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# Introduction

This document contains summary of email discussion to agree details of the RRC-based solution for small data transmission in INACTIVE:

* [Post111-e][925][R17 Small Data] Agreeable details of RRC-based solution (RACH and CG) (ZTE)

Scope:

• Develop further understanding of detailed steps for the RRC-based solution for both CG and RACH based schemes (e.g. contents of the first UL message, security aspects, and subsequent network and UE procedure etc).

• Identify any impacts to other WGs (e.g. RAN1)

Outcome: Report, Agreeable proposals and identified impacts to other groups

Deadline: Long

**Deadline for company comments:**

To allow sufficient time to summarise and submit the summary and proposals to the upcoming meeting, the following deadline for company comments is proposed:

**Tuesday Oct 13th 0700 UTC**

**Discussion summary**

A total of 26 companies participated in the email discussion:

1. ZTE, 2) Mediatek, 3) Oppo, 4) LG, 5) CMCC, 6) Sharp, 7) CATT, 8) ITRI, 9) Huawei, 10) Nokia, 11) Ericsson, 12) Qualcomm, 13) Panasonic, 14) IDC, 15) NEC, 16) ETRI, 17) Samsung, 18) Asus, 19) Sony, 20) Intel, 21) Fujitsu, 22) Xiaomi, 23) Lenovo, 24) Spreadtrum, 25) Vivo, 26) Apple

Discussion summary is added under each question and some proposals are made:

* Green: Proposals with consensus
* Orange: Proposals where there is some divergence but rapporteur thinks an agreement is likely or it is worth checking the understanding of the companies

# Overall procedure for RRC-based small data transmission

## UE procedure upon moving to INACTIVE

Currently when the UE moves to INACTIVE state, the following are performed:

1. MAC is reset and default MAC cell group configuration is released
2. RLC entities for SRB1 are reestablished
3. All SRBs and DRBs are suspended, except SRB0

First question is whether any changes are needed for any of the above procedures to support SDT. Since some changes are expected for CG (e.g. handling of TAT timer and MAC configuration etc) compared to RACH, discussion for RACH and is separated for this issue:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Q 2.1.1: For small data, for RACH based solutions (i.e. 2-step and 4-step RACH based SDT configured but no CG) are there any changes needed to the current procedure when UE moves to INACTIVE state?**  **i.e. can the UE perform the following actions**   * **MAC reset and default MAC cell group released** * **RLC entities for SRB1 reestablished** * **SRBs and DRBs are suspended except SRB0**   **If any changes are needed for any of the above procedure, please elaborate.**  **Note: The goal of this question is to identify what aspects can be kept as it is and which aspects need updates and further discussion.** | | |
| **Company** | **Views: e.g.: All can be reused/Some changes needed (explanation)** | **Rapporteur summary** |
| ZTE | Yes, all can be reused for RACH-based solution  Note that when CG resources are also configured, then the UE doesn’t know whether the CG resources will be valid or not when the RESUME is to be initiated (e.g. there may have been a cell change in the meanwhile etc). So, if CG resources are configured then may be some changes are needed (e.g. the UE may keep some of the MAC context – specifically something related to TAT and the CG specific MAC configuration). Apart from that the rest can be reused. The CG specific aspects can be discussed as part of the question below. | Yes  (changes needed for CG) |
| Mediatek | Yes, all the above actions can be reused for RACH-based solution. | Yes |
| OPPO | Yes, above three actions can be reused as baseline for RACH-based SDT solutions. For the second action, RLC entity for SRB1 is re-established and resumed for the reception of DL RRC message before moving into RRC\_CONNECTED. Considering that DRBs should be resumed in RRC\_INACTIVE for SDT, we are wondering whether the RLC entities for DRBs should also be re-established. | Yes  (RLC entities for DRBs should be reestablished?) |
| LG | We think DRB suspension needs more discussion. When a DRB is suspended, PDCP status variables are initialized. However, such initialization may not be needed for SDT.  In addition, BSR configuration used for RRC\_INACTIVE needs more discussion because the default MAC cell group configuration includes BSR configuration. | Initialization of PDCP variables may be not needed when DRB is suspended.  BSR configuration needs discussion? |
| CMCC | All the above three actions can be reused.  If BSR or another MAC CE can be included in MSGA or MSG3, some configuration, e.g. Logical channel group, should not be released when perform RRC suspend. | Yes  But BSR configuration should be kept? |
| Sharp | Yes, all the above actions can be reused as baseline for RA based SDT. | Yes |
| CATT | All can be reused. We don’t see a need for changing the behavior for the UE moving to INACTIVE state because of introduction of small data transmission (RACH based) in INACTIVE state. | Yes |
| ITRI | Yes, all above actions could be reuse as baseline for the RACH-based solution. | Yes |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | All can be reused but it should be “release default MAC Cell group configuration” | Yes  (only the default MAC cell group configuration should be released) => this seems correct |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes. | Yes |
| Ericsson | Yes, as baseline | Yes |
| Qualcomm | Yes, current procedure of moving to RRC\_INACTIVE can be reused for RACH based schemes. | Yes |
| Panasonic | Yes, the above actions can be reused as the baseline for the RACH based schemes. | Yes |
| InterDigital | Yes | Yes |
| NEC | Yes, all can be reused for RACH-based SDT. | Yes |
| ETRI | Yes. | Yes |
| Samsung | Yes | Yes |
| ASUSTeK | Yes, when the UE enters RRC\_INACTIVE from RRC\_CONNECTED, all the above actions can be reused for RACH-based solution. | Yes |
| Sony | Yes, as a baseline assumption. | Yes |
| Intel | Yes, all the above (assuming this question is for the case when the UE moves “back” to INACTIVE after SDT). | Yes  Clarify whether this is only after SDT.  => Rapp: Yes; but in general, today (for non SDT case) these actions are performed anyway. So, there will be no change to that. |
| Fujitsu | Yes. | Yes |
| Xiaomi | Yes | Yes |
| Lenovo | Yes | Yes |
| Spreadtrum | Yes. They can be the baseline. | Yes |
| vivo | Yes, for RACH-based solution, we think the legacy behavior upon the reception of *RRCRelease* with *suspendConfig* can be reused. | Yes |
| Apple | Yes | Yes |
| **Comments Summary:**   * MAC reset and release default MAC cell group configuration (26/26)   + Open issues for discussion: Discuss if some changes are needed for handling the BSR configuration? => (discuss based on tdocs – no proposal made) * RLC entities for SRB1 reestablished (26/26)   + Open issues for discussion: Should the RLC entities for DRBs subject to SDT be also reestablished (like SRB1)? => (discuss based on tdocs – no proposal made) * SRBs and DRBs are suspended except SRB0 (24/26)   + One company thinks that DRB suspension needs more discussion since the PDCP variables need not be initialized. However, it still seems that DRB suspension can still be performed, but may be some changes are needed in PDCP? Propose to discuss the PDCP aspects based on company contributions and we can agree the DRB suspension given the views expressed   Open issues for discussion:   * Changes needed for BSR configuration => (discuss based on tdocs – no proposal made) * Handling of RLC entities for SDT => (discuss based on tdocs – no proposal made) * Any further changes needed for PDCP suspend operation? => (discuss based on tdocs – no proposal made) | | |
| **Proposals:**  **Proposal 1:** **For small data, for RACH based solutions (i.e. 2-step and 4-step RACH based SDT configured but no CG) when the UE moves to INACTIVE state, the UE performs the following actions:**   * **MAC is reset and default MAC cell group configuration is released** * **RLC entities for SRB1 are reestablished** * **SRBs and DRBs are suspended except SRB0 (25/26)** | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Q 2.1.2: For small data, when CG based SDT resources are configured are there any changes needed to the current procedure when UE moves to INACTIVE state?**  **Specifically, are there any changes needed for the following existing procedures:**   * **MAC reset and default MAC cell group released (please comment on handling of TAT – e.g. whether the current TAT can be run in INACTIVE state or a new timer is needed and whether some MAC configuration specific to CG will need to be stored etc)** * **RLC entities for SRB1 reestablished** * **SRBs and DRBs are suspended except SRB0**   **If any changes are needed for any of the above procedure, please elaborate.**  **Note: The goal of this question is to identify what aspects can be kept as it is and which aspects need updates and further discussion.** | | |
| **Company** | **Views: e.g.: All can be reused/Some changes needed (explanation)** | **Rapporteur summary** |
| ZTE | When MAC is reset, the TAT timer is stopped. However, for CG solution, some timer is needed to ensure the TA alignment at the UE is monitored during INACTIVE state. We think we can reuse the existing TAT for this. So, some changes are needed for MAC Reset for this case. Apart from this, we think the rest can be reused.  With regards to the CG configuration, we think this can be stored as part of the INACTIVE state context in the UE. | Yes, Reuse the existing TAT |
| Mediatek | For UL time alignment in INACTIVE to enable CG based SDT transmission, there are two solutions:   1. Use current TAT: since current TAT only works in CONNECTED, the current UL time alignment mechanism needs to be modified to cover the INACTIVE state. 2. Introduce a new timer specific for CG based SDT transmission: the current TAT mechanism for CONNECTED will not be impacted. This timer is started when CG resources are configured and stopped when CG resources are released. UE restarts the timer when a TA command/adjustment is received.   In our understanding, both solutions can work. But we prefer option 2 to introduce a new TA timer specific for CG based SDT for sake of clear function and clean specification.  UE also needs to store the CG-related configurations as part of the UE INACTIVE AS Context to enable CG-based SDT transmission later in INACTIVE. The detailed CG configuration can be discussed in stage-3.  The above procedures can be reused expect for MAC reset. The MAC reset needs to be changed that it keeps running and is not stopped when MAC is reset. | Yes, New TAT timer |
| OPPO | Firstly, we agree that above actions can also be reused for CG based SDT solution.  For the timer maintained during UE in RRC\_INACTIVE, we think either keeping the current TAT or introduce a new timer can work. Since the function has already been used in LTE PUR transmission, we prefer a new timer included in the CG configuration and keep the actions when MAC is reset as legacy. | Yes, New TAT timer |
| LG | For CG transmission, a new TAT is needed. We think the new TAT is similar to the legacy TAT, but is only used in RRC\_INACTIVE. Detailed behavior of the new TAT needs more discussion.  For DRB suspension and BSR configuration, see our comments in Q2.1.1. | Yes, New TAT timer  DRB suspension may not be needed? |
| CMCC | MAC entity cannot be totally reset，CG relative configuration should be retained or partially retained. TA value should be reused for small data transmission and current TAT can be reset. We are fine to introduce a new timer for CG based SDT. | Yes (?), New TAT timer |
| Sharp | The above actions can be reused for CG based SDT and for the timing alignment, a new timer as clarified by Mediatek is preferred to avoid the impact on current TA timer. | Yes, New TAT timer |
| CATT | We would like that the SDT solution should have minimum impact to the existing functionality and procedures. Therefore we think having a new TA timer is better for SDT. A new timer, pur-TimeAlignmentTimer is defined to maintain TAT in LTE. We could follow the same approach for SDT in NR.  We agree that the above exiting procedure to be reused while moving to INACTIVE state. | Yes, New TAT timer |
| ITRI | All above actions could be reuse as baseline for the CG based solution.  Regarding to whether a new TAT is needed, we think introducing a new TAT similar will help make the functionality clearer. Therefore, we prefer a new timer be introduced for the TA validity purposes. | Yes, New TAT timer |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | All can be reused as baseline. For TAT, we prefer to have a new timer to follow the design in PUR. | Yes, New TAT timer |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes. TA maintenance and CG configuration in INACTIVE mode needs to be additionally specified. | Yes, further discussion needed for TAT timer |
| Ericsson | Yes, changes are needed but should be based on legacy. I.e changes to TAT and how to retain a CG configuration based on existing functionality and use. | Yes, reuse legacy (also TAT??) |
| Qualcomm | A new TA timer should be introduced for CG based solution. CG configuration should be stored in RRC\_INACTIVE state, hence some changes are needed for MAC reset. | Yes, New TAT timer |
| Panasonic | Some changes are required, especially for the TA maintenance and the validity control for the CG configuration after UE moving to RRC\_INACTIVE. | Yes, changes needed for TA handling |
| InterDigital | Yes these procedures can be reused as baseline, and changes to the TA timer can be discussed to ensure TA is maintained and aligned. | Yes, changes needed for TA handling |
| NEC | We agree that the above actions can also be reused for CG based SDT.  Regarding the choice of timer, we prefer having a new timer specific to CG based SDT as it can be tailored to CG and avoid affecting current TA. | Yes, New TAT timer |
| ETRI | For UL timing in INACTIVE state, a new TA timer should be introduced so that the current CONNECTED state operation is not affected. | Yes, New TAT timer |
| Samsung | TA maintenance and CG configuration handling needs to be additionally specified. New timer can be introduced for TA as in LTE. | Yes, New TAT timer |
| ASUSTeK | Yes, all the above actions can be reused for CG-based solution, except for MAC reset. A new TA timer can be introduced as LTE. And CG configuration should be retained in RRC\_INACTIVE state. | Yes, New TAT timer |
| Sony | Yes. Some procedures are needed at least for the maintenance of UL TA and CG configuration in INACTIVE mode. | Yes, new procedures needed |
| Intel | All of the above and agree about making an exception for keeping a timer running during INACTIVE when there UE is configured with a CG. We also prefer a separate timer to TAT as it is cleaner and provides more flexibility in terms of configuration and use. | Yes, New TAT timer |
| Fujitsu | As MediaTek points out, there are two ways to specify the timer to maintain uplink synchronization status. One question is whether the CG resource would be persistent resource during INACTIVE or not. This question is related to the case when TAT is reused during INACTIVE because CG resource is cleared after TAT expiry. If the CG resource would consider to be permanent resource during INACTIVE, the clearance would be avoided by e.g. continuously sending TA command by the gNB to the UE, setting the value of TA timer to enough long value, and so on.   |  | | --- | | 1. when a *timeAlignmentTimer* expires:   2> if the *timeAlignmentTimer* is associated with the PTAG:  3> flush all HARQ buffers for all Serving Cells;  3> notify RRC to release PUCCH for all Serving Cells, if configured;  3> notify RRC to release SRS for all Serving Cells, if configured;  3> clear any configured downlink assignments and configured uplink grants;  3> clear any PUSCH resource for semi-persistent CSI reporting;  3> consider all running *timeAlignmentTimer*s as expired;  3> maintain NTA (defined in TS 38.211 [8]) of all TAGs. | | Yes, discuss what happens when the “CG TA” timer expires |
| Xiaomi | We agree that the above actions can also be reused for CG based SDT, and TA maintenance and CG configuration in INACTIVE mode needs to be additionally specified. | Yes, discussion needed |
| Lenovo | All above actions could be reuse as baseline for the CG based solution.  For the CG configuration, it can be stored as part of the INACTIVE state context in the UE  For TAT, it depends on the definition of TAT for CG based solution. Generally, we prefer to introduce a new TA timer based on the further discussion on CG based solution. | Yes, New TAT timer |
| Spreadtrum | All of them can be the baseline. A timer-based solution can be considered for maintaining the validity of CG configuration. TA and CG configuration maintenance shall be further considered for CG based SDT transmission. | Yes, discussion needed |
| vivo | Regarding the CG-based solution, we think the legacy behavior upon the reception of *RRCRelease* with *suspendConfig* can be reused.  Additionally, for the TAT handling issue, we agree that a TAT-alike mechanism is needed to avoid the long-time accumulation of crystal oscillator offset. And we prefer to introduce a new TAT timer for the CG-based solution, just the same as the LTE DPUR. Further, considering that uplink transmission (e.g. DMRS/PUSCH) infrequently occurs in the case of the CG-based solution for the background data, the TA might not be updated in time by the NW when the UE is mobility state. We think a potential pathloss based mechanism should be further considered for the validation of TA. | Yes, New TAT timer  Also study a pathloss based mechanism for TA maintanence |
| Apple | For CG based SDT procedure, UE needs to maintain upink sync for the potential CG transmission. So the TAT timer should be applied in INACTIVE state, and weprefer the new TAT timer. | Yes, New TAT timer |
| **Comments Summary:**   * MAC reset and default MAC cell group configuration released (25/25)   + Open issues for discussion: New TAT (16) vs existing TAT (2), the remaining (7) companies thought that we need further discussion. One company also mentioned other mechanisms (in addition to TAT) to handle the TA in INACTIVE – pathloss based. However, it is clear that some handling is needed for TA in INACTIVE state when CG resources are configured. So, given this it seems we can first try the majority view (since it is feasible to define a new timer) and we can further discuss the functionality of this timer (based on contributions) * RLC entities for SRB1 reestablished (26/26)   + Open issues for discussion: Should the RLC entities for DRBs subject to SDT be also reestablished (like SRB1) – also see 2.1.1 * SRBs and DRBs are suspended except SRB0 (25/26)   + See the discussion in 2.1.1 regarding DRB suspension. This can be discussed based on contributions   Open issues for discussion: See above | | |
| **Proposals:**  **Proposal 2:** **For small data, when CG based SDT resources are configured when UE moves to INACTIVE state, the UE performs the following actions:**   * **MAC is reset and default MAC cell group configuration is released** * **RLC entities for SRB1 are reestablished** * **SRBs and DRBs are suspended except SRB0 (24/25)**   **Proposal 3: New TAT is defined for the TA maintenance in INACTIVE state for CG case. Detailed UE ehavior upon expiry of this timer needs discussion (i.e. FFS whether to release CG resources or some other action) – (16/22)** | | |

## UE procedure upon initiating small data transmission

Currently, the NAS will provide an access category and resume cause is obtained. Based on this, the UE performs UAC procedure. The question is whether this procedure can be reused for small data transmission as well.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Q 2.2.1: For RACH and CG, can the existing UAC procedure, to determine whether access attempt is allowed, be reused for small data transmission?** | | |
| **Company** | **Views: e.g.: Yes can be reused/Some changes needed (explanation)** | **Rapporteur summary** |
| ZTE | Yes, we think UAC shall be applicable (as normal) even for SDT and the existing UAC check shall be reused.  For Resume cause, for data arrival, UE will determine the resume cause by interaction with NAS and this can be kept as it is.  For non-data arrival cases (e.g. RNA Update), the resume cause is determined by AS and this can also be kept as it is. | Reuse existing UAC |
| Mediatek | Yes, the existing UAC procedure can be reused for SDT in INACTIVE.  For resume cause, we have slightly different opinions from ZTE. In last RAN2 meeting it is agreed that small data transmission is configured by the network on a per DRB basis, we assume that NAS layer doesn’t need to indicate the intention to initiate SDT in INACTIVE when requesting the resume of a connection and AS decides to initiate SDT based on the DRB configuration. In other words, SDT can only be triggered for certain resume causes. | Reuse existing UAC  No need for NAS to indicate SDT cause.  Rapp: Yes, this is the intention. i.e. not to involve NAS in generating a new SDT resume cause. In general, NAS will be unaware of SDT/non-SDT (and it will generate only one of the existing resume causes).  => check this understanding. |
| OPPO | Yes. The UAC procedure can be reused. | Reuse existing UAC |
| LG | SDT is different from RRC Resume. The purpose of SDT is data transmission, not resuming RRC connection. Thus, we think UAC is not applicable to SDT. Similarly, Resume cause is not applicable to SDT. | UAC is not applicable |
| CMCC | Yes，the UAC mechanism can be reused. | Reuse existing UAC |
| Sharp | Yes, the UAC could be reused. | Reuse existing UAC |
| CATT | Yes, we think the existing UAC procedure can be reused for small data transmission. | Reuse existing UAC |
| ITRI | Yes, the UAC should also be applied for SDT in INACTIVE and the current UAC procedure could be reused for SDT. | Reuse existing UAC |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes, but agree with MTK and LG that the cause of mo-data may not be applicable anymore. The old gNB should be able to know that the context retrieval is due to small data transmission | Reuse existing UAC  ResumeCause for mo-data may be not applicable? |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | UAC is normally applicable for access attempts with SDT. However, there should be a mechanism for the NW to block the SDT specifically. | Reuse existing UAC  But need separate mechanism to control SDT itself |
| Ericsson | Support for UAC should be possible, and then reused as in legacy. | Reuse existing UAC |
| Qualcomm | Yes. Regarding the resume cause, share the same view with MTK. | Reuse existing UAC  No need for NAS to indicate SDT cause  (this is the understanding anyway per the comment above) |
| Panasonic | Yes, the existing UAC mechanism should be reused. | Reuse existing UAC |
| InterDigital | Yes to reuse UAC. | Reuse existing UAC |
| NEC | Yes, the existing UAC procedure can be reused. For resume cause in the RRCResumeRequest message, we think the legacy scheme is not changed for SDT. | Reuse existing UAC |
| ETRI | Yes, we share the same view with Mediatek. | Reuse existing UAC  No need for NAS to indicate SDT cause  (this is the understanding anyway per the comment above) |
| Samsung | Yes, existing UAC procedure can be reused. | Reuse existing UAC |
| ASUSTeK | Yes. | Reuse existing UAC |
| Sony | Yes. | Reuse existing UAC |
| Intel | Yes, the triggering and contents of Resume Request handling in the UE remains unchanged apart from that SDT may not be used in certain cases. That is, the UAC is reused. | Reuse existing UAC |
| Fujitsu | Yes. | Reuse existing UAC |
| Xiaomi | Yes, existing UAC procedure can be reused. | Reuse existing UAC |
| Lenovo | Yes, the existing UAC could be reused. | Reuse existing UAC |
| Spreadtrum | Yes, the existing UAC procedure can be reused for SDT. | Reuse existing UAC |
| vivo | Yes, we also think that the existing UAC procedure can be reused for SDT. | Reuse existing UAC |
| Apple | Yes, existing UAC procedure can be reused for SDT. | Reuse existing UAC, no need for NAS to indicate the SDT cause. |
| **Comments Summary:**  Seems majority companies believe we can reuse existing UAC framework (25/26)  One company thinks that UAC is not applicable since SDT is different from normal RESUME. However, even if SDT is different from normal Resume, since UAC framework is applicable in general for all UL access attempts anyway, it seems it is okay to reuse this framework in general.  Open issues:   * How to determine the resume cause => (discuss based on tdocs – no proposal made)   + Can the current resume causes be reused?   + Is MO-Data cause applicable? * NAS is unaware of SDT procedure (i.e. the normal resume causes will be generated by NAS anyway)? -> this should be the common understanding we can check this via proposal | | |
| **Proposals:**  **Proposal 4: For RACH and CG, the existing UAC procedure, to determine whether access attempt is allowed, will reused for SDT (25/26)**  **Proposal 5: SDT is transparent to NAS layer (i.e. NAS generates one of the existing resume causes and AS decides SDT vs non-SDT access)** | | |

## Handling of user plane and contents of first UL message

At RAN2#111e, the following agreement was made:

Agreement: *Small data transmission is configured by the network on a per DRB basis*

Currently, the UE only re-establishes and resumes SRB1 upon initiating Resume procedure. The DRBs are resumed only upon receiving the *RRCResume* message from the network. In case of small data, the intention is to also include user plane data in the first uplink message (i.e. before RRCResume is received by the UE). In order to be able to do this, the UE shall also re-establish and resume the DRBs which are subject to small data transmission per the agreement above. The following question is to confirm this understanding:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Q 2.3.1: For both RACH and CG based solutions, upon initiating RESUME procedure, should the UE reestablish and resume the DRBs that are configured for small data transmission (along with the SRB1)?** | | |
| **Company** | **Views: Yes (DRBs should also be resumed) / No (explain)**  **Note: companies can also include any comments on changes (if any) to the PDCP suspend/resume operation** | **Rapporteur summary** |
| ZTE | Yes, in general the DRBs configured for SDT shall be reestablished and resumed upon initiating the RESUME procedure (and even before receiving the RRCResume message). The data from these DRBs then can be submitted by PDCP to the MAC layer.  However, some changes may be needed for the PDCP suspend/resume procedure:  For the legacy PDCP suspend/resume procedure, the PDCP PDU stored for TX will be discarded, and TX\_NEXT, RX\_NEXT, RX\_DELIV will be set to initial value. Since the data transmission in INACTIVE state is allowed through SDT, the NW may push the UE to INACTIVE state even if some small data transmission is expected, to cover this scenario, we think the PDCP PDU stored for TX shall not be discarded and the varaibles shall not be reset. To achieve this, one simple solution is to perform DRB suspension without PDCP suspension, or only perform the t-Reordering related operation in PDCP resume for SDT. | Yes, SDT DRBs should be resumed.  Changes needed for PDCP suspend operation (to allow suspension whilst there is pending data) |
| Mediatek | Yes, DRBs should be resumed. But definitely, there are some necessary changes to current resume procedures.  CP: In current resume procedure, DRBs are resumed (together with SRB2, SRB3 if configured) when RRCResume message is received. For SDT, only DRBs configured with SDT should be resumed together with SRB1when RRCResumeRequest message is to be transmitted.  UP: we think current PDCP suspend procedure can be reused without change. For the scenario described by ZTE, we are not sure whether it’s a typical or particular network implementation. In our understanding, if some small data transmission is expected when UE in CONNECTED and the PDCP PDUs have already been stored in UE buffer, the network should keep the UE in CONNECTED mode and send to UE to INACTIVE after the transmission of the small data burst is completed. Then UE can initiate SDT later for the following bursts of UL data transmission in INACTIVE. In this case, UE suspends the DRBs and suspends PDCP when it is sent to INACTIVE state by RRCRelease message with suspendConfig. UE resumes DRBs when SDT in INACTIVE is initiated. | Yes, SDT DRBs should be resumed.  No changes needed for PDCP suspend operation |
| OPPO | Yes, UE should at least resume the DRBs subjecting to SDT when the procedure is initiated. In addition, we should further discuss whether it is allowed to trigger SDT when data is available for both SDT allowed DRBs and not allowed DRBs, in which case the SDT is triggered for SDT allowed DRBs. If SDT is still supported in this case, we think all DRBs should be resumed for buffer status reporting. | Yes, SDT DRBs should be resumed.  If data is available for other DRBs, they should also be resumed (to be able to include BSR).  Rapp: But we agreed only some DRBs will be “allowed” for SDT. So, if data is available for any other DRBs, SDT cannot be triggered => check this understanding |
| LG | The question is not correct. The SDT procedure is not the Resume procedure.  However, DRB re-establishment is needed to change the security key. | SDT is different to Resume  But, DRB reestablishment is needed to change the key |
| CMCC | UE remains work in RRC\_inactived state after small data transmission. Network will not transimit RRCResume message to UE, even if there are subsequence data packets. If the DRB that are configured for small data transmission is resumed, relative DRB release procedure or timer to trigger DRB release is needed, which may increase complexity and against to the original intention of SDT. | Resuming DRBs may require “relative DRB release procedure”?  Rapp: however, this seems not necessary since all DRBs will be suspended again upon Release – see Q 2.1.2 |
| Sharp | Yes, at least the DRBs configured for SDT should be resumed.  For the PDCP resumption, if duplication is configured, it should be deactivated in SDT. | Yes, SDT DRBs should be resumed. |
| CATT | Yes, at least the DRBs configured for SDT should be resumed upon initiating RESUME procedure for SDT. Whether to resume all DRBs (including DRBs not configured with SDT) should be discussed. How to handle data arrival of DRBs (including SDT DRBs and non-SDT DRBs) during the small data transmission should be discussed.  We don’t see the scenario proposed by ZTE is a typical scenario for SDT. If there is data still available for transmission, there is no benefit of the NW sending the UE to INACTIVE. We don’t see a great benefit on keeping PDCP variables. The current PDCP procedure without changes can be reused. Also we prefer minimum change=s on the legacy procedure due introduction of SDT in INACTIVE state. | Yes, SDT DRBs should be resumed.  No changes needed for PDCP suspend operation |
| ITRI | Yes, but only for the DRBs configured with SDT should be resumed during the SDT procedure. | Yes, SDT DRBs should be resumed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes, but not sure why re-establish DRB. The UE simply resume DRBs that are used for SDT | Yes, to resume no to re-establishment of DRBs |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes, we share the views with Mediatek. | Yes, SDT DRBs should be resumed.  No changes needed for PDCP suspend operation |
| Ericsson | Similarly to other companies, DRBs configured for SDT should be resumed. The details here need to be discussed further. | Yes, SDT DRBs should be resumed. |
| Qualcomm | Yes. We share the same views with MTK. If there are still some data stored in the UE buffer, network should keep the UE in the RRC\_CONNECTED state and transit UE to RRC\_INACTIVE state after the user data transmission is finished. The legacy PDCP suspend/resume procedure does not need to be changed. | Yes, SDT DRBs should be resumed.  No changes needed for PDCP suspend operation |
| Panasonic | Yes, but only the DRBs associated with SDT shall be resumed. The details on how the association is created need further discussion. | Yes, SDT DRBs should be resumed. |
| InterDigital | Yes, DRBs configured for SDT should be resumed upon initiating resume procedure for small data. | Yes, SDT DRBs should be resumed. |
| NEC | The question “reestablish and resume the DRBs” is not accurate, as we don’t have behavior of reestablishing DRB. Using stricter wording, upon initiating SDT procedure, at least DRBs configured with SDT and with new data arriving should be resumed, and the PDCP entities of the DRBs should be re-established so as to apply the new security key. | Yes, to resume no to re-establishment of DRBs |
| ETRI | Yes, DRBs should be resumed and the current PDCP suspend procedure can be reused. | Yes, SDT DRBs should be resumed.  No changes needed for PDCP suspend operation |
| Samsung | We share the views with MTK. | Yes, SDT DRBs should be resumed.  No changes needed for PDCP suspend operation |
| ASUSTeK | Yes, at least the DRBs configured for SDT should be resumed. Whether to resume other DRBs not configured for SDT can be further discussed. | Yes, SDT DRBs should be resumed.  If data is available for other DRBs, should they also be resumed?  Rapp: see Oppo comment above |
| Sony | Yes, we think at least DRBs configured for SDT should be resumed. | Yes, SDT DRBs should be resumed. |
| Intel | The PDCP of the DRBs that are resumed should be reestablished as the keys have changed. As SDT is configurable at a DRB level, the other DRBs should also be discussed. | Yes, SDT DRBs should be resumed and PDCP should be reestablished since key has changed => agree  Discuss other DRBs (see Oppo comment above) |
| Fujitsu | Also don’t get why re-establishment is needed. According to the current RRCResumeRequest description in TS38.331, only SRB1 is resumed after PDCP re-establishment for SRB1 the conveying RRCResumeRequest. On top of this, DRBs behaviors need to be discussed.  We put our views raised in the above: - Whether to resume all DRBs or only DRBs configured with DRBs => Only DRBs configured with SDT. If all DRBs need to be resumed, then the gNB should send RRCResume to incur state transition from INACTIVE to CONNECTED. - PDCP duplication => Need discussions since duplication status during INACTIVE is not specified in TS38.321 and TS38.323. - PDCP variables => Not sure the benefit of keeping PDCP variables. | Yes to resume not sure above reestablishment |
| Xiaomi | Yes | Yes |
| Lenovo | Yes, DRBs for SDT should be resumed. For the DRBs not for SDT, we need to further discuss it considering it is beneficial to report BSR of all DRB. | Yes  Discuss how to handle data for other DRBs |
| Spreadtrum | Yes, at least the UE should resume the DRBs configured with SDT. Whether other DRBs should be resumed in the SDT procedure can be discussed further. | Yes  Discuss how to handle data for other DRBs |
| vivo | Yes. We hold a similar view as MediaTek. Besides, considering that an RRC INACTIVE UE may maintain MCG SCell and/or NE-DC/NR-DC configurations since NR Rel-16, to reduce the UE complexity, we would like to further limit that only DRB(s) belonging to PCell can be configured for SDT. | Yes, SDT DRBs should be resumed.  No changes needed for PDCP suspend operation  Only PCell can be configured for SDT |
| Apple | We share the views with MTK. | Yes, SDT DRB should be resumed. |
| **Comments Summary:**   * Seems majority companies believe at least SDT DRBs shall be resumed and PDCP reestablishment is needed for these DRBs (for key update) (22/26) * One company thinks that PDCP reestablishment is needed but also think the procedure is different because this is not like normal Resume. * Another company was not sure because they think relative DRB suspend may be needed (but this seems not necessary since RRCRelease will suspend/release all DRBs anyway) * A few other companies agreed the DRBs should be resumed but were not sure if PDCP reestablishment is needed (but it was clarified by others that this is needed for the key change as in legacy).   Open issues:   * Should other DRBs (i.e. DRBs not configured for SDT) also be resumed? – seems not necessary (and if there is data for these other DRBs, then the UE shall actually perform normal Resume as a consequence of the agreements made at last meeting? – we can check this understanding via an explicit proposal). * Changes for PDCP suspend operation were proposed by one company but not supported by other companies. So, no proposal is made for this. | | |
| **Proposals:**  **Proposal 6: For both RACH and CG based solutions, upon initiating RESUME procedure, the UE shall reestablish the PDCP entities and resume the DRBs that are configured for small data transmission (along with the SRB1) – (22/26)**  **Proposal 7: If there is data available for other DRBs (i.e. DRBs not subject to SDT), then the UE shall initiate normal resume (this is the consequence of the agreement we made that the network can configure the DRBs that are subject to SDT) – check if this is agreeable** | | |

Currently, the first UL message will contain only the CCCH message in case of the legacy resume procedure. Assuming both SRB0 and DRBs are resumed for small data transmission per the above discussion, MAC will submit UL DRB data along with the CCCH data. In addition, MAC may also generate any MAC CEs (e.g. BSR) depending on the size of the available resources. Based on this, the following is discussed:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Q 2.3.2: Do companies agree that the first UL message (i.e. MSG3 for 4-step RACH, MSGA payload for 2-step RACH and the CG transmission for CG) may contain the following contents (depending on the size of the message):**   * **CCCH message (i.e. RRCResumeRequest)** * **DRB data from one or more DRBs which are configured by the network for small data transmission** * **MAC Ces (e.g. BSR)** | | |
| **Company** | **Views: Yes / No (explain)** | **Rapporteur summary** |
| ZTE | Yes, once the DRBs are resumed per Q 2.3.1 above, the multiplexing and assembly unit in MAC will collect the data and assemble the MAC PDU per the existing rules and priorities – i.e. no changes are foreseen for this. The contents of the first UL message may then comprise the CCCH/DRB/MAC CE(s) – again depending on the priorities and the payload size (i.e. size of the MSGA/MSG3 payload or the CG grant TB size). | Yes |
| Mediatek | Yes, for RRC-based methods, the above elements can be contained in the first UL message subject to LCP procedure. | Yes |
| OPPO | Yes. | Yes |
| LG | RAN2 didn’t agree that CCCH message is RRCResumeRequest message. Some elements of RRCResumeRequest message may need to be included, e.g. I-RNTI and shortMAC-I, but the CCCH message may be different from the RRCResumeRequest message. Whether to reuse RRCResumeRequest message needs more discussion.  For DRB data, we are not sure whether multiplexing of multiple DRBs should be allowed considering the limited size of UL grant. Moreover, we are not sure whether it is ok to include DRB data in the first UL message considering the potential loss due to the collision. It also needs more discussion. | Discuss whether to define new CCCH message  No multiplexing  DRB data should not be included since the data may be lost  Rapp: the WID objectives mention larger payload sizes to support data in first UL message |
| CMCC | CCCH message is needed at least for RRC-involved SDT;MAC CE can be include in the first UL message, however, more discussion on MAC CE transmission restriction is needed, e.g., data priority is higher than MAC CE. | Yes, but needs discussion on prioritization |
| Sharp | Yes | Yes |
| CATT | CCCH message is transmitted in the MSGA/MSG3 as usual. Depending on the size of the message and the detail of the solution, it would also be possible to transmit UL data from one or more DRB and MAC CE (assistance information). However the details of DRB multiplexing, MAC CE and prioritization should be further discussed. | Yes  Discussion needed on prioritization |
| ITRI | Yes, the above contents can be contained in the first UL message for SDT. | Yes |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Yes |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes. It needs to be discussed whether the CCCH message contains *RRCResumeRequest* or a new RRC message defined for SDT. | Yes  Discuss whether to define new CCCH message |
| Ericsson | Yes. The contents of the CCCH message should be discussed. For multiplexing DRBs, we think a baseline is to include also data for only DRB configured for SDT and MAC CE. | Yes,  No Multiplexing |
| Qualcomm | Yes. At least the above contents can be contained in the first UL message. But it should not exclude any other UE assisted information such as traffic pattern information that could be included in CCCH message together with *RRCResumeRequest* in a new RRC message or included in new MAC CE together with Buffer Status information. | Yes,  Discuss whether to define new CCCH message  Discuss other assistance information |
| Panasonic | Yes, the above should be the baseline. Additionally, UE assistance information indicating the traffic patterns or UE’s preferred RRC state can be contained as well. This is for the case where UE may have frequent UL small data that will not be accumulated at UE’s buffer. In such case, something other than the BSR can be sent to gNB, so that gNB can configure dedicated resources accordingly or even ask UE to transition to RRC\_CONNECTED. | Yes,  Discuss other assistance information |
| InterDigital | Yes, but the CCCH message is necessary only for RRC based SDT. | Yes  (current discussion is only for RRC-based SDT) |
| NEC | Yes | Yes |
| ETRI | Yes, the above contents can be included in the first UL message. | Yes |
| Samsung | Yes. | Yes |
| ASUSTeK | Yes, but the first UL message contains MAC Ces only when necessary. | Yes (the MAC will generate MAC Ces only if necessary) |
| Sony | Yes. | Yes |
| Intel | For RRC based, the first UL message must contain the CCCH (RRCResumeRequest) message. It may additionally contain anything – DRBs, MAC Ces or even DCCH. Even if there may not be a use case for DCCH that can be sent with CCCH in Rel-16, from SDT perspective, there is no need to restrict it unless some issue is identified. | Yes |
| Fujitsu | Yes. The listed contents would be the starting point of this discussion. | Yes |
| Xiaomi | Yes , we think MAC CE is only contained if necessary | Yes (the MAC will generate MAC Ces only if necessary) |
| Lenovo | Yes | Yes |
| Spreadtrum | Yes. | Yes |
| vivo | Yes, we think the above-mentioned contents can be included in the first UL message as the baseline (i.e. other potential contents are not excluded). Besides, we are wondering what other existing MAC CE (maybe PHR MAC CE?) can be multiplexed into the first UL message since the rapporteur use “e.g.” in the MAC CE bullet. It will be better to clarify more details. | Yes  May be other MAC Ces (e.g. PHR can be triggered too)? |
| Apple | Yes for RRC based SDT procedure. | Yes |
| **Comments Summary:**  Seems majority of companies agree that the first UL message for RRC\_based SDT procedure can contain the following:   * CCCH message – (26/26) – FFS whether RRCResume or a new msg * DRB data from one or more DRBs which are configured by the network for small data transmission (25/26) * MAC CEs (e.g. BSR) (25/26)   One company thinks that DRB data shall not be included in first message (but this goes against the WID (objective: “*payload sizes larger than the Rel-16 CCCH message size that is possible currently for INACTIVE state for MSGA and MSG3 to support UP data transmission in UL*”).  Open issues:   * Reuse RRCResume or define new CCCH message? => (discuss based on tdocs – no proposal made) * What additional assistance information is needed (other than the MAC CEs)? => (discuss based on tdocs – no proposal made) * What MAC CEs can be included (In addition to BSR, PHR was also mentioned by one company) => (discuss based on tdocs – no proposal made) | | |
| **Proposals:**  **Proposal 8: the first UL message (i.e. MSG3 for 4-step RACH, MSGA payload for 2-step RACH and the CG transmission for CG) may contain the following contents (depending on the size of the message):**   * **CCCH message** * **DRB data from one or more DRBs which are configured by the network for small data transmission (25/26)** * **MAC Ces (e.g. BSR) (25/26)** | | |

## Security framework

Currently, the UE uses the stored security context to generate the contents of *ResumeRequest* message and derives new security context (i.e. new keys) by using the NCC value received in the Release message. The question is whether this can be reused for both RACH and CG in case of RRC-based solution.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Q 2.4.1: In case of RRC-based solution, for both RACH and CG based solutions, do companies agree that the contents of the RRCResumeRequest message (specifically the ResumeMAC-I) is generated using the stored security context – i.e same as Rel-16.** | | |
| **Company** | **Yes / No (explain)** | **Rapporteur summary** |
| ZTE | Yes. This can be the same as legacy. | Yes |
| Mediatek | Yes. For more clarification, UE should have NCC prior to initiate RRC-based SDT. The NCC should be provided to the UE by the previous RRCRelease message with suspendConfig which sent UE to INACTIVE. UL data in Msg3 is integrity protected and ciphered using newly derived key. Old integrity key is used to generate ResuemMAC-I. | Yes |
| OPPO | Yes. | Yes |
| LG | For UE authentication purpose, ResumeMAC-I is needed. However, it is not correct to say that the RRC message is the RRCResumerequest message. | Yes  But new RRC message needed |
| CMCC | Yes. | Yes |
| Sharp | Yes | Yes |
| CATT | Yes. The legacy procedure should be used. | Yes |
| ITRI | Yes | Yes |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Yes |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes | Yes |
| Ericsson | Yes | Yes |
| Qualcomm | Yes. The legacy can be reused. | Yes |
| Panasonic | Yes. | Yes |
| InterDigital | Yes | Yes |
| NEC | Yes | Yes |
| ETRI | Yes. | Yes |
| Samsung | Yes | Yes |
| ASUSTeK | Yes. | Yes |
| Sony | Yes. | Yes |
| Intel | Yes, same as legacy for Resume Request. | Yes |
| Fujitsu | Yes. | Yes |
| Xiaomi | Yes, this can be as baseline, but we should evaluate any impact. | Yes |
| Lenovo | Yes | Yes |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | Yes |
| vivo | Yes. | Yes |
| Apple | Yes | Yes |
| **Comments Summary:**  All companies agree that the legacy security framework is used to generate the short-MACI  Open issues:  None (FFS the RRC message to be used – see above) | | |
| **Proposals:**  **Proposal 9: In case of RRC-based solution, for both RACH and CG based solutions, the CCCH message contains ResumeMAC-I generated using the stored security key – i.e same as Rel-16.** | | |

Subsequently, the UE generates new keys using the stored security context and the NCC value received in the previous RRCRelease message and uses the new keys for the data transmission which happens after the reception of RRCResume message. However, in case of small data transmission, the DRB data may already be included in the first UL message per the discussion above. So, the question is whether the new keys can be generated and used for the data that is included in the first UL message.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Q 2.4.2: For both RACH and CG based solutions, do companies agree that new keys are generated using the stored security context and the NCC value received in the previous RRCRelease message (i.e. same as legacy procedure) and these new keys are used for generating the data of DRBs that are configured for small data transmission.** | | |
| **Company** | **Yes / No (explain)** | **Rapporteur summary** |
| ZTE | Yes. This can be the same as legacy. | Yes |
| Mediatek | Yes. Same comment as above question. | Yes |
| OPPO | Yes | Yes |
| LG | New key should be used for SDT. The issue is whether the new key is used for all SDT or the new key is generated each time SDT is performed. | Yes  But the same key may be used for all SDT attempts? |
| CMCC | Yes. | Yes |
| Sharp | Yes | Yes |
| CATT | Yes, legacy procedure can be used in key generation. We wonder how this applies to subsequent data transmission. Whether the same procedure with new key generation to be used for every UL SDT. | Yes |
| ITRI | Yes | Yes |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Yes |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes. The new keys are used for the ResumeMAC-I generation as well as ciphering of the SDT data. | Yes  Rapp: Seems it is a typo to say “the new key is used for ResumeMAC-I generation” (based on the answer to the previous question)? |
| Ericsson | Yes | Yes |
| Qualcomm | Yes. | Yes |
| Panasonic | Yes. | Yes |
| InterDigital | Yes | Yes |
| NEC | Yes | Yes |
| ETRI | Yes. | Yes |
| Samsung | Yes | Yes |
| ASUSTeK | Yes. | Yes |
| Sony | Yes. | Yes |
| Intel | Yes, as mentioned above, UE uses the keys based on the latest NCC for the RBs other than SRB0. This should be specified in a way that it also works when RRCless CG solution is introduced. For example, the keys based on the latest NCC value provided is used for the DRB. | Yes |
| Fujitsu | Yes. | Yes |
| Xiaomi | Yes | Yes |
| Lenovo | Yes | Yes |
| Spreadtrum | Yes. | Yes |
| vivo | Yes. | Yes |
| Apple | Yes. It is assumed that for the RRC\_based SDT procedure, RRCRelease message will be always sent from NW to UE to deliver the NCC value for the next SDT transmission. | Yes |
| **Comments Summary:**  All companies agree that the PDCP PDU is generated using the new key generated using the stored NCC Value  Open issues:  One company asked whether the same key can be used for all SDT attempts – this can be discussed using tdocs. | | |
| **Proposals:**  **Proposal 10: For both RACH and CG based solutions, new keys are generated using the stored security context and the NCC value received in the previous RRCRelease message (i.e. same as legacy procedure) and these new keys are used for generating the data of DRBs that are configured for SDT.** | | |

## Subsequent data transmission

At RAN2#111-e, the following agreement was made:

*Agreement: When UE is in RRC\_INACTIVE, it should be possible to send multiple UL and DL packets as part of the same SDT mechanism and without transitioning to RRC\_CONNECTED on dedicated grant. FFS on details and whether any indication to network is needed.*

Currently, in case of RACH (i.e. 2-step and 4-step RACH), upon successful completion of the RACH procedure (i.e. contention resolution), the UE will be monitoring C-RNTI search space for subsequent scheduling messages (both in UL and DL). The network can hence transmit DL messages and schedule the UE for further UL transmissions using the C-RNTI based scheduling. The question whether this can be used to allow multiple UL/DL messages per the above agreement.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Q 2.5.1: For RACH based solutions, do companies agree that upon successful completion of contention resolution, the UE shall monitor C-RNTI search space for further UL and DL scheduling from the network?**  Note: the understanding is that with this approach, it is up to the network to whether to allow subsequent UL/DL messages or to send RRCResume message in DL (i.e. no further discussion is needed on this aspect). Companies can comment on this understanding too. | | |
| **Company** | **Yes / No (if No, explain then how to enable the multiple UL and DL packets without moving to connected)** | **Rapporteur summary** |
| ZTE | Yes, the UE shall monitor the C-RNTI search space for further scheduling messages on the PDCCH:   * In case of RACH, this is the usual procedure and needs no further changes * In case of CG, some further discussion might be needed (see below) | Yes |
| Mediatek | Generally Yes. UE shall monitor PDCCH addressed to C-RNTI for subsequent data transmission for both DL and UL. In other words, UE relies on the dynamic scheduling to enable subsequent data transmission. However, it is FFS whether common search space or UE specific search base or both need to be monitored. | Yes  Discuss which search space is used (common/UE specific) |
| OPPO | Yes, this can be one of the options to schedule the UL grant for subsequent transmission. We can also study the method to schedule the UL grant together with the contention resolution indication addressed by TC-RNTI or MsgB-RNTI. | Yes  UL grant can be scheduled together with contention resolution message? |
| LG | For the UE to monitor PDCCH after SDT transmission, the network may need to send an indication to the UE. We think a new RNTI, e.g. SDT-RNTI is needed for SDT in RRC\_INACTIVE. | Yes, but the RNTI should be called SDT-RNTI |
| CMCC | Whether move to RRC\_connected state is under network control. If network response SDT with contention resolution, UE transfers to RRC\_connnected and monitor C-RNTI; if no contention resolution is received from network, UE remains in RRC\_inactived. | Yes |
| Sharp | Yes | Yes |
| CATT | Generally Yes that C-RNTI can be used to address the UE, if dynamic grant is given for subsequent data transmission. According to on the current spec, the UE is allowed to monitor the C-RNTI on common search space upon successful completion of contention resolution. However, common search space may be limited when the number of UEs for subsequent small data transmission is high. | Yes  Common search space is used currently but this may result in PDCCH congestion over this search space |
| ITRI | Yes. For RACH based solutions, UE monitors C-RNTI search space for subsequent transmission could be one of the option. | Yes |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | First of all, not clear what does it mean by C\_RNTI search space and not sure if the search space ue-specific search space or common search space?  We are generally fine with the dynamic grant approach for the subsequent UL with RA-based scheme, since TA does not need to be requested again. | Yes (but need discussion on common/UE-specific search space) |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes, the UE monitors C-RNTI. Up to RAN1 which search space the UE monitors its C-RNTI. | Yes  Ask RAN1 about search space |
| Ericsson | Yes. Not sure a new RNTI is needed. | Yes |
| Qualcomm | The question is unclear on whether asking the C-RNTI or search space. UE may monitor the PDCCH addressed by C-RNTI for the further DL/UL dynamic scheduling from the network. But for the search space, it depends on network configures what kind of search space (common or UE-specific) for PDCCH monitoring and we think it needs more discussion. This part has RAN1 impact.  In addition, it is not enough for UE to rely on dynamic scheduling only for subsequent data transmission. For example, UE may send the first object as small data, and its buffer becomes empty. But once network returns its ACK, UE’s application layer may generate another object to send. Hence the dynamic scheduling can only handle the one shot-traffic rather than the small data traffic with gaps in between. We think other solutions for subsequent small data transfer should also be studied, i.e. using Configured Grant resource to transmit subsequent small data after RACH. | Yes  Ask RAN1 about search space  Discuss if DG is sufficient for subsequent data |
| Panasonic | Yes, UE shall monitor C-RNTI for receiving the dynamic grants from gNB to enable the subsequent data transmission. How long UE needs to keep monitoring C-RNTI and the relevant timer (T319 or other timer) will have specification impact and therefore need further discussion.  Another way to enable the subsequent data transmission is to rely on the CG resources that are configured after the RACH-Based SDT, which should be also supported. | Yes  Can use CG resources for subsequent data |
| InterDigital | Yes, per the baseline RACH procedure. Which search space is used can be discussed further. | Yes  Discuss search space |
| NEC | Yes, as by random access procedure, the UE has acquired valid T-C-RNTI from the network and will use it as “C-RNTI” for subsequent transmission or reception. However, RAN2 should wait for RAN1 decision about how this “C-RNTI” is used for a mapping to a search space configuration, e.g. exactly the same as C-RNTI in CONNECTED (i.e. reusing *common* and/or *ue-Specific* for CONNECTED) or a kind of specific mapping (i.e. separate IE/field like *ue-Specific-SDT*)?  In the latter case, maybe better to rename C-RNTI to e.g. SDT-C-RNTI. | Yes  Ask RAN1 about search space |
| ETRI | Yes, we agree with NEC. | Yes  Ask RAN1 about search space |
| Samsung | UE monitors PDCCH addressed to C-RNTI upon RA completion. Search space aspects needs further discussion. | Yes  Discuss search space |
| ASUSTeK | Yes. And which search space to monitor C-RNTI needs further discussion. | Yes  Discuss search space |
| Sony | We think upon successful completion of contention resolution where a UE is moved to RRC connection, then the UE monitors PDCCH addressed to C-RNTI, that is a legacy behavior.  If a UE is in INACTIVE state with subsequent SDT transmission, then a UE may monitor PDCCH addressed to another RNTI (e.g. SDT-RNTI). RAN1 should be involved here which search space to monitor (common or UE specific). | Yes  Discuss search space |
| Intel | Yes – on this particular aspect regarding monitoring of C-RNTI for UL/DL scheduling. Other UE behavior applicable during this period requires more discussion. | Yes |
| Fujitsu | Yes, the UE shall monitor C-RNTI. The detail of search space is up to RAN1. Fujitsu don’t see the necessity to introduce new RNTI. | Yes  Discuss search space |
| Xiaomi | Yes, the details should be further discussed. | Yes  Discuss search space |
| Lenovo | Yes, generally, it is a baseline to use a C-RNTI search space for further UL and DL scheduling from the network. | Yes |
| Spreadtrum | Yes, the C-RNTI can be used for dynamic scheduling after successfully transmitting the first UL message and other solutions for subsequent transmission can be discussed further. | Yes |
| vivo | We also share a similar view with Qualcomm and Huawei that the terminology “C-RNTI search space” mentioned in the Q2.5.1 is not understandable. We guess the intended meaning is that the UE shall monitor C-RNTI PDCCH on a search space for subsequent data transmission. Based on this understanding, our answer is Yes. Besides, we would like to point out that the RRC INACTIVE UE with C-RNTI is already able to monitor the C-RNTI PDCCH on common search space (e.g. random access search space/paging search space) for subsequent scheduling according to the current PHY spec. Thus, we think the legacy PDCCH reception procedure can be reused for SDT. | Yes  Common search space should be used for C-RNTI |
| Apple | Yes. The subsequent transmission/reception is scheduled via NW allocated C-RNTI via the RACH procedure. | Yes |
| |  | | --- | | **Comments Summary:**  All companies agree that the RNTI (i.e. the RNTI that would result from the RACH procedure) needs to be monitored  Discussion needed on the search space  Open issues:   * Search space for the RNTI to be monitored needs further discussion   + Is it in the common search space or UE specific search space how is this configured etc   + RAN1 input is needed on the search space | | **Proposals:**  **Proposal 11: For RACH based solutions, upon successful completion of contention resolution, the UE shall monitor the resulting RNTI.**  **Proposal 12: Ask RAN1 for input on the coreset/search space for the RNTI** | | | |

Then, for CG case, there is no need for contention resolution since the assumption is that dedicated resources are used in the same serving cell. It is worth confirming this understanding first.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Q 2.5.2: In case of CG, do companies agree that there is no need for contention resolution since dedicated resources are used in the same serving cell – i.e. no cell change?** | | |
| **Company** | **Yes / No (explain)** | **Rapporteur summary** |
| ZTE | Yes, there is no need for an explicit contention resolution step for CG since dedicated resources are used in the same serving cell. | Yes |
| Mediatek | Absolutely yes. | Yes |
| OPPO | Yes. | Yes |
| LG | RAN2 didn’t agree that the CG is dedicated resource. If the CG is shared resource, contention resolution is needed. | No, discussion needed. |
| CMCC | Yes. | Yes |
| Sharp | Yes | Yes |
| CATT | Yes | Yes |
| ITRI | We share the same view as LG that whether the CG resources are dedicated resource should be discussed first. | No, discussion needed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No, We think the resource can be shared between time/frequency/DMRS port, like what we had for configured grant in R15. Although UE use dedicated ignaling to configure CG resource for the UE, while for different Ues, whether time/frequency/DMRS port is different or the same is up to network implementation. Even though no contention resolution is needed, some ACK for data should be considered. | Yes?  Rapp: Answered No, but the answer seems to suggest the resources are orthogonal (at least in time/freq/DMRS port domain) and subsequently mentions no contention resolution needed but ACK needed |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | There is no need for contention resolution if the UE has dedicated resources. But it needs to be discussed if the CG is allowed in a single cell case only or also in multi-cell case and whether the possibility is to provide only dedicated CG resources or also common resources are possible. | Yes, if CG resources are dedicated  Discuss if CG resources are dedicated |
| Ericsson | This should be pending the discussion on if dedicated CG resources are available. | Discuss if CG resources are dedicated |
| Qualcomm | We should first discuss whether configured CG resource solution is dedicated for UE or not. If it is dedicated, contention resolution is not needed. | Yes, if CG resources are dedicated  Discuss if CG resources are dedicated |
| Panasonic | Yes. | Yes |
| InterDigital | This depends on whether the CG is shared or dedicated. | Discuss if CG resources are dedicated |
| NEC | We agree with LG, it is unclear whether CG for SDT can be a shared resource and contention resolution would be needed in that case. | Discuss if CG resources are dedicated |
| ETRI | We agree with LG. | Discuss if CG resources are dedicated |
| Samsung | Yes, contention resolution is not needed. Assumption is that CG resources are dedicatedly assigned to UE. | Yes |
| ASUSTeK | Yes. We agree with Samsung. | Yes |
| Sony | We share the same view with the companies who suggested to discuss first whether CG is dedicated or common resource. | Discuss if CG resources are dedicated |
| Intel | Yes, with regard to contention resolution, there is no need for contention resolution. Whether the resources are dedicated to one UE or not can be discussed further or left to network implementation. | Discuss if CG resources are dedicated |
| Fujitsu | RAN2 should first discuss whether configured CG resource solution is dedicated to the STD UE or not. The current specification is not prohibited that CG is shared among Ues. If it is dedicated, contention resolution is not needed. | Discuss if CG resources are dedicated |
| Xiaomi | This is up to whether the CG is shared or dedicated for UE, RAN2 should firstly confirm this. | Discuss if CG resources are dedicated |
| Lenovo | Yes | Yes |
| Spreadtrum | Yes, contention resolution is not needed. Whether the CG resources are dedicated or not can be controlled by the network. | Yes |
| vivo | Yes because we think the CG resource is assumed to be UE-dedicated. We prefer not to take shared CG resource into account in this release since a lot of input is needed from RAN1 in terms of the RS design, performance evaluation, configuration (e.g. the number of RB, GP), etc. Unfortunately, no dedicated TU for SDT WI is allocated to RAN1. | Yes |
| Apple | Yes for the UE dedicated CG resource allocation | Yes for the UE dedicated CG resource allocation.  But if shared CG resource is considered, the contention resolution is still needed. |
| |  | | --- | | **Comments Summary:**  13/26 companies think no contention resolution needed (i.e. CG resources are dedicated resources)  13/26 companies think discussion is needed whether CG resources are dedicated or not  Open issues:  Discussion is needed whether CG resources are dedicated or not specifically whether it is allowed to configure same time/frequency resource but DMRS – details can be left to RAN1.  However, it seems there is some confusion regarding “*dedicated resources*” i.e. as long as one of the time/freq/DMRS port is different, then the resource should be considered dedicated, but it is unclear if companies share this understanding. Also, assuming the UE monitors a dedicated RNTI (e.g. C-RNTI or SDT-RNTI for ACK/NACK), then it seems no further contention resolution is needed (this seems to be the understanding from even the companies)? Further checking is needed on the details and can be left to tdocs – check the company understanding regarding the contention resolution with this assumption. | | **Proposals:**  **Proposal 13: There is no need for explicit contention resolution ID in DL if UE monitors a dedicated RNTI in DL (note that ACK on DL may still be needed – FFS) – check if this can be agreed**  **Proposal 14: Ask RAN1 about details of CG resources (specifically how time/freq/DMRS port should be configured)** | | | |

Then, since same serving cell is used for CG, it is possible for the UE to be configured with a UE ID to be used for the new resume procedure. This could be same as the C-RNTI used in the previous RRC-Connection or some other UEID configured by the network (e.g. SDT-RNTI) etc. Companies are invited to comment on which UE ID the UE will monitor after sending the initial UL message on the configured CG resources.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Q 2.5.3: For CG based solution, do companies agree that after transmitting the first UL message on the CG resource, the UE shall monitor a configured UE RNTI? If yes, which RNTI is this (options are: old C-RNTI, some other RNTI configured by the network – such as SDT-RNTI, other options – please elaborate)** | | |
| **Company** | **Yes, UE shall monitor an RNTI – clarify which RNTI / No explanation** | **Rapporteur summary** |
| ZTE | Yes, the UE shall monitor a UE specific RNTI. We think this can be the same as the C-RNTI used in the previous RRC Connection, which will be stored in UE Inactive AS context anyway for the calculation of Resume MAC-I. Since the CG resources are assumed to be valid only in the same serving cell, as long as the CG resources are valid, the C-RNTI of the UE can also be considered to be valid in the cell. | Yes, monitor UE specific RNTI  Same as the previous C-RNTI |
| Mediatek | We think C-RNTI can be used. | Yes, monitor UE specific RNTI  Same as the previous C-RNTI |
| OPPO | Yes, UE shall monitor an RNTI for the response of the transmitted UL message and/or the UL grant for subsequent transmission. We prefer C-RNTI. | Yes, monitor UE specific RNTI  Same as the previous C-RNTI |
| LG | It has to be discussed first whether the subsequent data transmission after CG transmission is performed using CG or DG. If the subsequent data transmission uses CG, then PDCCH monitoring is not needed.  However, if the subsequent data transmission uses DG, then PDCCH monitoring is needed. For the UE to monitor PDCCH after SDT transmission, the network may need to send an indication to the UE. For PDCCH monitoring, we think a new RNTI, e.g. SDT-RNTI is needed. | Subsequent data uses CG -> no PDCCH monitoring  Subsequent data uses DG -> new SDT-RNTI |
| CMCC | For CG based solution, no serving cell change is common understanding. The C-RNTI is valid. UE can monitor C-RNTI for subsequent downlink data in a period of time (a timer). UE stop monitoring C-RNTI and moves to RRC\_inactive after the above timer expired. | Yes, monitor UE specific RNTI  Same as the previous C-RNTI |
| Sharp | Yes, a UE shall monitor an RNTI for retransmission and new transmission. A new RNTI, e.g. SDT-RNTI is preferred. | Yes, monitor UE specific RNTI  New RNTI (e.g. SDT-RNTI) needed |
| CATT | In CG, the UE stays in the same cell, hence C-RNTI of the previous RRC connection can be used to address the UE from RAN2 point of view. However, it needs to discuss detail of subsequent data transmission solution when using CG. Is that dynamic grant is used for subsequent data transmission?  Also PUR-RNTI is introduced for PUR based on a request from RAN1. It would be good to check whether there are lower layer implications for use of C-RNTI. | Yes, monitor UE specific RNTI  Same as the previous C-RNTI  (check with RAN1) |
| ITRI | We share the same view as LG, that we should discuss first whether subsequent data transmission after CG transmission is performed by using CG or DG.  In using CG for subsequent data transmission case, UE may not need to monitor a configured UE RNTI for subsequent data transmission.  In using DG for subsequent data transmission case, UE will need to monitor a configured UE RNTI. In this case, we prefer using a new configured UE RNTI. | Subsequent data uses CG -> no PDCCH monitoring  Subsequent data uses DG -> new SDT-RNTI |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes. We prefer to follow the legacy PUR approach to have a new RNTI for monitoring. The old C-RNTI is only used for shortMAC-I derivation and not used for PDCCH monitoring. It can be allocated by the NW to the other Ues. | Yes, monitor UE specific RNTI  New RNTI (e.g. SDT-RNTI) needed |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | UE needs to monitor some RNTI, e.g., for NW response. It seems unnecessary to restrict to C-RNTI at this stage, especially, since it has not been agreed whether the CG based solution works within one cell or multiple cells. | Yes, monitor UE specific RNTI  Discuss first whether CG resources are in same cell |
| Ericsson | The details and support of subsequent SDT transmission needs to be progressed more, and if procedures differ between CG and DG. It is not clear if a “new” RNTI is needed. | Yes (?) but first need to discuss subsequent data transfer |
| Qualcomm | We prefer a new RNTI monitoring for network response. | Yes, monitor UE specific RNTI  New RNTI (e.g. SDT-RNTI) needed |
| Panasonic | For CG based solution, it is assumed that UE shall still stay in the same cell. Therefore C-RNTI can be reused as long as both gNB and UE have not released the C-RNTI. | Yes, monitor UE specific RNTI  Same as the previous C-RNTI |
| InterDigital | This depends on whether the CG configuration can be used by more than one cell. A new RNTI is generally preferred to align with PUR. | New RNTI (e.g. SDT-RNTI) needed  Discuss whether CG is valid in more than one cell  Note: There is no context fetch/data forwarding for CG scenario, so, WID requires this to be in the same cell |
| NEC | Yes, Ues shall monitor a specific RNTI. We believe that the existing C-RNTI can be reused for CG. | Yes, monitor UE specific RNTI  Same as the previous C-RNTI |
| ETRI | Yes, the UE shall monitor a UE specific RNTI (e.g., C-RNTI or SDT-RNTI). | Yes, monitor UE specific RNTI  Old or new (discuss) |
| Samsung | C-RNTI can be used. Our understanding is that CG resources are for UL transmission. Upon transmitting UL data in CG resource, network may send RRC message (e.g. resume, release). UE needs to monitor PDCCH even if there isn’t any subsequent UL transmission. | Yes, monitor UE specific RNTI  Same as the previous C-RNTI |
| ASUSTeK | Yes, the UE shall monitor a UE specific RNTI for NW response, e.g. C-RNTI. If the subsequent data transmission also uses CG, the UE may need to monitor another UE specific RNTI for retransmission scheduling, e.g. CS-RNTI. It needs further discussion on how to configure the RNTIs. | Yes, monitor C-RNTI  If subsequent data use CG -> monitor CS-RNTI |
| Sony | A UE could monitor a new RNTI (e.g. SDT-RNTI which could be UL resource specific). | New RNTI (e.g. SDT-RNTI) needed |
| Intel | Yes. We also think the old-CRNTI can be used as in our understanding of the WI scope, CG is only applicable in the same cell. | Yes, monitor C-RNTI |
| Fujitsu | C-RNTI can be used. The subsequence transmission of the STD includes DL data corresponding to the STD (RLC STATUS REPORT, TCP ACK…) and dynamic PDCCH indicating retransmission of the STD. | Yes, monitor C-RNTI |
| Xiaomi | It depends on whether the resource is CG or DG for subsequent UL message. | Subsequent data uses CG -> no PDCCH monitoring  Subsequent data uses DG -> new SDT-RNTI |
| Lenovo | Yes, we prefer to introduce a new UE-RNTI for SDT as PUR in NB-IOT. | Yes, monitor UE specific RNTI  New RNTI (e.g. SDT-RNTI) needed |
| Spreadtrum | Yes, the C-RNTI can be used. | Yes, monitor C-RNTI |
| vivo | Yes. We prefer to use a new RNTI for the CG-based solution. If the old C-RNTI is used and maintained, the UE will keep monitoring C-RNTI PDCCH on CSS even if SDT is not triggered according to the current PHY spec. We think this is harmful from UE power saving perspective unless we modify the legacy PDCCH monitoring function in the PHY spec. | Yes, monitor UE specific RNTI  New RNTI (e.g. SDT-RNTI) needed  (It seems the concern is that PHY specs mention that CSS needs to be monitored all the time – even if SDT is not triggered! – to be checked – anyway, this can be changed if needed) |
| Apple | Yes, UE shall monitor the UE specific RNTI, and we prefer a new RNTI. | Yes, monitor UE specific RNTI  New RNTI (e.g. SDT-RNTI) needed |
| **Comments Summary:**   * 18/26 companies think that UE shall monitor a dedicated RNTI   + Of these 11/25 think it can be same as the previous C-RNTI   + 6/25 think a new SDT-RNTI can be configured by the network * 8/26 companies think further discussion is needed   + 4/22 companies said that this depends on whether the subsequent data uses DG or CG   Open issues:   * For CG, should the subsequent data be sent only over CG or is DG also allowed? Seems natural to allow DG as is the case for CG today (note that anyway for DL transmission during subsequent data phase, it seems we need DG?) – we can check this understanding via an explicit proposal * If DG is also allowed should we use C-RNTI or a new SDT-RNTI? | | |
| **Proposals:**  **Proposal 15: In case of CG, subsequent data transmission can use both CG and DG (check if this is agreeable)**  **Proposal 16: To support DG select one of the following options**   * **UE monitors C-RNTI after transmitting the first UL message in CG (the C-RNTI is same as the C-RNTI in the previous RRC CONNECTION)** * **UE monitors SDT-RNTI after transmitting the first UL message in CG (the SDT-RNTI is configured by the network along with the CG configuration)** | | |

# Other aspects with potential impact to other WGs

## Resource configuration

For RACH based solution, a few companies mentioned that separate RACH resources can be configured for SDT. The question is whether both separate and shared RACH resources are allowed for SDT and if so, how to distinguish MSG2/MSGB for SDT from normal legacy MSG2/MSGB. The overall design here may impact RAN1 and hence it is worth having an initial discussion on this earlier so as to trigger the necessary investigations in RAN1 if any.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Q 3.1.1: For RACH based solution, do companies agree that the following options should be allowed for SDT**   * **Shared RACH resources between SDT and non-SDT** * **Separate RACH resources between SDT and non-SDT** | | |
| **Company** | **Yes, both should be allowed / No (explain)** | **Rapporteur summary** |
| ZTE | Yes, both options should be allowed | Both shared and separate |
| Mediatek | I think from UE aspect, a particular RACH resources for SDT should be configured. But from network aspect, those RACH resources can be shared or separate resources from non-SDT. | UE needs to know SDT RACH resources but these can be shared (from network perspective) |
| OPPO | Yes, we think both the two options can work. From the network configuration perspective, considering that the preambles have been partitioned into multiple components due to the introduction of 2-step RACH, we think the second option is more feasible. | Separate resources preferred |
| LG | Shared RACH resource is default, and separate RACH resource should also be allowed. In addition, we think separate BWP needs to be considered considering that SDT requires larger bandwidth than legacy RA procedure. | Shared is default but separate can be allowed |
| CMCC | Both optional configurations are ok.  For 2-step, MSGA size for SDT is different from legacy 2-step RACH. We slightly prefer separate RACH resource configuration between SDT and non-SDT for 2-step RA. | Both are okay |
| Sharp | At least separate RACH resources between SDT and non-SDT could be support.  For shared RACH resources between SDT and non-SDT, RAN1’s feedback may be necessary. | Support separate resources |
| CATT | From UE perspective, separated RACH resources for SDT should be considered. In this way, the network can distinguish SDT UEs and send the UL grant accordingly. | Separate RACH resource needed to give correct grant |
| ITRI | We prefer that particular RACH resource for SDT. | Support separate resources |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | RACH occasion can be both separated or shared. But RACH resource in terms of time/frequency/code should be separated between SDT and non-SDT. | RO can be shared but RO+Preamble shold be separate |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We are unsure what does the “shared RACH resource” specifically mean, ie., whether it is just same RO with separate preambles between SDT and non-SDT. | The “resource” is not clear (i.e. is it RO or RO+preamble)? |
| Ericsson | This should be up to NW configuration and supported as baseline. We understand the term “shared resources” similar to what was discussed for 2-step/4-step RA with for example same RO etc. | Both supported, up to network configuration |
| Qualcomm | The separate RACH resources between SDT and non-SDT should be supported. | Separate should be supported |
| Panasonic | We think both options should be supported and it is up to network to choose which option. | Both |
| InterDigital | Yes, both should be possible to configure. Depending on the cell load, it can be beneficial to separate Ues performing RA for legacy reasons from Ues transmitting small data. However, at high cell loads, PRACH space portioning can result in capacity loss and potentially random-access delays to legacy Ues. It’s therefore beneficial to also support configuring PRACH resources that can be used for both small data transmission and non-SDT random access. | Both |
| NEC | For 4-step RACH, separate RACH resource for SDT should be configured to enable the network to allocate UL grant larger than CCCH message size.  For 2-step RACH, as the UE is aware of the UL grant size for MsgA, both separate RACH resource for SDT can be considered. | Separate for 4-step RACH, shared for 2-step RACH  Note: But even for 2-step RACH, the network needs to know the TB size of the payload. So, RO+PO combination needs to indicate the size |
| ETRI | Yes, both options should be allowed. |  |
| Samsung | ‘RO +Preamble’ combination used for SDT should be different from that used for non SDT.   * If Ros for SDT and non SDT are different, preamble partitioning between SDT and non SDT is not needed. * If Ros for SDT and non SDT are same, preamble partitioning is needed | RO + Preamble combination indicates SDT |
| ASUSTeK | Yes, both options should be allowed. It could depend on NW to configure shared or separated resources. | Both |
| Sony | Yes, both separate and shared RACH resources are allowed for SDT. | Both |
| Intel | Both options should be supported. Separate resources allow identification of SDT at msg 1 and different handling by the network for SDT. On the other hand, it may not be essential to differentiate SDT at msg 1 for example to provide additional resources for msg 3 and shared resources could also be used. | Both |
| Fujitsu | Fujitsu want to clarify the meaning of “separate RO” because this question is relevant to the next question. Does it mean that “separate RO” is the RO that the corresponding to RA-RNTI can already be distinguished for the MSGB/Msg2 reception? In any case, this is network configuration issue, meaning that this should be up to NW. | The “resource” is not clear (i.e. is it RO or RO+preamble)? |
| Xiaomi | Yes, this depends on the NW configuration. | Depends on network configuration |
| Lenovo | The separate RACH resources between SDT and non-SDT is preferable, it could make network identify the SDT procedure as early as possible. | Separate resources is preferable |
| Spreadtrum | Separate RACH resources are preferred. For 4-step RACH, at least the separate preambles can be used to inform the procedure is a SDT procedure and network can allocate proper UL grant size for SDT. For 2-step RACH, different MsgA payload size should be configured for SDT and non-SDT. | Separate resources is preferable |
| vivo | It will be better to clarify the meaning of “shared RACH resource”. Does it mean “shared RO”? In our opinion, if shared RO are configured for both SDT and non-SDT, we think preamble partitioning is needed to indicate the UE’s intention to use SDT.  Besides, we think separate RO configuration for SDT can be further considered. | RO + Preamble combination indicates SDT |
| Apple | Both options can work, and it's up to NW configuration. | Both |
|  | | |
| **Comments Summary:**   * It seems there is some confusion regarding the question. Specifically, some companies pointed out that as long as RO+Preamble combination used for SDT is different from that used for non-SDT then there are no issues to be solved. Perhaps this issue first needs to be clarified before we can discuss this aspect any further as the responses from other companies seem unclear regarding this point (i.e. some companies consider that RACH resource refers only to RO whilst it seems other companies think that RACH resources comprise both RO and preamble). * Given the above confusion, it is first worth clarifying what the company understanding is regarding “RACH resource” and whether it is enough if RO+preamble combination indicates SDT.   Open issues:   * Check the understanding whether companies agree that the RO+Preamble combination used for SDT is different from that used for non-SDT? * If the understanding is that the RO+preamble combination is not different between SDT and non-SDT, then some further discussion is needed on this aspect and this is left to tdocs. | | |
| **Proposals (check if the following is agreeable):**  **Proposal: The RACH resource i.e. (RO+preamble combination) is different between SDT and non-SDT – check if this is agreeable** | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Q 3.1.2: Do companies agree that the MSG2/MSGB for SDT needs to be distinguished from the normal MSG2/MSGB? If the answer is yes, please also explain how to distinguish this (e.g. separate RNTI, Corset and/or search space etc)** | | |
| **Company** | **Yes, MSG2 and MSGB should be distinguished from legacy (explain how) / No (explain)** | **Rapporteur summary** |
| ZTE | Yes,  If separate RACH resource pool for SDT and non-SDT is allowed, then some ambiguity may exist in the MSG2/MSGB for different RA resource pool, since the same RA-RNTI/RAP-ID may be used in the two separate resource pool. To solve this issue, the following alternatives can be considered:  Alt1: RA-RNTI based solution (e.g. a special RA-RNTI can be used to indicate the MSG2/MSGB for SDT, and more information can be included in MAC RAR to identify UE)  Alt2: Separate SearchSpace/CORESET (needs RAN1 input)  For the two alternatives above, we think alternative 2 is more straightforward. Also considering one of the intention to allow the configuration of separate RA resource pool for SDT is to avoid the congestion on non-SDT RA resource, having a separate SearchSpace/CORESET can be used to avoid the congestion on the legacy RA SearchSpace/CORESET.  Therefore, we prefer to have separate SearchSpace/CORESET from RAN2 perspective, and ask RAN1 to confirm the feasibility | Yes, MSG2/MSGB for SDT should be different to non-SDT  Separate searchspace/coreset preferred |
| Mediatek | Yes. From RAN2 aspect, MSG2/MSGB for SDT needs to be distinguished from the normal MSG2/MSGB.  The above mentioned methods through separate RNTI or separate COREST/search space are workable and need to be evaluated by RAN1. | Yes, MSG2/MSGB for SDT should be different to non-SDT  Details -> ask RAN1 |
| OPPO | No, this issue also exists in CFRA and CBRA. We think the ambiguity can be avoided depending on network configuration. | No need to differentiate. |
| LG | Yes. We think separate BWP needs to be considered, and ask RAN1 about the feasibility. | Yes, via a separate BWP |
| CMCC | Yes, MSG2 and MSGB should be distinguished from legacy. Separate RNTI is OK if RACH resource id separate between SDT and non-SDT.  Whether Corset or search space can work is RAN1 issue. | Yes, MSG2/MSGB for SDT should be different to non-SDT  Details -> ask RAN1 |
| Sharp | Yes, MSG2 and MSGB should be distinguished from legacy. For any possible solutions, RAN1’s feedback is necessary. | Yes, MSG2/MSGB for SDT should be different to non-SDT  Details -> ask RAN1 |
| CATT | Yes. MSG2 and MSGB should be distinguished from legacy. Solutions should be investigated by RAN1. | Yes, MSG2/MSGB for SDT should be different to non-SDT  Details -> ask RAN1 |
| ITRI | First, we agree that the MSG2/MSGB for SDT needs to be distinguished from the normal MSG2/MSGB. However, how to avoid that could be resolved through network configuration. | Yes, MSG2/MSGB for SDT should be different to non-SDT by network configuration? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree with the above company and think it is more suitable to let RAN1 to decide. Actually, in R16, for the 2-step RACH discussion, the decision was finalized by RAN1 | Yes, MSG2/MSGB for SDT should be different to non-SDT  Details -> ask RAN1 |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We are unsure why they would need to be distinguished. If separate RO is used for SDT and non-SDT, then the distinguishing happens by the RNTI. However, if same RO is used, seems the same MSG2/MSGB can be used by the NW to address the SDT and non-SDT responses – MSG2 can provide different size of grants for different Ues and MSGB already supports transmitting SDUs. | If RO+preamble is different then there is no need to differentiate |
| Ericsson | We share the same view as Nokia. Details need to be discussed to decide on what is needed. If necessary, then both a new RNTI set (e.g. offset) or separate Search Space/CORESET can be possible solutions. | If RO+preamble is different then there is no need to differentiate |
| Qualcomm | If the separate RO is used for SDT and non-SDT, the RA-RNTI can already be distinguished for the MSGB/Msg2 reception. For the separate SearchSpace/CORESET solution, it should be decided by RAN1. | If RO+preamble is different then there is no need to differentiate |
| Panasonic | No. Not sure what are the actual merits of having such separation. This also requires network to distinguish the preambles for SDT and non-SDT in the first place. | If RO+preamble is different then there is no need to differentiate |
| InterDigital | Yes, specifically for Ros shared with non-SDT Ues. RAN1’s feedback can be considered for the solutions. | For shared RO case some differentiation is needed |
| NEC | Yes, MSG2 and MSGB should be distinguished from legacy. RAN1’s input is needed for the final decision. | Yes, MSG2/MSGB for SDT should be different to non-SDT  Details -> ask RAN1 |
| ETRI | Yes, MSG2/MSGB for SDT should be distinguished from the normal MSG2/MSGB (i.e., the separate RACH resource in UL, COREST/search space in DL, or sperate RNTI). | Yes, MSG2/MSGB for SDT should be different to non-SDT |
| Samsung | If Ros are shared between SDT and non SDT, preamble will be partitioned. So even if RA-RNTI/MsgB-RNTI can be same, RAPID can distinguish whether response is for SDT or non SDT.  If Ros are not shared between SDT and non SDT, RA-RNTI/MsgB-RNTI can distinguish whether response is for SDT or non SDT. In R16, for flexible configuration of Ros, new parameters prach-ConfigurationPeriodScaling, prach-ConfigurationFrameOffset, prach-ConfigurationSOffset are introduced. These can be included in RACH configuration of SDT so that network has enough flexibility to configure Ros for SDT so that RA-RNTI/MsgB-RNTI for SDT is different from that of non SDT. | If RO+preamble is different then there is no need to differentiate  Rel-16 baseline is enough to provide sufficient flexibility for RO and preamble combination to be different. |
| ASUSTeK | We share the same view with LG. Different BWPs could be used to distinguish the SDT RA from the legacy RA. | Yes, via a separate BWP |
| Sony | Yes, this can be achieved through a separate RNTI or separate CORESTs. However, RAN1 should be asked to evaluate them. | Yes, MSG2/MSGB for SDT should be different to non-SDT  Details -> ask RAN1 |
| Intel | In relation to the previous question, for the case when shared resource pool is used for SDT and non-SDT RACH, while differentiation might not be possible in the time/freq domain, RACH preambles can be partitioned for SDT and non-SDT usage and the network should be able to distinguish that way. However, we need to check with RAN1 on the feasibility of partitioning of preamble domain. On the other hand, for the separate resource pool case, RA-RNTI based solution can be considered to distinguish between them, which can be feasible from RAN2 point of view. | If RO+preamble is different then there is no need to differentiate, if not we need to ask RAN1 |
| Fujitsu | Yes. Assuming that “separate RO” is the “RO that the corresponding to RA-RNTI can already be distinguished for the MSGB/Msg2 reception”, then Alt.1 works. Alt.2 is up to RAN1 discussion. | Yes, needs RAN1 input |
| Xiaomi | Share same view as Nokia and Ericsson | If RO+preamble is different then there is no need to differentiate |
| Lenovo | Yes, MSG2 and MSGB could be distinguished based on separate RO for SDT and normal case. RAN1’s input is needed for the final decision. | Yes, needs RAN1 input |
| Spreadtrum | Share same view as Nokia. | If RO+preamble is different then there is no need to differentiate |
| vivo | It seems too early to discuss this stage-3 issue related to MAC PDU format. Currently, we haven’t discussed what can be included in Msg2/MsgB for RACH-based SDT.  In Rel-16, As the MAC PDU format (i.e. contents that can be included in MsgB) of 2-step RACH is different than that of 4-step RACH, msgb-RNTI is introduced to avoid legacy UE receiving MsgB in Rel-16 NR.  Regarding the SDT procedure, we don’t find out any specific issue if the current MAC PDU format of RAR/MsgB is reused. Specifically, for 4-step RACH and 4-step RACH based SDT, the legacy R15 would not process the MAC RAR associated with an E/T/RAPID subheader in which the RAPID is corresponding to a preamble specific for SDT. In other words, the legacy Ues will not be impacted by the new feature. For 2-step RACH and 2-step RACH based SDT, since at most two MAC subPDUs for MAC SDU of a given UE can be put into one MAC PDU, it is practical to multiplex the SuccessRAR, RRC message, and DRB data into the same MAC PDU for the UE performing small data transmission. Besides, considering that multiple MAC subPDUs for MAC SDU of multiple Ues cannot be multiplexed in the same MsgB, the potential impacts to Rel-16 2-step RACH UE is limited in terms of decoding complexity. | No need to differentiate if MAC PDU format is the same |
| Apple | We share the same view as Nokia and Ericsson. | If RO+preamble is different then there is no need to differentiate |
| **Comments Summary:**   * Similar to the previous question, again it is worth checking whether the RO+preamble combination is unique (see above) * Some companies rightly pointed out that if RO+preamble combination is the same and if there is no change to the MSG2/MSGB format then there is no need to discuss this further.   Open issues:   * If RO+preamble combination for SDT is not assumed to be different to non-SDT, then further discussion is needed and this is TBD (can be left to tdocs) | | |
| **Proposals (check if the following is agreeable):**  **Proposal: The RACH resource i.e. (RO+preamble combination) is different between SDT and non-SDT then there is no further need for any differentiation between MSG2/MSGB for SDT vs non-SDT – check if this is agreeable** | | |

## Cell reselection and failure handling

Currently, RLM and beam failure detection are not applicable before *RRCResume* is received and UE relies on T319 for detecting failures. The first question is whether the T319 is to be extended to support SDT and the subsequent question then is whether we can rely on the T319 for detecting SDT failure.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Q 3.2.1: Do companies agree that T319 should be extended to support SDT and if yes, by how much** | | |
| **Company** | **Yes (provide value range) / No (explain)** | **Rapporteur summary** |
| ZTE | Yes, T319 should be extended. We think the range should be enough to cover typical round trip time for the upper layer ack messages if any. This is important to avoid a subsequent paging to deliver the response messages in the opposite direction. In case of LTE and NB-IoT, the timer is extended to take also into account the massive repetitions used on the air interface. Given this is not the target of this WI, we think the extended T319 just needs to be in the order of a few seconds (we propose 10 sec) | Yes (range up to 10 sec) |
| Mediatek | Yes. T319 needs to be extended. But considering the diverse cases considered for SDT, we can have several values, which can be configurable. | Yes (range configurable) |
| OPPO | No. Considering the backward compatibility, we prefer to introduce a new timer other than extending T319. If T319 is extended, legacy UEs have to keep monitoring PDCCH for a long time, which is power consumption. We can introduce a new timer which has the same function as T319 but with longer value for SDT.  Since the transmission times and the scheduled uplink grant are up to network, it is difficult to determine a suitable timer value to guarantee that the subsequent transmissions can be completed within the timer. Another solution it that T319 can be restarted when UL for new transmission is received or a new UL is transmitted, in which way we can keep the value of T319 as it is. | Introduce new timer  Reason is to avoid impact to legacy Ues |
| LG | The SDT is different from the RRC Resume, and whether to reuse T319 for SDT needs more discussion. | Needs discussion |
| Sharp | We share some view of OPPO.  Extended T319 could impact legacy UE. A new timer could avoid this drawback. And if it is difficult to determine a suitable timer value considering subsequent transmissions, such a new timer could be restarted when new transmission is transmitted. | Introduce new timer (restart after each UL transmission)  Reason is to avoid impact to legacy Ues |
| CATT | Whether T319 can be reused with extending the range should be further discussed. In any case, an extended timer would be required to count for subsequent small data transmission. The value of the timer depends on how we define subsequent data transmission. | Yes (range TBD) |
| ITRI | No, we don’t prefer to extend T319.  The current T319 value is workable for the “RNA update procedure with UE context relocation” case. In that case, UE context retrieve and network path switch will be performed. We are not sure whether any additional time will be needed for SDT case.  Another aspect, if we configure an extended T319, the UE may keep monitoring PDCCH for a long time for resume failure case. The power consumption concern should be taken into account. | No (increases UE power consumption) |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We prefer to have a new timer for SDT transmission. While for the value of the timer, we think the value should be extended than that of T319. IN addition to the normal caluculation we had for RNAU, for SDT, there is also time spent for waiting for the DL data from UPF. Hence, it is reasonable to extend the length of the timer compared to that of T319 | Introduce new timer |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Due to the subsequent SDT transmissions the SDT session length is arbitrary, hence, it needs to be discussed whether the current functionality is suitable for SDT. | New mechanism needed (because of the flexible subsequent data transmission phase) – likely hinting towards restarting the timer perhaps like others ? |
| Ericsson | Since SDT is different from RRC Resume, it may be simpler for defining a new timer. This can be based on legacy handling cf. T319. | Introduce new timer |
| Qualcomm | Yes. T319 should be extended. The value can be configurable. | Yes (range configurable) |
| Panasonic | No, extending T319 will have negative impact to the legacy Ues, as well as to the new Ues intending to use the RRC resume procedure for non-SDT purposes.  If we want to reuse T319 for SDT failure handling, we also need to consider the possible subsequent data transmissions. Restarting T319 upon each UL data transmission or upon each BSR transmission could be one option to extend the lifetime of C-RNTI.  Another option is T319 is started/stopped as it is now, and a new timer is started/restarted upon each UL data transmission or upon each BSR transmission. UE keeps monitoring C-RNTI as long as either T319 or the new timer is still running. | Introduce new timer (restart after each UL transmission) |
| InterDigital | Given the time involved to complete the SDT procedure can be longer and may involve subsequent transmissions, it is preferred to define a new timer. | Introduce new timer |
| NEC | Agree that longer value timer is needed. And a new timer is better to avoid impact on normal RRC Resume procedure. | Introduce new timer |
| ETRI | No, we support to introduce a new timer with longer value than T319. | Introduce new timer |
| Samsung | Timer needs to be longer that T319. Ok to extend T 319. | Yes (range configurable) |
| ASUSTeK | No, either a new timer or restart of T319 could be used for SDT. | Introduce new timer (or restart existing timer for each UL transmission) |
| Sony | We agree with Nokia that some discussion is needed whether the current functionality is suitable for SDT. | New mechanism needed (because of the flexible subsequent data transmission phase) – likely hinting towards restarting the timer perhaps like others ? |
| Intel | We agree a longer value than current T319 for Resume will be needed for Resume with SDT. However, we think it is cleaner to use a different timer to T319 that can be configured with longer values just for SDT such that use of T319 for Resume to Connected is not adversely impacted. | Introduce new timer |
| Fujitsu | No. As stated in the introduction, the purpose of T319 is for RRC resume failure, not for subsequent SDT. If T319 is extended, then this means that failure detection is also extended, which seems to delay the failure recovery. The question is if such a delay is intended UE behavior. As CATT mentions, Fujitsu think that it is better to have a common understanding on overall picture of subsequent data transmission. | No |
| Xiaomi | Agree with Nokia | New mechanism needed (because of the flexible subsequent data transmission phase) – likely hinting towards restarting the timer perhaps like others ? |
| Lenovo | We prefer a new timer is introduced for SDT considering maybe subsequent DL data will be transmitted in the following RRC response message. | Introduce new timer |
| Spreadtrum | A new timer is preferred. | Introduce new timer |
| vivo | Yes, we agree to extend the length of T319. The detailed maximum value can be discussed further by taking the CG configuration and modeling into account. | Yes (range TBD) |
| Apple | T319 needs to be extended since NW may need more time for the data processing. And the timer cannot cover the subsequent transmission part. | Yes |
| **Comments Summary:**   * Option 1a (extend T319): 6/25 companies think we can extend T319 and use this for failure handling * Option 1b (new, longer timer) : 12/25 companies think we need a new timer to control the failure handling for SDT * Option 2 (new mechanism): 6/25 companies mentioned that we may need a new mechanism where the timer is restarted for each UL transmission * One company thinks that we should not extend the timer at all.   Option 1a and 1b above a fairly similar, we just need to decide whether to define a new timer or not. Option 2 is a different mechanism compared to how we handle failure currently and needs further discussion.  Open issues:  General discussion is needed on failure handling among the following options | | |
| **Proposals (select one of the following options):**  **Proposal: RAN2 to select one of the following options (try to narrow it down between option 1 and option 2 at least and further discussion can happen via tdocs)**   * **Option 1: Extended timer is used (18/25)**   + **1a: Extend T319 to handle the subsequent data transmission phase for SDT (extended range TBD)**   + **1b: Define a new timer to handle the subsequent data transmission phase for SDT (range TBD)** * **Option 2: New mechanism for failure handling (6/25)**   + **2a: define a new timer which is restarted after every UL transmission (failure declared if the timer expires)** | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Q 3.2.2: Do companies agree that we can rely on T319 expiry for failure handling and no need to have RLM/beam failure detection during STD?** | | |
| **Company** | **Yes (we can rely on T319) / No (explain)** | **Rapporteur summary** |
| ZTE | Yes, we think this is sufficient. | No need for RLM/BFR during SDT |
| Mediatek | It depends on how the subsequent data transmission is designed. If subsequent data transmission requires certain measurement, it’s possible to have RLM. But we agree that we should not have complicated and power consuming measurement for data transmission in INACTIVE. | Further discussion needed  Lower layer failure detection may be needed for subsequent data phase (further discussion needed) |
| OPPO | Yes. Since the procedure is for RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, we prefer to keep it in a simple way. | No need for RLM/BFR during SDT |
| LG | The SDT is different from the RRC Resume, and whether to reuse T319 for SDT needs more discussion. | Further discussion needed |
| CMCC | Yes. T319 should to be extended. | No need for RLM/BFR during SDT |
| Sharp | The failure handling in RRC layer is necessary, T319 or T319-like timer is ok. However, the failure detection in lower layer should also be considered if necessary, especially for subsequent data transmission. | Further discussion needed  Lower layer failure detection may be needed for subsequent data phase |
| CATT | We think this should be further studied based on the detail solution for subsequent data transmission. | Further discussion needed  Lower layer failure detection may be needed for subsequent data phase |
| ITRI | We share the same view as Mediatek that it should depend on how the subsequent data transmission is designed. Therefore, whether to reuse T319 for SDT handling RLF and beam failure needs more discussion. | Further discussion needed  Lower layer failure detection may be needed for subsequent data phase |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It is ok for us not to have RLM/beam failure detection during SDT.  But does it mean we only rely on T319/New timer for the failure handling? How about the RLC counter for RLF? | No need for RLM/BFR during SDT  How about RLC failure? (Note: currently this is also ignored during the initial access phase) |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Whether T319 is sufficient needs to be discussed. The beam validity should be taken into account at least for the CG based solution. | Further discussion needed  Lower layer failure detection may be needed for subsequent data phase (especially for CG) |
| Ericsson | Needs some more discussion. | Further discussion needed |
| Qualcomm | It needs further study based on the solution of subsequent data transmission. | Further discussion needed  Lower layer failure detection may be needed for subsequent data phase |
| Panasonic | Yes, we think the failure handling based on T319 or T319-like timer is sufficient. | No need for RLM/BFR during SDT |
| InterDigital | Whether T319 is reused needs further discussion. | Further discussion needed |
| NEC | For the subsequent data transmission, we see the need for RLF detection, e.g. when the maximum RLC retransmission exceeds. For the RLM/beam failure detection, we should be careful about it to avoid overdesign for SDT. And as the RLM/beam failure procedure usually takes a while (e.g. more than 1s for RLM) before the failure is triggered, we are not sure if we need more than 1s data transmission for SDT. This can be decided when we have clear understanding of how subsequent SDT works. Other WG (e.g. RAN4) may also need to be consulted. | Further discussion needed  Lower layer failure detection may be needed for subsequent data phase  RLC failure needs to be considered separately |
| ETRI | More discussion is needed. | Further discussion needed |
| Samsung | Upon completion of RA procedure and until the expiry of SDT timer, it is not clear which beam is used for subsequent UL/DL transmission/reception and what happens if that beam is no longer suitable. Further discussion is needed. | Further discussion needed |
| ASUSTeK | It needs more discussion. | Further discussion needed |
| Sony | We need more discussion and see how the subsequent data transmission is designed. | Further discussion needed |
| Intel | We should rely on T319 like timer and avoid RLM detection. However, we think another T319 like timer for SDT is beneficial to provide a longer value and not have to use a common value for normal Resume and Resume for SDT. | No need for RLM/BFR but rely on new timer |
| Fujitsu | Yes. T319 has been introduced to detect failures. | No need for RLM/BFR during SDT |
| Xiaomi | Needs more discussion | Further discussion needed |
| Lenovo | Further discussion is needed. | Further discussion needed |
| Spreadtrum | It depends on the solution of subsequent transmission. | Further discussion needed |
| vivo | From RAN2 perspective, we agree with ZTE. Maybe some input from RAN1 is needed. | No need for RLM/BFR during SDT (from RAN2 perspective) |
| Apple | Further discussion is needed | Further discussion needed |
| **Comments Summary:**   * 15/25 companies think that further discussion is needed given that the subsequent data transmission phase might be extended * 8/25 companies think that there is no need for RLM/BFD (i.e. same as today)   Open issues:   * Discussion needed on the following aspects (to be done via tdocs – i.e. no proposals made):   + Can we rely on a timer (T319 or new) to detect RLF and BFR during the SDT phase (including subsequent data transmission phase)?   RAN1 input is likely needed to conclude the above. So, we can send a question to RAN1, however, before we do this, it is preferable to first conclude on the T319 length (i.e. the above question). So, for now, no proposal is made | | |
| **Proposals:**  None | | |

Finally, currently cell reselection is possible while T319 is running. If this happens, UE moves to IDLE mode. The question is whether the same approach can be adopted with SDT (in which case there will be potentially data loss) or if some optimisation is needed to avoid data loss in this case.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Q 3.2.3: How to handle cell reselection during T319 for the case of SDT**  **Option 1: No optimizations (UE moves to IDLE mode) this will result in data loss and it is up to higher layers in the UE to recover the lost data**  **Option 2: RAN2 will define solutions to potentially recover the lost data (companies can provide basic details of the mechanisms)** | | |
| **Company** | **Option 1 / Option 2 with comments** | **Rapporteur summary** |
| ZTE | In general, option 2 will enable SDT to be used for more services and hence we think RAN2 should consider option 2.  If option 2 is to be pursued, the following basic design can be used:   * When cell reselection happens during SDT, the UE Remains in INACTIVE state and suspends all the DRBs * After selecting the new cell, UE initiates PDCP level retransmission for the unacknowledged PDCP PDUs * Further discussion however is needed on how to handle the security context in this case:   + Depending on when the cell reselection happens, we need to discuss and decide whether the new security keys are generated based on the stored security context (i.e. security context in the UE’s INACTIVE context) or whether the new keys are generated after replacing the keys in the stored security context.   + The other option is to use Reestablishment procedure to recover the security context and then proceed with UP recovery. Again, details need to be further discussed in RAN2. | Option 2 (solutions needed)  Use reestablishment framework |
| Mediatek | Option1 is the baseline.  We assume that SDT in INACTIVE will not endure a long time and the probability of cell reselection should be low. Option 2 is a minor optimization but has lots of impacts/changes/complexity at both UE side and network side. | Option 1 (up to UE) |
| OPPO | Option1. It up to UE implementation to avoid data loss. | Option 1 (up to UE) |
| LG | First, the SDT is different from the RRC Resume, and whether to reuse T319 for SDT needs more discussion.  For cell reselection during SDT, we agree with Mediatek that the option 2 is minor optimization. | Option 1 (up to UE) |
| CMCC | No optimization is baseline. | Option 1 (up to UE) |
| Sharp | Option 1. | Option 1 (up to UE) |
| CATT | Option 1. Considering it is a corner case, we prefer to keep the procedure simple and leave it to higher layers in the UE to recover the lost data. | Option 1 (up to UE)  Corner case |
| ITRI | We prefer option 2.  If the cell reselection happens during SDT transmission, the inactive UE will enter idle mode in current procedure. If the SDT transmission causes anchor relocation, some additional signaling is needed to handle the inactive UE moving to idle mode event.  A simple approach for the option 2 is taking the serving cell signal quality as a criteria related to whether triggers SDT.  - If the serving cell signal quality is good enough, the cell reselection will not happen. Therefore, the inactive state UE could trigger SDT without considering cell reselection.  - If the serving cell signal quality is not good enough, the cell reselection may happen soon. In this case, the inactive state UE may include an indicator within the SDT to inform network that the subsequent data transmission should be prevented due to the bad signal quality. | Option 2 (solutions needed)  Indicate the network whether subsequent data phase is preferred or not based on cell quality |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We prefer Option2. For RACH-based scheme, we have considered mobility even in the WI description that we considered for anchor relocation. Similarly here, we should also consider the scenario when the UE mobility during data transmission and data loss should be avoided somehow. | Option 2 (solutions needed) |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Since the subsequent data can extend the SDT procedure arbitrarily, the cell reselection scenario seems to become more frequent than in legacy connection setup/resume procedures. Furthermore, multiple SDT data transmissions can be performed before the cell reselection happens which can lead to loss of quite much data. Hence, it seems desirable to consider options how the data loss could be avoided. | Option 2 (solutions needed)  Especially since subsequent data transmission prolongs the SDT phase |
| Ericsson | We are not sure cell reselection is such a common problem that it needs an optimized solution as in Opt 2. | Option 1 (up to UE)  Corner case? |
| Qualcomm | We prefer Option 1. | Option 1 (up to UE) |
| Panasonic | We prefer Option 2, as the likelihood of UE reselecting another cell will increase if the SDT procedure is prolonged due to the subsequent data transmissions. If it is a non-corner case, we think enhancements are required. | Option 2 (solutions needed)  Subsequent data transmission prolongs the SDT phase |
| InterDigital | Option 1 is preferred, though failure recovery should be discussed further. | Option 1 (up to UE) |
| NEC | Option 1 is baseline. Option 2 can be considered in further Release. | Option 1 (up to UE) |
| ETRI | Option1. | Option 1 (up to UE) |
| Samsung | Option 2 | Option 2 (solutions needed) |
| ASUSTeK | Option 1 is preferred. | Option 1 (up to UE) |
| Sony | Option 2. | Option 2 (solutions needed) |
| Intel | Option 2 should be considered. Introducing SDT should not increase chances of data loss. This should be discussed in subsequent meetings. | Option 2 (solutions needed) |
| Fujitsu | Option 1. Fujitsu think that camping on proper cell is more important than recovering data loss. | Option 1 (up to UE) |
| Xiaomi | Opt1 | Option 1 (up to UE) |
| Lenovo | Option.1, option.2 will introduce lots of impact to legacy UE behavior. | Option 1 (up to UE) |
| Spreadtrum | Option2. Since the subsequent transmission is supported for SDT, the cell reselection scenarios may happen more frequently. Data loss should be avoided and anchor relocation can be considered. | Option 2 (solutions needed) |
| vivo | We think option 2 can be considered for the CG-based solution for the sake of service continuity. For example, the NW can inform the UE that the CG resources are valid and reserved amongst small cell 1/2/3 (i.e. multi-cell based CG resource for SDT). As long as the TA and Cg resource are valid, the UE can keep performing CG-based SDT after re-selecting to cell 2 from cell 1 without moving to IDLE. | Option 2 for CG! |
| Apple | Option 2. Some enhancement needs to be introduced if the subsequent SDT transmission is enabled. | Option 2 |
| **Comments Summary:**   * Option 1 (UE moves to IDLE and up to implementation to recover lost data): 15/26 * Option 2 (RAN2 to define solutions to potentially recover lost data: 11/26 * No consensus. There is slight majority to do nothing but it seems there is interest in trying to avoid data loss here. It seems some of the concerns from companies are due to the likely complexity of the solution. However, no details of solution were discussed so far. So, given the situation, it is hard to judge whether a solution is feasible and how complex it is. It may be worth discussing this via tdocs directly => no proposals made but companies supporting a solution are encouraged to show the details of the solution in tdocs   Open issues:   * If option 2 is agreed, then further discussion is needed on the actual solution space. Some companies proposed the Reestablishment framework but this needs further investigation. * Seems it is hard to agree this based on this email discussion alone. Companies can bring tdocs (especially showing details of option 2). | | |
| **Proposals:**  **None** | | |

# Conclusion and proposals

TBD
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