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# 1 Introduction

This paper addresses the following email discussion:

* [AT113-e][030][eIAB] Reply LS DAPS-like solution (Ericsson)

Scope: Achieve common understanding of what is to be achieved by request by R3 in R2-2100038. Collect comments to facilitate efficient on-line discussion on how to reply. Can Take submitted papers on the topic into account e.g. to determine the options.

Intended outcome: Report with organized options / comments

Deadline: To be treated on-line Thursday Feb 28

The rapporteur would like to set the following deadline:

**Deadline: Thursday, 28th Jan. 1500 UTC**

# 2 Discussion

This email discussion aims at discussing how to reply to RAN3 LS R2-2100038. For convenience, the LS is reported here:

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Overall Description:**   RAN3 discussed the “DAPS-like” solution, and the following agreement is achieved:  Discuss how to support simultaneous connectivity with 2 donors, to reduce service interruption; potential solutions may include dual-protocol-stack solutions (“DAPS-like”); FFS whether the same solution also applies to descendant nodes.  The simultaneous connectivity dual-protocol solution (“DAPS-like”) of an IAB node should allow at least simultaneous DL reception of BH traffic carried on BH RLC channels on the paths from both donors  However, RAN3 cannot reach agreement for the UL simultaneous transmission since it may have impact to IAB-MT part. Thus, RAN3 would like to ask RAN2’s advice on whether simultaneous UL transmission can be supported in Rel-17. **2. Actions:** **To RAN2:**  **ACTION:** RAN3 respectfully asks RAN2 to take the above into account and to provide feedback. |

Hence, according to the request in the above LS, RAN2 should discuss in this email discussion whether simultaneous UL transmission can be supported in Rel.17.

Regarding this topic, the following contributions submitted to RAN2#113e were explicitly treating this topic:

* [R2-2100360](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2100360.zip), [Discussion on RAN3 LS of DAPS-like solution](https://ericsson.sharepoint.com/R2-2100360.zip), Intel Corporation
* [R2-2101450](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101450.zip), [LS on DAPS-like solution for service interruption reduction](https://ericsson.sharepoint.com/R2-2101450.zip), Ericsson
* [R2-2100226](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2100226.zip), [CHO and DAPS](https://ericsson.sharepoint.com/R2-2100226.zip), CATT

## 2.2 Rel-17 DAPS-like solution for IAB

## From RAN3#110 chairman notes the following agreement is captured:

|  |
| --- |
| **The simultaneous connectivity dual-protocol-stack solutions (“DAPS-like”) of an IAB node should allow at least DL simultaneous transmission of BH traffic carried on BH RLC channels, on the paths to both donors.** |

Before discussing whether simultaneous UL transmission can be supported in Rel-17 for “DAPS-like” IAB, Rapporteur would like to discuss what is a “DAPS-like” solution from a RAN2 protocol architecture and taking into account the above RAN3 agreement.  
Rapporteur would set the following definition:

“A DAPS-like solution for IAB consists of two independent protocols PHY/MAC/RLC/BAP defined in the MT”

**Q1: Do you agree with the definition that a DAPS-like solution for IAB, from a RAN2 protocol view, consists of two independent protocol stacks “PHY/MAC/RLC/BAP” defined in the MT? If no, please provide your definition.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preference (Y/N)** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | N | The RAN3 agreement is (the green sentence only): “dual-protocol-stack solutions of an IAB node should allow at least DL simultaneous transmission of BH traffic carried on BH RLC channels, on the paths to both donors.”  To meet the requirements, DAPS-like solution for IAB, from RAN2 protocol view, would be feasible once similar to DC: PHY/MAC/RLC would be independent. However, BAP is a common entity and cannot be independent since UL/DL BAP routing happens in the BAP layer. DAPS-like solution should involve a single BAP entity.  Furthermore, DAPS is defined for HO to reduce interruption in UE data transmission. Similarly, if DAPS-like were adopted for IAB-nodes, it should be specified for reduction of service interruption in case of IAB-node migration, not for specifying another multiconnection scheme for IAB-nodes.  DL and UL redundancy is already supported with DC. Therefore, there is no need to specify an alternative option for the redundancy. |
| Sony | Y | In general agree but BAP could be common to both. It is good to inform RAN3 that DAPS like applies to single MT only. |
| Ericsson | Y | Rel.16 DAPS is based on 2 independent protocols; hence it seems natural to assume that a DAPS-like solution for IAB also consists of two independent protocol stacks.  Additionally, since the protocol stack for an IAB node consists of “PHY/MAC/RLC/BAP”, then our conclusion is that a DAPS-like solution for IAB should consist of two independent protocol stacks of “PHY/MAC/RLC/BAP” defined in the MT.  That seems also aligned with the RAN3 discussion noted above. |
| Qualcomm | N | There are two RLC stacks underneath one common BAP entity on the MT. There can only be one BAP entity on the MT, since it has the task to perform routing between both links, i.e., RLC stacks. This has already been done for NRDC in Rel-16 IAB. |
| vivo | N | We prefer to have single MT with single BAP entity. We should maximize the similarity with DC protocol stacks. |
| Futurewei | N | There is no “PHY/MAC/RLC/BAP” independent protocol branch in DAPS operation. DAPS can’t be directly applied to IAB nodes. If the intention is to specify a new “DAPS-like” protocol structure for IAB, it should be discussed in RAN2 first. |
| Huawei |  | It seems companies are discussing different issues:   1. What does R3 mean by “DAPS-like”? 2. What’s the preferred solution for simultaneous transmission? 3. What’s the DAPS if it applies to IAB? 4. Whether we have the single or separated BAP?   Not sure on the discussion point of this question. |
| Lenovo&MM | N | If DAPS is used in the IAB system, the BAP should be maintained for both source and target at the same time. We slightly prefer one common BAP entity in order to align with the legacy IAB specification. |
|  |  |  |

## The RAN3 LS asks whether simultaneous UL transmission can be supported in Rel-17 for “DAPS-like” IAB. Looking that legacy DAPS, tt is noted that a capability signalling already exists indicating whether the UE supports simultaneous UL transmission in source PCell and target PCell during an inter-freq DAPS handover, i.e. *interFreqMultiUL-TransmissionDAPS-r16*. However, Rapporteur´s understanding is that after random access completion on the target cell, there is an uplink data switching at PDCP level from source to target which makes not possible simultaneous UL transmissions on source and target after the handover completion.

Companies are asked to provide their views on the legacy DAPS functionality when it comes to simultaneous UL transmissions on source and target

**Q2: Do you agree with the following Rapporteur´s understanding on the Rel.16 DAPS functionality related to UL simultaneous transmissions on source and target? If not, please provide your view or clarification if needed.**

* *interFreqMultiUL-TransmissionDAPS-r16* already indicates whether the UE supports simultaneous UL transmission in source PCell and target PCell during an inter-freq DAPS handover.
* After random access completion on the target cell, there is an uplink data switching at PDCP level from source to target which makes not possible simultaneous UL transmissions on source and target after the handover completion.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preference (Y/N)** | **Comments** |
| Nokia |  | After successful RA there is UL switch. Simultaneous UL **data** transmission is not possible after the handover completion. |
| Sony | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | Agree with Nokia. |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Futurewei | Y | Simultaneous UL data transmission is not supported in DAPS. |
| Huawei | Yes in general, but see comment | It seems the R16 status is as following:  **Rel.16 DAPS does support simultaneous UL transmission optionally before HO completion, but NOT after HO completion.** |
| Lenovo&MM | Y | After successful RA, the UL data will be switched to the target link. The data for service will not be transmitted in the source link for new transmission. But the information related with HARQ, ARQ and ROHC will continue in source link until the UE releases the source link after receiving the release indication from target cell. Therefore, we can consider that simultaneous UL transmissions for normal data on source and target will not happen in the legacy DAPS HO. |
|  |  |  |

## Related to DAPS-like solution for IAB, according to [R2-2100360](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2100360.zip), simultaneous UL transmission for IAB DAPS should not be supported in Rel.17 either, while according to [R2-2101450](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101450.zip) that should be possible. Before agreeing on whether simultaneous UL transmissions for IAB DAPS can be supported in Rel.17, Rapporteur would like to ask companies how to support simultaneous UL transmissions for an IAB DAPS-like solution from a RAN2 point of view, and which changes (if any) can be foreseen in RAN2 specifications. Companies are also invited to provide the reason for the envisaged changes.

**Q3: How could simultaneous UL transmissions be supported using a DAPS-like solution in RAN2 specifications and what is the foreseen RAN2 standard impact?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Changes foreseen to RAN2 specifications** | **Reason for the change** |
| Nokia | New concept for the controlling entity above PHY/MAC/RLC: BAP routing and routing tables needs to be redefined  Configuration of IAB nodes (more changes to F1AP since BAP is mostly configured by it) | Instead of MCG and SCG there will be a primary stack and secondary stack  New option for the topological redundancy needs to be configured. |
| Sony | In our understanding, configuration of multiple BH RLC channels is already supported in RRC and higher layers may take care of reordering and duplication detection. |  |
| Ericsson | RRC specification:   * No changes foreseen for the support of simultaneous UL for IAB DAPS. Normative text in TS38.331 does not present any specific clause/procedure that limits UL simultaneous transmissions with Rel.16 DAPS. * Changes required to establish/configure the new BAP entity and associated BH RLC channels when DAPS for IAB is configured. Some clarifications might be also needed to specify that the PDCP entity is not affected when a DAPS for IAB is configured (since the IAB DAPS-like operates at BAP level):   BAP specification:   * No changes foreseen to TS38.340 to support simultaneous UL transmissions. Each BAP layer of the dual protocol stack can operate independently, and there is no need to specify any interaction when it comes to simultaneous UL transmissions. * RAN2 should discuss if changes are needed in the receiver side to route the data to the right transmitter side according to the RRC configuration. However, that can be left also unspecified as it was done in Rel.16 for local routing after RLF or for NR DC SA.   PDCP specification:   * No changes foreseen, since DAPS for IAB does not impact PDCP, i.e. the uplink data switching for the PDCP entity which limits simultaneous UL transmissions in source and target is not applicable in this case | RRC: The mentioned changes are needed to configure the dual protocol stack for IAB, and to clarify that PDCP is not affected in this case  BAP: The mentioned changes might be needed to allow the IAB node to perform a local routing of data to the right protocol stack. However, RAN2 should discuss if that is really needed or if it can be left to implementation.  Note however that the above-mentioned changes are not directly related to the support of UL simultaneous transmissions, which as mentioned, are only explicitly prevented at PDCP layer which is not present in an IAB node. |
| Qualcomm | Simultaneous support of RLC channels is already part of DAPS and need to be extended to BH RLC channels.  No changes to BAP routing, UL mapping, etc, for intra-donor DAPS since NRDC solution defined for Rel-16 intra-donor redundancy can be reused.  Inter-donor DAPS should wait for RAN3 progress on inter-donor IAB-node migration. |  |
| vivo | The major complexity comes from BAP change: BAP modelling, BAP entity setup procedure, BAP routing and BH RLC channel mapping, especially for inter-donor case. |  |
| Futurewei | From RAN2 side (there may be RAN1 impact too), changes are foreseen to RRC, PDCP, MAC, BAP specifications. | The underline assumption of DAPS is to apply it only during transient period of HO for 0ms interruption time of DL transmission. Hence, there is no specification support for DAPS to work together with CA, DC, multi-TRP etc to achieve maximal throughput and spectral efficiency.  ROHC is effectively disabled when DAPS is configured.  New UE capability signalling (for MT) is needed to support simultaneous UL transmission in DAPS across different band combinations. |
| Huawei | Again, not sure if companies are discussing the same solution:   1. The “DAPS-like” proposed by rapporteur   The IAB specific DAPS solution. |  |
| Lenovo&MM | RAN2 needs to discuss the UE behaviour if simultaneous UL in source and target can be supported. e.g one packet is delivered to one of source link and target link or both? |  |
|  |  |  |

Depending on the changes foreseen in the previous question, Rapporteur would like to ask now whether RAN2 foresees any fundamental issue for not supporting simultaneous UL transmissions in IAB DAPS. An additional option could be that RAN2 asks RAN1 whether that is feasible from their point of view, since also their specifications might be eventually impacted.

**Q4: Given the changes foreseen in Q3, do you see, from a RAN2 point of view, any fundamental issue for not supporting simultaneous UL transmissions with an IAB DAPS-like solution? Please explain your answer.**

* **Option 1: No**
* **Option 2: Yes**
* **Option 3: RAN2 asks RAN1 whether simultaneous UL transmissions can be supported in Rel-17 from their point of view**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option(s)** | **Detailed Comments** |
| Nokia | Option 2 | IAB Rel16 already supports the topological redundancy with DC which allows simultaneous transmissions and load balancing in both DL and UL. There is no need to specify an alternative (multi-MT) option for the same functionality as proposed in R2-2101449. |
| Sony | Option 1/3 | We think RAN1 involvement is needed |
| Ericsson | 1, 3 | From RAN2 point of view there seems to be no fundamental issue for the support of UL simultaneous transmissions in a DAPS-like IAB solution.  RAN1 may be anyhow asked to check if there are any other limitation from their point of view. |
| Qualcomm | Option 3 | We don’t see a fundamental reason to NOT support simultaneous UL transmission since this is already supported for NRDC. In fact, DAPS would become an alternative to NR-DC in this case. We should still be polite and ask RAN1. |
| vivo | Option 3 | There is no essential issue to support simultaneous UL TX for RAN2. RAN2 should further ask RAN1 to study the feasibility. |
| Futurewei | Option 2 | The question is a bit convoluted. If simultaneous UL transmission is not supported, BAP and overall IAB operation is impacted, as DL/UL operation is defined together for them.  If simultaneous UL transmission needs to be supported, there’d be significant impact overall on RAN2 and RAN1 specifications, as explained in our answer to Q3. |
| Huawei | Option 3 | We need to check with R1. Maybe it’s better to let R3 send the LS to R1 with the clear definition of “DAPS-like”. |
| Lenovo&MM | Option 3 | We don’t see the fundamental issue. But it is beneficial to reduce the UL interruption during IAB mobility since some child IAB node(s) and the served UE(s) are also involved. |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Conclusion

To be updated