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# Introduction

**Partial modification is not allowed**

**CB: # 124\_SNinitSNmod**

**- Check history**

**- spec text should clearly convey that partial modification is not allowed**

(E/// - moderator)

Summary of offline disc [R3-212763](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5C5088196%5CDownloads%5CInbox%5CR3-212763.zip)

# For the Chairman’s Notes

Propose the following:

R3-20xxxa, R3-20xxxc merged

R3-20xxxc rev [in xxxg] – agreed

R3-20xxxd rev [in xxxh] – agreed

R3-20xxxe rev [in xxxi] – agreed

R3-20xxxf rev [in xxxj] – endorsed

Propose to capture the following:

**Agreement text…**

**Agreement text…**

**WA: carefully crafted text…**

Issue 1: no consensus

**Issue 2: issue is acknowledged; need to further check the impact on xxx. May be possible to address with a pure st2 change. To be continued…**

# Discussion

## Issue 1

Companies acknowledged that partial success/failure is not allowed during SgNB initiated SgNB Modification procedure, i.e., for EN-DC the SN initiated SN modification procedure shall be failed by sending SGNB MODIFICATION REFUSE message once any of the E-RABs is not successfully modified.

In the legacy discussion, firstly [1] was agreed to support PDCP duplication with CA, then [2] was accepted to clarify the usage of EN-DC Resource Configuration initiated by addition procedure. Afterwards the issue of partial success was observed and corrected by clarifying the condition of included E-RABs within the *E-RABs Admitted To Be Modified List* IE for the SN initiated SN modification procedure. However, the following paragraph was not removed due to its introduction in [2]:

*For each E-RAB successfully modified or released as requested by the en-gNB, the MeNB shall inform the en-gNB, in the SGNB MODIFICATION CONFIRM message, the same value in the EN-DC Resource Configuration IE as received in the SGNB MODIFICATION REQUIRED message.*

The above implies that some of the E-RABs can be successfully modified or released in the procedure, which is contradicting with RAN3’s conclusion. Does company agree to remove this paragraph and keep the conclusion of partial success not being allowed in the SgNB initiated SgNB Modification procedure?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| E/// | Yes |
| NTTDOCOMO | Yes |
| Huawei | No, if the paragraph is removed, the requirement of using same value in the confirmed message is missing.  |
| ZTE | Yes, I think it is the intention of this CR. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Issue 2

If company does not agree to remove the above paragraph in [4][5], is there any way to solve the contradiction? Please give your proposal below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Huawei | Capture in chairman notes of the common understanding that partial success is not allowed. |
| ZTE | “**Partial modification is not allowed**” is already included in the chairman’s note. So, HW’s suggestion is feasible, but I do not think it is a good way.I try to provide a compromised suggestion, we have this CR and capture anther sentence “*The receiving node is not allowed to change the values of EN-DC Resource Configuration IE*.” in the Chairman’s note. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Conclusion, Recommendations

If needed
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