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# 1 Introduction

This document is the report of the following email discussion:

* [AT114-e][018][NR16] MAC III (Nokia)

 Scope: Treat R2-2104724, R2-2105231, R2-2105865, R2-2105232, R2-2105749, R2-2106031, R2-2106321, R2-2105851

 Phase 1, determine agreeable parts, Phase 2, for agreeable parts Work on CRs.

 Intended outcome: Report and Agreed CRs.

 Deadline: Schedule A

# 2 Contact Points

Respondents to the email discussion are kindly asked to fill in the following table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | Email Address |
| Nokia (Rapporteur) | Chunli Wu | Chunli.wu@nokia-sbell.com |
| Qualcomm  | Linhai He | linhaihe@qti.qualcomm.com |
| LG | SunYoung LEE | ssunyoung.lee@lge.com |
| Xiaomi | Yumin Wu | wuyumin@xiaomi.com |
| Lenovo | Joachim LÖhr | jlohr@lenovo.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Discussion

NR-U

[R2-2104724](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_114-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2104724.zip) LS on SCell activation requirements for NR-U (R4-2105699; contact: Nokia) RAN4 LS in Rel-16 NR\_unlic-Core To:RAN2

Moved here

[R2-2105231](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_114-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2105231.zip) Analysis on SCell activation/deactivation requirements for NR-U Huawei, HiSilicon discussion Rel-16 NR\_unlic-Core

No action is required from the RAN4 LS R2-2104724, which also stated in the contribution R2-2105231 “Proposal 1: The RAN4 LS on SCell activation requirements for NR-U has no explicit impacts to RAN2 specs.” Rapporteur propose to note the LS.

**Question 1**: Do companies agree there is no impact to RAN2 from the RAN4 LS and the LS can be noted?

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 1 |
| Company | Yes/No | Technical Arguments |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 1**: TBD.

**Proposal 1**: TBD.

The following proposal is proposed in R2-2105231 for *sCellDeactivationTimer* handling in MAC:

**“Proposal 2: If an SCell Activation/Deactivation MAC CE is received deactivating the SCell configured with shared spectrum channel access, UE may stop the *sCellDeactivationTimer* associated with the SCell after the HARQ feedback for the SCell deactivation MAC CE is successfully transmitted. ”**

**Question 2**: Do companies think the change proposed in proposal 2 in R2-2105231 is needed?

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 2 |
| Company | Yes/No | Technical Arguments |
| Qualcomm | No | The problem described in the paper could happen in theory but it should be a rare event. Even if LBT failure persists for a very long time, it is likely that RLF will be triggered. Lastly, the proposed solution itself is not completely fault proof either, e.g. in the case where there is persistent HARQ feedback failure.  |
| LG | No | Although HARQ feedback is not transmitted due to LBT failure, *sCellDeactivationTimer* will be finally expired and the SCell will be in deactivated state. The statement in TS38.321 should not prevent expiring *sCellDeactivationTimer*. ‘The MAC does not stop *sCellDeactivationTimer*’ is not equal to ‘The MAC prevents *sCellDeactivationTimer* expired’.1> else if an SCell Activation/Deactivation MAC CE is received deactivating the SCell; or1> if the *sCellDeactivationTimer* associated with the activated SCell expires:2> deactivate the SCell according to the timing defined in TS 38.213 [6];2> stop the *sCellDeactivationTimer* associated with the SCell; |
| Xiaomi | No | If the HARQ feedback for the SCell deactivation command is not transmitted due to LBT failure, the UE will trigger “5.21.2 LBT failure detection and recovery procedure”. It seems there is no issue to resolve. |
| Lenovo | No  | Agree with others that in the rare case that LBT failure occurs for very long time, other mechanism will kick in like e.g. LBT failure recovery mechanism |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 2**: TBD.

**Proposal 2**: TBD.

[R2-2105865](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_114-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2105865.zip) Clarification on prioritization of retransmission over initial transmission for HARQ PID selection in NR-U Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell CR Rel-16 38.321 16.4.0 1115 - F NR\_unlic-Core

R2-2105865 proposed to clarify that the UE shall prioritize retransmissions before initial transmissions is only applicable to HARQ PID selection but not for intra-UE prioritization for multiple UL grants, since there has been some different understandings in the context of I-IoT discussions:

|  |
| --- |
| For configured uplink grants configured with *cg-RetransmissionTimer*, the UE implementation selects an HARQ Process ID among the HARQ process IDs available for the configured grant configuration. For HARQ Process ID selection, the UE shall prioritize retransmissions before initial transmissions. The UE shall toggle the NDI in the CG-UCI for new transmissions and not toggle the NDI in the CG-UCI in retransmissions. |

**Question 3**: Do companies agree with the issue and if yes, are the suggested changes fine or does the text need to be improved / corrected ?

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 3 |
| Company | Yes/No | Technical Arguments |
| Qualcomm | No | We do not think the reasons for change is correct. The agreement was for grant selection. Moreover, we do not think there is HARQ PID selection for retransmission. |
| LG | Yes | Indeed, it is a necessary clarification. The intention is to prioritize retx over initial when selecting HARQ PID. Regarding QC’s comment, we don’t think there is an intention to select HARQ PID even for retransmission. |
| Xiaomi | No | We understand that the current specification text is to avoid new data flushing the old data in the HARQ process when the cg-RetransmissionTimer expires. However the whole paragraph is under the condition “configured uplink grants configured with *cg-RetransmissionTimer*”. This is definitely not for I-IOT CG. And RAN2 already agreed that the gNB implementation will ensure that no functional collision for the CG handling between NR-U and IIOT, and no CR is needed.* R2 Confirm the assumption that network implementation is to handle the potential ambiguities for R16 UEs, e.g. by not configuring both features at the same time (*cg-RetransmissionTimer* and *autonomousTransmission*). R2 will not further work on this for R16 UEs. No R16 CRs are expected.
 |
| Lenovo | Yes/No | We agree that the prioritization is for the HARQ process selection, i.e. UE shall prioritize the HARQ process with pending retransmission over a different HARQ process used for initial transmission. However we are not sure whether the clarification is really needed. We would be OK to go with the clarification is majority prefers to have it.  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 3**: TBD.

**Proposal 3**: TBD.

Secondary DRX

[R2-2105232](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_114-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2105232.zip) Clarification on secondary DRX group Samsung CR Rel-16 38.321 16.4.0 1104 - F TEI16

R2-2105232 proposed to remove “associated” drx-onDurationTimer and specify in MAC “secondary DRX group is not configured, when DCP monitoring is configured”. Note that the restriction has already captured in RRC:

|  |
| --- |
| ***drx-ConfigSecondaryGroup***Used to configure DRX related parameters for the second DRX group as specified in TS 38.321 [3]. The network does not configure secondary DRX group with DCP simultaneously nor secondary DRX group with a dormant BWP simultaneously. |

**Question 4**: Do companies agree with the issue and if yes, are the suggested changes fine or does the text need to be improved / corrected ?

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 4 |
| Company | Yes/No | Technical Arguments |
| Qualcomm | No | We do not think #1 change is correct. Each DCP occasion has an associated on duration timer, which is the first instance of on duration timer after a DCP. That's why "associated" is used in the current text.We do not think #2 change is not necessary. This restriction is already captured in the field description of drx-ConfigSecondaryGroup in 331. |
| LG |  | 1st change (to remove 'associated') – not necessary because *drx-onDurationTimer* is associated with the DRX group.2nd change (to specify secondary DRX in presence of DCP monitoring) – no strong view, but no need to redundantly capture that across TSs. |
| Xiaomi | No | The configuration restriction captured in 38.331 seems sufficient. |
| Lenovo | No |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 4**: TBD.

**Proposal 4**: TBD.

eLCID

[R2-2105749](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_114-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2105749.zip) Clarification on MAC PDU assembly with eLCID Huawei, HiSilicon discussion Rel-16 NR\_IAB-Core

[R2-2106031](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_114-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2106031.zip) Clarification to transmission of padding and padding BSR with eLCID in IAB Ericsson, Apple CR Rel-16 38.321 16.4.0 1116 - F NR\_IAB-Core

[R2-2106321](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_114-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2106321.zip) CR for not transmitting only padding and padding BSR with eLCID Samsung, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, Qualcomm, LG, ZTE, MediaTek, Intel CR Rel-16 38.321 16.4.0 1118 - F NR\_IAB-Core

It has been agreed in the previous meeting to clarify this in MAC. Different styles are proposed in the above 3 contribution/CRs.

**Question 5**: Which of the changes proposed in the above TDocs do companies support?

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 5 |
| Company | R2-2105749/R2-2106031/R2-2106321 | Technical Arguments |
| Qualcomm | R2-2106321 | We are fine with the TP in R2-2105749 too. |
| LG | 6321 | We think it is possible that MAC includes zero RLC SDU segment but only the RLC header. Therefore, 5749 is not the way to go.As a proponent of 6321, the change in 6321 is simple and sufficient. |
| Xiaomi | R2-2106321 |  |
| Lenovo | R2-2106321 |  |
| Ericsson | [R2-2106031](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_114-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2106031.zip)  | Regarding R2-2106321, we have concerns on the terminology used. In particular, the term “is used” is not clear whether it refers to the IAB node being configured with eLCID or using it for this transmission. In our understanding the “is used” should refer to the LCID associated to “data available and allowed” that are going to be transmitted. However, that is not clear from R2-2106321. In any case if R2-2106321 is agreed, we believe that the inter-operability analysis should be changed since it seems that also UEs are involved, which is not correct. Additionally, we do not foresee any inter-operability issues, since in any case the NW will always decode the MAC PDU, and if data are detected, those will not be discarded.For this reason, we believe that R2-2106031 is technically more correct, because it solves the issue related to the “is used” above. It also increases readability, since it clearly separates the scenarios of 8 and 10 bytes, and clarifies that the 10 bytes scenario is only applicable to the case two-octet LCID. Regarding R2-2105749, we agree with the intention to find a general statement that applies to all cases, however that modifies a legacy text (since the 8 bytes handling is removed), which is better to avoid at this stage.  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 5**: TBD.

**Proposal 5**: TBD.

2-Step RACH

[R2-2105851](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_114-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2105851.zip) Correction to 38.321 on msga-TransMax selection for 2-step RACH ZTE, Sanechips CR Rel-16 38.321 16.4.0 1112 - F NR\_2step\_RACH-Core

R2-2105851 proposed to change the rach-ConfigDedicated to cfra-TwoStep-r16 for the application of the msgA-TransMax in subclause 5.1.1a to correct the behaviour for HO:

|  |
| --- |
| 1> if *RA\_TYPE* is set to *2-stepRA*:2> set *PREAMBLE\_POWER\_RAMPING\_STEP* to *msgA-PreamblePowerRampingStep*;2> set *SCALING\_FACTOR\_BI* to 1;2> apply *preambleTransMax* included in the *RACH-ConfigGenericTwoStepRA*;2> if the Random Access procedure was initiated for handover; and2> if *cfra-TwoStep* is configured for the selected carrier:3> if *msgA-TransMax* is configured in the *cfra-TwoStep;*4> apply *msgA-TransMax* configured in the *cfra-TwoStep*.2> else if *msgA-TransMax* is included in the *RACH-ConfigCommonTwoStepRA*:3> apply *msgA-TransMax* included in the *RACH-ConfigCommonTwoStepRA*. |

**Question 6**: Do companies agree with the issue and if yes, are the suggested changes fine or does the text need to be improved / corrected ?

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 6 |
| Company | Yes/No | Technical Arguments |
| Qualcomm | Yes | We think the reasons for change are correct, and we are fine with the TP. |
| LG | No | In our understanding, the original intention is not to allow switching from 2-step RA to 4-step RA if msaA-TransMax is not present in rach-ConfigDedicated. Please see the parameter description copied from 38.331:**msgA-TransMax**Max number of MsgA preamble transmissions performed before switching to 4-step type random access (see TS 38.321 [3], clauses 5.1.1). This field is only applicable when 2-step and 4-step RA type are configured and switching to 4-step type RA is supported. If the field is absent in RACH-ConfigDedidated, switching from 2-step RA type to 4-step RA type is not allowed. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | It seems that the two bullets 2> and 3> can be combined as one, which may make the specification more readable.2> if *msgA-TransMax* is configured in the *cfra-TwoStep* for the selected carrier:3> apply *msgA-TransMax* configured in the *cfra-TwoStep*.We think that the 38.331 sentence quoted by LG should be removed as it does not cover the case when “*msgA-TransMax* is only included in the *RACH-ConfigCommonTwoStepRA*”. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 6**: TBD.

**Proposal 6**: TBD.

# 4 Conclusion

TBD.