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# 1 Introduction

This paper aims to capture the discussion report on the below offline discussion:

* [AT131][103][MOB] (Vivo)

      **Scope:** Discuss and conclude MAC-26, MAC-27, MAC-28, MAC-29, MAC-30, MAC-31, and P2 in R2-2505926.

      **Intended outcome:** Discussion summary in R2-2506213.

**Deadline: 1000 – 1100 (8/26 Tuesday, main session room)**

# 2. Discussion

## 2.1 Inter-CU LTM

2.1.2 MAC-26 REAMBLE\_POWER\_RAMPING\_COUNTER with two TAGs

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Index** | **Issue description** | **Rapporteur suggestion** |
| MAC-26 | **How to consider the TAG ID when determining whether to set the *REAMBLE\_POWER\_RAMPING\_COUNTER* to 1 for an (C)LTM candidate cell which is configured with two TAGs in RACH-less (C)LTM**[Rapp]: In RACH-less (C)LTM, for an (C)LTM candidate cell which is configured with two TAGs, TAG ID is not considered when determining whether to set the *REAMBLE\_POWER\_RAMPING\_COUNTER* to 1. Rapporteur realized the same issue exists for Rel-18 LTM, which was missing.  | **Issue Type:** Not essential but important**How to address it:** based on companies’ contribution |

Based on the input, there are the following options for MAC-26 open issue that whether to set the *REAMBLE\_POWER\_RAMPING\_COUNTER* to 1 for an (C)LTM candidate cell which is configured with two TAGs in RACH-less (C)LTM:

* Option 1: *REAMBLE\_POWER\_RAMPING\_COUNTER* is set to 1 when TAG changes. (4/8 companies).
	+ 1 company thinks only Rel-19 LTM could apply this principle, while no impact to Rel-18 LTM.
	+ 1 company further considers the missing case of this initial transmission of PDCCH order for new TAG, *REAMBLE\_POWER\_RAMPING\_COUNTER* should also be set to 1 for the retransmission of PDCCH order.
* Option 2: TAG ID is not considered when determining whether to set the *REAM-BLE\_POWER\_RAMPING\_COUNTER* to 1. (4/8 companies)

The following were proposed on this issue:

|  |
| --- |
| **Option 1: *REAMBLE\_POWER\_RAMPING\_COUNTER* is set to 1 when TAG changes.****R2-2505098 Lekha Wireless Solutions**  Proposal 4: ...If TAG changes from last RA attempt, set counter to 1; else maintain as per existing rules.**R2-2505349 Fujitsu** Proposal 3 (MAC-26): To support RACH towards a CLTM candidate cell configured with two TAGs, REAMBLE\_POWER\_RAMPING\_COUNTER is set to 1 when TAG changes.Proposal 3bis (MAC-26): TAG change will not be considered when determining whether to set the REAMBLE\_POWER\_RAMPING\_COUNTER to 1 for RACH towards an intra-CU LTM candidate cell configured with two TAGs (i.e. no modification to Rel-18 MAC spec).**R2-2505399 vivo** Proposal 2: [MAC-26] The PREAMBLE\_POWER\_RAMPING\_COUNTER should be set to 1 if the PDCCH order indicates preamble re-transmission associated with a TAG different from the TAG within the same (C)LTM candidate cell to which the UE performed the last Random Access Preamble transmission.**R2-2505167 CATT** Proposal 2 (MAC-26): When network triggers PDCCH order to another TRP of the same candidate cell while the early TA acquisition of one TRP is ongoing, it should indicate preamble initial transmission in the PDCCH order.**Option 2: TAG ID is not considered when determining whether to set the *REAM-BLE\_POWER\_RAMPING\_COUNTER* to 1****R2-2505893 Huawei**Proposal: (MAC-26) When the candidate cell is configured with two TAGs, there is no additional MAC impact for the early RACH procedure.**R2-2505945 CMCC**Proposal 7：For RACH-less intra-/inter-CU LTM and Conditional intra-CU LTM with two TAGs, TAG ID is not considered when determining whether to set the REAM-BLE\_POWER\_RAMPING\_COUNTER to 1.**R2-2505517 OPPO** Proposal 4: In case that the candidate cell is configured with 2TAGs, the TAG ID is not considered when performing power ramping during the RACH either for early UL sync or LTM execution.**R2-2506141 ZTE**Proposal 2 (MAC-26) For an (C)LTM candidate cell configured with two TAGs, the TAG ID is not considered when determining whether to set the REAMBLE\_POWER\_RAMPING\_COUNTER to 1. No change to the current spec. |

Based on above, rapporteur has re-structure the below proposal for discussion.

**Proposal 1: PDCCH order will indicate preamble initial transmission when TAG ID has changed, in this case REAMABLE\_POWER\_RAMPING\_COUNTER is set to 1.**

**Proposal 2: RAN2 discuss whether to set the REAMBLE\_POWER\_RAMPING\_COUNTER to 1 for an (C)LTM candidate cell which is configured with two TAGs in RACH-less (C)LTM,** **if the PDCCH order indicates preamble re-transmission associated with a TAG different from the TAG within the same (C)LTM candidate cell to which the UE performed the last Random Access Preamble transmission.**

**e.g.**

- T1: PDCCH order for cell1 TAG1

- T2: PDCCH order for cell1 TAG2 – initial tx // this one is missing at UE.

- T3: PDCCH order for cell2 TAG2 – retx

**Discussion on P1**

* Samsung not sure whether need this. this is transparent to UE. if NW indicate the initial tx, counter will be set to 1.
* Qualcomm think this is NW behaviour.
* **Rapp suggest: RAN2 understands that it is up NW whether to indicate preamble initial transmission in PDCCH order when TAG ID has changed. No spec impact.**
* Samsung thinks no need to confirm.
* Ericssson support samsung

**Discussion on P2**

* Samsung: UE has no information on which TAG is associated. it is up to NW to indicate the initial or retx. one option is UE may know the TAG ID with the associated TCI state, but which is not agreed.
* Samsung think even without set counter to 1, there is no big problem.
* Apple agrees with Samsung. UE just follows the NW indication.
* ZTE think UE only increase the counter when SSB is not changed.
* MTK support Apple, it only impact the early TA.
* CATT, Nokia, HW agree with Samsung. there is no big problem.
* **Rapp: MAC-26 is closed.**

2.2 L1 event triggered measurement reporting

2.2.1 MAC-27 Behaviour upon Beam Failure on SpCell

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Index** | **Issue description** | **Rapporteur suggestion** |
| MAC-27 | **Whether/how to cancel the triggered Event Triggered L1 MR, and whether/how to reset TTT upon beam failure**[Rapp]: New added based on Anil’s comments.Sine the event triggered MR procedure is triggered based on the current beam, the procedure may be cancelled upon the beam failure on the SpCell. The TTT also may be stopped.i.e. the following may be needed. Upon beam failure on the SpCell:1>cancel, if any, triggered Event Triggered L1 Measurement Report;1>reset TTT for event triggered L1 measurement report triggering condition evaluation;Since it is not discussed an FFS may be added and this issue can be added in open issue list. | **Issue Type:** Not essential**How to address it:** can be discussed based on companies’ contribution |

Based on the input, there are the following options for MAC-27 open issue that whether/how to cancel the triggered Event Triggered L1 MR, and whether/how to reset TTT upon beam failure:

* Option 1: No impact on event triggered L1 MR upon beam failure on SpCell (3/5 companies)
* Option 2: Having impacts on event triggered L1 MR upon beam failure on SpCell, including cancel the triggering MR and reset the TTT (2/5 companies)

The following were proposed on this issue:

|  |
| --- |
| **Option 1: No impact on L1 MR procedure** **R2-2505135 Xiaomi** Proposal 1: (MAC-27) Specification changes are not needed for event triggered L1 MR upon beam failure on SpCell.**R2-2505482 Apple** Proposal 3: There is no impact on event triggered L1 MR procedure when beam failure is detected.**R2-2506140 ZTE Corporation, Sanechips** Proposal 4: (MAC-27) Upon beam failure on the SpCell, the UE shall not cancel the triggered L1 MR procedure and not reset TTT. No change to the current spec.**Option 2: L1 MR is impacted** **R2-2505787 Ofinno** Proposal 5: On detecting beam failure on SpCell, cancel the triggered L1 MR and reset TTT.Proposal 6: Upon detecting beam failure on SpCell, the UE stops performing L1 measurement evaluation.**R2-2506149 Samsung**  Proposal 2: RAN2 to discuss the behavior of any trigged L1 MR during beam failure and recovery on the SpCell: a. Cancel the triggered L1 MR. b. Send the triggered L1 MR. Proposal 3: RAN2 to discuss the behavior of TTT for L1 MR during beam failure and recovery on the SpCell: a. UE resets TTT for L1 MR. b. TTT is continued if the condition is satisfied with the new beam. |

Based on above, rapporteur has re-structure the below proposal for discussion.

**Proposal 3a: (MAC-27)** **No impact on event triggered L1 MR procedure when beam failure is detected.**

**Proposal 3b: (MAC-27)** **Upon the beam failure on SpCell, cancel the triggered L1 MR, reset TTT, and stop evaluating the L1 measurement.**

**Discussion on P3**

* Xiaomi, Nokia, lenovo thinks that MR will be reported after BFR. support 3a.
* Samsung asks if there is new beam satisfied/not satisfied.

|  |
| --- |
| **Offline agreement:*** **No impact on event triggered L1 MR procedure when beam failure is detected.**
 |

2.2.1 P2 in R2-2505926

Lenovo thinks it is not clear the meaning of the Type 4 beam, they proposed in R2-2505926 that about the Type 4 beam type, the current definition captured in MAC CR is:

***“…it is set to 11 to indicate the RS(s) not satisfying the event for the entire TTT, if configured by network by allowReportAnyBeam specified in TS 38.331 [5], i.e. the RS(s) with Type set to neither 00, 01, nor 11”***

Not satisfying the even for "entire" TTT can possibly mean two things:

1. The RS has entered reporting range, but TTT is still running
2. RS has not even entered the reporting range and therefore the "***not satisfying the event for the entire TTT***" can be said to be true (below “Trigger Condition” in Figure 1)

And propose:

|  |
| --- |
| **Lenovo Proposal 2: Type 4 beams are the RS for which TTT has been started but it is still running at the time of reporting.** |

**Discussion:**

* NEC ask what is the intention.
* Lenovo explains current spec means Type II includes any beam.
* Nokia is not OK with this type of beam with TTT and without TTT. When satisfying event, it could be considered. Type II should be the beam satifies the event but TTT is running.
* Ofinno agree with Nokia. not understand the lenovo’s intention.
* Ericsson support the current defination of type II. NW can configure the max. number of beams.
* Lenovo want to clarify in the MAC that truncated MAC CE is used if max. number of beams have not been included in the MAC CE.
* Ericsson ZTE think truncated MAC CE will be used only when grant is not enough for the triggering beam, which has been agreed, but not include/consider the beam with type II.

Rapp: **Truncated event-triggered L1 measurement report MAC CE can be used when the available grant is not sufficient to accommodate the normal measurement report MAC CE plus subheader.**

* Samsung confirms the previous agreement is correct. Xiaomi, OPPO, LG, Ericsson agrees.
* Lenovo, MTK, Qualcomm, Nokia, NEC want to exclude Type II.

|  |
| --- |
| **Offline agreement:*** **RAN2 will keep the current definition of Type II in MAC, i.e. any beam.**
 |

2.3 Conditional intra-CU LTM

2.3.2 MAC-28 Condition on RACH-less CLTM fallback to RACH-based CLTM

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Index** | **Issue description** | **Rapporteur suggestion** |
| MAC-28 | **During CLTM is ongoing, after the first transmission, if TAT timer expires while RACH-less LTM is ongoing, if UE based TA is valid, whether/how to fallback.**[Rapp]: New added based on Lenovo’s comments. | **Issue Type:** Not essential **How to address it:** based on companies’ contribution |

Based on the input, there are the following options for MAC-28 open issue that for the case after the first transmission, if TAT timer expires while RACH-less LTM is ongoing, if UE based TA is valid:

* Option 1: UE always fall back to RACH-based CLTM (3/5 companies)
* Option 2: UE fall back to RACH-less CLTM using UE based TA (2/5 companies)

The following were proposed on this issue:

|  |
| --- |
| **Option 1: UE always fall back to RACH-based CLTM** **R2-2505098 Lekha Wireless Solutions**Proposal 6: Upon TAT expiry during RACH-less CLTM execution, the UE shall initiate a random access procedure (preferably contention-free) to re-establish uplink timing, ensuring sync reliability.**R2-2505278 Xiaomi**Proposal 2: (MAC-28) During CLTM is ongoing, after the first transmission, if TAT timer expires while RACH-less LTM is ongoing, irrespective of whether the UE based TA is valid or not, fallback to RACH-based CLTM.**R2-2505584 LG**Proposal 3. [MAC-28] UE follows the PDCCH order based TA for the case that both PDCCH order based TA and UE based TA are available upon CLTM execution.Proposal 4. [MAC-28] During CLTM is ongoing, after the first transmission, if TAT timer expires while RACH-less LTM is ongoing, fallback to RACH-based CLTM even if UE based TA has been obtained.**Option 2: UE fall back to RACH-less CLTM using UE based TA****R2-2505098 Lekha Wireless Solutions**Proposal 7: Upon TAT expiry during RACH-less CLTM, the UE may continue transmissions if local TA validation (e.g., via downlink timing tracking) confirms TA remains within allowed tolerance; otherwise, trigger RA.**R2-2505696 Lenovo**Proposal 4: During CLTM is ongoing using TA from MAC CE, after the first transmission, if the TAT timer expires while RACH-less LTM using TA from MAC CE is ongoing, UE can fall back to RACHless CLTM using UE based TA. |

Based on the inputs from companies’ contributions, it seems most companies except the proponent prefer not consider UE based TA when UE performs RACH-less CLTM based on PDCCH ordered TA.

Based on above, rapporteur has re-structure the below proposal for discussion.

**Proposal 4a: (MAC-28) During CLTM is ongoing, after the first transmission, if TAT timer expires while RACH-less LTM is ongoing, UE always fall back to RACH-based LTM regardless whether UE based TA is valid.**

**Proposal 4b: (MAC-28) During CLTM is ongoing, after the first transmission, if TAT timer expires while RACH-less LTM is ongoing, UE falls back to RACH-less LTM if UE based TA is valid.**

**Discussion:**

* Huawei ask why not re-est. it is similar as RACH-based RACH. it is simpler.
* Samsung think we already have option 1. lenovo’s proposal has been discussed in last RAN2 meeting. This is not real scenario.
* ZTE thinks UE based TA is enabled by RRC. it may happen. Rapp agree. ZTE thinks the smart UE will not perform UE based TA if there is TA from NW. MTK is not sure about this.
* Ericsson, MTK support 4a.
* Lenovo is fine to follow majority.
* Xiaomi, vivo support 4a. vivo think this case could happen.

|  |
| --- |
| **Offline agreement:*** **During CLTM is ongoing, after the first transmission, if TAT timer expires while RACH-less LTM is ongoing, UE always fall back to RACH-based LTM regardless whether UE based TA is valid or not.**
 |

After official offline, Samsung suggests to update it as:

* When TAT expires after the 1st UL tx during the ongoing RACH-less CLTM based on network configured TA, UE does not fall back to RACH-less CLTM based on UE based TA.

Rapporteur thinks it is OK, then, the offline agreement is updated as:

|  |
| --- |
| **Offline agreement:****When TAT timer expires after the first transmission during the ongoing RACH-less CLTM based on network configured TA, UE does not fallback to RACH-less CLTM based on UE based TA, i.e. UE always falls back to RACH-based LTM.** |

2.3.3 MAC-29 CLTM candidate configuration reconfigured/released

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Index** | **Issue description** | **Rapporteur suggestion** |
| MAC-29 | **When CLTM candidate configuration is reconfigured/released, whether/how to handle the stored TA value and the running TAT for the corresponding candidate cell.**[Rapp]: New added based on Offinno’s comments. | **Issue Type:** Not essential **How to address it:** based on companies’ contribution |

Based on the input, there are the following options for MAC-29 open issue that when CLTM candidate configuration is reconfigured/released, whether/how to handle the stored TA value and the running TAT for the corresponding candidate cell:

* Option 1: Stop the *ltm-Candidate-TimeAlignmentTimer* and release the stored TA value for the candidate cell if the corresponding CLTM candidate configuration is released. (5/6 companies)
* Option 2: Keep running the *ltm-Candidate-TimeAlignmentTimer* for the candidate cell if the corresponding CLTM candidate configuration is released. (1/6 companies)

The following were proposed on this issue:

|  |
| --- |
| **Option 1：Stops the *ltm-Candidate-TimeAlignmentTimer* and release the stored TA value for the candidate cell if the corresponding CLTM candidate configuration is released.** **R2-2505160 MediaTek**Proposal: The stored TA value for an LTM candidate cell should be released, and the corresponding TAT stopped, when the candidate cell is removed from the LTM candidate list.**R2-2505278 Xiaomi**Proposal 3: (MAC-29) When CLTM candidate configuration is reconfigured/released, the UE shall remove the stored TA value and stop the running TAT for the corresponding candidate cell.**R2-2505483 Apple**Proposal 2: Reconfiguration of a CLTM candidate cell does not affect C-TA value and C-TATimer status associated with the candidate cell in MAC.Proposal 3: Releas of a CLTM candidate cell will cause MAC to delete C-TA value and C-TATimer associated with the candidate cell.**R2-2505519 OPPO**1. The *ltm-Candidate-TimeAlignmentTimer* is stopped if corresponding LTM candidate config is released.

**R2-2505788 ofinno**Proposal 5: Stop TA timer for a CLTM candidate cell when the candidate cell configuration corresponding to the CLTM candidate cell is released.**Option 2: Keep running the *ltm-Candidate-TimeAlignmentTimer* for the candidate cell if the corresponding CLTM candidate configuration is released.****R2-2505584 LG****Proposal 5. [MAC-29] The corresponding TAT keeps running if the candidate cell is released.** |

It seems most companies agree to stop the *ltm-Candidate-TimeAlignmentTimer* and release the stored TA value for the candidate cell if the corresponding CLTM candidate configuration is released, and no enough inputs on the UE behaviour when CLTM candidate configuration is reconfigured.

Based on above, rapporteur has re-structure the below proposal for discussion.

**Proposal 5a: (MAC-29)** **Stop the running *ltm-Candidate-TimeAlignmentTimer* and release the stored TA value for the candidate cell if the corresponding CLTM candidate configuration is released.**

**Proposal 5b: (MAC-29)** **Stop the running TAT for the corresponding candidate cell and release the stored TA value if the corresponding CLTM candidate configuration is reconfigured.**

**Discussion on 5b:**

* OPPO lenovo Nokia asks why stop TAT when reconfigured. Nokia think if the candidate configure is reconfigured, we donot need to do anything.
* Huawei think this is just to modify the configuration. NW could change the configuration. support 5b
* Samsung also support 5b.
* MTK suggest to add “if the candidate ID is not included”
* OPPO Ericsson suggest to add “**if the PCI for the candidate has been changed.**” Ofinno support the modified. Huawei think PCI is not enough. we need to include the frequency. we shouldl say if the NW doesnot want to change the …
* LG think it is up to UE implementation how to understand the configuration. Nokia agrees.
* **Rapp: 4 companies supports the modified proposal.**
* HW suggest that UE do nothing and it is up to NW how/when to release the configuration.

|  |
| --- |
| **Offline agreement:*** **Stop the running ltm-Candidate-TimeAlignmentTimer for the corresponding candidate cell and release the stored TA value for the candidate cell if the corresponding CLTM candidate configuration is released.**
 |

2.3.4 MAC-30 MAC PDU acquisition for Msg3/A buffer in fallback scenario

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Index** | **Issue description** | **Rapporteur suggestion** |
| MAC-30 | **If RACH-less CLTM fallback to RACH-based CLTM is declared due to PTAG expiration, how does UE obtain the MAC PDU from HARQ buffer to Msg3/A buffer.**[Rapp]: New added based on OPPO’s comments. | **Issue Type:** Not essential **How to address it:** based on companies’ contribution |

Based on the input, there are the following options on obtaining the MAC PDU for RACH-based CLTM:

* Option 1: No need to obtain the MAC PDU stored in Msg3/A buffer in case RACH-less CLTM fallback to RACH-based CLTM and the *RRCReconfigurationComplete* message can be re-transmitted after the competition of the RACH procedure. (2/7 companies)
* Option 2: UE needs to obtain the MAC PDU stored in Msg3/A buffer in case RACH-less CLTM fallback to RACH-based CLTM. (5/7companies)
	+ Option 2-1: It’s up to UE implementation to obtain the MAC PDU for 1st UL transmission and store in the Msg3/A buffer. (1 company)
	+ Option 2-2: Rely on RLC retransmission to obtain the MAC PDU for 1st UL transmission and store in the Msg3/A buffer. (1 company)
	+ Option 2-3: From the HARQ buffer of the HARQ process used for the first initial uplink transmission to obtain the MAC PDU for 1st UL transmission. (2 companies)
	+ Option 2-4: From the multiplexing and assembly entity to obtain the MAC PDU for 1st UL transmission. MAC subPDU(s) carrying MAC SDU from the obtained MAC PDU in RACH-less CLTM cell switch procedure will be included in the multiplexing and assembly entity. (1 company)

The following were proposed on this issue:

|  |
| --- |
| **Option 1: No need to obtain the MAC PDU for RACH-based CLTM and the RRCReconfigurationComplete message can be re-transmitted after the competition of the RACH procedure.****R2-2505160 MediaTek**Proposal: For the scenario where RACH-less CLTM falls back to RACH-based CLTM, no additional specification is needed for UE behavior regarding the transmission of *RRCReconfigurationComplete* message.**R2-2505278 Xiaomi**Proposal 4: (MAC-30) If RACH-less CLTM fallback to RACH-based CLTM is declared due to PTAG expiration, the *RRCReconfigurationComplete* message can be re-transmitted after the competition of the RACH procedure.**Option 2-1: It’s up to UE implementation to obtain the MAC PDU for 1st UL transmission and store in the Msg3/A buffer.****R2-2505483 Apple**Proposal 4: To support the fallback from RACH-less CLTM CS to RACH-based CLTM CS procedure, it’s up to UE implementation to obtain the MAC PDU for 1st UL transmission and store in the Msg3/A buffer. **Option 2-2: Relys on RLC retransmission to obtain the MAC PDU for 1st UL transmission and store in the Msg3/A buffer.****R2-2505584 LG**Proposal 6. [MAC-30] When RACH-less CLTM falls back to RACH-based CLTM due to PTAG expiration, the transmission of the *RRCReconfigurationComplete* message relys on RLC retransmission.**Option 2-3: From the HARQ buffer of the HARQ process used for the first initial uplink transmission to obtain the MAC PDU for 1st UL transmission.** **R2-2505620 NEC**Proposal 2. (MAC-30) When fallback from RACH-less LTM to RACH-based LTM, the UE obtains MAC PDU from the HARQ buffer of the HARQ process used for the first PUSCH transmission of LTM, and stores the obtained MAC PDU in the Msg 3 buffer or Msg A buffer of the RA procedure. **R2-2505519 OPPO**1. During the RACH-based CLTM which fallback from RACH-less CLTM, the MAC entity performs the following steps when generating Msg3/MsgA payload:
2. obtain the MAC PDU (initial uplink transmission) from the HARQ buffer corresponding to CG based initial uplink transmission
3. indicate to the Multiplexing and assembly entity to include MAC subPDU carrying MAC SDU from the obtained MAC PDU
4. obtain the MAC PDU to transmit from the Multiplexing and assembly entity and store it in the MsgA/ Msg3 buffer.

**Option 2-4: From the Multiplexing and assembly entity to obtain the MAC PDU for 1st UL transmission. MAC subPDU(s) carrying MAC SDU from the obtained MAC PDU in RACH-less CLTM cell switch procedure will be included in the Multiplexing and assembly entity.****R2-2505349 Fujitsu****Proposal 4 (MAC-30): MAC subPDU(s) carrying MAC SDU from the obtained MAC PDU in RACH-less CLTM cell switch procedure will be included in the Multiplexing and assembly entity for the uplink transmission in a fallback RACH-based CLTM cell switch procedure.** |

Rapporteur understandings that in case 2-step RACH fallback to 4-step RACH, MAC PDU should be obtained from Msg.A buffer.

Based on above, rapporteur has re-structure the below proposal for discussion.

**Proposal 6: UE needs to obtain the MAC PDU to be stored in Msg3/A buffer in case RACH-less CLTM fallback to RACH-based CLTM.**

**Proposal 7: Discussion on the following options on how UE obtains the MAC PDU to be stored in Msg3/A buffer in case RACH-less CLTM fallback to RACH-based CLTM:**

* **Option 2-1: It’s up to UE implementation to obtain the MAC PDU for 1st UL transmission and store in the Msg3/A buffer. (1 company)**
* **Option 2-2: Rely on RLC retransmission to obtain the MAC PDU for 1st UL transmission and store in the Msg3/A buffer. (1 company)**
* **Option 2-3: From the HARQ buffer of the HARQ process used for the first initial uplink transmission to obtain the MAC PDU for 1st UL transmission. (2 companies)**
* **Option 2-4: From the multiplexing and assembly entity to obtain the MAC PDU for 1st UL transmission. MAC subPDU(s) carrying MAC SDU from the obtained MAC PDU in RACH-less CLTM cell switch procedure will be included in the multiplexing and assembly entity. (1 company)**

**Discussion:**

* QC asks what is the spec impact. it should be UE implementaiton.
* Samsung think we have explicitly capture this for 2-step fallback to 4-step RACH. we need to discuss whether to sent it to msg.3/A buffer. whether trigger retx in this case. if you want to send it earlier, we need to discuss it. Samsung think it is OK to leave it to HARQ retx. no need to spec anything in this case.
* OPPO think there is problem if we postponet the transmission. how to define the CLTM completion.
* **Rapp: who support to discuss it? or we will leave it to UE implementtion.**
* Samsung think we should follow the current MAC spec. we should not leave it to UE implementation.

After official offline

* Rapp: some companies further commented on this issue, and they think we need to capture something in the MAC to specify the behavour how/where to obtain the PDU. Otherwise, it doesn’t work according to the current specification. Rapporteur provides one updated proposal as below and the corresponding TP is provided below.

**Updated Proposal 6: If RACH-less CLTM fallback to RACH-based CLTM due to PTAG expiration and UL grant received in Random Access Response (i.e. in a MAC RAR) or in the uplink grant determined as specified in clause 5.1.2a for the transmission of the MSGA payload is large enough, MAC entity indicates to the Multiplexing and assembly entity to include MAC subPDU(s) carrying MAC SDU from the MAC PDU of the initial uplink transmission in the UL grant.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Alt1: // Captured in the procedure**5.4.2.1         HARQ Entity:For each uplink grant, the HARQ entity shall:1> identify the HARQ process associated with this grant, and for each identified HARQ process:2> if the received grant was not addressed to a Temporary C-RNTI on PDCCH, and the NDI provided in the associated HARQ information has been toggled compared to the value in the previous transmission of this TB of this HARQ process; or2> if the uplink grant was received on PDCCH for the C-RNTI and the HARQ buffer of the identified process is empty; or2> if the uplink grant was received in a Random Access Response (i.e. in a MAC RAR or a fallback RAR); or2> if the uplink grant was determined as specified in clause 5.1.2a for the transmission of the MSGA payload; or2> if the uplink grant was received on PDCCH for the C-RNTI in *ra-ResponseWindow* and this PDCCH successfully completed the Random Access procedure initiated for beam failure recovery; or2> if the uplink grant is part of a bundle of the configured uplink grant, and may be used for initial transmission according to clause 6.1.2.3 of TS 38.214 [7], and if no MAC PDU has been obtained for this bundle:3> if there is a MAC PDU in the MSGA buffer and the uplink grant determined as specified in clause 5.1.2a for the transmission of the MSGA payload was selected; or3> if there is a MAC PDU in the MSGA buffer and the uplink grant was received in a fallbackRAR and this fallbackRAR successfully completed the Random Access procedure:4> obtain the MAC PDU to transmit from the MSGA buffer.3> else if there is a MAC PDU in the Msg3 buffer and the uplink grant was received in a fallbackRAR:4> obtain the MAC PDU to transmit from the Msg3 buffer.3> else if there is a MAC PDU in the Msg3 buffer and the uplink grant was received in a MAC RAR; or3> if there is a MAC PDU in the Msg3 buffer and the uplink grant was received on PDCCH for the C-RNTI in *ra-ResponseWindow* and this PDCCH successfully completed the Random Access procedure initiated for beam failure recovery:4> obtain the MAC PDU to transmit from the Msg3 buffer.4> if the uplink grant size does not match with size of the obtained MAC PDU; and4> if the Random Access procedure was successfully completed upon receiving the uplink grant:5> indicate to the Multiplexing and assembly entity to include MAC subPDU(s) carrying MAC SDU from the obtained MAC PDU in the subsequent uplink transmission;5> obtain the MAC PDU to transmit from the Multiplexing and assembly entity.3> else if this uplink grant is a configured grant configured with *autonomousTx*; and3> if the previous configured uplink grant, in the BWP, for this HARQ process was not prioritized; and3> if a MAC PDU had already been obtained for this HARQ process; and3> if the uplink grant size matches with size of the obtained MAC PDU; and3> if none of PUSCH transmission(s) of the obtained MAC PDU has been completely performed:4> consider the MAC PDU has been obtained.3> else if the MAC entity is not configured with *lch-basedPrioritization*; or3> if this uplink grant is a prioritized uplink grant:4> if this uplink grant was received in a Random Access Response (i.e. in a MAC RAR); or4> if this uplink grant was determined as specified in clause 5.1.2a for the transmission of the MSGA payload:5> if the random access procedure was initiated due to expiry of *TimeAlignmentTimer* associated with PTAG after the initial uplink transmsission during the RACH-less CLTM cell switch, according to clause 5.y.3:6> indicate to the Multiplexing and assembly entity to include MAC subPDU(s) carrying MAC SDU from the MAC PDU of the initial uplink transmsission.4> obtain the MAC PDU to transmit from the Multiplexing and assembly entity, if any; |
| **Alt2: // Captured as a Note**NOTE: If the random access procedure is initiated due to expiry of *TimeAlignmentTimer* associated with PTAG after the initial uplink transmission during the RACH-less CLTM cell switch according to clause 5.y.3, and the UL grant received in Random Access Response (i.e. in a MAC RAR) or in the uplink grant determined as specified in clause 5.1.2a for the transmission of the MSGA payload is large enough, MAC entity indicates to the Multiplexing and assembly entity to include MAC subPDU(s) carrying MAC SDU from the MAC PDU of the initial uplink transmission in the UL grant. |

**2nd round discussion:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Offline agreement:** |

2.3.5 MAC-31 Activated candidate TCI state(s) for target cell

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Index** | **Issue description** | **Rapporteur suggestion** |
| MAC-31 | **Upon the CLTM execution, whether activated candidate TCI state(s), other than the TCI state associated with the triggered beam, should be deactivated or not.**[Rapp]: New added based on vivo’s comments. | **Issue Type:** Not essential **How to address it:** based on companies’ contribution |

The following were proposed on this issue:

|  |
| --- |
| **R2-2505278 Xiaomi****Proposal 5: (MAC-31) Upon the CLTM execution, activated candidate TCI state(s), other than the TCI state associated with the triggered beam, should be deactivated.****vivo (R2-2505401):****Proposal 4: Activated Candidate TCI state(s), other than the TCI state associated with the selected beam, should be deactivated upon CLTM procedure being triggered.** **R2-2505483 Apple****Proposal 5: Upone CLTM execution, all the activated candidate TCI state(s) other than the TCI state associated with the trigged beam should be deactivated.** **R2-2505584 LG****Proposal 7. [MAC-31] The UE deactivates the activated Candidate TCI state(s) other than the TCI state associated with the triggered beam upon CLTM execution.** |

Based on above, it could be observed that companies’ views are aligned on this issue. While for the issue that using the “selected beam” or “triggered beam”, rapporteur thinks the “triggered beam” could be only applied to L1 based CLTM while not applied to L3 based CLTM, thus using “selected beam” is more suitable. Rapporteur has re-structure the below proposal for discussion.

**Proposal 8: Upon CLTM execution, all the activated candidate TCI state(s) other than the TCI state associated with the selected beam should be deactivated.**

**Discussion:**

* HW Nokia think all TCI states should be deactivated, should be no exception. it is different from Rel-18.

After official offline:

* Rapp: in Rel-18, the corresponding conclusion was agreed in RAN1. In this RAN1 meeting, there is some discussion on this part. So rapporteur suggests to wait for the RAN1 discussion.

|  |
| --- |
| **Offline agreement:** |

2.4 IM resource and NZP CSI resource

2.4.1 MAC-20 (essential)

This issue was discussed during comeback:

|  |
| --- |
| **Comeback:** [Vivo]: After checking further, IM resource and NZP CSI resource cannot be configured for a CSI-RS resource configuration id. [Samsung]: Do not understand it. In legacy, it was already allowed. [Apple]: Understand Samsung’s concern, but it was RAN1 decision. [CATT]: Prefer to re-design the MAC CE to enable to include two CSI-RS resource configuration id. [Ericsson]: Do not see a need. Nothing is broken. Two MAC CEs can be sent. * **IM resource and NZP CSI resource cannot be configured for a CSI-RS resource configuration id.**
* **Will keep the current MAC CE format.**
 |

Some companies want to re-discuss it and try to include IM resource and NZP CSI resource in one activation/ deactivation MAC CE.

**Discussion:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Offline agreement:** |

# 3 Conclusion

Based on the discussion above, we have the following offline agreement:

**Proposal: RAN2 to agree the below offline agreement:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Offline agreement for Event triggered L1 measurement:*** **No impact on event triggered L1 MR procedure when beam failure is detected.**
* **RAN2 will keep the current definition of Type II in MAC, i.e. any beam.**

**Offline agreement for conditional intra-CU LTM:*** **When TAT timer expires after the first transmission during the ongoing RACH-less CLTM based on network configured TA, UE does not fallback to RACH-less CLTM based on UE based TA, i.e. UE always falls back to RACH-based LTM.**
* **Stop the running ltm-Candidate-TimeAlignmentTimer for the corresponding candidate cell and release the stored TA value for the candidate cell if the corresponding CLTM candidate configuration is released.**
 |

4 Reference

1. Xxxx