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# 1 Introduction

This document is the report of the phase 2 of following email discussion:

* [POST131][504][XR] Final 38.300 CR (Nokia)

 Scope: Produce a final CR for R19 XR and merge with RAN3 CR

 Intended outcome: CR for agreement in R2-2506335

 Deadline:

1. Initial list of open issues by rapporteur, proposed resolutions for easy open issues or resolution options for other issues: sept. 19th
2. Input from other companies and final set of proposals and resolutions for identified issues that don’t require contribution input: Oct. 1st

NOTE: no contributions from other companies expected

# 2 Contact Points

Respondents to the email discussion are kindly asked to fill in the following table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | Email Address |
| Nokia (Rapporteur) | Benoist Sébire | benoist.sebire@nokia.com |
| CATT | Hao Xu | xuhao@catt.cn  |
| Sharp | Sangkyu Baek | baeks@sharplabs.com  |
| Ericsson | Nithin Srinivasan | nithin.srinivasan@ericsson.com  |
| OPPO | Zhe Fu | fuzhe@OPPO.com  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Discussion

The current Stage 2 states the following regarding uplink rate control:

- *To enable faster adaptation of the uplink source rate (e.g. to handle uplink congestion), an uplink physical-layer bit rate available to a QoS flow can be suggested by the gNB via a downlink MAC CE, and the UE can also request a desired one via an uplink MAC CE*.

According to Ericsson, although the possible use is only an example, the term congestion is not a specified term and could be misconstrued. Rate adaptation can be triggered under any condition, so our suggestion is to refrain from suggesting specific examples here and keep this generic.

NOTE: This has already been discussed a couple of times before.

**Question 1**: do you agree that the term congestion should be removed in the description of uplink rate control?

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 1 |
| Company | Yes/No | If yes, describe a possible solution |
| CATT | No | The current shape is align with WID description. |
| Sharp | No | We think congestion was considered as a main use case of this feature in the WI. Also, it does not block any other application. We can keep it as it is. |
| Ericsson | Yes | As mentioned, the word congestion is not a standardized term. Although the starting point of this feature was “specify uplink congestion signalling”, this has evolved during the WI. This is now a recommended bit rate on a QoS flow level granularity. And it also includes a query message which is not fully aligned with the congestion use case. So, we would argue that congestion is not the main use case rather faster source rate adaptation is key and would be good to keep it generic i.e., remove the example.  |
| Nokia | No | Just an example and hard to understand how *congestion* can be misinterpreted. |
| OPPO | No | It is just an example and does not exclude other cases.  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 1**: only one company expressed support for removing the term “congestion”.

**Proposal 1**: keep the Stage 2 as it is.

The current Stage 2 describes DSR as follows:

*- Triggered for an LCH when the remaining time before discard of any buffered PDCP SDU goes below a configured threshold (threshold configured per LCG by the gNB);*

*- When triggered for an LCH, reports for each threshold configured, the buffer size and the shortest remaining time before discard of buffered PDCP SDUs associated to this threshold.*

According to Huawei, another point we might be able to improve is on the Stage 2 description of delay-reporting data or non-delay reporting data. For sure there are Stage 3 definition in this, but it is quite cryptic to understand with all the cases. It is better to have some Stage 2 description that could highlight their relationship with PDU set importance and PDU set integrated handling.

**Question 2**: do you agree that the Stage 2 description of DSR should be more detailed?

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 2 |
| Company | Yes/No | If yes, describe a possible solution |
| CATT | See comments | Neutral. We can follow the majority’s view. |
| Sharp | Slightly yes | It would be nicer to have simple descriptions for easy understanding, but it should not be so complicated stage-2 texts. I think the CR rapporteur can decide whether to have. |
| Nokia | No | While a desire to make things clearer is always welcome, we should also make sure this does not translate into something that is too detailed and complex for the Stage 2. So unless we have a proposal on the table, we cannot agree. |
| OPPO | See comments | Not sure whether we need to describe such detailed things in the stage-2 spec, but we can follow the majority. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 2**: no strong support for changing the description.

**Proposal 2**: keep the Stage 2 as it is. If a concrete proposal is made to enhance the DSR description, it can be considered.

# 4 Conclusion

No open issues identified and the Stage 2 can be kept as is.