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# 1 Introduction

This document comprises the contents of the following email discussion:

* [AT109e][101][RACS] Stage 2 CRs (Mediatek)

Intended outcome: Agreed 36.300 and 38.330 CRs, also taking into account proposals in [R2-2000939](file:///C:\Data\3GPP\Extracts\R2-2000939%20-%20Generic%20stage-2%20description%20for%20RRC%20segmentation.docx)

Deadline: Friday 2020-02-28 12:00 CET

Status: Started

The rapporteur requests that comments to this document be made available **24h before the deadline** (i.e. Thursday 2020-02-27 12:00 CET) to allow time for editing the CRs.

# 2 Discussion

## 2.1 Generic description of segmentation

It is proposed in [1] to migrate the description of uplink segmentation into the TEI16 CRs for downlink segmentation, thus introducing a single generic description covering segmentation in both directions.

**Question** 1**: Companies are requested to provide their views on merging into a generic stage 2 description of RRC segmentation, and if done, how it should be handled.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **CATT** | Since the UL segmentation is part of this WI, it is better to capture segmentation in the stage 2 CR in this WI. It also can capture DL part in the same CR to avoid extra description and clashing.  So we propose to have general description in stage 2 RACS CR. |
| **Nokia** | Generic description is fine. |
| **Apple** | Agree with CATT proposal to have a generic description in the stage 2 RACS CR. |
|  |  |

## 2.2 Any other issues

Any additional comments on the stage 2 CRs in [2] and [3] are invited.

**Question** 2**: Companies are requested to provide any other comments on the RACS stage 2 CRs.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **Ericsson** | We have no further comments on top of for the above issue. Our views on the issue above should be clear as it is our contribution. |
| **Nokia** | 7.X Segmentation of RRC messages An RRC message may be segmented in case the size of the encoded RRC message PDU exceeds the maximum PDCP SDU size. Segmentation is performed in the RRC layer using a separate RRC PDU to carry each segment. The receiver reassembles the segments to form the complete RRC message. All segments of an RRC message are transmitted before sending another RRC message. Segmentation is supported in both uplink and downlink.  In this version of the specification, segmentation applies only to the *UECapabilityInformation*, *RRCReconfiguration* and *RRCResume* messages. |
| **Apple** | In section 7.x, for the sentence *“An RRC message sent may be segmented in case the size of the encoded RRC message PDU exceeds the maximum PDCP SDU size*” do we need the word “sent” ? This seems to be a remnant of the previous UL description and actually the segmentation is done before sending.  Instead the following description seems sufficient.  *“An RRC message may be segmented in case the size of the encoded RRC message PDU exceeds the maximum PDCP SDU size.”* |
|  |  |

# 3 Conclusion

[To be populated]
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