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**1. Overall Description:**

For intra-UE prioritization cases with uplink grants overlapping in time (i.e. DG v.s. CG collision and CG v.s. CG collision), it was agreed in RAN2 #108 that prioritization in MAC should be determined based on the highest logical channel (LCH) priority of data that can be conveyed by each grant, as well as considering the data availability in the buffer of these LCHs:

|  |
| --- |
| **RAN2 #108 Chairman’s Notes:*** For CGCG conflicts, and CGDG conflicts, the priority value of an uplink grant (UL-SCH resource) is the highest priority of the LCHs that is multiplexed or can be multiplexed in MAC PDU, taking into account LCH restrictions and data availability.
 |

This agreement is already captured in the latest MAC specifications, TS 38.321 v16.0.0. Furthermore, it was concluded in RAN2 #109e that there can be situations where MAC delivers two MAC PDUs for the two conflicting grants to PHY sequentially when the conflicting grants have the same L1 priority, and the second MAC PDU carries data with higher LCH priority (due to e.g. late traffic arrival) than the first MAC PDU:

|  |
| --- |
| **RAN2 #109e Chairman’s Notes:*** Observation, acc to current R2 agreements: In case that two MAC PDUs with the same L1 priority (i.e. high-high or low-low) are delivered by MAC, the second PDU has priority from RAN2 perspective (based on LCH priority).
 |

From MAC perspective, the second PDU is delivered to PHY, as it has higher priority data. However, it is RAN2’s understanding that PHY may not transmit this second PDU, e.g. the PUSCH of a dynamic grant would always prioritize the PUSCH of a conflicting configured grant with the same L1 priority regardless of the LCH priority of carried data. Hence, there is a gap between RAN1 and RAN2 that is desirable to resolve.

RAN2 has concluded two possible options to address this gap:

1. RAN2 changes MAC specification to accommodate current PHY behaviour of basing the prioritization decisions based on L1 priorities. With this option, MAC will avoid providing second MAC PDU with the same L1 priority to PHY.
2. RAN1 changes PHY specification to accommodate current MAC behaviour of prioritizing the second MAC PDU provided from MAC.

As the issue concerns both PHY and MAC layers, RAN2 would like to request feedback from RAN1 on the preferred way to eliminate this gap. RAN2 has no preference between the two options. RAN2 has identified the area of changes in the MAC specification if Option 1 is selected.

**2. Actions:**

**To RAN1 group.**

**ACTION:** RAN2 respectfully asks RAN1 to take the above information into account and provide feedback on which option is more feasible/appropriate as the way forward to resolve the RAN1/RAN2 gap identified in this LS.

**3. Date of Next TSG-RAN WG2 Meetings:**

3GPPRAN2#110e 01 Jun -12 Jun 2020 Online

3GPPRAN2#111 24 Aug -28 Aug 2020 Toulouse, France