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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](mailto:benoist.sebire@nokia.com) |
| CATT | Hao Xu | xuhao@catt.cn |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 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. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 1**: TBD.

**Proposal 1**: TBD.

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 | Netural. We can follow the majority’s view. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 2**: TBD.

**Proposal 2**: TBD.

# 4 Conclusion

TBD.