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# Introduction

The discussion handles:

* [Post111-e][903][eIAB] Topology adaptation enhancements RAN2 scope (Qualcomm)

Scope: Aim to clarify the scope. Determine which technical issues to address in RAN2 as a part of this WI objective. Identify and clarify driving scenario(s). Determine work split R2 R3 when / if applicable.

Intended Outcome: Report

Deadline: long

The email discussion has two parts.

* Part 1: Identification of enhancement candidates to be handled by RAN2 under the topology adaptation topic. **Deadline: Sept 30, 23:59 PT**.
* Part 2: Clarification, consolidation, down-scoping of candidate features. **Deadline: Oct 16, 23:59 PT**.

As a reminder, the WID includes the following objectives on topology adaptation enhancements [1]:

|  |
| --- |
| *Topology adaptation enhancements [RAN3-led, RAN2]:*   * *Specification of procedures for inter-donor IAB-node migration to enhance robustness and load-balancing, including enhancements to reduce signalling load.* * *Specification of enhancements to reduce service interruption due to IAB-node migration and BH RLF recovery.* * *Specification of enhancements to topological redundancy, including support of CP/UP separation.* |

The Annex further includes agreements from last RAN3 meeting (R3#109e) on the topology adaptation enhancements topic.

# Phase I: Identification of enhancement candidates

## Purpose/benefit of enhancement

Before discussing specific features for topology adaptation enhancements, we need to converge on what these features are supposed to accomplish, e.g., if they aim to support an additional use case, improve on a specific performance indicator, etc.

In the further discussion (below), we will evaluate if and how well each feature proposed can meet/achieve at least one of these purposes/benefits.

**Q0: Please provide your company’s views on the main purposes/benefits to be expected from topology adaptation enhancements**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Kyocera | We think Rel-17 should provide more robust IAB operations under uncertain BH link quality, such as the frequent shadowing in mmWave and/or the mobile IAB. |
| LG | Main purposes/benefits of topology adaptation enhancements should be:   * Reducing recovery time and Minimizing service interruption time incurred by BH RLF. * Increasing reliability thorough path diversity |
| Huawei | This is for topology update due to some IAB node located in the cell edges of two donors.  BTW, the purposes is clear from the WID itself, including service interruption reduction, robustness, topology redundancy, etc. So, any enhancement aligned with the WID scope can be discussed below in this email for R17. |
| samsung | In our understanding, this feature has the following purposes and benefits:   * Load balance among different IAB nodes/IAB donor DUs/IAB donor CUs * Improve the robustness of backhaul links served by the IAB node * Reduce the data transmission interruption due to channel status degradation or backhaul link failure * Improve the reliability of control plane signalling |
| Ericsson | Related to topology adaptation enhancements, we believe that the main purposes for Rel.17 should be load balancing, especially when inter-CU migration is in focus. Intra-CU load balancing is already possible in Rel.16, but how to realize that in inter-CU framework should be studied by RAN2/RAN3. Increased robustness can also be considered, even though RLF should be a rare even in a static IAB network, especially in inter-CU scenarios.  RAN2 has a lot of discussion to address RLF enhancements for inter-CU case. However, these aspects need to be considered:   * IAB deployments will only happen in specific scenarios * It will be rare that in these specific scenarios, some cells are under the control of two distinct CUs * CUs are not dimensioned to carry own traffic plus neighbors cells, especially for IABs which may aggregate lots of traffic. * RLFs can be mainly avoided by proper planning * Considering all these aspects, enhancements for RLF in inter-CU scenarios will be unlikely to be implement as the scenario as such (RLF + inter-CU) will be an extremely rare case.   Load balancing may make more sense and it would be reasonable to study load balancing solution which may also address the RLF case. But aiming at RLF-only solutions should be avoided. |
| Intel | The main purposes to improve topology adaptation can be included into following aspects: 1) improve topology adaptation efficiency considering channel quality, RSRP, etc 2) improve robustness during topology adaptation, such as packet loss, etc 3) latency reduction in topology adaptation and recovery procedures |
| vivo | The main purpose is to support one IAB node and its downstream nodes fully/partially migrate from a CU network to another CU network.  At the meantime, we shall:   1. Reduce service interruption in case of inter-CU migration; 2. Reduce the signalling storm for migration. |
| ZTE | Topology adaptation enhancements are expected to enhance robustness in R17 IAB. For example, the radio link quality in the backhaul link deteriorate due to blockage, then IAB node could perform migration procedure to avoid BH link radio failure and to ensure service continuity.  With regard to load balance, it could be achieved by some other methods, e.g. topology redundancy via dual connectivity, multi-path routing, UE handover, etc. |
| Sony | Minimize interruption time and improve topology robustness. |
| KDDI | We think that the three objectives mentioned in the WID are thoroughly covered by the following individual topics(2.2.1-2.2.15). But one missing issue /use case to be addressed is IAB specific cell priority on the RLF recovery. We may want to have some IAB unique cell selection criteria regarding which donor IAB should be prioritized. If there is no enhancement on priority handling then an IAB node which can get a higher RSRP from the nearest IAB node might end up to connected to a donor which is further away, or some IAB nodes which can receive higher RSRPs from donors might not be able to join the network because of access limitations/congestion and end up connected to a parent IAB node that is further away. |
| CATT | Regards to topology adaptation enhancements‎, we think the main purpose is to deal with the issues on mobile IAB use case, for example, procedures for inter-donor IAB-node migration, reducing service interruption due to IAB-node migration and BH RLF recovery‎.  Besides that topology redundancy via dual connectivity can be also discussed to improve the robustness of IAB network. |
| Sharp | Our understanding is the same as LG and Sony. |
| Futurewei | It seems this question should have been addressed when the objectives of the WI were defined. Our understanding is that the WID has already defined the purpose/benefits of topology adaptation as enhancing robustness and load balancing via inter-donor IAB-node migration, reduction of service interruption due to BH RLF, and improve robustness of CP signalling via enhanced support for CP/UP separation.  Unfortunately, the protocol stack selected in Rel. 16 for BH transport is quite brittle, and not at all well suited for inter-donor mobility/migration primarily due to the inclusion of an unnecessary IP layer. |
| AT&T | At a high level, the motivation for topology adaptation enhancements stems from the need to achieve:   * 1. Robustness via topological redundancy, which includes the ability to support control plane and user plane via different paths and the ability to migrate IAB nodes from one donor to another.   2. Service efficiency by reducing the amount of signaling load and service interruption time when performing migration of IAB nodes. |
| Apple | Ensuring reliable links and connectivity along with assurance of latency is for us the objective of this WI. We believe that both are complementary. Adapting topology to ensure both these metrics are met in cases of link failures, unexpected congestions, network loads and # of hops to donor together should make up topology adaptations WI. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We think that the main purpose/benefit is the reduction of the service interruption to the UE due to the blockage or a failure of an IAB node’s backhaul link, considering also IAB nodes at donor-coverage borders. |

**Summary:**

This discussion is only on the purposes/benefits related to topology adaptation enhancements. Some proposals included technical solutions (e.g. “…using XYZ technique”), which are not considered here.

The following purpose/benefits were identified:

Robustness

* This includes robustness against RLF, e.g., as caused by rapid shadowing
* It includes aspects related to physical IAB-node mobility that cause backhaul link changes in analogue manner as rapid shadowing. Since the support for IAB-node mobility is not explicitly captured as a separate objective in the WID, we cannot define features that solely serve to support IAB-node mobility.

Reduced service interruption

* This includes reduction in RLF recovery time and service interruption due to other topology adaptation procedures.
* It further includes reduction in packet loss and latency due to topology adaptation procedures and RLF recovery.

Load balancing

* This includes load balancing among different IAB-nodes, IAB-donor-DUs and IAB-donor-CUs.

Reduction of signaling load

* This refers to signaling load related to topology adaptation

**The rapporteur’s view:** We will consider all of these purposes/benefits for the following discussion on enhancements.

**Proposal 0: Consider enhancements to topology adaptation that improve:**

* **Robustness, e.g., to rapid shadowing,**
* **service-interruption,**
* **load balancing among different IAB-nodes IAB-donor-DUs and IAB-donor-CUs, and**
* **reduction in signaling load.**

## Candidates for enhancements

This subsection aims to identify candidates for topology adaptation enhancements. We start with candidates that were discussed during Rel-16, in contributions to R2#111e, and/or in the last RAN3 meeting (R3#109). At the end of this subsection, further candidate enhancements can be proposed.

Each candidate should be evaluated with respect to:

* **Purpose/benefit**. It should be assessed which of the above purposes/benefits (section 2.1) are addressed by the candidate and how effective the enhancement is in that respect.
* **Technical solution**. The solution may be obvious for some enhancements, but it may need more discussion for others. At this stage, the description should establish a rough baseline. Discussion on details, optimization, etc can follow later.
* **Potential shortcomings**.Some features may have great benefits but also significant shortcomings. It is important to understand this trade-off.
* **Specification effort**. This will be a coarse estimate. It should also be identified, which WGs have to be involved.

The discussion rapporteur has allowed himself to provide guidance, i.e., emphasize where clarification is needed for an enhancement, or elaborate on where and how RAN3 has already made progress.

### 2.2.1 CHO

Proposed by R2-2006626, R2-2006967, R2-2007167, R2-2007501, R2-2007863, R2-2008025, R2-2008026, comment by RAN3 chairman

RAN3 chairman added to notes:

**CHO should be supported for IAB-MT.**

Chair: unless excluded, normally current functionality is applicable

**Q1: Please provide your views on purpose/benefit, technical solution, potential shortcomings and specification effort for this enhancement candidate.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Kyocera | We assume CHO can be used for IAB as it is, from Rel-16.  In case of BH RLF in Rel-16, however, cell selection for RRC Reestablishment is triggered, but CHO is only executed when the IAB-MT selects a cell that is in the CHO configuration. In addition, CHO is never triggered if the BH RLF happens at the parent node, since the radio condition of BH link at the concerned IAB-node is still good.  We think more deterministic behaviour for full utilization of CHO is desirable for Rel-17 eIAB and assume it could be solved by a new triggering condition for CHO, e.g., upon reception of BH RLF Indication. |
| LG | CHO is a useful way to reduce recovery time upon occurrence of BH problems. However, it should be noted that it is completely unknown when the conditional mobility actually occur and hence preparation should be done for many UEs. |
| Huawei | Agree to support CHO for R17 IAB-MT;  **Purpose/benefit**: migration robustness  **Technical solution**: reuse R16 CHO for UE  **Potential shortcomings**: some minor standard efforts  **Specification effort**: To discuss the behaviour of child MT/UE upon CHO for parent node. |
| Samsung | * Purpose/benefit: This is straightforward to be supported. CHO is responsible to reliability enhancement. NR frequency could be vulnerable and CHO can recover this. Since single CU can handle the resource management for different IAB node as the target cell, there is less complexity of CHO in IAB case than normal UE’s CHO where inter node signalling is necessary. * Technical solution: IAB MT can be configured for the condition to excute CHO to predefined IAB parent node, and upon condition met IAB MT will execute CHO without signalling. * Potential shortcomings: We don’t see any potential short coming since already this is supported by normal UE.   Specification effort: Almost same solution as the normal UE can be applied, so not difficult to specify this further. |
| Ericsson | CHO can be considered already supported for Rel.16. However, if the intention is to enhance CHO functionalities for the sake of IAB networks, e.g. to make it more robust in case of RLF, we are a skeptical.  CHO has been designed in Rel.16 to make mobility more robust. In CHO, the UE does not need to wait for an HO command to trigger the HO. Rather, the UE itself can trigger an HO when certain conditions configured by the network, i.e. A3/A5 events, are fulfilled. One critical aspect of CHO is that the source cell should prepare one or more target cells well in advance before the actual HO is triggered at the UE side.  Since IAB nodes are not moving, it is certainly not reasonable for a source CU to prepare a target DU/CU for an undefined amount of time, just for the sake of an RLF that in this type of network will likely occur very rarely. |
| Intel | We support CHO functionality should be considered for IAB-MT to reduce service interruption during both intra-CU and inter-CU migration. However, some modification may be considered in IAB scenario, especially IAB node with multiple parent nodes. |
| vivo | Conditional handover has the following benefits/purposes:   * Guide an IAB node to find a proper new parent IAB node in case of RLF occurrence; * Reduce the service interruption in case of RLF by quickly moving to the preconfigured target parent IAB node using CHO command; * Avoid signalling storm for IAB network to migrate from a CU to another CU compared to traditional handover procedure;   For CHO handover of an IAB node from a CU to another CU, we shall consider that the IAB node and its downstream nodes migrates together from the source CU network to the target CU network. The detail procedure is FFS. |
| ZTE | We generally think CHO can be supported in R17 eIAB to reduce service interruption. The migrating IAB-MT can perform the CHO procedure as R16 UE. It is suggested to reuse legacy CHO procedure without additional specification enhancement. |
| Sony | We think CHO is beneficial in terms of minimizing interruption time and improving topology robustness. CHO candidate cells may be configured in good radio conditions to provide a separate path. |
| KDDI | First we have to discuss whether we can have some enhancements on this area. Potentially we can have a mechanism for conditional routing, the mechanism enables the CU to configure multiple BAP configurations and multiple BH routing configurations( may be configured by F1-AP) which are activated in the configured radio conditions or event X. If we agree to have such an enhancement, then next we can discuss configurations (what the CU can multiple configures) and conditions ( when the IAB node activates one configuration of multiple pre-configured configurations) |
| CATT | We think it is straightforward to support CHO for R17 IAB-MT;  **Purpose/benefit**: migration robustness and reduce interruption  **Technical solution**: R16 CHO can be as baseline  **Potential shortcomings**: some minor standard efforts  **Specification effort**: whether/how to additional enhancements on CHO on IAB-MT, whether/how CHO can be used for intra-CU and intre-CU migration and the behaviour of child MT/UE upon CHO for parent node. |
| Sharp | We think the CHO mechanism in Rel-16 can be used as a baseline. The enhancement possibly needed for Rel-17 may be a procedure upon receiving an RLF notification from a parent node while CHO is configured, as pointed out by Kyocera. |
| Futurewei | Our understanding is quite similar to the view expressed by E///, in that CHO can be considered to already be supported for Rel. 16.  One concern, as raised by E/// above, is that the effectiveness of CHO is dependent on pre-preparation of target cells with MT context. This may warrant some optimization of signalling/procedures for the inter-CU case. Which seems to be within the scope of RAN3 to consider. |
| AT&T | CHO may be used to provide robustness and reduction of service interruption. R16 CHO features should be used as the baseline. Additional enhancements for IAB-MT should be evaluated based on trade-off between expected benefit and specification effort. |
| Apple | We believe that the current R16 CHO is sufficient for IAB unless specific cases are identified. Adapting R16 baseline may help improve reliability on the IAB nodes. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We think that CHO has potential for preventing failures of IAB MT handovers and thus, reduce the interruption time on the UE side due to potential IAB MT failures.  The main scenario we consider is the IAB nodes located at donor-coverage borders. In this case CHO could greatly improve the service interruption time. |

**Support:** All companies supported CHO for IAB-MT. Many companies emphasize that IAB-specific modifications need to be considered.

**Purpose/benefit**:

* Robustness through avoidance of HO failure.
* Improvement of service interruption for RLF recovery.

**Technical solution**:

* Rel-16 CHO can be used as baseline. The following IAB-specific aspects or enhancements were proposed:
  + Preparation of descendant nodes/UEs
  + Consideration of different conditions for HO execution
  + Preparation of routing for candidate cells

**Potential shortcomings**: No shortcomings were identified.

**Specification effort**: Dependent on enhancements needed over baseline.

**The rapporteur’s view:** The benefit is obvious and there is a lot of support. RAN2 should work on the IAB-specific modifications.

**Proposal 1: Rel-16 CHO is supported for IAB-MT as baseline; IAB-specific enhancements should be considered.**

### 2.2.2 DAPS

Proposed by R2-2006626, R2-2007501, R2-2007863

Please include aspects such as:

* If DAPS would be used for reduced interruption time of MT handover or to create a prolonged state of topological redundancy between source and parent nodes.
* If and how intra-frequency handover would be supported for FR1 and/or FR2. How resource allocation would be managed during handover between multi-vendor nodes.

**Q2: Please provide your views on purpose/benefit, technical solution, potential shortcomings and specification effort for this enhancement candidate.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Kyocera | We don’t have strong view, but be wondering what DAPS means for IAB, e.g., since there is no PDCP layer in intermediate IAB-nodes on multi-hop relaying path. |
| LG | Not prefer to include DAPS for IAB.  DAPS has been specified for 0ms user plane data interruption, and the PDCP has an important role as an anchor point in DAPS. However, there is a BAP entity and no PDCP entity for forwarded user plane data in the intermediate IAB nodes. If it is determined to support DAPS in IAB node, the current DAPS mechanism would not be a baseline and huge RAN2 and RAN3 (maybe RAN1 as well) work are expected. |
| Huawei | Agree to support DAPS for R17 IAB-MT;  **Purpose/benefit**: supporting the DAPS of migrating IAB-MT can reduce the service interruption of this IAB node. Also it provides the simultaneous connections with both source and target donor. At least, we can support the inter-frequency HO with DAPS. We can further discuss the intra-frequency case after R1 finalize the support of intra-frequency DC for IAB.  **Technical solution**: reuse R16 DAPS for UE  **Potential shortcomings**: N/A  **Specification effort**: Minor, if we only support the DAPS of migrating IAB-MT. |
| Samsung | DAPS is a misleading word here. The main purpose of this solution is to allow IAB-MT to keep the connection with the source path while performing the migration. Thus, the data transmission can be kept with source path until the source path is ready. We propose to call this solution as “DAPS”-like solution.   * **Purpose/benefit**: it can reduce the interruption time since the IAB-MT can use the source path for data transmission until the target path is ready. * **Technical solution**: during the IAB node migration procedure, the IAB-MT can keep the connection with its source parent node. Thus, the data transmission can be continuously performed before the target path is ready. * **Shortcomings:**   We didn’t see very explicit shortcomings. One concern from our side is that how to keep the UL transmission at the source path. In Rel-16 DAPS, the UL transmission at the source is stopped after success RACH. However, in IAB, we may need keep UL transmission at the source path even after success RACH. As a network node, we think keeping such capability may not be a problem. Anyway, we can discuss the details about this after confirming this “DAPS”-like solution in Rel-17.   * **Specification efforts:**   In our understanding, the normal IAB migration procedure (without considering any enhancements on, e.g., interruption reduction, signalling overhead reduction, etc) will be the baseline when we determine the specification effort. Thus, on top of the normal IAB migration procedure, such “DAPS”-like solution would not cause too much specification effort. The additional enhancements may include, e.g., configure to IAB node on keeping the BAP related configuration at the source path, release the source path after target path is ready, etc.  For intra-frequency handover, we need consider this issue. However, in Rel-16, DAPS also face the same problem. Thus, we need first look at the solutions used in Rel-16 DAPS, and then decide if further enhancements are needed or not. |
| Ericsson | We are skeptical about the usage of DAPS in IAB, at least if the Rel.16-type of dual active protocol stack is considered here.  As mentioned by LG and Kyocera, DAPS works at PDCP level, so how to make it work at BAP level might require significant amount of work. Additionally, DAPS is mainly intended to enforce the DL. In fact, while the dual DL from source and target cell can be kept until the target releases the source cell configuration, the UE can only perform UL UP communications with the target cell after HO successful completion. Given the above reasons, we foresee that non-trivial standardization work might be needed to make DAPS suitable for IAB. |
| Intel | We think it needs FFS on how DAPS can be used for IAB-MT handover |
| vivo | DAPS has the following disadvantages:   * Even if DAPS is to be used for an IAB node, it means DAPS has to be used for each of its downstream nodes as well to ensure data transmission robustness. However, a downstream node may only have single radio connection, which makes DAPS not configurable for this downstream node. * DAPS is only applicable for DRB while DRB for IAB-MT is optional feature at this time;   If DAPS is to be used, enhancements are needed so that DAPS can be supported for each migration node in the migration network, which seems very complex, if not impossible. |
| ZTE | We generally think DAPS can be supported in R17 eIAB. With DAPS, IAB-MT may perform DL reception from source parent DU and the target parent DU simultaneously after receiving the HO command, so that service interruption time could be reduced during handover. In addition, we may start with the inter-frequency DAPS handover in Rel-17. The intra-frequency support may be further discussed if it’s decided to include this scenario in Rel-17 IAB. |
| Sony | We don’t see the benefits of DAPS for IAB, considering the specification efforts. |
| KDDI | It would be helpful to have a clarification on this topic, e.g. what does the DAPS mean to and how are we aiming to |
| CATT | We think DAPS is not a correct word here, since there is no PDCP layer in IAB-MT. The main purpose of this solution is to allow IAB-MT to keep the connections with both of the source path and target path during migration. Thus, we think this “dual paths” solution can be discussed in R17 IAB.  **Purpose/benefit**: To reduce interruption during migration, which is an important issues in R17 IAB enhancement.  **Technical solution**: To allow IAB-MT to connect with both of the source path and target path during migration.  **Potential shortcomings**: whether/how to achieve this “dual paths” solution for intra-CU migration.  **Specification effort**: We can first discuss the normal procedure of inter-CU migration. Then this “dual paths” solution can be discussed further as an enhancement. |
| Sharp | As pointed out by some other companies, DAPS may not work in a straightforward way due to PDCP. Major surgeries on the specification may not be justified. |
| Futurewei | DAPS (or a DAPS-like solution per SS) seems promising to address the WID’s first sub-objective of Topology Adaptation Enhancements, as it could certainly fulfil the aim of enhanced robustness. It might be particularly useful for the case of load balancing, when the IAB-node migration is under direct control of the network (as opposed to BH RLF recovery).  As far as specification effort, this seems quite manageable from a RAN2 perspective. If there is any RAN3 impacts at all, they are likely to be very minor. |
| AT&T | Some clarification is needed on what DAPS means in this context. We should assess specification impact before deciding to specify a solution. |
| Apple | We agree with some of the others and don’t see any benefit with DAPS for IAB. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We think that DAPS gain may be too small for the main scenario considered, where IAB nodes are located at donor-coverage borders and inter-CU handover may be expected due to blockage or failure of the backhaul link. That is because: a likely scenario is the connection to the source disappears quickly due to the backhaul blockage and then Dual Access with DAPS won’t be feasible. Given the shortcomings, benefit of DAPS would be quite limited.  On the other hand, CHO may provide notable gains thanks to early preparation of the handover. |

**Summary:**

**Support:**

5 companies expressed favorable views for DAPS, 7 companies unfavorable, 4 companies ask for more clarifications or are undecided.

Several companies believe that clarification is needed on what DAPS means for BH RLC channels since it is presently only defined for PDCP connections.

**Purpose/benefit**:

* The principal benefit is the reduction of interruption time.
* Some companies point out that this benefit presently only applies to inter-frequency handover. Since last RAN Plenary meeting could not agree to support intra-frequency NR DC in Rel-17 IAB, it is unlikely that intra-frequency DAPS will be supported for Rel-17 IAB.
* There is presently no support for (inter-frequency) FR2-FR2 DAPS which further reduces the potential benefit.
* The benefit further needs to be compared to other interruption time contributions which are significant.

**Technical solution**: DAPS needs to be extended to BH RLC channels.

**Potential shortcomings**: Not obvious at present stage.

**Specification effort**: Many companies claim that the specification effort is significant.

**The rapporteur’s view:**

The rapporteur believes that the term *Dual Active Protocol Stack* is well applicable to IAB, even though it is not used for PDCP connections. Rel-16 IAB uses the term *NR DC* for backhaul even though it primarily applies to BH RLC channels rather than DRBs. It is obvious that DAPS might need modifications when applied to IAB.

Since the benefit of DAPS is rather limited, the specification effort is considered significant, and the majority of companies does not support the effort, it is proposed to deprioritize DAPS for backhaul.

**Proposal 2: DAPS is deprioritized for backhaul.**

### 2.2.3 CP redundancy via separate NR access link

Agreed by RAN3.

This enhancement defines the analogue of F1-C routing via LTE/X2 for standalone, i.e., for IAB-nodes that use NR-DC instead of EN-DC.

RAN3 agreed on the following functionality:

**Consider Scenario 1 and 2 for CP/UP separation:**

**Scenario 1: F1-C via M-NG-RAN node (non-donor node) + F1-U via S-NG-RAN node (donor node)**

**Scenario 2: F1-U via M-NG-RAN node (donor node) + F1-C via S-NG-RAN node (non-donor node)**

Please capture the RAN2-related aspects for this enhancement.

**Q3: Please provide your views on purpose/benefit, technical solution, potential shortcomings and specification effort for this enhancement candidate.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Kyocera | We think the CP redundancy in NR-DC is beneficial to be introduced as the same gain considered in EN-DC IAB. We assume it would be specified with the same solution with what Rel-16 did for EN-DC IAB, i.e., F1 container in RRC message. |
| LG | Not prefer to discuss this issue in this email discussion and want to wait more RAN3 progress.  It’s too early to figure out clearly what the RAN3 identified issue and we also think it is not urgent from RAN2 point of view and the RAN2 discussion/conclusion may be different depending on RAN3 decision/progress. Thus, we would like to discuss other RAN2 originated issues first, which are based on the contributions submitted in the last RAN2 meeting and it would be better to wait RAN3 progress on it and then RAN2 can start to discuss this issue based on more concrete RAN3 conclusion/progress. |
| Huawei | Not support the scenario 1 and 2  **Purpose/benefit**: We supported the EN-DC case in R16. If we want to support the F1-C on FR1 but F1-U on FR2, we can also reuse the NR-DC in R16, with F1-C on one FR1 BH path while F1-U on another FR2 BH path. We need to clarify if any purpose/benefit is not supported in R16.  For the new deployment case, where F1-C is on the non-backhaul NR link of FR1, we are not sure if this is explicitly under WID scope. “support of CP/UP separation” is in the scope, which is already supported by R16. But “CP redundancy via separate NR access link” may require the update of WID.  **Technical solution**: reuse R16 F1-C over LTE (only if the scenario is agreed by R2)  **Potential shortcomings**: less benefits but require new discussion.  **Specification effort**: This may also open more discussion on how IAB-MT integrates in the NR-DC with non-backhaul MN. |
| Samsung | * Purpose/benefit: This can ensure the reliability of control signalling. for scenario 1, it has the same benefit as in ENDC case, i.e., has more reliability on controlling F1-C. for scenario 2, it is also effective to have more reliability of control signalling if different FR is used with ENDC. * Technical solution: as described by rapporteur * Potential shortcoming: * Specification effort: we can take ENDC case as the baseline scheme. The specification impact would not be too much. The details can be further discussed later. |
| Ericsson | We don’t have a strong opinion on this topic but RAN2 should first wait for RAN3 progress. |
| Intel | We agree with RAN3’s agreement. |
| vivo | Of the two enhancement candidates we see Scenario 1 is meaningful. It helps improve the signalling robustness, e.g. when MN is macro gNB and micro gNB can provide high data rate over SN link.  Good use cases need to be found for Scenario 2.  Maybe we should wait for further RAN3 progress |
| ZTE | These two scenarios are similar to the F1-C over LTE scenario discussed in R16 IAB.  In R16 IAB, RAN2 discussed how to transfer F1-C traffic over LTE Uu interface. It was agreed to encapsulate F1-C traffic in LTE RRC. SRB2 is used for transporting the F1-C traffic  Similarly, In R17 IAB, RAN2 may consider how to transmit the F1-C traffic over NR Uu interface, the design of protocol stack. The solution of R16 F1-C over LTE can be reused as much as possible. |
| Sony | We think CP redundancy can improve the topology robustness and need to wait RAN3’s progress on this. |
| KDDI | We are fine to discuss this redundancy aspect, and let us share our considerations for use cases and its requirement below.  We think that 2.2.3 and 2.2.4 should be discussed together. With the following figure, we can consider the following use cases.  CU separation : (Leg1=F1-C, Leg2=F1-U) or (Leg1=F1-U, Leg2=F1-C)  U-plane redundancy: (F1-U on only Leg1) or (F1-U on only Leg2) or (F1-U on both Leg1 and Leg2)  C-plane redundancy: (F1-C on only Leg1) or (F1-C on only Leg2) or (F1-C on both Leg1 and Leg2)  Furthermore RAN2/3 may want to be tasked to design the above redundancy/CU split settings can be configured by the donor CU(maybe primary CU)  cid:image001.png@01D6972C.DE7C4690 |
| CATT | We wonder whether this scenario 1/2 is in the scope of R17 IAB WID. To specify scenario 1/2 may need more spec efforts. Due to the time limitation of R17, we don’t think there is enough time to enlarge the WID scope to support this scenario 1/2.  We need to wait until RAN3/RANP have a clear progress on this. |
| Sharp | Agree on waiting for RAN3 inputs. |
| Futurewei | Our understanding is that both scenarios 1 & 2 above can already be addressed with the existing Rel. 16 IAB solution. The only thing new here seems to be the designation of the gNB providing F1-C to the IAB node as a “non-donor” node.  As such, we think that before discussing such scenarios we need to first understand what functionality is lacking with the current Rel. 16 solution. If there is an issue that needs to be addressed, then we can discuss potential solutions. If there is no issue that is not addressed with the current solution, then we don’t see any value to add redundant solutions that do not provide new functionality. |
| AT&T | We are aligned with RAN3 agreement. CP redundancy via NR-DC can provide control plane robustness. The same principles as R16 solution for EN-DC should be reused here. |
| Apple | No strong opinion and can wait for RAN3 outcome to discuss further. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | For IAB in EN-DC, *dedicatedInfoF1AP* was introduced in DLInformationTransfer and ULInformationTransfer in36.331. Considering the RAN3 agreement on the CP redundancy, for NR-DC, we would need to define similar solution in 38.331 |

**Summary:**

**Support:** 7 companies expressed favorable views, 1 company unfavorable views, 7 companies believe that more progress needs to be made in RAN3.

**Purpose/benefit**: Same as for equivalent ENDC solution in Rel-16 (which is enhanced robustness).

**Technical solution**: Very close to equivalent ENDC solution in Rel-16.

**Potential shortcomings**: Nothing obvious.

**Specification effort**: Many companies claim that the specification effort is rather small.

**The rapporteur’s view:**

There is a lot of support for this feature. The benefit is obvious. The specification effort is believed to be rather small. The main question is if RAN3 should make more progress before RAN2 picks up.

RAN3 has already determined that the feature can be used, and it can be expected that they to do their part of the effort. Further, the specification can be expected straightforward since the functionality is very close to what RAN2 has already done for ENDC in Rel-16. It is therefore not clear why RAN2 would have to wait for RAN3. Instead, RAN2 should go ahead and do their part of the work.

**Proposal 3: RAN2 to support CP redundancy via separate NR access link.**

### 2.2.4 Redundancy via inter-donor NR-DC

Agreed by RAN3.

RAN3 agreed on the following functionality:

**Analyze Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 for inter-Donor Topology Redundancy, with the principle that an IAB-DU only have F1 interface with one Donor-CU:**

**Scenario 1: the IAB is multi-connected with 2 Donors.**

**Scenario 2: the IAB’s parent/ancestor node is multi-connected with 2 Donors.**

Please capture the RAN2-related aspects for this enhancement.

**Q4: Please provide your views on purpose/benefit, technical solution, potential shortcomings and specification effort for this enhancement candidate.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Kyocera | We’re wondering what the “multi-connected with 2 Donors” means from RAN2’s perspective, i.e., whether it’s a normal DC (single RRC connection) or an IAB-MT has dual RRC connections. |
| LG | Not prefer to discuss this issue in this email discussion and want to wait more RAN3 progress.  It’s too early to figure out clearly what the RAN3 identified issue and we also think it is not urgent from RAN2 point of view and the RAN2 discussion/conclusion may be different depending on RAN3 decision/progress. Thus, we would like to discuss other RAN2 originated issues first, which are based on the contributions submitted in the last RAN2 meeting and it would be better to wait RAN3 progress on it and then RAN2 can start to discuss this issue based on more concrete RAN3 conclusion/progress. |
| Huawei | We prefer to first identify the R2 impacts before we agree on any of those scenarios. We also prefer to discuss this later after we have some progress on the basic inter-CU migration procedure. Note that this was not agreed by R3 yet (it is only to **analyse**).  **Purpose/benefit**:  1) For the case of inter-CU migration, the service interruption reduction can be achieved. We need to finalize how the inter-CU migration procedure works before we agree on the support of the above two scenarios. It seems we already have sufficient interruption reduction with the agreed R3 cases “IAB-MT is simultaneously connected to two IAB-donors + IAB-DU is simultaneously connected to 2 donor-CUs”;  2) For the case of F1-U redundancy when there is no migration, this could bring the topology redundancy for the IAB node in the middle of two donors. Not sure if this is the common deployment.  **Technical solution**: To be discussed  **Potential shortcomings**: not clear on the benefits but require more standard impact and efforts.  **Specification effort**: How the BAP path/BH RLC under the target donor and the corresponding IAB nodes are controlled/configured by source donor requires significant discussion and spec impacts. |
| Samsung | - Purpose/benefit: there must be a physical boundary of a single donor CU due to the propagation delay and physical maintenance on connection between CU and IAB nodes. Therefore, in the border area of two different donor CUs, keep connection with two different donor CUs at IAB node seems reasonable for link vulnerability.  - technical solution: described by rapporteur  - potential shortcoming: any specific shortcoming found  - specification effort: in the initial estimate, not much since current RRC signalling on MRDC can be used for this i.e., separation of MN/SN is assumed. The main impact may be at RAN3. |
| Ericsson | The RAN3 agreement is too vague and can be interpreted in different ways. So, this makes it difficult for us to assess the RAN2-related aspects of this agreement. |
| Intel | We agree with RAN3’s agreement and RAN2 should consider redundancy enhancement of local routing and configuration maintenance of descendent IAB nodes during inter-donor NR-DC migration after RAN3 further progress. |
| vivo | This seems the scope of RAN3.  For scenario 1, the IAB node itself can perform local-rerouting according to preconfigured conditions.  For scenario 2, it is preferred that it can be achieved by means of local-rerouting of the parent/ancestor IAB nodes, i.e. the IAB node itself is transparent to path selection/rerouting of its parent/ancestor IAB nodes. |
| ZTE | RAN3 firstly discussed these two scenarios during last meeting. No more details were given. RAN2 is suggested to wait for more RAN3 progress before discussing the RAN2 impacts. |
| Sony | It’s better to clarify scenario 1 is from an IAB-MT or IAB-DU point of view. |
| KDDI | Please find our comment on 2.2.3 |
| CATT | We prefer to wait RAN3 progress on this issues. |
| Sharp | Agree on waiting for RAN3 inputs. |
| Futurewei | We tend to agree with E///, in that the statement of this RAN3 agreement seems to be very vague. The first statement talks about the IAB-DU having an F1 with one donor-CU, but subsequent description of the scenarios 1 & 2 talks about connectivity to 2 donors. It is not clear what the intent here. What is the exact meaning of a donor that does not have an F1 interface with the IAB node? This needs to be clarified before potential RAN2 impacts can be evaluated. |
| AT&T | We support Scenarios 1 and 2. However, additional discussions are needed regarding solutions to support these scenarios. |
| Apple | Agree with others that we should wait for more details from RAN3. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Considering the RAN3 agreement, we think that the solution and associated specification efforts are needed in the areas of BAP routing, for instance, BAP routing needs to be configured to an IAB node by different donors.  Also, in this scenario we think that the CU serving the access UE can be kept the same even if the routing happens via IAB nodes controlled by another CU. |

**Summary:**

**Support:** 3 companies expressed favorable views, 9 companies believe that more RAN3 work is needed, 4 companies do not understand the feature. One of the companies, who does not understand the feature, actually promoted it in RAN3. It was further pointed out by that RAN3 had not really agreed to support this feature but to rather analyze the above two scenarios. Some companies promoted specific technical solutions, e.g., such as local rerouting, which were not considered since they were out of scope.

**Purpose/benefit**: Robustness and fine-granular inter-donor load balancing. Note that only few companies addressed the potential benefit.

**Technical solution**: Many companies believe that more RAN3 work is needed. Coordination between both donors for transport and resource allocation between adjacent topologies is needed.

**Potential shortcomings**: Not clear without more detailed technical solution.

**Specification effort**: Not obvious in absence of further progress in RAN3.

**The rapporteur’s view:** There is no doubt that this feature is beneficial for robustness and load balancing. There are multiple technical issues related to coordination between both donors, which presently reside in the realm of RAN3. It therefore seems that RAN2 should wait for more progress in RAN3.

**Proposal 4: For redundancy via inter-donor NR-DC, RAN2 to wait for further progress by RAN3.**

### 2.2.5 Redundancy using routing via descendant nodes

Proposed by R2-2006967, R2-2007023, RAN3 agreement

RAN3 agreed that:

**Routing Enhancement via descendant node can be discussed later or after RAN2 decision.**

This enhancement aims to leverage route redundancy via a dual-connected descendant node, e.g., in case of upstream RLF.

Please include the following aspects:

* Applicability to CP vs. UP
* Conditions to use descendant-node path, e.g., only at upstream RLF or also for other reasons

**Q5: Please provide your views on purpose/benefit, technical solution, potential shortcomings and specification effort for this enhancement candidate.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Kyocera | In Rel-16, the IAB-node, experiencing upstream BH RLF, first tries RRC Reestablishment to the descendant node (if selected), and then it transmits UP data to the new parent. If Rel-17 still follows this principle, we think it ends up the enhancements of cell selection. The descendant node can be the candidate of cell selection unless its RRC connection (i.e. CP path) goes through the concerned IAB-node (i.e., the one experiencing BH RLF).  We need further clarification of the intended solution, if the intended solution aims to UP data transmissions/re-routing to the descendant node without RRC connection to the IAB-donor (i.e., it’s broken by upstream BH RLF). |
| LG | This requires complex operation unnecessarily. For example, the IAB node should know the descendant IAB node has a route to the intended destination IAB node in advance because if there is no path to the intended IAB node in the descendant node, the IAB node cannot use this descendant IAB node as redundancy. Furthermore, in Rel-17, two different IAB donors may be used to transmit CP/UP data. In this condition, if the descendant IAB node has a path to only one IAB donor, the IAB node should select packets which can be forwarded to the descendant IAB node. Another point is that when the routing configuration or channel condition is changed in the descendant IAB node, this information should be indicated to the parent IAB node to avoid unnecessary data forwarding from the parent IAB node. Given this aspects, we doubt whether there is much gain to overcome this complex and how frequently use this redundancy route. |
| Huawei | Agree to support this for both CP and UP. The condition to use this can be same as the R17 condition for local re-routing.  **Purpose/benefit**:  This is for service interruption reduction in case at least RLF, and for robustness, topology redundancy. This is to support the missing upstream topology redundancy in R16, where parent IAB node has no DC but child IAB node has DC.  **Technical solution**: allow IAB node forwards the upstream data to its child node in case at least for RLF. No need to change the topology between parent and child node. The backup BAP path via descendant node is configured by CU as ususal.  **Potential shortcomings**: N/A.  **Specification effort**: Minor or barely not spec impact. Some clarification in 38340 may be needed. |
| Samsung | First of all, this seems to be a sub category of mesh network that only UL broken triggers the detour. We first to check this topology can be agreed in RAN2.   * Purpose/benefit: route redundancy can be enhanced, and reduce the interruption time. * Technical solution: if UL RLF is detected, IAB finds alternative path using its child node * Potential shortcoming: every IAB node has to maintain this additional set of route information per UL path. Once topology has been changed, all the related route information also should be signalled to reflect the latest one. Also, packet those been rerouted can have uncontrolled delay. To resolve this, there should be a longevity metric for packet handling in each IAB node.   The method may cause a lot of impacts. For example, a topology is donor DU 🡪 IAB node 1 🡪 IAB node 3, and donor DU 🡪 IAB node 2 🡪 IAB node 3. If the RLF occurs between donor DU and IAB node 1, the re-routing path becomes IAB node 1 🡪 IAB node 3 🡪 IAB node 2 🡪 donor DU. In this re-routing path, IAB node 1 has to re-send the packets received from IAB node 3 back to IAB node 3, and then IAB node 3 resends the packets to IAB node 2. This causes the data transmission re-direction, i.e., IAB node 1 redirect its UL data to DL, and IAB node 3 redirects its DL data to UL. Is this redirection technically feasible currently? To achieve redirection, the BAP routing ID should be changed by IAB node, is this aligned with Rel-16 design?  In addition, this method may be only applicable for the case that such re-routing path is under the same donor DU, which restricts its benefit.  Considering the limited time unit, we think it is better to focus on the fundamental and important issues at this stage, and de-prioritize this scheme.  Specification effort: BAP spec needs to enhance this aspect, e.g., the BAP header change may be needed. Compared to the actual signalling between CU and each IAB node, the spec might not have much impact since CU is anyhow in charge of configuration of this info. However, the impact of data transmission redirection should be evaluated. |
| Ericsson | We agree with LG analysis. In our view, this enhancement will require significant specification effort without any real benefits. Thus, RAN2 should de-prioritize this topic. |
| Intel | It is not clear to us how to reuse descendant nodes in this case, 1) whether IAB-MT at parent node access to IAB-DU at child node (the previous child node is now parent node), or 2) previous upstream traffic is sent as downstream data to child node indicating it’s upstream data from parent node, and child node forwards the data via another existing path through another parent node. Comparing above two options, we prefer routing via descendant nodes can be further discussed within scope of option 2) for CP and UP. |
| vivo | It may not be the case that each IAB node in the IAB network knows the alternative ways to any donor IAB node in the network. There could be ping-pong transmissions of packets if wrong next hop is selected in complex topology cases. Furthermore, in case of RLF, the stalled transmission during long RLF detection period must probably already trigger TCP retransmission, which makes rerouting useless.  Given the time budget of the work item, let’s still leave it for implementation in Rel-17. |
| ZTE | The re-routing via descendant node may exploit new available path during RLF and thus improve service continuity. However, it introduce more hops and thus longer delay for backhaul traffic forwarding. In addition, the same data packet might be re-routed to and from a intermediate IAB node multiple times. New BAP header might be designed to avoid this problem.  Nevertheless, we think the benefits are trivial and it is better to de-prioritize this re-routing scenario. |
| Sony | We think the benefits needs more discussion, as it’s not obvious e.g. why via descendant nodes has more advantages than any other nodes. |
| CATT | For routing enhancement, we think the most important issue is to discuss whether/how to enhance local re-routing on another BH link based on R16 routing mechanism. Then, if R17 time allow, we can further discuss the enhancement on routing via descendant nodes. Thus, we prefer to de-prioritize this scenario at current stage. |
| Sharp | Agree on LG’s analysis. |
| Futurewei | I’m wondering what enhancements compared to Rel. 16 are really needed in order to support this. Would it not suffice for the donor to simply provide a BH Routing Configuration that maps the Destination address (i.e. donor DU address) towards the downstream node? In that case, if there was a BH RLF to the upstream node, the current BAP routing procedure can simply select to route the packets towards the downstream direction instead?  I guess the only concern there would be that the child node should not then turn around and route the packets back towards the parent that is experiencing the RLF.  In general, it seems appropriate to address this in conjunction with enhancements for local routing (Q11 below). |
| Apple | Agree with others that the scenario of using descendent node redundancy is not completely clear. We can achieve this through better cell selection mechanisms aided by the network. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We think that when assuming the redundancy using routing via descendant nodes, CP/UP applicability could be configurable. Also, the conditions should be aligned with BAP routing in general. |

**Summary:**

**Support:**

3 companies expressed favorable views, 6 companies unfavorable, 4 companies think that more discussion is necessary, and 1 company believes it should be left up to implementation.

There seems to be lack of understanding how this feature would work. For instance, several companies believe that the features should be discussed together with enhancements local rerouting. This is not correct; the feature could leverage centralized route configuration and RLF-based local rerouting.

**Purpose/benefit**: Robustness, faster recovery in case of RLF.

**Technical solution**: As was pointed out be a few companies, rerouting via descendant nodes can use the Rel-16 centralized route configuration framework together with Rel-16 RLF-based local-rerouting.

**Potential shortcomings**: Not clear if there are actual shortcomings or misunderstanding on how the feature works.

**Specification effort**: Some companies believe there is hardly any specification effort necessary while others believe it is significant.

**The rapporteur’s view:** The benefit of the feature is obvious. However, it seems that there is quite some confusion on how this feature would work, and therefore, the views are spread on how much specification effort is needed. Promoters of the features should be given the chance to clarify in more detail what specifications would be necessary to accommodate this enhancement.

**Proposal 5: Redundancy using routing via descendant nodes is FFS.**

### 2.2.6 Redundancy via collocation of multiple MTs

Proposed by R2-2006967, RAN3 agreement

RAN3 agreed that:

**Multi-MT Support is FFS in RAN3 pending RAN2**

This enhancement was already discussed during Rel-15 SI. Please provide a brief outline on the technical solution with an emphasis on what could be accomplished via implementation and where specification would be necessary.

**Q6: Please provide your views on purpose/benefit, technical solution, potential shortcomings and specification effort for this enhancement candidate.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Kyocera | We’re wondering what impacts is foreseen from RAN2’s perspective, since TR38.874 states in section 9.7.8 that “*Multi-connectivity of IAB-node (Case 2 above) can be supported by* […] *using several independent MT functions in the IAB-node, where* ***each MT function makes an independent connection*** *to the network (using normal MT setup).*” |
| LG | Not prefer to support multi-MT.  We think that this needs complex inter-operation between one IAB-DU and multiple IAB-MT and between multiple IAB-MTs. For example, given that IAB-MT is considered as sort of UE, if multiple IAB-MTs are supported, it should be clarified whether each IAB-MT has RRC connection or one RRC connection manages all multi-MTs in one IAB node. BAP specification may be impacted to handle the case of two IAB-MTs and one BAP SDU is given to be forwarded since each IAB-MT has one BAP entity which handles routing ID determination and selection of next hop IAB node. In addition, inter-operability between IAB nodes would be also complex. |
| Huawei | Not to support this.  **Purpose/benefit**: The benefit seems for UL redundancy with more than 2 links. With single MT, we can support the 2 link redundancy. With two MTs, we can support the 4 link redundancy. However, the performance gain is small when we compare 4 links to 2 links. Since we do not support the BAP layer duplication, the rest 3 backup links can only be used if the primary link is under RLF. Base on R16 design, only 1 backup link is sufficient, because there is no benefit to select among 3 or more than 3 backlinks if anyway we only support the BAP data via single path at a give time.  Anyway, multiple MT is not under the WID scope.  **Technical solution**: In R16, we agree to use the multiple MT redundancy by implementation, by combining the two pair of DU&MT or two IAB nodes in one box. We see no big difference in R17.  **Potential shortcomings**: whether this works requires R1 analyses.  **Specification effort**: Significant R1 impact. How the BAP at MT side works is to be discussed (e.g. shared or dedicated BAP for the multiple MTs). |
| Samsung | **Purpose/benefit**:  the intention is to extend the number of connectivity of an IAB node. So, the number of routing paths of an IAB node can be increased. However, we are wondering how much benefit can be brought by such method: 1) the number of available routing paths of an IAB node can be increased with the increase of the number hops. Specifically, the parent node of an IAB node can have dual connectivity, and its grandparent can also have dual connectivity; 2) if multi-MT is introduced, the coverage of a logical IAB-MT would be reduced since the maximum transmission power is limited. Thus, the increase of routing path number is reached at the cost of reducing the coverage of an IAB node.  **Technical solution:**  as discussed in both Rel-15 and Rel-16  **Potential shortcoming:**   * Multi-MT may cause the coverage reduction of an IAB node since multiple MTs should share the same transmission power limitation * The close coordination among parent nodes serving different MTs at the same IAB node is needed. For example, those MTs cannot be scheduled to the same time-frequency resource; those MTs cannot be allocated the same transmission direction (e.g., DL, UL) at any time. To solve this problem, the FDM or TDM can be applied. However, this will reduce the capacity of one IAB-MT. * The specification impact is not neglected. It will introduce impacts among WGs, including RAN1/2/3.   **Specification impact:**   * RAN1: TDD configuration coordination, RS signalling coordination, power control, etc. * RAN2: initial access (when one IAB-MT, e.g., IAB-MT1, already accesses the network, how to perform the initial access of another collocated logical IAB-MT, e.g., IAB-MT2, without impact the IAB-MT1 ?), scheduling coordination, BAP configuration enhancement, etc * RAN3: in this scheme, multiple MTs are shared by the same IAB-DU. Thus, how to configure the routing and bearer mapping needs further analysis.   In addition, multi-MT seems to be a comprised method to support the multi-connectivity due to no support at the normal UE case. We are wondering if we need spend effort on such compromised method. In our opinion, the better way is to start the study on multi-connectivity for normal UE first, and then check if any further enhancement is needed for IAB case.  Based on above analysis, we prefer to de-prioritize such multi-MT solution. |
| Ericsson | It would be good to define multi-MT. In our view, multi-MT would be equivalent to have one MT with multiple protocol stacks, similar to DAPS but just having the protocols which an intermediate IAB node has. It can be called multi-MT, double IAB protocols, or any other suitable name. But the concept is simple. One protocol stack is connected to one CU and a second protocol stack is connected to another CU.  In our understanding, multi-MT provides a simple solution for supporting multiple connections to the IAB node(s) without the limitations associated with the current DC-based solution, or with the current DAPS solution (as mentioned in our reply to Q2).  When it comes to specification effort, we believe that is feasible in the WI time frame. The only additional functionality required is to ensure that the different MT connections are set-up via different radio paths, which can be ensured by implementation. From an RRC signalling perspective, the multiple MTs will look like independent MTs and can receive separate configurations and operate on independent links/channels.  From RAN3 perspective, the multiple MTs of a given IAB node need to be associated/linked to the DU of the same IAB node. For the baseline case of a single-MT IAB node, RAN3 specification (TS 38.401) has defined the following approach for the IAB-donor-CU to discover collocation of IAB-MT and IAB-DU:  “The IAB-donor-CU discovers collocation of IAB-MT and IAB-DU from the IAB-node’s BAP Address included in the F1 SETUP REQUEST message.”  Thus, the same approach can be used to associate more than one MT to a given DU. |
| Intel | We are ok to study further on the complexity impact to the architecture, RAN1 and RAN4 should also study the impact |
| vivo | Multiple MT has impacts to RAN1, RAN2 and RAN3:   * For RAN2, integration procedure via multiple MT has to be defined with the precondition that single F1 connection is assumed for single DU. There seems quite some standardization work; * For RAN2/3, routing/flow control/RLF logic seems different, which also need some standardization effort; * BTW, for RAN1, does multiple-MT means multiple logic or physical MTs? I think RAN2/RAN3 cannot estimate the standardization effort for this;   With existing basis, even with multiple MT, it seems difficult to set up a dual topology network with acceptable workload. It is a complex work and further studies are needed before entering WI phase. |
| ZTE | With multi-MT, IAB node could be connected with more than two parent node. However, we are doubt with the necessity and benefits. With dual-connectivity, IAB node could support topology redundancy and multi-path routing. We see no strong motivations for the multi-MT support. |
| Sony | This can be implemented without specification impacts. |
| CATT | In R16, we already support one IAB-MT with dual BH links. Based on that, we wonder the benefit of supporting multiple IAB-MTs. We also don’t see the big motivation to support multiple IAB-MTs. |
| Futurewei | First, I’m a bit confused about the intent here. The introduction of this section states that multi-MT support is proposed by R2-2006967. However, I could not find any reference to multi-MT support in R2-2006967. Therefore, I’m wondering if this is the correct reference.  The one statement that might somehow be related to this in R2-2006967 seems to be:   * The IAB-node supports more than two parent links.   If this is the intent of the question, then I think we can discuss this proposal, which is quite different than multi-MT support. In general, we tend to agree with other comments above, that under normal operating conditions the incremental benefit of providing more than 2-link redundancy would likely be rather limited (should be evaluated by RAN1). However, more than 2-link redundancy could be useful to improve the robustness of the IAB node connectivity, particularly in the case of BH RLF.  On the other hand, if the intent was rather that the IAB node should support multiple independent MT functions, then as pointed out by Kyocera above, this case is already possible in Rel. 16 via implementation. We don’t see any value to try an optimize this option with further standardization in Rel. 17, as this would be even more complex from a specification perspective than just extending the number of links per MT to be > 2. |
| AT&T | During Rel-16 discussions, the multi-MT scenario was found to require significant coordination across different MTs, especially in the case where they are operating on the same frequency resources and subject to the Rel-16 TDM/half-duplex constraint at the physical layer of the IAB node. These issues should be discussed first before deciding to support redundancy via multiple MTs. |
| Apple | We are ok with further exploring this option. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We think that alongside DC, support for multiple MTs would seem to come with a risk of fragmentation of solutions which needs to be avoided. |

**Summary**

**Support:** 3 companies expressed favorable views, 8 companies unfavorable, 3 companies believe it can be done via implementation.

**Purpose/benefit**: Robustness, load balancing. Same as DC; however, more than two parents can be supported.

**Technical solution**: There seems to be some confusion on how this feature would work. The rapporteur believes to understand that separate IAB-MTs can be collocated in the IAB-node via implementation. Some coordination is necessary between multiple parent links, but this is the same as for NR-DC-based redundancy and therefore supported. The CU(s) still need(s) to be informed about the collocation of the multiple IAB-MTs with the IAB-DU.

**Potential shortcomings**: Coordination of multiple parent links, i.e., same as for NR-DC-based redundancy solution.

**Specification effort**: The CU has to be informed that the IAB-MTs are collocated with IAB-DU. This is a minor effort.

**The rapporteur’s view:** The benefit is the same as for NR-DC-based redundancy. The benefit over NR-DC-base redundancy is that more than 2 parent nodes can be supported. There is some support for this feature, and the proponents believe that the specification effort is only minor. We may want to give the proponents the chance to elaborate what exactly this specification effort is, and to clarify why nothing else would be needed.

**Proposal 6: Support for multiple collocated IAB-MTs at the IAB-node is FFS.**

### 2.2.7 Enhancements to RLF indication

Proposed by R2-2006626, R2-2006948, R2-2006967, R2-2007165, R2-2007773, R2-2007864, R2-2008025, R2-2008026

This enhancement was already addressed in a Rel-16 email discussion. To proceed where this discussion ended, rather than repeating it, please describe:

* Difference of Rel-17 RLF indication over Rel-16 RLF indication (e.g. condition of transmission, information carried, etc).
* How the expected purpose/benefit is achieved via such indication (e.g. what needs to happen upon reception of reception of this indication so that the benefit is achieved).
* Potential shortcomings, if applicable (e.g. uncontrolled behaviour, reestablishment at incorrect node, etc.).

**Q7: Please provide your views on purpose/benefit, technical solution, potential shortcomings and specification effort for this enhancement candidate.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Kyocera | We think…  The additional indication is transmitted when the IAB node experiences BH RLF or be trying BH link recovery (a.k.a., Type 1 or Type 2), and/or when the IAB node successfully recovered BH link (a.k.a., Type 3). We assume Type 1 and Type 2 depicture the same condition.  We prefer Type 1/2 Indication is sent via SIB1 since it allows not only IAB-MTs but also UEs to read/use it, while BAP control PDU is only readable by IAB-MTs.  The child node(s), upon reception of Type 1/2 Indication, stop sending Scheduling Request, and/or it may decide to do the local re-routing (if introduced). As an implementation option, the child node(s) may prepare possibility of its BH recovery, e.g., pre-measurements. The child node(s) should resume the normal operation when the IAB node’s BH link is recovered.  As an optimization, if Type 1/2 Indication is transmitted repeatedly (e.g., via SIB1), Type 3 Indication may not be needed, since the IAB node would stop sending Type 1/2 Indication when its BH link is recovered. |
| LG | We suggest to introduce BH RLF indications that are triggered upon BH RLF and upon successful recovery of BH RLF. These additional indications would reduce service interruption significantly and benefit sustaining preferred/planned topology. |
| Huawei | Agree to introduce two new RLF indication: type1/2: “BH recovering indication” and type3 as “BH recovered indication”;  **Purpose/benefit**: The purpose is for the scope of reducing service interruption in case RLF. “BH link recovering indication” is to warn its child to prepare for the possible RRC re-establishment and allow child node’s local re-routing. “BH link recovered indication” is to notify the child node to go back to the normal operations.  **Technical solution**: The child node behaviour upon reception of this indication needs more discussion. We don’t need to work on the detailed solution by this email discussion.  **Potential shortcomings**: N/A.  **Specification effort**: New BAP control PDUs. |
| Samsung | * Purpose/ benefit: reduce the interruption time which can occur when Rel-16 RLF failure notification is only used. * Technical solution: RLF indication is triggered when RLF is declared on the link to the parent node. If there is single parent node, and that node is on RLF, then any additional RRC control cannot be delievered to the IAB node. In this case, RLF detection indication can trigger the Cho type of command. Then IAB node can be switched without significant interruption. * Potential shortcoming: not explicit shortcoming found   Specification effort: Already CHO is specified, so there not much thing to be considered further but some modification of execution condition including RLF detection indication. |
| Ericsson | In general, we support the enhancement of RLF notification messages, such as including “trying to recover” and “BH link recovered” messages, etc. This will enable the child node to prepare for possible performance degradation at the parent node or search for alternative parents or resume normal operations after parent node recovery.  However, in our view, assuming that these RLF indications signaling are in place, it could be left to the implementation of the child/parent node how to behave. |
| Intel | Significant delays should be noted at each step through the network multiple hops, and performance cell search/measurement and read SI from candidate parents takes significant amount of time. Comparing with Rel-16 RLF indication, a more timing-advanced indication (type 2) is beneficial to reduce RLF recovery latency, that is, a downstream indication of RLF at an IAB node in addition to existing RLF failure indication in Rel-16. Type 2 indication can enable the descendant nodes to perform cell search measurements and prepare for a possible change of parent nodes. The type 4 indication in Rel-16 triggers the actual change of parent nodes. |
| vivo | * **Purpose/benefit**. Type 2 RLF indication allows the child node to take precautions against the potential performance degradation at the parent node, such as the searching for an alternative parent node. Type 3 RLF indication informs the child node that the parent has recovered from the RLF and the child node can resume the normal transmissions. Specifically, we’d like to specify the indications as well as the behaviours after the triggering of those indications, which were not discussed in Rel-17. * **Technical solution**. Solutions would be quite straight-forward, two additional PDU types should be used for Type 2/3 indications. * **Potential shortcomings**.There are 4 bits reserved for PDU types, which means that the control PDUs used for IAB can only be up to 16. Since 4 codes were already specified in the current spec, in this case, the trade-off is that the reserved PDUs will be left to 11. * **Specification effort**. The foreseeable effort is negligible. |
| ZTE | It is suggested to include the type1/2 BH recovering indication and type3 BH recovered indication. If Type 1/2 indication is received, the child node may perform early measurements in order to prepare for possible BH RLF recovery. If Type 3 indication is received, the early preparation can be canceled. |
| Sony | We are ok to consider further enhancements |
| CATT | We agree to introduce type1/2 BH recovering indication and type3 BH recovered indication. The behavior of child node can be further discussed. |
| Sharp | We support additions of “RLF detected” and “RLF recovered” indications. |
| Futurewei | Perhaps it is first useful to understand the use case for these enhancements to BH RLF notifications:  Type 1 (RLF detected): As I recall, the reason we could not agree to Type 1 indication in Rel. 16 is that we not want child nodes to perform reselection and reestablishment via another node in response to what may very well be a temporary condition.  Type 2 (Trying to recover): It seems to be a given if there was a RLF detected, then the IAB node will attempt to recover the failed BH link. So, we don’t see any additional value from Type 2 compared to Type 1.  Type 3 (BH link recovered): Presumably, the reason to have a Type 3 RLF notification is that the child IAB node, upon receiving a Type 1 notification, undertakes some action (e.g. re-establishment). But then, if it subsequently received a Type 3 notification the child node can cancel this action? We are not so clear what type of action could be cancelled by the child node. Assuming for example the child node initiates an RRC connection reestablishment via another node, could this action then be cancelled?  Alternatively, we can envision that the child node might start a timer based on receiving a Type 1 notification, and if no Type 3 notification is received before the timer expires, then the child node could take the specified action (e.g. RRC re-establishment). However, this would seem to be functionally equivalent to receiving a Type 4 indication, which is already supported.  Therefore, although we agreed that the functionality of the Rel. 16 BH RLF indication left much to be desired, we are not yet convinced that adding additional types of BH RLF indications would bring much value. First, we would like to understand what specific problem we are trying to address, and then we can discuss possible solutions.  We think a much more pressing issue regarding BH RLF notification is that it can easily be spoofed, since BAP does not support any mechanism for integrity protection. This was already pointed out by operators during the Rel. 16 WI. Hence, we are extremely reticent to add further functionality related to BH RLF notification, unless the integrity can be guaranteed to the receiving IAB node. Otherwise, we will just be adding functionality in the spec that will never be used in the field. |
| AT&T | Agree with comments from Ericsson |
| Apple | Agree that we should look into these enhancements. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We think that extended RLF indication type would enable more optimized behavior of the child nodes, either to initiate BH change or prepare (measurements/candidate node selection, stop UL scheduling, etc) for potential failure of the BH connection. Furthermore, it could shorten the service break at the child nodes. |

**Summary**

**Support:** 15 companies expressed favorable views, 1 company unfavorable views.

**Purpose/benefit**: Reduction of service interruption. Many other reasons were named that were not in compliance with those identified in section 2.1.

**Technical solution**: Additional indications, e.g., upon RLF determination and after RLF, were proposed. The behavior of the receiving node needs more discussion.

**Potential shortcomings**: Overhead on BAP control PDU, prolonged recovery if behavior of receiving node is not well defined.

**Specification effort**: The specification of the signaling enhancements seems straightforward. However, significant discussion is expected on the conditions for transmission of these signaling messages and the behavior of the receiving node.

**The rapporteur’s view:** Some companies believe this enhancement can reduce interruption time after BH RLF. Many companies do not provide concrete views on purpose/benefits, or the benefits provided are not in compliance with those identified in section 2.1. The further discussion should therefore focus on the reduction of interruption time.

The rapporteur believes that this overall feature needs to be well defined to ensure proper operation in a multi-operator network. This includes defining the condition for transmission of the new indications as well as the expected behavior on the receiving node.

**Proposal 7: RAN2 to discuss enhancements to RLF indication with the focus on the reduction of service interruption after BH RLF.**

### 2.2.8 Avoiding RLF recovery at former descendant node

Proposed by R2-2006626, R2-2006948, R2-2006961, R2-2007773

This issue was already addressed during a Rel-16 email discussion. To proceed where this discussion ended, rather than repeating it, please describe the technical solutions on *how* RLF recovery at former descendant node is avoided.

**Q8: Please provide your views on purpose/benefit, technical solution, potential shortcomings and specification effort for this enhancement candidate.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Kyocera | We think the blacklist and/or the whitelist should be provided to the IAB nodes in order to prevent selecting unsuitable cells. We think the list(s) should be updated dynamically, considering frequent topology changes in Rel-17 eIAB nature. In this sense, we prefer RRC should manage the list(s), not OAM.  We’re wondering if this enhancement may or may not be related to Q1 (i.e., CHO) or Q5 (i.e., Redundancy using routing via descendant nodes). So, RAN2 should consider the relationship of solutions and avoid the potential functional duplication. |
| LG | We do not see the need of this; Cell selection during RLF recovery is already up to implementations, and hence the reasonable implementations would avoid this, i.e. no standardization work is necessary. WE observe that our arguments are further justified by the fact that that IAB topology should be well pre-planned, i.e. topological knowledge is well known a-priori to those IAB nodes. |
| Huawei | No need of this.  By implementation in R16, if one IAB node select its descendant node after RLF, there is no available path to the donor CU. Then, the RRC re-establishment procedure will fail anyway, due to no response from CU. As the consequence, IAB node will then select another cell.  In addition, in the realistic IAB deployment, parent IAB-MT is usually not able to select child IAB-DU due to the beam forming. |
| Samsung | * For LG/Huawei’s comment, in current 38.304 the following is said:   b) Cell selection by leveraging stored information:  1. This procedure requires stored information of frequencies and optionally also information on cell parameters from previously received measurement control information elements or from previously detected cells.   * “the stored information” is freq and cell parameters previously received from measurement control info. In detail, this would be measurement object and some cell list. So these are static information as stored in UE, and cannot reflect the the IAB specific topology and cannot filter any failed cell which is the dynamically changed. * Purpose/benefit: reduce the interruption time on RRCreestablishment procedure for access UE as it is. This needs to be resolved since implementation information in legacy cell selection is not enough to handle this since only meas config information formerly used for RRM can be reused as the cell selection stored information, and this information cannot reflect the IAB node hierarchy. * Technical solution: Method can be either CU’s signalling on cell information to be excluded or IAB node’s failure indicating “out of connection” in SIB1 so that this failed cell can be filtered by neighbour cells. * Potential shortcoming: specification   Specification effort: Idle spec or RRC needs to be modified to realize this. |
| Ericsson | As the rapporteur mentioned that this issue is already addressed in Rel-16, so it seems that the purpose of this discussion to enhance the solution set for avoiding RLF recovery at former descendant node. If so, then companies have to provide strong motivation for why RAN2 should discuss additional solutions for a problem that has already been solved. |
| Intel | As discussed in R2-2006948, upon receiving a recovery failure indication, an IAB node should not choose for reestablishment, parent nodes or ancestor nodes that have experienced RLF or have received a recovery failure indication. This can lead to significant delays and eventual failure.  RAN2 should make modifications according to the following to ensure that an IAB node does not choose for reestablishment nodes that have failed:  - A failed IAB node modifies system information to bar access to new IAB nodes or UEs; and  - The recovery failure indication also includes information about ancestor nodes that have failed.  The first modification above requires the IAB node to be able to locally modify system information (as opposed to the IAB node just transmitting the system information blocks provided by the CU). It is necessary to ensure that new IAB nodes do not attach to the failed node. The second modification enables quicker reestablishment since descendant IAB nodes do not need to acquire system information of the failed nodes. |
| vivo | It seems good enough to leave it for implementation. We don’t see the serious impact when a former descending IAB node is selected as a candidate parent IAB node if this former descending IAB node has already setup radio connection to a new parent IAB node which can provide services after the descending IAB nodes receiving RLF recovery failure notification from its parent IAB node.  Instead, it may result in suboptimal network topology if a former descending IAB node is the best candidate parent IAB node for an IAB node and the former descending IAB node is not allowed to be selected by this IAB node. |
| ZTE | Avoiding RLF recovery at former descendant nodes can be up to implementation. For example, if IAB node detects RLF and selects descendant node to perform RRC re-establishment, the re-establishment will definitely fail since no path available towards donor CU. In addition, suppose descendant IAB node receives the RLF indication, it may reject the access of IAB-MT or bar the cell. |
| Sony | We think the blacklist/whitelist is feasible. |
| CATT | We support to address this issue in R17.  The benefit is obviously that it can reduce the service interruption during cell reselection and RRC re-establishment.  The spec effort is minor, e.g., to add some limitation during IAB-MT cell re-selection. |
| Sharp | In the last email discission, RAN2 decided to take no action on this issue. Our understanding is that the main reason not to do anything was since RRC reestablishment will fail after all, this may not be a showstopper if we accept a longer service interruption.  In Rel-17, if RAN2 has a consensus on reducing service interruption time, we think it makes sense to discuss this now, and the options we had prevously should be evaluated again. |
| Futurewei | As other companies have noted, this issue was discussed in Rel. 16. However, we disagree with E/// that the issue was already solved in Rel. 16. Our recollection is that we agreed not to optimize for this scenario, as an attempt to re-establish via a disconnected child IAB node should anyway fail eventually (as indicated above by Huawei). However, this topic seems well within the scope of this WI to address, as one of the sub-objectives is:   * Specification of enhancements to reduce service interruption due to IAB-node migration and BH RLF recovery.   In terms of potential technical solutions, some combination of whitelisting/blacklisting of cells (as proposed by Kyocera & Sony) seems rather straightforward. Whether such information should be configured via RRC or OAM, we are less certain but are open to discuss. |
| Apple | There is no additional need to discuss this again and can leave it up to implementation. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We think it is unclear if any specification changes are needed. Receiving a failure indication, the child node can e.g., reset the IAB support indication to prevent selection of that node. |

**Summary**

**Support:** 8 companies expressed favorable views to discuss the matter, 4 company unfavorable views, 2 companies asked for more clarification.

**Purpose/benefit**: Reduction of service interruption due to RLF recovery (only named by one company).

**Technical solution**: This “enhancement” defines a problem rather than a solution.

**Potential shortcomings**: Not clear since his “enhancement” defines a problem rather than a solution.

**Specification effort**: Not clear since his “enhancement” defines a problem rather than a solution.

**The rapporteur’s view**: Recovery attempts at former descendant nodes refers to a problem rather than an enhancement proposal. Many companies acknowledge that this is a relevant problem that should be discussed in Rel-17 IAB. All except one company fail to identify the purpose or benefit of this feature. Therefore, discussion on the avoidance of recovery attempts at former descendent nodes can continue for the benefit of reduced service interruption due to RLF recovery, named by this one company.

**Proposal 8: Avoidance of recovery attempts at former descendent nodes for reduced service interruption due to RLF recovery is FFS.**

### 2.2.9 Message bundling (e.g. “group mobility”)

Proposed by R2-2006961, R2-2007313, R2-2007863, RAN3 discussion

RAN3 had a discussion on this topic and the following issues were raised: While bundling of multiple, e.g., UE messages reduces the total number of messages, it does not necessarily reduce the processing load. Further, bundling is restricted by the upper bound of the message size.

Please include in your comments what type of messages you believe the bundling could apply to, and please address RAN3’s concerns.

**Q9: Please provide your views on purpose/benefit, technical solution, potential shortcomings and specification effort for this enhancement candidate.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Kyocera | We don’t have strong view, but be wondering if it’s problematic the handover requests of some UEs/IAB-nodes are accepted but some others are rejected, in case of non-bundling (i.e., the existing) messages. |
| LG | We do not think group mobility is essential for enhancing IAB network performance. Group mobility would aim to solve the problem of signalling storm upon the change of topology, but we are not convinced if the problem is really severe or jeopardize the IAB network’s stability. |
| Huawei | For group mobility, we agree to support this, i.e. migrating node and all/parts its child nodes/UEs migrate together as a group;  For the bundling singling, the XnAP message and F1AP message, which are related to the IAB nodes within the migrating group, during the migration procedure can be bundled.  Please note that R3 agreed: 1) all parent-child relations are retained at the new donor; 2) topology-related information should be made available to the new donor. This means the migrating IAB node and some its descendant nodes/UEs will migrate to the target CU **together as a topology/group**, and target should be aware of this topology. So, we anyway need the group mobility, but leave the group singling to be discussed by R3 mainly.  **Purpose/benefit**: The group mobility itself is essential for the migration procedure. As to the group signalling, the purpose is to reduce the latency and overhead of multiple separate signalling.  **Technical solution**: Design new XnAP and F1AP message as the grouped signalling.  **Potential shortcomings**: N/A.  **Specification effort**: New XnAP/F1AP procedure and message. |
| Samsung | **purpose/benefit:**   * The benefit is unclear. The transmitted information during migration cannot be reduced. The reduced part is only the number of messages. However, it may cause a lot of specification impact.   **technical solution:**   * Group multiple UE contexts in the same message   **potential shortcomings**   * We didn’t see clear benefit. We need first focus on the basic procedure by trying to reuse the existing signalling as much as possible. Such scheme looks like a further optimization.   **specification effort:**  New messages are needed. |
| Ericsson | In our view, it is a bit early to discuss such topic before assessing the real benefits and specification effort of “group mobility”. Additionally, since the IAB network is not mobile, there is no strong latency/performance requirement to move at once all IAB nodes/UEs involved in the migration.  Hence, RAN2 should de-prioritize this topic. |
| Intel | Supporting message bundling may be complex and not that useful. For DL signalling, MAC multiplexing can be used for message bundling, and for UL messages, considering different UEs may complete HO at different times, multiplexing or bundling seems not efficient and not possible considering massive UE connecting within IAB network. |
| vivo | For group mobility, it is not necessary that the source CU integrates the handover requests of the all nodes in the migration network into one message block and sends it to target CU and the target CU integrates all handover commands into one message block and sends to the source CU. Too large message size shall be avoided to avoid potential NW instability due to high transport / processing capacity requirement.  It is the duty of source CU to ensure that the respective handover commands of all nodes in the migration network has been received from target CU and delivered to all nodes in the migration network. Mechanism for proper delivery of handover commands by the source CU shall be studied instead. |
| ZTE | Message bundling has already been introduced in R16 IAB to reduce signaling overhead. For example, new F1AP/E1AP messages (i.e. IAB UP configuration update in F1, IAB UP TNL ADDRESS UPDATE in E1) are introduced in R16 IAB to update information for multiple UEs and child IAB-MTs which can be used in IAB node migration/RLF recovery scenarios for the purpose of signaling overhead reduction.  In R17 IAB, it could be also applied to XnAP (e.g. handover request, handover request ack messages) and F1AP messages (e.g. UE context modification) for the same purpose as in R16 IAB. |
| Sony | We think group mobility is beneficial to reduce interruption time. We think group mobility applies to handover request and handover response message. Although the processing load is not reduced as RAN3 pointed out, the handover sequence (among migrating IAB nodes and its descendant nodes) can be managed in better order therefore reducing the potential handover failures. |
| KDDI | We emphasize two use cases should be discussed in this topic, one is handover and the other is RLF recovery. Basically, we consider the RAN3 related Xn or F1 interfaces in the group mobility could be bundled, and it seems a little bit difficult to bundle the RAN2 related RRC messages. But we may want to have some change on RRC message, and one possibility is to add IAB specific information (for example number of the UEs which the IAB node accommodates, the UE identities of those UEs). We think RAN3/2 should have the coordinated discussion including 2.2.15 Sending F1AP configuration information via RRC |
| CATT | We support group mobility for IAB inter-CU migration.  The benefit is to reduce the latency and overhead of multiple separate signalling.  But we also think this is mainly for RAN3 issues. We can wait for RAN3 progress. |
| Sharp | Agree on waiting for RAN3 progress. |
| Futurewei | This topic does not seem to have any clear RAN2 impacts. As far as we can deduce such functionality would primarily impact RAN3 interfaces (F1, X2/Xn). So, we think it is a bit premature to discuss this in RAN2.  Regarding RAN3 impacts, we do not have a strong view at this time. One of the sub-objectives of the WID is to reduce service interruption time in the case of BH RLF recovery, and message bundling would certainly seem to support this objective. However, we think it is useful to first understand if there are alternative approaches, and then weigh all the alternatives considering various aspects (e.g. standards impact, complexity, service interruption time, etc.) |
| AT&T | Group mobility is essential for reducing the volume of signaling traffic generated by IAB node migration to a different donor. Simply bundling messages in a brute-force manner may not be the best way to specify group mobility. The benefits of group mobility can be achieved by leveraging relatively simple synergies across groups of UEs associated with a migrating IAB node, for example, by avoiding RACH access and measurements associated with a handover procedure. |
| Apple | With no clear architecture description on how IAB nodes are mobile, we don’t see the need for group mobility for IAB at this time. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We think that rather than supporting message bundling, RAN2/RAN3 should specify solutions that do not require massive signalling to large number of access UEs simultaneously. |

**Summary:**

**Support:** 5 companies expressed favorable views, 6 company unfavorable views, 3 companies prefer to wait for further progress in RAN3 and 2 companies had no strong view.

**Purpose/benefit**: Reduction of signaling and service interruption (due to processing of signaling). One company claims that there is no benefit.

**Technical solution**: Many companies felt that this mainly affected RAN3.

**Potential shortcomings**: Large message size.

**Specification effort**: Several companies referred to F1 and Xn which are in the realm of RAN3.

**The rapporteur’s view**: The promoters claim there is some benefit in the bundling of signaling. While there was some support for this enhancement, it seems not clear if this effort affects RAN2 or if it is primarily confined to RAN3. For this, more progress on topology adaptation procedures needs to be made by RAN3.

**Proposal 8: For message bundling, RAN2 to wait for more progress to be made in RAN3 on topology adaptation procedures.**

### 2.2.10 Replace/avoid UE/child-MT RACH at inter-donor topology adaptation

Proposed by R2-2006625, R2-2007863

If rapporteur understands the above contributions correctly, this enhancement tries to avoid RACH for UE or descendant-node IAB-MTs during inter-donor migration. Such RACH would generally be considered necessary since the UE and descendant-node IAB-MT change their security association from the source to the target IAB-donor and therefore have to perform an RRC reconfiguration with resync. The proposal is that the RACH procedure of the resync could be avoided since the IAB-DU remains the same. The rapporteur is not certain what signalling would trigger the switch between the security associations, i.e., with what the RACH procedure would be replaced and what benefit this replacement would have.

Please address these issues in your comment.

**Q10: Please provide your views on purpose/benefit, technical solution, potential shortcomings and specification effort for this enhancement candidate.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Kyocera | We think the RACH-less handover was supported in LTE, so it could be assumed there is no significant issue here and the same solution is the baseline. We assume the UE/Child-MT avoids Msg1 and Msg2, so it starts from Msg3 (i.e., RRC Reconfiguration Complete). It’s beneficial to reduce the service interruption due to the handover procedure as considered in LTE. |
| LG | It is too pre-mature to discuss this point at this stage. We can discuss it after making more progress about mobility enhancement. |
| Huawei | Agree to support the RACH less at decedent IAB MT/UE.  Please note that the HO command (e.g. *RRCReconfiguration* including *reconfigurationWithSync* but no RACH resource) will still be sent to child MT/UE. Child IAB-MT still perform the RRC reconfiguration with resync, which will trigger the security change operation, but without MAC layer RACH.  **Purpose/benefit**: The purpose is to reduce the latency caused by lots of RA procedure at almost the same time.  **Technical solution**: Child MT/UE has the valid TA to its cell of parent node, since the parent-child relations are retained at the new donor. UL grant can also be allocated by parent DU as usual. Therefore, the MAC layer RA procedure can be saved during the inter-CU migration.  **Potential shortcomings**: N/A.  **Specification effort**: Minor updates to the reconfiguration with resync procedure. |
| Samsung | * Purpose / benefit: RACH congestion might be avoided * Technical solution: MT doesn’t do RACH during parent IAB node’s migration * Potential shortcoming: security information change always needs the RACH operation, and this principle first needs to be broken. And also has the same understanding as rapporteur how the change of security parameters can be separated without RACH operation   Specification effort: RRC/MAC to describe the anchor node change without RACH. |
| Ericsson | It is not clear at the moment what is the issue with current legacy procedures. |
| Intel | It is not clear at this moment. For UE, as we still need to support legacy UE, we don’t see a need to change only for IAB scenario; For IAB-MT, considering number of IAB-MT is limited, the benefit of avoiding RACH may be limited. |
| vivo | RACH less handover could be beneficial to avoid RA storm and signalling overhead and should be supported. |
| ZTE | It is suggested to perform RACH-less handover for descendant IAB node/UEs since their parent node does not change. The switch between the security associations could be triggered by RRC reconfiguration with sync. It is beneficial to reduce the service interruption. |
| Sony | We can discuss this issue after making progress on topology adaptation procedure. |
| KDDI | Skip RACH process could help to reduce interruption time and contributes the robustness |
| CATT | In general, we support this RACH-less mechanism at decedent IAB MT/UE.  But the scenario for this mechanism can be further discussed, e.g., whether the PCI is changed between serving cell and target cell.  We think if the PCI is changed, the decedent IAB MT/UE anyway needs to perform RACH during HO, which is similar as UE HO procedure. However, if the PCI is not changed, we think only RRC reconfiguration to the decedent IAB MT/UE is enough to trigger security change operation without RACH operation. |
| Sharp | We think it makes sense to skip the RACH process, as pointed out by the other companies. |
| Futurewei | Clearly if TA is not changing, there is no reason to perform a RACH. However, it is not clear to us that a HO command would necessarily need to be sent to every descendent MT/UE of a migrated IAB node. So, we think it is useful to first get a better understanding of the overall migration procedure, before deciding whether/when such optimizations are warranted.  In general, the specification impacts seem to be very minor, so we don’t see a technical challenge to support this. |
| AT&T | We support avoiding UE/child-MT RACH procedure at inter-donor IAB node migration. This is one of the solutions that should be leveraged to reduce signaling overhead and avoid random access storms during inter-donor IAB node migration. |
| Apple | Agree this issue should be discussed after making some actual progress on topology adaptation. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We think that one kind of precedent already exists in the handling of bearer-type change in MR-DC where the change in *keyToUse* for DRB can be handled with LCID change instead of RACH. This could be taken as the baseline for the solution needed for replacing/avoiding UE/child-MT RACH at inter-donor topology adaptation. |

**Summary:**

**Support:** 6 companies expressed support for RACH-less procedure without any indication on how the associated security association change would be triggered. This, however, is the main issue at stake. 1 company believes it is too premature to discuss this topic. Another company supports the feature and at least recognizes that there is a security issue to be addressed. Yet another company actually proposes a solution.

**Purpose/benefit**: Companies named reduction of signaling and service interruption (due to processing of signaling). One company claims that there is no benefit.

**Technical solution**: Some companies felt that this mainly affected RAN3. Only one company proposed a solution.

**Potential shortcomings**: Break of legacy security procedure unless an alternative to RA procedure is used.

**Specification effort**: Not clear in absence of a technical discussion/solution.

**The rapporteur’s view**: It does not make sense to discuss a RACH-less procedure if the associated security issue is not addressed. Only two companies seemed to acknowledge the security issue. This indicates that it is too premature to discuss the feature in RAN2. Let’s wait for RAN3 to make further progress on this topic.

**Proposal 10: RAN3 to make further progress on inter-donor topology adaptation before optimizations to UE and descendant-node RA procedures can be considered.**

### 2.2.11 Local route selection beyond RLF

Proposed by R2-2007023, R2-2007200, R2-2007295, R2-2007840, R2-2008026, RAN3 agreements

RAN3 has already agreed that:

**Local re-routing scenario other than RLF can be discussed later or after RAN2 decision.**

As discussed in Rel-16, local rerouting tends to be suboptimal if the node has only local scope. Please describe how this issue would be addressed.

**Q11: Please provide your views on purpose/benefit, technical solution, potential shortcomings and specification effort for this enhancement candidate.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Kyocera | We assume the IAB-donor may configure the IAB-node(s) with some alternative routes, and the IAB-nodes may select one of them in case of the local re-routing. It leverages the topology-wide knowledge/optimization by the IAB-donor and the quick response/recovery by the local decision. |
| LG | Even if one of main enhancement in IAB Rel-17 is to provide topological and path redundancy, just supporting path/topological redundancy is not enough and RAN2 should also study and develop the proper way to use this redundancy.  We think that allowing local route selection beyond BH RLF would be the correct way not only to use topological and path redundancy efficiently but also to provide load balancing and resolve a DL congestion problem as well. Specifically, when the IAB node 1 receives a flow control feedback from the IAB node 3 to indicate a DL congestion problem toward the IAB node 4, even if the IAB node 1 has another route toward the IAB node 4, the IAB node 1 cannot forward the packet to the IAB node 2 because there is an entry matched to both BAP address and BAP path ID of the packet and no BH RLF on the link to the IAB node 3 occurs. In this condition, if the IAB node 1 holds all packets related to the flow control feedback until the congestion problem in the IAB node 3 is resolved, this may cause another congestion problem in the IAB node 1. But, if local re-routing is allowed before BH RLF occurs, the IAB node 1 not only reduce congestion problem in the IAB node 3 but also provide proper load balancing over the IAB network. For this, most of work would be RAN2. |
| Huawei | Agree to support the local re-routing for congestion mitigation or load balancing.  The principle should be that IAB node will use the CU configured path based on the routing ID as in R16, unless some triggers (e.g. the RLF in R16 and other new conditions defined in R17) allow the IAB node to select the backup path (which is also configured by CU).  **Purpose/benefit**: The purpose is to avoid UP data interruption or congestion caused by the cases other than RLF. For example, in case the primary BH link is congested but not under RLF yet, IAB node can switch the traffic to the backup BH link without any interruption to the traffic transmission.  **Technical solution**: discuss the new cases other than RLF to trigger the local re-routing. For the re-routing itself, R16 BAP spec can be reused.  **Potential shortcomings**: N/A.  **Specification effort**: Minor updates to the routing performed at BAP layer. See no impact on the configuration. |
| Samsung | * Purpose/benefit: to be more reflective on latency and load level routing * Technical solution: IAB node can reroute by itself with some configuration from CU when other condition (load balancing /latency reduction/scheduling enh is needed) happens. * Potential shortcomings: related specification is necessary.   Specification effort: mainly BAP spec needs to resolve this routing operation. |
| Ericsson | We agree that RAN2 discusses whether local routing could be beneficial for other scenarios, such as link congestion while ensuring no undesirable effect of these local decisions on the other IAB nodes of the network. |
| Intel | Yes, we support local re-routing scenario other than RLF should be discussed and supported in Rel-17. IAB network can consider both topology-wide (centralized) routing and local re-routing as local re-routing can bring flexibility to IAB network in following aspects: 1) traffic congestion 2) QoS enhancement 3) topology fairness, etc. |
| vivo | Local rerouting could be helpful to solve temporal local congestions and we shall support it. |
| ZTE | It is suggested to consider the local re-routing due to latency consideration. In order to satisfy the PDB requirement of packets, the IAB node could be able to measure and report the experienced delay per BH RLC channel to IAB-donor-CU, the IAB-donor-CU may estimate the accumulated latency for different routing paths based on the one hop latency per BH RLC channel report and configure appropriate routing paths for DL/UL backhaul traffic.  When the intermediate IAB node detects that the original path associated with the data packet could no longer satisfy the PDB requirement of the data packet, the intermediate IAB-node may check if other backup path could satisfy the PDB requirement and then re-route the data packet to the backup path. |
| Sony | We think local route selection is beneficial in reducing interruption time and improving topology robustness. Together with the introduction of local route selection criterion and potentially additional assistance information, each IAB node can make its local decision. The criterion and assistance information can still be controlled by CU. |
| CATT | We think the local re-routing for congestion mitigation can be supported. Re-routing can reduce the congestion of IAB-node by change the congested path.  Based on above, the new triggering for local re-routing can be further discussed, e.g., flow control indication. |
| Futurewei | We agree that local routing decisions by IAB node should be supported in Rel. 17. Alternative forwarding addresses for a Routing ID, and prioritization of forwarding addresses for a given Routing ID should be configured by the IAB donor CU.  We agree with observations from other companies that congestion information provided by flow control feedback may be leveraged by IAB nodes to make good local routing decisions in support of routing robustness and load balancing. |
| AT&T | We support local re-routing for scenarios other than RLF, e.g. congestion mitigation or load balancing. RAN2 should discuss mechanisms to allow the donor node to provide assisting information to enable the IAB node to make better informed local decisions when needed, while still keeping the donor in control of the overall routing functionality across the IAB network. |
| Apple | We agree this is beneficial in multiple negative scenarios. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We think that unrestricted re-routing may result in e2e flow control observing inconsistent behaviour. |

**Summary:**

**Support:** Many companies believe that local rerouting should be supported for load balancing and congestion mitigation. Only 2 companies address the rapporteur’s question on how such local rerouting can have topology-wide view. Only one company thinks that unrestricted re-routing may result in inconsistent behavior for E2E flow control.

**Purpose/benefit**: Companies provided load balancing and congestion mitigation as reasons.

* No company explained why local rerouting would balance load better than CU-controlled load balancing.
* No compny addressed the question raised by the rapporteur on how the local node can have the topology-wide view that is essential for load balancing.
* The rapporteur further does not understand how local load balancing would comply with RAN3’s agreement:

**Deprioritize Multi-Route Support with data split in IAB.**

* Congestion mitigation is not part of this email discussion. Further, congestion mitigation was not considered in section 2.1 as potential purpose/benefit for enhancements to topology adaptation.

**Technical solution**: A few companies indicated that the node could select among multiple BAP routes configured by the CU (e.g. which have routing ID). The conditions are configured by the CU. Concrete examples for such conditions were not given. Companies did not address how topology-wide criteria could be considered by the local node.

**Potential shortcomings**: Performance deterioration if the node selects only based on local rather than global conditions.

**Specification effort**: The understanding of purpose and benefit are too vague at present to gauge the specification effort. The discussion on what this feature should achieve will certainly take a significant amount of time.

**The rapporteur’s view**: While almost every company is in favor of local rerouting nobody can clearly explain what benefits it has over centrally configured route configurations, and how topology-wide objectives can be satisfied by local decision-making. It does not make sense to spend time on specification unless these issues have been addressed. Therefore, RAN2 needs to first agree on the benefits of local rerouting over central route configuration, and how topology-wide objectives can be addressed via local rerouting.

**Proposal 11: RAN2 to agree on specific benefits of local rerouting over central route configuration, and on how topology-wide objectives can be guaranteed via local decision making.**

### 2.2.12 Multiple routes with route priority

Proposed by R2-2006624, R2-200720

This topic was considered during early Rel-16 discussions on routing and never followed up anymore.

**Q12: Please provide your views on purpose/benefit, technical solution, potential shortcomings and specification effort for this enhancement candidate.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Kyocera | We think this topic can be considered together with Q11 (i.e., Local route selection beyond RLF). We assume the route with the smallest number of hops should be prioritized but the route priority is up to IAB-donor configuration |
| LG | We think that this enhancement is minor optimization and needed only when local rerouting is allowed other than BH RLF. If local rerouting is performed only after BH RLF as in Rel-16 IAB, gains of this enhancement is very limited and may be not meaningful. Thus, it is better to discuss the local rerouting or route selection issue first and then we can come back to discuss this issue after RAN2 determines something on local rerouting issue. It is also expected that if we do on this issue, most of work may be charged in RAN2. |
| Huawei | Before we agree anything, we need ensure this does not conflict with the R16 BAP routing architecture (based on routing ID configured by CU rather than based on the routing entry priority).  We need to clarify if this is only used in case of local re-routing.  Need more clarification on the proposal before we provide views on purpose/benefit, technical solution, potential shortcomings and specification effort for this enhancement candidate. |
| Samsung | * Purpose / benefit: to respond swiftly on the local situation of channel, load, latency status etc * Technical solution: donor CU configures the priority on each possible paths, and gives the related condition. IAB node follow this configuration * Potential shortcomings: related specification is necessary   Specification effort: mainly BAP spec needs to resolve this routing opration. |
| Ericsson | During Rel-16, RAN2 didn’t find any real benefits of multiple routes with route priority. Hence, the proponents of route priority should highlight why it is worth the effort to discuss in Rel-17. |
| Intel | No, path priority can be various considering different scenarios, it’s hard to set a common priority criterion, considering throughput/latency/QoS/fairness/etc. |
| vivo | Not sure what does priority mean. The current routing scheme implicitly support two priorities: the desired route to destination and other route that can reach the same destination. If the route of the highest priority is always selected, there is no need to introduce route priority.  We prefer not to introduce route priority. |
| ZTE | We also think this question can be pending on the progress of Q11. Whether priority or other routing metric should be considered depends on what kind of re-routing scenario is supported. |
| Sony | As in 2.2.11, we think this should be considered. The detailed criteria and assistance information can be discussed later. |
| CATT | We have no strong view on this. We wonder how to set the priority on the routing path. We should first clarify whether/ what the priority is based on some criterion. |
| Futurewei | In our opinion this issue can not be separated from Q11. If we support local routing decisions in Rel. 17, then to be consistent with the Rel 16 BAP routing mechanisms, the forwarding options for a given Routing ID should be configured by the donor CU. Furthermore, if more than one forwarding option is provided for a Routing ID, then the donor CU should also define how the IAB node prioritizes these different forwarding options. |
| AT&T | We believe there are benefits of introducing route priority or route metric to better assist IAB nodes to make local routing decisions while still keeping the donor node in control of the overall routing functionality in an IAB network. |
| Apple | Agree for this to be considered. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We think that this would increase the level of control of local re-routing compared to the current specification where any alternative link available toward the destination may be selected. |

**Summary**

**Support:** 5 companies support multiple routes with route priority. 3 companies believe it should be made dependent on the discussion on local rerouting (Q11). 2 companies feel that more clarification is required (e.g. on the benefits). 2 companies do not support this feature.

**Purpose/benefit**: None of the benefits defined in section 2.1. were named in context of this feature.

**Technical solution**: While configuration of multiple routes seems straightforward, several companies felt that the route priority needs more clarification.

**Potential shortcomings**: Nothing obvious.

**Specification effort**: The problem is the unprecise definition of purpose and expected benefit of this feature. This discussion may take considerable effort.

**The rapporteur’s view**: Since no obvious purpose/benefit could be named, we should not spend time on further discussion.

**Proposal 12: Multiple routes with route priorities are deprioritized.**

### 2.2.13 Inter-donor-DU rerouting

Proposed by R2-2007865, RAN3 agreement

RAN3 has already agreed that:

**Inter-Donor-DU re-routing can be discussed later or after RAN2 decision.**

RAN3 precluded inter-donor-DU rerouting during Rel-16 since this could create packet discard on the wireless network as the source IP address of the rerouted packet would not be compliant with the address pool of the local subnet.

Please address this issue in your comment.

**Q13: Please provide your views on purpose/benefit, technical solution, potential shortcomings and specification effort for this enhancement candidate.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Kyocera | We don’t have strong view on this topic. |
| LG | The inter-Donor-DU re-routing is to retransmit the buffered BAP PDUs to the new donor-DU after intra-donor topology or inter-donor topology update, but this requires to change the carried BAP routing ID which is not allowed for re-routing even after BH RLF in Rel-16 IAB. In addition, in inter-donor topology update case, even though the packets containing PDCP PDUs is successfully retransmitted to the new donor-CU, these PDCP PDUs may be discarded because the applied security configuration is different the at the new donor-CU. This means that radio resource is wasted. We think that simple approach is to rely on upper layer retransmission mechanism, e.g., TCP or application level retransmission. |
| Huawei | Agree to support the inter-donor-DU rerouting.  We intend to solve this for the case of intra-/inter-CU migration.  For the packed discard issue at new donor-DU, as mentioned by rapporteur, one example is that new donor-DU does not apply the “IP address filer” during the period of migration.  **Purpose/benefit**: The purpose is for data lossless, which is more like to fix the R16 leftover/bugs. In R17, once we have the intra-/inter-CU migration, the destination donor-DU (i.e. destination BAP address) may change. The UE’s traffic may be lost once the data has been added with the BAP header, which is not allowed to be modified, even in case the destination donor-DU has changed.  **Technical solution**: In R17, the BAP routing ID in the BAP header should be allowed to be modified, so that the BAP data during the migration period can be routed to the new donor-DU.  **Potential shortcomings**: N/A.  **Specification effort**: To specific how to route the on-the-air data to the target donor DU and how to avoid the data being discarded at target donor DU due to the source IP address filer. |
| Samsung | **purpose/benefit:**   * During inter-donor-DU migration, such inter-donor-DU rerouting can help to anchor the packets transmitted via the source path to the source donor CU even if the donor DU is changed. Thus, we think such inter-donor-DU re-routing can avoid packet loss   **technical solution:**   * Source IP filtering enhancement at the target donor DU, e.g., avoid discarding the packets with the source IP address at the source path   **potential shortcomings:**   * Need enhancement to overcome the source IP filtering at the donor DU.   **specification effort:**   * F1AP enhancement inside donor. |
| Ericsson | In our view, RAN3 should solve the issue of packet discard for inter-donor-DU rerouting before any discussion on this topic in RAN2. |
| Intel | We think this can be left to RAN3 discussion |
| vivo | We don’t prefer inter-donor rerouting in Rel-17 as the rerouting is complex. We can just rely on TCP retransmission for simplicity. |
| ZTE | Inter-donor DU re-routing is beneficial to avoid data packet loss in topology adaptation or BH RLF recovery scenario. However, to support this feature, the ingress IP filtering in the routers between the new donor DU and the new donor CU should be disabled. |
| Sony | We have no strong view on this. |
| KDDI | we should also consider how to deal with Cipher process in this topic |
| CATT | We think this issue is mainly for RAN3. We prefer to wait until RAN3 have clear way for this. |
| Futurewei | It would be useful to support inter-donor-DU routing. Unfortunately, this problem was a direct result of the ill-advised decision to include an IP layer in the BH transport, which has no functional use whatsoever. In fact, many of the complications of the Rel. 16 solution, and much of the discussion time was wasted, trying to find work arounds that were the direct result of this protocol stack decision. We suspect that going forward, this protocol stack will continue to present new challenges and problems, in addition to those that were already identified in Rel. 16.  Therefore, we will not support adding additional kludges in each release to work around every new consequence of this protocol stack decision, as this would be a complete waste of time and effort.  Rather our view is that time and effort be better spent on defining an alternative BH transport protocol stack that eliminates the unnecessary IP layer, and thereby frees us from the need to consider such work-arounds in the future. |
| Apple | No strong view. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We think that further RAN3 discussions are needed here e.g., regarding IP addressing. At this stage RAN2 scope to discuss is not fully clear. |

**Summary**

**Support:** 4 companies support local rerouting. 4 companies believe that this is RAN3 discussions are needed. 4 companies have no strong view. 2 companies do not support the feature.

**Purpose/benefit**: Based on the replies, the main benefit is improved service interruption through the reduction of packet loss during topology adaptation.

**Technical solution**: Some companies referred to BAP header rewriting. Also, the need for re-ciphering was considered. One company proposed a new protocol stack.

**Potential shortcomings**: Packet discarding by routers for non-local IP source address.

**Specification effort**: Not easy to estimate since no obvious solution has been proposed.

**The rapporteur’s view**: Local rerouting is already supported by implementation in Rel-16 IAB if the CU configures IAB-donor-DUs with same BAP address. This, in fact, does not require any further specification effort. The problem of packet discard by routers still applies, and it needs to be addressed via implementation.

**Proposal 13:** -/-

### 2.2.14 IAB-specific admission control during RLF recovery

Identified in RAN3 discussion

The main idea is to give IAB-MT’s priority over UEs in admission control during RLF recovery. Please describe in more detail how this could be accomplished.

**Q14: Please provide your views on purpose/benefit, technical solution, potential shortcomings and specification effort for this enhancement candidate.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Kyocera | We have no strong view, but tend to think we should wait for more information from RAN3. |
| LG | Not prefer to discuss this issue in this email discussion and want to wait more RAN3 progress.  It’s too early to figure out clearly what the RAN3 identified issue and we also think it is not urgent from RAN2 point of view and the RAN2 discussion/conclusion may be different depending on RAN3 decision/progress. Thus, we would like to discuss other RAN2 originated issues first, which are based on the contributions submitted in the last RAN2 meeting and it would be better to wait RAN3 progress on it and then RAN2 can start to discuss this issue based on more concrete RAN3 conclusion/progress. |
| Huawei | No strong view, but not clear on the purpose.  In R16, we agreed there is no need of early IAB indication than Msg5. We need to clarify why there is no need to prioritize the IAB during RRC connection setup but there is the need in RRC re-establishment case. |
| Samsung | This scheme is unclear to us. If the intention is to give IAB-MT’s priority over UEs in admission control during RLF recovery, it sounds a potential enhancement. However, before we have technical discussions, we need some more information about this scheme. |
| Ericsson | Admission control is not a RAN2-driven topic. So RAN2 can wait progress in RAN3 before discussing, if needed, this issue. |
| Intel | It will be nice to quote the RAN3 discussion text, or at least under which agenda item was found for RAN2 to better capture the discussion.  We think differentiation between priority of IAB-MT and UE is not essential. RLF recovery can be prioritized over regular access any time, whether further prioritization is necessary is not clear to us. |
| vivo | Good NW implementation shall be able handle this, e.g., to prioritize IAB re-establishment over UE access. |
| ZTE | It is suggested to first clarify this scenario and given more details. Or we can wait for RAN3’s progress. |
| Sony | We have no strong view. |
| CATT | We don’t see the big motivation to differentiate the admission control between MT and UE. |
| Sharp | Agree on waiting for RAN3 progress. |
| Futurewei | It does not seem that anything related was captured in RAN3 agreements, so I’m not sure exactly what we should comment on.  In general, proponent companies are welcome to bring related contributions to either or both RAN2 and RAN3, and we can evaluate any related proposals (business as usual). |
| AT&T | At a conceptual level we see benefits of such a feature. However, details need to be discussed before agreeing to specify. |
| Apple | No strong view. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | At this stage, no clear impacts to RAN2 identified by this RAN3 item. |

**Summary:**

**Support:** 0 companies support IAB-specific admission control. 6 companies believe that RAN3 should first make progress on this topic. 5 companies need more clarification on the topic. 2 companies have no strong view. 1 company is opposed to support this feature.

**Purpose/benefit**: Company replies did not identify an obvious benefit.

**Technical solution**: Company replies did not identify an obvious solution.

**Potential shortcomings**: Not obvious due to lack of solution.

**Specification effort**: Not clear due to lack of solution.

**The rapporteur’s view**: Nobody really seems to like this feature.

**Proposal 13: IAB-specific admission control during RLF recovery is deprioritized.**

### 2.2.15 Sending F1AP configuration information via RRC

Identified in RAN3 discussion

The main idea is to avoid F1AP reconfiguration signalling handshakes by including the information in the handover command, for instance.

**Q15: Please provide your views on purpose/benefit, technical solution, potential shortcomings and specification effort for this enhancement candidate.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Kyocera | We’re wondering if RAN2 should wait for RAN3’s progress. |
| LG | Not prefer to discuss this issue in this email discussion and want to wait more RAN3 progress.  It’s too early to figure out clearly what the RAN3 identified issue and we also think it is not urgent from RAN2 point of view and the RAN2 discussion/conclusion may be different depending on RAN3 decision/progress. Thus, we would like to discuss other RAN2 originated issues first, which are based on the contributions submitted in the last RAN2 meeting and it would be better to wait RAN3 progress on it and then RAN2 can start to discuss this issue based on more concrete RAN3 conclusion/progress. |
| Huawei | We need to first clarify the proposal on what is the “F1AP reconfiguration signalling handshakes” and how can it be saved by included in RRC. |
| Samsung | To support CP-UP separate, NR RRC will be enhanced to include the F1AP message in the NR RRC as a container. However, I am not sure if it is beneficial to include F1AP message in some other RRC message, e.g., HO Command. Normally, I would like to separate the F1AP transmission from the RRC message. The reason is that in Rel-16, F1AP message is always transmitted via BH RLC CH. I don’t think breaking such principle is a good practice.  **purpose/benefit:**   * The benefit is unclear to us   **technical solution:**   * As described above   **Potential shortcomings:**   * Break the basic design in Rel-16, i.e., F1AP via BH RLC CH   **specification effort:**  Include F1AP in other RRC messages, e.g., HO CMD. |
| Ericsson | This is a RAN3 topic. So RAN2 can wait progress in RAN3 before discussing, if needed, this issue. |
| Intel | We think this can be left to RAN3 discussion, and RAN2 further enhance RRC signalling if there’s any RAN3 agreement. |
| vivo | Not sure if it is the right way to tightly couple the F1-AP reconfiguration signalling with RRC signalling. There could be many ways (e.g.old BAP address or node ID) to identify for which IAB node the F1-AP reconfiguration message is. We can discusses the solutions later after RAN3 progress. |
| ZTE | Sending F1AP configuration information via RRC (e.g. handover command) is beneficial to reduce service interruption in inter donor migration scenario. For example, NCGI, routing and traffic mapping information configured by target donor CU could be sent by target donor CU to source donor CU in advance via RRC in handover command during handover preparation phase. |
| Sony | We need RAN3 input on this. |
| KDDI | we are fine to discuss the enhancement of RRC so that some of the F1AP configuration can be configured with a RRC message, we think it will help to reduce the interruption time |
| CATT | Prefer to wait RAN3 progress. |
| Sharp | Agree on waiting for RAN3 progress. |
| Futurewei | I guess RAN2 discussed a somehow similar topic during the Rel. 16 WI phase. In that case we proposed defining containers for BAP configuration which can be carried by either RRC or F1AP. At the time there were concerns about the effort needed to define such a framework, and hence RAN2 concluded that BAP configuration should be done with F1AP only.  Our view is the same now as it was then: we should avoid duplication of information between the two protocols, as this would make the management of the configuration protocols too complicated going forward. We note that what SS discusses above (NR RRC container) avoids configuration duplication, so that is good.  That said, we should carefully consider the protocol stack and network architecture implications. Since RRC itself is encapsulated within parent node F1AP, it would seem that such a solution could result in recursive nesting of F1AP within RRC within F1AP, etc. which we explicitly tried to avoid during the SI phase. |
| AT&T | This issue may need to be discussed in RAN3. |
| Apple | Agree this is a RAN3 topic. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We think that in one form this seems already implemented, as discussed in section 2.2.3 above. On handover command specifically, increasing the message size may be undesirable unless CHO is used. |

**Summary:**

**Support:** 2 companies support sending F1AP configuration information via RRC. 9 companies prefer to wait for RAN3 on this topic. 1 company needs more clarification, another company believes that this is already supported in 2.2.3, i.e., CP redundancy via separate NR access link. 2 companies do not support this feature.

**Purpose/benefit**: The rapporteur believes that the benefit is reduction in service interruption. Other companies did not mention any further benefit.

**Technical solution**: Not provided.

**Potential shortcomings**: Not obvious.

**Specification effort**: Unclear.

**The rapporteur’s view**: Most companies believe that this feature is in the realm of RAN3.

**Proposal 15: RAN3 to decide on enhancements related to sending F1-AP information via RRC.**

### 2.2.16 Conditional packet duplication on BAP layer

Proposed by R2-2008025,

Conditional packet duplication is expected to increase robustness of the IAB networks. It would be also useful to decrease latency. To maximally utilize path diversity, it should be possible for conditional packet duplication to occur at the intermediate nodes over the routing path, not limited to the originating/source node. For this reason, packet duplication functionality should be located at BAP.

**Q16: Please provide your views on purpose/benefit, technical solution, potential shortcomings and specification effort for this enhancement candidate.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| LG | We think that it is worthwhile to discuss packet duplication at BAP entity to overcome packet loss and increase reliability after BH RLF.  One important issue is that conditional packet duplication should be triggered in a strictly controlled manner to avoid packet flooding in the IAB networks. This requires investigation on the triggering condition of duplication, selection of target packet flows allowed for duplication. |
| Ericsson | PDCP packet duplication is already possible and, with proper route ID setting and good implementation, it could be achieved that those packets follow different path. Nevertheless, packet duplication has a high cost in terms of resource consumption. For this reason, that should not be used as general solution to increase robustness, rather as a feature that can be beneficial only for certain specific types of traffic requiring high reliability and low latency. Also the standardization effort might not be trivial. That will affect the BAP, which will have to support at least functionalities for duplication execution, duplicates detection/discard. Also new BAP control signalling might be needed to indicate to child nodes that duplication is activated/deactivated. Besides, also the MAC layer will be affected since it has to ensure that the duplicates have to be mapped to separate carriers, as it happens in the legacy PDCP duplication.  If then the intention is to even support BAP duplicates transmissions towards different links/childs, then there is the risk that a high amount of duplicates are unnecessarily traversing different “branches” of the IAB network, which is certainly not desired from performance perspective |
| vivo | PDCP duplication can be used if necessary. Not sure if we have enough resource to discuss the new duplication scheme. |
| ZTE | It is suggested to only consider the PDCP duplication of UE instead of IAB node. |
| CATT | Same view as ZTE. |
| Futurewei | Similar to other companies we are a bit skeptical about the idea of duplicating (excuse the pun) the same/similar functionality in different protocol stack layers. We would prefer to avoid this if possible.  Perhaps there are alternative ways to accomplish the same goal without major changes to the functionality of existing protocols. |
| Apple | We agree with LG here and also agree that standardization might not be trivial esp. considering 1:N mapping and that losses might happen at intermediate RLCs. Irrespective of current timelines, a discussion should atleast happen on this topic. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Duplication options can be investigated but we should be careful with any “conditional” actions done at the IAB-nodes (especially any intermediate nodes, to avoid uncontrolled or undecodable packets generation).  If any potential scenario for conditional packet duplication is justified, it should rely on CU controlled packet duplications. However, we believe, a scenario needs to be made more clear, at first place. |

**Summary:**

**Support:** 3 companies believe that conditions packet duplication on BAP could be considered but all of these companies want to see strict control on the conditions. 5 companies believe that PDCP-based packet duplication can be used instead.

**Purpose/benefit**: Same as for PDCP-based packet duplication.

**Technical solution**: Not provided.

**Potential shortcomings**: Not obvious.

**Specification effort**: Even the three proponents consider the matter as non-trivial.

**The rapporteur’s view**: While the purpose of packet duplication is well known, it is not clear what benefit BAP-layer duplication would have over PDCP-layer duplication, which already exists.

**Proposal 15: BAP-layer packet duplication is deprioritized.**

### 2.2.17 Topology Establishment Enhancement

Proposed in R2-2006947,

Improve IAB topology establishment efficiency by considering IAB node integration sequence can help to reduce complexity of handover as well as reduce burden of topology reorganization and optimization. Hence, we propose that IAB node selects another IAB node or an IAB donor as a parent only if the RSRP of the IAB node or IAB donor exceeds a threshold (which is provided in system information). The threshold is successively decreased in steps to allow all IAB nodes to integrate into the network. Meanwhile, techniques to ensure that the number of hops to an access IAB node is limited should be considered.

**Q17: Please provide your views on purpose/benefit, technical solution, potential shortcomings and specification effort for this enhancement candidate.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Intel | Current topology node integration is highly dependent on the chosen sequence for activation of IAB nodes. To reorganize an inefficient topology towards a more efficient topology, the network needs to perform handovers in very specific sequences. Determining the sequences of such handovers is non-trivial and managing the complexity of such sequences of handovers can be challenging. An initial topology that is efficient can significantly reduce the burden of topology reorganization and optimization for network operators. |
| vivo | Topology adaption from the perspective of topology optimization can be achieved via migration procedure which is already in the WI scope. Some cell search procedure may cause additional standardization effort. |
| CATT | We understand the benefit as described by Intel. But we wonder whether it can be left to implementation of IAB network establishment. |
| Futurewei | Intel’s assumption seems to be that all IAB nodes served by a particular donor cell will be integrated into the network at the same time. The most likely deployment scenario is that IAB nodes will be added to the network gradually, as needed to enhance network coverage and/or capacity. Once the IAB MT establishes connectivity with the network, it is straight forward for the network to migrate this node to another cell, if desired. Alternatively, the operator may simply configure the IAB MT (via a local control/configuration interface) to connect via the desired parent node at integration time. Therefore, we don’t see any value to standardize anything related to this topic. |
| Apple | We believe this topology adaptation inherently has some advantages but doesn’t solve all of issues mentioned by Intel. We proposed a similar but enhanced procedure in R2-2002814 (RAN2#109bis-e) which will be resubmitted. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | The solution for selection among IAB nodes can be left to implementation choice. |

**Summary**

**Support:** 2 companies believe that the topology establishment enhancements described by R2-2006947 or R2-2002814 can have benefits. 4 companies believe that the topology establishment enhancements can be achieved via implementation.

**Purpose/benefit**: Faster achievement of final topology.

**Technical solution**: Procedure not described.

**Potential shortcomings**: Not obvious.

**Specification effort**: Not clear in absence of technical solution.

**The rapporteur’s view**: Assuming a procedure could be devised that leads to faster network integration of many nodes. Let’s further assume that such a procedure would need some specification (opposed to solely implementation). As Futurewei pointed out, it is not obvious that simultaneous integration of multiple IAB-nodes is realistic since nodes can be expected to come up incrementally with potentially large time intervals. Further, even if the scenario were realistic it is still not obvious if faster network integration is a relevant objective. Even if the centralized procedure would take multiple topology adaptation steps, it may require only a few minutes until the IAB-nodes become available for service, which might be considered acceptable. Finally, the objective of fast network integration was never considered under purposes/benefits in section 2.1.

**Proposal 17: Procedures for faster topology integration are deprioritized.**

### 2.2.18 Other enhancements

**Q18: Please propose other enhancements. Please include your views on purpose/benefit, technical solution, potential shortcomings and specification effort for this enhancement candidate.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Enhancement proposed** |
| Kyocera | We think the lossless delivery over hop-by-hop RLC ARQ becomes more important in Rel-17, which was studied as in section 8.2.3 of TR 38.874. We assume the IAB-DU may delay RLC ACK to its child nodes by implementation, but think Stage-2 should capture the outline of how to achieve the end-to-end reliability over multi-hop network. |
| Huawei | R2 impact for **inter-CU RLF recovery** (not enhancement but the basic procedure)  RAN2 needs to discuss the behaviours of the descendent IAB-nodes/UEs of the IAB-node recovering to a new IAB-donor-CU, in the following two aspects: 1) How can descendent IAB-nodes and UEs be aware of the CU change? 2) Whether descendent IAB-nodes and UEs should migrate/re-establish to the new IAB-donor-CU together with the recovering IAB-node? |
| vivo | Intra-frequency DC needs to be discussed from the perspective of inter-CU migration. It seems feasible to introduce intra-frequency DC to create redundant route for migration in Rel-17. For intra-carrier DC, the major standardization work is in RAN1 for radio aspects. The RAN2/RAN3 protocols for inter-carrier DC can be just reused. It is FFS which aspects shall be enhanced from RAN2/3 later on. |
| CATT | We think the loss-less packet delivery during IAB-node migration is needed‎. The benefit is to reduce the packet loss and potential re-transmission which can also reduce the latency. The loss-less packet delivery may impact RAN2 and RAN3 specs. |
| Apple | We believe that additional enhancements are needed for RLC atleast for 1:N mapped scenarios to ensure lower latency. |
|  |  |

**Summary: The rapporteur’s view**

**Lossless delivery over hop-by-hop RLC ARQ**:

Packet loss avoidance and recovery during topology adaptation have been captured in RAN3 agreement:

**Discuss mitigation of packet loss and reduction of unnecessary transmissions during IAB-node migration.**

This will be part of RAN3’s discussion on enhancements to topology adaptation procedures.

**Inter-CU RLF recovery for descendant nodes/UEs:**

RAN3 certainly needs to first identify a baseline procedure for inter-CU RLF recovery. This procedure is necessary to understand the shortcomings from collective migration of the entire subtree. Apart from that, all descendant nodes (and their UEs), which have a redundant CP path, can always be migrated independently, disregarding of the inter-DU RLF recovery procedure.

**Intra-frequency DC:** This has just been discussed in RAN Plenary #89 for Rel-17 IAB without agreement. This is further primarily in RAN1 scope.

**Enhancements to RLC for N:1 mapped bearers:** It is not clear what enhancements would need to be considered.

# Phase 2: Clarification, consolidation, down-scoping of candidate features

### 2.1 Purpose/benefit of enhancement

**Summary:**

This discussion was only on the purposes/benefits related to topology adaptation enhancements. Some proposals included technical solutions (e.g. “…using XYZ technique”), which are not considered here.

The following purpose/benefits were identified:

Robustness

* This includes robustness against RLF, e.g., as caused by rapid shadowing
* It includes aspects related to physical IAB-node mobility that cause backhaul link changes in analogue manner as rapid shadowing. Since the support for IAB-node mobility is not explicitly captured as a separate objective in the WID, we cannot define features that solely serve to support IAB-node mobility.

Reduced service interruption

* This includes reduction in RLF recovery time and service interruption due to other topology adaptation procedures.
* It further includes reduction in packet loss and latency due to topology adaptation procedures and RLF recovery.

Load balancing

* This includes load balancing among different IAB-nodes, IAB-donor-DUs and IAB-donor-CUs.

Reduction of signaling load

* This refers to signaling load related to topology adaptation

**The rapporteur’s view:** We will consider all of these purposes/benefits for the following discussion on enhancements.

**Proposal 0: Consider enhancements to topology adaptation that improve:**

* **Robustness, e.g., to rapid shadowing,**
* **service-interruption,**
* **load balancing among different IAB-nodes IAB-donor-DUs and IAB-donor-CUs, and**
* **reduction in signaling load.**

**Q0: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Kyocera | We assume Proposal 0 intends all aspects the rapporteur summarized above. In this sense, we agree with Proposal 0. |
| **Huawei** | Prefer to delete “e.g., to rapid shadowing”. |
| Futurewei | It seems more appropriate to refer to enhancements to *topology adaptation procedures*, rather than to *topology adaptation*. Therefore, we propose to slight change proposal 0 to read:  **Proposal 0: Consider enhancements to topology adaptation *procedures* that improve:**  **…**  A second concern is that it is not entirely clear what “considering enhancements to improve load balancing” actually means. Surely topology adaptation procedures can be used to achieve better load balancing. However, load balancing seems to be something that the network would decide on and invoke an appropriate procedure if necessary. So, we’re not sure what RAN2 would be attempting to capture in the spec in this regard. Certainly, a procedure might be invoked with the purpose of achieving load balancing, but it’s difficult to envision what a “load balancing” specific topology adaptation procedure would look like. Therefore, we think the 3rd bullet under proposal is not really needed and can be removed. |
|  |  |

### 2.2.1 CHO

**Support:** All companies supported CHO for IAB-MT. Many companies emphasize that IAB-specific modifications need to be considered.

**Purpose/benefit**:

* Robustness through avoidance of HO failure.
* Improvement of service interruption for RLF recovery.

**Technical solution**:

* Rel-16 CHO can be used as baseline. The following IAB-specific aspects or enhancements were proposed:
  + Preparation of descendant nodes/UEs
  + Consideration of different conditions for HO execution
  + Preparation of routing for candidate cells

**Potential shortcomings**: No shortcomings were identified.

**Specification effort**: Dependent on enhancements needed over baseline.

**The rapporteur’s view:** The benefit is obvious and there is a lot of support. RAN2 should work on the IAB-specific modifications.

**Proposal 1: Rel-16 CHO is supported for IAB-MT as baseline; IAB-specific enhancements should be considered.**

**Q1: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### 2.2.2 DAPS

**Summary:**

**Support:**

5 companies expressed favorable views for DAPS, 7 companies unfavorable, 4 companies ask for more clarifications or are undecided.

Several companies believe that clarification is needed on what DAPS means for BH RLC channels since it is presently only defined for PDCP connections.

**Purpose/benefit**:

* The principal benefit is the reduction of interruption time.
* Some companies point out that this benefit presently only applies to inter-frequency handover. Since last RAN Plenary meeting could not agree to support intra-frequency NR DC in Rel-17 IAB, it is unlikely that intra-frequency DAPS will be supported for Rel-17 IAB.
* There is presently no support for (inter-frequency) FR2-FR2 DAPS which further reduces the potential benefit.
* The benefit further needs to be compared to other interruption time contributions which are significant.

**Technical solution**: DAPS needs to be extended to BH RLC channels.

**Potential shortcomings**: Not obvious at present stage.

**Specification effort**: Many companies claim that the specification effort is significant.

**The rapporteur’s view:**

The rapporteur believes that the term *Dual Active Protocol Stack* is well applicable to IAB, even though it is not used for PDCP connections. Rel-16 IAB uses the term *NR DC* for backhaul even though it primarily applies to BH RLC channels rather than DRBs. It is obvious that DAPS might need modifications when applied to IAB.

Since the benefit of DAPS is rather limited, the specification effort is considered significant, and the majority of companies does not support the effort, it is proposed to deprioritize DAPS for backhaul.

**Proposal 2: DAPS is deprioritized for backhaul.**

**Q2: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **Huawei** | We are wondering the relationship with R3 agreement “The following cases for inter-donor migration are studied: IAB-MT is simultaneously connected to two IAB-donors”. Does it mean the only way to use simultaneous connection, if we agree P2, is to use the DC?  We need to clarify if it is still OK for IAB-MT itself to use the DAPS when performing migration between donors. |
| Futurewei | Huawei has raised a good point. The wording of the proposal seems too strong. Should we prevent the IAB-MT from using DAPS even for radio bearers that terminate at the IAB-MT (e.g. SRBs), and hence do have a PDCP.  Perhaps it would be better to clarify the proposal. |

### 2.2.3 CP redundancy via separate NR access link

**Summary:**

**Support:** 7 companies expressed favorable views, 1 company unfavorable views, 7 companies believe that more progress needs to be made in RAN3.

**Purpose/benefit**: Same as for equivalent ENDC solution in Rel-16 (which is enhanced robustness).

**Technical solution**: Very close to equivalent ENDC solution in Rel-16.

**Potential shortcomings**: Nothing obvious.

**Specification effort**: Many companies claim that the specification effort is rather small.

**The rapporteur’s view:**

There is a lot of support for this feature. The benefit is obvious. The specification effort is believed to be rather small. The main question is if RAN3 should make more progress before RAN2 picks up.

RAN3 has already determined that the feature can be used, and it can be expected that they to do their part of the effort. Further, the specification can be expected straightforward since the functionality is very close to what RAN2 has already done for ENDC in Rel-16. It is therefore not clear why RAN2 would have to wait for RAN3. Instead, RAN2 should go ahead and do their part of the work.

**Proposal 3: RAN2 to support CP redundancy via separate NR access link.**

**Q3: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Kyocera | We’re fine with Proposal 3 in general. We just wonder if Proposal 3 can make more progress with adding e.g., “RAN2 assumes Rel-16 solution for EN-DC can be reused”, if it’s already clear among companies. |
| **Huawei** | We are not ready to agree this before R3 make the decision.  BTW, if the R2 impact is quiet small, what’s the rush to work on this rather than wait for more progress in R3.  Please note the R3 agreement is only for “Consider Scenario 1 and 2” rather than “support”. |
| Futurewei | If the intent of this proposal is limited specifically to the intra-donor case, then we don’t support it.  If the intent is to address the inter-donor case, then we are not clear what is the difference compared to 2.2.4 “Redundancy via inter-donor NR\_DC”.  The reason that we can not support this proposal for the intra-donor case is that, per our understanding, redundancy is already supported for F1-C via multi-homing in Rel. 16. Therefore, it seems that there would be nothing new to be addressed here.  If on the other hand, this issue is related to the inter-donor case, then we do not see this as separate from 2.2.4 “Redundancy via inter-donor NR\_DC”.  Furthermore, the RAN3 agreement cited does not seem to be related to CP redundancy at all:  **Consider Scenario 1 and 2 for CP/UP separation:**  **Scenario 1: F1-C via M-NG-RAN node (non-donor node) + F1-U via S-NG-RAN node (donor node)**  **Scenario 2: F1-U via M-NG-RAN node (donor node) + F1-C via S-NG-RAN node (non-donor node)**  This agreement is discussing routing F1-C and F1-U via different gNBs, not CP redundancy. In other words, the agreement is discussing CP/UP separation. Also, it is not clear here what is the exact meaning of a “non-donor node”.  Since it is not clear what issue needs to be addressed, nor even what topic Proposal 3 pertains to, we can not agree to the proposal. |

### 2.2.4 Redundancy via inter-donor NR-DC

**Summary:**

**Support:** 3 companies expressed favorable views, 9 companies believe that more RAN3 work is needed, 4 companies do not understand the feature. One of the companies, who does not understand the feature, actually promoted it in RAN3. It was further pointed out by that RAN3 had not really agreed to support this feature but to rather analyze the above two scenarios. Some companies promoted specific technical solutions, e.g., such as local rerouting, which were not considered since they were out of scope.

**Purpose/benefit**: Robustness and fine-granular inter-donor load balancing. Note that only few companies addressed the potential benefit.

**Technical solution**: Many companies believe that more RAN3 work is needed. Coordination between both donors for transport and resource allocation between adjacent topologies is needed.

**Potential shortcomings**: Not clear without more detailed technical solution.

**Specification effort**: Not obvious in absence of further progress in RAN3.

**The rapporteur’s view:** There is no doubt that this feature is beneficial for robustness and load balancing. There are multiple technical issues related to coordination between both donors, which presently reside in the realm of RAN3. It therefore seems that RAN2 should wait for more progress in RAN3.

**Proposal 4: For redundancy via inter-donor NR-DC, RAN2 to wait for further progress by RAN3.**

**Q4: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### 2.2.5 Redundancy using routing via descendant nodes

**Summary:**

**Support:**

3 companies expressed favorable views, 6 companies unfavorable, 4 companies think that more discussion is necessary, and 1 company believes it should be left up to implementation.

There seems to be lack of understanding how this feature would work. For instance, several companies believe that the features should be discussed together with enhancements local rerouting. This is not correct; the feature could leverage centralized route configuration and RLF-based local rerouting.

**Purpose/benefit**: Robustness, faster recovery in case of RLF.

**Technical solution**: As was pointed out be a few companies, rerouting via descendant nodes can use the Rel-16 centralized route configuration framework together with Rel-16 RLF-based local-rerouting.

**Potential shortcomings**: Not clear if there are actual shortcomings or misunderstanding on how the feature works.

**Specification effort**: Some companies believe there is hardly any specification effort necessary while others believe it is significant.

**The rapporteur’s view:** The benefit of the feature is obvious. However, it seems that there is quite some confusion on how this feature would work, and therefore, the views are spread on how much specification effort is needed. Promoters of the features should be given the chance to clarify in more detail what specifications would be necessary to accommodate this enhancement.

**Proposal 5: Redundancy using routing via descendant nodes is FFS.**

**Q5: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Futurewei | Agree. RAN2 should further study how routing via descendant nodes can be achieved. |
|  |  |

### 2.2.6 Redundancy via collocation of multiple MTs

**Support:** 3 companies expressed favorable views, 8 companies unfavorable, 3 companies believe it can be done via implementation.

**Purpose/benefit**: Robustness, load balancing. Same as DC; however, more than two parents can be supported.

**Technical solution**: There seems to be some confusion on how this feature would work. The rapporteur believes to understand that separate IAB-MTs can be collocated in the IAB-node via implementation. Some coordination is necessary between multiple parent links, but this is the same as for NR-DC-based redundancy and therefore supported. The CU(s) still need(s) to be informed about the collocation of the multiple IAB-MTs with the IAB-DU.

**Potential shortcomings**: Coordination of multiple parent links, i.e., same as for NR-DC-based redundancy solution.

**Specification effort**: The CU has to be informed that the IAB-MTs are collocated with IAB-DU. This is a minor effort.

**The rapporteur’s view:** The benefit is the same as for NR-DC-based redundancy. The benefit over NR-DC-base redundancy is that more than 2 parent nodes can be supported. There is some support for this feature, and the proponents believe that the specification effort is only minor. We may want to give the proponents the chance to elaborate what exactly this specification effort is, and to clarify why nothing else would be needed.

**Proposal 6: Support for multiple collocated IAB-MTs at the IAB-node is FFS.**

**Q6: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **Huawei** | No need to support this multi-MT, because this is the majority view in R17 (11 vs 3) and already discussed in R16.  At least, we need to add “…, pending on other RAN WGs” |
| Futurewei | A very clear majority of companies in Phase 1 indicated that they don’t see this topic as useful. Therefore, we propose that it would be appropriate to deprioritize this topic:  **Proposal 6: Support for multiple collocated IAB-MTs at the IAB-node is ~~FFS~~ *deprioritized*.** |

### 2.2.7 Enhancements to RLF indication

**Support:** 15 companies expressed favorable views, 1 company unfavorable views.

**Purpose/benefit**: Reduction of service interruption. Many other reasons were named that were not in compliance with those identified in section 2.1.

**Technical solution**: Additional indications, e.g., upon RLF determination and after RLF, were proposed. The behavior of the receiving node needs more discussion.

**Potential shortcomings**: Overhead on BAP control PDU, prolonged recovery if behavior of receiving node is not well defined.

**Specification effort**: The specification of the signaling enhancements seems straightforward. However, significant discussion is expected on the conditions for transmission of these signaling messages and the behavior of the receiving node.

**The rapporteur’s view:** Some companies believe this enhancement can reduce interruption time after BH RLF. Many companies do not provide concrete views on purpose/benefits, or the benefits provided are not in compliance with those identified in section 2.1. The further discussion should therefore focus on the reduction of interruption time.

The rapporteur believes that this overall feature needs to be well defined to ensure proper operation in a multi-operator network. This includes defining the condition for transmission of the new indications as well as the expected behavior on the receiving node.

**Proposal 7: RAN2 to discuss enhancements to RLF indication with the focus on the reduction of service interruption after BH RLF.**

**Q7: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Futurewei | We are generally fine with the proposal. However, we would prefer to slightly rephrase the scope as:  **Proposal 7: RAN2 to discuss *potential* enhancements to RLF indication *procedure* with the focus on the reduction of service interruption after BH RLF.** |
|  |  |

### 2.2.8 Avoiding RLF recovery at former descendant node

**Support:** 8 companies expressed favorable views to discuss the matter, 4 company unfavorable views, 2 companies asked for more clarification.

**Purpose/benefit**: Reduction of service interruption due to RLF recovery (only named by one company).

**Technical solution**: This “enhancement” defines a problem rather than a solution.

**Potential shortcomings**: Not clear since his “enhancement” defines a problem rather than a solution.

**Specification effort**: Not clear since his “enhancement” defines a problem rather than a solution.

**The rapporteur’s view**: Recovery attempts at former descendant nodes refers to a problem rather than an enhancement proposal. Many companies acknowledge that this is a relevant problem that should be discussed in Rel-17 IAB. All except one company fail to identify the purpose or benefit of this feature. Therefore, discussion on the avoidance of recovery attempts at former descendent nodes can continue for the benefit of reduced service interruption due to RLF recovery, named by this one company.

**Proposal 8: Avoidance of recovery attempts at former descendent nodes for reduced service interruption due to RLF recovery is FFS.**

**Q8: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **Huawei** | We prefer to the wording “deprioritized” rather than “FFS”, since the implementation handling is anyway the baseline solution for this issue. |
| Futurewei | No strong opinion whether this topic should be deprioritized or considered FFS. We are fine to go with the majority view. |

### 2.2.9 Message bundling (e.g. “group mobility”)

**Support:** 5 companies expressed favorable views, 6 company unfavorable views, 3 companies prefer to wait for further progress in RAN3 and 2 companies had no strong view.

**Purpose/benefit**: Reduction of signaling and service interruption (due to processing of signaling). One company claims that there is no benefit.

**Technical solution**: Many companies felt that this mainly affected RAN3.

**Potential shortcomings**: Large message size.

**Specification effort**: Several companies referred to F1 and Xn which are in the realm of RAN3.

**The rapporteur’s view**: The promoters claim there is some benefit in the bundling of signaling. While there was some support for this enhancement, it seems not clear if this effort affects RAN2 or if it is primarily confined to RAN3. For this, more progress on topology adaptation procedures needs to be made by RAN3.

**Proposal 9: For message bundling, RAN2 to wait for more progress to be made in RAN3 on topology adaptation procedures.**

**Q9: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### 2.2.10 Replace/avoid UE/child-MT RACH at inter-donor topology adaptation

**Support:** 6 companies expressed support for RACH-less procedure without any indication on how the associated security association change would be triggered. This, however, is the main issue at stake. 1 company believes it is too premature to discuss this topic. Another company supports the feature and at least recognizes that there is a security issue to be addressed. Yet another company actually proposes a solution.

**Purpose/benefit**: Companies named reduction of signaling and service interruption (due to processing of signaling). One company claims that there is no benefit.

**Technical solution**: Some companies felt that this mainly affected RAN3. Only one company proposed a solution.

**Potential shortcomings**: Break of legacy security procedure unless an alternative to RA procedure is used.

**Specification effort**: Not clear in absence of a technical discussion/solution.

**The rapporteur’s view**: It does not make sense to discuss a RACH-less procedure if the associated security issue is not addressed. Only two companies seemed to acknowledge the security issue. This indicates that it is too premature to discuss the feature in RAN2. Let’s wait for RAN3 to make further progress on this topic.

**Proposal 10: RAN3 to make further progress on inter-donor topology adaptation before optimizations to UE and descendant-node RA procedures can be considered.**

**Q10: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **Huawei** | Based on the phase 1 discussion, there seems enough/majority supports and the explanation on the security. The rapporteur’s concern is more like on the detailed solution rather than on the need.  It does not have to be agreed for next meeting but should be discussed by R2 or keep it as FFS at least. Therefore, we prefer instead: “RAN2 to discuss the optimizations to UE and descendant-node RA procedures.” |
|  |  |

### 2.2.11 Local route selection beyond RLF

**Support:** Many companies believe that local rerouting should be supported for load balancing and congestion mitigation. Only 2 companies address the rapporteur’s question on how such local rerouting can have topology-wide view. Only one company thinks that unrestricted re-routing may result in inconsistent behavior for E2E flow control.

**Purpose/benefit**: Companies provided load balancing and congestion mitigation as reasons.

* No company explained why local rerouting would balance load better than CU-controlled load balancing.
* No compny addressed the question raised by the rapporteur on how the local node can have the topology-wide view that is essential for load balancing.
* The rapporteur further does not understand how local load balancing would comply with RAN3’s agreement:

**Deprioritize Multi-Route Support with data split in IAB.**

* Congestion mitigation is not part of this email discussion. Further, congestion mitigation was not considered in section 2.1 as potential purpose/benefit for enhancements to topology adaptation.

**Technical solution**: A few companies indicated that the node could select among multiple BAP routes configured by the CU (e.g. which have routing ID). The conditions are configured by the CU. Concrete examples for such conditions were not given. Companies did not address how topology-wide criteria could be considered by the local node.

**Potential shortcomings**: Performance deterioration if the node selects only based on local rather than global conditions.

**Specification effort**: The understanding of purpose and benefit are too vague at present to gauge the specification effort. The discussion on what this feature should achieve will certainly take a significant amount of time.

**The rapporteur’s view**: While almost every company is in favor of local rerouting nobody can clearly explain what benefits it has over centrally configured route configurations, and how topology-wide objectives can be satisfied by local decision-making. It does not make sense to spend time on specification unless these issues have been addressed. Therefore, RAN2 needs to first agree on the benefits of local rerouting over central route configuration, and how topology-wide objectives can be addressed via local rerouting.

**Proposal 11: RAN2 to agree on specific benefits of local rerouting over central route configuration, and on how topology-wide objectives can be guaranteed via local decision making.**

**Q11: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Kyocera | Considering “almost every company is in favor of local rerouting” as the rapporteur summarized, we wonder if RAN2 can agree that “RAN2 will aim to the solutions for the local rerouting that should guarantee topology-wide objective”. We also assume the local rerouting does not replace the central route configuration, but it’s rather supplemental mechanism on top of Rel-16 routing. |
| **Huawei** | The answer to “on the benefits of local rerouting over central route configuration, and how topology-wide objectives can be addressed via local rerouting” can be referred to R16 local rerouting in RLF, where the benefit is the fast response and the backup path is also central configuration.  Therefore, based on the clear majority view, we prefer to formulate as below:  “R2 to discuss the local rerouting including the benefits over central route configuration, and on how topology-wide objectives can be guaranteed.” |
| Futurewei | We are generally fine with the proposed wording from Huawei. However, as mentioned by Kyocera above, we also do not view local routing as somehow being a replacement for central route configuration, but rather as supplemental. Therefore, we prefer to slightly qualify the wording proposed by Huawei as:  **Proposal 11: R2 to discuss the local rerouting including the benefits ~~over~~ *compared to* central route configuration *alone*, and on how topology-wide objectives can be ~~guaranteed~~ *addressed*.** |

### 2.2.12 Multiple routes with route priority

**Support:** 5 companies support multiple routes with route priority. 3 companies believe it should be made dependent on the discussion on local rerouting (Q11). 2 companies feel that more clarification is required (e.g. on the benefits). 2 companies do not support this feature.

**Purpose/benefit**: None of the benefits defined in section 2.1. were named in context of this feature.

**Technical solution**: While configuration of multiple routes seems straightforward, several companies felt that the route priority needs more clarification.

**Potential shortcomings**: Nothing obvious.

**Specification effort**: The problem is the unprecise definition of purpose and expected benefit of this feature. This discussion may take considerable effort.

**The rapporteur’s view**: Since no obvious purpose/benefit could be named, we should not spend time on further discussion.

**Proposal 12: Multiple routes with route priorities are deprioritized.**

**Q12: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Kyocera | We think the multiple routes could be related to the local routing in Q11. So, it’s too early to decide to deprioritize. As we commented in Phase 1, we think the least number of hops could be prioritized, which would naturally reduce service interruption due to less likelihood of BH RLF. |
| Futurewei | Similar to 2.2.11, it seems that the view of most companies is that some form of priorities may be useful for the CU to configure the behavior of local routing decisions at the IAB node. There were a few negative comments in phase 1, but these were by no means the majority view.  We see this topic as just part of the local routing discussion. So we don’t need to exclude anything at this stage. After discussing local routing, we may conclude that priorities are beneficial, or that they are not needed. But this should be contribution driven (i.e. business as usual). Therefore, we suggest to change proposal 12 to read:  **Proposal 12: Whether and how to define priorities for local route selection is FFS ~~Multiple routes with route priorities are deprioritized~~.** |

### 2.2.13 Inter-donor-DU rerouting

**Support:** 4 companies support local rerouting. 4 companies believe that this is RAN3 discussions are needed. 4 companies have no strong view. 2 companies do not support the feature.

**Purpose/benefit**: Based on the replies, the main benefit is improved service interruption through the reduction of packet loss during topology adaptation.

**Technical solution**: Some companies referred to BAP header rewriting. Also, the need for re-ciphering was considered. One company proposed a new protocol stack.

**Potential shortcomings**: Packet discarding by routers for non-local IP source address.

**Specification effort**: Not easy to estimate since no obvious solution has been proposed.

**The rapporteur’s view**: Local rerouting is already supported by implementation in Rel-16 IAB if the CU configures IAB-donor-DUs with same BAP address. This, in fact, does not require any further specification effort. The problem of packet discard by routers still applies, and it needs to be addressed via implementation.

**Proposal 13: -/-**

**Q13: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **Huawei** | This should not be R3 decision from last R3 meeting agreement. “Inter-Donor-DU re-routing can be discussed later or after RAN2 decision.”  As we discussed in R16, the BAP address under donor CU should be unique, which does not allow “CU configures IAB-donor-DUs with same BAP address”. We are not sure how to ensure the data lossless in case of IAB RLF recovery/migration to a different donor DU, by implementation.  If only two companies do not support this in phase 1, the essential issue on data lossless at least should be addressed/discussed by R2 with some proposal like “R2 to discuss the solution to support inter-donor-DU rerouting”. |
|  |  |

### 2.2.14 IAB-specific admission control during RLF recovery

**Support:** 0 companies support IAB-specific admission control. 6 companies believe that RAN3 should first make progress on this topic. 5 companies need more clarification on the topic. 2 companies have no strong view. 1 company is opposed to support this feature.

**Purpose/benefit**: Company replies did not identify an obvious benefit.

**Technical solution**: Company replies did not identify an obvious solution.

**Potential shortcomings**: Not obvious due to lack of solution.

**Specification effort**: Not clear due to lack of solution.

**The rapporteur’s view**: Nobody really seems to like this feature.

**Proposal 14: IAB-specific admission control during RLF recovery is deprioritized.**

**Q14: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### 2.2.15 Sending F1AP configuration information via RRC

**Support:** 2 companies support sending F1AP configuration information via RRC. 9 companies prefer to wait for RAN3 on this topic. 1 company needs more clarification, another company believes that this is already supported in 2.2.3, i.e., CP redundancy via separate NR access link. 2 companies do not support this feature.

**Purpose/benefit**: The rapporteur believes that the benefit is reduction in service interruption. Other companies did not mention any further benefit.

**Technical solution**: Not provided.

**Potential shortcomings**: Not obvious.

**Specification effort**: Unclear.

**The rapporteur’s view**: Most companies believe that this feature is in the realm of RAN3.

**Proposal 15: RAN3 to decide on enhancements related to sending F1-AP information via RRC.**

**Q15: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **Huawei** | We prefer no proposal in R2 at all. |
| Futurewei | We don’t agree to this wording. It seems to imply that RAN3 will decide what RRC does. This does not seem appropriate. |

### 2.2.16 Conditional packet duplication on BAP layer

**Support:** 3 companies believe that conditions packet duplication on BAP could be considered but all of these companies want to see strict control on the conditions. 5 companies believe that PDCP-based packet duplication can be used instead.

**Purpose/benefit**: Same as for PDCP-based packet duplication.

**Technical solution**: Not provided.

**Potential shortcomings**: Not obvious.

**Specification effort**: Even the three proponents consider the matter as non-trivial.

**The rapporteur’s view**: While the purpose of packet duplication is well known, it is not clear what benefit BAP-layer duplication would have over PDCP-layer duplication, which already exists.

**Proposal 16: BAP-layer packet duplication is deprioritized.**

**Q16: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### 2.2.17 Topology Establishment Enhancement

**Support:** 2 companies believe that the topology establishment enhancements described by R2-2006947 or R2-2002814 can have benefits. 4 companies believe that the topology establishment enhancements can be achieved via implementation.

**Purpose/benefit**: Faster achievement of final topology.

**Technical solution**: Procedure not described.

**Potential shortcomings**: Not obvious.

**Specification effort**: Not clear in absence of technical solution.

**The rapporteur’s view**: Assuming a procedure could be devised that leads to faster network integration of many nodes. Let’s further assume that such a procedure would need some specification (opposed to solely implementation). As Futurewei pointed out, it is not obvious that simultaneous integration of multiple IAB-nodes is realistic since nodes can be expected to come up incrementally with potentially large time intervals. Further, even if the scenario were realistic it is still not obvious if faster network integration is a relevant objective. Even if the centralized procedure would take multiple topology adaptation steps, it may require only a few minutes until the IAB-nodes become available for service, which might be considered acceptable. Finally, the objective of fast network integration was never considered under purposes/benefits in section 2.1.

**Proposal 17: Procedures for faster topology integration are deprioritized.**

**Q17: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### 2.2.18 Other enhancements

**Lossless delivery over hop-by-hop RLC ARQ**:

Packet loss avoidance and recovery during topology adaptation have been captured in RAN3 agreement:

**Discuss mitigation of packet loss and reduction of unnecessary transmissions during IAB-node migration.**

This will be part of RAN3’s discussion on enhancements to topology adaptation procedures.

**Inter-CU RLF recovery for descendant nodes/UEs:**

RAN3 certainly needs to first identify a baseline procedure for inter-CU RLF recovery. This procedure is necessary to understand the shortcomings from collective migration of the entire subtree. Apart from that, all descendant nodes (and their UEs), which have a redundant CP path, can always be migrated independently, disregarding of the inter-DU RLF recovery procedure.

**Intra-frequency DC:** This has just been discussed in RAN Plenary #89 for Rel-17 IAB without agreement. This is further primarily in RAN1 scope.

**Enhancements to RLC for N:1 mapped bearers:** It is not clear what enhancements would need to be considered.

**Proposal 18:** -/-

**Q18: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Kyocera | Regarding “Lossless delivery over hop-by-hop RLC ARQ”, we agree it’s related to RAN3 agreement as the rapporteur pointed out. However, given the WID states the topology adaptation enhancements, i.e., all the topics in this paper, are RAN3-led objectives but some topics will go forward as the rapporteur suggested above, and RAN2 already captured the Layer 2 issues/ the candidate solutions in TR 38.874, we still think RAN2 may start the discussion to resolve the Layer 2 issues.  Regarding “Inter-CU RLF recovery for descendant nodes/UEs”, we agree this is the basic procedure as Huawei pointed out, while RAN2 may need to wait for RAN3 progress a bit.  So, we think Proposal 18 should cover at least these two issues by e.g., “RAN2 will discuss the L2 issues on lossless delivery and inter-CU RLF recovery”. |
| **Huawei** | **Inter-CU RLF recovery for descendant nodes/UEs:** As to **“**all descendant nodes (and their UEs), which have a redundant CP path, can always be migrated independently” The common case is the child node may not have a redundant CP path. How to handle that case? |
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# Annex: RAN3 agreements from R3#109e

## 13.2. Topology Adaptation Enhancements

### 13.2.1. Inter-Donor IAB Node Migration

**Inter-donor migration due to load balancing and RLF recovery may use the same signaling, where additional procedures and signaling, specific for each of the use cases, are possible.**

**The following cases for inter-donor migration are studied:**

**a) IAB-MT is migrated between IAB-donors.**

**b) IAB-MT is simultaneously connected to two IAB-donors**

**c) IAB-DU is simultaneously connected to 2 donor-CUs (common understanding is that we won’t break F1 interface principles)**

**d) IAB-MT performs RLF recovery at new IAB-donor.**

**How to achieve b)?**

I) IAB-MT simultaneously connected to 2 donors;

**-> How to achieve I)?**

II) IAB node simultaneously connected to 2 donor-CUs.

**-> How to achieve II)?**

**When evaluating the solutions for inter-donor migration, the following aspects should be considered:**

**- the ability to avoid service interruption,**

**- the ability to avoid signaling storm caused by the migration,**

**- the incurred processing load caused by the migration (clarification: simultaneous migration of all affected devices causes more processing load than gradual migration),**

**- the complexity of the solution,**

**- the specification impact**

**The migration mechanism should allow to migrate to another donor all or some devices (the IAB nodes and/or UEs directly or indirectly served by the top-level IAB node).**

**We assume that all parent-child relations are retained at the new donor**

**(common understanding that this also includes UEs)**

**UEs and IAB-MTs should not be forced into connection re-establishment in order to migrate to a new donor**

**(common understanding that the network shall not force disconnection)**

The inter-donor migration solutions where IAB nodes maintain simultaneous connections to both donors are enabled.

**The following information should be made available to the new donor:**

**1. Contexts of all involved UEs,**

**2. Contexts of all involved MTs,**

**3. Contexts of all involved DUs,**

**4. Backhaul and topology-related information,**

**5. IP address information**

**Current signaling is taken as baseline for inter-donor migration of UEs and IAB-MTs**

**(common understanding is that we shall consider reducing the associated signaling load)**

**The approach where IAB-MT migration uses separate procedure from the ones used for migration of the collocated IAB-DU and the served UEs and MTs is adopted as baseline.**

**As baseline, IAB-MT migration should use a separate procedure w.r.t. the migration of the co-located IAB-DU, the served UEs and the served MTs**

### 13.2.2. Reduction of Service Interruption

**Topological redundancy should be considered as one mean among others for service interruption reduction.**

**CHO should be supported for IAB-MT.**

Chair: unless excluded, normally current functionality is applicable

**We shall consider how to reconfigure descendant nodes in order to reduce service interruption during migration**

**Discuss mitigation of packet loss and reduction of unnecessary transmissions during IAB-node migration.**

### 13.2.3. Topology Redundancy

**Consider Scenario 1 and 2 for CP/UP separation:**

**Scenario 1: F1-C via M-NG-RAN node (non-donor node) + F1-U via S-NG-RAN node (donor node)**

**Scenario 2: F1-U via M-NG-RAN node (donor node) + F1-C via S-NG-RAN node (non-donor node)**

**Analyze Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 for inter-Donor Topology Redundancy, with the principle that an IAB-DU only have F1 interface with one Donor-CU:**

**Scenario 1: the IAB is multi-connected with 2 Donors.**

**Scenario 2: the IAB’s parent/ancestor node is multi-connected with 2 Donors.**

**Routing Enhancement via descendant node can be discussed later or after RAN2 decision.**

**local re-routing scenario other than RLF can be discussed later or after RAN2 decision.**

**inter-Donor-DU re-routing can be discussed later or after RAN2 decision.**

**Deprioritize Multi-Route Support with data split in IAB.**

**Multi-MT Support is FFS in RAN3 pending RAN2**