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# 1 Introduction

This tdoc provides the list RILs allocated to Gen/MULTI and multiple WIs, with related 38331 Rapporteur status setting and comments.

The yellow-marked columns reflect the RIL status at the end of RAN2#125he RIL list is based on Review file v212.

Below is RIL issues the Rapp did not sort out before kick-off of email discussion, that should be sorted out during the discussion:

1. B016: verify that main session agreement is implemented in WI CRs for ULTxSwitch, UECap, POS, SL
2. H502: Since FFS in “FFS SIB24 (for multicast in RRC\_INACTIVE) should not be supported”, kept the RIL ToDo.
3. B009: Verify that RIL solution is captured in UE Cap WI CR
4. E117: Should be captured in NES WI CR
5. E105: Not clear if 38331 impact, E105 might have been discussed in SL relay breakout session.
6. O310/O311: Spec impact and WI CR unclear
7. B014: Verify that RIL solution is captured in WI CRs for MBS, Slrelay

Remaining RILs with status ToDo are

|  |
| --- |
| E074 |
| E105 |
| H071 |
| H500 |
| O310 |
| O311 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Work Item** | **Status****before #125** | **Status after #125** | **WI CR to implement the RIL solution** | **38331 Rapp Comment****Main/common ASN1 session agreement** | **Description** | **Proposed Change** | **Comments** |
| Z420 | RedCap, CovEnh | ToDo | Agreed | CovEnh | Agreed in CovEnh WI session | In Rel-18 further NR coverage enhancements WI, SI request config for MSG1 Repetition (e.g. si-RequestConfigMSG1-Repetition and si-RequestConfigRedCap-MSG1-Repetition) has been introduced. The si-RequestConfigRedCap-MSG1-Repetition can be used for both RedCap UE and eRedCap UE (if applicable), but the eRedCap UE related description is missing. | Add “(e)” infront of RedCap. | LGE (Hanseul): Agree that it has not been determined whether the Msg1-based SI request with Msg1 repetition can be applied for eRedCap UE, this issue is already included in RRC open issue of CovEnh. Therefore, we suggest to handle this in CE session as an open issue (not as a RIL discussion), and implement the related behaviour based on the discussion in next meeting. Same comment for other related comments on for Msg1-based SI request for eRedCap UEs. Ericsson (WI Rapporteur): Agree that this requires further discussion since this was introduced within the context of coverage enhancements WI. We need to decide whether we should add “(e)” before “RedCap” and there is a need to introduce a separate parameter si-RequestConfigRedCap-MSG1 for eRedCap UEs. Considering that RedCap delegates should also be involved in the discussion, we suggest having a joint session with the delagates following the CE WI. |
| E156 | RedCap, CovEnh | Duplicate |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Duplicate |   |   |

 |  |  | Please see RIL Z420 |  |  |
| Z423 | RedCap, CovEnh | ToDo | Agreed | CovEnh | Agreed in CovEnh WI session | See Z420 | Change to: “an (e)RedCap” | LGE (Hanseul): Same comment with Z420, suggest to handle this as an RRC open issue in CE session. Ericsson (WI Rapporteur): This is similar to Z420. Agree that further discussion is required in a joint session with the CE WI |
| E157 | RedCap, CovEnh | Duplicate | Duplicate |   |   | Please see RIL Z423 |  |  |
| N003 | NES, NTN, ATG | Duplicate | Duplicate |  |  | Why ATG and NES (and NTN) J060written differently? If there is no need we should have similar handling for all e.g. have separate bullet 2> for all cases | separate NES barring procedural text to separate bullet (also add “; and” at end of NTN text) => 2> the UE is not capable of NES cell DTX/DRX; and | [Huawei - Rapporteur] We would like to emphasize that the wording in the current spec is not backwards compatible with legacy NTN, as explained in the comment for J060. The proposal to split as in J060 is one way to solve it. If some common solution is proposed for NTN, ATG and NES it needs to be discussed on the main session but keep in mind that NES barring works differently as a NES UE does not completely ignore the MIB cell barring which is reflected in the procedural text. |
| C621 | GEN | PropAgree | Agreed | Common ASN1 CR | Agree. Ok to add in 38331 Rapp CR | Miss the operation “, upon which the procedure ends” for ATG and NES related operations | Add the description “, upon which the procedure ends” in the below two “if” braches for consistency: “1> if the access is for ATG:” “1> if the UE supports NES cell DTX/DRX and it is in RRC\_IDLE or in RRC\_INACTIVE, or if the UE supporting NES cell DTX/DRX is in RRC\_CONNECTED while T311 is running:” | Nokia: Agree Huawei: Agree. |
| E105 | GEN | ToDo | ToDo |   | Main session Agreements:Alternative 1: Only direct path is part of MCG in 3GPP specifications with the corresponding change to 38.300 by CR rapporteur. Can include in the stage 2 description that direct and indirect path should be in the same gNB. Whether any stage 3 clarification are needed can be discussed in SL relay breakout session.38331 Rapp: Not clear if 38331 impact, as might have been discussed in SL relay breakout session. | The use of MCG here is wrong because for the case of MP, there are cases where the UE is connected to the same gNB via two different paths, but this does not imply that is in MR-DC. The definition from 37.340 clearly state that MCG is only for a UE in MR-DC:Master Cell Group: in MR-DC, a group of serving cells associated with the Master Node, comprising of the SpCell (PCell) and optionally one or more SCells. The adoption of this terminology may also modify the definition of MR-DC, which is something that is not preferable at this stage. | Delete “(i.e. MCG)” from the parts of text referred to SL MP and do not re-use, in general, MCG and SCG for SL MP. Try to find a new terminology for the specific case of SL MP |  |
| H502 | MULTI | ToDo | Agreed | Common ASN1 CR | ASN.1 review common session Agreement:Regarding SIBs introduced in R18 for on-demand SIB request in RRC\_CONNECTED: Adopt the TP in Annex A - SIB22 (for ATG) should not be supported- SIB23 (for SL positioning) should be supported- FFS SIB24 (for multicast in RRC\_INACTIVE) should not be supported - SIB25 (for NTN) should not be supported. | Should discuss what new SIBs can be reeuqested in RRC\_CONNECTED via dedicatedSIBrequest | SIB22 for ATG should be not supported SIB23 for SL positioning should be supported SIB24 for MBS multicast reception in RRC\_INACTIVE does not need to be supported SIB25 for NTN should not be supported |  |
| I051 | Multiple | ToDo | Agreed | Common ASN1 CR | ASN.1 review common session:Agree and include in rapporteur CR: Additional Rel-18 content in otherConfig in RRCReconfiguration when configured for the SCG. RIL proposal: idc-AssistanceConfig, multiRx-PreferenceReportingConfigFR2, ul-TrafficInfoReportingConfig, n3c-RelayUE-InfoReportConfig, successPSCell-Config, sn-InitiatedPSCellChange, ~~musim-GapPriorityAssistanceConfig, musim-CapabilityRestrictionConfig~~ | The field description needs to include all new Rel-18 configuration added (as currently it was only updated with UAV one) | Contains configuration related to other configurations. When configured for the SCG, only fields drx-PreferenceConfig, maxBW-PreferenceConfig, maxBW-PreferenceConfigFR2-2, maxCC-PreferenceConfig, maxMIMO-LayerPreferenceConfig, maxMIMO-LayerPreferenceConfigFR2-2, minSchedulingOffsetPreferenceConfig, minSchedulingOffsetPreferenceConfigExt, rlm-RelaxationReportingConfig, bfd-RelaxationReportingConfig, btNameList, wlanNameList, sensorNameList and, obtainCommonLocation, idc-AssistanceConfig, multiRx-PreferenceReportingConfigFR2, ul-TrafficInfoReportingConfig, n3c-RelayUE-InfoReportConfig, successPSCell-Config, sn-InitiatedPSCellChange, musim-GapPriorityAssistanceConfig, musim-CapabilityRestrictionConfig and uav-FlightPathAvailabilityConfig can be included. | [Huawei v158] For MUSIM, SN does not configure the UE with gap related config. So MUSIM related changes are not needed |
| B011 | GEN | PropAgree | Agreed | Pos, SL | ASN.1 review common session agreements:Ensure we follow the principle - when you a list that is not a addmodlist than all fields shouldn’t use need M or setuprelease (e.g. follow what is captured the guidance that is already in the specification). This should be followed by all WI rapporteurs. Fix the issues on incorrect use of IE types and need codes in lists by the respective WI-specific CRs (POS, SL) and how to capture will be left to WI rapportuers for SL and Positioning38331 Rapp: This RIL can be set to Agreed. | SRS-PosRRC-InactiveValidityAreaConfig-r18 is a list element and uses SetupRelease type. But SetupRelease type in a list element makes no sense acc. to how lists are used, see ASN.1 guideline A.3.10 (Guidelines on use of lists (without ToAddModList and ToReleaseList)). We will submit a general contribution to address the issue on inappropriate use of IE types and need codes in list elements since we have spotted same issues in some other places. | Not use SetupRelease type in SRS-PosRRC-InactiveValidityAreaConfig-r18 and instead, use IEs directly. |  |
| E159 | RedCap, MBS | ToDo | Agreed | RedCap | ASN.1 review common session agreements:Common frequency resource used for MCCH and MTCH reception for RedCap UEs is used also by eRedCap UE, if eRedCap UEs support that bandwitch.38331 Rapp: Offline agreed to capture in eRedCap WI CR | Further discussion is needed in a joint session with the MBS WI on whether “RedCap” should be replaced with “(e)RedCap” This is related to RIL E158. |  |  |
| E158 | RedCap, MBS | ToDo | Agreed | RedCap | ASN.1 review common session agreements:Common frequency resource used for MCCH and MTCH reception for RedCap UEs is used also by eRedCap UE, if eRedCap UEs support that bandwitch.38331 Rapp: Offline agreed to capture in eRedCap WI CR | Further discussion is needed in a joint session with the MBS WI on whether “RedCap” should be replaced with “(e)RedCap” |  |  |
| O310 | Pos, SL, SLrelay, MULTI | ToDo | ToDo |   | ASN.1 review common session:Proposal 1 R2 discuss the two solutions, 1) rely on SIB12 only and not define SIB23, 2) define a SIB23, but clarify the separation between SIB12 and SIB23 to avoid parameter overlapping.- We will support both and we will discuss the details on what each SIB contains in positioning breakout sessionProposal 2 R2 discuss the two solutions, 1) rely on SL-PreconfigurationNR only and not define SL-PosPreconfigurationNR, 2) define a SL-PosPreconfigurationNR, but clarify the separation between SL-PreconfigurationNR and SIB23 to avoid parameter overlapping.- rely on SL-PreconfigurationNR only and not define SL-PosPreconfigurationNR, 2Noted | Previously, R2 did not include two SIBs with the same IE definition, now here we have SIB12 and SIB23 here. It is not clear whether the two SIBs 1) aim at different IEs, or 2) there might be overlapping IEs in-between. And in case of 1) good to separate the IEs out using a different structure, and in case of 2), whether the two SIBs tend to give different/same values for the overlapping IEs. If different values, what is the reason, and if same values, what is the benefit to do duplicate configuration? (the overhead issue is obvious by seeing B012 request to do segmentaion operation like SIB12). | We will bring a paper for R2 to further discuss the motivation to have a separate SIB via same IE. |  |
| C620 | GEN, NTN | PropReject | Rejected |  |  | Inappropriate explicit ID introduced in the full list in system information | This tn-AreaID-r18 is useless and should be removed. The reason is that the CoverageAreaInfoList is a full list included in SIB, and the identification of a entry in a full list should have been done by referring to the position of that entry in the full list, instead of relying on an explicit ID assigned for such identification which causes unnecessary signalling overhead. Therefore, this field needs to be deleted, and the reference to TN area configuration in this list in SIB4/5 should be modified based on the entry position. It is thus proposed to remove this field and the corresponding IE “TN-AreaId-r18”, and add the field description to “tn-AreaIdList-r18” in SIB4/5 as follows: “Indicates the TN areas associated with the frequency. Each TN-AreaId value indicates the entry of the associated TN area configuration in the tn-AreaList-r18 in SIB25, i.e. value 1 refers to the TN area configured of the 1st entry, value 2 refers to the 2nd entry and so on.” | [QC v084] Disagree. It is to make robust to the change of the order of the list. [CATT v087] No strong view, but there seemed few cases in legacy that explicit ID is specifically introduced for the indexing purpose towards a full list in SIB. So not sure why it turns out to be essential here to have to introduce an explicit ID for this TN list. Also, not sure how to index to a full list in SIB from this release on, if we start to use the explicit-ID manner here. [Ericsson - Ignacio] Same view as Qualcomm. As discussed during previous meetings, this approach gives flexibility to the network to adjust the order of frequencies in SIB4/5 without the need to update SIB25. [CATT (Xiao)\_v126] But why cannot the case raised by Ericsson be supported by referring directly to the entry position in the full list, but having to rely on an explicit ID? |
| H501 | covEnh, MULTI | ToDo | Rejected |   | Rejected in CovEnh session | RACH resource for SI request should be configured as RACH feature | remove the fieldes and define the RACH resource for SI request by RACH feature | OPPO (Qianxi): for CE, the repetition is more like another dimension to be considered, on top of both 1) SI request and 2) feature-based RACH partition (it has thus already been included in the resource partition). So the motivation to remove the field here is not clear. ZTE (LiuJing): Same question as OPPO. Rapporteur: See comments to H50 |
| Z428 | RedCap, CovEnh | ToDo | Agreed | CovEnh | Agreed in CovEnh WI session | See Z420 | Configuration of Msg1 repetition resources for initialUplinkBWP-RedCap that the (e)RedCap UE | Ericsson (WI Rapporteur): This is similar to Z420. Agree that further discussion is required in a joint session with the CE WI. |
| E052 | Gen | ToDo | Agreed | Other CR | [POST125][028][RACH-less] CR to 38.331 (Ericsson)Intended outcome: Agree to CRDeadline: Short | There are multiple WIs which agreed to use the CG standardized by SDT in Rel-17. However, there is an unneccesary repetition of field since IAB, Mob, and NTN uses exactly the same structure. Would be good to create a new separate IE for the CG-SDT so that the other WIs car refer to it without repeating each field. | Create a new separate IE to include the field of the CG specified by SDT in Rel-17. We are planning to submit a contribution about this. |  |
| C704 | IAB,NTN,MULTI | ToDo | Agreed | Other CR | [POST125][028][RACH-less] CR to 38.331 (Ericsson)Intended outcome: Agree to CRDeadline: Short | It can be observed that most of the parameters for mIAB CG configuration and NTN CG configuration are the same. As indicated by AI 7.0.4, the issue whether NTN and mIAB can share the same RACH-less HO procedure would probably be discussed. As result, CG for mIAB and NTN will use exactly the same parameters or those of little difference. Whatever conclusion is made in this AI, separate sets of CG configuration for mIAB and NTN is not necessary. | Remove the fields of mIAB CG configuration, keep the fields of NTN CG configuration and remove “NTN” prefix of the field names. |  |
| H507 | IAB, Mob, NTN, MULTI | ToDo | Agreed | Other CR | [POST125][028][RACH-less] CR to 38.331 (Ericsson)Intended outcome: Agree to CRDeadline: Short | Almost exactly the same as cg-sdt-Configuration for the NTN, IAB, LTM configuration | Maybe can reuse the legacy CG-SDT type. can consider how to handle the field name in R17 and handle it also correspondingly in MAC specification. At the very minimum, for SSB-PerCG-PUSC, P0-PUSCH, DMRS-Ports and NrofDMRS-Sequences, ranges shoudl be defined that are used by all CG-xxx-Configuration-rX types. |  |
| V507 | NTN, IAB | PropReject | Rejected |  | Agreement on reduced periodicty range seems missing. | The periodicity that can be used for RACH-less should be clarified | Clarify only 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 10, 16, 20, 32, 40, 64, 80, 128, 160, 320, 640 can be used for RACH-less CG. | [Ericsson - Ignacio] Ericsson agrees with the intention. However, there is no formal agreement and we do not think these kind of restrictions should be captured in Stage 3. |
| E051 | Gen | PropReject | Rejected |  | Field was introduced in Rel-15, e.g. in ServingCellConfigCommon. Although creating IE can be made without BW issues, no strong need to impact earlier releases. | The SSB-PositionsInBurst field is used in multiple places in the RRC spec and, in order to avoid unnecessary repetitions in the ASN.1, it would be good to created a new separate IE. | Create a new separate IE for the SSB-PositionsInBust. We are planning to submit a contribution about this. |  |
| H031 | GEN | ToDo | Agreed | No CR | ASN.1 review common session Agreements:1. Fields for which the UE behaviour is specified in procedure text should not have a field description in ASN.1, unless to provide additional information not provided in procedure text (e.g. encoding, configuration restrictions). For IEs that are specified in RAN1 specs we can add a reference but shouldn’t re-describe everything that is in RAN1 specs. 2. WI rapporteurs are expected to go back and clean up the field descriptions for Rel-18 and all reviewers should identify when we have redundant field descriptions | Useless field description | This is a typical useless field description. In this IE, the big majority of field descriptions are just rewording of the field name or not providing actual information. This is not harmless because the field descriptions that do contain useful information are drawn into useless text and don't get proper attention for maintenance work. We will submit a Tdoc with examples and come with a TP for guidelines to avoid this. |  |
| H069 | GEN | ToDo | Agreed | No CR | ASN.1 review common session Agreements:1. Fields for which the UE behaviour is specified in procedure text should not have a field description in ASN.1, unless to provide additional information not provided in procedure text (e.g. encoding, configuration restrictions). For IEs that are specified in RAN1 specs we can add a reference but shouldn’t re-describe everything that is in RAN1 specs. 2. WI rapporteurs are expected to go back and clean up the field descriptions for Rel-18 and all reviewers should identify when we have redundant field descriptions | Redundant/unnecessary field descritpion | All of the field descriptions here are redundant with procedure text. This results in RAN2 discussions to review them, increases the work for corrections/modifications, creates a risk of divering UE behaviorus and make really useful information less visible. Remove the whole table, none of the descriptions actually gives any information not already covered in procedure text. |  |
| H046 | GEN, MIMO | PropAgree | Agreed | MIMO | 38331 Rapp: Handled in MIMO session | CHOICE values should not be SetupRelease | Such a construct seems to mean that in one message, it is possible to either setup SDM-Scheme-r18 or release SDM-Scheme-r18 or setup SFN-Scheme-r18 or release SFN-Scheme-r18. So it means that both can be configured together, but in one message, it is only possible to setup or to release one of them. It is very unlikely that this is the intention. sdm-r18 and sfn-r18 should be independent fields, not inside a CHOICE. If there is any restriction that sdm-r18 should not be configured for a BWP or cell or Cell Group or UE for which sfn-r18 is configured, this can be captured in the field description, and the wording should use "configured", it should not be "presence". Beyond this example, this should be a generic principle that might be captured in guidelines. | [Samsung-S899] Agree. Do not need SetupRelease within CHOICE structure requires the redundant release operation. Just directly adding the fields in IE using SEQ structure is enough. Same comment for sfn-r18 |
| H047 | GEN, MIMO | PropAgree | Rejected | MIMO | 38331 Rapp: Rejected in MIMO session | SetupRelease fields should not have a presence condition whose truth value can change. | For a SetupRelease field, "mandatory" means that it must be explicitly set to setup or explictly set to release, so it is like a simple Need R field without any restriction. If the intention is that a SetupRelease structure must be \*configured\* when something else is \*configured\*, that cannot be captured in a presence condition, this can only be in a field description. Propose to remove the condition and provide field description. Suggest agreeing the principle and capturing something in guidelines. |  |
| E117 | GEN | PropAgree | Agreed | NES | 38331 Rapp: Not clear if captured in NES WI CR | The other versions of SearchSpace IE do not have extension marker at the end, but know this has been added in Rel-18 for SearchSpaceExt. It should be discussed if we change now in Rel-18 or we continue to do as we did for the previous releases. | In principle we can delete the extension marker so to align with what we have don in previour releases. |  |
| B016 | Multi | ToDo | Agreed | ULTxSwitch, UECap, POS, SL | ASN.1 review common session Agreements:Replace the ambiguous term “legacy” by a more meaningful description. This should be done by the respective WI-specific CRs (ULTxSwitch, UECap, POS, SL). Furthermore, send an LS to RAN1 requesting them not to use the term “legacy” in their NR UE features and higher layers parameter lists in the future. | Ambiguous term “legacy” is used. It should be replaced by a more meaningful description. There are many other places where this ambiguous term is used. We will submit a contribution listing all occurrences of the term “legacy”. | Replace the ambiguous term “legacy” by a more meaningful description. This should be done in the respective WI-specific sessions. |  |
| H505 | covEnh, MULTI | ToDo | Rejected |   | Rejected in CovEnh session | RACH resource for SI request should be configured as RACH feature | remove the fieldes and define the RACH resource for SI request by RACH feature | OPPO (Qianxi): for CE, the repetition is more like another dimension to be considered, on top of both 1) SI request and 2) feature-based RACH partition (it has thus already been included in the resource partition). So the motivation to remove the field here is not clear. LGE (Hanseul): Suggest to keep the current text. Since the RACH feature is indicated only in CBRA procedure, there is no indication for RACH feature for Msg1-based SI request. Therefore, in order to support Msg1-based SI request with Msg1 repetition, separated RA resource configuration is needed, as in the current spec. Note that current feature indication can be applied for Msg3 based SI request. ZTE (LiuJing): Same question as OPPO. Rapporteur: An offline has been trigged with several companies. It seems companies need more time to check. So it can be open for now and further discussion can be based on company contributions at the meeting |
| Z430 | RedCap, CovEnh | ToDo | Agreed | CovEnh | Agreed in CovEnh WI session | See Z420. | Add “(e)” infront of RedCap | Ericsson (WI Rapporteur): This is similar to Z420. Agree that further discussion is required in a joint session with the CE WI. |
| E074 | GEN | ToDo | ToDo |   | ASN.1 review common session: Postponed. | With the introduction of conditional mobility configurations (i.e., many flavours such as CHO, CPC, CPA, CPAC, CHO with SCGs) and LTM, the ID space for the transaction identifier may be too limiting for the network to understand which RRC message is which. Therefore, we should consider whether the ID space of the transaction identifier should be extended. | It would be good to extend the ID space of the transaction identifier. We are planning to submit a contribution about this. |  |
| H608 | Pos, GEN | PropAgree | Agreed | Pos | ASN.1 review common session agreements: RAN2 will not correct the issue above in the legacy NR releases38331 Rapp: See agreements on B011.  | There should not be need M for fields within a list | Change the field from need M to need R |  |
| C607 | MULTI | PropAgree | Agreed | Common ASN1 CR |   | Improper and incorrect descriptions of T304 stop condition for LTM RACH-less cell switch and IAB/NTN RACH-less HO (RIL for mIAB/NR NTN/eMob). | Problems for the current descriptions are: Common RACH-less HO procedure is supported for mIAB and NR-NTN in MAC. And the stop condition is reflected correctly by last one, so the first one canbe removed. For LTM cell switch, it has the same T304 stop condition as RACH-less HO, as specified in MAC, i.e. relying on the MAC layer indication. So the second condition can be revised into the similar way as the last one, and merged into it For T304 stop conditions, following change is proposed to cover all the above cases into the descriptions on RACH-less HO completinfor NR NTN: Upon successful completion of random access on the corresponding SpCell. In case of a reconfiguration with sync without performing random access procedure, upon receiving a PDCCH transmission addressed to C-RNTI after first UL transmission, for the same HARQ process. In case of an LTM cell switch without performing a random access procedure, upon receiving a PDCCH transmission addressed to C-RNTI after first UL transmission, for the same HARQ process. Upon receiving an indication from lower layers of successful completion of Rach-less handover, or upon receiving an indication from lower layers of successful completion of an LTM RACH-less cell switch. | [Ericsson – Tony] We have actually a different understanding. For us the first and second sentence are the correct one while the last sentence introduced by NTN is not needed. Therefore, our proposal is to delete the last sentence. [CATT (Xiao)\_v167] Actually, PDCCH reception is not visible in RRC, but only in MAC. So RRC needs to depend on the indication of MAC to judge whether T304 can be stopped. From this perspective, seems not preferable to appear "PDCCH" related description in this table, as in the 1st and 2nd sentences. [NEC-Yuhua, v211] we agree to modify the descritotion, and we perfer to not have "PDCCH" appearing in this table, but simply follow the indication from MAC. we shall not miss the case that RACH-less and LTM can be completed upon receiving PDCCH addressing to C-RNTI but for new DL transmission. |
| O311 | Pos, SL, SLrelay, MULTI | ToDo | ToDo |   | ASN.1 review common session:Proposal 1 R2 discuss the two solutions, 1) rely on SIB12 only and not define SIB23, 2) define a SIB23, but clarify the separation between SIB12 and SIB23 to avoid parameter overlapping.- We will support both and we will discuss the details on what each SIB contains in positioning breakout sessionProposal 2 R2 discuss the two solutions, 1) rely on SL-PreconfigurationNR only and not define SL-PosPreconfigurationNR, 2) define a SL-PosPreconfigurationNR, but clarify the separation between SL-PreconfigurationNR and SIB23 to avoid parameter overlapping.- rely on SL-PreconfigurationNR only and not define SL-PosPreconfigurationNR, 2Noted | Previously, R2 did not include two SIBs /Preconfigurations with the same IE definition, now here we have SIB12 and SIB23 here, and SL-PreconfigurationNR and SL-PosPreconfigurationNR . It is not clear whether the two SIBs/Preconfigurations 1) aim at different IEs, or 2) there might be overlapping IEs in-between. And in case of 1) good to separate the IEs out using a different structure, and in case of 2), whether the two SIBs tend to give different/same values for the overlapping IEs. If different values, what is the reason, and if same values, what is the benefit to do duplicate configuration? (the overhead issue is obvious by seeing B012 request to do segmentaion operation like SIB12). | We will bring a paper for R2 to further discuss the motivation to have a separate Preconfiguration although the included IE is the same |  |
| H506 | GEN | PropReject | Rejected |   | ASN.1 review common session:Confirm that late NCE is only used in exceptional cases for introducing late features/functionalities in earlier releases when regular NCE cannot be used.38331 Rapp: Rejected, not essential to have guideline for this. | Add descitription for late non- critical extensions | Add description for late non-critical extention | Lenovo (Hyung-Nam): Disagree. After using ASN.1 for more than 24 years I wonder what the issue with late NCE is and what needs to be clarified |
| B014 | SLrelay, MBS | PropAgree | Agreed | MBS, Slrelay |   | The new R18 RRC messages are missing in Annex B.1: IndirectPathFailureInformation message (SLrelay): it should never be sent unprotected prior to and after security activation (same as for other Failure messages). MBSMulticastConfiguration message (MBS): it can be sent unprotected prior to and after security activation (same as for MBSBroadcastConfiguration message). | Add the new R18 RRC messages as shown below: Message P A-I A-C FailureInformation - - - IndirectPathFailureInformation - - - LocationMeasurementIndication - - - MCGFailureInformation - - - MeasurementReportAppLayer - - - MBSBroadcastConfiguration + + + MBSInterestIndication - - - MBSMulticastConfiguration + + + MIB + + +  | Huawei (Xubin): Agree. The changes will be reflected in MBS RRC Rapp CR and SL Relay RRC Rapp CR, respectively |