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# Introduction

This document aims at gathering and summarizing companies’ views for the following offline discussion:

* [AT113-e][037][MBS] MBS General (Huawei)

      Scope: Based on R2-2102253, work on running CR to make it acceptable (based on previous meeting agreements). Address the issues needed to reply to SA2 LS, progress as much as possible, Come Back ON-line if needed. (note that the issue whether Multicast can be supported in Idle or inactive will be treated online).

      Intended outcome: Endorsable Running CR, Draft LS out, Report

      Deadline: In time for next online session for the items that need on-line attention, EOM for the rest.

Section 2 contains questions related to SA2 LS received by RAN2 in [1] and captured as editor’s notes in Clause 8 of TR 23.757 [2].

In Section 3, companies are requested to provide their concerns with the draft running 38.300 CR, taking version in [3] as the baseline for discussion.

# Discussion on the reply LS to SA2

* 1. Editor’s note on session leave idication (section 8.2.2.2 of TR 23.757)

- The UE shall indicate leaving an MBS session in CM-CONNECTED with RRC-CONNECTED state.

Editor's note: Whether the UE can stop receiving traffic of a multicast session without indicating leaving in CM-IDLE state or CM-CONNECTED with RRC-INACTIVE state relies on RAN WG feedback.

RAN2 did not agree to support the multicast session reception for RRC\_INACTIVE and RRC\_IDLE so far and this issue is supposed to be discussed online during this meeting. Nevertheless, the issue is discussed in the context of SA2 LS in [4], [5], and [6] with different views being expressed.

It should be noted that session join and leave are procedures handled by NAS layer at the UE and are currently assumed to be transparent for AS layer. From RAN2 perspective, it could be beneficial to keep it that way, i.e. session join/leave indication is triggered by NAS layer and processed as normal NAS signalling by AS layer. This way there is no impact to RAN2 specifications while SA2 can use the same procedures for multicast sessions regardless of whether multicast session is received in RRC Connected state or in RRC Idle/Inactive (if agreed to be supported).

**Question 1: Do companies agree that RAN2 should assume that session join/leave indications are transparent to AS layer and handled by upper layers in the same way regardless of the RRC state the UE is in?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments (if you disagree, please provide clarifications and an alternative proposal)** |
| **QC** | **Yes** | Using NAS SM procedure, UE can join/leave Multicast session. RAN relies on the information provided by CN, and the assumption from RAN is that any NAS indication from UE regarding multicast session join/leave procedure is transparent to RAN and is assumed to be processed at CN. |
| **MediaTek** | **Yes** |  |
| **Nokia** | **Yes** |  |
| **Kyocera** | **Yes** | We assume the gNB is notified by the CN when a UE joins/leaves a multicast session, although it’s out of RAN2 scope. |
| **CATT** | **Yes, with comments** | To control multicast transmission dynamically, RAN should be aware of which UE is receiving which multicast session on cell level.  So we suggest to reply to SA2 as following,  “RAN2 expects that UE should indicate join/leave an MBS session via NAS procedure regardless of the RRC state the UE is in, and subsequently 5GC should inform this to RAN.” |
| **Xiaomi** | **Yes** |  |
| **Spreadtrum** | **Yes** |  |
| **Ericsson** | **Yes, with comments** | The UE may have joined a multicast session that starts later, i.e. the UE is waiting in idle or inactive for the multicast session to start.  We think that the UE shall explicitly signal (at NAS layer) that it is no longer interested to receive the multicast data after the UE has joined a multicast session. Otherwise the network may spend unnecessary resources on such UE (e.g. try to page that UE when the multicast session starts). The whole point with multicast compared to broadcast is that the network knows if the UE is interested to receive the session. This obviously then should also cover the case when the UE is no longer interested.  Yes, Leave signalling is transparent to RAN but we are not sure if that is the point in this discussion. And we prefer to keep the Leave signalling at NAS level, i.e. no need for RRC signalling.  We support the suggestion provided by CATT. |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | **Yes** | Session join/leave indications can be either NAS or application layer message and can be handled transparent to AS layer. E.g. if UE is in RRC inactive/idle state and would like to send MBS session join/leave message to CN, the UE can simply enters RRC connected following the legacy procedure. |
| **OPPO** | **Yes** | For multicast, the UE should notify the leaving via NAS, and 5GC will notify RAN to release the MBS configuration via RRC signalling. |

* 1. Editor’s note on security handling (section 8.2.2.2 of TR 23.757)

Editor's note: RAN and/or SA3 is assumed to determine the handling of the security for MBS traffic.

Regarding the security issue for MBS traffic, the work is being carried out by SA3 and summarised in TR 33.850 [7]. RAN2 can indicate that we are waiting for SA3 to conclude their study before discussing the security.

Question 2: Do companies agree to reply that RAN2 will wait for SA3 to finalize their study on security for MBS before discussing security aspects in RAN2?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments (if you disagree, please provide clarifications and an alternative proposal)** |
| **QC** | **Yes** |  |
| **MediaTek** | **Yes** |  |
| **Nokia** | **Yes** |  |
| **Kyocera** | **Yes** |  |
| **CATT** | **Yes** |  |
| **Xiaomi** | **Yes** |  |
| **Spreadtrum** | **Yes** |  |
| **Ericsson** | **Yes** |  |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | **Yes** |  |
| **OPPO** | **Yes** | The security protect function will be discussed in SA3, e.g. which node the security function will be located in. |

* 1. Editor’s note on multicast session start notification (section 8.2.2.2 of TR 23.757)

- The 5GC shall be able to trigger NG-RAN nodes to notify session start/activation of an MBS session to UEs.

Editor's note: How the NG-RAN node notify session activation to UEs relies on RAN WG feedback.

In both [4] and [6], it is indicated that existing procedures can be reused depending on the RRC state the UE is in while the session start/activation is triggered by 5GC. In [5] on the other hand, it is indicated that the meaning of the session activation requires further clarification. However, it is rapporteur’s understanding that the editor’s note refers to both session start and activation and these terms are currently being utilized interchangeably by SA2.

Furthermore, this issue has again a dependency on whether and how the multicast session can be received by the UEs in RRC Idle and/or RRC Inactive state. Since this is to be discussed online, it is proposed to limit the discussion to the current agreement, i.e. the multicast sessions that require the UE to be in RRC Connected state to receive them.

**Question 3: For the multicast sessions that can only be received by the UE in the RRC Connected state, do companies agree that UE’s are notified about the session start/activation using:**

* **CN paging for RRC\_IDLE UEs**
* **RAN paging for RRC\_INACTIVE UEs**
* **RRC Reconfiguration message for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments (if you disagree, please provide clarifications and an alternative proposal)** |
| **QC** | **Yes** | For RRC\_IDLE CN paging, we need to use Multicast Session ID (Example: TMGI) as Group ID.  For RRC\_INACTIVE RAN paging, we may need to use Group ID and we need additional enhancement to indicate CN vs RAN paging (since RRC\_INACTIVE UE behavior is different for CN and RAN Paging reception).  In our understanding, for RRC\_CONNECETD UEs, use of RRC Reconfig message is to provide MRB config if not already configured. Otherwise, there is no need of RRC Reconfig procedure. |
| **MediaTek** | **Yes** |  |
| **Nokia** |  | We probably do not need to agree on a list of possible alternatives at this stage and it is not clear whether session start and session activation means the same, which should be clarified by SA2. However, if a UE is allowed to be released to RRC\_IDLE or RRC\_INACTIVE when it joined a multicast session that can be received only in RRC\_CONNECTED, then a CN paging and RAN paging are needed. |
| **Kyocera** | **Yes** | For IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, we agree with QC in general that CN/RAN paging should be group-based e.g., by a multicast session ID, TMGI or G-RNTI.  For Connected UEs, we think RRC Reconfiguration is baseline in case the UE is not configured with MRB. We’re wondering if an activation indication (e.g., by MAC CE) is needed, if MRB is already configured but deactivated (if supported). |
| **CATT** | **Partially** | Yes on “RRC Reconfiguration message for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs”.  But for idle/inactive UEs, we understand there are two possible options:  Option 1:use CN paging for idle UEs and RAN paging for inactive UEs  Option 2: reuse MCCH based change notification mechanism which is expected to be used for delivery mode 2.  It seems both options are workable, so further discussions are needed.  Hence perhaps for now we can simply reply to SA2 that “RAN2 is working on solution(s) to notify session start/activation of an multicast session to UEs ” |
| **Xiaomi** |  | For the session start, this depends on the content of USD, given that the USD of LTE already includes the session start time which is relatively static. Regarding the session activation/deactivation, we think this can be transparent to the RAN. However we are open to the RAN solutions for the session activation/deactivation, if the UE power saving is proved. |
| **Spreadtrum** | **Partially** | We agree with Nokia that the meanings of session start and session activation should be clarified by SA2 first.  For the connected UE, the RRC Reconfiguration message can be used.  For IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, considering the signalling overhead of paging messages, the MCCH or DCI method can also be considered in future discussion. |
| **Ericsson** | **Partially** | We basically agree with what is proposed, except that we cannot use UE individual paging, which is not scalable for large groups, but some type of group paging is required, as explained in our contribution ([R2-2101736](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101736.zip)). We think QC and Kyocera are pointing out the same issue.  We agree that RRC reconfiguration can be used for connected mode. |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | **Yes with comment** | We assume rapporteur is suggesting to take the legacy CN paging, RAN paging, and RRC reconfiguration message as baseline since details need FFS. |
| **OPPO** | **Yes** | Furthermore, we also think the clarification should be necessary for session activation/start from SA2. |

* 1. Editor's note on 5GC SharedMBS delivery (section in 8.7 of TR 23.757)

Editor's note: How 5GC Shared MBS delivery is enabled for the UE will be developed with RAN WGs.

In rapporteur’s understanding, this note is more related to RAN3 work and RAN3 has already replied to this question to SA2 in a previous meeting in [8]:

|  |
| --- |
| *- SA2 agrees that for N3 transport of the shared delivery method of MBS data, GTP-U tunnelling using a transport layer IP multicast method and shared N3 (GTP-U) Point-to-Point tunnel shall be supported from MB-UPF to NG-RAN nodes. This tunnel can use either IP multicast transport (NG-RAN sends IGMP/MLD Join/Leave to a multicast router) or point-to-point unidirectional N3 tunnels from MB-UPF to NG-RAN nodes. For unicast transport there shall be 1-1 mapping between MBS Session and GTP-U tunnel towards a RAN node, and for multicast transport there shall be 1-1 mapping between MBS Session and the GTP-U tunnel.*  **Feedback:** RAN3 will develop protocol support to control both transmission modes for shared N3 transport between the MB-UPF and the NG-RAN. |

**Question 4: Do companies agree that RAN2 does not have to address the note on 5GC Shared MBS delivery in the reply LS to SA2?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments (if you disagree, please provide clarifications and an alternative proposal)** |
| **QC** | **Yes** | It is RAN3 discussion. |
| **MediaTek** | **Yes** |  |
| **Nokia** | **Yes** | RAN3 issue. |
| **Kyocera** | **Yes** | We agree the rapporteur’s analysis. |
| **CATT** | **Yes** | Agree not to reply from RAN2 point of view.  By the way, RAN2 may also need to discuss on how to enable 5GC Shared MBS delivery on target cell after handover from RAN not supporting 5MBS to NG-RAN supporting 5MBS based on RAN3 conclusion. But anyway this should be discussed under agenda item on mobility. |
| **Xiaomi** | **Yes** |  |
| **Spreadtrum** | **Yes** |  |
| **Ericsson** | **Yes** | This is discussed in RAN3 (e.g. [R3-210632](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG3_Iu/TSGR3_111-e/Docs/R3-210632.zip)) |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | **Yes** |  |
| **OPPO** | **Yes** | It is up to RAN3. |

* 1. Editor's note on handover to non-MBS NG-RAN node (section in 8.7 of TR 23.757)

- During the inter supporting 5MBS NG-RAN node handover, minimization of data loss may be supported, e.g. by data forwarding, details for RAN WGs to decide.

Editor's note: It is FFS whether the support for lossless handover with data forwarding from source NG-RAN supporting 5MBS to the target NG-RAN not supporting 5MBS is needed, which needs confirmation by RAN.

Currently, RAN2 has agreed the following: ‘*R2 aim to support lossless handover for MBS-MBS mobility for service that requires this (TBD which detailed scenario but at least PTP-PTP)*’ and has not discussed MBS to non-MBS node handover yet. This editor’s note is discussed in several contribution, e.g. [4], [5], [6], [9], [10]. Many companies indicate that this scenario can be handled in a similar way as legacy handover, i.e. by switching the traffic from delivery via MRB to delivery via DRB either before or during the handover. However, it is also underlined that whether this can be done without data losses has to be further investigated and requires progress from other WGs, i.e. RAN3 and SA2.

**Question 5: Do companies agree that:**

1. **From RAN2 perspective, mobility between the source gNB supporting MBS and target gNB not supporting MBS can be achieved by switching the traffic from delivery via MRB to delivery via DRB either before or during the handover.**
2. **Whether and how this can be done without data losses has to be further investigated and requires progress from other WGs, i.e. RAN3 and SA2.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | | **Yes/No** | | **Comments (if you disagree, please provide clarifications and an alternative proposal)** | |
| **QC** | | **Yes** | | NR MBS loss-less HO from source gNB supporting MBS to target gNB “not” supporting MBS can be supported in 2 steps.  - Step 1: source gNB switches Multicast delivery from PTM RLC to PTP RLC link and  - Step 2: perform unicast loss-less HO from source gNB PTP to target gNB unicast DRB.  NR MBS loss-less HO from source gNB “not” supporting MBS to target gNB supporting MBS can be supported in 2 steps.  - Step 1: Perform unicast loss-less HO from source gNB unicast DRB to target gNB PTP RLC leg.  - Step 2: Target gNB switches Multicast delivery from PTP RLC leg to PTM RLC leg. | |
| **MediaTek** | | **Yes** | |  | |
| **Nokia** | | **Yes** | | For the purpose of answering the LS, the high level description from the rapporteur above is good enough. | |
| **Kyocera** | | **Yes** | | We agree the rapporteur’s analysis. | |
| **CATT** | | **Yes** | | Agree to answer the LS with this.  And for the two options mentioned by Rapporteur to perform the handover from MBS cell to non-MBS cell,  Option 1: switching the traffic from delivery via MRB to delivery via DRB before the handover  Option 2:switching the traffic from delivery via MRB to delivery via DRB during the handover  We understand which option to choose should be discussed further under the agenda item on mobility, but not here. | |
| **Xiaomi** | | **Yes** | |  | |
| **Spreadtrum** | | **Yes** | |  | |
| **Ericsson** | | **Yes, but** | | First of all, we note that the SA2 note speaks of "lossless handover with data forwarding **from source NG-RAN supporting 5MBS to the target NG-RAN not supporting 5MBS**" and the question speaks of "**mobility between the source gNB supporting MBS and target gNB not supporting MBS**", which means that the SA2 note is for support in one direction while the moderator speaks of support in both directions. The moderator goes beyond the SA2 note.  In our contribution [9] we state:  Like the basic case of mobility between two MBS supporting nodes, depending on service requirements, lossless HO may be needed also in case of handover between an MBS supporting and non-MBS supporting nodes. For handling lossless, it is assumed that legacy mechanisms (e.g., SN status transfer, data forwarding, PDCP status reporting) can be used. However, as in the basic MBS-MBS mobility, there is need of synchronization of PDCP SN between source and target. This may not be the case if the UE moves from a non-MBS to MBS nodes. RAN2 should wait for progress in RAN3 on this topic before discussing lossless handling for these mobility scenarios.  For the case of mobility **from a NG-RAN supporting MBS to NG-RAN not supporting MBS,** a question is when to configure/setup radio resources associated with the unicast PDU session used for individual delivery. For example, setting up radio resources for the associated unicast PDU session before the actual HO would unnecessarily waste resources. It is therefore desired to have a full unicast PDU session setup (including RAN part, i.e., associated radio resource configuration) ready right before the source sends the non-MBS target HO request, i.e., when the source makes a handover decision. This can be left to network implementation.  Similarly, for the case of mobility **from a NG-RAN not supporting MBS to NG-RAN supporting MBS**, after switching from unicast PDU session to MBS session with MRB setup, it is proposed that RAN node should release radio resources associated with the unicast PDU session, i.e., used for individual delivery. Detailed solution can be left to network implementation.  In conclusion, mobility can be achieved between the two cells in the scenario raised by the moderator. However, that does not mean RAN2 needs to specify anything. To determine that, RAN2 should consider if:   * it is feasible to specify it (e.g. whether it is too complex given the allocated time in RAN2); or * whether it can be left to implementation (e.g. the necessary signalling already exists, and it is only a matter for an implementor to use it wisely). | |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | | **Yes** | |  | |
| **OPPO** | | **Yes** | |  | |

* 1. Editor's note on handover to non-MBS NG-RAN node (section in 8.7 of TR 23.757)

For delivery method switching not due to mobility, the following principle are agreed,

- Switching between PTP and PTM delivery methods for 5GC Shared MBS traffic delivery shall be supported. NG-RAN is the decision point for of switching the PTP and PTM delivery methods.

Editor's note: Whether any assistance information from CN is needed, e.g. for PTP/PTM delivery method decision and switching, needs further confirmation when the relevant conclusion is reached in RAN WGs.

Regarding the assistance information from CN to RAN for PTP/PTM decision and switching, it has been answered in the reply LS from RAN2 in R2-2011271. The conclusion was:

*RAN2 agreed that at least information of MBS services/groups subscribed by the UE (e.g. TMGI) and QoS requirements of a MBS service should be provided to RAN for MBS operation in general. RAN2 has not concluded whether any information from CN is needed, e.g. for PTP/PTM delivery method decision and switching.*

**Question 6: Do companies agree there is no need to further reply to SA2 on assistance information from CN to RAN on PTP/PTM delivery method decision and switching?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments (if you disagree, please provide clarifications and an alternative proposal)** |
| **QC** | **Yes** |  |
| **MediaTek** | **Yes** |  |
| **Nokia** | **Yes** | Perhaps a pointer towards that reply would help though. |
| **Kyocera** | **Yes** |  |
| **CATT** | **Yes** | No need to further reply for now. |
| **Xiaomi** | **Yes** |  |
| **Spreadtrum** | **Yes** |  |
| **Ericsson** | **Yes** |  |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | **Yes** |  |
| **OPPO** | **Yes** |  |

* 1. SA4’s question on SYNC and ROHC

In their LS, SA2 quotes SA4 question where SA4 asks the view on the need of SYNC and/or RoHC support in the MBSF-U. Regarding the SYNC issue, it is clarified in the WID on NR Multicast and Broadcast Services that [3]:

‘*SFN provides synchronized delivery of user plane packets over the air from different cells. No standardized support specifically for SFN, is provided in this WI. Any SFN operation is transparent to the UE, and any related synchronization is left to network implementation*.’

Based on WID, MBSFN can be supported by implementation within a gNB-DU. Therefore, SYNC is not required in Rel-17. Furthermore, RAN3 has the agreement, ‘*No SYNC protocol for this release*’. It is hard to speculate whether MBSFN would be supported in later releases in future. However, it is clear that the SYNC is not supported in Rel-17.

Regarding the ROHC issue, RAN2 has agreed to support ROHC in PDCP layer and this can be informed to SA2 and SA4.

Question 7: Do companies agree to reply to SA2/SA4 that:

1. SYNC protocol is not needed in Rel-17 as RAN has agreed that MBSFN is up to network implementation within one gNB-DU
2. RAN2 has agreed that ROHC is to be located in RAN.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments (if you disagree, please provide clarifications and an alternative proposal)** |
| **QC** | **Yes** |  |
| **MediaTek** | **Yes** |  |
| **Nokia** | **Yes** |  |
| **Kyocera** | **Yes** | However, we’re just wondering if RAN2 really needs to reply about SYNC protocol, i.e., it’s up to RAN3 to respond it. |
| **CATT** | **Yes** |  |
| **Xiaomi** | **Yes** |  |
| **Spreadtrum** | **Yes** |  |
| **Ericsson** | **Yes** | **Suggestion:**  SYNC protocol is not supported in the specifications in Rel-17 |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | **1)Yes**  **2) No** | 1) is fine for us.  2) Regarding ROHC, SA2 captured in their TR 23.757 8.2.2.2 that ROHC for MBS traffic is supported by the 5GS.   |  | | --- | | TR 23.757 8.2.2.2  - ROHC for MBS traffic is supported by the 5GS, e.g based on AF request.  - MBSF-C and MBSF-U functionality is supported based on A.3.  Editor's note: Coordination with SA4 is required to determine MBSF-C and MBSF-U functionality. |   Therefore, RAN2 is suggested to revisit the last time agreement:  - RoHC (at least U-mode) can be configured for NR MBS bearers. This is applicable for Mcast, assume this is applicable also to broadcast.  - RoHC is located at PDCP.  We understand the current ROHC support is only for multicast services. RAN2 is also suggested to discuss the handling of ROHC for broadcast services. |
| **OPPO** | **Yes** | RAN3 has agreed that no SYNC is needed in this release in RAN3#109 meeting. |

* 1. Summary

TBD

# Discussion on the running stage-2 CR

To be able to update the running stage-2 CR it is proposed to proceed in a following way:

1. Phase 1: Companies are requested to express their concerns in the table below keeping in mind the following principles:
   1. Please clarify the reason for concern and offer a solution (e.g. removal of something, alternative wording etc.)
   2. Please consider input from other companies and if you disagree with the proposals, please indicate so also with a clarification and a solution that could be satisfactory also to other companies.
   3. Please remember this is a running CR, so it should express the current status of work based on current agreements.
2. After Phase 1 input is gathered, discussion rapporteur summarizes the proposal and prepares an updated running CR for discussion.
3. Phase 2: Discussion on the updated running CR.

**Companies are requested to provide their concerns and suggestions for the running CR as captured in [3], in the table below.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Issue / problematic fragment** | **Clarification of the concern** | **Proposed solution (e.g. alternative wording)** |
| **QC** | Issue1: 16.x.1  Issue2: 16.x.2.5:  PDCP status report is supported.  Issue 3: 16.x.2.4 Configuration | Issue1: certain multicast services may have high reliability requirement but may be delay tolerant. Suggest adding “high latency” as well.  Issue 2: Better wording needed.  Issue 3: missing Editor Note | Issue 1: In case of multicast session with QoS requirement of high reliability, high or low latency, the UE can receive MBS data in RRC\_CONNECTED with mechanisms to guarantee required QoS requirement, e.g. feedback/retransmission and/or PTP assistance, if needed  Issue2: Suggested rewording as “UE is allowed to send PDCP status report during multicast loss-less HO”.  [Nokia]: disagree with the addition because a. not a new mechanism, b. the UE is not “allowed” but configured.  Issue 3: Suggest adding Editor’s Note as “ FFS how multicast configuration is provided for supporting Multicast reception in RRC\_CONNECTED state” |
| **MediaTek** | **Issue 1:** 16.x.1 General | **Issue 1: for** the transmission of MBS service, even though we may not use delivery mode ½ in the text but we need to align the expression for both cases. | **Issue 1: proposed wording**   * **In case of** the transmission for MBS service with QoS requirement of high reliability and/or low latency, the UE can receive MBS data in RRC\_CONNECTED with mechanisms to guarantee required QoS requirement, e.g. feedback/retransmission and/or PTP assistance, if needed. * **In case of** the transmission of MBS service with QoS requirement of low reliability and/or latency- tolerant , the UE can receive MBS data in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE/RRC\_CONNECTED and neither feedback/retransmission nor PTP assistance for reliability guarantee is needed. |
| AT&T | *Issue 1*: 16.x.1, the two sentences starting with “In case of”  *Issue 2*: 16.x.1 and other places | *Issue 1*: Use of subjective and undefined terms such as “high” and “low” reads like marketing, not technical text, including reference to low reliability as a “requirement”. Technically, the sentences may be inaccurate, as same QoS (in terms of packet loss and delay) that can be achieved in M mode via HARQ and/or PTP, can also be achieved in B mode using fixed lower modulation/coding and quick repeat.  *Issue 2*: While use of the word “session” aligns terminology with SA2 today, it may cause mis-alignment for RAN2 in the future, if SA2 adds new features and/or RAN2 defines new stuff, lifts restrictions or adds optimizations. In addition, and for example, the word “session” is overloaded and often implies “connection”, which looks strange for MBS which normally uses connectionless UDP protocol. | *Issue 1*: suggest remove all QoS/reliability references that could be technically inaccurate or interpreted negatively towards broadcast mode:  “**In case of** broadcast session, the UE can receive MBS data in RRC\_IDLE, RRC\_INACTIVE and RRC\_CONNECTED.”  “**In case of** multicast session, the UE can receive MBS data in RRC\_CONNECTED and use additional assistance mechanisms like feedback/retransmission and/or PTP delivery.”  *Issue 2*: suggest use the terms “MBS delivery”, “multicast delivery” and “broadcast delivery” in lieu of “MBS session”, “multicast session” and “broadcast session”, respectively. |
| Nokia | 1. Terminology  2. High Level Description in 16.x.1  3. PTP/PTM switch  4. Configuration | 1. Several terms are used to cover the same thing :  1A.NG-RAN/NG-RAN node  1B. 5G MBS Service / MBS service  2. Convoluted   * 3. Not clear | 1A. Stick to gNB as NG-RAN node has a broader scope than gNB.  1B. Stick to MBS service  2A. We understand the intention was to reuse what SA2 has agreed in 23.757. We would prefer simply importing the definitions untouched.  2B. It seems odd to say that the UE can receive. It would be better to say that the UE is configured to receive.  3A. PTP and PTM have been used extensively e.g. in 36.300 without being defined so perhaps we do not need those definitions?  3B. If we do, the definition of PTP should be corrected “NG-RAN individually delivers separate copies of MBS data packet to UEs” instead of “NG-RAN delivers separate copies of MBS data packet over radio to individual UE”.  3C. “are available for the transmission of MBS packet flows over radio via NG-RAN” does not seem to be bring any value and should be removed. Also not clear what a packet flow is, nor what alternative to the radio there is for transmission.   * 3D. The whole text could be simplified by “For multicast delivery to a given UE, the gNB decides whether to use point-to-point (PTP) or point-to-multipoint (PTM). |
| Xiaomi | 1. Protocol architecture for broadcast | 1. No section is reserved for the protocol architecture for broadcast | We can have a new section or re-structure the section a little bit to allow the inclusion of the protocol architecture for broadcast. |
| Ericsson | 1. High Level Description in 16.x.1  2. Editorials | 1a. Similar issues as identified by AT&T, i.e. the use of “high” / “low” is ambiguous, and we share the view that with different means similar quality can be achieved via broadcast or multicast (perhaps cell border performance is challenging).  1b. We do not understand what is meant with “specific data content”. We think not all UEs in the geographical area can receive the broadcast session. We wonder if there can be different geographical areas for different broadcast sessions? A dedicated set of UEs can receive a multicast session, not the multicast service. The term "deliver" is used, but it is perhaps better to clarify who can receive it? We wonder if it would not be more clear to say "UE that has joined a multicast session" instead of “dedicated UEs”, or are there cases where a UE can receive multicast data without joining a session? The reference TX 23.xxx refers to a to be created specification by SA2, i.e. not TR 23.757. We wonder if these aspects should be specified when SA2 has written TS 23.xxx?  2. Editorials | 1a. We support the wording suggested by AT&T  1b. We are not sure how this paragraph should be corrected, because some issues are not clear to us.  2.  The UE can receive the MBS configuration for broadcast session in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE/. |
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