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# 1 Introduction

This is a summary document on collection of comments to TS 38.304 CR during below running CR discussion:

* [POST129][104][NES] (Apple)

**Scope:** Capture all agreements in 38.304 running CR and identify stage 3 open issues.

**Intended outcome:** Endorsed 38.304 running CR in R2-2501464 (including editor’s notes for stage 3 open issues)

**Deadline: Long email discussion**

# 2 Collection of comments

Please provide your comments in below table, and Rapporteur will response. Please do not insert any comments in running CR directly, which is hard for Rapporteur to follow all comments.

And based on existing EN and your comments, Rapporteur will identify stage 3 open issues.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Detailed comments** | **Rapporteur response** |
| CATT | The OD-SIB1 UE determines the cell reservations and access restrictions in accordance with Section 5. On top of it, OD-SIB1 UE considers the OD-SIB1 cell as if cell status is “barred” and excludes it as a candidate for reselection in the following cases:   * if it has no corresponding UL WUS configuration, or (CATT: suggest to remove it as it seems not correct. The UE does not know whether a cell is NES cell UE does not have corresponding UL WUS configuration ) * if the RACH procedure to acquire OD-SIB1 is failed, or * if it fails to acquire SIB1.(CATT: suggest to change it to “if it fails to acquire SIB1 after successfully receiving RAR for the OD-SIB1 request.”,otherwise it is overlapped with bullet 2 above)   Meanwhile, the OD-SIB1 UE would treat the OD-SIB1 cell as if cell status is “not barred” and consider it as candidate for cell reselection in the following cases:   * if it hasn’t acquired SIB1 from the OD-SIB1 cell before initialization of OD-SIB1 procedure but has received a valid UL WUS configuration, or * if it regarded the OD-SIB1 cell as if cell status is “barred” due to lack of corresponding UL WUS configuration before but has received a valid UL-WUS configuration.   After the OD-SIB1 UE successfully receives SIB1 from the selected OD-SIB1 Cell and if it is a suitable cell, it camps in the OD-SIB1 Cell and follows the behavior of Camped Normally state specified in Section 5.2.5. The OD-SIB1 UE may receive UL WUS configuration updates in SIB-X via the system information modification procedures defined in TS 38.331 [3].  CATT: The highlighted sentence above seems not necessary. |  |
| vivo1 | **Section 3.1:**  1. Suggest to clarify the UE in OD-SIB1 cell definition as “**OD-SIB1 Cell:** A cell that may transmit SIB1 in response to UL WUS from ~~a~~ an OD-SIB1 UE.” |  |
| vivo2 | **Section 7.1:**  For a UE supporting paging adaptation, if another set of paging configuration is signaled in system information, it only monitors the PO(s) derived from this set of paging parameters. In this case, the UE still monitors one PO per DRX cycle. Based on Network configuration, it is allowed that the UE(s) supporting paging adaptation to monitor the same PO as the UE(s) which don’t support paging adaptation. Paging adaptation configuration can only be updated via system information update notification.  [vivo] We understand the highlighted part comes from the RAN2 agreement ‘Allowing legacy and R19 UEs to co-ex in the same PF/PO is possible, based on NW configuration.‘. Yet, we think it has no spec impact from the UE side, as it is already mentioned in this paragraph ‘it only monitors the PO(s) derived from this set of paging parameters.’.  If the majority prefers to keep the agreement, perhaps we can state from the NW side as a note. Here’s an example, the detailed wording is up to Rapp to decide:  Note: The network can configure the legacy UEs and the UEs supporting paging adaptation in the same PF/PO. |  |
| vivo3 | **Section X:**  For an OD-SIB1 UE in RRC\_IDLE or RRC\_INACTIVE state, it may acquire UL WUS configuration from SIB-X of its camping cell for request of SIB1 transmission in one OD-SIB1 cell. The SIB-X can be cell specific configured or area specific configured, and the OD-SIB1 UE determines whether it is valid according to the validity mechanism defined in TS 38.331 [3].  [vivo] The yellow highlighted part is not needed as 38.331 has already specified that ‘Any SIB or posSIB except *SIB1* can be configured to be cell specific or area specific, using an indication in *SIB1*.’ and the agreement from OD-SIB1 does not violate it. |  |
| vivo4 | **Section X:**  If dedicated frequenecy priority parameters are provided in system information, the OD-SIB1 UE ignores the *cellReselectionPriority* in the system information and applies dedicated ones to determine frequency prioritization in accordance with Section 5.2.4.1. If dedicated inter-frequency and/or intra-frequecy excluded cell lists are provided in system information, the OD-SIB1 UE ignores *intraFreqExcludedCellList / interFreqExcludedCellList* and doesn’t consider the cell(s) in the dedicated lists as candidates for cell reselection.  [vivo] The whole paragraph is not needed as the details will be mentioned in the corresponding IE fields in 38.331. |  |
| vivo5 | **Section X:**  The OD-SIB1 UE determines the cell reservations and access restrictions in accordance with Section 5. On top of it, OD-SIB1 UE considers the OD-SIB1 cell as if cell status is “barred” and excludes it as a candidate for reselection in the following cases:  - if it has no corresponding UL WUS configuration, or  - if the RACH procedure to acquire OD-SIB1 is failed, or  - if it fails to acquire SIB1.  [vivo] We think the yellow highlighted part is not necessary as it is legacy behavior.  For the greenhighted part, as commented by companies online, the definition of ‘RACH procedure failure’ is not quite clear according to 38.321 and thus it was agreed as ‘ The UE considers the cell as barred after MAC indicates max number of preamble transmission for the OD-SIB1 request.’. Therefore, maybe it’s better to stick with the agreement wording, or we leave it specified in 38.321? |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Conclusion

Based on post-meeting email discussion, Rapporteur identify the following stage 3 open issues: