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# Introduction

The contribution is the report of following email discussion.

* [AT109bis-e][030][IIOT] Ethernet Header Compression (Intel)

Scope: Treat topics in 6.7.4.2, based on [R2-2003782](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_109bis-e\Docs\R2-2003782.zip) and comments.

Part 1: Determine which issues that need resolution, find agreeable proposals, can consider attempt to agree TP. Deadline: April 24 0700 UTC. Result to be merged to PDCP CRs.

# Discussion

## Whether to have reserved bit in EHC header

Terminology: to avoid confusion regarding reserved bit discussion, we’d like to emphasize that *EHC header* denotes the header in EHC full header format and/or EHC compressed header format in clause A.2.1.1 of TS 38.323 v16.0.0 [1], and *EHC* *feedback packet* is specified in clause A.2.1.2 of TS 38.323 v16.0.0 [1].

In RAN2#109-e meeting, following was agreed: “*EHC header only contains Context ID field, format indication bit, and reserved bit(s) if needed. The number of reserved bit(s) are FFS*”. Contributions R2-2002718 [4], R2-2002773 [6], and R2-2002973 [9] propose to have reserved bit/codepoint for future extensibility, e.g. when introducing profiles for EHC in future releases. On the other hand, contributions R2-2002712 [3], R2-2002758 [5], R2-2002936 [8], R2-2003171 [10], , R2-2003321 [13], and R2-2003755 [14] propose not to have reserved bit in EHC header, with the following reasons: 1) there is very little possibility to introduce a new packet format in future releases, because Ethernet header is long-existing format and difficult to be changed; 2) if there is a need to introduce new EHC profile in future releases, a new EHC header format can be introduced with RRC configuration; 3) the drawback of having reserved bit in EHC header is that the maximum number of EHC contexts is reduced to half; 4) potential future support for non-standard-Ethernet based protocols requires probably further changes in the EHC than using 1-2 bits.

One thing to note is that there are different options for companies proposing to have reserved bit/code point. R2-2002718 [4] proposes to have 1 reserved bit in EHC header, R2-2002773 [6] proposes to have 1 reserved code point, while R2-2002973 [9] proposes to have 1 and 3 reserved bits for 1 byte and 2 byte EHC header, respectively.

Given that there are majority views (6 out of 9 companies) to not have reserved bit/codepoint in EHC header, and agreeing on having reserved bits will take further discussion regarding reserved bit vs. reserved code point, and the number of reserved bits for 2 byte EHC header, following is proposed.

**Proposal 1**: There is no reserved bit/codepoint in EHC header.

**Question 1**: please provide your feedback on Proposal 1.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support Proposal 1 (Yes/No)** | **Comments** |
| LG | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | No | We are not sure there’d be need of a large number of CID in the first release of EHC application, and we see having a reserve bit would provide more flexibility for future extension, not only for possible new profiles, but also for new EHC header format in general.  We can, however, go with the majority, as this is not a critical issue. |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |

If there is no reserved bit in EHC header, contributions R2-2002712 [3], R2-2002758 [5], R2-2002936 [8], R2-2003171 [10], and R2-2003321 [13] propose that CID length is 7 or 15 bits, for 1 byte and 2 bytes EHC header, respectively. Note that this also applies to the case that there is one reserved code point in EHC header. On the other hand, with the assumption of have reserved bit, according to R2-2002718 [4], CID length is 6 or 14 bits, for 1 byte and 2 byte EHC header, respectively. According to R2-2002973 [9], CID length is 4 or 14 bits, for 1 byte and 2 bytes EHC header, respectively.

For consistency with Proposal 1, following is proposed:

**Proposal 2**: CID length is 7 or 15 bits, for 1 byte and 2 byte EHC header, respectively.

If Proposal 2 is agreed, then following Editor’s notes in TS 38.323 v16.0.0 can be removed:

* Clause A.2.1.1: *It is FFS whether and how many reserved bits are included in the EHC header*
* Clause A.2.2: *It is decided that 1 or 2 bytes are allocated for CID field. However, exact length of the CID field is not decided yet.*

**Question 2:** please provide your feedback on Proposal 2. Companies do not support the proposal are invited to provide their preference on CID length for 1 byte and 2 byte EHC header.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support Proposal 2 (Yes/No)** | **Comments** |
| LG | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | Yes if Proposal 1 is taken |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |

EHC feedback packet contains only CID field, and there is a related Editor’s note in TS 38.323 v16.0.0 [1]: “*It is FFS how many reserved bits are included in the EHC feedback packet*”. The specification assumes 1 reserved bit in EHC feedback packet since only CID field is included. If there is no reserved bit in EHC header, contributions R2-2002758 [5], R2-2003171 [10], and R2-2003321 [13] propose to confirm the EHC feedback packet format in PDCP running CR, i.e. there is 1 reserved bit in EHC feedback packet. Note that this also applies to the case that there is one reserved code point in EHC header. On the other hand, with the assumption of having reserved bit in EHC header, according to R2-2002718 [4], there should be 2 reserved bits in EHC feedback packet format, while according to R2-2002973 [9], there are 4 and 2 reserved bits in EHC feedback packet format, for 1 byte and 2 byte EHC header, respectively.

For consistency with Proposal 1, following is proposed:

**Proposal 3**: EHC feedback packet format in TS 38.323 v16.0.0 clause A2.1.2 can be confirmed, i.e. there is 1 reserved bit in EHC feedback packet.

If Proposal 3 is agreed, editor’s note “*It is FFS how many reserved bits are included in the EHC feedback packet*” in TS 38.323 v16.0.0 clause A.2.1.2 can be removed.

**Question 3:** please provide your feedback on Proposal 3. Companies do not support the proposal are invited to provide their preference on the number of reserved bits in EHC feedback packet.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support Proposal 3 (Yes/No)** | **Comments** |
| LG | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | Yes if Proposal 1 is taken |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |

## Decompressor behavior when receiving unknow context ID

The issue was discussed in RAN2#109e-meeting without conclusion and was postpone to this meeting. R2-2002669 [2] proposes that decompressor should indicate to the compressor when receiving unknown context ID, R2-2003296 [12] suggest not to address this issue since this is an error case, and R2-2003758 [15] proposes to confirm that EHC feedback contains only CID, and further proposes to define compressor’s behaviour when overwriting a CID so that decompressor cannot receive unknow context IDs. In TS 38.323 v16.0.0 Annex A.1, it is specified that “*The EHC compressor keeps transmitting the FH packets until the EHC feedback is received from the EHC decompressor*…*After receiving the EHC feedback, the EHC compressor starts to transmit the CH packets to the EHC decompressor including the associated CID.*” It is understood that above specification text also applies to the case that compressor selects the CID which had already established (i.e. CID overwriting case), therefore there is no need to have further clarification.

Given that there is only 1 company proposing to specify decompressor behavior if it receives a compressed packet with an unknow context ID, and current feedback mechanism specified in TS 38.323 v16.0.0 prevents the problem of unknown context ID (compressor only sends compressed packet after receiving the feedback), it is proposed to not specify decompressor behavior when receiving unknown context ID.

**Proposal 4**: There is no need to specify decompressor behavior if it receives a compressed packet with an unknown context ID.

**Question 4:** please provide your feedback on Proposal 4.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support Proposal 4 (Yes/No)** | **Comments** |
| LG | Yes |  |
| Ericssson | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |

## RRC parameter

Contribution R2-2002758 [5] and R2-2002936 [8] propose to replace parameter *ehc-HeaderSize*with *ehc-CIDLength*, to align between PDCP and RRC specification. R2-2002712 [3] proposes to keep *ehc-HeaderSize* and PDCP specification describes corresponding EHC header formats and therein clarifies to which CID the headers sizes belong to. R2-2003171 [10] proposes to introduce parameter *maxCID-EHC* and removes both *ehc-HeaderSize* and *ehc-CIDLength*, and R2-2003758 [15] also proposes to introduce MAX\_CID for EHC.

**Question 5:** please provide your preference on following options:

Option a: replace parameter *ehc-HeaderSize*with *ehc-CIDLength*

Option b: keep *ehc-HeaderSize*

Option c: introduce parameter *maxCID-EHC* and remove both *ehc-HeaderSize* and *ehc-CIDLength*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preference (a/b/c)** | **Comments** |
| LG | a | Option b is not correct because; for the FH packet, the EHC header comprises bytes for CID field and Ethernet header, which would be much larger than 1 or 2 bytes.  Option c is used in ROHC to indicate three kinds of CID fields, i.e. small CID, 1 byte large CID and 2 bytes large CID. However, in EHC, there are only two kinds of CID fields, and there is no reason to introduce such parameter. |
| Ericsson | a | Option a is the most correct option. However also b would be acceptable when clearly described. |
| Futurewei | a | CID length is a DRB parameter, and it’d be better to clearly separate it from the max number of CID a UE can support.  Header size can be different between FH packet and compressed packet for the same length of CID. |
| Qualcomm | a |  |
|  |  |  |

A related discussion is on how to handle clause “5.12.3 Protocol parameters” and its Editor’s Note: “*The need for configuration parameters is FFS.*” Contribution R2-2002758 [5] proposes to remove the clause since it is a copy of corresponding ROHC clause. R2-2002712 [3] proposes that RRC parameters can be described in this section. R2-2003171 [10] proposed to clarify that EHC header size and CID field length in EHC header are derived based on *maxCID-EHC*.

**Question 6:** please provide your preference on how to handle clause “5.12.3 Protocol parameters”.

Option a: Remove clause “5.12.3 Protocol parameters”.

Option b: Update clause “5.12.3 Protocol parameters” to document EHC parameters.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preference (a/b)** | **Comments (including e.g. proposed text for clause “5.12.3 Protocol parameters”)** |
| LG | a | But we have to make VOID for this section instead of removing. |
| Ericsson | a |  |
| Futurewei | a | This section can be VOID’ed, as EHC is fully specified in PDCP. |
| Qualcomm | a | Agree with Futurewei explanation |
|  |  |  |

## Configuration

Reconfiguration involving PDCP re-establishment

R2-2002718 [4] and R2-2003171 [10] propose that network reconfigures *ethernetHeaderCompression* only upon reconfiguration involving PDCP re-establishment, similar to ROHC. In the email discussion in RAN2#109-e meeting, some companies indicated that this can be handled by the implementation and that such restriction is not required. From contributions submitted to this meeting, both companies prefer to capture the restriction.

**Proposal 5**: Network reconfigures *ethernetHeaderCompression* only upon reconfiguration involving PDCP re-establishment.

**Question 7:** please provide your feedback on Proposal 5.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support Proposal 5 (Yes/No)** | **Comments** |
| LG | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | No | Can be handled by network implementation. |
| Futurewei | Yes | This avoid the context confusion (e.g., the CID length) when the reconfiguration message is received. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | We are open to discuss if there is any constraint placed on the network due to the “yes” answer. |
|  |  |  |

LTE EHC configuration

Contribution R2-2002908 [7] proposes that for LTE, EHC cannot be configured with UDC, following the same principle of not configuring ROHC and UDC together. Although it is only proposed by one company, the proposal is expected to be easily agreeable.

**Proposal 6**: For LTE, EHC cannot be configured together with UDC.

**Question 8:** please provide your feedback on Proposal 6.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support Proposal 6 (Yes/No)** | **Comments** |
| LG | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |

## Other potential open issues

Differentiation between SDAP control and data PDUs

Contribution R2-2002908 [7] proposes to distinguish SDAP control PDU from SDAP Data PDU if both SDAP header and EHC are configured, since PDCP entity should generate EHC header for SDAP Data PDU while it should not generate EHC header for SDAP control PDU.

**Question 9:** please provide your preference on following options if both SDAP header and EHC are configured:

Option a: add clarification in PDCP specification to distinguish SDAP control PDU from SDAP Data PDU.

Option b: leave the handling to UE implementation.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preference (a/b)** | **Comments** |
| LG | b | For ROHC, there is no special handling on distinguishing SDAP header. Thus, it should be also left up to UE implementation for EHC. |
| Ericsson | b |  |
| Futurewei | b | The compressor and decompressor can already distinguish SDAP data PDU and control PDU, and know that there is no ethernet header in SDAP control PDU. |
| Qualcomm | b |  |
|  |  |  |

Ethernet frame handling by EHC

R2-2003172 [11] proposes to adopt a TP regarding detailed example of operation on different Ethernet header structures as informative text.

**Question 10:** please provide your preference on whether to capture example of operation on different Ethernet header structures as informative text.:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Whether to capture an informative text (Yes/No)** | **Comments (including proposed changes to the TP if any)** |
| LG | No | We don’t see any clear reason to include such informative example. |
| Ericsson | No |  |
| Futurewei | Yes | An informative section (e.g., an annex) can be helpful. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Not a strong view though |
|  |  |  |

# Conclusion

**[To be provided at the end of email discussion]**
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