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# 1 Discussion

This paper is to summarize the outcome of the discussion on the open RILs.

Rapporteur proposes to agree on the solutions for the following RILs, as captured in the latest Rapporteur CR.

1. Agree on the solutions for the following RILs, as captured in Rapporteur CR: H041, S734, S728, S729, S731, S732, S727, S726, F003, F004, H041, Z629, E144, I045, H043, Z630, Z631, H047, H048.

Rapporteur proposes the following for the RILs to be rejected.

1. RAN2 does not address the following RILs: S730, F009, H044, H045, N101, V223, F006, F007.

### 1.1 RILs that require more discussion

In this section, the RILs that require more discussion are addressed.

In the RIL v222, it is proposed to decouple the new Rel-17 availabilityCombinationsRBGroups, from the legacy Rel.16 AvailabilityCombinationsPerCell. In the current implementation the new Rel-17 availabilityCombinationsRBGroups is included as an optional configuration within the legacy Rel.16 AvailabilityCombinationsPerCell. The solution for this RIL would imply introducing a new AvailabilityCombinationsPerCell-r17 in the form of a Add/ReleaseModList structure. Then we would need to create a new AvailabilityCombinationPerCell type, e.g. AvailabilityCombinationPerCellExt, which would basically have the same structure as the AvailabilityCombinationPerCell-r16, and also a lot of parameters in common with the legacy AvailabilityCombinationPerCell-r16, e.g. the availability combination ID, the cell ID, the position in DCI, etc. RAN2 should discuss whether there is a strong need for this change.

1. Related to RIL v222, RAN2 to discuss the need to decouple the new Rel-17 availabilityCombinationsRBGroups, from the legacy Rel.16 AvailabilityCombinationsPerCell.

In the RIL F005, it is proposed to clarify in the field description of iab-donor-DU-BAP-Address, that for a boundary IAB node’s descendant node, this field may be a pseudo BAP address. RAN2 should discuss the need of addressing this issue, considering that RRC procedures are agnostic with respect to whether the IAB node is boundary IAB node or descendant node, and that the IAB-MT of the descendant IAB may not be affected by inter-topology routing at the boundary IAB node.

1. Related to RIL F005, RAN2 to discuss whether there is the need to clarify in the field description of *iab-donor-DU-BAP-*Address, that for the descendant node of a boundary IAB node, this field may be a pseudo BAP address.

In the RIL H046, it is proposed to clarify that the f1c-TransferPathNRDC is only used for CP/UP separation (not for topology redundancy), i.e. when the IAB-MT is configured with NR-DC with one non-donor CU (no BH RLC channels in one leg).

1. Related to RIL H046, RAN2 to discuss whether to clarify that f1c-TransferPathNRDC is only used for CP/UP separation, i.e. when the IAB-MT is configured with NR-DC with one non-donor CU (no BH RLC channels in one leg).

In the RIL Z632, it is proposed that if the f1c-TransferPathNRDC is configured with ”both”, it should not be left to the IAB-MT to select the MCG or the SCG for F1-C transfer, rather the IAB-MT should prioritize F1-C transmission over the CG with configured BH RLC CH. Rapporteur notes that RAN2 just agreed that if the IAB node selects a leg where there is a BH RLC channel, then the IAB-MT should use F1-C over BAP, otherwise F1-C over RRC. But we did not agree that “both” corresponds to F1-C over BAP.

1. Related to RIL Z632, RAN2 discuss whether it is needed that when f1c-TransferPathNRDC is configured with ”both”, the IAB-MT should prioritize F1-C transmission over the CG with configured BH RLC channels.

In the S733, it is proposed that the logicalChannelGroup configuration for IAB should go from 0 to 255, rather than from 8 to 255. The reason for specifying it from 8 to 255 was that in case the network does not want to configure the extended LCGs, it can simply configure the legacy logicalChannelGroup with 0 to 7 LCGs. Companies that see the need for this change argue that the extended short BSR allows 8bits buffer size, rather than 5bits buffer size as the legacy short BSR.

1. Related to RIL S733, RAN2 to discuss whether there is the need to define the logicalChannelGroup-IAB-Ext-r17 from 0 to 255, rather than from 8 to 255 (as it is in the current spec).

Rapporteur proposes discussing the following with lower priority:

1. Related to RIL F008, discuss the need for clarifying, e.g. in a note, that the boundary IAB node should use the iab-IP-AddressConfigurationList configured by the SCG for communication towards the SCG, and the iab-IP-AddressConfigurationList configured by the MCG for communication towards the MCG.

# Conclusion

Based on the discussion in the previous sections we propose the following:

[Proposal 1 Agree on the solutions for the following RILs, as captured in Rapporteur CR: H041, S734, S728, S729, S731, S732, S727, S726, F003, F004, H041, Z629, E144, I045, H043, Z630, Z631, H047, H048.](#_Toc103012057)

[Proposal 2 RAN2 does not address the following RILs: S730, F009, H044, H045, N101, V223, F006, F007.](#_Toc103012058)

[Proposal 3 Related to RIL v222, RAN2 to discuss the need to decouple the new Rel-17 availabilityCombinationsRBGroups, from the legacy Rel.16 AvailabilityCombinationsPerCell.](#_Toc103012059)

[Proposal 4 Related to RIL F005, RAN2 to discuss whether there is the need to clarify in the field description of *iab-donor-DU-BAP-*Address, that for the descendant node of a boundary IAB node, this field may be a pseudo BAP address.](#_Toc103012060)

[Proposal 5 Related to RIL H046, RAN2 to discuss whether to clarify that f1c-TransferPathNRDC is only used for CP/UP separation, i.e. when the IAB-MT is configured with NR-DC with one non-donor CU (no BH RLC channels in one leg).](#_Toc103012061)

[Proposal 6 Related to RIL Z632, RAN2 discuss whether it is needed that when f1c-TransferPathNRDC is configured with ”both”, the IAB-MT should prioritize F1-C transmission over the CG with configured BH RLC channels.](#_Toc103012062)

[Proposal 7 Related to RIL S733, RAN2 to discuss whether there is the need to define the logicalChannelGroup-IAB-Ext-r17 from 0 to 255, rather than from 8 to 255 (as it is in the current spec).](#_Toc103012063)

[Proposal 8 Related to RIL F008, discuss the need for clarifying, e.g. in a note, that the boundary IAB node should use the iab-IP-AddressConfigurationList configured by the SCG for communication towards the SCG, and the iab-IP-AddressConfigurationList configured by the MCG for communication towards the MCG.](#_Toc103012064)