

3GPP TSG RAN #97e RP-222593 Electronic Meeting, 12 - 16 September 2022

Agenda Item:9.10

Source: Moderator (NEC)

Title: Moderator's summary for discussion [97e-33-TEI-Handling]

---

## 1 Introduction

After more than a year of experience in using the endorsed [1] (Handling of TEI CRs), discussion document [2] identified in RAN#96 a number of issues with the interpretation of [1], based on practical usage by delegates, Working Groups and WG Chairs over the past year, and proposed clarifications to remove misunderstandings.

At RAN#96 the result of the discussion on [2] was to request formal input for RAN#97e to update the rules for TEI CR handling.

Accordingly, Annex A of [3] is a "pCR" to RP-210826 [1] based on the discussion on [2] at RAN#96. After the Initial Round at RAN#97e, [3] was revised to RP-222610 [4].

The purpose of the discussion at RAN#97e is to endorse Annex A of [4], or a revision of it, in order to create an endorsed update (without revision marks) of [1] (Handling of TEI CRs).

---

## 2 Initial Round

### 2.1 Discussion

**Feedback Form 1: Do you agree to endorse the pCR in Annex A of [3]. to create an updated version of the rules on handling TEI, as currently endorsed in [1]?**

#### 1 – Ericsson LM

Thanks for preparing it. We are ok to endorse the updates, while doing so we can also take the opportunity to correct the the word "acknowledged", it should be "acknowledged". You find in the beginning of the last paragraph in the introduction part.

#### 2 – Nokia Corporation

We agree we should update the pCR, but we also found some minor typos in the latest version in [1] (see next question).

### **3 – CATT**

We agree to endorse these updated in Annex[3]. And we also agree with Nokia's comments on these typos. Besides these typos, there are two more tab spaces in section 2 E.3 which can be removed.

### **4 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software**

Also like to extend our thanks for addressing this. We note that due to editing particularities there are a number of tabs/spaces in particular within section 2 sub-bullets E1, E2 and E3 which require cleaning up? we also observed some additional clean up editorial aspects.

### **5 – ZTE Corporation**

We agree to endorse the pCR (taking into account Nokia's comments)

### **6 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd**

Thanks for providing this update. We agree to endorse the pCR with the various editorial comments as mentioned by others.

### **7 – HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.**

[Huawei] We agree to endorse the pCR with the various editorial comments.

**Feedback Form 2: If the answer to the previous question is "No", what changes are needed to the pCR in Annex A of [3] to be able to endorse it?**

### **1 – Nokia Corporation**

We found some minor typos that could be fixed in the pCR:

Section 1: justifaction → justification

Section 1: achnowledged → acknowledged

Section 3: TEIx\_Test → TEIxx\_Test (just to use the same pseudo-ID consistently within the document)

Section 3: idendifiers → identifiers

Section 3: necessary → necessary

Section 3: lile → like

### **2 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software**

If we're going there then maybe consider the following in addition to the above, section 2 & 3 sub bullets

E.2 "follow-up Cat.F/A CRs without" → "follow-up **TEI** cat.F/A CRs without" also, "follow-up Cat.F/A CRs require" → "follow-up **cat.F/A** CRs require"

E2. "original Cat.B/C CRs" → "original **cat.B/C** CRs"

E.3 "WG chairman reports report" -> "WG chair(s) report" (seems sufficient given the explanation in section 3 regarding how this can be carried out, and I also note the use of chairman and chairmen throughout the document which is an antiquated way to address our leadership.)

### 3 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software

maybe a proposed CR can be placed in the drafts folder for the next round?

## 2.2 Summary after Initial Round

All companies that commented agree to endorse the pCR, but request to correct a number of spelling mistakes and other editorials in addition. It was also requested to correct the use of "chairman" and "chairmen" in line with inclusive language.

---

## 3 Intermediate Round

### 3.1 Discussion

The pCR has been updated in RP-222610 [4], taking into account all comments from the First Round.

Note: To check the correctness of tabs and spaces, please view this document in "no markup" mode.

Proposal: To endorse the updated pCR in Annex A of RP-222610 [4] and, as a result, create an endorsed and new clean version of RP-210826 [1] for use by delegates, WGs, TSG-RAN, and officials.

**Feedback Form 3: Do you have any further comments? No comment means you agree to endorse the updated pCR in Annex A RP-222610 [4] without further need for changes.**

### 1 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software

Regarding RP-222610, a couple of minor checks from me. Honestly I think is in good shape but considering how polished this is now these are really minor for your consideration, I definitely wont object if you choose to leave as is.

E.3 I see you kept the "**reports report**", rather than just "**WG chairs reportsreport to TSG RAN**", even though the description of how reporting may be provided is elaborated in section 3 E.3. I only mention to check this was intentional and not a miss understanding regarding my previous comment? No quarrel either way.

A couple of other very small editorials, again happy to have noted and certainly not convinced an update is required if this is all there is,

Section 3 E2 there seems to be one missing tab in the 2nd sub-bullet, "CRs in later meetings use" requires a tabs before "meetings"

Same section sub bullet 3 "Cat.F/A CRs" à "cat.F/A CRs"

A couple of formatting “tabs” missing from the second sub-bullet under the tabular examples following section 3 E.3,

- 2 tabs to add and 2 tabs to delete (underline emphasis added) from, “also to list cat.F/A TEI CRs to correct formerly as cat.B/C TEI introduced features (corresponding CRs will have [ ] at the end of the Tdoc title and CRproponents will inform the WG”

very polished, already

## 2 – CATT

Thanks for updating the pCR. It looks good. But I still have two small comments:

1. There are some manual line breaks in several places which break one sentence into several parts. E.g. E.1 in section 2, E.1 in section 3. It is better to remove them.
2. The full point in D2 in section 3 are duplicated. One can be removed.

## 3 – NEC Europe Ltd

Thanks to Xiaomi and CATT for pointing out several editorials.

To Xiaomi:

\* Regarding the E3 “**reports report**”, it is intentional. Although the text still says that the WG Chair can report the way (s)he wants, in practice we want to see that the WG Chairs’ **reports** include the relevant information. So, indeed the **reports report** (formulation may be a little clumsy but it’s clear and it’s like that in the original text; I only corrected for inclusive language).

\* Regarding Section 3 E2: ack on the tab before “meeting” and changing Cat to cat for consistency, if a further update is made.

\* Regarding Section 3 E3: ack on the need of correcting the tabs, if a further update is made.

To CATT:

\* Regarding point 1.: If I look in the “no markup” view (i.e. the view with all changes accepted), the manual breaks in E.1 in sections 2 and 3 look exactly as they should be. It is only when revision marks are visible that it looks wrong. For the pCR we need the revision marks, but it should eventually (after accepting the changes) be correct, and I believe that is the case.

\* Regarding point 2.: I think you mean the “: \*: ” sequence in the original text (both in sections 2 and 3). If a further update is made I can take care of removing the “\*:” leaving only one colon “:”.

#### **4 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software**

to NEC thanks for the confirmations in particular regarding ”reports report” :)

#### **5 – NEC Europe Ltd**

Small correction regarding CATT point 2.: The ”\*” refers to a point earlier in the text, so I will change to ”\*NOTE: ” instead.

I consulted Joern (MCC). A ’pCR’ can formally only be used for specifications. Instead, at Joern’s advice, this document shall be a full replacement of RP-210826, with both a version with revision marks compared to that endorsed document and a clean version. I have been allocated RP-222624 for that document, which is then intended to be endorsed (and thus replace RP-210826).

Since, based on Joern’s feedback, I have to adapt RP-222610 anyway, I will include the updates requested. I will also remove the ’cover sheet’ part of RP-222610 (without revision marks) and just leave a document header for this meeting and the updated version of RP-210826 with and without revision marks for endorsement.

#### **6 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd**

Document looks in good shape. Thanks

### **3.2 Summary after Intermediate Round**

Only a number of additional editorial issues were identified.

Following offline consultation with MCC, an update of RP-222610 will in any case be needed because it shall be a complete replacement of RP-210826, not a ”pCR” as the moderator had originally planned.

The update in RP-222624 addresses the above editorial issues and is provided both as a version with revision marks to RP-210826 and a clean version.

---

## **4 Final Round**

There is no need for a Final Round in NWM.

### **4.1 Discussion**

There is no need for a Final Round in NWM.

## 4.2 Summary after Final Round

There is no need for a Final Round in NWM.

---

## 5 Overall summary/conclusion

Moderator's recommendations:

- To endorse RP-222624
- To apply the updated requirements/rules/guidance aspects of section 2 and 3 in RP-222624 starting after RAN #97e

Status of other related documents:

- RP-222593 (this document): can be noted
- RP-221935: revised to RP-222610
- RP-222610: revised to RP-222624

---

## 6 References

- [1] RP-210826 Handling of TEI CRs ETSI MCC
- [2] RP-221821 Reminder of TEI handling NEC
- [3] RP-221935 Handling of TEI CRs NEC
- [4] RP-222610 Handling of TEI CRs NEC