[94e-31-RAN2-AdHoc-April] - Version 0.0.3
RAN

GPP TSG RAN Meeting #94-e **RP-213608**

Electronic Meeting, December 06 - 17, 2021

Agenda Item: 5.2

Source: RAN2 Chair (MediaTek Inc)

Title: Moderator's summary of discussion [94e-31-RAN2-AdHoc_April]

Document Type: Report

Document for: Discussion & Decision

1 Introduction

This discussion treats the proposal in the RAN2 report RP-212644 on Slide 11, to have a RAN2 ad-hoc meeting in April for Rel-17 ASN.1 review.

2 The proposal

Ad-hoc Scope: NR ASN.1 review (including NR+LTE parts but not EUTRA-specific parts), TBD whether NR UE caps would be included (beyond ASN.1 review).

Ad-hoc GTW session: April 20, 21, 22: 3h + 3h + 1h, likely no parallel session, the last session April 22 will only be used if needed.

Ad-hoc to approve and send LSes, and make endorsements (for final approval at RAN2 118)

Ad-hoc submission April 19 or April 14 (TBD), (TBD to what extent tdocs invitation is pre-coordinated).

Preparation email discussions (at least for collecting comments) up to ad-hoc. Deadline TBD

TS baseline available: TBD

Request to TSG RAN 94e: Confirm the ad-hoc and high level plan

Feedback Form 1: High level comments on having an ad-hoc meeting (or not).

1 – MediaTek Inc.

R2 Chair (moderator): ASN.1 review is normally a major offline effort. Discussion online at GTW sessions would simplify the work, and ease the total effort compared to offline alternative. In a second pass ASN.1

issues are also expected to be treated at RAN2-118 (the May meeting).

2 – Ericsson LM

We support having an ad-hoc.

It is going to be easier to discuss some of the more complicated issues in a GTW-format rather than having to send an end-less series of emails. So having an ad-hoc with GTW will likely reduce the total workload for the delegates, and also improve the end spec quality.

3 – Motorola Mobility UK Ltd.

We agree on the AH meeting and high level plan. We agree with rapporteur that the AH session should focus on the more complicated issues. Therefore, we suggest that the rapporteur should provide the list of issues which will be treated in the AH (of course this depends on the outcome of comments made during the ASN.1 review phase 1 and their classification).

4 – VODAFONE Group Plc

We support that such an ad hoc is held (although we are unlikely to be an active participant, sorry).

5 – Apple Switzerland AG

We support the ad-hoc for NR ASN.1 review to be held in April.

6 – CATT

We support such plan as outline by R2 Chair.

7 – Futurewei Technologies

We agree that an ad-hoc for ASN.1 review is helpful.

8 – Samsung Electronics Co.

We support the ad-hoc meeting and high level plan from RAN2 chair.

9 – vivo Mobile Communication Co.

Traditionally, RAN2 has ad-hoc ASN.1 reveiw meeting. We see that it is useful. We also support ad-hoc ASN.1 meeting for R17.

10 – DOCOMO Communications Lab.

We support having an ad-hoc meeting and high level plan from R2 Chair.

11 – DENSO CORPORATION

Agree to plan the AH meeting and focus on the key issues that has to be discussed on-line (e.g. class 3 issues).

12 – QUALCOMM JAPAN LLC.

We support the proposal.

13 – Fujitsu Limited

We support the proposal from RAN2 Chairman.

14 – Spreadtrum Communications

We support the ad-hoc meeting for NR ASN.1 review.

15 – NEC Corporation

We support to have an ad-hoc meeting especially to discuss the ASN.1 review issues.

16 – HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.

Huawei, HiSilicon we are fine to have the adhoc in April for the sake of progress.

17 – Nokia Corporation

RAN2 has often used ASN.1 AHs and we do not doubt it can help the RRC work, but the only reason this is needed is because RANP has not been able to guarantee a reasonable workload and RAN1 is always late with their input. If the AH is seen needed, we can accept it but this is clearly yet another symptom of the overload experienced in RAN2.

It could have been better to have the ASN.1 AH only in June after the RAN2 May meeting, but that seems impossible given the timing of RAN2#118e and RAN#96.

Feedback Form 2: Scope of the Ad-hoc.

1 – MediaTek Inc.

R2 Chair (Moderator): The main scope should be ASN.1 review, and the Ad-hoc need to be able to treat the relevant incoming LSes and send outgoing LSes asking questions. All other desicions can be confirmed at the regular May meeting. Any further scope details can be refined at TSG RAN in March if needed.

2 – Ericsson LM

We think the proposed scope looks fine.

We do not see a need to already not exclude treatment of any ASN.1 review related issues for capabilities.

3 – Motorola Mobility UK Ltd.

We agree on the proposed scope. NR UE caps issues can be discussed in the AH if deemed necessary.

4 – VODAFONE Group Plc

Agree with Motorola.

5 – Apple Switzerland AG

R2 chair's proposal looks fine.

6 – CATT

Agree with Chair's proposed scope.

7 – Futurewei Technologies

Agree with RAN2 chair's scope proposal.

8 – Samsung Electronics Co.

Agree with the proposed scope from RAN2 chair.

9 – vivo Mobile Communication Co.

We also support the scope proposed by chair.

10 – DOCOMO Communications Lab.

We agree with the proposed scope from R2 Chair.

11 – DENSO CORPORATION

Agree. The capability aspects could be discussed if deemed as necessary.

12 – QUALCOMM JAPAN LLC.

We support the proposal. ASN.1 review should be higher priority. Non-ASN.1 related UE capability discussion should be treated only if time permits.

13 – Fujitsu Limited

We support the scopes given by RAN2 Chairman. If the progress of the ASN.1 discussions is better than expected, non-ASN.1 related UE capability may be considered in the AH meeting.

14 – Spreadtrum Communications

We agree with the proposed scope from RAN2 chair.

15 – NEC Corporation

We agree with the proposed scope. Basically discussion should focus on the ASN.1 review with one exception (UE capability issue which needs to be solved urgently).

16 – HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.

Huawei, HiSilicon We think the discussion should focus on ASN.1, and UE capability should also be one aspect to be discussed in the ad-hoc. In our understanding RAN1 will continue updating their feature list in Q1 and Q2, and RAN4 would start feature list discussion in Q1 and will continue their update in Q2. Thus in Q2 it is expected that there would be considerable amount of workload to make UE capability updated in RAN2 specifications, which is complicated and time consuming as usual. Therefore discussion at least on UE capability ASN.1 is seen useful and should be considered. We think the discussion should exclude any stage 3 remaining issues for any Rel-17 topics, we should focus on ASN.1 and UE capability which have already reached consensus.

17 – Nokia Corporation

The AH scope should be limited to critical ASN.1 aspects only. For LSs, only LSs related to RRC parameters should be handled.

Since the meeting time is short, the number of at-meeting email discussions should also be limited to the most critical issues, and most aspects can be done in post-meeting emails.

Feedback Form 3: Time-line and Organization

1 – MediaTek Inc.

R2 Chair (Moderator): Proposal as above, Ad-hoc April 20, 21, 22. tdoc submission deadline either April 14 or 19 (no strong view). One GTW session per day. Before the ad-hoc, issues need to be collected, sorted and the more serious issues are up for on-line discussion at the ad-hoc.

2 – Ericsson LM

The proposed schedule looks fine.

Regarding the submission deadline, we think we must have at least one day of review, preferably two. Hence we prefer to have the submission deadline on the 14th to allow some time for review of the papers. To have the deadline on the 19th will give almost no time for review/internal checking and without this we may not be able to reach agreements.

3 – Motorola Mobility UK Ltd.

The proposed time line of the AH looks also fine with us. On the submission deadline we suggest a deadline already on the 12th April due to Easter holidays (mainly in Europe) and the phasing of the ASN.1 review should be adjusted accordingly.

4 – Apple Switzerland AG

The ad-hoc meeting time line looks fine. On submission deadline, April 14 is preferred to allow more time to review.

5 – CATT

On timeline -> we also think it's better to leave a bit more room for review, as there will be many details and a lot of x-topic checking.

On orginazation -> we think one TBD above, i.e., (TBD to what extent tdocs invitation is pre-coordinated) can be important, for two reasons, i.e., 1) coordinated submission saves a lot of effort in discussing and coverging the differnet propsoals for the same part of the spec, and b) to some extend it saves companies effort in preparing and reviewing a large number of Tdocs.

6 – Futurewei Technologies

The proposed timeline looks reasonable, and we agree with other companies that an earlier submission deadline is better to give time for companies to review submissions.

7 – Samsung Electronics Co.

We are also fine with the proposed timeline, and share the view with many others that April 14 is preferred to have enough time for review.

8 – vivo Mobile Communication Co.

Timeline is fine for us. we perfer April 14 as Tdoc submission deadline.

9 – DOCOMO Communications Lab.

We are also fine with the proposed timeline, and share the view with many others that April 14 is preferred to have enough time for review.

10 – DENSO CORPORATION

The timeline looks O.K. April 14 is desirable for everyone to review tdocs before the start of the AH meeting.

11 – QUALCOMM JAPAN LLC.

Support the proposal, but suggest we be flexible going forward to accomodate needs from the RRC specification rapporteur.

12 – Fujitsu Limited

The timeline is fine with us. We prefer April 14 as the tdoc submission day.

13 – Spreadtrum Communications

The timeline is fine for us, and we agree with other companies that April 14 is preferred as submission deadline to have enough time for review.

14 – NEC Corporation

Ad-hoc meeting on 20,21 and 22 are fine. Regarding the tdoc submission deadline, we think 14th is much better than 19th to check the input in advance.

15 – HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.

Huawei, HiSilicon We support to have only one GTW session per day, because to further split parallel sessions do not help as experts on ASN.1 or UE CAPA are the same from companies. We are fine to have 3 days ad-hoc and we prefer the submission on April 14th. Maybe it should be first clarified when we would start this ASN.1 review process and decide which is the most suitable date for tdoc submission. In our view, we think the following could be a candidate time plan:

1. 11 March: WI specific RRC CRs approved
2. 21 March: Review kick-off (this gives the rapporteur 1 week to prepare the combined specs, not sure if that is sufficient, but it does not have to be error-less at this stage)
3. 1 April: Deadline for the review comments (this gives two weeks for the review)
4. 8 April: Rapporteur's summary available (this gives rapporteur 1 week to prepare it)
5. 14 April: submission deadline (4 days to draft Tdocs, which is not much but there is also Easter in Europe which, depending on the country means 15 April (Friday) and/or 18 April (Monday) off.

If one week is not enough to prepare the combined specs, then we could shorten the review part to 1.5 weeks (and extend time to prepare specs to 1.5 week as well)

16 – Nokia Corporation

April 19th as deadline is not useful as companies will not have had time to read the contributions by the time the meeting starts, so it may be even counter-productive as ASN.1 aspects often require careful scrutiny. April 14th should be used as deadline.

We would also note that there are in practice no inactive periods before or after the ASN.1 AH for RAN2, which would be good to acknowledge to give the correction impression that RAN2 is working more than other WGs.

3 Conclusion

This discussion can be closed after the initial Round. There is no need to determine now whether UE caps shall be part of the scope or other further details of the ad-hoc. Detailed plan will be settled later, e.g. detailed agenda for the ad-hoc is expected as part of the ASN.1 review plan to be discussed in RAN2 in Q1 2022. For information: Huawei provided a potentially reasonable detailed time line in one comment above.

Outcome of initial Rnd: There was wide support and no objection to plan for the proposed ad-hoc.

Proposal

The plan for a RAN2 ad-hoc in April 2022 is confirmed / endorsed, with the following:

- Ad-hoc Scope: NR ASN.1 review (including NR+LTE parts but not EUTRA-specific parts), TBD whether NR UE caps would be included (i.e. beyond ASN.1 review of NR UE caps signalling).
- Ad-hoc to treat input tdocs, and to treat, approve and send LSes (e.g. for asking questions) within the scope of the Ad-Hoc. Endorsements (of TPs, Draft CRs, CRs) are subject to final approval/agreement at RAN2 118.
- Ad-hoc GTW sessions: April 20, 21, 22 (e.g. 3h + 3h + 1h), the last session April 22 will only be used if needed.
- Ad-hoc tdoc submission deadline: April 14