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# Introduction

This document captures the following discussion:

* [AT118-e][069][eIAB] UE caps (Intel)

 Scope: Address the corrections / remaining issues from tdocs submitted under AI 6.4.5. 2. Progress UE caps draft CRs (38306, 38331). Identify new impact if any.

 Intended outcome: Report (if needed), endorsed draft CRs (for merge with mega CRs

 Deadline: CB W2 Wed (if needed), Endorsed Draft CRs ready at EOM

The discussion consists of two phases, Phase 1 and Phase 2, and the deadline of each phase is given below:

Phase 1: Deadline: Friday W1, 5:00pm UTC.

Address the corrections / remaining issues from tdocs submitted under AI 6.4.5.

Phase 2: Deadline: Wednesday W2, 10:00am UTC.

Review updated draft CRs for UE capabilities (38306, 38331).

**Contact**

To make it easier to find the correct contact delegate in each company for potential follow-up questions, the rapporteur encourages the delegates who provided input to provide their contacts information in this table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Contact: Name (Email)** |
| Intel (Rapporteur) | Ziyi.li@intel.com |
| Apple | Ralf Rossbach (rrossbach@apple.com) |
| LG Electronics | Gyeong-Cheol LEE (gyeongcheol.lee@lge.com) |
| Samsung | Milos Tesanovic (m.tesanovic@samsung.com) |
| Nokia | malgorzata.tomala@nokia.com |
| Ericsson | Marco.belleschi@ericsson.com |
| ZTE | chen.lin23@zte.com.cn |
| vivo | kimba@vivo.com |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yulong (shiyulong5@huawei.com) |

# Discussion

## Header rewriting based Re-routing IAB-MT capability

As discussed in [1], a single bit is agreed to be used as IAB-MT capability for BAP header rewriting based re-routing of all scenarios. [1] proposes with following changes by removing ‘/or’:

| Definitions for parameters | Per | M | FDD-TDDDIFF | FR1-FR2DIFF |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***bapHeaderRewriting-Rerouting-r17***Indicates whether the IAB-MT supports BAP header rewriting based re-routing, including inter-donor DU local re-routing and inter-donor CU re-routing, as specified in TS 38.340 [23]. | IAB-MT | No | No | No |

#### **Q1. Do you agree with above change?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company  | Y/N | Comment |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y  | As an aside, please note that ‘including…’ implies there may be other types of re-routing supported which are not mentioned.  |
| Nokia | N | Less restrictive IAB implementation can be considered without the change. See also comment to Q2 (similar simplicifaction can be considered) |
| Ericsson | Y | The use of “and/or” is confusing. However, the word “based” sounds strange, better “for” maybe. |
| ZTE | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Either way | “supports BAP header rewriting based re-routing” is more critical, while “including” seems just explanation. We anyway know the capability details based on the specified behaviour from BAP spec. |

## Header rewriting based Routing IAB-MT capability

As discussed in [2], BH RLF recovery under inter-donor CU scenario is missed in the field description of *bapHeaderRewriting-Routing-r17*, which also requires to perform BAP header rewriting. [2] proposes with following changes by adding ‘inter-donor CU RLF recovery’:

| ***bapHeaderRewriting-Routing-r17***Indicates whether the IAB-MT supports BAP header rewriting based inter-donor CU routing, including inter-donor CU partial migration, inter-donor CU RLF recovery, and inter-donor CU routing for topology redundancy, as specified in TS 38.340 [23]. | IAB-MT | No | No | No |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

#### **Q2. Do you agree with above changes?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company  | Y/N | Comment |
| Apple | Yes | To add inter-donor CU RLF as a trigger scenario for header rewriting looks correct. However, the text in the capability description does not quite match what is there in TS 38.340. For example, the scenarios are described in TS 38.401. Secondly, “BAP header rewriting based inter-donor CU routing” is misleading, it should read “based on”. We propose to include these two changes as shown below. ***bapHeaderRewriting-Routing-r17***Indicates whether the IAB-MT supports BAP header rewriting based on inter-donor CU routing, including inter-donor CU partial migration, inter-donor CU RLF recovery, and inter-donor CU routing for topology redundancy, as specified in TS 38.340 [23] and 38.401 [x]. |
| LGE | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y  | OK with original change (although keeping ‘including…’ implies there may be other scenarious which are not mentioned). Also OK with second change from Apple. Not ok with first change from Apple – it changes the meaning. We believe we are in fact talking about inter-donor CU routing based on BAP header rewriting (= original meaning), and not on BAP header rewriting based on inter-donor CU routing (Apple’s interpretation). |
| Nokia | N | We propose the capablity to be simply described as: Indicates whether the IAB-MT supports BAP header rewriting operation as defined in 38.340.By reference to 38.340 none of the use cases becomes clear: “based inter-donor CU routing, including inter-donor CU partial migration, inter-donor CU RLF recovery, and inter-donor CU routing for topology redundancy”While use cases and generic description would be covered by stage 2. |
| Ericsson | Y | Otherwise it will be ambiguous whether the scenario of inter-donor CU RLF- recover is already considered (e.g within the inter-CU partial migration) o not. OK, with the change proposed by Apple, or use “for” rather than “based”. |
| ZTE | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |

## LCG Extention IAB-MT capability

As discussed in [2], extended BSR is also supported when IAB-MT supports LCG extension. The field description should be updated accordingly with following changes:

| ***lcg-ExtensionIAB-r17***Indicates whether the IAB-MT supports extended logical channel group and extended Buffer Status Report as specified in TS 38.321 [8]. | IAB-MT | No | No | No |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

#### **Q3. Do you agree with above changes?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company  | Y/N | Comment |
| Apple | No | If companies prefer using extended BSR without logicalChannelGroup-IAB-Ext-r17, extended BSR would require a separate capability. However, this depends on other decisions to be taken in MAC/RRC based on contributions, it was already discussed earlier. |
| LGE | Y |  |
| Samsung | N | We never agreed to use extended BSR without configuring logicalChannelGroup-IAB-Ext-r17. It would need further discussion in MAC/CR offlines. |
| Nokia | Y | In our understanding, its is correct change, as extended logical channel group is needed for extended BSR reporting |
| Ericsson | Y | The support of the extended LCG goes together with the support of extended BSR. Supporting the extended LCGs without supporting extending BSR seems strange. So better to clarify it. |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |

# Conclusion

Based on the discussion above, the following is proposed:
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