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# 1 Introduction

This document is to kick off the following email discussion:

* [AT111-e][210][DCCA] Other DCCA Corrections (Ericsson)

Scope:

* + - Collect companies’ feedback for the contributions under 6.8.1 and 6.8.3.3 marked for this email discussion
    - Proponents may provide updated versions (if needed) under this email discussion (Tdoc numbers can be requested for this purpose from the session chair or the RAN2 secretary)

Intended outcome:

* + - Discussion summary in [R2-2008140](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_111-e/Docs//R2-2008140.zip) (by email rapporteur).
    - Session chair proposes agreements after the summary report is available

Deadline for providing comments, for rapporteur inputs, conclusions and CR finalization:

* + - Deadline for companies' feedback: Thursday 2020-08-20 09:00 UTC
    - Deadline for rapporteur's summary (in [R2-2008140](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_111-e/Docs//R2-2008140.zip)): Friday 2020-08-21 09:00 UTC
    - Deadline for CR finalization (for agreed CRs): Thursday 2020-08-27 07:00 UTC

# 2 Discussion

To make it easier to find the correct contact delegate in each company for potential follow-up questions, the rapporteur encourages the delegates who provide input to provide their contact information in this table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Delegate contact |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ZTE | LiuJing (liu.jing30@zte.com.cn) |
| Jarkko | Jarkko Koskela (Jarkko.t.koskela@nokia.com) |
| Huawei | David Lecompte (david.lecompte@huawei.com) |
| NEC | Hisashi Futaki (hisashi.futaki[at]nec.com) |
| Qualcomm | Peng Cheng (chengp@qti.qualcomm.com) |
|  |  |

Companies are requested to add their comments for each of the treated CRs of this email discussion in the boxes below.

## 2.1 General and Stage 2 Corrections

[R2-2007690](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_111-e/Docs//R2-2007690.zip) Correction on power coordination in NR-DC Huawei, HiSilicon CR Rel-16 37.340 16.2.0 0224 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

*Rapporteur comment: Minor addition that maximum power is coordinated between MN and SN in NR-DC. Rapporteur proposes this could be added to 37.340 rapporteur CR.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree CR? (Yes or No) | Comments |
| ZTE | Yes | Would be fine to include it in the Rapporteur CR. |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| Huawei | Yes (proponent) |  |
| NEC | Yes | can add this in Rapp CR |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Agree with rapporteur |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

[R2-2006897](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_111-e/Docs//R2-2006897.zip) CR to 37.340 on SCG resume procedure ZTE Corporation, Sanechips CR Rel-16 37.340 16.2.0 0217 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

*Rapporteur comment: Agree to the principle of CR, but some questions arise:*

*- In updated figure 10.12.2-3, the box 11b is not needed. In figure 10.12.2-2, the box 8 is used to simplify the figure by hiding the resume signalling. In figure 10.12.2-3, the signalling is explicitly shown.*

*- In figure 10.12.2-2 RRCReconfiguration is used in the figure between the MN and the UE, whereas the describing text uses RRCConnectionReconfiguration. We should probably update these at the same time and align with wording in figure 10.12.2-3, which uses both NR and EUTRA cases.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree CR? (Yes or No) | Comments |
| ZTE | Yes (proponent) | Regarding the question from the Rapporteur.   1. Agree, box 1b should be removed. 2. Agree to align 10.12.2-2 with 10.12.2-3, thanks for checking. |
| Nokia | Yes | Agree with rapporteur comment. |
| Huawei | Yes | By the way, you could use MSC generator for the modified figure, which is gradually used in all RAN2 specifications |
| NEC | Yes | Agree with Rapporteur |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Agree with rapporteur comment. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 2.2 CA aspects (related to RAN1-led features)

[R2-2007221](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_111-e/Docs//R2-2007221.zip) Adding enableDefaultBeamForCSS for cross-carrier scheduling with different SCS vivo CR Rel-16 38.331 16.1.0 1803 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

*Rapporteur comment: Agree to the principle of the CR, but impact analysis is missing!*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree CR? (Yes or No) | Comments |
| ZTE | Yes with changes | According to 38.214, RAN1 spec already defined the UE behaviour when the the field is absent. Considering the field description includes a reference to RAN1 spec, we think the statement of “if not present, Rel-15 behaviour is used” can be removed .   |  | | --- | | ***enableDefaultBeamForCCS***  This field indicates whether default beam selection for cross-carrier scheduled PDSCH is enabled, see TS 38.214 [19]. ~~If not present, Rel-15 behaviour is used.~~ |   In addition, RAN1 spec added “[ ]” to the field name, because they think the field name can be determined by RAN2. We prefer to rename the field into “enableDefaultBeam-ForCCS” to align with other similar fields, but no strong view.  enableDefaultBeamPL-ForPUSCH0-r16 ENUMERATED {enabled} OPTIONAL, -- Need R  enableDefaultBeamPL-ForPUCCH-r16 ENUMERATED {enabled} OPTIONAL, -- Need R  enableDefaultBeamPL-ForSRS-r16 ENUMERATED {enabled} OPTIONAL, -- Need R |
| Nokia | Yes | Agree with rapporteur comment. |
| Huawei | Yes | (the dash mentioned by ZTE seems was used to separate the parameter from the physical channel/signal, this is not just because of the word "For", so suggest not to do this) |
| NEC | Yes | slight preference is to capture the case of “if not present” (but it may need to be reworded), as this is to be added with Need S. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | For ZTE comment, we think the presence condition can be captured because RAN1 LS explicitly indicated this condition.  However, as NEC mentioned, the wording pf presence condition needs refined, e.g.  "If not present, the default beam selection behaviour is not applied, i.e. Rel-15 behavior is applied" |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

[R2-2007008](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_111-e/Docs//R2-2007008.zip) Correction on the Field Description for Field Using SetupRelease Structure CATT CR Rel-16 38.331 16.1.0 1769 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

*Rapporteur comment: The CR proposes to replace “present/included” with “configured” in the field description for fields of SetupRelease type, referring to the agreement last meeting to “Remove conditional presence for SetupRelease fields and move the intended network behaviour to field description”. Reason for change mentions that “It is ambiguous whether the descriptions prevent the release of the field.” It is not clear what is meant with this and whether the proposed changes are really needed?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree CR? (Yes or No) | Comments |
| ZTE | Yes with comments | We understand the intention of the CR is clarify that network is allowed to provide the field (e.g. set to release) when the condition is not fulfilled. For instance, for T316 timer, when network releases the split SRB1 or SRB3, network may want to release T316 configuration in the same message. But seems the “present” disallows network to include the field (even if the field is set to “release”).  “This field can be present only if the UE is configured with split SRB1 or SRB3”  The similar clarification has been discussed before (for several fields), and most of them are concluded to be included in Rapporteur CR. So we are fine with the correction, but prefer to include in Rapporteur CR. |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| Huawei | Yes | but in the field description of outsideActiveTimeConfig, "confiugred" should be changed to "configured" |
| NEC | Yes | good to add into the Rapp CR |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Agree with rapporteur’s comments. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

[R2-2007882](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_111-e/Docs//R2-2007882.zip) Clarification on CA slot offset configuration MediaTek Inc. CR Rel-16 38.331 16.1.0 1941 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

*Rapporteur comment: Agree to the principle of the CR. Another way could be to define the restriction to SCell addition in the field condition, e.g. “This field is mandatory present for SCell addition whose slot offset between the SpCell is not 0. Otherwise it is absent, Need S.”*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree CR? (Yes or No) | Comments |
| ZTE | Yes | The correction in the CR looks simpler than adding a new condition. |
| Nokia | Yes | It’s just aligning with the principle that SCells cannot be changed very dynamically for the “fundamental” configurations (e.g. PUCCH group) but must be done with release and add |
| Huawei | Not sure | If the intention is what said by Nokia, we agree but the proposed description is not clear.  What is the intention at SCell reconfiguration? That the network always repeats the value provided at SCell addition? Or that the network does not repeat the value and the UE remembers it? |
| NEC | Yes | agree with the intention |
| Qualcomm | Yes | We agree the intention, i.e. it can’t be reconfigured on-the-fly  We also prefer the correction of the CR, instead of adding new condition. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

[R2-2006886](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_111-e/Docs//R2-2006886.zip) Add tdm-PatternConfig-r16 in the inter-node message Google Inc. CR Rel-16 36.331 16.1.1 4361 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

*Rapporteur comment: AS-Config-v1550 already includes the TDM pattern. The Rel-16 field was added to allow setting the TDM pattern also in RRCResume message (in addition to RRCReconfiguration), but it uses the same Rel-15 definition. There is only one TDM pattern per UE, either tdm-PatternConfig or tdm-PatternConfig2.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree CR? (Yes or No) | Comments |
| ZTE | See comment | Not sure whether the intention is to capture below new tdm-PatternConfig2 in INM? We understand RAN2 defined separate fields in RRCConnectionReconfigration message for different purpose. If this is the intention of CR, it is better to make it clear in field descriptions.  We also wonder whether the network(target cell) can obtain this information from other configuration?   |  | | --- | | ***tdm-PatternConfig***  This field is used when power control or IMD issues require single UL transmission in (NG)EN-DC as specified in TS 38.101-3 [101] and TS 38.213 [88]. | | ***tdm-PatternConfig2***  This field is used for dual UL transmission in EN-DC with LTE FDD PCell and for single UL transmission in EN-DC with LTE FDD/TDD PCell, as specified in TS 38.101-3 [101] and TS 38.213 [88].  The network sets at most one of *tdm-PatternConfig* and *tdm-PatternConfig2* to setup.  When this field is configured in EN-DC with LTE TDD PCell, it is not applicable if TDD configuration is sa0 or sa6 in SIB1. | |
| Nokia |  | Agree with rapporteur. |
| Huawei | Yes | but also agree with ZTE that we need to clarify the field descriptions. Minor comment: the newly imported type could be used also for the existing field. |
| NEC |  | similar view as Rapporteur, while want to know better real intention for this, e.g. as commented by ZTE, and whether actually it is needed? |
| Qualcomm |  | Same view as Rapporteur |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 2.3 Fast MCG recovery

[R2-2007683](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_111-e/Docs//R2-2007683.zip) Correction on SCG RLF detection while MCG is suspended Huawei, HiSilicon CR Rel-16 38.331 16.1.0 1880 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

*Rapporteur comment: The CR may not necessarily be needed, as the UE will anyway trigger the RRC re-establishment, but for clarity it could be good to align with other sections of the spec.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree CR? (Yes or No) | Comments |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes | Aligning different sections is desirable as proposed by rapporteur |
| Huawei | Yes (proponent) |  |
| NEC | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Ok to align with other spec |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

[R2-2007686](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_111-e/Docs//R2-2007686.zip) Miscellaneous corrections for fast MCG link recovery Huawei, HiSilicon CR Rel-16 36.331 16.1.1 4398 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

*Rapporteur comment: Not needed. Regarding the three proposed changes:*

*- Fast MCG link recovery is already defined in 37.340, is there really a need to add the reference here?*

*- The check that MCG is not suspended is already performed in 38.331 clause 5.7.3.2, so there is no need to add here.*

*- There is no reason for change for the last change to remove the check for t316 running before triggering MCG failure information.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree CR? (Yes or No) | Comments |
| ZTE | Yes for 2nd change;  No for 3rd change. | For 1st change, tend to agree with Rapporteur that it seems trivial by only adding a reference here.  The 2nd change looks fine to us, although it is mentioned in TS 38.331, maybe it is better to align the wording in TS 36.331.  We disagree to the 3rd change. The intention of that sentence is to avoid double triggering. |
| Nokia | No | Agree with rapporteur comments. Specifically, we think there exists no valid reason for the last change, that could be added to the coversheet. |
| Huawei |  | About rapporteur's comment to 2nd change: with the same argument, one should remove "when NR SCG transmission is not suspended" because the check is also in 5.7.3.2. We should have either the full condition or no condition.  About t316: does it mean the UE continues RLM after RLF has occurred? |
| NEC | No | agree with Rapporteur, do not see necessity |
| Qualcomm | No | Agree with rapporteur |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

[R2-2007687](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_111-e/Docs//R2-2007687.zip) Miscellaneous corrections for fast MCG link recovery Huawei, HiSilicon CR Rel-16 38.331 16.1.0 1883 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

*Rapporteur comment: Not needed. Regarding the three proposed changes:*

*- Fast MCG link recovery is already defined in 37.340, is there really a need to add the reference here?*

*- The check that MCG is not suspended is already performed in 36.331 clause 5.6.13.2, so there is no need to add here.*

*- The check whether t316 is running may be redundant, but there is no error in the current text.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree CR? (Yes or No) | Comments |
| ZTE | Yes for 2nd change;  No for 3rd change. | Same comments as above. |
| Nokia | No | Agree with rapporteur comments. |
| Huawei |  | About rapporteur's comment to 2nd change: with the same argument, one should remove "when E-UTRA SCG transmission is not suspended" because the check is also in 5.6.13.2. We should have either the full condition or no condition. |
| NEC | No | same as previous one |
| Qualcomm | No | Agree with rapporteur |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

[R2-2007279](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_111-e/Docs//R2-2007279.zip) Correction to field condition of refFR2ServCellAsyncCA Ericsson CR Rel-16 38.331 16.1.0 1823 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

*(moved from 6.8.3)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree CR? (Yes or No) | Comments |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| Huawei | Yes but | We entirely disagree with the problem because "when configuring" does not exclude the case that the gap pattern is already configured, so:  - nothing is broken  - this CR is totally NBC and there will be problems if implemented by the network and not the UE, while there is no problem if implemented by the UE and not the network (because the network will repeat the field).  That said, we think that it is strange that refFR2ServCellAsyncCA-r16 is Need R while refServCellIndicator is need M. Since NBC changes are acceptable now, we agree to make it need M as in the proposed text. But if the intention is "when the gap pattern is not already configured", it should be written.  However, we wonder why there is "Otherwise it is absent, need R" but "Otherwise ,it is absent" for refServCellIndicator. Should it not be the same for both? |
| NEC | Yes but | one question as from Huawei, why still „Need R“ is kept for *AsyncCA*? |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

[R2-2006780](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_111-e/Docs//R2-2006780.zip) Corrections to failure type for MCGFailureInformation and SCGFailureInformation Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd CR Rel-16 38.331 16.1.0 1737 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

*(moved from 6.8.3)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree CR? (Yes or No) | Comments |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Partially Yes | OK, seems in line with current 5.3.10.4 "RLF cause determination" - but for some reason the CR also contains many changes of ";" to "." that seem incorrect. |
| Huawei | Partially yes | Same view like Nokia |
| NEC | Yes | we suggested the same thing, so fine.  however, the cause value of “beamFailureRecoveryFailure” was introduced under SON/MDT WI, so good to add the SON/MDT WI code in the cover sheet and keep it separate from other CRs. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | We assume the changes of “;” to “.” are typos. Maybe Samsung can clarify |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 2.4 Other topics

[R2-2007681](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_111-e/Docs//R2-2007681.zip) Correction on storing SCG configuration in UE INACTIVE AS context Huawei, HiSilicon CR Rel-16 38.331 16.1.0 1879 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree CR? (Yes or No) | Comments |
| ZTE | Yes with changes | Agree the intention, to make it more clear, suggest to modifiy further as below (i.e. see green highlight).  3> store in the UE Inactive AS Context the current KgNB and KRRCint keys, the ROHC state, the stored QoS flow to DRB mapping rules, the C-RNTI used in the source PCell, the *cellIdentity* and the physical cell identity of the source PCell, the *spCellConfigCommon* within *ReconfigurationWithSync* of the NR PSCell (if configured) and all other parameters configured except for the ones within *ReconfigurationWithSync* of the PCell and of the NR PSCell (if configured), and except for the ones ~~or~~ within *MobilityControlInfoSCG* of the E-UTRA PSCell (if configured), and except for *servingCellConfigCommonSIB*; |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| Huawei | Yes (proponent) | Ok with ZTE's suggestion |
| NEC | Yes | fine with ZTE modifications |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Ok with ZTE suggestion |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

[R2-2006815](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_111-e/Docs//R2-2006815.zip) Clarifications on concept of suspend XCG transmission OPPO discussion Rel-16 LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

*Rapporteur comment: Discussion paper on whether further clarifications of the meaning of suspending MCG/SCG transmissions are needed in the MCG/SCG failure information procedures. RAN2 is requested to discuss whether new sections should be added to RLC and MAC specifications to describe MCG/SCG suspension. The contribution did not make any proposal on what the sections would include. Rapporteur considers such sections are not necessarily needed, as there are no protocol actions on RLC/MAC associated with the suspension of MCG/SCG transmission. But rapporteur is open for suggestions. If something is unclear, it would be good to clarify.*

*The proposals listed in the contribution are listed below for reference:*

**Proposal 1: “suspend MCG transmission……” means only suspend the RLC bearer for all SRBs and DRBs in MCG side.**

**Proposal 2: RAN2 is kindly asked to choose one option to address the confusion issue.**

**Option 1: add a definition in section 3.1 as:**

**MCG transmission:** the RLC bearer of one RB in MCG performs transmission.

**Option 2: capture the below changes in TS 38.331.**

|  |
| --- |
| 5.7.3 SCG failure information5.7.3.2 Initiation ==========omit some text========  Upon initiating the procedure, the UE shall:  1> suspend RLC bearer for all SRBs and DRBs in SCG;  1> reset SCG MAC;   1. stop T304 for the SCG, if running;   ==========omit some text======== |

|  |
| --- |
| 5.7.3b MCG failure information5.7.3b.2 Initiation A UE configured with split SRB1 or SRB3 initiates the procedure to report MCG failures when neither MCG nor SCG transmission is suspended, *t316* is configured, and when the following condition is met:  1> upon detecting radio link failure of the MCG, in accordance with 5.3.10.3, while T316 is not running.  Upon initiating the procedure, the UE shall:  1> stop timer T310 for the PCell, if running;  1> stop timer T312 for the PCell, if running;  1> suspend RLC bearer for all SRBs and DRBs in MCG, except SRB0;  1> reset MCG MAC;  ==========omit some text======== |

**Proposal 3: RAN2 is kindly asked to discuss whether a new section is needed in TS38.322/321 to captured behaviour description for RLC suspend, and/or MAC suspend.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| ZTE | Seems nothing is broken. Perfer not to over-specify it.  In addition, shouldn’t “suspend MCG transmission” also covers “stopping SR/SRS…. transmission in MCG”? |
| Nokia | We note that already at Initiation of LTE RRC Re-establishment, UE shall "suspend all RBs", without any further clarifications in other specs.  Proposal 1: We agree.  Proposal 2: Given our note above, we are not sure anything is needed, but of the provided Options 1 and 2 we prefer the latter.  P3 Given our note above, we are doubtful that anything would be needed in RLC/MAC specs. |
| Huawei | MCG is the CellGroupConfig with cell GroupId 0, so it seems rather clear actually. |
| NEC | agree with meaning of “suspend …” but nothing is really needed.. |
| Qualcomm | We also think nothing is broken. And we think what is "MCG transmission" seems to be common understanding in RAN2. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Conclusion
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