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# 1 Introduction

This document is the report of the following discussion:

* [POST125][019][NES] CR to 38.331 (Huawei)

Intended outcome: Agree to CR ([R2-2401877](file:///C:\Users\panidx\OneDrive%20-%20InterDigital%20Communications,%20Inc\Documents\3GPP%20RAN\TSGR2_125\Docs\R2-2401877.zip)) and RIL list ([R2-2401878](file:///C:\Users\panidx\OneDrive%20-%20InterDigital%20Communications,%20Inc\Documents\3GPP%20RAN\TSGR2_125\Docs\R2-2401878.zip))

Deadline: Short (March 7th, 21:00 UTC)

Please provide your comments by Thursday March 7th 12:00 UTC to allow some time for the rapporteur to update the CR before the deadline.

# 2 RRC CR for NES

The post-RAN2#125 RRC miscellaneous corrections CR for NES, a document for providing comments and the proposed RIL resolutions are provided in the discussion folder. Please don’t change the CR text or insert comments to the CR file. Please use the table below for comments and suggestions on procedures or wording changes for clarity of the CR tdoc. If you want to highlight several issues please use numbers so it is easier for the rapporteur to respond.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Detailed comments** | **Rapporteur response** |
| Ericsson | Why is the “of PCELL added” in procedures?  4> if NES mode indication is received from lower layers, indicating that the NES-specific CHO execution condition of the PCell is enabled; and  Mobility is always Pcell change and the NES specific conditions themselves are actually for candidate target RSRP and pending on PCell/SCell.  [Apple] Since CHO is only applied to PCell and PSCell, we understand the intention of the change is to preclude PSCell, which follows RAN1 agreement that DCI 2-9 for CHO is only applied to PCell.    Since IE PortIndexFor8Ranks is now used in more than one other IE it should be separated is independent IE together with description and field descriptions.  Field description of codebookSubConfig needs at least a reference where the applicable parameters are specified. Or, written restrictions here. | 1. It was based on RIL O500/O501. 2. I generally agree but since we have not discussed the capturing non-PMI-PortIndication-r18 I only adopted the wording from Nokia’s TP from R2-2401171 as a placeholder. We are still checking and would like to finalize the signaling in the next phase of the review. 3. We will add more descriptions of the restrictions and a reference to RAN1 spec. |
| Apple A001 | On the changes of CSI-ReportSubConfig-r18, we see Rapporteur changed the CHOICE structure for case 1a) and 1b). However, we think the following IEs are still missed for case 1a):  - codebook subset restriction,  - rank restriction  - N1, N2 if single panel codebook is configured and additionally Ng if multi-panel codebook configured  - twoTX-CodebookSubsetRestriction,  Please note that above IEs are mentioned in RAN1 sent excel.  =================  Update Apple2:  We just noticed Rapporteur added IE CodebookConfig in case 1a) with restriction only type1 codebook is configured. It included above missed parameters requested by RAN1. However, we still see below 2 issues:   1. Type 1 codebook of Multiple TRP is still allowed (i.e. typeI-SinglePanel-Group1-r17). It seems not support sub configuration. 2. Since MIMO is enhanced in each release, this IE CodebookConfig is increasing in each release. It may have forward compatibility issue.   [Nokia] We have sympathy for Apple comment. We would consider that it is best to raise new RIL (similar to N042 in the first round) about details of parameters. This may not be aligned with Ran1 agreement and some parameters are unnecessary in codebookConfig and some missing like Apple mentioned.  Also it might make sense to not include whole codebookConfig as indicated by Apple as well – sub-configuration don’t support all the possibilities. People could still have second look at our paper to Athens meeting. | We decided to include a legacy *CodebookConfig* with written restrictions to type1 not to copy paste all the parameters here. After discussions with RAN1 we think all the parameters needed are included in the legacy *CodebookConfig type1*. There is no need for the Rel-17 version as it is not allowed in our understanding. It is the same understanding as in the TP from R2-2401218 from Mediatek, just reusing the legacy IE. I do not see a forward compatibility issue, if RAN1 decided there is a restriction to these specific parameters no other ones from new releases can be added.  We will keep the current form for now and I encourage companies to check with their RAN1 colleagues. If any issues found please submit a new RIL. We still think the whole *CodebookConfig type1* is needed so either we go the way it is in the current CR or the way proposed by Mediatek, it is exactly the same. |
| Apple A002 | In field description of ***nesEvent***, Rapporteur added: “This field can only be configured for CHO….”. It is a little confusing.  Our understanding on the change is to clarify it is only applied to CHO but not CAPC. If our understanding is correct, we suggest to change it to “This field cannot be configured for CPAC”. | Your understanding is correct. “Cannot be configured for CPAC” is another option. |
| Apple A003 | Typo: -r18 should be removed.  NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceIndex-r18 ::= INTEGER (0..maxNrofNZP-CSI-RS-ResourcesPerSet-1-r18)  [CATT]: As we define a new parameter maxNrofNZP-CSI-RS-ResourcesPerSet-1 in Rel-18. It seems that the suffix is necessary and should not be removed. | Agree with CATT |
| CATT | As the new field cellDTXDRX-L1activation is introduced in Rel-18, we should add the suffix ‘–r18’ to this field.  cellDTXDRX-L1activation-r18 ENUMERATED {enabled} OPTIONAL, -- Need R | Agree |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3 NES RIL list

The proposed final RIL resolutions are provided in the discussion folder. As per the Chairlady’s guidance the WI RIL list check is only to confirm that the meeting agreements have been correctly captured, not for further comments on RILs. You can input in the table below if you have any comments to the capturing of meeting agreements in the RIL resolutions.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Detailed comments** | **Rapporteur response** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |