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# 1. Introduction

Per instruction from the chairlady, this document is to collect open issues identified for Rel-19 XR 38.321 CR. More specifically, please provide here open issues that were identified but not addressed during the running CR review phase or we expect to come from other WGs.

Please provide your input no later than **Friday September 19 18:00 UTC**. After the deadline, I will provide a draft CR for companies to review before submission. In addition, I will also identify issues that are difficult to resolve and should be discussed by contributions, if any, as suggested by the chairlady.

# 2. Contact information

Please provide your contact information in the table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Name** | **Email** |
| CATT | Hao Xu | xuhao@catt.cn |
| NEC | Yuhua | Yuhua.chen@emea.nec.com |
| Vivo | Chenli | Chenli5g@vivo.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3. Open issues

## 3.1 LCP

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Description of open issues** |
| NEC | The applied priority (either *additionalpriority* or *priority*) of a LCH is currently determined at the time when UE process a grant for a new transmission. With the limit time budget to prepare a new transmission, this would potentially stress the online processing time at UE. As same as for Bj handling, we think it is possible and beneficial to maintain the applied priority (*additionalpriority* or *priority*) of a logical channel along the time with the buffer situation changes. Basically, we propose to move out the description on determining the applied priority from section 5.4.3.1.3 “The MAC entity shall, when a new transmission is performed” branch, place this description to the section above, and section 5.4.3.1.3 could remain unchanged, with the understanding “priority” means the determined “applied priority”[Rapp] To determine whether an LCH has priority adjustable PDCP SDUs, there are two possible options (for the sake of discussion I am not going to cover all configuration scenarios below):* Option A. UE checks if an LCH is eligible for priority adjustment when it receives a UL grant for new transmission, as specified in the current spec. This option is performed only when there is a scheduled PUSCH transmission, because the transmission time of this PUSCH is used as the reference by UE to calculate the remaining time of SDUs.
* Option B. At any point in time (even when there is no PUSCH scheduled), UE can check if there is a PDCP SDU whose remaining time is less than the priority adjustment threshold. If it is true, then the LCH can be considered for priority adjustment from this point on. No additional checks (including these steps) are necessary. Otherwise, UE still has to perform Option A if an LCH is not eligible for priority adjustment right before it receives a UL grant.

As you may see from the above, Option A alone is sufficient, whereas Option B requires UE to implement Option A too. The rapporteur therefore thinks that a good approach is to specify Option A in normative text and leave Option B to UE implementation. And we can follow the convention that if something is not specified in the spec, it is up to UE implementation. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 3.2 DSR

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Description of open issues** |
| CATT | In RAN2#130 meeting, the below agrrement was reached:[UE Cap-1] From UE capability signalling perspective, no need to have the pre-requisite for the capability of Rel-19 DSR.That is to say, a R19 UE who is support of R19 DSR may not need to support R18 DSR. But in the current 38.321 spec, there is one case who is controversy with the above agreement.In R2-2506349, 5.4.9 Delay status reportingIf there is at least one DSR pending, the MAC entity shall:1> if UL-SCH resources are available for a new transmission:2> if at least one LCG is configured with *dsr-ReportingThresList* and the UL-SCH resources can accommodate the Multiple Entry DSR MAC CE as specified in clause 6.1.3.72 plus its subheader as a result of logical channel prioritization:3> instruct the Multiplexing and Assembly procedure to generate the Multiple Entry DSR MAC CE as specified in clause 6.1.3.72;2> else if none of the LCG(s) is configured with *dsr-ReportingThresList* and the UL-SCH resources can accommodate the Single Entry DSR MAC CE as specified in clause 6.1.3.72 plus its subheader as a result of logical channel prioritization:3> instruct the Multiplexing and Assembly procedure to generate the Single Entry DSR MAC CE as specified in clause 6.1.3.72;2> else if there is no pending SR already triggered by the DSR procedure for the same logical channel as of this DSR:3> trigger a Scheduling Request;1> else if there is no pending SR already triggered by the DSR procedure for the same logical channel as of this DSR:2> trigger a Scheduling Request.NOTE 1: The availability of UL-SCH resources for the transmission of a DSR MAC CE follows the same critieria specified in clause 5.4.5.We assume that the UE and gNB are all R19 DSR function supported. The concerned case is the gNB didn’t configure the *dsr-ReportingThresList* for any LCG(s)*,* under this case and with the current specification, the green marked part will be carried out which implies that for the current R19 DSR supported UE should also need to support R18 DSR function(then it can follow the procedure to generate the Single Entry DSR MAC CE which is bound to R18 DSR capability). [Rapp] In RAN2#129, the following agreement was made: *If UE is configured to use R19 DSR, then any LCG with a triggering threshold shall be configured with at least one reporting threshold.*Therefore, if a UE indicates support of R19 DSR, the network **shall** configure at least one reporting threshold for any LCG configured with DSR. The case of concern to you, i.e. an LCG has a triggering threshold but no reporting thresholds, can happen only with a UE that supports only R18 DSR. For this reason, the rapporteur thinks the current spec (38.321) is correct. If you think the above agreement should be formally captured in some way, I’d suggest you ask the RRC rapporteur if he is willing to capture it in some field description.  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 3.3 UL Rate control

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Description of open issues** |
| vivo | In section 5.18.x, it states that “A bit rate query remains pending after being triggered, until it is cancelled.”.We think in some cases, UE may cancel the pending bit rate query by its implementation. For example, the pending query waits for a very long time and becomes outdated, leading that UE intends not to send it anymore. The current description may limit the UE implementation, so we suggest to remove this sentence or the later half sentence “until it is cancelled”. |
| vivo | As UL rate control is used to handle the congestion case, after congestion relief, it is better to increase the UL bit rate to guarantee the UE experience. Comparing the NW side, the UE application layer has more information to determine the appropriate adjustment of the UL rate control, it would be preferable to allow the UE to send the corresponding rate control query information after congestion relief. Thus, in the case of congestion relief, the gNB should inform the UE as early as possible, so that the service bit rate for the application could be increased to meet the required QoS. In our understanding, one specific codepoint of bit rate (i.e., Index 0) could be defined for the case of congestion relief; upon receiving DL Rate Control MAC CE indicating this codepoint for a QoS flow from the network, the UE can consider that the network allows rate query about such QoS flow, and therefore can send the UL Rate Control MAC CE regarding this QoS flow and (re-)start the prohibit timer, if any. |
| vivo | In section 6.1.3.x, for the description of Fi, the index may vary for UL rate control and UL rate query due to the independent configuration for supported QoS flows as specified in RRC. In order to make the description clearer and more direct, we suggest describing rate control and rate control query separately to avoid misunderstanding.Similar issue also in 6.2.1, two MAC CEs for DL-SCH and UL-SCH are named the same. Follow the legacy description, we also see clearer if we name the UL-SCH MAC CE with “UL Rate Control Query”. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 3.4 Other

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Description of open issues** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 4. Summary

Based on the discussion above, the following is a list of open issues that will not be addressed in the CR. Instead companies should discuss them by contributions to the RAN2#131bis meeting.

(To be filled, if needed)