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# Introduction

This is the report of offline discussion collecting the comments on open issues for SDT control plane as noted below:

* [AT118-e][501][Sdata] CP Open issues and CR to 38.331 (ZTE)

CP open issues and CR capturing agreed corrections

Deadline: To be set by rapporteur aiming to have company inputs and proposals by Friday

**Deadline for company comments: Thursday (12th) 23:59 UTC**

# CP open issues from Monday online discussion

# T319a handling

During the online discussion, the following was agreed:

|  |
| --- |
| 1 Captured in RRC to clarify that UE can delay the start of the T319a until the lower layers transmit the message including the CCCH payload. FFS how it is captured and whether/how it is limited to CG-SDT2 Baseline, max timer value is 4s. FFS if there is a compromise for 6s (i.e. have the restart mechanism or UE capability) |

For the issue regarding delayed start for T319a, we need to first decide whether to specify this only for CG-SDT or just capture as a general requirement. Whilst the problem is mainly for CG-SDT, we could have a general sentence to say the UE is allowed to delay it for SDT in general. On the other hand, Samsung clarified that they prefer to specify this only for CG case. This also feasible and can be done without introducing any further MAC RRC interaction (i.e. no need to specify how RRC knows CG-SDT is chosen in this case). So, both options seem feasible. So companies are first invited to clarify which one they prefer. So, the possible text could be as shown as below:

|  |
| --- |
| 5.3.13.2 Initiation…1> if conditions for initiating SDT in accordance with 5.3.13.1b are fulfilled:2> consider the resume procedure is initiated for SDT;2> start timer T319a;Note: The UE shall, [in case of CG-SDT], delay the start of the timer T319a until lower layers transmit the CCCH message. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Q 2.1.1: For capturing the delayed start of T319a, which option do you prefer?****Option a: specify this only for CG-SDT****Option b: specify this for both CG-SDT and RA-SDT** |
| Company | Preferred option: (a/b) | Comments |
| ZTE | b | We think it can be applied to both cases and there is no need to specify any MAC/RRC interaction just for this even if it is applied to CG-SDT only (i.e., both options can work).  |
| LG | b | But we are ok with option a. |
| Intel | See comment | We are not sure whether the note is the right way to address this. Firstly, we don’t use a “shall” in a NOTE – if we want a UE defined behaviour, it has to be captured in normative text. If majority of companies prefer defining this kind of behaviour, we have slightly preference to limit the scope to the concern scenario (i.e., CG-SDT) and to add this as part of the procedural text. |
| ASUSTeK | b |  |
| Google | a | “shall” should be removed from the note. |
| Samsung | a | Ok to add Note.  |
| Huawei | a | We have a similar views as Intel, i.e. capture this in a procedural text and only for CG-SDT which is a problematic scenario. A note as currently proposed is also acceptable, but we should keep “shall” here, so that the UE behaviour is clear.  |
| NEC | a | Prefer to option a but also OK with option b. And we think it is better to use “may” in the NOTE. |
| China Telecom | a | Also fine with option b. |
| Qualcomm | b |  |
| CATT | a | Share the same view that “shall” should be removed from the note. |
| Sharp | b |  |
| OPPO | a |  |
| Ericsson | b |  |
| Sony | b | Note is ok. |
| Xiaomi | b |  |
| Apple | a | The intention is to resolve the misalignment issue between UE and gNB, but we donot think the NOTE can address the issue in RA-SDT, so we prefer to have it only for CG-SDT. In addition, it’s strange to have “shall” in NOTE, so we prefer to change “shall” to “should”.  |
| Interdigital | b | We don’t see any reason to define different behaviour for RA and CG cases and so let’s go for b. |

Then the next question is whether we can extend the T319a value to 6s and or if we adopt the mechanism of start/restart the timer. Companies are invited to comment on the following options:

|  |
| --- |
| **Q 2.1.2: For T319a value, which option can you accept/do you prefer?** * Please indicate both preferred and acceptable options so that we can conclude this.

**Option a: Extend it to 6s with UE capability** *Note: There was some discussion on how UE capability works. Rapporteur understanding is that in this case the intention is still that T319a is included in SIB and if the UE supports 6s value then it will use T319a to be 6s when 6s value is signalled. Otherwise (i.e. if the UE doesn’t support 6s value, then it uses 4s when the 6s value is signalled in SIB – since he network knows the UE, it can use the correct value upon receiving the first UL message).* **Option b: Use a smaller value for the timer (e.g. 2s) but restart it after each UL/DL transmission****Option c: Use a large value for T319a but terminate the SDT procedure (i.e. UE moves to IDLE mode) upon expiry of data inactivity timer (which can be short – e.g. 2 sec)****Option d: Do nothing (i.e. nothing other than 4 s value is specified)** |
| Company | **Preferred option** (a/b/c/d) | **Acceptable option** (a/b/c/d) | Comments |
| ZTE | a | c | We think option a is simplest and provides the UE with the flexibility to not support it if it is critical for power consumption and is a good compromise. Option b is too late a change in our view and if we do want to go this way, then we think we should instead reuse the data inactivity timer and go to option c to minimise the changes. This option is also acceptable to us. Finally, we hope some solution can be found for this and have a preference to avoid option d hence.  |
| LG | c | a | Option c seems to be a new option that never been discussed, but we feel that this option requires minimum change (e.g. add RRC\_INACTIVE for data inactivity monitoring). |
| Intel | b | d | Option (c) is setting an upper value of the maximum duration of the SDT session, however we do not see this as a critical timer to be specified on top of the “data inactivity timer”. |
| ASUSTeK | b | a | Considering both power saving and multiple UL/DL transmissions, we prefer the option b.  |
| Google | a | d | Option c is against the agreement “DataInactivityTimer is not supported for SDT” made in RAN2#115-e. |
| Samsung | a | d |   |
| Huawei | d | a, c | We think the current duration of 4 seconds is sufficient already. Option b is not acceptable to us as we would like to ensure there is an upper limit on the SDT session duration. |
| NEC | a | c | Option a has minimum impact to solve the concerns from some UE sides. Option c is new concept but looks smaller impact than b. |
| China Telecom | a | d | Option a is simplest and has minimum impact. Option c may have some spec impact, as the DataInactivityTimer is not supported for SDT currently. |
| Qualcomm | d | a | We think 4 sec is sufficient in option d. For option a, in addition the UE capability, smaller values are also needed, such as 500ms, 800ms, 1500ms. It is important to give network more flexibility to configure shorter timer value to finish SDT session soon for some cases and we believe it is helpful for both network and UE in terms of resource utilization and power consumption. Currently, we have many spare values. So, such changes could be minor. |
| CATT | a | d | We think option a provides the flexibility that the network can configure longer timer to cover the worst case while the timer can be restricted to 4ms if the UE doesn’t support the capability. |
| Sharp | a | d |  |
| OPPO | a | d |  |
| Ericsson | a | d |  |
| Sony | b  | c |  |
| Xiaomi | d | a |  |
| Apple | d | a | Option c is not feasible since the data inactivity timer is not supported for SDT, and the max value of the data inactivity timer (i.e. s180) is too large.  |
| Interdigital | b | a  | Option b makes sense to cover the subsequent data communication case. But a is also fine. |

# SDT for time sensitive NAS procedures

During the online discussion of R2-2205354, it seems that companies are reluctant to capture some detailed NAS/AS interaction for the time critical NAS procedures and prefer to leave it to CT1. There seems reluctance to send yet another LS to CT1 too. Hence, it was suggested to check offline if there is a possibility to agree some note in RRC to allow UEs to not initiate SDT for time critical NAS procedures such as emergency calls.

Firstly, it should be clear that for emergency calls, the network can of course know it from the *resumeCause*. So, obviously, the network can initiate normal resume even if SDT is initiated by the UE. However, in R2-2205354 it is highlighted that there may be some other time critical NAS messages that may fulfil other SDT criteria. So, may be we can check if companies prefer to capture some UE behaviour for these using a note.

|  |
| --- |
| Option 15.3.13.1b Conditions for initiating SDTA UE in RRC\_INACTIVE initiates the resume procedure for SDT when all of the following conditions are fulfilled:1> the upper layers request resumption of RRC connection and the *resumeCause* is not set to emergency; and1> *SIB1* includes *sdt-ConfigCommon*; and1> *sdt-Config* is configured; and1> all the pending data in UL is mapped to the radio bearers configured for SDT; and1. lower layers indicate that conditions for initiating SDT as specified in TS 38.321 [3] are fulfilled.

Option 25.3.13.1b Conditions for initiating SDTA UE in RRC\_INACTIVE initiates the resume procedure for SDT when all of the following conditions are fulfilled:1> the upper layers request resumption of RRC connection; and1> *SIB1* includes *sdt-ConfigCommon*; and1> *sdt-Config* is configured; and1> all the pending data in UL is mapped to the radio bearers configured for SDT; and1>lower layers indicate that conditions for initiating SDT as specified in TS 38.321 [3] are fulfilled.Note: The UE need not initiate resume procedure for SDT when time critical NAS procedure such as emergency service is ongoing. How the UE knows about the ongoing time critical NAS procedure such as emergency service is up to UE implementation. |

Companies are invited to comment on whether such clarification above is and d you can support such change?

|  |
| --- |
| **Q 2.2.1: Do companies think that we need to clarify something similar to above? If yes, do you support the change as proposed above.**  |
| Company | Preferred option: Option 1 or Option 2 or Do nothing | Comments |
| ZTE | Do nothing (but we are also okay with options 1 or 2 if majority prefer this) | It seems resumeCause already provides the network with sufficient information to resume connection (even if UE triggers SDT). For instance when resumeCause is set to emergency network can simply move the UE to connected even if UE initiates SDT. So, this is an optimisation for some usecases where the resume cause doesn’t provide enough information in our view. So, “Do nothing” is acceptable to us. However, we are also okay with the majority preference between options 1 or 2 if that is the view from companies.  |
| LG | Comments | It should be clarified first what is the UE behavior if time-critical NAS message is triggered while SDT procedure is ongoing? Terminate ongoing SDT procedure and trigger new RRCResume procedure? or ignore time-critical NAS message?Should be discussed together with a005. |
| Intel | Do nothing but OK to consider other option (see comment for details) | We want to point out that it is not just Emergency call that has high priority – there are also the others high priority access such as MPS, MCS. If we go with option 1, we will need to add all the applicable cause values or find a wording that is applicable for all of them.On other hand, a UE may have additional aspects to consider beyond the SDT initiation criteria, such as for example:* A UE may initially get small amount of data available in a RB configured for SDT but might be aware that larger amount is coming (e.g. based on which application is active), and therefore resume might be more preferable than SDT.
* A UE moving at high/medium speed might also prefer resuming over SDT.

Therefore, we suggest updating current specification to capture that it is up to UE decision whether SDT is initiated instead than legacy resume when all the required conditions for SDT are met. This behaviour could be captured with the following:**1st suggested modification:** to add “may” to the conditions for initiation of SDT: 5.3.13.1b Conditions for initiating SDTA UE in RRC\_INACTIVE may initiate~~s~~ the resume procedure for SDT when all of the following conditions are fulfilled:1> the upper layers request resumption of RRC connection; and1> *SIB1* includes *sdt-ConfigCommon*; and1> *sdt-Config* is configured; and1> all the pending data in UL is mapped to the radio bearers configured for SDT; and1>lower layers indicate that conditions for initiating SDT as specified in TS 38.321 [3] are fulfilled.**2nd suggested modification:** to capture that when conditions of 5.3.13.1b are met, resume for SDT may be initiated, and if so, T319a is started:**5.3.13.2 Initiation**1> if conditions for initiating SDT in accordance with 5.3.13.1b are fulfilled:2> ~~consider~~ the resume procedure may be ~~is~~ initiated for SDT; 1> if resume procedure is initiated for SDT:2> start timer T319a; 1> else:2> start timer T319;2> instruct the MAC entity to consider the *cg*-*SDT*-*TimeAlignmentTimer* as expired, if it is running; |
| ASUSTeK | Do nothing | Agree with ZTE. |
| Google | Do nothing | The network can send an RRCResume message to the UE based on the resume cause. |
| Samsung | Do nothing |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2 | We think that not clarifying anything can lead to serious performance degradation for some procedures, in particular setting up an emergency call. In consequence, configuring SDT for SRB2 may become an unusable feature in real deployments as no network operator will probably risk degrading emergency services performance. In consequence, it will not be possible to use SDT over SRB2 even for the scenarios where this is truly useful, e.g. positioning. We are not sure CT1 understands how exactly SDT works, e.g. that it is not always possible to simply send RRCResume message to the UE in case the procedure with no anchor relocation is used. We do not think this case was mentioned to them in any previous LS, so we could try to make them analyse this particular issue via the LS. If that is not acceptable, then at least a note as in Option 2 is needed. |
| NEC | Do noting | Agree with ZTE. We are also fine with either Option 1 or 2, if majority support it. |
| China Telecom | Do nothing | The network can get sufficient information from the resumeCause. If the resumeCause is set to emergency or other high priority access, the network can move the UE into RRC Connected.  |
| Qualcomm | Do nothing with comments | We have similar view with Intel. UE may be in different situation and has various service. It can be up to UE to decide whether SDT is initiated or use the legacy resume procedure even all criteria in 5.3.13.1b are met. So, the 1st suggested modification of Intel is good for us.In addition, resumeCause is already sufficient to inform network and network can decide whether moves UE to connected or allow UE performing SDT. |
| CATT | Do nothing | We share the same view that based on resumeCause the network can decide if to resume connection directly. |
| Sharp | Do nothing | Agree with ZTE. |
| OPPO | Do nothing | Resume cause is enough for NW to act properly. |
| Ericsson | Do nothing |  |
| Xiaomi | Do nothing | Agree with ZTE that resumeCause already provides the network with sufficient information. |
| Apple | Do nothing | NW can acquire the emergency information from the ResumeCause, and no further enhancement is needed.  |
| Interdigital | Comment  | Agree with LGE. |

# Open RIL issues

This section is dedicated to collection of comments to open RIL issues.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RIL ID** | **Description** | **Proposed Change** | **Pre-meeting comments** | **AT meeting comments** |
| **WI RRC Rapporteur comments** | **Company comments** | **Company** | **Company comments****(Include your company name and explain if you support the change or not and why.** **Also please explain why it is an essential correction if you think it is)** | **Essential issue? (Y/N)** |
| e.g. | Xxx | Xxx | Xxx | Xxx | Company X:  | Agree/disagree with the proposal because… etc | Y/N |
| A000AndA001 | UE requirement on the MIB/SIB1 reception should be same as that in CONNECTED state. | “in RRC\_INACTIVE” is modified to “”in RRC\_INACTIVE while the T319a is not running.” | My understanding is same as Apple. The issue about SI change notification is when paging is received, but this is about MIB reception. But we can discuss based on the comments received. So, changed to "discuss" and removed the change for now. [AT meeting guidance]: The intention of Apple seems to be that the MIB/SIB1 reception in connected mode and during SDT should be aligned and companies can explain whether they share this view or not and also explain then whether they agree with the change.  | [Samsung]Disagree. While T319a is running, UE still receives SI change indication and will acquire MIB/SIB1 upon reception of SI change indication.[Apple] During the SDT procedure, UE operation on MIB/SIB1 reception should be same as that in CONNECTED state, because the MIB/SIB1 transmission and UE dedicated transmission may ocur simultanously. According to current description, in case of the MIB/SIB1 and unicast transmisson conflict, if UE select the UE dedicate transmission and ignore MIB/SIB1, UE will perform operation in secton 5.2.2.5 (i.e. bar the current cell and perform cell reselection). It's not our expectation. [Huawei] We agree with Samsung in general that the UE should receive updated SI upon SI change indication, as per the agreements. If some additional clarification is needed, it can be discussed, but we should not go against this agreement (hence we disagree with the current change).[Intel] Agree also with Samsung. | ZTE | We think some clarification is needed and we are okay with the suggestion from Apple to align the behaviour with connected state.  | Yes it is an essential issue |
| Intel | We agree OK with the suggested change in companion TDoc R2-2205668 on adding the text on T319a.Regarding MIB/SIB1 acquisition, while we have some sympathy for Apple comment, in our view, SDT should be kept short and hence UE should be able to acquire MIB/SIB1. So we don’t see it essential to change. | Y (partially) |
| Google | The SI change happens rarely so we don’t see a need to align with the connected state. | N |
| Samsung | 1. If UE receives emergency notification (irrespective of UE state, i.e. even in RRC\_CONNECTED), UE immediately reacquire SIB1. (refer 5.2.2.2.2 in TS 38.331). So we do not see any need to change any normative procedure for this.

“If the UE receives a Short Message, the UE shall:1> if the UE is ETWS capable or CMAS capable, the *etwsAndCmasIndication* bit of Short Message is set, and the UE is provided with *searchSpaceSIB1* and *searchSpaceOtherSystemInformation* on the active BWP or the initial BWP:2> immediately re-acquire the *SIB1*;“1. If UE receives SI notification in RRC\_CONNECTED mode, UE re-acquire SIB1. ((refer 5.2.2.3.1 in TS 38.331). Same behaviour is applied for RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_INACTIVE. So we do not see any need to change any normative procedure for this.

1> if the UE is in RRC\_CONNECTED with an active BWP with common search space configured by *searchSpaceSIB1* and *pagingSearchSpace* and has received an indication about change of system information; or1> if the UE is in RRC\_CONNECTED with an active BWP with common search space configured by *searchSpaceSIB1* and the UE has not stored a valid version of a SIB or posSIB, in accordance with clause 5.2.2.2.1, of one or several required SIB(s) or posSIB(s) in accordance with clause 5.2.2.1, and, UE has not acquired SIB1 in current modification period; or1> if the UE is in RRC\_CONNECTED with an active BWP with common search space configured by *searchSpaceSIB1*, and, the UE has not stored a valid version of a SIB or posSIB, in accordance with clause 5.2.2.2.1, of one or several required SIB(s) or posSIB(s) in accordance with clause 5.2.2.1, and, *si-BroadcastStatus* for the required SIB(s) or *posSI-BroadcastStatus* for the required posSIB(s) is set to *notbroadcasting* in acquired *SIB1* in current modification period; or1> if the UE is in RRC\_IDLE or in RRC\_INACTIVE; or1> if the UE is in RRC\_CONNECTED while T311 is running:2> if *ssb-SubcarrierOffset* indicates *SIB1* is transmitted in the cell (TS 38.213 [13]) and if *SIB1* acquisition is required for the UE:3> acquire the *SIB1,* which is scheduled as specified in TS 38.213 [13];1. Regarding MIB acquisition, upon receiving SI change notification UE reacquire MIB in RRC\_INACTIVE.

 There is a note in 5.2.2.3.1NOTE: The UE in RRC\_CONNECTED is only required to acquire broadcasted *SIB1* if the UE can acquire it without disrupting unicast or MBS multicast data reception, i.e. the broadcast and unicast/MBS multicast beams are quasi co-located.We can modify this note as follows:NOTE: The UE in RRC\_CONNECTED is only required to acquire broadcasted *SIB1* if the UE can acquire it without disrupting unicast or MBS multicast data reception, i.e. the broadcast and unicast/MBS multicast beams are quasi co-located. While the T319a is running, UE is only required to acquire broadcasted *SIB1 and MIB* if the UE can acquire it without disrupting unicast or MBS multicast data reception, i.e. the broadcast and unicast/MBS multicast beams are quasi co-located. | N (see comments). Ok to modify only the note in 5.2.2.3.1 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | If the intention is to align with RRC CONNECTED, i.e. UE does not have to receive an updated MIB, but it has to receive updated SIB1 (which seems to be the case based on the TP in R2-2205668), then we agree with the proposal. |  |
| China Telecom | We are fine with the suggestions from Apple to align with the connected state.  | Y |
| Qualcomm | UE still needs to receive SI change and acquire MIB/SIB1 during SDT. SDT should be a short session.  | N |
| CATT | We agree with the intention. But prefer to add a note as suggested by Samsung | Yes with comments |
| OPPO | Agree with the intention. Fine with the change proposed by Samsung. | Y |
| Xiaomi | We agree with the intention to align with the CONNECTED UE behaviour. We are fine with the proposal from either Apple or Samsung. | Y |
| Apple | The intention is to align with RRC CONNECTED, and make UE operation clear when the MIB/SIB1 and dedicated transmission is collided. To achieve this purpose, the wording suggested by Samsung is acceptable to us. | Y |
| Interdigital | Share Qualcomm view | N |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| A001 | UE requirement on the MIB/SIB1 reception should be same as that in CONNECTED state. | “in RRC\_INACTIVE” is modified to “”in RRC\_INACTIVE while the T319a is not running.” | same as above. [AT meeting guidance]: No need to comment explicitly on this. The same conclusion as A000 can apply here too. | [Samsung]Disagree. While T319a is running, UE still receives SI change indication and will acquire MIB/SIB1 upon reception of SI change indication.[Apple] Same feedback as A000.  According to current description, in case of the MIB/SIB1 and unicast transmisson conflict, if UE select the UE dedicate transmission and ignore MIB/SIB1, UE will perform operation in secton 5.2.2.5 (i.e. bar the current cell and perform cell reselection). It's not our expectation. [Huawei] Agree with Samsung, see above.[Intel] Agree with Samsung |  |  |
| I506AndA002 | It would be helpful to also capture which RRC messages can be exchanged during SDT. This avoids confusion and having to add explicit statement to any RRC msg that is not allowed. | We suggest adding the following clarification at the end:\*\* Suggested update of the TP – START \*\*“In response to a resume procedure initiated for SDT, the network may resume the suspended RRC connection and send UE to RRC\_CONNECTED, or reject the request to resume and send UE to RRC\_INACTIVE (with a wait timer), or directly re-suspend the RRC connection and send UE to RRC\_INACTIVE, or directly release the RRC connection and send UE to RRC\_IDLE, or instruct the UE to initiate NAS level recovery (in this case the network sends an RRC setup message). Therefore, the following RRC messages can be exchanged during SDT: RRCResumeRequest, RRCRelease, RRCReject, RRCResume, ULInformationTransfer, DLInformationTransfer and RRCSetup.”\*\* Suggested update of the TP – END \*\* | Need and wording needs disucssion, Is it better to clarify which messages are not allowed for instance (e.g. RRCReconfiguration?)[AT meeting guidance]: So, the options are: 1. Do nothing
2. Clarify in RRC which messages are allowed
3. Clarify in RRC which messages are **not** allowed (see A002)
4. Clarify something in stage-2

Companies can express preference to one of these.  | [Samsung]: It would be good to clarify which RRC messages are allowed during SDT.[Apple]: Agree to clarify which RRC message are allowed/not allowed during the SDT. [Intel] Further justification details and TP available in R2-2205822. We suggest creating a list of RRC message that are allowed during SDT as if we want to capture what it is not allowed, it will be much longer and will require updates in future releases when new messages are defined. | ZTE | We think it is not really an essential issue. We have a slight preference to clarify it in stage-2 (option d). However, we don’t have a strong view and can go with majority on this.  | No – not an essential correction |
| LG | Clarification may be useful, but not essential. In any case, option C is not desirable. | No |
| Intel | Our preference is b) or otherwise d) | Y |
| Google | From the UE implementation perspective, it is good to know which RRC messages are allowed or not allowed. | Y |
| Samsung | b) or d) | Y |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In our understanding b) is what we already have in RRC, e.g. for RRCReconfiguration:5.3.5.2 InitiationThe Network may initiate the RRC reconfiguration procedure to a UE in RRC\_CONNECTED. The Network applies the procedure as follows:Or for SecurityModeCommand5.3.4.2 InitiationThe network initiates the security mode command procedure to a UE in RRC\_CONNECTED.Or for UEAssistanceInformation:A UE capable of SDT initiates this procedure when data and/or signalling mapped to radio bearers that are not configured for SDT becomes available during SDT (i.e. while T319a is running).Etc. Hence, we think this is clear already in the current specifications and there is no need for any additional clarifications. | N |
| NEC | Agree with ZTE | No |
| China Telecom | Agree with ZTE. | No |
| Qualcomm | We prefer option a, or then option d. | N |
| CATT | Prefer a (do nothing) or d (clarify something in stage 2) | N |
| Sharp | Agree with ZTE. | No |
| OPPO | Prefer a) Or d)  | N |
| Xiaomi | No strong preference, but we consider that this change is not essential. | N |
| Apple | We are fine to go for b) or d). | Y |
| Interdigital | It’s better to clarify that NW won’t be able to send RRCReconfiguration. We prefer either b or d. | Y |
|  |  |  |
| A002 | it should be clarified that the RRCReconfiguration message cannot be delivered via the SDT procedure. | clarify that the RRCReconfiguration message cannot be delivered via the SDT procedure. | Alternative to I506. Discuss togetherRapp: Discussed together with I506. So, please include your comments above. | [Samsung]: Agree to discuss together with I506[Apple]: OK to discuss discuss it together with I506. [Intel] See related discussion in I506 |  |  |
| W002 | To avoid CG-SDT resource being cleared by MAC reset, the order of MAC reset behavior were changed to a position before the applying of CG-SDT configuration. However, changing the order of “MAC reset and release the default MAC Cell Group configuration” behavior would impact the legacy behavior and Rel-16 features other than SDT. | Change MAC reset behavior back to where it is, and apply the CG-SDT related configuration after MAC reset:1> if the RRCRelease includes suspendConfig:2> reset MAC and release the default MAC Cell Group configuration, if any;2> apply the received suspendConfig except the received nextHopChainingCount and sdt-MAC-PHY-CG-Config, if any;2> if the sdt-Config is configured:3> for each of the DRB in the sdt-DRB-List:4> consider the DRB to be configured for SDT;3> if sdt-SRB2-Indication is configured:4> consider the SRB2 to be configured for SDT;3> for each of the RLC bearer that is part of the UE configuration:4> re-establish the RLC entity as specified in TS 38.322 [4];3> for SRB2, if it is resumed and for SRB1:4> trigger the PDCP entity to perform SDU discard as specified in TS 38.323 [5];3> if configured grant resources for SDT are configured:4> configure the MAC entity with the configured grant resources for SDT and instruct MAC to start the cg-SDT-TimeAlignmentTimer;2> remove all the entries within VarConditionalReconfig, if any;2> for each measId, if the associated reportConfig has a reportType set to condTriggerConfig:3> for the associated reportConfigId:4> remove the entry with the matching reportConfigId from the reportConfigList within the VarMeasConfig;3> if the associated measObjectId is only associated to a reportConfig with reportType set to condTriggerConfig:4> remove the entry with the matching measObjectId from the measObjectList within the VarMeasConfig;3> remove the entry with the matching measId from the measIdList within the VarMeasConfig;2> reset MAC and release the default MAC Cell Group configuration, if any;2> apply the sdt-MAC-PHY-CG-Config, if any; | It is not clear what is the issue with resetting the MAC first and then applying the received configuration? Which legacy feature is impacted by this. In general, we should first reset MAC and apply the received configuraiton anyway. With the proposed change, it seems we have to apply the configuration twice (once we apply and then we release and reapply, which is a bit odd). [Rapp2] marked as discuss. [AT meeting guidance]: If you agree to change this, please explain what is broken with the current implementation and which legacy feature is impacted by this (if any).  | [Samsung]: Agree with rapporteur.[NEC] Changing the order of existing behaviors will impact all Rel-17 UE. For example a Redcap UE not supporting SDT would also need to perform MAC reset first. This should be avoided if there is other way to limit the change within SDT. And we don't understand why repporteur think the propossed change implies twice configuration application. The configuration except CG-SDT configuation is applied before MAC reset (the same as legacy), and the new introduced CG-SDT configuration is applied after MAC reset. So there is only one time of application of configuration. MAC reset and release the default MAC Cell Group configuration[Apple]: Since no error is introduced by changing the order in general, we are fine with current description.[Huawei] We tend to agree with NEC that there is impact on legacy UEs as the order of actions is changed and it would be better to avoid this.[Intel] We share same view as NEC and HUW that prefer avoid changing order of legacy actions within the procedure | ZTE | We don’t understand what is broken if we change the order since this is a Rel-17 spec anyway (i.e. pre release 17 specs are not changed). If nothing is broken we should not change this. The disadvantage of the proposal from NEC is that we need to apply the CG configuration twice and this is not nice.  | No – not an essential correction |
| Intel | We have slightly preference to stick with the principle of not changing legacy procedure when adding new features (unless it is strictly necessary). In this case, it does not seem critical the update of legacy sequence of events. | Y |
| Google | We also don’t understand what the problem is in the current text. | N |
| Samsung | Agree with rapporteur | N |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are also slightly in favour of not impacting legacy procedures when possible, but it is true that nothing would be broken if we keep Rel-17 specs as they are currently. | N |
| NEC | The bar to change legacy behaviour should be set high. We don’t think we can change legacy behaviour freely although nothing is broken. The legacy behaviour should only be updated if it has some issue itself. So for this case, we don’t think we have reached that bar.About the comment from rapporteur that we need to apply the CG configuration twice, as we already explained, the suspendConfig except CG configuration is applied before MAC reset, and the CG configuration is applied after MAC reset, so there is only one time of CG configuration application. | Yes |
| China Telecom | If possible, we slightly prefer to introduce new features without affecting the legacy procedure. | N |
| Qualcomm | Same view with ZTE. So, no change is needed. | N |
| CATT | There is no problem for R16 and R17 specs. | N |
| Sharp | Agree with rapporteur | N |
| OPPO | We also do not understand what’s the problem with current description. No change is needed. | N |
| Xiaomi | We do not see any issue for the CG configuration. | N |
| Apple | Agree with rapporteur | N |
| Interdigital | Agree with rapporteur.  | N |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| I507 | It seems unclear to say “part of the UE configuration” when this should refer to the configuration in used i.e. those that are resumed/active | We suggest referring to the RBs that are active which would cover any RB established when UE is RRC\_CONNECTED, as well as, the resumed RBs configured for SDT.\*\* Suggested update of the TP – START \*\*3> for each of the RLC bearer that is not suspended that is part of the UE configuration\*\* Suggested update of the TP – STOP \*\* | The orgiinal intention is to clear all bearers. If this is not the case the data in non-SDT bearers can result in SDT being not initiated. [AT meeting guidance]: Please explain why it is a problem to clear pending content (which anyway will be discarded) for all bearers – not just SDT.  | [Samsung]: Disagree. Intention is to clear all bearers[Apple]: If the intention is for all the configured RLC entities, we can just say "for each of the configured RLC beares" . If the intention is only for the SDT RBs, we can update this sentence as "for each of the RLC bearer configured for SDT". [LG] Our understanding is that RLC re-establishment at RRC release is only for SDT RLC bearer. For non-SDT RLC bearer, whether to re-establish RLC entity or not is provided by RRC reconfiguration message depending on reestablishRLC indication. Thus, we prefer what Apple said, i.e. "for each of the RLC bearer configured for SDT". [Intel] Further justification details and TP available in R2-2205823. This text needs to apply when UE is in RRC\_CONNECTED and in RRC\_INACTICE with SDT. For SDT, "part of UE configuration" is ambiguous as UE has RBs resumed and in used, as well as, others suspended and stored in UE AS Context (i.e. non-SDT RBs); however for SDT, only resumed RBs should perform re-establishment of the RLC entities. We suggest the use of “each RLC bearer associated with a RB that is not suspended” | ZTE | We think it is correct to clear all the bearers since the data anyway will not be transmitted.  | No – not an essential correction |
| LG | The data in non-SDT RB will be discarded after the UE moves to RRC\_CONNECTED. It is redundant to discard data for non-SDT RB at RRCRelease. But it is not an essential issue anyway. | No |
| Intel | For a UE with an SDT session ongoing, it is unclear which bearer and configuration refer to e.g. UE’s stored and/or active configuration, bearer’s suspended and/or resumed. The suggested modification is:*3> for each ~~of the~~ RLC bearer associated with a RB that is not suspended ~~that is part of the UE configuration~~:**4> re-establish the RLC entity as specified in TS 38.322 [4];* | Y |
| Google | The following agreement were mad in RAN2#116Bis-e. The original intention is for SDT RBs only. For non-SDT RBs, the UE follows the legacy behaviour.*For both DRBs and SRBs configured with SDT, RLC entity should be re-established upon reception of RRCRelease message including suspendConfig*  | Y |
| Samsung | Same view as ZTE | N |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think the change is correct and there is no need to re-establish non-SDT RLC bearers. | N |
| NEC | Agree with LG and HW that the data of non-SDT RB after the UE moves to RRC\_CONNECTED, so It is redundant to discard data for non-SDT RB at RRCRelease. Also we agree that the wording “that is part of UE configuration” is not good, we prefer the wording suggested by Apple. | Y |
| China Telecom | Agree with ZTE. Clearing all the bearers is correct.  | N |
| Qualcomm | If the ‘part of the UE configuration’ is unclear, we can update it to ‘for each of the RCL bearer configured for SDT’, which is also aligned with the agreements pointed out by Google.  | N |
| CATT | Agee with the intention. | Y |
| Sharp | Same view as ZTE | N |
| OPPO | Same view as ZTE. The RLC entity of all RBs shall be re-established. If only RLC of SDT-RB is re-established, there might be non-SDT data buffered at RLC. SDT can not be triggered due to that but these data would be cleared anyway when UE goes back to RRC\_CONNECTED. | N |
| Xiaomi | Agree with ZTE | N |
| Apple | Agree with the intention, but for the wording we can say the RLC bearer configured with SDT. | Y |
| Interdigital | Agree with ZTE and LG. | N |
|  |  |  |
| I503 | For SDT, it is not clear which branch the UE should use e.g. RRCRelease may not always be received as response of RRCResumerRequest for SDT, and even so RRCRelease may have SDT related configuration which need to be updated in the UE AS Context. This is also related to the discussion on how and what part of the UE INACTIVE context is restored. | We will bring a TDoc on May meeting to discuss which branch should be used for SDT e.g. when multiple SDT data is exchanged, RRCRelease may not be considered a response to RRCResumeRequest e.g. DL SDT data as well as DLInformaitonTransfer might sent during an SDT session. Based on the conclusion, current text might need to be changed. | RRCRelease can always be considered as a response to the original resume request regardless of any subsequent data and or other messages. [AT meeting guidance]: There are two questions to discuss: Q1: Do you agree that we need to explicitly add T319a check in the if clause as proposed in R2-2205818?Q2: Do you agree that the ROHC state and new configuration needs to be updated?  |  [Apple]: We can add a NOTE (i.e.) to clarify this bullets is for legacy Resume and for SDT, e.g. "2> if the RRCRelease message with suspendConfig was received in response to an RRCResumeRequest or an RRCResumeRequest1 (i.e. for he RRC Connection resumption or for SDT procedure):"[Intel] Further justification details and TP available in R2-2205818. Upon reception of RRCRelease message with SDT configuration, it seems preferable updating the IF branches that relies on UE having an stored UE context (i.e. which uses the term “replace” instead of “store”). If so, this IF branch needs to also apply when SDT session is ongoing (i.e. T319a is running) and indicate that for SDT, UE replaces in the stored UE Inactive AS context with the updated ROHC state and new configurations received in current RRCRelease message.  | ZTE | The clarification is nice to have and we are okay with the changes proposed.  | No – not an essential correction |
| LG | We don’t understand the problem described. The RRCRelease message is always the response to the RRCResumeRequest for SDT. We think no change is needed. | No |
| Intel | Q1: Y; Q2: YWe understand that current IF statement is not applicable for some SDT scenarios. For example, when UE send UL/DL RRC messages as part of the SDT session, the RRCRelease message with suspendConfig is not received in response to an RRCResumeRequest. In addition, current IF branch only updated those configurations in used for RNAU. | Y |
| Google | The current text may be confusing so we prefer to clarify it as proposed by Intel. | Y |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Q1: No, Q2: YThe additional check is not needed as the RRCRelease is always a response to an RRC message from the UE (i.e. RRCResumeRequest in this case). We do not think it is a right interpretation that the RRCRelease is sent in response to user data as user data is not part of the RRC procedure. So, we think the changes are needed, but with some modificaitons, i.e.:2> if the *RRCRelease* message with *suspendConfig* was received in response to an *RRCResumeRequest* or an *RRCResumeRequest1*~~, or if T319a is running~~:3> if T319a is running, in the stored UE Inactive AS context:4> replace the ROHC state;~~4~~3> replace the ~~applicable~~ stored *sdt-config* ~~configuration~~ with the one received in the *RRCRelease* message; | Y |
| NEC | We think the correction for Intel is correct and needed. | Y |
| China Telecom | The current text is not suitable for SDT procedure, so some corrections are needed as recommended by Intel.  | Y |
| Qualcomm | The issue is valid. We agree the proposal. | Y |
| CATT | Q1:N, as it has already been covered by the case that the UE receives *RRCRelease* message with *suspendConfig* in response to an *RRCResumeRequest* or an *RRCResumeRequest1*.Q2: N. The the ROHC state and new configuration received from RRC message has already been covered with the following highlighted part. And the proposed changed part in R2-2205818 is to replace the info in the stored UE Inactive AS context which is not included in *RRCRelease* message. We wonder why we need to replace the updated ROHC state and new configurations received in current *RRCRelease* message again.1> if the *RRCRelease* includes *suspendConfig*:2> reset MAC and release the default MAC Cell Group configuration, if any;2> apply the received *suspendConfig* except the received *nextHopChainingCount*; | N |
| Sharp | The issue is valid. We agree the proposal. | Y |
| OPPO | Q1: Y, Q2: YFine with the change proposed by Intel | N |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposed changes from Intel | N |
| Apple | The correction is needed.  | Y |
| Interdigital | Share ZTE view. It’s good to have clarification but not essential. | N |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| I508 | Current diagrams show resume procedure without the support of SDT e.g. SDT data is not shown multiplexed with RRCResumeRequest or it is not shown how RRCResume or RRCRelease may be sent after exchanging DL/UL SDT traffic. | We will bring a TDoc on May meeting to discuss with suggested update in current figures or adding clarification notes that show how RRC connection resume can be used for SDT. The key points to show in the figure or shortly explain are for example, UL SDT data can be multiplexed in 1st UL SDT, subsequent DL/UL SDT data can be exchanged before network responds to terminate the SDT session with RRCRelease, or RRCResume. | Don't think we need to update the figures. There are other cases where data is multiplexed with other RRC messages (RRCResume is used for RNAU, during handover data can be multiplexed with RRCReconfigurationComplete etc). [Rapp2]: Apple, added some more text regarding the use of RRCResume and release per above comments, may be this is enough now then? [Rapp4] can discuss. [AT meeting guidance]: It seems that this is not essential change. But companies are invited to comment on whether they prefer to add new figures as proposed.  |  [Apple]: support Intel's suggestion since it' can make SDT procedure clear in the spec. If no change in figure, we can add some wording/description to say the data exchange occurs during the resume procedure. [Intel] Further justification details and TP available in R2-2205821. We suggest add that the scenarios of Figure 5.3.13.1-1/2/3/4 in TS 38.331 are also applicable to SDT showing the difference that UL SDT data is multiplexed with RRCResumeRequest/RRCResumeRequest1 and subsequent DL/UL SDT data may be exchanged before network response with an RRC message to terminate the resume for SDT. In addition, 2 new figures are also added to: - (new) Figure 5.3.13.1-6: RRC connection resume for SDT, network reject or fallback to RRC connection establishment - (new) Figure 5.3.13.1-7: RRC connection resume for SDT, with subsequent optional exchange of SDT data followed by network release or suspend or resume | ZTE | We don’t agree that the figures should be updated. We don’t have pictures showing all use cases that RRCResume procedure is used for.  | No – not an essential correction |
| LG | The figures in RRC specification explains exchange of RRC messages, not exchange of UL/DL data. The proposed figures are not aligned with RRC specification. | No |
| Intel | We understand it is important to explain the differences allowed by SDT similarly as it was done for LTE EDT.  | Y |
| Google | Same view as Intel | Y |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree with LG. We have some diagrams in stage-2 and can update this if needed, but RRC specs is not a right place for this. | No |
| NEC | Agree with ZTE and LG. | No |
| China Telecom | Agree with LG.  | No |
| Qualcomm | We don’t think it is necessary to update the general RRC figures for the specific use case. | N |
| CATT | Stage 2 is enough to capture the info. | N |
| Sharp | Agree with ZTE  | N |
| OPPO | Agree with LG | N |
| Xiaomi | We agree with ZTE and LG. | N |
| Apple | Same view as Intel | Y |
| Interdigital | Agree with LG and HW | N |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| A005 | NAS layers may trigger resume request during the SDT procedure. We should exclude this case. | modified this condition as follows:"1> the upper layers request resumption of RRC connection and T319a is not running; and" | It is not clear why NAS requests second resume whilst previous procedure is ongoing (same as legacy anyway, so no need to change for SDT). [Rapp2] @Apple: If change is needed then it is not SDT specific (we can discuss if clarification is needed in general for Resume - e.g. when T319 is running - should be from Rel-15 onwards). [AT meeting guidance]: Proposal from Intel seems fairly straightforward. However, one concern is that if we clarify this only for SDT, then the non-SDT case may remain ambiguous (i.e. it would appear that when T319 is running UE is allowed to reinitiate resume, but we agreed this is not possible and only captured this in chairman’s notes). So, companies can explain if and why we should clarify this only for SDT.  |  [Apple]: It seems NAS spec has no description to fobbiden this case happen. Then according to current spec, does it mean UE will trigger another procdure (RRCresume/SDT) during the SDT procedure?[CATT] Different from legacy resume procedure, the UE is allowed to send RRC message, i.e. UAI, during SDT before receiving RRC response message from NW. We also support to clarify this a bit more.[Intel] We are ok with Apple's intention to capture that T319a should not be running understanding in order to initiate SDT procedure, however we suggest adding it as an indepdent condition, e.g. as follow*"A UE in RRC\_INACTIVE initiates the resume procedure for SDT when all of the following conditions are fulfilled:1> the upper layers request resumption of RRC connection; and****1> T319a is not running; and*** *1> SIB1 includes sdt-ConfigCommon; and1> sdt-Config is configured; and1> all the pending data in UL is mapped to the radio bearers configured for SDT; and1> lower layers indicate that conditions for initiating SDT as specified in TS 38.321 [3] are fulfilled.*¨ | ZTE | As explained by rapporteur the behaviour can also happen when T319 is running. So, if we clarify this for SDT, we think we should do the same also for legacy resume. Otherwise, the spec is misleading. We are happy to clarify for both cases or for none of them with the understanding that second resume is not initiated whilst there is an ongoing resume.  | No – not an essential correction |
| LG | We think this issue is related to Q2.2.1. What if time-critical NAS message is triggered while SDT procedure is ongoing? | Yes |
| Intel | We are ok capturing both T319a and T319 conditions *"A UE in RRC\_INACTIVE initiates the resume procedure for SDT when all of the following conditions are fulfilled:1> the upper layers request resumption of RRC connection; and****1> T319a and T319 are not running; and*** *1> SIB1 includes sdt-ConfigCommon; and1> sdt-Config is configured; and1> all the pending data in UL is mapped to the radio bearers configured for SDT; and1> lower layers indicate that conditions for initiating SDT as specified in TS 38.321 [3] are fulfilled.*¨ | Y |
| Google | This should be discussed in CT1 first. | N |
| Samsung | Same view as intel. Capturing only T319a may mean that it is allowed to initiate 2nd resume while T319 is running. | Y |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Similar issue was discussed in the past for the second RRC Resume and RRC establishment procedure (from RAN2#113bis):* [006] Not agreed
* [006] The UE should not start the 2nd RRC resumption procedure when there is a RRC resumption procedure ongoing

And from RAN2#114 meeting:* [004] The UE should not start the 2nd RRC connection establishment procedure when there is a RRC connection establishment procedure ongoing. (only capture in chairman notes, no spec change is required)

Even though the common understanding was confirmed, eventually, it was not captured in specs for neither establishment nor resume. If we now capture for SDT, then it will give a wrong impression. Hence, we think such change should not captured. | No |
| NEC | Agree with ZTE that it is the same for legacy resume. So if no correction is not needed for legacy RRC Resume, then it is not needed for SDT either. | No |
| China Telecom | Agree with ZTE. If corrections of SDT is clarified, the legacy procedure should also be clarified. | No |
| Qualcomm | We don’t think change is needed and it could be the same also for the legacy resume. If really needed, a note is enough. | N |
| CATT | We have some sympathy with the intention. Either adding the condition ‘T319a and T319 are not running;’ or a note is ok. | Y |
| Sharp | Agree with ZTE. No more clarification is necessary | No |
| Xiaomi | We agree with ZTE, and we think that even in the legacy resume procedure, a proper UE implementation can avoid overlapping procedures. | N |
| Apple | We are fine to capture both T319 and T319a, and make the spec clear.  | Y |
| Interdigital | Agree with LG. We need to specify the expected UE behaviour for the case. | Y |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| O201, O204 | Since it is not definitely clear whether data can arrive at AS before radio bearers resumed, it is up to UE implementation to make decision on the radio bearers to which the incoming data is mapped. A note maybe needed to make this clear. | Add note ‘It is up to UE implementation how the UE determines whether the pending data in UL is mapped to radio bearers configured for SDT.’ | Discuss (okay to add note if there is consensus). [AT meeting guidance]: Seems not essential, but can be added if there is consensus. Do companies support such note to be added?  |  [Intel] OK with adding a clarification note | ZTE: | No strong view | No – not an essential correction |
| LG | OK for the NOTE. | No |
| Intel | OK adding the clarification note as NAS/AS related specification is left up to UE implementation | Y |
| Google | Anyway, this will be handled by UE implementation regardless of whether there is a note. | N |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We tend to agree with Google this is not needed, but OK to add if there is consensus. | N |
| NEC | No strong view | No |
| China Telecom | No strong view | No |
| Qualcomm | OK | N |
| CATT | No strong view. | N |
| Sharp | No strong view. | N |
| OPPO | OK | Y |
| Xiaomi | No strong view. | N |
| Apple | No strong view. | N |
| Interdigital | No strong view. We can live without the note. | N |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| I513 | It is unclear whether SRB1 uses the default or stored configuration for SDT. In the initiation of resume procedure (section 5.3.13.2), default SRB1 configuration is applied based on legacy resume procedure. In the section 5.3.13.3 that describes the actions related to transmission of RRCResumeRequest message, it is currently captured that stored configuration is used for all RBs configured for SDT. Our understanding is that SRB1 should also use stored configuration although this is unclear as SRB1 is not explicitly configured by the network for SDT (as pointed in a related RIL [Z361]) although it is always resumed/used during SDT | Clarify that SRB1 uses the stored configuration in UE Inactive AS context | [AT meeting guidance]: Both options can work, but companies can clarify whether stored configuration should be used for this case. Question: Do you support the view that stored configuration shall be used for SRB1?  | [Intel] Further justification details and TP available in R2-2205825. We ask RAN2 to confirm that SRB1 should use UE’s stored configuration (which is aligned with RAN2 previous agreement) and corresponding configuration handling needs to be clarified in TS 38.331. TP explicitly indicates that SRB1 is considered as configured for SDT, and updates the procedure associated to SRB1 on the re-establishment of the PDCP entity and its resume in order to use UE’s configuration stored in UE Inactive AS context. This RIL might be related to [O200] | ZTE: | Current option can work, but we can update it to use stored configuration if majority prefer to go this way.  | No – not an essential correction |
| LG | Could be ok to change. |  |
| Intel | There are two points to discuss. 1. Whether to apply the stored or default configuration for SRB1. RAN2 had previously agreed to use stored configuration – no exception was made for SRB1. Further, it is a bit strange and add complexity for further network configuration if SRB1 uses default and SRB2 and other DRBs uses stored. This issue is further aggravated when a UE transitions to RRC\_CONNECTED from SDT as SRB1 configuration in used (i.e. default) would need to be updated to be the stored or delta configured from the default.
2. Explicitly capturing that SRB1 is considered as configured for SDT when sdt config is provided. This point is relevant only if point 1) is agreed.

The suggested TP can also avoid any future/further confusion on whether SRB1 applies or not for SDT as it is always used for RRC signaling. The suggested change would be:**5.3.8.3 Reception of the *RRCRelease* by the UE***<\*\* omitted text \*\*>*2> if the *sdt-Config* is configured:3> consider the SRB1 to be configured for SDT;3> for each of the DRB in the *sdt-DRB-List*:4> consider the DRB to be configured for SDT;3> if *sdt-SRB2-Indication* is configured:4> consider the SRB2 to be configured for SDT;3> for each of the RLC bearer that is part of the UE configuration:4> re-establish the RLC entity as specified in TS 38.322 [4];3> for SRB2 (if it is resumed) and for SRB1:4> trigger the PDCP entity to perform SDU discard as specified in TS 38.323 [5];3> if *sdt-MAC-PHY-CG-Config* is configured:4> configure the MAC entity with the configured grant resources for SDT and instruct MAC to start the *cg-SDT-TimeAlignmentTimer*;*<\*\* omitted text \*\*>***5.3.13.3 Actions related to transmission of RRCResumeRequest or RRCResumeRequest1 message***<\*\* omitted text \*\*>*~~1> re-establish PDCP entities for SRB1;~~~~1> resume SRB1;~~1> if the resume procedure is initiated for SDT:2> for each radio bearer that is configured for SDT:3> restore the configuration associated with the RLC bearers of *masterCellGroup* and *pdcp-Config* from the UE Inactive AS context;3> re-establish PDCP entity for the radio bearer without triggering PDCP status report;2> resume all the radio bearers that are configured for SDT;1> else:2> re-establish PDCP entities for SRB1;2> resume SRB1;*<\*\* omitted text \*\*>* | Y |
| Google | No strong view. The current text and Intel’s changes are OK. | N |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree the stored configuration should be used. We think the changes introduced by the RRC CR rapporteur in R2-2205549 are sufficient for this, i.e.:1> if the resume procedure is initiated for SDT:2> for each radio bearer that is configured for SDT and for SRB1:3> restore the configuration associated with the RLC bearers of *masterCellGroup* and *pdcp-Config* from the UE Inactive AS context;And2> if any radio bearer is configured for SDT:3SRB1 and for 442> suspend SRB1 and the radio bearers configured for SDT, if any;2> the procedure ends; | Y |
| NEC | There may be some benefit to use stored SRB1 configuration, for example to avoid potential collision of LCID with other RBs, but this can also be handled by proper network configuration. So using the default configuration can also work. We can follow the majority. | No |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the Intel’s proposal. | N |
| CATT | It can work with default configuration of SRB1. Furthermore, it is aligned with legacy RRC Resume procedure. There is no strong motivation to change current procedure. | N |
| Sharp | We think Intel’s change is ok. | N |
| OPPO | Fine with the change proposed by Intel | N |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with the Intel’s proposal. | N |
| Apple | We agree that the SRB1 uses the stored configuration in UE Inactive AS context. | Y |
| Interdigital | Intel’s proposed changes above should be applied. | Y |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| H549 | Currently, the restored configuration from the UE inactive context only includes the RLC and PDCP configuration corresponding to the radio bearers configured for SDT. However, it should be noted that the logicalChannelGroup, logicalChannelSR-DelayTimerApplied, and logicalChannelSR-Mask within the logical channel configurations are also needed for the UE. The following agreement has been made regarding logicalChannelSR-Mask2. It is up to the network how to configure the logicalChannelSR-Mask value for LCHs of DRBs configured for SDT. logicalChannelSR-DelayTimerApplied is also needed for indicating whether SR delay is applied to the logical channelAlso, logical channel group configuration is needed for BSRThere are two approaches to handle the issue (a) The configuration is delivered per RLC configured with SDT within the RRCRelease message. (b) The configuration is restored from the UE inactive context. We think that there is no need for additional configuration in the RRCRelease message and the UE only needs to restore the configuration from the UE inactive context. |   | In general the stored configuration should be used. If this is unclear, then we can clarify[AT meeting guidance]: Please comment on whether there is some ambiguity for the stored configuration being restored and also clarify what changes are needed if any. | [Apple]: propose to clarify it. [Intel] This RIL could be related to [A007] where we explained that it is important to discuss whether any clarification is needed on the handling of non-SDT configuration during an SDT session and when moving from an SDT session to CONNECTED | ZTE | ZTE: We think some clarification as proposed could be okay. No strong view.  | No – not an essential correction |
| LG | This issue is related to UP discussion Q11 in [AT118-e][502]. Should be discussed there. |  |
| Intel | We support Huawei’s suggested TP to avoid any confusion.  | Y |
| Google | We agree to the issue and support the TP proposed by Huawei. | Y |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think this is missing from the current specifications and it is important to clarify this. | Y |
| NEC | Maybe some clarification is needed. But there are many logical channel related parameters needs to be restored, for example *priority, prioritisedBitRate, allowedCG-List,* do we need to list them all? Can we use a more general description like restored the logical channel related parameters? | Y |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the clarification  | Y |
| CATT | The configurations, *logicalChannelGroup*, *logicalChannelSR-DelayTimerApplied*, and *logicalChannelSR-Mask*, is in IE *LogicalChannelConfig*, while IE *LogicalChannelConfig* is in IE *RLC-BearerConfig*. As shown below, the configuration associated with the RLC bearers for SDT has already been restored, we wonder if we need to clarify further which parameters of logical channel need to be restored.1> if the resume procedure is initiated for SDT:2> for each radio bearer that is configured for SDT:3> restore the configuration associated with the RLC bearers of *masterCellGroup* and *pdcp-Config* from the UE Inactive AS context; | N |
| Sharp | The clarification is necessary | Y |
| OPPO | Share the same view as CATT | N |
| Xiaomi | Agree with CATT. | N |
| Apple | We agree that the SRB1 uses the stored configuration in UE Inactive AS context. | Y |
| Interdigital | We are fine with HW proposed changes for clarification. | Y |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| H550, A019 | RAN2 already agreed that cg-SDT-TimeAlignmentTimer is stopped when UE enters RRC\_connected and CG resources for SDT should be released, it was not captured in the spec.Agreements:• As baseline, the CG-SDT-TAT is stopped when a) UE enters RRC connected, and b) UE receives RRC Release at the end of SDT procedure and RRC Release does not include/configure CG resources. FFS if there is any impact to this agreement as a result of delta signalling |   | Some changes may be needed in MAC spec too?[Rapp2]: it was typo in the implemenation for TAT, will be corrected in the next version. [Rapp3]: Marked as to disc based on LG comment (original change is left in the CR though will be updated according to final conclusion). My concern with LG proposal is that it adds overhead unecessarily in DL and may also have some RAN3 impacts (since the DU needs to know to include this when RRCRelease is sent). [AT meeting guidance]: Seems the main open issue is to select one of the following: Option 1: UE implicitly starts TAT upon moving to connected Option 2: network always includes TAC MAC CE when UE moves from CG SDT to RRC connected. Please explain which is your preference and why.  | [Samsung]: Text change is not correct. Why is TimeAlignmentTimer stopped? This should not be stopped.[Rapp2]: sorry it was typo. TAT is to be started! Corrected in new version! [LG] TAT should not be stopped. For CG-SDT-TAT, no change is needed for MAC.[ASUS] Agree with Samsung and LG.[Apple] Agree with HW's proposal. CG-SDT-TAT is only used during the CG-SDT procedure, so when entering CONNECTED state UE should stop this timer. For legacy TAT, it's not used during the CG-SDT, so it should be started when entering CONNECTED setate. [Huawei] The proposal was different from what the rapporteur implemented, i.e. TAT should be started, not stopped (i.e. we agree with the comments from companies above).[LG] We don't think instruction from RRC to MAC to start legacy TAT is needed. It's enough to send TAC MAC CE together with RRC release message. Then, the UE will start legacy TAT. No change is needed.[Intel] It is not clear why legacy TAT should be stopped. Regarding CG-SDT related config./resources, delta configuration is only agreed across SDT sessions and not when entering into CONNECTED. During this procedure (i.e. Reception of the RRCResume by the UE), suspendConfig (which includes all SDT config (which includes CG-SDT)) is released (except RNA config) and we are also ok to capture explicitly that CG-SDT-TAT is stopped | ZTE:  | We prefer option 1. Option 2 will result in unnecessary overhead (TAC MAC CE needs to be added even when not necessary) and it will also have some implications on network (i.e. how does DU know that TAC MAC CE should be appended with RRC message containing RRCResume?). Seems it is complicated and may have RAN3 impacts. So, we want to go with the simple approach of option 1.  | Yes – Essential correction |
| LG | Option 1 is not needed, but Option 2 is not correct. The network does not need to always include TAC MAC CE. The network includes TAC MAC CE only when the legacy TAT is not running. And we don’t understand ZTE’s comment. If the DU does not know whether the RRC message is RRCResume or not, the network does not know when the UE implicitly starts legacy TAT in option 1. The TAT desynch problem is much severe in option 1.In addition, option 1 requires new trigger to start TAT which is more complicated than option 2. | Yes |
| Intel | Option 1 seems simpler | Y |
| Google | Both options can work. We prefer option 1 because it is simple. | Y |
| Samsung | Legacy TAT if running should not be stopped. If Legacy TAT is not running, ok to start TAT | - |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree with ZTE and the modification proposed in R2-2205549 is OK to us. | Y |
| NEC | Option 1.  | Y |
| China Telecom | Option 1 is simpler.  | Y |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 is more reasonable. | Y |
| CATT | Option 1 | Y |
| Sharp | Option 1.  | Y |
| OPPO | Option 1 | Y |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 | Y |
| Apple | Option 1 | Y |
| Interdigital | Option 2 looks simpler.  | Y |
|  |  |  |
| A019 | When UE switches from CG-SDT to CONNECTED state, UE should start the legacy TATimer, because the legacy TATimer is not running during the CG-SDT procedure. | RRC informs MAC to start the legacy TATimer upon receiving the RRCResume procedure while the T319a is running. | Agree! See also H550. [Rapp3]: agree with the intention, but marked as disc (see H550 above)[AT meeting guidance]: No need to comment explicitly. Comment above.  |   |  |  |
| W005 | After reception of RRCReject during SDT, UE goes back to normal INACTIVE state, and may initiate a second SDT procedure later. To avoid the buffered/old data in SRB2 being counted into SDT data volume calculation, they should be discarded upon reception of RRCReject, just like the behavior of RRC Release. Note that PDCP suspend can only discard PDCP PDU, but not PDCP SDU. | Add the following step:2> for SRB2, trigger the PDCP entity to perform SDU discard as specified in TS 38.323 [5]; | I don't think it is correct to delete the PDCP SDUs in this case. We only agreed to delete the PDCP SDUs in case of SRBs when these will not be transmitted anyway. However, in case of RRCReject,the PDCP SDUs may need to be retransmitted. So, it is okay to keep them.[Rapp2]: based on the comments received, it seems companies want to agree to discard SDUs in this case. We can try this approach. Changed this as discuss. [AT meeting guidance]: Seems both options (discard SDUs and keep them) can work in this case. But companies can clarify if they prefer one or the other.  | [NEC] Response to rapporteur's comment: The buffered/old SRB2 data (both SDUs and PDUs) would be discarded during PDCP reestablishment of the second RRC Resume procedure anyway, so it is not possbile to retransmit them by PDCP ( if any retransmission is needed, it should be handled by upper layer). So the buffer in PDCP of SRB2 should be cleared such that they won't be counted into SDT data volume calcuation.[LG] We agree with the problem that NEC addressed. When RRC Resume procedure is initiated, all the PDCP entities of the SDT RBs are re-established. During PDCP re-establishment, PDCP SDUs are discarded for SRBs. Then, it is correct observation that PDCP of SRB2 would be counted into SDT data volume even though they will be discarded at initiation of SDT procedure.[CATT] We agree with NEC and LG.[Intel] This might not be a critical issue understanding that NAS/AS interaction is not fully specified for this scenario. | ZTE | ZTEWe are not sure what is wrong in this case if we keep the SDUs since these may anyway need to be retransmitted.  | No - Not an essential correction |
| LG | As already commented, PDCP SDU of SRB2 would be counted into SDT data volume even though they will be discarded at initiation of SDT procedure. This is the problem, and we support the change. | Yes |
| Intel | Change does not seem essential considering that NAS/AS interaction is not fully specified for SDT operation. | N |
| Google | This can be left to the UE implementation. | N |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the change, since as explained by the RIL proponent, this data will be unnecessarily counted towards the data volume even though it will not be sent. It is unclear to us why we would capture this correctly for RRCRelease, but not for RRCReject. | Y |
| NEC | Agree with LG and HW. Since these old packets would be discarded during PDCP re-establishment anyway, they should be discarded to avoid being counted into SDT data volume. And we don’t think this is related to NAS/AS interaction. This is a pure AS layer issue, since it is clear in that the packets would be discarded by AS layer (PDCP). | Yes |
| China Telecom | Agree with NEC. To avoid the PDCP SRB2 counted into SDT data volume, the PDCP buffer of SRB2 should be cleared.  | Y |
| Qualcomm | In case of RRCReject, the PDCP SDU can be kept, and it is up to UE implementation to handle this data. So, the proposed change is not needed. | N |
| CATT | When the UE can initiate RRC Resume procedure again, the PDCP SDU of SRB2 should not be counted into SDT data volume. So we support to discard it. And this is aligned with the behaviour for reception of *RRCRelease* message. | Y |
| Sharp | Agree with NEC. The PDCP SDU should be discarded in this case. | Y |
| OPPO | Prefer to clear PDCP SDU | Y |
| Xiao | Agree with the change | Y |
| Apple | It could be up to UE implementation. | N |
| Interdigital | It can be left to UE implementation. | N |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| C092 | In last RAN2#117e-meeting, it was agreed:If UE detects an SDT failure of ongoing SDT session for the transfer of NAS message, RRC informs NAS about the failure for NAS message transfer. Discuss further if any specification change is needed or not. [CB] LS to CT1? The network may send RRCRlease message to the UE to end the current SDT procedure even if there are NAS messages that successful delivery of these message was not confirmed by lower layers. For example: The network sends RRCRelease message for DL non-SDT data arrival without anchor relocation. As some ULInformationTransfer messages are successful delivery to the network but some are not confirmed by lower layers either, AS needs to inform NAS about the failure for NAS message transfer for the case. But in this case, upon reception of RRCRelease message, PDCP re-estamlishment or release/addition is not performed. Hence, we propose to add a new case to inform upper layers about the possible failure. | Change to:if PDCP re-establishment or release/addition (e.g due to key refresh upon PCell or PSCell change, or RRC connection re-establishment, or failure of resume procedure initiated for SDT) occurs on an SRB on which ULInformationTransfer messages were submitted for transmission but successful delivery of these messages was not confirmed by lower layers; orif RRCRelease message was received that is response to a resume procedure initiated for SDT while ULInformationTransfer messages were submitted for transmission but successful delivery of these messages was not confirmed by lower layers:2> inform upper layers about the possible failure to deliver the information contained in the concerned ULInformationTransfer messages, unless the messages only include dedicatedInfoF1c. | Reject. In any case PDCP reestablishment will be performed (when the UE resumes again). Is the intention that the information to upper layers should be provided upon release but not upon resume (?). [Rapp3]: marked as discuss[AT meeting guidance]: Do companies think that a new trigger to indicate to upper layers about potential loss of NAS PDU is needed for this case? Please explain why.  | [CATT]According to current agreement, the UE performs PDCP re-establishment for RB configured for SDT and for SRB1 if the resume procedure is initiated for SDT. And if the resume procedure is not initiated for SDT, the UE doesn't perform PDCP re-establiment for SRB2 autonomously. Hence, in order to ensure the information to upper layers, we prefer to provide the info upon release, not upon resume. Maybe we can clarify if SRB2 is suspended, RRC provides the info to upper layers too.[Intel] OK with Rapporteur | ZTE | Since PDCP reestablishment is performed when UE resumes, it seems this is just an optimisation (the internal interface between AS/NAS can generate this at any point and we need not introduce a new trigger for this case in our view). But we are okay to go with majority view on this.  | No – not an essential correction |
| Intel | This does not seem essential considering that NAS/AS interaction is not fully specified for SDT operation. If this were needed, CT1 should sent an LS on this. | N |
| Google | There are other cases for NAS/AS interaction. This should be triggered by CT1. | N |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are OK to clarify this. We should not expect CT1 to analyse SDT in detail as they do not even have a WI for SDT. If we find an issue, we should try to fix it, if possible. | No |
| NEC | For the case mentioned by CATT, we understand if the resume is not initiated for SDT, PDCP re-establishment for SRB2 still be triggered by the network by reestablishPDCP. In legacy, if there is an unsuccessful transmission of NAS message and RRCRelease is received, the AS layer would indicate to NAS layer about this during subsequent RRC Resume procedure (when PDCP re-establishment performed for SRB2). So the SDT case is the same as legacy, and there is no need to add a new trigger. | N |
| Qualcomm | This is related to NAS/AS interaction. We can follow the legacy, i.e. not introduce new trigger for this case. | N |
| CATT | If SDT is initiated again after reception of *RRCRelease* message, the UE performs PDCP re-establishment for RB configured for SDT and for SRB1 if the resume procedure is initiated for SDT according to current TS. But the UE suspend SRB2, discard PDCP SDU(s) for SRB2, and enters RRC\_INACTIVE state upon reception of *RRCRelease* message. And there is **gap** between the UE receives *RRCRelease* message. We wonder if the UE can be aware there are some *ULInformationTransfer messages* were submitted for transmission but successful delivery of these messages was not confirmed by lower layers when it initiated SDT again after reception of *RRCRelease* message. If not, the retransmission of the NAS message needs to depends on upper layer, e.g. for positioning, LPP layer triggers retransmission. And the delay is introduced.And if legacy resume procedure is initiated after reception of *RRCRelease* message, the UE doesn't perform PDCP re-establishment for SRB2 autonomously. It’s depended on network implementation. And please note PDCP SDU(s) for SRB2 are discarded upon reception of *RRCRelease* message if SRB2 is resumed. So there is no harm if the UE doesn’t perform PDCP re-establishment for SRB2 with legacy resume procedure after reception of *RRCRelease* message. So beside the **gap** between the UE receives *RRCRelease* message, we cannot ensure that PDCP re-establishment for SRB2 always happens in this case.Hence, we propose to indicate to upper layers about potential loss of NAS PDU upon release, not upon resumption. | Y |
| Sharp | We think legacy procedure is ok, i.e no new trigger for this case | N |
| Xiaomi | We do not think a new trigger is needed. | N |
| Apple | It’s related to the NAS/AS interaction, and we are not sure whether the new trigger is needed. It could be discussed in CT1 first.  | N |
| Interdigital | Same view as Intel | N |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| O204 | Similar comments as O201. A note is needed to clarify how to determine there is non-SDT data/signalling. | Add note ‘It is up to UE implementation how the UE determines whether data and/or signalling mapped to radio bearers not configured for SDT becomes available.’ | Can be added if there is consensus. See O201 above.  |   |  |  |
| O205 | If there is emergency service, it is beneficial to include the resumeCause by setting to emergency. With this information, NW can make proper/fast actions. If resume request is not provided from upper layer, it can be up to UE implementation on how RRC layer is aware of an onging emergency service, as specified in 5.3.13.2. | 1> if transmission of the UEAssistanceInformation message is initiated to indicate availability of data mapped to radio bearers not configured for SDT according to 5.7.4.2:2> include and set the resumeCause according to the information received from the upper layers, if provided.2> if an emergency service is ongoing, include and set the resumeCause to emergency.NOTE: How the RRC layer in the UE is aware of an ongoing emergency service is up to UE implementation. | Discuss. Not essential. [AT meeting guidance]: Seems not essential, and we have discussed this in the past perhaps? but companies can comment if they prefer to add a note for this.  |  [Intel] OK with Rapporteur | ZTE | This was already discussed in the past and we don’t think this is needed. It can be left to upper layers to provide this information in this case.  | No – not an essential correction |
| Intel | We agree that there is no need to discuss this again | N |
| Google | Same view as ZTE and Intel | N |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In our understanding the resume cause should be included if provided by upper layers. There is no need for AS to determine the resume cause by itself. | No |
| NEC | Agree with ZTE | N |
| China Telecom | Agree with ZTE | N |
| Qualcomm | Agree with ZTE | N |
| CATT | Resume cause can cover the case. | N |
| Sharp | Agree with ZTE | N |
| OPPO | We think the change is needed in case that emergency services arrives during an ongoing SDT. According to the LS from CT1, they do not make consensus on whether NAS can provide another resume request to AS without receiving the response to previous one. Resume cause is not included in UAI if resume request is not provided from upper layer. | N |
| Xiaomi | Agree with ZTE | N |
| Apple | Agree with ZTE. | N |
| Interdigital | Agree with ZTE | N |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| I512 | The configuration provided by SRS-PosRRC-InactiveConfig-r17 might require some update to work with CU/DU split where the information from the DU needs to be in a container  and to allow delta signaling between SDT sessions (similarly as it was done for SDT configuration e.g. sdt-MAC-PHY-CG-Config-r17). Note that the delta part is inter-related to previous comment I010. | We will provide a TDoc to discuss the suggested update to SRS-PosRRC-InactiveConfig-r17 | Discuss in positionining session. [Rapp4] the positioning guys should review the CR it whereever it gets agreed. [AT meeting guidance]: Place holder for now. May be this should be moved to positioning session. We should clarify this first. It seems positioning experts should implement this change in any case?? Update from positioning session. The following plan was agreed in positioning session: *Chair’s note: Companies’ attention is drawn to email discussion [AT118-e][501], where the discussion of document R2-2205824 for RRC RIL I512 is handled. The proposal is to change the ASN.1 structure around the positioning-related field srs-PosRRC-InactiveConfig-r17. It is assumed that the conclusion will be captured by the positioning RRC rapporteur.*So, please do comment on this (especially if you donot agree with this change). The rapporteur thinks this is merely an alignment with SDT way of signalling and hence is technically correct. So, unless I see some negative comments, I will propose to agree this.  | [Intel] We understand that this topic should be better discuss on SDT session as positioning session agreed to follow the same approach as agreed for SDT on the signaling handling (e.g. on the delta behaviour). Further justification details and TP available in R2-2205824. We propose: - Proposal1. RAN2 assumes that DU can set the configuration associated to SRS-PosRRC-InactiveConfig-r17 and should be provided in a container as part of the corresponding ASN.1. - Proposal 2. If Proposal 1 is agreed, to inform RAN3 via an LS (with details in TDoc) - Proposal 3. Update ASN.1 to define srs-PosRRC-InactiveConfig-r17 with a SetupRelease type. | ZTE | We agree with the changes but these should be discusssed in positioning session.  |  |
| Intel | Positioning session Chair has informed positioning experts to check this email discussion, and the conclusion will be captured in positioning RRC CR directly. We suggest agreeing on P1/P2. Note that P3 has already being updated by positioning RRC Rapp. | Y |
| Google | We agree with the changes because SRS-PosRRC-InactiveConfig-r17 should be generated by the DU. | Y |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree with the proposal, but it is completely unclear why this is discussed within SDT WI and not positioning WI. | Y (for positioning) |
| Qualcomm | It seems this should be discussed in Positioning session. | N |
| CATT | Discuss it in positioning session. |  |
| Xiaomi | This can be discussed in the positioning session. |  |
| Apple | It may need to be discussed in positioning session first.  |  |
| Interdigital | It should be discussed in positioning session. |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| H551 | Since the behaviour upon absence is described in the field description, it should be NEED S | change need R to need S | There should be a way to release this. So, Need R can be kept. We can clarify in field description what happens when it is not configured (rather than to say not included). [Rapp2]: In the ASN.1 review this was discussed and it was agreed that we can have some description about what UE does when it is not configured for need R cases. I guess for need S we need description upon abscense of the field as far as I understood. But, happy to mark this as discuss if there is some confusion**ASN.1 adhoc agreements**P2: Use Need R (instead of Need S) for fields whose absence simply means a configuration is released.P3: Use Need R (instead of Need S) for fields for which there are some conditions when network does or does not include the field.[AT meeting guidance]:Per above, it seems need R is correct for this. Can be confirmed quickly. Do you agree to keep need R? | [Huawei] I am not sure I understand the difference between field being absent and the field being not configured (there is a difference when we speak of the field which is SetupRelease type, as for H554, but in this case the difference is unclear). I still think this should be Need S and it still can be released (and then the behaviour is that "PDCP entity for the radio bearers configured for SDT reset the ROHC header compression protocol during PDCP re-establishment during SDT procedure, as specified in TS 38.323 ", as described in the filed description.[Intel] Agree with Rapporteur. The use of "need S" was also discussed during ASN.1 review and Intel's comment was that it is ok to keep current desciption of the "not configure" and "Need R"  | ZTE | We don’t think the change is needed as explained by the rapporteur, the current use of the need code is aligned with the agreements made at the ASN.1 adhoc.  | Y – Essential issue |
| Intel | We agree with ZTE | N |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The agreements from the ad-hoc are correct. However, the current use of the need code is misaligned with the outcome of the ad-hoc for sdt-DRB-ContinueROHC field. For this field, we have a UE behaviour described for the absence and this behaviour goes beyond simply releasing the configuration:***sdt-DRB-ContinueROHC***Indicates whether the PDCP entity for the radio bearers configured for SDT continues or resets the ROHC header compression protocol during PDCP re-establishment during SDT procedure, as specified in TS 38.323 [5]. Value *cell* indicates that ROHC header compression continues when the UE resumes for SDT in the same cell as the PCell when the RRCRelease message is received. Value *rna* indicates that ROHC header compression continues when the UE resumes for SDT in a cell belonging to the same RNA as the PCell when the RRCRelease message is received. If the field is absent PDCP entity for the radio bearers configured for SDT reset the ROHC header compression protocol during PDCP re-establishment during SDT procedure, as specified in TS 38.323 [5].Therefore, the need code here should be “S”.We are OK to keep NEED R for sdt-LogicalChannelSR-DelayTimer, but the highlighted sentence can be then removed from the field description as there is no need to capture this for every field with NEED R code.***sdt-LogicalChannelSR-DelayTimer***The value of logicalChannelSR-DelayTimer applied during SDT for logical channels configured with SDT, as specified in TS 38.321 [3]. Value in number of subframes. Value *sf20* corresponds to 20 subframes, *sf40* corresponds to 40 subframes, and so on. If this field is not configured, then logicalChannelSR-DelayTimer is not applied for SDT logical channels. | Y – (specs work in any way, but if we misuse the need codes, this will make the specs less clear) |
| NEC | Agree with ZTE and Intel | No |
| Sharp | Agree with ZTE and Intel | No |
| Xiaomi | Agree with ZTE. | N |
|  |  |  |
| IneterDigital | Agree with Huawei. If the field description explains how to handle the IE, then need code should be S rather than R. | Y |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| H555 | It is more appropriate to capture this as a condition. |   | Rapp2: agree that the wording is not perfect. Adopted something similar to what isproposed by LG here. [Rapp4] No strong view, but I tend to agree that changing this to condition seems to create some issues. Also slightly prefer to not do this. Marked as discuss (kept the change for now)[AT meeting guidance]: Both options can work but converting to condition seems to create some ambiguity. Perhaps we should go back to the original text?? Please comment.  | [LG] In the explanation of CG-SDT, "for the first time" is not clear. Maybe we can say "while the sdt-MAC-PHY-CG-Config is not configured".[Huawei] Also, sdt-MAC-PHY-CG-Config should be in italics. [Intel] We prefer keeping current text in the field description as it seems more clear than the proposed new condition e.g. term "first time..." is not clear. The text "network always configure" is also extensively used on other fileds within 38.331  | ZTE | We actually think that the original text is fine for this and we don’t need to convert this into conditional code.  | No – not an essential correction |
| LG | It is not clear what is the original text. Need more clarification on both options. |  |
| Intel | We prefer keeping the text in the field description instead the new conditional code | N |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It is true that we use “network always configure” in field descriptions, but in our understanding this is not correct as this is what we have conditions for. We think the text proposed in R2-2205549 is clear. | N |
| Xiaomi | Agree with ZTE | N |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| I511 | During RAN2#117e discussion, companies seemed divided between the following options 1.a) and 1.b):Option 1)  T319a is not re-started during a given SDT session Option 1.a) T319a is defined with large max. range (e.g. 6 or 10 sec) Option 1.b) T319a is defined with short max. range (e.g. 1 or 2 or even 3 sec) Option 2) T319a is re-started with every reception and (re)transmission within a given SDT session where T319a is defined with a short max. range (e.g. 1 or 2sec) Companies that preferred option 1.a) wanted to give enough time for UE to get DL responses into account, while those that preferred option 1.b) had the concern on the potential negative impact to UE’s power consumption (as C-DRX is not supported) and UE’s performance (as measurements/HO is not supported). So maybe Option 2) might be the middle ground not to restrict the length of the SDT session while not keeping the UE monitoring PDCCH for very long time unnecessarily. We understand that there is no time to re-discuss all of this now via short email discussion. We wonder whether we could reuse same range as legacy T319 (up to 2sec) with additional spare values and next meeting, we continue the discussion on whether larger values are allowed/defined, or 2) the operation of the timer is revisited e.g. as explained in above option 2). | We bring a TDoc in May meeting to discuss whether to remove 4sec value (and set it as another spare value) and enable a different handling for T319a (i.e. option 2) might be preferable vs having larger timer values allowed (as explained in option 1.a). | [At meeting guidance] No need to comment on this as we have separate discussion above for this one (see section 2.1).  | [Intel] Further justification details and TP available in R2-2205819. The proposal is to define maximum range of T319a up to 3 seconds.  |  |  |
| Q305, I505 | sdt-CG-SearchSpace-r17 in RAN1 small data higher layer parameter list is missing | add sdt-CG-SearchSpace-r17 | In the current implementation, separate search space is configured (included in pdcch-Config-r17 in BWP-Downlink-Dedicated-SDT ). It is unclear if we need a separate name for this IE since any search space configured in RRCRelease can be used as dedicated CG search space. May be the issue is that RAN1 uses this name in their specs should we ask them to update their specs instead?[AT meeting guidance]: It is unclear why we need a separate name for the search space. It can just be referred to as the dedicated search space included for CG-SDT. Companies can comment on the need for separate name and how we should harmonize RAN1 specs with what we have.  | [Intel] See related discussion in RIL [I505] with the supportive TDoc R2-2205820. Two options are dicussed and finally concluded that RAN2 should send a LS to RAN1 asking to update the references of sdt-CG-SearchSpace-r17 in TS 38.213 to use instead SearchSpace that is defined as part of PDCCH-Config-r17 (which is sent as part of UE’s CG-SDT configuration within the BWP-Downlink-Dedicated-SDT). No change required in current ASN.1. | ZTE | Indeed there is a misalignment here between RAN1 and RAN2 specs. However, we think RRC implementation is fine and we should just inform RAN1 that the new search space is included in RRCRelease and there is no need to have a new name for this search space. So, RAN1 specs can refer directly to the search space configured using the RRCRelease message instead.  | Y – Essential issue |
| Intel | OK to inform RAN1 as explained by ZTE and in R2-2205820 | Y |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree with ZTE we can keep RRC untouched and let RAN1 update. | Y |
| Qualcomm | At this stage, we prefer to update RRC spec to add a new parameter sdt-CG-SearchSpace in pdcch-config-r17 under the BWP-Downlink-Dedicated-SDT. It is noted that RAN1 spec has become stable, and they already defined this new parameter in their spec, and they have already sent this parameter to RAN2. | Y |
| CATT | Agree with ZTE. | Y |
| OPPO | Agree with ZTE | Y |
| Xiaomi | Agree with ZTE | Y |
| Apple | Agree with ZTE. | Y |
| Interdigital | Agree with ZTE | Y |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| I505 | RAN1 defined the sdt-CG-SearchSpace-r17 to be included in BWP-Downlink-Dedicated-SDT as part of pdcch-Config for CG-SDT (as captured in updated\_R1-2112976 Consolidated higher layers parameter list for Rel-17 NR\_SDT\_v2.xlsx – related row copied also below). However SDT running CR seemed not to include this.NR\_SmallData\_INACTIVE-CoreCG-SDTincluded in pdcch-Config-r17 in BWP-Downlink-Dedicated-SDT sdt-CG-SearchSpace-r17NewUE specific Search Space for CG-SDT.SearchSpacePer UEUE specificAgreementRAN1 confirms the working assumption in RAN2 that UE-specific search space is configured for UEs performing CG-SDT. This does not exclude the configuration of CSS for UEs performing CG-SDT. | Suggest to update the following\*\* Suggested update of the TP – START \*\*PDCCH-Config ::= SEQUENCE { controlResourceSetToAddModList SEQUENCE(SIZE (1..3)) OF ControlResourceSet OPTIONAL, -- Need N controlResourceSetToReleaseList SEQUENCE(SIZE (1..3)) OF ControlResourceSetId OPTIONAL, -- Need N searchSpacesToAddModList SEQUENCE(SIZE (1..10)) OF SearchSpace OPTIONAL, -- Need N searchSpacesToReleaseList SEQUENCE(SIZE (1..10)) OF SearchSpaceId OPTIONAL, -- Need N downlinkPreemption SetupRelease { DownlinkPreemption } OPTIONAL, -- Need M tpc-PUSCH SetupRelease { PUSCH-TPC-CommandConfig } OPTIONAL, -- Need M tpc-PUCCH SetupRelease { PUCCH-TPC-CommandConfig } OPTIONAL, -- Need M tpc-SRS SetupRelease { SRS-TPC-CommandConfig} OPTIONAL, -- Need M ..., [[ controlResourceSetToAddModListSizeExt-v1610 SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..2)) OF ControlResourceSet OPTIONAL, -- Need N controlResourceSetToReleaseListSizeExt-r16 SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..5)) OF ControlResourceSetId-r16 OPTIONAL, -- Need N searchSpacesToAddModListExt-r16 SEQUENCE(SIZE (1..10)) OF SearchSpaceExt-r16 OPTIONAL, -- Need N uplinkCancellation-r16 SetupRelease { UplinkCancellation-r16 } OPTIONAL, -- Need M monitoringCapabilityConfig-r16 ENUMERATED { r15monitoringcapability,r16monitoringcapability } OPTIONAL, -- Need M searchSpaceSwitchConfig-r16 SearchSpaceSwitchConfig-r16 OPTIONAL -- Need R ]], [[ sfnScheme-r17 ENUMERATED {sfnSchemeA,sfnSchemeB} OPTIONAL, -- Need R searchSpacesToAddModListExt-v1700 SEQUENCE(SIZE (1..10)) OF SearchSpaceExt-v1700 OPTIONAL, -- Need N monitoringCapabilityConfig-r17 ENUMERATED { r15monitoringcapability, r16monitoringcapability, r17monitoringcapability } OPTIONAL, -- Need M searchSpaceSwitchTimer-r17 INTEGER (1..800) OPTIONAL, -- Need R pdcch-SkippingDurationList-r17 SEQUENCE(SIZE (1..3)) OF PDCCH-SkippingDuration-r17 OPTIONAL -- Need R sdt-CG-SearchSpace-r17 SearchSpaceSwitchConfig-r16 OPTIONAL -- Need R ]]}\*\* Suggested update of the TP – STOP \*\* | In the current implementation, separate search space is configured (included in pdcch-Config-r17 in BWP-Downlink-Dedicated-SDT ). It is unclear if we need a separate name for this IE since any search space configured in RRCRelease can be used as dedicated CG search space. May be the issue is that RAN1 uses this name in their specs should we ask them to update their specs instead?[Rapp4] yes, same view as Intel. But either way is okay in the end... Let discuss this quicklyPlease include your comments above (Q305) | [Intel] Further justification details and TP available in R2-2205820. Two options are dicussed and finally concluded that RAN2 should send a LS to RAN1 asking to update the references of sdt-CG-SearchSpace-r17 in TS 38.213 to use instead SearchSpace that is defined as part of PDCCH-Config-r17 (which is sent as part of UE’s CG-SDT configuration within the BWP-Downlink-Dedicated-SDT). No change required in current ASN.1. This RIL seems related to Q305 |  |  |
| Z354 | The search space could either be an existing search space or a new search space. So, propose to make it chise of search space ID and search space | Convert the IE to a choice structure to configure either an existing search space with search space ID or to configure a new search space. | [Rapp2]: The separate search space with choice structure is still optional. So, if this is not configured then the UE can use ra-searchSpace. Is this not the intention then? Marked as Discuss anyway. And the change is removed for now. [AT meeting guidance]: If a separate search space is not configured for SDT then ra-searchSpace can be monitored. However, it is not clear that the separate search space should be an existing one (i.e. can it not be a separate search space for SDT?). Companies can comment on whether we should allow separate search space (which is not an existing search space) in this case.  | [ASUS] In 38.213 section 19.2, "A UE can be provided by sdt-SearchSpace a CSS set to monitor ... otherwise, if the UE is not provided sdt-SearchSpace, the UE monitors PDCCH according to a Type1-PDCCH CSS set as described in clause 10.1." Since the behaviour of absence of the new search space is to resue ra-SearchSpace, there seems no need to introduce the choice structure. [Huawei] Agree with the comment from ASUST on this[Intel] Agree with ASUS's comment | ZTE | We think it is allowed to configure separate search space which is not an existing one and if no separate search space is configured then ra search space should be used.  | Essential issue |
| ASUSTeK | Agree with ZTE. | Y |
| NEC | Actually we think the separate search space should be an existing one (other than the ra-searchSpace). Based on LS from RAN1, we don’t think RAN1 intend to introduce extend the total number of common search space. To make it clear, we think it is better that RAN2 sends LS to RAN1 as soon as possible since this is ASN.1 related. | Y |
| Qualcomm | It is clear that if no separate search space is configured, ra-searchspace is used. For either an existing one or a new search space, maybe we should send LS to RAN1. | Y |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We have the same understanding as NEC, i.e. the SDT search space should be one of the common search spaces configured in SIB1. Hence the field type for sdt-SearchSpace-r17 should be SearchSpace**Id**. |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree with NEC and Qualcomm. It is safer to check with RAN1. | Y |
| Interdigital | Same understanding as NEC. Let’s clarify this by sending LS to RAN1 | Y |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| H562 | Currently no SDT related configuration is being transferred in the inter node RRC message. Without transferring this, the receiving gNB will not be able to continue with the RA-SDT procedure after relocation as it will not know which DRBs are configured with SDT, whether or not the SRB2 is configured for SDT or how the ROHC is to be performed after relocation. Simplest approach for addressing this issue is that the SDT specific configuration defined in SDT-Config-r17 IE (SDT specific configuration that is provided to the UE in RRCRelease message) needs to be transferred form the last serving gNB to the receiving gNB when RA-based SDT with UE context relocation procedure is performed |   | Not clear if this is the correct message. Need to make sure that SDT-Config-r17 Is included as a separate container in RAN3 signalling. [Rapp 4] yes, conatiner approach vs RAN3 Xn signalling has to be decided first, seems RAN3 signalling is simpler, they are discussing it. But still marked as "discuss" for now, but we can postpone this. [AT meeting guidance] RAN3 are discussing this. So, propose to wait for their outcome. No need to comment on this for now hence.  |  [Intel] We believe RAN3 also has TDocs discussing this topic for the coming meeting. RAN2 can wait for RAN3 input (if any). | Google | Support of delta configuration has been agreed in RAN2#117-e. The source should provide the SDT-Config to the target in the UE Context Retrieval procedure to support delta configuration.*26. Delta signalling is based on the previous SDT configuration (i.e. only applicable to SDT operation and will be released when the UE moves to connected and hence delta configuration based on connected mode CG configuration is not supported). FFS other details*  | Y |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree with Google and it does not make sense to replicate the RRC configuration in XnAP protocol. We think using an RRC container is the simplest approach, so we need to define something and should probably not wait for RAN3 (unless they can conclude very quickly, so that we can introduce the required changes, if needed). | Y |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Conclusion and proposals

TBD
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