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# 1 Introduction

This document is to handle the following email discussion:

* [AT116-e][007][NR1516] PDCP (Samsung)

Scope: Determine agreeable parts in a first phase, for agreeable parts agree on CRs. Treat [R2-2111027](file:///D%3A%5C%5CDocuments%5C%5C3GPP%5C%5Ctsg_ran%5C%5CWG2%5C%5CTSGR2_116-e%5C%5CDocs%5C%5CR2-2111027.zip%22%20%5Co%20%22D%3ADocuments3GPPtsg_ranWG2TSGR2_116-eDocsR2-2111027.zip) (AI 5.3.2), [R2-2109945](file:///D%3A%5C%5CDocuments%5C%5C3GPP%5C%5Ctsg_ran%5C%5CWG2%5C%5CTSGR2_116-e%5C%5CDocs%5C%5CR2-2109945.zip%22%20%5Co%20%22D%3ADocuments3GPPtsg_ranWG2TSGR2_116-eDocsR2-2109945.zip), [R2-2109946](file:///D%3A%5C%5CDocuments%5C%5C3GPP%5C%5Ctsg_ran%5C%5CWG2%5C%5CTSGR2_116-e%5C%5CDocs%5C%5CR2-2109946.zip%22%20%5Co%20%22D%3ADocuments3GPPtsg_ranWG2TSGR2_116-eDocsR2-2109946.zip), [R2-2109947](file:///D%3A%5C%5CDocuments%5C%5C3GPP%5C%5Ctsg_ran%5C%5CWG2%5C%5CTSGR2_116-e%5C%5CDocs%5C%5CR2-2109947.zip%22%20%5Co%20%22D%3ADocuments3GPPtsg_ranWG2TSGR2_116-eDocsR2-2109947.zip), [R2-2110757](file:///D%3A%5C%5CDocuments%5C%5C3GPP%5C%5Ctsg_ran%5C%5CWG2%5C%5CTSGR2_116-e%5C%5CDocs%5C%5CR2-2110757.zip%22%20%5Co%20%22D%3ADocuments3GPPtsg_ranWG2TSGR2_116-eDocsR2-2110757.zip), [R2-2110758](file:///D%3A%5C%5CDocuments%5C%5C3GPP%5C%5Ctsg_ran%5C%5CWG2%5C%5CTSGR2_116-e%5C%5CDocs%5C%5CR2-2110758.zip%22%20%5Co%20%22D%3ADocuments3GPPtsg_ranWG2TSGR2_116-eDocsR2-2110758.zip)

Intended outcome: Report, Agreed CRs if applicable

Deadline: Schedule 1

The following documents are to be treated in this email discussion:

## 5.3.2 RLC PDCP SDAP

[R2-2111027](file:///D%3A%5C%5CDocuments%5C%5C3GPP%5C%5Ctsg_ran%5C%5CWG2%5C%5CTSGR2_116-e%5C%5CDocs%5C%5CR2-2111027.zip%22%20%5Co%20%22D%3ADocuments3GPPtsg_ranWG2TSGR2_116-eDocsR2-2111027.zip) On association between RLC entities and PDCP entity Huawei, HiSilicon discussion Rel-15 NR\_newRAT-Core

## 6.1.3.3 PDCP

[R2-2109945](file:///D%3A%5C%5CDocuments%5C%5C3GPP%5C%5Ctsg_ran%5C%5CWG2%5C%5CTSGR2_116-e%5C%5CDocs%5C%5CR2-2109945.zip%22%20%5Co%20%22D%3ADocuments3GPPtsg_ranWG2TSGR2_116-eDocsR2-2109945.zip) Clarification on the ciphering of LTE EHC header Samsung discussion Rel-16 NR\_IIOT-Core

[R2-2109946](file:///D%3A%5C%5CDocuments%5C%5C3GPP%5C%5Ctsg_ran%5C%5CWG2%5C%5CTSGR2_116-e%5C%5CDocs%5C%5CR2-2109946.zip%22%20%5Co%20%22D%3ADocuments3GPPtsg_ranWG2TSGR2_116-eDocsR2-2109946.zip) CR for the ciphering of LTE EHC header (Rel-15) Samsung CR Rel-15 36.323 15.6.0 0297 - F NR\_IIOT-Core

[R2-2109947](file:///D%3A%5C%5CDocuments%5C%5C3GPP%5C%5Ctsg_ran%5C%5CWG2%5C%5CTSGR2_116-e%5C%5CDocs%5C%5CR2-2109947.zip%22%20%5Co%20%22D%3ADocuments3GPPtsg_ranWG2TSGR2_116-eDocsR2-2109947.zip) CR for the ciphering of LTE EHC header (Rel-16) Samsung CR Rel-16 36.323 16.4.0 0298 - A NR\_IIOT-Core

[R2-2110757](file:///D%3A%5C%5CDocuments%5C%5C3GPP%5C%5Ctsg_ran%5C%5CWG2%5C%5CTSGR2_116-e%5C%5CDocs%5C%5CR2-2110757.zip%22%20%5Co%20%22D%3ADocuments3GPPtsg_ranWG2TSGR2_116-eDocsR2-2110757.zip) Clarification on joint EHC and RoHC operation MediaTek Inc. CR Rel-16 38.323 16.5.0 0083 - F NR\_IIOT-Core

[R2-2110758](file:///D%3A%5C%5CDocuments%5C%5C3GPP%5C%5Ctsg_ran%5C%5CWG2%5C%5CTSGR2_116-e%5C%5CDocs%5C%5CR2-2110758.zip%22%20%5Co%20%22D%3ADocuments3GPPtsg_ranWG2TSGR2_116-eDocsR2-2110758.zip) Clarification on joint EHC and RoHC operation MediaTek Inc. CR Rel-16 36.323 16.4.0 0299 - F NR\_IIOT-Core

2 Contact Information

The rapporteur encourages the delegates who provide input to provide their contact information in the below table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Contact: Name (E-mail) |
| Samsung (Donggun Kim) | s\_dg.kim@samsung.com |
| Huawei, HiSilicon (Chong Lou) | louchong@huawei.com |
| LG Electronics (SeungJune Yi) | seungjune.yi@lge.com |
| ZTE Corporation | Dong.fei@zte.com.cn |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 3 Discussion

## [R2-2111027](file:///D%3A%5C%5CDocuments%5C%5C3GPP%5C%5Ctsg_ran%5C%5CWG2%5C%5CTSGR2_116-e%5C%5CDocs%5C%5CR2-2111027.zip%22%20%5Co%20%22D%3ADocuments3GPPtsg_ranWG2TSGR2_116-eDocsR2-2111027.zip) On association between RLC entities and PDCP entity Huawei, HiSilicon discussion Rel-15 NR\_newRAT-Core

**Proposal 1: RAN2 to discuss whether it is possible to lift the restriction about the symmetric association between RLC entities and PDCP entity in PDCP spec, to allow building asymmetric UM RLC entities for a radio bearer with marginal spec impact but offer much more flexibility.**

**Q1. Do you agree to lift the restriction about the symmetric association between RLC entities and PDCP entity specified in 38.323 to allow building asymmetric UM RLC entities for a radio bearer?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree | Proponent, we don’t see much value to set this limitation in spec.  |
| LGE | Comments | We have some sympathy for proposal. But, this change should not be considered for Rel-15/16. It could be discussed for TEI17. |
| ZTE | Not for R15 | It can only be discussed in TEI 17  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## [R2-2109945](file:///D%3A%5C%5C01_RAN2%20meeting%5C%5C2021%201101%20RAN2-116e%5C%5C%EB%82%B4%EB%B6%80%20%EC%A4%80%EB%B9%84%20%ED%9A%8C%EC%9D%98%20%EA%B4%80%EB%A0%A8%5C%5CDocs%5C%5CR2-2109945.zip) Clarification on the ciphering of LTE EHC header Samsung discussion Rel-16 NR\_IIOT-Core

[R2-2109946](file:///D%3A%5C%5C01_RAN2%20meeting%5C%5C2021%201101%20RAN2-116e%5C%5C%EB%82%B4%EB%B6%80%20%EC%A4%80%EB%B9%84%20%ED%9A%8C%EC%9D%98%20%EA%B4%80%EB%A0%A8%5C%5CDocs%5C%5CR2-2109946.zip) CR for the ciphering of LTE EHC header (Rel-15) Samsung CR Rel-15 36.323 15.6.0 0297 - F NR\_IIOT-Core

[R2-2109947](file:///D%3A%5C%5C01_RAN2%20meeting%5C%5C2021%201101%20RAN2-116e%5C%5C%EB%82%B4%EB%B6%80%20%EC%A4%80%EB%B9%84%20%ED%9A%8C%EC%9D%98%20%EA%B4%80%EB%A0%A8%5C%5CDocs%5C%5CR2-2109947.zip) CR for the ciphering of LTE EHC header (Rel-16) Samsung CR Rel-16 36.323 16.4.0 0298 - A NR\_IIOT-Core

**Reason for change:**

In RAN2#107bis, RAN2 made the following agreements:

* The EHC function is in PDCP
* The EHC header is located after the SDAP header, and it is ciphered

However, it is not clear whether to cipher the EHC header in the current PDCP specification.

**Q2. Do you agree to clarify the ciphering of LTE EHC header in 36.323 given that RAN2 already clarified the ciphering of NR EHC header in 38.323 in the last meeting?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree, but | We still don’t think it is essential. But we can follow the majority view.  |
| LGE | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Follow the majorities | No strong view. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Q3. Which option do you prefer if you agree to clarify the ciphering of LTE EHC header in 36.323? or do you have any other suggestion?**

|  |
| --- |
| **Option 1 (LTE style)**6.3.3 DataLength: VariableThe Data field may include either one of the following:- Uncompressed PDCP SDU (user plane data, or control plane data); or- Compressed PDCP SDU (user plane data only); or- UDC header and UDC Data Block if UDC is configured.- EHC header and compressed PDCP SDU if EHC is configured. |

If we go for Option 1, then one Rel-16 CR would be needed.

|  |
| --- |
| **Option 2 (NR style)** 6.3.3 DataLength: VariableThe Data field may include either one of the following:- Uncompressed PDCP SDU (user plane data, or control plane data); or- Compressed PDCP SDU (user plane data only); orNOTE: All fields other than PDCP PDU header and MAC-I belong to Data field.‎ |

If we go for Option 2, then one Rel-15 CR and one Rel-16 CR would be needed.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Preferred option | Comments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2 with revisions | If we have to have a CR, we can compromise to Option 2 with revisions in order to align with NR spec, but we don’t think the last bullet of “UDC header and UDC Data Block if UDC is configured” should be removed. We see no issue with this bullet for the proposed NOTE. It is worthy noting that we should minimize the CR maintenance burden for developers especially it is just to beautify the LTE text.  |
| LGE | Option 2 | We don’t understand Huawei’s concern. The NOTE covers UDC, and leaving the UDC bullet makes more confusion.[LC]: Sorry I should be clearer when making the comment. Our concern is to remove the legacy text will cause more confusion for the developers to trace the CR history for internal implementation check. Given that Option 2 doesn’t affect the UDC bullet but to address EHC case, we don’t see a strong reason to remove LTE text and we can only compromise to add a generic NOTE. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Q4. Do you agree to both R2-2109946 (Rel-15 CR) and R2-2109947 (Rel-16 CR) if you prefer Option 2?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree with revisions | As above |
| LGE | Agree |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## [R2-2110757](file:///D%3A%5C%5C01_RAN2%20meeting%5C%5C2021%201101%20RAN2-116e%5C%5C%EB%82%B4%EB%B6%80%20%EC%A4%80%EB%B9%84%20%ED%9A%8C%EC%9D%98%20%EA%B4%80%EB%A0%A8%5C%5CDocs%5C%5CR2-2110757.zip) Clarification on joint EHC and RoHC operation MediaTek Inc. CR Rel-16 38.323 16.5.0 0083 - F NR\_IIOT-Core

[R2-2110758](file:///D%3A%5C%5C01_RAN2%20meeting%5C%5C2021%201101%20RAN2-116e%5C%5C%EB%82%B4%EB%B6%80%20%EC%A4%80%EB%B9%84%20%ED%9A%8C%EC%9D%98%20%EA%B4%80%EB%A0%A8%5C%5CDocs%5C%5CR2-2110758.zip) Clarification on joint EHC and RoHC operation MediaTek Inc. CR Rel-16 36.323 16.4.0 0299 - F NR\_IIOT-Core

**Reason for change:**

When ROHC and EHC are jointly configured for a DRB, the current specifications require the EHC decompressor to bypass the ROHC decompressor for non-IP packets. When this operation was discussed in R2-109e, the understanding was that the EHC decompressor could detect the presence or absence of an IP header from the Ether type field in the Ethernet header (post decompression). Hence the following agreement was reached:

*When a DRB is configured with RoHC and EHC, the receiver/decompressor behaviour* ***for a packet that has non-IP Ethertype (after EHC decompression) is to bypass RoHC*** *and deliver the packet directly to higher layers.*

This agreement is currently captured in the PDCP specification as below:

*If a PDCP Data PDU including non-IP Ethernet packet is received from lower layers, the EHC decompressor shall bypass the ROHC decompressor and deliver the EHC decompressed non-IP Ethernet packet to upper layers*

However, the above requirement does not consider the case where the Ethernet header uses the Length field in place of the Ether type field. If the length field is used, there **is no way** for the EHC decompressor to know if the PDCP data PDU contains an IP packet or a non-IP packet, and the decompressor cannot meet the requirement above. Therefore, the specification needs to be updated to clarify that a mix of IP and non-IP packets can only be expected by the EHC decompressor, if the Ether type field is present in the Ethernet header.

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposed change**5.12.7 Simultaneous configuration of ROHC and EHCIf both ROHC and EHC are configured for a DRB, the ROHC header shall be located after the EHC header. Figure 5.12.7-1 shows the location of the ROHC header and the EHC header in a PDCP Data PDU.*

**Figure 5.12.7-1: Location of ROHC header and EHC header in a PDCP Data PDU**If a PDCP SDU including non-IP Ethernet packet is received from upper layers, the EHC compressor shall bypass the ROHC compressor and submit the EHC compressed non-IP Ethernet packet to lower layers according to clause 5.2.1.If a PDCP Data PDU including non-IP Ethernet packet is received from lower layers, the EHC decompressor shall bypass the ROHC decompressor and deliver the EHC decompressed non-IP Ethernet packet to upper layers according to clause 5.2.2.If both ROHC and EHC are configured for a DRB, the DRB is only expected to have a mix of IP and non-IP packets if the Ethernet header contains the TYPE field. |

**Q5. Do you agree to R2-2110757 (38.323) and R2-2110758 (36.323)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | We think it is an internal UE implementation issue. Not sure if any spec update is needed on top of the previous agreement on “bypass ROHC/EHC for a non-IP packet”. Nevertheless, we understand the most critical issue is how to align the understanding on both transmitter and receiver. We need more time to check and tend to believe it is not a sensible/feasible approach to limit the network configuration.  |
| LGE | Comments | We want to clarify first whether a mix of IP packet and non-IP packet is possible for one DRB. If mix is not allowed, the EHC decompressor can bypass the ROHC decompressor by configuration. Otherwise, internal check should be done by the EHC decompressor. But for internal check, we are wondering whether it is possible for the EHC decompressor to know whether the included field is LENGTH or TYPE field. We need more time to check whether the addressed problem is a real problem, and whether the proposed solution can solve the addressed problem. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Conclusion

**TBD**