agreed on this in RAN2. Therefore, this cannot be of low priority. | Issue addressed above. |
| Nokia | CHO config stored per candidate cell so this would be only duplication |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Retainment of RLF report contents

In [17], it is proposed that in case there is a failure in the CHO recovery cell, the UE should not delete the previous HOF information associated to the CHO. Rapporteur notes that in the current running CR if there is a failure in the CHO cell, that will be treated as a normal RLF and thus the UE rewrtires the contents of the RLF report. Rapporteur also wants to indicate that the replacing only part of the RLF report and keeping the rest would also cause issues in how the single RLF report is interpreted by the source cell at a later point in time. Based on this, rapporteur believes there is no need to change the existing behaviour of overwriting the RLF report if the UE declares RLF in the reconnect cell ID.

1. [low] RAN2 to discuss if the UE should keep the previous RLF-Report if a failure occurs in the CHO recovery cell.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## CHO configuration in RLF report

In [17], Huawei proposes that the UE includes the CHO configuration of the cell where RLF is detected in the RLF Report. Rapporteur notes that in the current running CR, the CHO configuration at RLF is provided for each candidate target cell. In the CHO context, it is not clear what is the CHO configuration of the cell where the RLF is detected, since the CHO configuration is for target cells not for the source cells.

1. [low] RAN2 to discuss the need to include in the RLF-Report the CHO configuration of the cell where RLF is detected

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
| Qualcomm | UE clears the CHO configuration after successfulCompletion of CHO. Therefore, UE cannot report CHO configuration if RLF happens at target. Furthermore, we have not agreed to include CHO configuration. It has a huge overhead. |  |
| Nokia | We fail to understand the issue | As indicated in the explanation, rapporteur also failed to follow the proposal of the proponent but this proposal has been kept here to avoid any late comments. But this would be a low priority topic. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## DAPS fallback related

In [17], related to DAPS, it is proposed to refine the information provided in the RLF-Report in case of DAPS fallback. Rapporteur believes that in the current implementation of DAPS related HOF, the UE includes the reestablishmentCellID only when the UE experiences dual failures (source RLF followed by HOF). If the UE experiences a HOF while executing DAPS HO, then the UE always sets *dapsHOF* to *true*. If the UE has not set *rlfInSource-DAPS* to *true* then it is an indciation that the UE would have performed the fallback to the source cell and the *nrPreviousCell* is the same as the source PCell on which the UE performs the fallback. Thus rapporteur believes there is no need to add reestablishmentCellId to indicate fallback or to indicate any explicit fallback indication.

1. [low] RAN2 to discuss the need to refine the information in the RLF-report for the scenario of DAPS fallback, e.g.:
   1. Redefine the reestablishmentCellId to support the fallback cell information
   2. Introduce a new IE, e.g., fallbackIndicator to indicate the successful fallback information
   3. No changes are made as this information can be derived implicitly

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Misc

In [18], Qualcomm proposes that the timeConnFailure should be set to 0 in case the failure occurs before the CHO execution. Rapporteur notes that, we should keep the principles that we have in legacy as agreed in last RAN2#116-meeting, i.e. if the failure occurs in cell B, the timeConnFailure is set to the time elapsed since the last HO execution from A->B, and the RLF in cell B. If the timeConnFailure is set to 0, the network will think that the failure occurred immediately after the HO from cell A to cell B, while this might not be true. Rapporteur proposes not further discussing this.

In [18], Qualcomm proposes that if there is an RLF in a target cell after the DAPS HO, a possible RLF in the source encountered during the DAPS HO will not be reported. Rapporteur notes that the running CR is already like that, i.e. the RLF in source can only be captured either if the SHR is generated or if an HOF occurs, otherwise for it is not included for RLF (please check the procedures related to *rlfInSource-DAPS* in the running CR). Rapporteur proposes not further discussing this.

In [20], LG proposes that in case of successive CHO failure, the UE shall not clear the RLF-Report associated to the first CHO failure. Rapporteur notes that this is already the way it is captured in the specification, i.e. if the second CHO failure occurs, the UE does not initiate a new RLF-Report, rather it just appends the new info (i.e. the choCellID in the existing RLF-Report). See the part below in yellow:

|  |
| --- |
| From running CR:  3> if the associated T304 was not initiated as per the cell selection procedure performed in subclause 5.3.7.3:  4> store the handover failure information in *VarRLF-Report* as described in the subclause 5.3.10.5; |

Rapporteur proposes not further discussing this.

In [22], Sharp would like to clarify the implications of the following agreement. “Successful CHO recovery while initial failure” is part of the RLF-Report. Rapporteur interpretation is that SHR should not be triggered if the CHO fails, no matter if the recovery is successful or not. This was already discussed in the past, and it is the way it is implemented in the CR already.

In [12] and in [15], Lenovo and CMCC propose to add further information to the RLF-Report for the case of CHO. Rapporteur notes however that radio measurements are already included in the RLF-Report for the candidate target cells as well as their CHO configuration and information on event´s fulfilment.

1. [low] RAN2 to discuss the need of the following additional information to be included in the RLF-Report for the case of CHO:
   1. Whether the entry condition of the second condition is met or not when the first condition is considered as ‘fulfilled’
   2. Whether the second condition is also satisfied during TTT but the status of the first event has been changed to ‘not satisfied’
   3. The measurement result of the corresponding serving cell and candidate cell associated with the second event when the first condition is considered as ‘fulfilled’
   4. The measurement result of the corresponding serving cell and candidate cell when the first condition is considered as ‘not fulfilled’
   5. For the case that two CondEvent A3 or two CondEvent A5 are configured, then the reported first satisfied event or condition includes the corresponding measurement quantity, e.g., RSRP or RSRQ
   * On the definition of timeConnSourceDAPSFailure, i.e. whether last DAPS handover ‘execution‘ or the last DAPS handover ‘initialization‘ should be used
   * Merging the field description of the rlfInSource-DAPS in the RLF-Report with the one under the SHR

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

In [11] and [13], Samsung and Lenovo proposes to include the actual values of the T304, T312, T310 in the SHR. Additionally Samsung propose to capture the time between the RLF in source during the DAPS HO and the successful random access in the targe. Rapporteur notes that the need for this information was already discussed in the past, but not agreed. The following proposal is anyhow added in case there is now more support.

1. [low] RAN2 to discuss the need of including the following information in the SHR:
   1. T310 value in source cell when T310 stops
   2. T312 value in source cell when T312 stops
   3. T304 value in target cell when T304 stops
   4. UE reports the time between RLF@source and successful RACH with the target in DAPS handover in SHR

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
| Nokia | We thought it is useful for the NW to know the actual value of timers |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

In [13], Lenovo further wonders what happens in case multiple triggering conditions for the SHR generation are fulfilled. According to the running CR, all the triggering conditions will be represented in the generated SHR. So it seems that no further discussion is needed.

During the previous discussions, companies has raised the following implementation related issues. One such issue is related to how the discarding of the SHR happens when the HO fails. In the current implementation, the UE generates the SHR when the UE generates the *RRCReconfigurationComplete* message. As can be seen from the highlighted text below, the UE generates the SHR only if the UE successfully completes the RA procedure towards the target cell. This way of implementation is done to reduce the over specification of exactly when the UE generates the SHR contents as this can be simply left to UE implementation. Otherwise, we would need to handle the generation of the SHR when any of the conditions occurs, and then delete it if the HO is successful. That would require a major impact to the procedural text because the SHR generation function should be invoked from many different places. Rapporteur wonders if this re-modeling is required from a specification point of view.

|  |
| --- |
| From SON Running CR:  3> if the UE was configured with *successHO-Config* when connected to the source PCell:  4> perform the actions for the successful handover report determination as specified in clause 5.7.10.x, upon successfully completing the Random Access procedure triggered for the *reconfigurationWithSync* in *spCellConfig* of the MCG;  3> if the UE has successful handover information available in *VarSuccessHO-Report*:  4> include *successHO-InfoAvailable* in the *RRCReconfigurationComplete* message; |

.

1. [low] RAN2 to discuss how to discard the SHR that is generated at the formation of RRCReconfigurationComplete message and if the corresponding T304 expires.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Inter-RAT SHR

Still in [11], inter-RAT SHR has been proposed. This has not been discussed before and can be down prioritized for Rel-17.

1. [low] RAN2 discusses if inter-RAT SHR is supported in this release. If so, RAN2 studies the encoding format for inter-RAT SHR.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## SHR triggering conditions.

In [16], CMCC proposes the enhance the content of the SHR about the BFR when none of beams in *candidateBeamRSList* could meet the measurement requirement. As this topic is a new issue but not very essential, rapporteur believes this can be treated with low priority.

1. [low] RAN2 to discuss the need to include BFR related information in the Successful Handover Report, when none of beams in candidateBeamRSList could meet the measurement requirement, e.g.
   1. Indication that none of beams in candidateBeamRSList could meet the measurement requirement
   2. ID and measurements of beams whose measurement higher than the threshod rsrp-ThresholdSSB but not within the configured list candidateBeamRSList
   3. Measurements of reference signals that within the configured list candidateBeamRSList

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Additional SHR contents

In [23], Sharp proposes to investigate whether for the case of SHR, the network needs to know whether the UE was configured with split SRB1 when the SHR was generated. This is a new topic and not essential for the Rel17 closure. Therefore rapporteur believes this can be treated with low priority.

1. [low] RAN2 to discuss whether the UE needs to indicate in the SHR whether the UE was configured with split SRB when the HO occurred.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## ContentionDetectedFlag for 2 step RA

One company has brought up the clarification regarding when the UE shall set the contentionDetected flag to TRUE while using the 2 step RA procedure. Their argument for doing so is that this condition is not clear in the MAC specification.

* The field contentionDetected corresponding to 2-Step RA is set to TRUE (Samsung [3]),
  + if msgB-ResponseWindow expires (and/or UE has received successRAR but does not include its contention resolution identity), or
  + if fallbackRAR is received for this attempt and contention resolution timer expires

Rapporteur believes this clarification is not an essential one as the interaction between the MAC and the RRC layers at the UE side are left for UE implementation.

1. [low] RAN2 to discuss whether it is necessary or not to clarify when the UE sets the contentionDetected flag to TRUE for 2 step RA procedure, e.g.
   1. if msgB-ResponseWindow expires (and/or UE has received successRAR but does not include its contention resolution identity)
   2. if fallbackRAR is received for this attempt and contention resolution timer expires.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Additional RA report contents

One of the company had the proposal to add the reason for changing the RA procedure from 2 step RA to 4 step RA. For example, this could be due to LBT issues or due to fallback RAR. Considering this is a new feature that has not been discussed and more of an optimization, rapporteur proposes this to be of lower priority.

1. [low] Consider to capture other reasons for changing the procedure from 2-step to 4-step, e.g. due to LBT, due to fallback RAR reception

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Further, one company would like to consider the case of fallback from 2 step CFRA to 4 step CBRA. This is something that can be derivable based on the RAReport contents (e.g., contention detected flag) and therefore, rapporteur believes this can be treated with low priority.

1. [low] Consider to capture fallback from 4-step CFRA to 4-step CBRA

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

One company brings up the topic of impact of power sharing on RA procedure (Samsung [3]).

* The UE indicates whether the UE could not transmit a PRACH due to the power limitation arising from the power allocation related to MR-DC (e.g., EN-DC, NE-DC, or NR-DC). The UE indicates whether the UE had to reduce its PRACH transmission power due to the power limitation arising from the power allocation related to MR-DC

This topic has not been discussed before in RAN2. Thus, rapporteur believes it might be too late for this release and therefore can be treated with low priority.

1. [low] RAN2 to decide whether to discuss the following new topic associated to RA report:
   1. The UE indicates whether the UE could not transmit a PRACH due to the power limitation arising from the power allocation related to MR-DC (e.g., EN-DC, NE-DC, or NR-DC). The UE indicates whether the UE had to reduce its PRACH transmission power due to the power limitation arising from the power allocation related to MR-DC

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## MHI

In [34], Ericsson proposes to clarify how to handle the time spent in case of DAPS.

1. [low] RAN2 to discuss whether to clarify the handling of the time spent in the MHI in case of DAPS, e.g. the time spent in previous PCell is captured as the time spent from entering the source cell until receiving the source DAPS release message.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Further, in [36], CATT proposes to add the PScell MHI also to the LTE specifications. Considering we have very little time left, rapporteur believes LTE specification should be left unchanged.

1. [low] RAN2 to discuss if the PSCell MHI should extended to LTE as well.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
| NOkia | New proposal, we wonder if this is really an open issue to close the WI? | Rapproteur agrees with Nokia that any LTE specification changes should be avoided at this late stage. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Capability discussion

### RLF report enhancements related capability

In [20], LG claims that there is no way to differentiate legacy RLF-Report and R17 enhanced RLF-Report because there is only single indicator in UE-MeasurementsAvailable.

In addition, it has been proposed by Huawei in [29] to introduce new UE capability bits for the following enhancements and they are optional without capability signalling:

* DAPS failure reporting
* CHO failure reporting
* PSCell change failure reporting

Rapporteur believes, the enhancement to RLF report need not have any explicit capability indication or any explicit availability flag as the additions to RLF report in LTE was never introduced with new capabilities. The same principles can be continued in NR as well as long as the changes to the report are not very significant (in terms of report size). Based on the above papers, Rapporteur proposes the following.

1. [low] Related to capabilities, RAN2 to discuss the need of the following:
   1. Release indicator for each report version, representing that there exists a SON related report needed to be exchanged
   2. Capability bits for DAPS/CHO/PSCell change failure reporting
   3. No changes as additions are not very large

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
| Huawei | Based on the session chair’s comment during CB session, all UE capabilities related to this WI will be discussed at the next RAN2 meeting. We do not have strong opinons whether to discuss UE capabilities here. If companies agree to capture these issues, we think SON related UE capabilities should be listed and our paper [29] can be referenced.  [29] [R2-2200968](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116bis-e/Docs/R2-2200968.zip), [Discussion on UE capabilities for R17 SON and MDT](https://ericsson.sharepoint.com/R2-2200968.zip), Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes, the objective should be to discuss it at next meeting. Reference [29] is cited above. |
| Nokia | For c – We think the additions are large as many new IEs are introduces some being lists etc. Also only information that the source/root cause anaysis node can decode/use should be sent/logged. |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Capability bit for on-demand SI related RA report enhancements

In [29], it has been discussed to introduce a new capability bit for the on-demand SI request related enhancement as part of RA reporting. Based on that, rapporteur wonders if companies agree to introduce a new capability bit for the on-demand SI request enhancement in the RA reporting.

1. [low] RAN2 discuss the necessity of a new capability bit for on-demand SI request enhancement of the RA reporting.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
| Nokia | There may be no need for the UE capability bit, but we wonder whats the guideline for the UE capabilities in the Open Isssue List (it seems its not the first priority) |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### UE capability of SN RA reporting to MN

Some companies have brought up the issue of whether the feature of SN RA Reporting to MN is a mandatory feature or is it an explicit capability from the UE side. This issue needs to be resolved.

Concerning the capability bit for the RA report, following have been proposed in [29],[30],[31]:

* Neither additional capability bit nor optional feature is needed for SgNB RACH Report for NR-DC case, while in EN-DC scenarios additional capability bit is needed for NR RA report enhancement in LTE [31].
* New UE capability bits for 2-step RA report enhancement and SN RA report are needed, and they are optional with capability signalling [29].
* Due to the time constrains prioritize NR DC scenarios and avoid changes in LTE spec for the time being [30].

Based on the above, rapporteur would like to propose the following proposal.

1. [low] RAN2 discuss whether a capability bit is needed for the RA report enhancements in Rel 17 (i.e., enhancement on 2-step RA information and SN related RA information).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company´s view** | **Rapporteur’s view** |
| Nokia | Wonder how important UE capabilities are for Open Issue List (see guideline from the Chair) |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 4 Conclusion

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

[Proposal 1 RAN2 to discuss whether the time elapsed between the DAPS HO initialization and the RLF in the source cell after fallback is represented by the timeConnFailure (as in the current running CR) or via the timeConnSourceDAPSFailure (which according to running CR is just used in case of RLF in source while performing DAPS HO).](#_Toc94263891)

[Proposal 2 RAN2 to discuss whether there is any issue for the following topics related to CHO/DAPS, and whether those should be addressed in the next revision of running CR:](#_Toc94263892)

[a. Whether the latest changes in the running CR captures modeling of the UE actions in the case of consecutive failures.](#_Toc94263893)

[Proposal 3 RAN2 to discuss how to handle the *timeUntilReconnection* in the RLF report for the consecutive CHO failure cases:](#_Toc94263894)

[a. Time from first failure to the time of reconnection](#_Toc94263895)

[b. Time from second failure to the time of reconnection](#_Toc94263896)

[Proposal 4 Related to the inclusion of the CHO candidate cell list and CHO configuration, RAN2 to discuss whether:](#_Toc94263897)

[a. To keep the CHO candidate cell list and the CHO configuration only in the RLF-Report (as in the current running CR)](#_Toc94263898)

[b. To include the CHO candidate cell list and the CHO configuration both in the RLF-Report and SHR](#_Toc94263899)

[c. To exclude the CHO candidate cell list both from the RLF-Report and the SHR](#_Toc94263900)

[Proposal 5 Related to T312, RAN2 to discuss the inclusion of the following information in the RLF-Report:](#_Toc94263905)

[a. ‘t312-expiry’ as a new rlf-cause in the RLF-Report](#_Toc94263906)

[b. [low] Indication of the frequency whose associated T312 expired](#_Toc94263907)

[Proposal 6 RAN2 to consider one or more of the following solutions to address the issue of SHR and RLF report are generated for the same HO:](#_Toc94263908)

[a. Indicator in the RLF-Report (SHR) indicating that the SHR (RLF-Report) has been already sent to the network for this HO](#_Toc94263909)

[b. Indicator in the RLF-Report (SHR) indicating that there is an SHR (RLF-Report) associated to the same HO](#_Toc94263910)

[c. UE-ID and C-RNTI to be included in the SHR, RLF-Report](#_Toc94263911)

[d. Timestamps in the SHR and RLF-Report to link them in time](#_Toc94263912)

[e. RLF-Report should be merged with the SHR if the SHR has not been sent yet at the moment of RLF-Report generation, or the SHR should be merged in the RLF-Report.](#_Toc94263913)

[f. If RLF occurs within a certain time window after the generation of the SHR, the SHR should be discarded if not yet transmitted](#_Toc94263914)

[Proposal 7 RAN2 to discuss in which HO scenarios the UP interruption measurements should be considered:](#_Toc94263915)

[a. Only at DAPS HO](#_Toc94263916)

[b. For all HO types (ordinary HO, DAPS, CHO)](#_Toc94263917)

[Proposal 8 RAN2 to discuss when the UE shall generate a SHR due to RLF in the source cell during a DAPS HO:](#_Toc94263918)

[a. Only if it is configured to do so in the SHR configuration (i.e. in the *successHO-Config*)](#_Toc94263919)

[b. The UE shall always generate a SHR due to RLF in the source cell during a DAPS HO](#_Toc94263920)

[Proposal 9 RAN2 to discuss which RRC message/configuration carries the SHR configuration.](#_Toc94263921)

[a. otherConfig (current implementation)](#_Toc94263922)

[b. RRCReconfiguration including reconfigurationWithSync](#_Toc94263923)

[Proposal 10 RAN2 to agree to include PLMN checking before sending the availability indicator for the SHR, as in RLF Report.](#_Toc94263924)

[Proposal 11 Given that the T312 is associated to the measurement identity, RAN2 to discuss whether to clarify in the specification in which cases the SHR is generated, e.g. one of the following:](#_Toc94263925)

[a. The UE shall log the SHR always when a T312 is running for any measurement identity configured to the UE. In this case, the UE shall indicate which frequency related measurements had triggered the timer T312.](#_Toc94263926)

[b. The SHR shall be generated only if the T312 associated to the measurement identity associated to the target cell is running](#_Toc94263927)

[Proposal 12 RAN2 to discuss whether the T312 threshold for the SHR generation should be configured per measurement identity or if that can be common for all measurement identities configured to the UE.](#_Toc94263928)

[Proposal 13 For the 2-step RA, the payload reported by the UE in the RA-Report is equivalent to:](#_Toc94263929)

[a. The overall payload without padding available in the UE buffer size at the time of initiating the 2 step RA procedure.](#_Toc94263930)

[b. The payload without padding sent by the UE over the PUSCH resources in the msgA.](#_Toc94263931)

[Proposal 14 RAN2 to agree on one of the following method of reporting the payload size.](#_Toc94263932)

[a. A 8-bit bit string in RA report, where the value of the 8-bit bitstring refers to the index of the BSR table in TS 38.321 (similar to the definition of the *messageSize* field within *SL-TrafficPatternInfo*)](#_Toc94263933)

[b. The payload size is reported as ENUMERATED {noPayload, sizeRange1, sizeRange2, sizeRange3, sizeRange4, sizeRange5, spare1, spare0} wherein each RANGE is known, e.g. hardcoded in the specification. FFS the values for each range](#_Toc94263934)

[c. Exactly following the definition of ra-MsgA-SizeGroupA [5]](#_Toc94263935)

[d. Simplified definition of ra-MsgA-SizeGroupA by removing some size ranges[5]](#_Toc94263936)

[Proposal 15 RAN2 to discuss the inclusion of one or more of the following PUSCH resource parameters:](#_Toc94263937)

[a. msgA-MCS (4 bits)](#_Toc94263938)

[b. nrofPRBs-PerMsgA-PO (5 bits)](#_Toc94263939)

[c. msgA-PUSCH-TimeDomainAllocation (4 bits)](#_Toc94263940)

[d. frequencyStartMsgA-PUSCH (9 bits)](#_Toc94263941)

[e. nrofMsgA-PO-FDM (2 bits)](#_Toc94263942)

[Proposal 16 RAN2 to confirm that the UE includes the RA resource related parameters (frequency start, FDM, and SubcarrierSpacing of the msgA RA resource) only under following scenarios:](#_Toc94263943)

[a. RA procedure involves only 2 step RA](#_Toc94263944)

[b. When 2 step RA to 4 step RA switching occurs, only those parameters that are different in 4 step RA resources compared to the 2 step RA resources.](#_Toc94263945)

[Proposal 17 RAN2 to discuss whether the TS 36.331 modifications are introduced to handle the scenario of LTE MN fetching the list of NR RA reports.](#_Toc94263950)

[Proposal 18 If it is agreed to support NR RA reporting to LTE, RAN2 to agree whether capability bit for NR RA report is needed in LTE specification](#_Toc94263951)

[Proposal 19 If it is agreed to support NR RA reporting to LTE, RAN2 confirms that UE reports all available RA-information (LTE RA information as well as SgNB RA-report if available) to LTE node regardless if it is in DC or not.](#_Toc94263952)

[Proposal 20 If it is agreed to support NR RA reporting to LTE, when reporting stored SgNB RA-report, the cell identity of stored SgNB RA-report is encoded in LTE format and put outside the SgNB RA-report container.](#_Toc94263953)

[Proposal 21 The RA Information associated to a SCG failure (when failureType is set to randomAccessProblem or beamFailureRecoveryFailure-r16) are included in the SCGFailureInformation.](#_Toc94263954)

[Proposal 22 RAN2 to discuss the necessity of inclusion of previousPSCellID, failedPSCellID, timeSCGFailure in the SCGFailureInformation message.](#_Toc94263955)

[Proposal 23 RAN2 to confirm that the UE sets the failureType to randomAccessProblem if the UE initiates transmission of the SCGFailureInformationNR message to indicate the reason for declaring failure to be the random access problem from the SCG MAC even if T304 is running. Otherwise, if no random access problem has been detected at T304 expiry, the UE sets the failureType to synchReconfigFailureSCG.](#_Toc94263956)

[Proposal 24 The UE includes a 1 bit flag in the SCGFailureInformation to indicate that the T304 was running when the UE declared the SCG failure due to random access problem indication in the SCG MAC.](#_Toc94263957)

[Proposal 25 RAN2 to discuss the need to introduce an explicit capability indicator that indicates that the UE is capable of storing the PSCell related MHI.](#_Toc94263958)

[Proposal 26 RAN2 to discuss the total number of PSCell (across all PCells) related information that should be stored by the UE in the MHI:](#_Toc94263959)

[a. 16 PSCells](#_Toc94263960)

[b. 32 PSCells](#_Toc94263961)

[c. 64 PSCells](#_Toc94263962)

[Proposal 27 RAN2 to discuss how to handle addition/release of PSCells, e.g.](#_Toc94263963)

[a. The UE should create a new PCell entry if upon PSCell transition while being on same PCell and the maximum PSCell number of the PCell entry has reached.](#_Toc94263964)

[b. When the UE reaches the maximum number of PSCell, if it gets a new PSCell, the UE removes the oldest stored PSCell entry and stores the newly configured PSCell entry](#_Toc94263965)

[Proposal 28 RAN2 to discuss the inclusion of the time spent with no PSCell in the MHI, when connected to a certain PCell.](#_Toc94263966)

[Proposal 29 [low] RAN2 to discuss if there is the need to not record the timeConnFailure for the first CHO failure, and just record it for the second.](#_Toc94263967)

[Proposal 30 [low]The field s condFirstEventFulfilled and condSecondEventFulfilled are included only when timeBetweenEvents and firstTriggeredEvent are not included from Running CR.](#_Toc94263968)

[Proposal 31 [low] RAN2 to discuss if it is needed to remove the CHO candidate cells IDs from the RLF Report in the running CR.](#_Toc94263969)

[Proposal 32 [low] RAN2 to discuss if the UE should keep the previous RLF-Report if a failure occurs in the CHO recovery cell.](#_Toc94263970)

[Proposal 33 [low] RAN2 to discuss the need to include in the RLF-Report the CHO configuration of the cell where RLF is detected](#_Toc94263971)

[Proposal 34 [low] RAN2 to discuss the need to refine the information in the RLF-report for the scenario of DAPS fallback, e.g.:](#_Toc94263972)

[a. Redefine the reestablishmentCellId to support the fallback cell information](#_Toc94263973)

[b. Introduce a new IE, e.g., fallbackIndicator to indicate the successful fallback information](#_Toc94263974)

[c. No changes are made as this information can be derived implicitly](#_Toc94263975)

[Proposal 35 [low] RAN2 to discuss the need of the following additional information to be included in the RLF-Report for the case of CHO:](#_Toc94263977)

[a. Whether the entry condition of the second condition is met or not when the first condition is considered as ‘fulfilled’](#_Toc94263978)

[b. Whether the second condition is also satisfied during TTT but the status of the first event has been changed to ‘not satisfied’](#_Toc94263979)

[c. The measurement result of the corresponding serving cell and candidate cell associated with the second event when the first condition is considered as ‘fulfilled’](#_Toc94263980)

[d. The measurement result of the corresponding serving cell and candidate cell when the first condition is considered as ‘not fulfilled’](#_Toc94263981)

[e. For the case that two CondEvent A3 or two CondEvent A5 are configured, then the reported first satisfied event or condition includes the corresponding measurement quantity, e.g., RSRP or RSRQ](#_Toc94263982)

[o On the definition of timeConnSourceDAPSFailure, i.e. whether last DAPS handover ‘execution‘ or the last DAPS handover ‘initialization‘ should be used](#_Toc94263983)

[o Merging the field description of the rlfInSource-DAPS in the RLF-Report with the one under the SHR](#_Toc94263984)

[Proposal 36 [low] RAN2 to discuss the need of including the following information in the SHR:](#_Toc94263985)

[a. T310 value in source cell when T310 stops](#_Toc94263986)

[b. T312 value in source cell when T312 stops](#_Toc94263987)

[c. T304 value in target cell when T304 stops](#_Toc94263988)

[d. UE reports the time between RLF@source and successful RACH with the target in DAPS handover in SHR](#_Toc94263989)

[Proposal 37 [low] RAN2 to discuss how to discard the SHR that is generated at the formation of RRCReconfigurationComplete message and if the corresponding T304 expires.](#_Toc94263990)

[Proposal 38 [low] RAN2 discusses if inter-RAT SHR is supported in this release. If so, RAN2 studies the encoding format for inter-RAT SHR.](#_Toc94263991)

[Proposal 39 [low] RAN2 to discuss the need to include BFR related information in the Successful Handover Report, when none of beams in candidateBeamRSList could meet the measurement requirement, e.g.](#_Toc94263992)

[a. Indication that none of beams in candidateBeamRSList could meet the measurement requirement](#_Toc94263993)

[b. ID and measurements of beams whose measurement higher than the threshod rsrp-ThresholdSSB but not within the configured list candidateBeamRSList](#_Toc94263994)

[c. Measurements of reference signals that within the configured list candidateBeamRSList](#_Toc94263995)

[Proposal 40 [low] RAN2 to discuss whether the UE needs to indicate in the SHR whether the UE was configured with split SRB when the HO occurred.](#_Toc94263996)

[Proposal 41 [low] RAN2 to discuss whether it is necessary or not to clarify when the UE sets the contentionDetected flag to TRUE for 2 step RA procedure, e.g.](#_Toc94263997)

[a. if msgB-ResponseWindow expires (and/or UE has received successRAR but does not include its contention resolution identity)](#_Toc94263998)

[b. if fallbackRAR is received for this attempt and contention resolution timer expires.](#_Toc94263999)

[Proposal 42 [low] Consider to capture other reasons for changing the procedure from 2-step to 4-step, e.g. due to LBT, due to fallback RAR reception](#_Toc94264000)

[Proposal 43 [low] Consider to capture fallback from 4-step CFRA to 4-step CBRA](#_Toc94264001)

[Proposal 44 [low] RAN2 to decide whether to discuss the following new topic associated to RA report:](#_Toc94264002)

[a. The UE indicates whether the UE could not transmit a PRACH due to the power limitation arising from the power allocation related to MR-DC (e.g., EN-DC, NE-DC, or NR-DC). The UE indicates whether the UE had to reduce its PRACH transmission power due to the power limitation arising from the power allocation related to MR-DC](#_Toc94264003)

[Proposal 45 [low] RAN2 to discuss whether to clarify the handling of the time spent in the MHI in case of DAPS, e.g. the time spent in previous PCell is captured as the time spent from entering the source cell until receiving the source DAPS release message.](#_Toc94264004)

[Proposal 46 [low] RAN2 to discuss if the PSCell MHI should extended to LTE as well.](#_Toc94264005)

[Proposal 47 [low] Related to capabilities, RAN2 to discuss the need of the following:](#_Toc94264006)

[a. Release indicator for each report version, representing that there exists a SON related report needed to be exchanged](#_Toc94264007)

[b. Capability bits for DAPS/CHO/PSCell change failure reporting](#_Toc94264008)

[c. No changes as additions are not very large](#_Toc94264009)

[Proposal 48 [low] RAN2 discuss the necessity of a new capability bit for on-demand SI request enhancement of the RA reporting.](#_Toc94264010)

[Proposal 49 [low] RAN2 discuss whether a capability bit is needed for the RA report enhancements in Rel 17 (i.e., enhancement on 2-step RA information and SN related RA information).](#_Toc94264011)
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