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# 1. Introduction

This document is to discuss open issues in Rel-19 XR PDCP CR (**R2-2506337**), following the chairlady’s guideline.

|  |
| --- |
| **Agenda**  The agenda has been updated for all Rel-19 features and new AIs have been created for R20 NR features and the 6G Study item.  Please carefully read the instructions.  Kind reminder to all CR rapporteurs (except RRC) to trigger the email discussions with all identified open issues by latest sept. 19th, suggest resolutions already if easy, and get inputs for possible resolution for other issues.   NOTE: for Stage 2 and UE capabilities, I expect companies to propose their corrections directly on the email discussion and not have contributions on these topics.  I suggest the following deadlines:   * For stage 2 and UE capabilities the email discussion deadline should be Oct. 1st. * For other CRs, by Sept. 26th , the rapporteur should make it clear for which issues contributions are expected.   To resolve the other issues that don't require contributions, the rapporteurs can take up to Oct. 1st to finalize their resolution proposals and get inputs (if some further discussions may be required). |

This discussion will proceed with following schedule:

* Gathering open issues identified from companies. Deadline September 19, 18:00 UTC.
* Discussion on the identified open issues. Deadline September 25, 23:59 UTC.
* Rapporteur resolution/suggestion will be provided on October 1.

# 2. Contact information

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | E-mail |
| LG Electronics | SeungJune Yi | seungjune.yi@lge.com |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yinghao Guo | Yinghaoguo@huawei.com |
| Nokia | Sunyoung Lee | sunyoung.lee@nokia.com |
| Samsung | Weiping Sun | wp.son@samsung.com |
| OPPO | Zhe Fu | fuzhe@OPPO.com |
| Fujitsu | Sue Yi | yisu@fujitsu.com |
| Sharp | Sangkyu Baek | baeks@sharplabs.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3. Open issues from PDCP CR (R2-2506337)

Companies are invited to list their identified open issues, using comment identifier (company ID and number), e.g. LGE001.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Comment identifier | Section | Open issue description |
| H001 | 3.1 | We still think that it is good to align with the definition with the procedure text for non-delay-reporting PDCP SDU, and disagree with the resolution below :    The change can be just as follow :  **Non-delay-reporting PDCP SDU**: a non-delay-reporting PDCP SDU associated with the *DSR-ReportingThreshold* is a PDCP SDU that will be transmitted prior to any of the delay-reporting PDCP SDUs associated with the i:th *DSR-ReportingThreshold* and that is not a delay-reporting or non-delay reporting PDCP SDU associated with any of the k:th *DSR-ReportingThreshold* where k<i.  [Rapporteur comment]  As already commented before, exclusion of non-delay-reporting is performed in procedure in 5.15. So, there is no issue with the current text. I also worry that if we change the definition, there may be unexpected issue brought up. Let me invite other companies views in the next section. |
| N001 | 5.16.1 | During the last review, we pointed out that one agreement seems to be missing from #131 meeting:  ***(RLC-12)*** *No special handling is needed in R19 for PDCP SN gap report during UE mobility. It can be left to UE implementation whether to re-send the gap report after HO.*  Rapportuer explained that this doesn’t need to be specified because we agreed on no additional handling. But our understanding is that, from the current specifiation, the UE cannot tell whether re-sending is even allowed (Rather it could understand that re-sending is not allowed). Thus, it needs to be specified in the clause 5.16.1 at least as a NOTE.  [Rapporteur comment]  As already commented before, there was no agreement to capture it in a NOTE. My understanding from the agreement is that there is no need to change the specification. Let me invite other companies views in the next section. |
| S001 | 3.1 | "i:th" is missing before the first "*DSR-ReportingThreshold*" in the definition of Non-delay-reporting PDCP SDU, or a clarification is appreciated if it is removed intentionally by a certain discussion that I've not noticed.  [OPPO] We share a similar view as Samsung. "i:th" would be added before the first "DSR-ReportingThreshold" in the definition of Non-delay-reporting PDCP SDU.  [Rapporteur comment]  Thanks. It is just a mistake, and should be corrected in the final version. No discussion is needed. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 4. Discussion on the identified open issues

Companies are invited to provide their views on the identified open issues.

**H001: Change the definition of “Non-delay-reporting PDCP SDU”**

**Non-delay-reporting PDCP SDU**: a non-delay-reporting PDCP SDU associated with the *DSR-ReportingThreshold* is a PDCP SDU that will be transmitted prior to any of the delay-reporting PDCP SDUs associated with the i:th *DSR-ReportingThreshold* and that is not a delay-reporting or non-delay reporting PDCP SDU associated with any of the k:th *DSR-ReportingThreshold* where k<i.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company name | Support H001? Y/N | Comment |
| Samsung | N | We didn't find technical issues with current CR in achieving the expected UE behavior. As Rapp mentioned, it is better to maintain current text to avoid any further issues that may arise otherwise. |
| OPPO | N | We do not see any technical issues by following the logic of the current CR, so we prefer to keep the spec as it is. |
| Fujitsu | See comment | We agree with the intention of H001. The issue on definition of non-delay-reporting PDCP SDU has been brought up several times in previous email discussions.  The issue with the current definition is that the non-delay-reporting PDCP SDUs associated with different reporting thresholds are not exclusive. For example, a non-delay-reportin PDCP SDU associated with i-th reporting thershold is also a non-delay-reporting PDCP SDU associated with (i+x)-th reporting thereshold. It relies on the procedural texts to remove the overlapping parts, which is not a good way for definition.  However we think Huawei’s proposal is not fully correct, since it involves self-reference (the first yellow part) in a definition.  We propose the following change to avoid the self-reference and also make the non-delay-reporting PDCP SDUs associated with different thresholds exclusive. The procedural texts can be simplified by the change:  **Non-delay-reporting PDCP SDU**: a non-delay-reporting PDCP SDU associated with the i:th *DSR-ReportingThreshold* is a PDCP SDU that will be transmitted prior to any of the delay-reporting PDCP SDUs associated with the i:th *DSR-ReportingThreshold* but after all delay-reporting PDCP SDUs associated with the i-1:th *DSR-ReportingThreshold,* and that is not a delay-reporting ~~or non-delay reporting~~ PDCP SDU associated with any of the k:th *DSR-ReportingThreshold* where k<=i. |
| Sharp | N | We failed to understand the technical issue. The current specified behavior seems to work well as intended. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**N001: Capture the agreement in #131bis in a NOTE**

***(RLC-12)*** *No special handling is needed in R19 for PDCP SN gap report during UE mobility. It can be left to UE implementation whether to re-send the gap report after HO.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company name | Support N001? Y/N | Comment |
| Samsung | N | It is already captured as an agreement in Chairnote, which seems enough. |
| OPPO | N | We tend to agree with Samsung. |
| Fujitsu | No strong view | Slightly prefer to follow the agreement, i.e., no change on the specification. |
| Sharp | Y | UE follows only what is written in the specification whereas the network has more freedom in the implementation. Without the note, our intepretation is that UE is not allowed to do so by the implementation. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 5. Summary