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# 1 Introduction

This paper summarizes the post meeting email discussion for the RRC running CR

* [POST129b][116][MOB] (Huawei)

 **Scope:**

1. Update RRC running CR for L1 event-driven MR based on RAN2#129bis progress
2. Essential open issue list in a separate contribution (RRC running CR can keep editor’s notes for readability).

 **Intended outcome:** Updated RRC running CR and essential RRC open issue list for L1 event-driven MR.

**Deadline: Long email discussion**

Based on the companies' inputs, the proposals have been formulated at the conclusion section.

Please fill in the contact information in the table below

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Contact Person** | **Email Address** |
| Xiaomi | Yujian Zhang | zhangyujian@xiaomi.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 2 Examining the running CR

***Question: Any comments on the RRC running CR for mobility?***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Issues** | **Comments** |
| Xiaomi | Condition for *candidateSpecificOffset-r19* | The condition eventLTM3 is “This field is optionally present when *eventId* is configured as *eventLTM3*, need R. Otherwise, it is absent.” In addition to LTM3, *candidateSpecificOffset-r19* should be applicable to LTM4 and LTM5 as well, since LTM4 and LTM5 also has candidate specific offset, as from MAC running CR on the entry condition, e.g. for LTM4: *Mn + Obn* *– Hys > Thresh*.Suggest to change the condition for *candidateSpecificOffset-r19* to notEventLTM2. |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Open issue list

* Issue1: FFS how report configuraiton for CSI acqusition should be configured. Pending with further R1 progress

# 4 Summary

# Annex A: Discussion achieve R2-2500804 in RAN2#129

## A.1 Resource configuration

Regarding the resource configuration, the current draft running CR is implemented as follows.



The reason why we introduce the CSI-RS configuration in parallel with the SSB configuration is that within the legacy field *LTM-CSI-ResourceConfig*, the field *LTM-SSB-CSI-Config* is configured as mandatory. Then, it is impossible to add CSI-RS configuration under this IE anymore.



So, the solution is

* The R18 *LTM-CSI-ResourceConfig* is used to configure CSI resources based on SSB for LTM
* We introduce a new R19 field *LTM-CSI-RS-ResourceConfig-r19* for configuring the CSI resources based on CSI-RS for LTM

During the RAN2 meeting 127bis, the following agreement regarding the resource configuration has been reached.

|  |
| --- |
| RAN2#127bis3. For measurement resource configuration, R18 LTM CSI resource configuration is reused if possible. If CSI-RS resource only IE needs to be defined, we can revisit it in the stage 3. |

The rapporteur observes that change per above agreement may have the following issues:

* In the legacy IR for *LTM-CSI-ResourceConfig,* the field *ltm-CSI-SSB-ResourceSet* is mandatory. If we reuse the existing LTM CSI configuration, it would mandatorily include the SSB configuration. While for R19 LTM, CSI-RB-based measurement is supported for both event-triggered report by MAC CE and legacy CSI report. It does not make sense to mandatorily support SSB for event-triggered measurement report or CSI-based report
* If we introduce the resource for event-triggered measurement report by MAC CE within the *LTM-CSI-ResourceConfig*, it is hard to see which resource is configured for report by CSI and which is for report by MAC CE. We could potentially by-pass the issue by what is currently being done in IE description that (a) the resource configuration associated with *LTM-ReportConfig* configured with *periodic/semi-persistentOnPUCCH/semi-persistentOnPUSCH/aperiodic* report type is for CSI report and (b) resource configuration associated with *LTM-ReportConfig* configured with *event-triggered* is for MAC CE report. But, the adding suffix like this makes the spec hard to read. For example, the current RAN1 spec (like TS 38.214 as an example in the figure below) for measurement report by CSI extensively uses the field name *LTM-CSI-ResourceConfig*



* The name of the IE and the fields within the IE still include the "CSI" part, which is not applicable for event-triggered measurement report by MAC CE anymore
* Limitation on the resource configuration Id and the number of *SSB-Index* and *LTM-CandidateId* with the introduction of event-triggered measurement report.

Based on the above observations and to revisit the issue during stage3, we would like to ask the following question:

***Question1: Do companies agree that, we add the resource configuration for event-triggered measurement report separately from the configuration for CSI resource?***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | No | Even if what is proposed it works, it will make the spec a bit more complex. For us a simpler solution to introduce CSI-RS would be to re-use the existing LTM-CSI-ResourceConfig. The following change (in red) it will avoid creating 4 new IEs.LTM-CSI-ResourceConfig-r18 ::= SEQUENCE { ltm-CSI-ResourceConfigId-r18 LTM-CSI-ResourceConfigId-r18, ltm-~~CSI-~~SSB-ResourceSet-r18 LTM-~~CSI-~~SSB-ResourceSet-r18, ..., [[ ltm-CSI-RS-ResourceSet-r19 LTM-CSI-RS-ResourceSet-r19 OPTIONAL --Need R ]]}LTM-~~CSI-~~SSB-ResourceSet-r18 ::= SEQUENCE { ltm-~~CSI-~~SSB-ResourceList-r18 SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxNrofLTM-CSI-~~SSB-~~ResourcesPerSet-r18)) OF SSB-Index, ltm-CandidateIdList-r18 SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxNrofLTM-CSI-~~SSB-~~ResourcesPerSet-r18)) OF LTM-CandidateId-r18, ...}LTM-CSI-RS-ResourceSet-r19 ::= SEQUENCE { ltm-CSI-RS-ResourceList-r19 SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxNrofLTM-CSI-ResourcesPerSet-r19)) OF FFS, ltm-CandidateIdList-r19 SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxNrofLTM-CSI-ResourcesPerSet-r19)) OF LTM-CandidateId-r18, ...}And in the field description of *ltm-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* we can clarify that if this field is present the UE shall ignore the field *ltm-CSI-SSB-ResourceSet*. This will simplify by a lot the implementation in current spec. |
| CATT | No | We think a new R19 IE is needed to include the csi-rs and/or the SSB due to the SSB is mandatory present in R18 IE *LTM-CSI-ResourceConfig,* But a separate resource configuration is not needed for event- triggered measurement report. The difference between the event triggered measurement report and legacy measurement report is only the way of reporting, not the measurement RS.  |
| Nokia | No | Agree with Ericsson. The same parent IE should be reused and support of CSI-RS resource set should be added there. |
| Xiaomi | No | Agree with Ericsson, whose proposal is simpler. The issue of mandatory presence of SSB can be addressed with field description. |
| OPPO | No  | Similar view with companies above. Rel-18 IE *LTM-CSI-ResourceConfig* can be reused to provide Rel-19 CSI-RS resource set configuration. |
| Sharp | No | The spec implementation should be simplified. So, we agree with Ericsson’s proposal. |
| vivo | No | We share the same view with Ericsson that the current *LTM-CSI-ResourceConfig* could be updated to add the CSI-RS configuration.Also, it is easy to clarify in the field description that UE can ignore that mandatory field as suggested by Ericsson.With this method the spec is easier to read. |
| ZTE | No with comments | We generally agree with Ericsson that existing LTM-CSI-ResourceConfig can be reused, but on whether the UE shall always ignore the SSB configuration, we think RAN2 can wait more on the CSI-RS configuration from RAN1. Similar to L3 CSI-RS measurements, we understand the UE may also need to detect the SSBs of candidate cell to obtain timing info, and “associatedSSB” may also be needed for L1 CSI-RS measurements, so maybe the SSB configuration in the same resourceConfig can be useful. If RAN1 decides to follow L3 MO configuration to obtain the timing info (e.g. L1 CSI-RS must require L3 CSI-RS measurement config), or the timing info are indicated in CSI-RS resource configuration, then we can specific the “ignore” behaviour as Ericsson proposed.  |
| Apple | No | Prefer Ericsson’s approach of reusing the existing LTM-CSI-ResourceConfig as it’s much simpler. Regarding whether it’s feasible to only configure CSI-RS without SSB (as ZTE’s comment), we can make it FFS and and wait for RAN1 progress.  |

Based on the views from the above, we propose the following:

***Proposal1a: Confirm on the previous agreement that "For measurement resource configuration, R18 LTM CSI resource configuration is reused if possible".***

***Proposal1b: Continue to carry the bits for SSB resouce set when CSI-RS resource set is configured. FFS whether CSI-RS can be configured without SSB (up to R1 to decide).***

The resource configuration in the current running CR is caputured as follows. An FFS is kept for how to indicate the CSI-RS resource. We need to downselect between two choices, whether to indicate in the resource set level or in the resource level



***Question2: How should the CSI-RS resource be indicated in the resource set for event-triggered measurement report ? (a) resource set id (b) resource id***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **(a)/(b)** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | See comment | If we do the way we suggest in question 1, there is no need to create a new resource configuration for the event triggered measurements as the resources will be the one specified within *LTM-CSI-ResourceConfig*. But regardless, we see no need to create a new resource configuration just for the event triggered measurements. |
| CATT |  | See our comment to Q1. |
| Nokia |  | Aligned with Ericsson’s and CATT’s opinion here. |
| Xiaomi |  | Agree with above comments that there is no need to define separate resource configuration for event-triggered measurements. |
| OPPO |  | Agree with comments above. |
| Sharp |  | No need new IEs for event-triggered report specific resource configuration. |
| vivo |  | Agree with comments by companies. |
| ZTE |  | Same comments as above companies. |
| Apple |  | Same comments as above companies.  |

Based on the feedback from companies, we propose the following.

***Proposal2: Do not create a new resource configuration just for the event triggered measurements.***

## A.2 Report configuration

Another issue to revisit is the configuration of report configuration for event-triggered report. Regaring the placement of the report configuration, we have agreed on the following in our previous RAN2 discussion.

|  |
| --- |
| 4. For measurement reporting configuration, R18 LTM-CSI-ReportConfig is reused if possible. We can revisit it in the stage 3 if needed. |

Current running CR implemented the previous agreement as follows:



Similar issue as report config also exists that

* In other groups’ spec, the name *LTM-CSI-ReportConfig* is extensively used for report by CSI, either as periodic, semi-persistent on PUSCH, semi-persistent on PUCCH or aperiodic. While if we want to keep the current structure, RAN1/4 would be required to change their spec by adding suffix to the procedure text that uses the name *LTM-CSI-ReportConfig*, restricting that the ReportConfigType set to *periodic, semi-persistent, aperiodic*.



* Same issue on the report config id and that the name CSI is not applicable for report by MAC CE

Based on the above, we would like to ask the following question:

***Question3: Do comapnies agree that we add report configuration for event-triggered measurementr report separately from the R18 LTM-CSI-ReportConfig?***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | No | Current implementation seems fine with the only difference that we don’t need to create a new resource configuration for the event triggered measurements. If we go as we suggest in Question 1, the resource are already references with the existing *ltm-ResourcesForChannelMeasurement-r18* (also the field *eventEvaluationRS-Type-r19* will not be needed). |
| CATT | No | No critical issue found by using R18 LTM-CSI-ReportConfig-for the impacts to other groups, whether there is a issue and how to address it should be discussed in the corresponding WGFor issue on the report config id and that the name CSI is not applicable for report by MAC CE, we do not see any issue here. |
| Nokia | No | We see no reason behind this proposal. Event-triggered reporting should be one form of CSI reporting carried in MAC CE.  |
| Xiaomi | No | We think reusing Rel-18 *LTM-CSI-ReportConfig* is fine. We could revisit if RAN1/RAN4 identify any issues.We do not see the issue of report config ID, given the discussion on Question 1. |
| OPPO | No | We see no issue to reuse Rel-18 IE *LTM-CSI-ReportConfig.* There is no need to introduce a new report config IE for event triggered. |
| Sharp | No | We don’t see critical issue. Current report configuration can include new configuration for event-triggered report. |
| vivo | No | Share the view with companies that current spec is fine, and we think there is no difference for the R18 and R19 basic reporting scheme except for the triggering type.  |
| ZTE | Yes with comments | We think this question is related to Q6, please see our response to Q6. One question for clarification, for LTM-2, which resource configure ID is supposed to be configured in LTM-CSI-ReportConfig? |
| Apple | No | We donot see any critical issues, then we should stick to the RAN2 agreements to reuse the R18 LTM-CSI-ReportConfig. * *For measurement reporting configuration, R18 LTM-CSI-ReportConfig is reused if possible. We can revisit it in the stage 3 if needed.(RAN2#127bis)*
 |

Based on the proposal above, we propose the following:

***Proposal3: Confirm on the previous agreement "For measurement reporting configuration, R18 LTM-CSI-ReportConfig is reused if possible".***

One of the original reasons to keep the report configuration on the level of serving cell configuration is to reuse the legacy field and to reduce the workload. If we reached agreement on the above question that report and resource confifguration does not need to reuse the legacy field, the above reason does not hold anymore.

Beside, if the report is sent by MAC CE, it is not reasonable either to configure the report configuration on the serving cell level, since MAC CE should be permitted to transmit on whichever cell with UL grant. We would like to ask the following question

***Question4: Do companies agree that the report configuration should be configued in the CG level rather than the serving cell level?***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | See comment | We see no issue in keeping the current structure (or at least we don’t really get what the issue is). The CG configuration can be used regardless on how these configurations are provided.  |
| CATT | No | It should be serving cell level as in our understanding,* Currently we only support SpCell LTM mobility based on L1 measurement, so it is only need to configure the LTM report configuration in the servingCellConfig of the SpCell
* the event triggering should involve the serving cell and the candidate cell, so if it is configured in the CG level, which cell is the serving cell for the involved event is not clear. so the event should be cell level
* currently the CSI report configuration is not restricted to use the resource of currently serving cell, e.g. PUCCH resource
* CG level will introduce more spec impact
 |
| Nokia |  | Current reporting framework should work without any issues. I.e. no need to allow reporting on different serving cell/within CG.  |
| Xiaomi |  | We are OK that the resource configuration is on the serving cell level. |
| OPPO |  | L1 measurement for candidate cell monitoring is only configured for SpCell, we understand providing report configuration in the *servingCellConfig* of the SpCell is sufficient. |
| Sharp | No | Even if measurement reports are sent via MAC CE, there is no motivation to change the structure of the current spec. |
| vivo | Not agree | We think the report could be configured in cell level rather than in CG level, since the event triggered L1 measurement is only for PCell. Besides, reusing the R18 LTM CSI report configuration is simpler, and it could work well for R19. |
| ZTE |  | The event report is only applicable for SpCell, it is up to implementation to ensure the reporting configure is only provided in the CSI-MeasConfig of SpCell in candidate configuration. The current signalling framework can be reused.  |
| Apple | No | As we agree to reuse the existing R18 LTM-CSI-ReportConfig as much as possible, it should be still serving cell level. We also share CATT’s understanding that CG level configuration will make the spec complex.  |

Since most of the companies think that we can confirm on the previous question, there is no need to formulate any proposal with proposal 3 above.

In the current draft CR, the following FFS has been kept for further studying the issue.



It needs to be further discussed the maximum number of measurement results can be reported for the beams.

***Question5: What should be the maximum number of beam measurement results can be reported?***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Maximum# of beams (e.g., 256, 128, etc)** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | Wait for RAN1? | Hard to decide now, maybe we can leave the FFS for the time being. We think that maybe RAN1 can decide this and thus we can wait for them to decide. |
| CATT |  | Level it to RAN1 or RAN4. |
| Nokia |  | We see no strong reason to change the numbers we have for Rel-18, just because now the reporting happens via MAC CE. But it is also fine to leave this aspect to RAN1.  |
| Xiaomi | Wait for RAN1 | Agree that we can leave this issue for RAN1 to decide. |
| OPPO |  | We can check with RAN1. |
| Sharp |  | Up to RAN1 |
| vivo |  | Agree to leave it to RAN1/RAN4. |
| ZTE |  | Wait for RAN1/RAN4. |
| Apple |  | We can wait for RAN1/RAN4.  |

***Proposal4: Ask RAN1 what should be the maximum number of beam measurement results that can be reported in event-triggered measurement report.***

## A.3 Linkage between resource and report configuration

In the legacy L3 measurmenet configuration, a meas ID is configuerd as the linkage between the measurment object configuration and measurement report configuration. This allows for flexible assocaition between MO and MR config and reduces the signaling overhead.

In the legacy LTM confifguration, a resource id is included in the report configuration to establish the association between the resource configuration and report configuration. In R19 LTM discussion, we have agreed on the following

|  |
| --- |
| For association between measurement resource configuration and measurement reporting configuration, R18 LTM way is reused if possible. We can revisit it in the stage 3 if needed. |

Hence, we would like to ask the following question

***Question6: Which option do companies prefer for association between measurement resource configuration and measurement reporting configuration,***

* ***(a) R18 LTM way is reused, ie., by adding resource id into report configuration***
* ***(b) Legacy L3 way is reused, ie., by a measurement id liking resource and report id***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **(a)/(b)** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | (a) with comments | If we go the way we suggested in question 1, the existing linkage between a resource configuration and a report configuration can be completely re-used without any modification. We don’t see the need to do something more or add new IEs. |
| CATT | a | a is aligned with Q3 and the RAN2 agreement.We do not see the critical issue to revisit the agreement |
| Nokia | a | No need to deviate from Rel-18 framework |
| Xiaomi | (a) | Rel-18 framework is fine. |
| OPPO | a | a is aligned with agreement. |
| Sharp | a |  |
| vivo | a | Basically, R18 LTM way should be reused and enhancement could be further discussed if needed e.g. whether different report configuration can include same resource ID etc. |
| ZTE | b | We understand option a) works, but in our view, b) is more flexible for NW implementation and reduces signalling overhead, because one reporting configuration can be linked to multiple RS resource configurations.  |
| Apple | a | Let’s follow RAN2 agreements.  |

***Proposal5: Confirm on the previous agreement that "For association between measurement resource configuration and measurement reporting configuration, R18 LTM way is reused if possible".***

## A.4 Confirmation of the RAN1/4 aspects

During RAN2#126, it was agreed that

|  |
| --- |
| 1. For event triggered L1 measurement, use of beam level measurement result for event evaluation is baseline. FFS for the cell level measurement. |

In the current running CR, the RSRP values is captured as a separate IE from the legacy, as it is used in both event-triggered and L3 measurement as the triggering quantity.



Then, in the definition of RSRP-Range, the following has been captured



In the RAN4 spec TS 38.133, the following table has been captured on the mapping between the integer value and the real RSRP value.



Since this table has been reused for R15 L1 measurement and R18 LTM measurement report by CSI, for R19 event-triggered measurement report, it can be still assumed that they are reused. Rapp would like to ask the following question.

***Question7: Confirm that the legacy RSRP values used for L1 measurement report can be reused for L2 measurement report***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Suggestion** |
| Ericsson | Yes | We are fine to re-use, but good to wait or confirm this with RAN4. |
| CATT | see comment | We agree to check with RAN1/4 about the value. But we only support L1-RSRP report, whether it is needed to reuse the IE defined for RSRP, RSRQ and SINR. |
| Nokia |  | We see no justification behind the introduction of new RSRP values. So likely the same (existing) RSRP tables should be used The same for differential RSRP, if it is supported. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | We are fine with the reuse. We can revisit if RAN4 identifies any issue. |
| OPPO |  | Prefer to check with RAN1/RAN4. |
| Sharp | Yes | We agree to wait for RAN4 confirmation. |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes | We can reuse the value range now, if RAN4 defines something different, they will inform us and RAN2 can update accordingly.  |
| Apple | Yes | There is no intention to change the legacy L1-RSRP value range. But it’s fine to check and confirm with RAN1. |

***Proposal6: Reuse the existing RSRP values and RSRP offset values and their interpretations in TS 38.133 for event-triggered measurement report. Can revisit if RAN4 identifies any issue.***

# Annex B: Discussion achieve R2-2502095 in RAN2#129bis

## B.1 Examining the running CR

This section is used to collect comments for the running CR in *Introduction of event-triggered L1 report for RRC spec\_v00*.

***Question1: Any comments on the running CR?***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Issue** | **Suggestion** |
| Ericsson | Included within the CR |  |
| Baicells | Included within the CR |  |
| CATT | Included within the CR |  |
| vivo | Included within the CR |  |
| Rapp01 | Comment on the field description***tm-CSI-ReportConfigToAddModList***Configured CSI report settings for LTM as specified in TS 38.214 [19]. LTM-CSI-ReportConfig with ltm-ReportConfigType configured as eventTriggered can only be configured on SpCell. | [Ericsson] This restriction is not correct. In LTM each candidate cell plus the serving cell prepares its own LTM-CSI-ReportConfig and we should keep this principle also here. The reason why we allow this, is to support subsequent LTM. With this restriction now we force the network to provide a new RRCReconfiguration message after every LTM/CLTM cell switch but this should not be the intention.Therefore, this restriction should be deleted.[VIVO] We are not sure about the intention of this restriction, it seems *eventTriggered* can just share the same configuration rule with other report types.[CATT] what is the intention of this restriction?seems conflict with the agreement, There is no restriction on which serving cell(s) L1 Measurement Report MAC CE can be transmitted on, i.e. not limited to SpCell.[OPPO] If the intention here is to restrict event triggered Scell L1 meas reporting, I understand it is already achieved since LTM-CSI-ReportConfig is associated with LTM-CSI-ResourceConfigId-r18 which does not include any RSs associated with candidate Scell.[Rapp] This was discussed and added before of the email discussion in the last R2 meeting based on the following comment from OPPO and ZTE@CATT, this change is not contradictory to the agreement you have cited. This is about RRC configuration while the agreement is about where to transmit MAC CEIn view of the comments above, i think we can further discuss it during the meeting. Proposal has been formulated as below. |
| Rapp2 | CSI-RS configuration in R19 | [Ericsson] This changes is very much related to how RAN1 design the support for the CSI-RS. We prefer to keep this out for the time being and to come back to this once we receive the RRC parameters from RAN1.We can add an editor note about this.[Rapp] OK to add an editor’s NOTE for this. |
| Rapp3 | Field description of ***ltm-NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceToAddModList*** | [CATT] suggest to reword it as,=>Pool of *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* which can be referred to from *CSI-ResourceConfig* or from MAC CEs.[Rapp] OK |
| Rapp4  | Question on the field ltm-NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceConfigToAddModList | [BaiCells] Is this configuration used for event triggered report?[Rapp] This config is used for both MAC-CE based report and CSI based report.  |
| Rapp5 | Discussion on the description of the IE LTM-CSI-ReportConfig | [Ericsson] We are not sure what we want to mean which this addition. Can’t we just merge this sentence with the subsequent one?[CATT] do not see the need of this addition.[Rapp] I think it is better to make it clear in this way that this configuration is used for both CSI-based report (introduced in R18) and MAC CE based report (introduced in R19). I dont see any technical issues in the current change until proven otherwise.  |
| Rapp6 | Comment on the description for LTM events | [VIVO] Although this is original agreement, should we clarify more, e.g., also mention SpCell for the events?[Rapp] We can make it in this way and see companies’ reaction. |
| Rapp7  | Report configuration for CLTM | [CATT] a question for CLTM.How does UE peform the CLTM evaluation if the associated ResourceConfig includes RS from other candidates?will UE evaluate beams of other candidates?[Rapp] I think for CLTM, the eveluation has to involve candidate cell; otherwise which cell the UE should switch to during the CLTM, right? So the type of event should only be LTM3/4/5.But this can be furtehr discused in the CLTM dicsussion? How is it related to RRC for event-triggered LTM?? |
| Rapp8 | Concerns on LTM2 config on the event evaluation RS type | [Ericsson] Our understanding is that RAN1 is actually discussing how to capture this case. We prefer to leave this FFS for now, meaning we delete this and we add an editor’s note. [Rapp] OK to add a NOTE. |
| Rapp9 | Event triggered report content | [Ericssion] Either we make this field optional, or we make the fields inside LTM-EventTriggeredReportContent-r19 optional. Otherwise, even if we have extension the network would be forces to include anyway unnecessary fields that than should be ignored by the UE.[Rapp] The intention is that when the type is configured as event triggered, the report content configuration has to be configured? But, I am Ok to make the field LTM-EventTriggeredReportContent-r19 optional just to be safe.  |
| Rapp10 | Spare bit for reportAmount | [Ericsson] Add a spare value since we use only 7 codepoints.[Rapp] Thanks, corrected. |
| Rapp11 | Fields within report content configuration | [Ericsson] Depending on RAN1 answer, perhaps we can re-use the rel-18 fields for beams and cells?[CATT] same view as Ericsson,we can wait for RAN1 to see if R18 fields can be resued.[Rapp] The R18 fields are as follows, how can they be reused?? They are all cell level configurations |
| Rapp12 | The field description for ltm-EventTriggeredMeasurement | [BaiCell] This field is missed out in the above IE LTM-CSI-ReportConfig.[Rapp] Thanks for the comment. This description is redundant and can be removed |
| Rapp13 | The wording of CSI report in the field description for ltm report config type | [CATT] "CSI report" seems a bit strange.suggest to change it,=>gNB shceduled measurement report.[VIVO] Can just say ‘UCI’?[Rapp] I have a slight preference for CATT’s proposal. This seems to be the wording that R1 has used in their discussion.  |
| Rapp14 | Comment on the wording for maxNumberOfReprotedBeams | [Ericsson] “beam if it is configured to be reported”[Rapp] This is based on the previous agreement that it is configurable whether the meas report for serving beam should be reported. |
| Rapp15 | Comment on the CSI-SSB-ResourceSet confifguration | [VIVO] Why ‘SSB’ is deleted here? We can have separate max number of resourcesperset for SSB and CSI-RS[Rapp] This is based on the following comment from E// in the last meeting’s email discussion. The reason is that the maximum value is reused for CSI-RS as well. So the SSB is removed. |
| Rapp16 | On the SSB configuration for the presence of SSB when CSI-RS resource set is configfured | [MTK] The SSB resource set should not be ignored, as the UE needs to measure the SSB first and then measure the CSI-RS. (Some discussions are ongoing in RAN4.)We understand that the intention of this sentence is to ensure the RS type of the measured and compared beams is consistent. However, this consistency should be captured elsewhere, not in the resource configuration for measurement.[Rapp] Note that an editor’s note has been captured for this. Let’s wait for R1’s further progress and then think about where the change should be made.  |
| Rapp17 | Field description for ltm-NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceToAddModList | [BaiCell] There is no  *ltm-CSI-RS-ResourceToAddModList* and *ltm-CSI-RS-ResourceSetToAddModList* in above LTM-Candidate. Should they be *ltm-NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceToAddModList* and *ltm-NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSetToAddModList*?[Rapp] Yes, you are correct.  |
| Rapp18 | MeasTrigger quantity | [VIVO] Now only L1-RSRP is agreed.[OPPO] L1-SINR measurements for event triggered reporting is still FFS in RAN1.[Rapp] We can say that when the IE is configured under LTM-ReportConfig, only the field rsrp is applicable.@OPPO, i think RAN1 has already agreed to not to support SINR |
| Rapp19 | Repetition in CSI resource config | [Ericsson] Again, we think we should wait for RAN1 before doing this change.[Rapp] For this, i think, there is clear R1 agreement. See the reason for change 8. |

***Proposal1: Discuss whether ltm-CSI-RS-ReportConfigToAddModList should only be configured on SpCell.***

## B.2 Discussions

During R2#129, regarding to the configuration of event-triggered periodic report, we have agreed that 

Note that in the legacy spec, the candidate values for report intervals are as follows:

ReportInterval ::= ENUMERATED {ms120, ms240, ms480, ms640, ms1024, ms2048, ms5120, ms10240, ms20480, ms40960, min1,min6, min12, min30 }

Companies are invited to answer the following question

***Question2: What should be the additional candidate values for report interval for event-triggered periodic report for LTM?***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **What should be the additional candidate values? (e.g., 10ms, 20ms)** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | ms20, ms60 | Since in this case we are working with unfiltered measurements, it would be good to have timer to triggers values which are a bit shorter than the ones we have for legacy L3 measurements. Since we have 2 spare values available, our proposal would be to use these to add 20ms and 60ms as new values. |
| MediaTek | ms20, ms60 | Share the same view as above. |
| Xiaomi | ms20, ms40 | Agree that we can have shorter values. We may consider values compatible with L1 LTM CSI reporting periodicities defined in LTM-CSI-ReportConfig-r18 🡪 reportSlotConfig-r18.CSI-ReportPeriodicityAndOffset ::= CHOICE { slots4 INTEGER(0..3), slots5 INTEGER(0..4), slots8 INTEGER(0..7), slots10 INTEGER(0..9), slots16 INTEGER(0..15), slots20 INTEGER(0..19), slots40 INTEGER(0..39), slots80 INTEGER(0..79), slots160 INTEGER(0..159), slots320 INTEGER(0..319)} |
| CATT | NA | The motivation to have additional values is not clear to us.[Rapp] The reason is that people think the current values are too large for LTM. But anyway, this has already been agreed.ReportInterval ::= ENUMERATED {ms120, ms240, ms480, ms640, ms1024, ms2048, ms5120, ms10240, ms20480, ms40960, min1,min6, min12, min30 } |
| vivo | ms20, ms60 | We are open to have shorted *ReportInterval* and the exact value can be futher discussed. |