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# 1 Introduction

* [AT109e][214][NR MOB] Finalization of T312 for fast handover failure recovery (Samsung)

Scope:

* + - Agreeing on the proposals as per [R2-2002070](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109_e/Docs/R2-2002070.zip).
		- Discuss open items as per [R2-2002070](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109_e/Docs/R2-2002070.zip) to seek companies feedback on open issues NR T312.

 Intended outcome:

* + - Proposals with consensus that can be incorporated (if needed) in the running CR(s) (aim to agree to those over email)
		- List of remaining open issues that need to be pursued in next meeting (if any).
		- Issues that should no longer be pursued

 Deadline for providing comments and for rappporteur inputs:

* + - Companies input: Thursday, Feb. 27th 3:00 CET
		- Rapporteur proposals: Friday, Feb. 28th 12:00 CET
		- Comments on proposals’ wording, Monday March 2nd by 17:00 CET

# 2 Progressing on the Summary Report ([R2-2002070](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109_e/Docs/R2-2002070.zip))

**Agreements proposed to be agreed in this meeting**

**Recommended Proposal#1: RAN2 is requested to agree the proposals in [**[**R2-2000928**](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109_e/Docs/R2-2000928.zip)**] and adopt in running CR the proposed TP.**

**Q1: Do you agree to the recommended proposal#1?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **[YES/NO]**  | **If you object Proposal#1, then please provide the technical reason for objection** |
| OPPO | YES |  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |

**Recommended Proposal#2: RAN2 is requested to quickly check the two alternatives proposed in [**[**R2-2001623**](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109_e/Docs/R2-2001623.zip)**] and agree one of them.**

**Q2: Do you agree to the recommended proposal#2?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **[YES/NO]** | **If you agree with Proposal#2, please indicate the alternative you prefer and why?** |
| Apple | Yes | We prefer Alt 1, since it’s simpler than Alt 2. |
| Samsung | Yes | Both alternatives work. However, we prefer Alt 1 as it is simpler. We think it is fine in principle to use the undefined code point. |
| Lenovo | No | Neither of the 2 alternatives are acceptable:* Alt1 is not backwards-compatible.
* Alt2 by introducing new IE FailureReportSCG-NR-r16 creates unnecessary redundancy since it is mostly a copy of FailureReportSCG-NR-r15.
 |

Companies can provide view if they object the proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **If you object Proposal#2, then please provide the technical reason for objection** |
| OPPO | Since T312 expiry means early T310 expiry, we wonder whether UE can reuse the code point of t310-Expiry for reporting SCG failure.  |
| Lenovo | New Alt3 is proposed where the new failure type t312-Expiry-v16xy is introduced as Rel-16 NCE of failureType-r15 as shown below in red font color.FailureReportSCG-NR-r15 ::=     SEQUENCE {    failureType-r15                    ENUMERATED {                                          t310-Expiry, randomAccessProblem,                                          rlc-MaxNumRetx,                                          synchReconfigFailureSCG, scg-reconfigFailure,                                          srb3-IntegrityFailure},    measResultFreqListNR-r15               MeasResultFreqListFailNR-r15        OPTIONAL,    measResultSCG-r15                      OCTET STRING                       OPTIONAL,    ...,    [[ failureType-v16xy               ENUMERATED {t312-Expiry-v16xy}          OPTIONAL    ]]} |

**Open items proposed to be further discussed in this meeting**

**DISC S1\_1:** Whether configuration of T312 in the CHO event configuration is allowed? If allowed, then the trigger condition to start T312 **[**[**R2-2001609**](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109_e/Docs/R2-2001609.zip)**]**.

**Q3: Whether configuration of T312 in the CHO event configuration i.e. CHO-TriggerConfig-r16 is allowed?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** |  **[YES/NO]**  | **Please provide technical justification** |
| OPPO | NO | CHO event configuration is not used for measurement reporting and we fail to understand how T312 can improve CHO execution. |
| Apple | No | T312 mechanism is to avoid the missing of measurement report transmission and HO command reception. For CHO, there is no the measurement report transmission and no HO command reception during the CHO execution phase, then the T312 cannot bring any benefit.  |
| Samsung | Yes | We think T312 can complement failure handling for CHO and can be introduced to CHO event configuration i.e. T312 does not hinder with the CHO execution procedure. Currently, when RLF occurs for a UE configured with CHO and attemptCHO, it performs CHO execution if cell selected is a CHO candidate, or RRE otherwise. While CHO candidate evaluation, it is possible that on expiry of TTT, candidate cell does not fulfil the entry. In such cases, we think we can use T312 to recover from RLF faster. |

If your answer to Q3 is YES, such configuration should be allowed for both LTE and NR?

**Q4: Whether configuration of T312 in the CHO event configuration i.e. CHO-TriggerConfig-r16 is allowed for both LTE and NR?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** |  **[YES/NO]**  | **Please provide technical justification** |
| Samsung | Yes | It can be supported for both NR and LTE |
|  |  |  |

If your answer to Q3 is YES, such configuration should be allowed for both CHO and CPC?

**Q5: Whether configuration of T312 in the CHO event configuration i.e. CHO-TriggerConfig-r16 is allowed for both CHO and CPC ?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** |  **[YES/NO]**  | **Please provide technical justification** |
| Samsung | Yes | We see no issue in supporting it for both CHO And CPC |
|  |  |  |

If your answer to Q3 is YES, then the trigger condition to start T312 need to be specified.

**Q4: Do you agree with P2 from [**[**R2-2001609**](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109_e/Docs/R2-2001609.zip)**]? If no, then specify the trigger condition**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** |  **[YES/NO]**  | **If no, then specify the trigger condition** |
| Samsung | Yes | We propose to start T312 after the TTT of a CHO candidate is expired i.e. trigger condition for starting T312 is only after CHO execution condition is not fulfilled. Therefore, there is no impact to CHO execution If the serving cell does not recover during TTT of the CHO candidate + T312 duration, we think it is better to declare RLF faster and recover either through CHO execution (if 'attemptCHO' is configured) or through RRE. Waiting for T310 to expire/ other candidate cell to fulfil condition does not really help the user. |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Rapporteur Summary

[TBD]
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