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# Introduction

This document collects the comments received during the following email discussion on PDCP CR for XR.

* [POST124][042][XR] 38.323 CR (LG)

Intended outcome: Agree to CR

Deadline: 2 weeks

# Contact information

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | Email |
| LG Electronics | SeungJune Yi | seungjune.yi@lge.com |
| Nokia | Benoist Sébire | benoist.sebire@nokia.com |
| Apple | Ralf Rossbach | rrossbach@apple.com |
| NEC | Satoaki Hayashi | [Satoaki-hayashi@nec.com](mailto:Satoaki-hayashi@nec.com) |
| ASUSTeK | Lider Pan | lider\_pan@asus.com |

# Discussions

Companies can provide comments and suggestions to the PDCP CR:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company + Issue Number (e.g., L001) | Issue | Comments and proposed changes | Rapporteur comment |
| N001 | Editorial | Just to make sure: the final version needs to remove changes on changes, and the Annex. | Yes, definitely.  The changes on changes and the Annex are only included during the discussion for easy checking. |
| N002 | 3.1 and 5.6 Delay Critical | While we understand modifying the definition makes the procedure on data volume lighter, we would prefer sticking to the previous text to avoid specifying a behaviour within a definition.  **In response to the rapporteur comments:** we have a slight preference for option 3 since it is the cleanest. | This is the most tricky issue I have.  I agree it is not good to specify a behaviour in the definition section. But, 5.6 is not a proper place to capture the UE behaviour of delay-critical indication to RLC because 5.6 only talks about the delay-critical data volume.  I think there are three options to capture the delay-critical indication to RLC.  1. Add the behaviour in the definition section (as in current CR)  2. Add the behaviour in a NOTE below delay-critical data volume in 5.6.  3. Add a new section to specify the delay-critical data volume calculation and indication to RLC.  Other options are also welcome.  Let me hear more opinions before making changes.  In r1, the CR is updated based on Option 3. |
| N003 | “ including both already stored PDCP SDUs and newly received PDCP SDUs” | We do not recall an agreement justifying this, so unless we have misunderstood something, this change should be removed.  **In response to the rapporteur comments:** for discard, we believe the previous wording covered the discard of all SDUs. The wording “newly received” is a bit ambiguous since anything received should become an SDU right away. How about a note instead, to state that discard should also apply to any future SDUs of the PDU set ?  For data volume, we also agree that the whole PDU set should be reported but if SDUs are not stored yet, we need to rely on the RTP header extension (PSSize) and since we left PSI handling up to UE implementation, it would seem logical to also leave that to UE implementation. That is, only state that all SDUs of the PDU set should be taken into account. If needed, a note could be added like we did for the PSI, e.g. *Identification of the size of a PDU Set when not all SDUs have been received is left up to UE implementation* | For delay-critical data volume in 3.1, there was an agreement in R2#123.  The data volume calculation to be reported in the DSR will consider the at size of the full remaining PDUs in the PDU set (if any PDU within the PDU set is with remaining time below the threshold), if the PDU set discard is configured.  For SDU discard, I think it is common understanding that all newly received SDUs are discarded if they belong to the same PDU Set.  Let me hear more opinions before making changes.  In r1, for discard, a NOTE is added. For data volume, the definition of delay-critical PDCP SDU is updated to cover this. |
| N004 | 5.3 : “stored” | We do not recall an agreement justifying changing how discard operates (the change also affects legacy operation). So unless we have misunderstood something, this change should be removed.  **In response to the rapporteur comments:** since this impacts legacy behaviour, we would prefer not adding “stored”. | This change is made from R2-2311908 (vivo), but I’m ok without “stored”.  Let me hear more opinions before making changes.  In r1, “stored” is removed. |
| A001 | psi-BasedDiscard (5.2.1 and 7.3 *)* | The current text uses in sections 5.2.1 and 7.3 the term *“if psi-BasedDiscard is configured and PSI based SDU discard is activated”*. However, the RRC CR does not have a configuration for *psi-BasedDiscard*, we just have a capability there, since RAN2 agreed to control PSI based discard with a MAC CE. On the other hand, we have an RRC config for the new discard timer (*discardTimerForLowImportance*) which the network only configures if *psi-BasedDiscard* is supported by the UE.  So, the PDCP CR may use *“if discardTimerForLowImportance is configured and PSI based SDU discard is activated”* instead. | Thanks, that’s correct observation.  I’ll change “if psi-BasedDiscard is configured” to “if discarTimerForLowImportance is configured” in 5.2.1.  In 7.3, I’ll remove “psi-BasedDiscard is configured and”.  In r1, above changes are made. |
| A002 | Identify that PSI based discarding is activated by MAC (5.2.1 and 7.3) | Add a reference to the MAC spec for places where the term “PSI based SDU discard” is used, e.g., “PSI based SDU discard is activated as specified in TS 38.321 [4]”, for linking and identification. | I worry that it breaks the consistency of the specification. Overall procedure is similar to PDCP duplication, but there is no reference to MAC for PDCP duplication. |
| NEC001 | * 1. definition   The definition of “Delay-critical PDCP SDU” | Suggest deleting following text and moving it to other section if necessary.  ~~If~~ *~~pdu-SetDiscard~~* ~~is configured, all PDCP SDUs (including both already stored PDCP SDUs and newly received PDCP SDUs) belonging to the PDU Set to which at least one delay-critical PDCP SDU belongs are considered as delay-critical PDCP SDUs. If the corresponding PDCP Data PDU has already been submitted to lower layers, the delay-critical indication for the PDCP Data PDU is provided to lower layers.~~  Regarding Rapporteur comment on N002, we prefer Option 3. | In r1, the definition of delay-critical PDCP SDU is updated, and a new section is added for data volume calculation for DSR. |
| NEC002 | * 1. definition   Propose to add the definition of “Delay-critical PDCP data volume” if Option 3 is adopted. | Delay-critical PDCP data volume: the amount of delay-critical data available for transmission in a PDCP entity. | The definition is not really needed, so I didn’t include it in r1. But, if many companies think it is needed, I’ll add it to the next version. |
| NEC003 | 5.3 SDU discard | Suggest modifying as following  if *pdu-SetDiscard* is configured:  - discard all PDCP SDUs ~~(including both already stored PDCP SDUs and newly received PDCP SDUs)~~ belonging to the PDU Set ~~to which the PDCP SDU belongs~~ along with the corresponding PDCP Data PDUs; | In r1, the first suggestion is moved to a NOTE. The second suggestion is not adopted. |
| FW001 | 3.1 Definition of delay-critical PDCP SDU | We agree with N002 and NEC001 that procedural text should be no part of the definition. We also think the definition needs to be self-contained, i.e., not using “delay-critical PDCP SDU” in defining delay-critical PDCP SDU. Hence, we suggest the following changes against the previous definition:  **Delay-critical PDCP SDU**: a PDCP SDU for which the corresponding remaining time till *discardTimer* expiry is less than the *remainingTimeThreshold,* or when *pdu-SetDiscard* is configured, a PDCP SDU belonging to a PDU Set of which at least one PDCP SDU has the corresponding remaining time till *discardTimer* expiry less than the *remainingTimeThreshold*. | In r1, the definition of delay-critical PDCP SDU is updated based on the suggestion. |
| FW002 | 5.2.1 Transmit operation | If *discardTimerForLowImportance* is configured with an initial value of zero, we wonder whether the UE still needs to start *discardTimerForLowImportance* under the “if”. What is the UE’s behaviour when the UE starts a timer of zero, e.g., will the timer ever expire? Or, should we consider, for this case, that the UE immediately discards the SDU without starting *discardTimerForLowImportance*? | If the timer value is zero, the timer expires immediately after starts, which means that the SDU is immediately discarded. I believe this is common understanding. |
| FW003 | 5.3 SDU discard | We partially agree with NEC003 in deleting “(including both already stored PDCP SDUs and newly received PDCP SDUs)”, but not the second deletion in NEC003. | In r1, the changes are made based on suggestions. |
| FW004 | 5.6 indication of delay-critical PDCP PDU to RLC | We think the following new paragraph, using similar style as the legacy discard indication, can be added in 5.6, after the new text for delay-critical PDCP data volume calculation:  If the corresponding PDCP Data PDU that contains the delay-critical PDCP SDU has already been submitted to lower layers, the delay-criticality is indicated to lower layers.  because the title of 5.6 is “Data volume calculation” and it didn’t say it has to be PDCP data volume until we get to the leading sentences of the following paragraphs, i.e., a new section is unnecessary.  However, if this is not agreeable, Option 3 mentioned by the Rapporteur would be our second choice. Option 2 is not preferable because even the legacy discard indication is captured by a normatic text. | In r1, the CR is updated based on Option 3. |
| FW005 | 5.6 Data volume calculation when associated with at least two RLC entities | Since we haven’t prohibited XR from using more than one RLC entities under a transmitting PDCP entity, we think, in some cases, the delay-critical PDCP data volume may need to be indicted to the secondary RLC entity as well. The detailed TP has been proposed in the Second changes (Page 6) in Annex A of R2-2313421. | This issue has not been discussed before, and cannot be implemented at this moment. You may need to bring up the issue at the next meeting. |
| ASUS01 | The timer *discardTimerForLowImportance* is per DRB. Since QoS flow remapping may cause PDUs of a PDU Set being delivered into different DRBs, expiry of *discardTimerForLowImportance* may just discard partial PDUs of the PDU Set on the corresponding DRB. | There is a need for clarification on SDU discard. Here is a text proposal in clause 5.3:  - discard all PDCP SDUs (including both already stored PDCP SDUs and newly received PDCP SDUs in the same or different DRBs) belonging to the PDU Set to which the PDCP SDU belongs along with the corresponding PDCP Data PDUs; | This issue has not been discussed before, and cannot be implemented at this moment. You may need to bring up the issue at the next meeting. |

# Conclusion

TBD