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# 1 Introduction

This is to report the result of the following email discussion in RAN2#112-e Meeting [1].

* [AT112-e][003][NR15] MAC II (Samsung)

Treat R2-2008909, R2-2010622, R2-2010623, R2-2010624, R2-2010426, R2-2010318, R2-2009910, R2-2009911, R2-2010418, R2-2010164, R2-2009482

Intended outcome: Intermediate: Determine agreeable parts. Final: For agreeable parts, agreed CRs.

Deadline: Intermediate deadline(s) by Rapporteur, Final: Discussion stop at Wed Nov 11, 1200 UTC

# 2 Contact Information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Contact: Name (E-mail) |
| Samsung | Jaehyuk JANG (jack.jang@samsung.com) |
| Qualcomm | Linhai He (linhaihe@qti.qualcomm.com) |
| Huawei,HiSilicon | Chong Lou (louchong@huawei.com) |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 3 Discussion

## 3.1 Fixing a CR implementation error of CR0767

R2-2008909 Fixing a CR implementation error of CR0767 Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Samsung (Rapporteur) CR Rel-15 38.321 15.10.0 0899 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree as is (from which release); Agree with changes; Disagree | Detailed Comments |
| Samsung | Agree as is (Rel-15) | It is clearly an implementation error, and Rel-15 specification should be corrected (as proposed). |
| Qualcomm | Agree as is (Rel-15) |  |
| HW | Agree, but | Can be merged into a misc CR that can be provided by the MAC rapporteur as there are quite a few corrections with minor changes in both MAC I and MAC II email discussions. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Conclusion:**

**TBD**

## 3.2 Stopping DRX retransmission timer when bundling is used

(The following five contributions are discussed together here.)

R2-2010622 Incorrectly stopping DRX retransmission timer when bundling is used Ericsson CR Rel-16 38.306 16.2.0 0468 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

R2-2010623 Incorrectly stopping DRX retransmission timer when bundling is used Ericsson CR Rel-16 38.321 16.2.0 0993 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

R2-2010624 Incorrectly stopping DRX retransmission timer when bundling is used Ericsson CR Rel-16 38.331 16.2.0 2263 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

R2-2010426 Correction on DRX with bundle transmission of configured uplink grant ASUSTeK CR Rel-16 38.321 16.2.1 0987 - F TEI16

R2-2010318 Further discussions on DRX with bundling operation Huawei, HiSilicon discussion Rel-16 TEI16

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree as is (which CR; from which release); Agree with changes;  To capture it in the meeting minutes;  Disagree | Detailed Comments |
| Samsung | Agree as is (ASUSTek or Ericsson (only MAC); Rel-16) | We understand that the proposed change to MAC (from both CRs) are the original intention, and thus support the change. As this is the intended behaviour, no additional capability would be needed as Ericsson proposed, and we are fine with either MAC CR. From the agreement from last meeting, we would need a Rel-16 CR only. |
| Qualcomm | Agree with Ericsson’s MAC CR as is; Rel-16 | We also think that UE capability and network configuration are not necessary, because most companies agreed in the last meeting that the proposed change to the MAC spec is the intended behavior, even for Rel-15. And since there is no UE capability for DG, it would be simpler/cleaner if we do not introduce UE capability just for CG, unless the proposed change is an NBC for some UE implementation.  Between the two MAC CRs from Ericsson and Asustek, we think both are technically correct but have a slight preference for Ericsson’s version.  [r1] As to the proposed clarification on DL reTx timer proposed by Huawei, we do not think it is needed. In our understanding, HARQ feedback for a DL transmission bundle is sent only after the last transmission in the bundle is complete. So there is no ambiguity when UE should stop/start DL HARQ RRT timer and reTx timer. The current spec text is clear enough for us on this behavior. |
| HW |  | 1. **UL DRX retx timer**   We can live without a CR to Rel-16 as it would cause exceptional case for CG bundling only from the spec. However, the sensible UE implementation should be consistent among CG/DG/SPS bundlings. But if majority thinks a CR is helpful indeed, we are fine with a CR without UE capability. Consider the consistent efforts of ASUSTek since last meeting, we slightly prefer to pick that CR.   1. **DL DRX retx timer**   Regarding the DL DRX retx timer, as we commented, if the intended UE behaviour is only to stop the timer once for the first transmission within a bundle for UL CG, it should also apply to SPS bundling. Otherwse, the UE has to check and to “stop” the DL DRX retx timer even it is not running from the current spec. We agree for DL, it has no functionality issue due to different start condition of HARQ RTT timer, but would cause even more ambiguity and redundancy.  *1> if a MAC PDU is received in a configured downlink assignment:*  *2> start the drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerDL for the corresponding HARQ process in the first symbol after the end of the corresponding transmission carrying the DL HARQ feedback;*  *2> stop the drx-RetransmissionTimerDL for the corresponding HARQ process.* |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Conclusion:**

**TBD**

## 3.3 HARQ process handling of retransmission within a bundle

R2-2009910 CR on 38.321 for HARQ process handling of retransmission within a bundle-R15 ZTE Corporation, Sanechips CR Rel-15 38.321 15.10.0 0951 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

R2-2009911 CR on 38.321 for HARQ process handling of retransmission within a bundle-R16 ZTE Corporation, Sanechips CR Rel-16 38.321 16.2.1 0952 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree as is (from which release); Agree with changes; Disagree | Detailed Comments |
| Samsung | Disagree | The change seems not needed as the text is interpreted as 'same (frequency) resources'. There would be no room to misinterpret the existing text. |
| Qualcomm | Disagree | We have the same understanding as Samsung. |
| HW | Disagree | This text intends to inherit the wording of non-adaptive HARQ and TTI bundling in LTE to some extent, so the “same” should have no risk of ambiguity. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Conclusion:**

**TBD**

## 3.4 Clarification for bundling transmission

R2-2010418 Clarification for bundling transmission ASUSTeK CR Rel-15 38.321 15.10.0 0983 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree as is (from which release); Agree with changes; Disagree | Detailed Comments |
| Samsung | Agree as is (Rel-15) | We are fine with the change which is more accurate. In addition, we recognize that separate CRs (with some additioinal changes) for Rel-16 were submitted this meeting, so Rel-16 can be discussed separately (i.e. not in this thread). |
| Qualcomm | Agree as is (Rel-15) | We think the reason for change is valid and the proposed change is a good clarification to the current text. |
| HW | Disagree | We discussed the issues for both CG and DG bundling and the reason why different texts are put is that, “flexible start” can be only applicable to the CG repetition, i,e, the actual starting point can be at any occasion with RV = 0 in some cases, e.g. RV seq = 0303/0000 (as described in RAN1 TS)，while it is not applicable to DG. So in this paragraph, the actual number of HARQ retx within a bundle is not indicated for CG repetition but it is for DG slot aggregation as shown below. From this point, we don't think this CR is correct.  *For CG repetition: After the initial transmission, HARQ retransmissions follow within a bundle.*  *For DG slot aggregation: If the MAC entity is configured with pusch-AggregationFactor > 1, and the initial transmission is performed within a bundle, pusch-AggregationFactor – 1 HARQ retransmissions follow within the bundle after the initial transmission.* |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Conclusion:**

**TBD**

## 3.5 Consistent use of terminology for bundling in MAC

R2-2010164 Consistent use of terminology for bundling in MAC Ericsson, Samsung CR Rel-16 38.321 16.2.1 0967 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree as is (from which release); Agree with changes; Disagree | Detailed Comments |
| Samsung | Agree as is (Rel-15) | We are fine with the changes, and it would be good to correct them from Rel-15.  Another terminology issue: the term "RACH procedure" in subclause 5.12 can be fixed to "Random Access procedure", and can be added to the CR. |
| Qualcomm | Agree as is (Rel-15) | We are fine with the changes. |
| HW | Not needed | The changes are not essential, and the terminology of repetition is already used in RAN1 spec, so the intention is to align between MAC and RAN1 spec, so it is not necessary to be consistent in the MAC spec as they are indeed different operations from RAN1 point. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Conclusion:**

**TBD**

## 3.6 PHR reporting for PUSCH skipping

R2-2009482 Clarification on PHR reporting for PUSCH skipping Apple CR Rel-16 38.321 16.2.1 0929 - F NR\_newRAT-Core, TEI16

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree as is (from which release); Agree with changes; Disagree | Detailed Comments |
| Samsung | Agree as is (Rel-16) | The changes are correct, as it cannot set PCMAX value in such scenario. Since the skipping behaviour will be clarified from Rel-16, Rel-16 CR would be sufficient. |
| Qualcomm | Disagree | The proposed change is against an existing RAN2 agreement (RAN2#103bis). If companies want to revert this agreement, it probably is better to have it first discussed and agreed in RAN1, as they have been discussing the impact of UL skipping.  And there can be alternative solutions, which in our view are better. For example, as UE has to wait until Tproc,2 before PUSCH transmission to determine UL skipping, UE does not determine PH type (real vs virtual) until the moment when it determines whether to skip. |
| HW | Disagree | Not aligned with the past discussions and LTE, the sensible UE implementation will take both of procedural text and MAC CE format into account. So we are not in favour of this CR which may bring NBC risk. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Conclusion:**

**TBD**

# 4 Conclusion

**TBD**
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