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# 1. Introduction

This paper is to trigger the part 2 discussion of the following email discussion of MBS PDCP. The draft CR is also provided in the inbox for your information. You can also provide any comment for polishing the draft CR.

* [AT118-e][032][MBS] PDCP (Xiaomi)

Scope: part 1 Treat [R2-2204626](file:///C:\Users\mtk65284\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2_RL2\TSGR2_118-e\Docs\R2-2204626.zip), [R2-2204683](file:///C:\Users\mtk65284\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2_RL2\TSGR2_118-e\Docs\R2-2204683.zip), [R2-2204906](file:///C:\Users\mtk65284\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2_RL2\TSGR2_118-e\Docs\R2-2204906.zip), [R2-2205714](file:///C:\Users\mtk65284\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2_RL2\TSGR2_118-e\Docs\R2-2205714.zip), [R2-2205630](file:///C:\Users\mtk65284\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2_RL2\TSGR2_118-e\Docs\R2-2205630.zip), [R2-2205479](file:///C:\Users\mtk65284\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2_RL2\TSGR2_118-e\Docs\R2-2205479.zip), [R2-2205155](file:///C:\Users\mtk65284\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2_RL2\TSGR2_118-e\Docs\R2-2205155.zip), [R2-2205454](file:///C:\Users\mtk65284\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2_RL2\TSGR2_118-e\Docs\R2-2205454.zip), Collect one round of comments, pave the way for on-line agreement (identify agreeable points, discussion points), part 2 progress CR including Rapporteur Resolutions (R2-2205455), corrections and including agreements from current meeting (can be phased)

Intended outcome: part 1 Report, Part 2 CR

Deadline: part1 CB W1 Thu, part 2 Deadlines set by rapporteur, Final review can be by post meeting disc

Deadline (for companies' feedback): Wednesday 2022-05-18 12:00 UTC

## 1.1 Contacts

Contact person for each participating company:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | Email Address |
| Xiaomi | Yumin Wu | wuyumin@xiaomi.com |
| LG Electronics | SeungJune Yi | seungjune.yi@lge.com |
| ZTE | Tao QI | qi.tao3@zte.com.cn |
| MediaTek | Xiaonan Zhang | Xiaonan.Zhang@mediatek.com |
| Lenovo | Mingzeng Dai | daimz4@lenovo.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 2. Discussion

## 2.1 List of changes from R2-2205455

According to the PDCP CR provided in R2-2205455, the changes are listed as follows:

* Change 1: MRB is clarified as not applicable for cyphering/deciphering and integrity protection/verification.
* Change 2: UDC is added for MRB
* Change 3: MRB is added for Window\_Size.

For Change 1, according to the current PDCP specification (e.g. section 5.1.2 and 5.2.2.1), there are several places mentioning “perform deciphering and integrity verification” or “apply the ciphering algorithm and key” also for MRB. However the MRB PDCP does not have the security configuration. Then it could be misunderstood that the MRB uses the uncast security key to “perform deciphering and integrity verification”, which would anyway fail. Then we could have some clarification similar to SL SRB4, as captured in section 5.8 and 5.9 of the PDCP specification.

For Change 2, althought MBS service is DL only and UDC is uplink only, the UE should also be able to provide uplink packets of voice for a multicast MRB of group call service. We could have the following two ways for the UE to provide the uplink data of the group call for the multicast MRB. If only Option 1 is allowed, then we do not need to add UDC support for MRB.

* Option 1: The UE uses a separate DRB to provide the uplink data for the multicast group call of MRB.
* Option 2: The UE uses the uplink channel of the same multicast MRB to provide the uplink data for the multicast group call of MRB.

For Change 3, Window\_Size is required for the receiving PDCP entity of the MRB .

#### Question 1: Which of the following changes are needed?

* Change 1: MRB is clarified as not applicable for cyphering/deciphering and integrity protection/verification.
* Change 2: UDC is added for MRB
* Change 3: MRB is added for Window\_Size.

(The rapporteur suggests that we firstly confirm whether the corresponding missing function/clarification is required, and then we can discuss further how to capture some required changes in the specification.)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer**  **(Change 1/2/3)** | **Comments** |
| Xiaomi | All | We think that Change 1 and 3 are required to avoid unnecessary misundertandings.  For Change 2, we think that both Option 1 and 2 are feasible solutions. It seems that there is no extra complexity of supporting UDC for multicast MRB. If companies consider that UDC is not applicable for MRB, we may need to add some clarification for the UDC configuration in 38.331. |
| LG | 1, 3 | For Change 2, we are not sure why the UDC is needed for MRB. The UDC is UPLINK data compression, and MRB is typically downlink. If there is UL data, it should be transmitted via separate DRB, not via MRB. |
| CATT | 1,3 | Agree with LG that UDC is for uplink data,it is not applicable to MRB |
| ZTE | 1, 3 | for one MRB, from service data perspective it is DL only.  - on session management, MRB QoS flow/ 5GC entities are only about DL  - on Uu, there is no flow to RB mapping at all (with the absence of SDAP entity functioning).  therefore, 1/ MRB is only for DL; 2/ if there is any UL service data, it will be the duty of other DRBs.  that being said, we have no strong view if companies want to apply UDC to PDCP Control PDU, if the spec impacts are acceptable, which however is not something we are so sure about. |
| MediaTek | 1,3 | For change 2, UL may be available if the MRB is configured with PTP or split-MRB (e.g. PDCP SR).So maybe option2 is right, The UE will uses the uplink channel of the same multicast MRB to provide the uplink data, if configured.  However, considering the UL data size, UDC may not be needed for MBS. |
| Lenovo | 1,3 | Not sure why UDC is needed for MRB since MRB has no uplink data. The motivation is not clear. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 2.2 Confirmation of the proposals from part 1 discussion

According to the part 1 discussion summary of [AT118-e][032][MBS] PDCP (Xiaomi), however due to the very short online discussion time, we have not been able to confirm some proposals as the RAN2 agreement. From the rapporteur’s understanding, we could try email approval for those proposals in the part 2 discussion, so as to avoid duplicated discussion in the future.

#### Question 2: Do you agree with the following proposals?

* Proposal 1: RX\_DELIV <= RX\_NEXT should be guaranteed for initial variable selection (12/16).
* Proposal 2: PDCP-SN-Size is updated to PDCP-SN-SizeDL. (16/16)
* Proposal 3: It is left to the network implementation for the prevention of the PDCP COUNT wrap-around of multicast MRB (15/16). No specification change is needed (12/16).

(Companies providing the answer “No” are also invited to indicate which Proposal is not agreed.)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer**  **(Yes/No)** | **Comments** |
| Xiaomi | Yes | We think that for both Proposal 1 and 3, no specification change is needed no matter if Proposal 1 or 3 is agreed or not, as the two proposals are more like a guidance for the network implementation. |
| LG | Yes | But, as Xiaomi indicated, no spec change is need for P1 and P3. |
| CATT | Yes | Agree with LG |
| ZTE | not P1 | for proposal one, we don't have to specify this if it does not break the system. see also question 3. |
| MediaTek | Yes | Agree with Xiaomi, NW should ensure COUNT not wrap-around. |
| Lenovo | Yes | We tend to agree with Xiaomi that no spec impact for P1&P3. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 2.3 Initial value of RX\_NEXT for multicast MRB

The followings are the RAN2 agreements related to to calculation of RX\_NEXT:

|  |
| --- |
| * The initial value of RX\_DELIV is set to a value before RX\_NEXT, e.g. the initial value of the SN part of RX\_DELIV is (x – 0.5 × 2[*PDCP-SN-Size*–1]) modulo (2[*PDCP-SN-Size*]), where x is the SN of the first received PDCP Data PDU. * For multicast MRB, the initial value of the SN part of RX\_NEXT is (x +1) modulo (2[*PDCP-SN-Size*]), where x is the SN of the first received PDCP Data PDU. * [027] If the initial value of HFN is indicated by the gNB, a reference SN corresponding to the initial value of HFN can be indicated to the UE. |
| RAN2#118-e meeting agreement:   * Go for Option 2   **Option 2: Initial RX\_DELIV is configured by RRC: SN(RX\_DELIV) = SN\_ref and HFN(RX\_DELIV) = HFN\_initial where HFN\_initial and SN\_ref are provided by RRC for multicast. (13/16)** |

According the latest RAN2 agreement, as the initial HFN is no longer left to the UE implementation, the initial HFN for the RX\_HFN should also be set to the HFN configured by RRC (i.e. *multicastHFN-AndRefSN*), same as the RX\_DELIV.

#### Question 3: Do you agree that the initial value of the HFN part of RX\_NEXT is set to the HFN configured by RRC, i.e. *multicastHFN-AndRefSN*?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer**  **(Yes/No)** | **Comments** |
| Xiaomi | Yes | We think that it is straight-forward that the initial value of the HFN part of RX\_DELIV and RX\_NEXT is set to the same value as configured by RRC. |
| LG | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| ZTE | probably yes | for RX\_NEXT initialisation, we have two options:  **A/as configured**, however, this will inevitably possibly result in RX\_NEXT < RX\_DELIV, although temporarily. this is against Proposal 1 in section 2.2.  **B/we follow previous agreement that the HFN of RX\_NEXT part shall be based on UE implementation**, such that we can still make sure RX\_DELIV <= RX\_NEXT. later RX\_NEXT will be updated based on RX\_DELIV and the received packets. however this might result in aggressive RX\_REORD setting, which could further result in packet loss. in a simplified example,  - PDCP SN is in the space of 0 to 99, RRC Config (HFN = 2, SN = 80)  - Received packet (HFN = x, SN = 70).  - if RX\_NEXT is set to (HFN = 3, SN = 70) to keep the rule of RX\_DELIV <= RX\_NEXT, then RX\_REORD might be set to (HFN = 3, SN = 70) later which might be way too aggressive.  therefore we might have to follow option A to set the initial value of the HFN part of RX\_NEXT to the HFN configured by RRC.  and we say no to Proposal 1 in section 2.2. actually in current spec, it does not limit itself to follow the principle that RX\_NEXT < RX\_DELIV, e.g.:  "- if t-Reordering is not running (includes the case when t-Reordering is stopped due to actions above), and RX\_DELIV < RX\_NEXT:" in section 5.2.2 Receive operation. // it is a condition, but not something always there |
| MediaTek | Yes | To be clear, if a PDU is received, section 5.2.2(HFN+1/HFN-1) will be applied if the HFN of the received PDU has been wrap-around, to further correct the HFN of RX\_NEXT.  @ZTE For the example, we think the NW can prevent this happened by setting the proper value of HFN+SN in RRC indicator, e.g.set to the next/first PDU which will be transmitted to UE.  So that within a proper SN length(e.g. 212 ), it is very rare for UE to receive the RRC with SN=X but the SN of the first received PDU is slightly smaller than X, since the SN range is enough to prevent this happening. |
| Lenovo | No | We would prefer to keep the previous agreement for RX\_NEXT |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3. Conclusion

**…**
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