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# Introduction

This document handles email discussion:

* [Post113-e][058][IAB17] Inter-donor topology adaptation (Qualcomm)

Scope: First round of discussion to understand impacts of inter-donor topology adaptation, based on RAN3 progress, and related required decisions in RAN2. Include e.g. BAP/IP routing and CP/UP split. Clarify the options on the table and their consequences. Pave the way for prioritization and selection decisions (to the extent possible).

Intended outcome: Report

Deadline: Long

We will try to cover two phases in this discussion.

**Phase 1**: Converge on the implications from RAN3 progress on RAN2.

The deadline of Phase 1 is Thursday, March 18, 11:00 UTC.

**Phase 2**: Derive proposals for online discussing during #114e.

The deadline of Phase 2 is Tuesday, April 1, 11:00 UTC.

The discussion is based on RAN3 progress on inter-donor topology adaptation and CP-UP split. I have copied the RAN3 agreements [1] here:

<https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Inbox/Drafts/eIAB>

The discussion includes two LS send by RAN3 to RAN2:

* [R2-2100040](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2100040.zip) LS on CP-UP separation of Rel-17 IAB (RAN3#110e)
* [R3-211331](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG3_Iu/TSGR3_111-e/Inbox/R3-211331.zip) LS on inter-donor topology redundancy (RAN3#111e)

The discussion includes additional RAN3 agreements from [1].

The discussion further includes the following contributions on CP-UP separation submitted to R2#113e:

* R2-2100612 On CP/UP split for topology adaptation enhancement (Nokia)
* R2-2101282 Discussion on CP/UP separation (ZTE, Sanechips)
* R2-2101905 Issues on UL RLF notification and CP-UP separation (Samsung)

# Discussion

## 2.1 CP-UP Separation

LS R2-2100040 states the following:

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Overall Description:**   RAN3 discussed the CP-UP separation and identified the benefit of allowing the F1-C over NR access link in FR1, e.g., improve the reliability and reduce the latency of F1-C traffic. Moreover, the following agreements were achieved:   * **In Rel-17 eIAB, the following two scenarios are supported for CP-UP separation, as shown in the following figure:** * **Scenario 1: F1-C uses NR access link via M-NG-RAN node (non-donor node) + F1-U uses backhaul link via S-NG-RAN node (donor node)** * **Scenario 2: F1-U uses backhaul link via M-NG-RAN node (donor node) + F1-C uses NR access link via S-NG-RAN node (non-donor node)**     Meanwhile, RAN3 analyzed the potential impacts to the specifications, which are similar to the design for EN-DC case in Rel-16. The following potential RAN2 impacts are identified during the discussion:   1. NR RRC for F1-C transfer path configuration   **ACTION:** RAN3 respectfully asks RAN2 to take the above into account and to decide specification impact for CP-UP separation. |

RAN3#111e further agreed:

|  |
| --- |
| [R3-211327](file:///C:\\Users\\ghampel\\AppData\\Roaming\\Microsoft\\chairman\\Inbox\\R3-211327.zip) **Endorsed unseen as BL**  [R3-211329](file:///C:\\Users\\ghampel\\AppData\\Roaming\\Microsoft\\chairman\\Inbox\\R3-211329.zip) **Endorsed unseen as BL**  **To support CP-UP separation, the node terminating F1 interface for the IAB-node determines the transfer path of F1-C traffic** |

R3-211327 and R3211329 include CRs to TS 38.423 and TS38.420, which add the F1-C transfer procedure to Xn.

### 2.1.1 Scenario 1: SN has donor functionality

R2-2101282 and R2-2101905 discuss which SRB to be used for scenario 1. R2-2101282 proposes that SRB2 is used. R2-2101905 considers both SRB1 and SRB2 as options. Note that Rel-16 IAB only uses SRB2 for transport of F1-C over LTE.

**Q1a: Should SRB1 and/or SRB2 be used for F1-C transport in scenario 1?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | SRB used | Comment |
| LG | SRB2 | Same argument as discussed in Rel-16 F1-C over LTE is valid for scenario 1. |
| Kyocera | SRB2 | We don’t have strong opinion, but we’re wondering if F1-C related information really requires the high priority transfer. So, we assume if Rel-16 mechanism can be reused. |
| Fujitsu | SRB2 | Reuse R16 F1-C over LTE solution for NR-DC. |
| Ericsson | SRB2 | We do not see the reason to diverge from F1-C over LTE, in which SRB2 is used. |
| Samsung | SRB2, but… | We are ok with Rel-16 solution for F1-C over LTE being used as baseline. However, we need to note an issue with that solution: current RRC specification focuses on the the message being used for F1-C traffic transfer (DLInformationTransfer and ULInformationTransfer), which can be transmitted by either SRB1 or SRB2. Given the fact that there is no clarification on how to handle F1-C when UL/DLInformationTranfer msg is blocked by any problems encountered by SRB2, this may need some further discussion. |
| NEC | SRB2 | Rel-16 mechanism can be reused. |
| Futurewei | Please see comment | No strong opinion on which SRB to use. However, we support a solution that maximizes commonality of solutions for scenarios 1 & 2. |
| Huawei | SRB2 | Prefer to reuse the R16 principle.  To clarify this should be using SRB2 if established, otherwise using SRB1. |
| vivo | SRB2 | R16 mechanism can be reused to carry F1-C traffic. |
| CATT | SRB2 but | No strong opinion actually. If the requirement of latency reduction for F1-C traffic is urgent, we can accept that SRB1 is used if SRB2 not established at least for DL. |
| Intel | SRB2 | In Rel-16, *DLInformatinTransfer* is used for delivering F1-C related information to UE via SRB2. SRB1 cannot not used since it can only be used replacing SRB2 when *DLInformationTransfer* carries *timeReferenceInfo* only. Considering scenario 1 is similar to EN-DC where F1-C transferred over LTE, SRB2 can be used for transport of F1-C over NR MCG. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | SRB2 |  |
| ZTE | SRB2 | Regarding the SRB used to deliver F1-C traffic, both SRB 1 and SRB 2 can be considered. As we know, SRB1 is designated for high priority signaling. If SRB 1 is used to transfer F1-C traffic, the delivery performance of original signalling carried on SRB1 would be negatively impacted. So it is suggested that SRB2 is used for F1-C traffic transfer. |

**Summary Q1a:**

13 companies participated.

12 companies support SRB2.

2 companies believe that SRB1 may also be supported, e.g., if SRB2 is not configured or if it is congested.

1 company believes that commonality with solution for scenario 2 should be considered.

**Proposal 1a: At least, SRB2 can be used for F1-C transport in CP/UP-separation scenario 1.**

R2-2100612 and R2-2101282 propose that NR *DLInformationTransfer* and *ULInformationTransfer* messages are enhanced to transfer F1-C related information in scenario 1. This represents the same solution as currently used for F1-C transport over LTE.

**Q1b: Do you agree that NR *DLInformationTransfer* and *ULInformationTransfer* are enhanced to transfer F1-C related information for scenario 1?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| LG | Yes | A new IE, .e.g, *DedicatedInfoF1c*, needs to be defined to carry F1-C information. |
| Kyocera | Yes | We assume Rel-16 solution can be reused. |
| Fujitsu | Yes | Reuse R16 F1-C over LTE solution for NR-DC. |
| Ericsson | Too early to decide | We can discuss during stage-3 whether to use a DL/ULInformationTransfer message or a dedicated message. |
| Samsung | Too early to decide | Each candidate RRC messages has their own allowed SRB type(s) in current RRC specification, and it is better to keep the allowed SRB type in order to minimize standardization effort. Therefore this discussion should wait until we’ve settled on (as Ericsson points out) any additional stage-3 details to do with required messaging. |
| NEC | Yes | Rel-16 mechanism can be reused. |
| Futurewei | Too early to decide | Agree with E/// and SS. We should discuss the details of which message to use in stage-3. |
| Huawei | Yes |  |
| vivo | See comments | The Rel-16 solution can be reused, but we tend to agree that this is a stage-3 issue and is no hurry to decide at this stage. |
| CATT | Yes | IE *DedicatedInfoF1c-r17* can be included in *DLInformationTransfer/ULInformationTransfer* and this information is transparent to RRC layer. |
| Intel | Yes | Similar IE in Rel-16 can be used in NR-DC. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes | The RRC signalling in EN-DC was extended to carry F1-C traffic as a container (*DedicatedInfoF1c* IE) in the *DLInformationTransfer* and *ULInformationTransfer* -messages. Straightforward approach would be to extend corresponding NR messages to convey the F1-C traffic. |
| ZTE | Yes | A new IE should be defined to carry F1-C traffic. |

**Summary Q1b:**

13 companies participated.

9 companies support using NR DLInformationTransfer and ULInformationTransfer for F1-C related information in scenario 1. An IE *DedicatedInfoF1c-r17* will have to be defined to essentially apply the Rel-16 ENDC-based solution to NRDC.

4 companies believe that this is a stage-3 issue, which can be decided later.

The rapporteur believes we can discuss these stage-3 matters after converging on the stage-2 issues.

**Q1c: Are there other aspects (e.g. RRC changes) to be considered for scenario 1?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | 1. The F1-C transfer path to be selected (SN, MN, both) needs to be added to cell group config.  2. UE capability f1c-OverNR-r17 needs to be added to NR RRC. |
| Samsung | 1. F1-c path indication  (MN, SN, both) as proposed by Qualcomm immediately above is an intuitive option. However, we prefer to use (MCG, SCG, both), which is more straightforward since each leg is referring to a cell group. On the other hand, do we need consider some future-proofing method in case multiple connectivity is allowed in the future?  2. F1-C transmission via SN  After we define the NR RRC for F1-C, at SN side, the IAB-MT can have two choices for F1-C traffic transmission, i.e., NR RRC and BH RLC CH. If we didn’t do anything, the IAB-MT could choose either NR RRC or BH RLC CH for F1-C transfer. Some options for a normative solution to this choice:   * Option 1: Use BH RLC CH as long as it is configured for F1-C traffic: this may need some clarification in the specification * Option 2: Use an explicit indication from the SN.   Please note that we didn’t face this issue for the EN-DC case. In EN-DC case, only LTE RRC is impacted by the F1-C transfer; thus, at en-gNB side, only BH RLC CH can be used.  3. Indication of default F1-C path.  Currently f1c-Transferpath field is optional and indicates NR leg if absent. However both current scenarios have NR leg for both MCG/SCG leg. So, we need to correct this. Basic assumption is that default f1c-path is the link on Donor node side. On the donor node side we need to check the Bap-config field in RRCReconfiguration message. If RRCReconfig msg including BAP-config is located in mrdc-SecondaryCellGroup field or is transferred via SRB3, then this means donor node is SN. If RRCReconfig msg including BAP-config is not in those above, i.e., just under the outer RRCReconfiguration msg, then this means donor node is MN. Since BAP-config is signaled early on at IAB node setup, it is easy to identify which path is the efault one by using this location info of BAP-config. |
| Huawei | Generally agree with QC, but we should discuss those issue later after we conclude the message and SRB. |
| vivo | The F1-C path should be configurable, i.e., the CU needs to indicate the IAB-node which path (MN, SN, or both) is selected to transfer the F1-C traffic. |
| Intel | Agree with Qualcomm. |
| ZTE | Regarding QC’s comment, let’s first go back to our initial discussion on scenario 1. We considered that an IAB node in NR-DC is configured with an FR1 MCG and an FR2 SCG. Since the FR1 is a lower frequency band in comparison with FR2, which is more reliable, it is beneficial that FR1 provides coverage (single-hop) for control and FR2 (multi-hop) is used for BH data transfer. Obviously, if IAB-node is configured to use SN to deliver F1-C traffic, it would be against the original intention, i.e. CP/UP separation, of scenario 1.  So it is not clear about the motivation to configure “SN” or “both” for F1-C transfer in this scenario. Or does it mean that the transfer path configuration only applies to the scenario where both MN and SN has donor functionality? In that case, the F1-C can be directly delivered to donor CU and it is not necessarily to encapsulate the F1-C traffic into the RRC message. |

**Summary Q1c:**

6 companies participated.

3 companies believe that the F1-C transfer path to be selected, i.e., (SN, MN, both) (or (SCG, MCG, both), needs to be added to cell group config.

1 company points out that this may not be future-proof in case multi-connectivity is introduced.

2 companies believe that UE capability f1c-OverNR-r17 needs to be added to NR RRC.

4 companies believe that this is a stage-3 issue, which can be decided later.

The rapporteur believes we can discussion these stage-3 matters after converging on the stage-2 issues.

### 2.1.2 Scenario 2: MN has donor functionality

R2-2101282 and R2-2101905 discuss SRB3 and split SRB2 as potential candidates to carry F1-C traffic.

**Option 1: Using SRB3**

Support for SRB3 is not mandatory. Establishment of SRB3 is decided by the SN. However, according to RAN3’s agreement, it is the MN that decides on the routing path of F1-C. Therefore, the MN would have to be able to ask SN to establish SRB3 for this purpose.

R2-2101282 further proposes to enhance *ULInformationTransferMRDC* message and *DLInformationTransferMRDC* to enable transfer of F1-C via SRB3.

**Option 2: Using split SRB**

Support for split SRB is not mandatory either. The MN configures the split SRB after asking the SN to allocate resources. This would comply with RAN3’s agreement that it is up to the MN to decide the F1-C routing path in scenario 2.

R2-2101282 proposes to enhance *ULInformationTransfer* message and *DLInformationTransfer* to enable transfer of F1-C via split SRB.

**Q2a: Which of SRB3 and/or split SRB should be used for the transport of F1-C in scenario 2?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | SRB used | Comment |
| LG | SRB3 preferred | Considering that path configuration can indicate explicitly SN, MN or both, SRB3 would be easier approach as in Rel-16 F1-C over LTE. On the other hand, in split SRB, transmission path is determined in PDCP layer with *primaryPath* and DataSplitThreshold. So if split SRB is used with explicit path configuration, some additional configuration/handling may be needed. |
| Kyocera | [Both] | We have no strong opinion, but we think Rel-16 DCCA supported both split SRB1 and SRB3 for Fast MCG Recovery, i.e., “*MCGFailureInformation*”. So, we wonder if it’s possible that both SRBs are optionally supported. It’s up to NW implementation which SRB is used, i.e., choice case by case. |
| Fujitsu | Split SRB | To be consistent with scenario 1, it’s better to enhance *DLInformationTransfer* and *ULInformationTransfer* for scenario 2 as well. Therefore, split SRB in option 2 is preferred. |
| Ericsson | Split SRB | The F1-C traffic is terminated in the MN, hence it is more natural to use split SRB which is terminated in the MN (unlike SRB3). Also, the split SRB request is already supported over the Xn, whereas the SRB3 request only applies to MCG recovery in legacy. Hence, split SRB is expected to require less specification effort than SRB3 in RAN3.  Additionally, with split SRB, the donor CU can decide whether to send the F1-C traffic via MN and/or SN which gives more reliability and flexibility. |
| Samsung | Discuss further | Scenario 2 could have SRB3 or split SRB for IAB node to be reached by the donor master node. Each option has its own pros and cons. In addition, as mentioned in our contribution, using split SRB needs specification clarification for primary path. |
| NEC | Both, but SRB3 preferred | We think SRB3 would be easier approach as in Rel-16 F1-C over LTE, but no strong view, both can be used. |
| Futurewei | Discuss further | Both approaches can work, and as SS has stated, each has its pros and cons.  One question we would like to discuss in regards to the split SRB approach: Does this imply that F1-C can be encapsulated within this split SRB and delivered via the MCG path, as well as the SCG path? Or is the proposal to limit the delivery of F1-C over SRB to the SCG path, and simply use the existing Xn solution for split SRBs? |
| Huawei | Split SRB2 | We should use the same RRC message as scenario 1, i.e. *ULInformationTransfer* |
| vivo | Both | Both options can work, we think the flexibility of the usage of SRBs should be left to NW’s implementation. |
| CATT | SRB3 | We don’t know how split SRB works. PDCP layer cannot distinguish RRC messages in one SRB. If deliver F1-C via split SRB, all RRC messages in the split SRB have to be transmitted in SCG. Otherwise, some optimization will be introduced, for example, PDCP can identify different RRC messages and decide the path accordingly. It is unwelcome for gNB implementer.  SRB3 is more logical. |
| Intel | Split SRB2 | In Rel-16, SRB2 (priority=3) is used to transfer F1-C message via MN path. It is considered that F1-C message has lower priority compared with other configurations in SRB1. In NR, both SRB1 and SRB3 has the same priority (priority = 1), while SRB2 has a lower priority (priority=3). It is suggested to keep the same priority for F1-C message in both scenarios. Hence, split SRB2 should be used for the transport of F1-C in scenario 2. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Split SRB2 | Could benefit from PDCP duplication. |
| ZTE | Both | Both SRB 3 and split SRB 2 can be used to align with the Rel-16 F1-C over LTE design.  For SRB 3, the *ULInformationTransferMRDC* and *DLInformationTransferMRDC* message which can be transferred over SRB2 need to be enhanced to transfer the F1-C traffic.  For split SRB 2, the *DLInformationTransfer* message and *ULInformationTransfer* message need to be enhanced to enable F1-C transfer over split SRB 2 in scenario 2. |

**Summary Q2a:**

13 companies participated.

There was quite a mix of views. The rapporteur will try to summarize the pros and cons for either solution:

Pros for only split SRB over SRB3:

* Allows better commonality with CP-UP separation scenario 1 since *DLInformationTransfer* and *ULInformationTransfer* can be used for both scenarios.
* Already terminates in MN and is routed via Xn which makes it easier to use than SRB3.
* Matches priority level as for scenario 1 (opposed to SRB3 which has same high priority as SRB1).
* Could benefit from PDCP duplication.
* Note: Further discussion is needed if only one path or both paths can be used via split SRB.

Pros for only SRB3 over split SRB:

* SRB3 might be more similar to EN-DC solution.
* In case of split SRB, when only one path is to be used then some path indication would be necessary.
* Note: Further discussion is needed on how MN asks SN to establish SRB3 (see next question).

Pros for both:

* Can Use same solution as for MCG recovery
* Provides flexibility where selection can be left up to implementation.

The rapporteur has the feeling that more discussion is needed.

**Proposal 2a1: RAN2 to consider SRB3 and split-SRB for scenario 2.**

**Proposal 2a2: RAN2 to discuss if F1-C can use both split-SRB paths in scenario 2.**

**Q2b: In case SRB3 is used, how would the MN initiate establishment of SRB3?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| LG | Given that, SRB3 is established by the SN in legacy NR, SRB3 on the SN needs to be established first before starting to use CP-UP separation. |
| Kyocera | We think it’s up to RAN3, but assume Rel-16 DCCA solution can be reused, e.g., TS38.423 specifies “*If the Requested Fast MCG recovery via SRB3 IE set to "true" is included in the S-NODE ADDITION REQUEST message and the S-NG-RAN node decides to configure fast MCG link recovery via SRB3 as specified in TS 37.340 [8], the S-NG-RAN shall, if supported, include the Available fast MCG recovery via SRB3 IE set to "true" in the S-NODE ADDITION REQUEST ACKNOWLEDGE message.*” |
| Ericsson | This is a RAN3 issue. It should be up to RAN3 to define how the MN requests SRB3 establishment to the SN. We note that SRB3 request only applies to MCG recovery in legacy Xn specification, hence Xn specification impact is expected. |
| Samsung | Xn signaling needs to be modified in order to ask SN to configure SRB3 for the IAB node, and some related signaling modification is expected (e.g. put such an indication in the XnAP message as an explicit indication). This is a RAN3 matter. |
| NEC | SRB3 should be established before the transmission of F1-C |
| Futurewei | Seems like an issue that should be discussed by RAN 3. |
| Huawei | Maybe we can assume SN always establishes SRB3, in case non-donor SN is deployed together with donor MN. |
| vivo | This is up to RAN3 decision. |
| CATT | It should be decided in RAN3. |
| ZTE | SN can setup SRB3 by some implicit information. For example, MN may send IAB node indication to SN via SGB ADDITION REQUEST message, then SN knows it is for IAB node and prepares to setup SRB3. Alternatively, MN can transmit the IAB-MT capability information, e.g. F1-C over non-donor node, to SN through the M-NG-RAN node to S-NG-RAN node Container via XnAP message. Then SN decides whether to setup SRB3 based on the capability information. As far as we know, in Rel-16, the EN-DC scenario already support these IAB indications. We may support similar indications in NR-DC scenario. |

**Summary Q2b:**

10 companies participated.

Issues raised:

* SRB3 needs to be established first by the SN.
* The request could be included into S-Node Addition Request as for SRB3 support for MCG link recovery.
* Could be done implicitly, e.g., by including IAB-node indication into S-Node Addition Request.
* MN may include indicator into IAB-MT capability information in M-NG-RAN node to S-NG-RAN node container via XnAP.
* Demand SRB3 to be always supported in case gNB is used together with a donor.
* It is up to RAN3 to discuss signaling for MN to request SN to establish SRB3.

The replies indicate that there is agreement that some from of indication is necessary between MN and SN. This may be in RAN3 territory. We may not want to send an LS to RAN3 yet since we have not agreed to support SRB3 for scenario 2.

**Proposal 2b: When F1-C is sent over SRB3 in scenario 2, an indication to SN is needed to request establishment of SRB3.**

**Q2c: Do you agree that NR *DLInformationTransfer* and *ULInformationTransfer* need to be enhanced to transfer F1-C related information in case of split SRB?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | SRB used | Comment |
| LG | Yes | Anyway, a new IE, .e.g, *DedicatedInfoF1c*, needs to be defined to carry F1-C information. |
| Kyocera | Yes | We assume the same solution as in Q1b. |
| Fujitsu | Yes | Same enhancement as in scenario 1. |
| Ericsson | Too early to decide | We can discuss during stage-3 whether to use a DLInformationTransfer message or a dedicated message. |
| Samsung | Yes if… | We are ok with this direction *if we agree* on using split SRB for F1-C traffic. |
| NEC | Yes | F1-C information should be included in ***DLInformationTransfer*** and ***ULInformationTransfer*** |
| Futurewei | Too early to decide | As indicated in the response to Q1b, this seems more appropriate to decide in stage-3.  However, as we also indicated in the response to Q1a above, we would prefer a solution that maximizes commonality of solutions for scenarios 1 & 2. |
| Huawei | Yes |  |
| vivo | See comments | This is a stage-3 issue and is no hurry to decide at this stage. |
| Intel | split SRB2, Yes | Similar as scenario 1, same enhancements also need to be considered in scenario 2. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | SRB2 | Agree |
| ZTE | Yes |  |

**Summary Q2c:**

12 companies participated.

9 companies agree that, assuming split SRB can be used for F1-C, then NR DLInformationTransfer and ULInformationTransfer need to be enhanced.

3 companies believe that such stage-3 details can be discussed at later stage.

The rapporteur believes we can discuss these stage-3 matters after converging on the stage-2 issues.

**Q2d: Do you agree that NR *DLInformationTransferMRDC* and *ULInformationTransferMRDC* need to be enhanced to transfer F1-C related information in case of SRB3?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | SRB used | Comment |
| LG | Yes | Anyway, a new IE, .e.g, *DedicatedInfoF1c*, needs to be defined to carry F1-C information. |
| Kyocera | Yes | We think current *DLInformationTransferMRDC* and *ULInformationTransferMRDC* cannot include F1-C related information, since for NR these only have *dl-DCCH-MessageNR* IE and *ul-DCCH-MessageNR* IE respectively. So, we assume some enhancement is needed. |
| Fujitsu | Yes | In this case, we need to enhance *DLInformationTransferMRDC* and *ULInformationTransferMRDC* to support F1-C transfer. |
| Ericsson | Too early to decide | Details should be discussed during stage-3. |
| Samsung | Yes if… | We are ok with this direction *if we agree* on using SRB3 for F1-C traffic. |
| NEC | Yes | F1-C information should be included in ***DLInformationTransferMRDC*** and ***ULInformationTransferMRDC*** |
| Furturewei | Too early to decide | As indicated in the response to Q1b, this seems more appropriate to decide in stage-3.  However, as we also indicated in the response to Q1a above, we would prefer a solution that maximizes commonality of solutions for scenarios 1 & 2. |
| Huawei | No | Prefer to use the same RRC message for two scenarios.  And, it may require to define a new RRC message carrying F1 to be included in the *ULInformationTransferMRDC*, as legacy design. *ULInformationTransferMRDC* The *ULInformationTransferMRDC* message is used for the uplink transfer of MR-DC dedicated information (e.g. for transferring the NR or E-UTRA RRC *MeasurementReport* message, the *FailureInformation* message, the *UEAssistanceInformation* message, the *RRCReconfigurationComplete* message or the *MCGFailureInformation* message).  ULInformationTransferMRDC ::= SEQUENCE {  criticalExtensions CHOICE {  c1 CHOICE {  ulInformationTransferMRDC ULInformationTransferMRDC-IEs,  spare3 NULL, spare2 NULL, spare1 NULL  },  criticalExtensionsFuture SEQUENCE {}  }  }  ULInformationTransferMRDC-IEs::= SEQUENCE {  ul-DCCH-MessageNR OCTET STRING OPTIONAL,  ul-DCCH-MessageEUTRA OCTET STRING OPTIONAL,  lateNonCriticalExtension OCTET STRING OPTIONAL,  nonCriticalExtension SEQUENCE {} OPTIONAL  } |
| vivo | See comments | This is a stage-3 issue and is no hurry to decide at this stage. |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |

**Summary Q2d:**

11 companies participated.

7 companies agree that, assuming SRB3 can be used for F1-C, then NR DLInformationTransferMRDC and ULInformationTransferMRDC need to be enhanced.

3 companies believe that such stage-3 details can be discussed at later stage.

1 company does not support this proposal.

The rapporteur believes we can discuss these stage-3 matters after converging on the stage-2 issues.

**Q2e: In case neither SRB3 nor split SRB are available, how would scenario 2 be supported?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| LG | In case neither SRB3 nor split SRB are available, scenario 2 for CP-UP separation should not be supported. |
| Kyocera | We’re wondering if Q2e should be really considered, i.e., the activation of CP-UP separation always needs either SRB3 or split SRB. |
| Fujitsu | Then scenario 2 is not supported. |
| Ericsson | Agree with above comments. |
| Samsung | We think at least one of these needs to be supported in order to support scenario 2. |
| NEC | I don’t think scenario can be supported without SRB3 or split SRB |
| Futurewei | Agree with comments above |
| Huawei | At least split SRB1 is always there. Not sure about the point of this issue. Still, we are fine to not support scenario2. |
| vivo | If CP/UP separation is required for scenario 2, then either SRB3 or split SRB should be available. |
| CATT | Agree above comments. |
| Intel | Scenario 2 should be not supported. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Not supported in that case since no SRB available to carry RRC |
| ZTE | What does “neither SRB3 nor split SRB are available” mean? The IAB-MT does not support the setup of SRB3 and split SRB? Or the SN does not support the setup of SRB3 and split SRB? In both cases, the CP-UP separation should not be supported. |

**Summary Q2e:**

13 companies participated.

12 companies agree that if neither SRB3 nor split SRB is supported, then scenario 2 cannot be supported.

1 company does not understand the question.

**Proposal 2e: If neither SRB3 nor split SRB is supported, then scenario 2 cannot be supported.**

**Q2f: Are there other aspects (e.g. RRC changes) to be considered for scenario 2?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Samsung | Please see our answer to Q1c. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Summary Q2f:**

Two additional aspects were raised by Samsung in Q1c (if I understand them correctly).

1. How does the IAB-MT know, which of the two gNBs in CP-UP separation is the non-donor vs. the donor? We may further ask how the IAB-MT differentiates CP-UP separation from inter-donor redundancy.
2. Can F1-C-over-RRC be used on the same parent link as F1-C over BAP?

These are overarching issues, which we should discuss first.

**Proposal 0a: RAN2 to discuss how IAB-MT knows, which of the two gNBs in CP-UP separation is non-donor vs. donor, and how the IAB-MT distinguishes between CP-UP separation and inter-donor redundancy.**

**Proposal 0b: RAN2 to discuss if F1-C-over-RRC and F1-C-over-BAP is simultaneously supported on the same parent link.**

## 2.2 Inter-donor redundancy

LS [R3-211331](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG3_Iu/TSGR3_111-e/Inbox/R3-211331.zip) states the following:

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Overall Description:**   RAN3 has agreed the following two scenarios for the inter-donor topology redundancy:   * **Scenario 1: the IAB is multi-connected with 2 Donors.** * **Scenario 2: the IAB’s parent/ancestor node is multi-connected with 2 Donors.**     (*Note: in previous LS to RAN2, i.e., R2-2100041, the support of these two scenarios is the working assumption in RAN3*).  In these two scenarios, RAN3 uses the following terminologies:   * Boundary IAB node: the node accesses two different parents node connected to two different donor CUs, respectively, e.g., IAB 3 in above figures; * Descendant IAB node: the node(s) accessing to network via boundary IAB node, and each node is single-connected to its parent node, e.g., IAB4 in scenario 2 * F1-termination node: the donor CU terminating F1 interface of the boundary IAB node and descendant node(s) * Non-F1-termination node: the CU with donor functionalities, which does not terminate F1 interface of the boundary IAB node and descendant node(s)   To support the above two scenarios, RAN3 has made the following agreements:  About F1 termination points:   * + As a starting point, the F1 interface of the boundary IAB node and descendant IAB node(s) terminate to the same donor   + The F1-terminating donor initiates the traffic offload to the other donor’s topology   About the granularity of load balancing:   * + For an MT with simultaneous connectivity to two IAB-donors, per-F1-U tunnel load balancing should be supported   + In inter-donor topology redundancy, the granularities of the load balancing is per TNL association for F1-C traffic   About IP address assignment:   * + Both F1-termination node and non-F1-termination node can assign IP address(es) to the boundary IAB node.   **About BAP routing and bearer mapping between two topologies:**   * + **To support the bearer mapping across two topologies at the boundary IAB node, the non-F1-termination donor CU needs to provide the ingress BH RLC CH ID(s) for DL traffic and egress BH RLC CH ID(s) for UL traffic to the F1-termination donor CU.**   + **The boundary IAB node belongs to two topologies of two donor CUs.**   + **RAN3 has considered the following options for the BAP routing across two topologies, i.e.,** * **Option 1: OAM based solution** * **Option 3: routing via a new unique identity (e.g., extended BAP address with CU component, separate set of (e)LCIDs)** * **Option 4: BAP header rewriting based on BAP routing ID at, e.g., the boundary node** * **Option 5: BAP header rewriting based on IP header at, e.g., the boundary node (seems to also impact RAN2)**   **ACTION:** RAN3 respectfully asks RAN2 to take the above into account and be involved in the design of inter-donor topology redundancy and provide feedback if any. |

Other agreements on this topic by RAN3#111e

|  |
| --- |
| **WA: NRDC is supported as a baseline procedure for the IAB-MT’s simultaneous connectivity to two IAB-donors; DAPS-like solution is not precluded**  **In Rel-17, RAN3 agrees to support the following scenarios for inter-donor topology redundancy with the principle that an IAB-DU only has F1 interface with one Donor-CU:**  **- Scenario 1: the IAB node is multi-connected with 2 Donors.**  **- Scenario 2: the IAB node’s parent/ancestor node is multi-connected with 2 Donors.**  **The BH RLC channel management for each BH link is controlled by the CU who controls the topology containing the BH link.** |

This following discussion focusses on the agreements in the LS listed under “**About BAP routing and bearer mapping between two topologies”.**

**The discussion only focusses on transport. The question on “who configures what” will be discussed later.**

For ease of discussion, we assume that the boundary node connects via NRDC, which currently is a baseline WA in RAN3. This does not preclude using potentially other procedures, e.g., based on DAPS.

The goal of this discussion is to understand the technical solutions envisioned by RAN3 for option 1, 3, 4, and 5 of inter-topology routing and bearer mapping.

### 2.2.1 Problem of inter-topology BAP routing

Figure 1a shows an example of two IAB topologies referred to as topology 1 (blue, controlled by CU1) and topology 2 (green, controlled by CU2), which are interconnected by the boundary IAB-node-3. The boundary node was initially part of the blue topology 1 via an MCG link and added an SCG link to topology 2 at a later point in time.

IAB-DU3 (on the boundary node) and the descendent IAB-node-4 remain with topology 1, i.e., they have their F1 connectivity with CU1. IAB-DU3’s and IAB-DU4’s F1 traffic can be routed on the IP layer via IAB-donor-DU1 (i.e. only topology 1) or via IAB-donor-DU2 (i.e. across topologies 1 and 2).



**Figure 1a – Example scenario with redundant IP routing via two interconnected topologies**

**Problem:**

We assume that the IAB-nodes and IAB-donor-DUs received BAP addresses from their respective IAB-donor-CUs before IAB-node-3 established the SCG link to topology 2.

Since assignment of BAP addresses, BAP path IDs and BH RLC CH IDs occurs independently in each topology, the same values may be reused in each topology.

When packets are routed across both topologies, i.e., between the boundary IAB-node or its descendent nodes and donor-DU-2, collisions among BAP addresses, BAP path IDs and BH RLC CH IDs may occur.

In Figure 1 (left), both IAB-donor-DUs have the same BAP address. Therefore, the BAP address on UL BAP PDUs cannot be used to differentiate between these two destinations.

In Figure 1 (center), IAB-nodes 4 and 5 have the same BAP address. Therefore, the BAP address on DL BAP PDUs cannot be used to differentiate between these two destinations.

In Figure 1 (right), IAB-nodes 2 and 3 have the same BAP address. Therefore, the BAP address on DL PDUs cannot be used by IAB-node-2 to decide if the packet has to be forwarded to upper layers or to the next hop.

The following options 1, 3a, 3b, 4 and 5 agreed by RAN3 aim to address these issues.



**Figure 1b - Conflicts on PDU forwarding for inter-topology BAP routing**

### 2.2.2 Option 1: OAM-based solution

In this option, OAM-based configuration ensures that conflicts due to collisions in the BAP and BH RLC CH name spaces are avoided. Such OAM-based solution can always be supported. How they work is out of scope.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Huawei | We need to clarify the relationship with option 3/4/5 (or the motivation to introduce option 3/4/5), if option 1 can be considered as the approach to avoid any BAP address collision with minor impact.  Does it mean other options is needed in case OAM-based BAP address separation is not deployed? |
|  |  |

Rapporteur’s view: If any coordination is needed between CUs on the allocation of BAP address and/or BAP path IDs, it needs to either regulated by specification or it is a vendor-specific solution that can be handled via OAM. Vendor-specific solutions are always supported but they are out-of-scope.

### 2.2.3 Option 3a: Routing via unique identity – Extended BAP address

In this option, BAP routing uses identifiers, which are unique across both topologies. This is accomplished by extending the BAP address with a CU-related identifier.

Figure 2 shows how this option is applied to the above example. In this example, the BAP address is extended with a CU-related ID referred to as CU1id for CU1 and CU2id for CU2.

Note that in this option, the traffic to different destination topologies can share the same BH RLC channel.



**Figure 2: Option 3a - Extending BAP address with CU-specific ID to create unique routes across both topologies**

What needs to be done:

* All instances of the BAP address, i.e., in the BAP header, the default routing configuration, the routing configuration, UL/DL mapping configurations, etc. need to include an CU-related identifier.
* The CU-related identifier needs to be globally unique.

**Q3a: Please provide feedback, comments, e.g., on open issues or aspects missing, if any, on option 3a.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| LG | BAP address collision should be very rare due to following reasons:Normally, the donor CU1 and donor CU2 would be controlled by one operator. In addition, considering that the current length of BAP address is 10bits and this can cover 1024 IAB nodes, we think that proper network configuration can avoid this BAP address collision. So we doubt whether BAP address collision is a valid problem. If BAP address needs to be extended, RAN2 can just give more bits to the BAP address, but it doesn’t need to specify a CU-related identifier in BAP address format which is globally unique. |
| Kyocera | We concern about the increasing overhead since all the data needs to have the extended BAP header. |
| Fujitsu | Firstly, we think BAP address collision is absolutely a valid problem. Secondly, we don’t think extending BAP address with a CU identifier is the suitable approach since it increases the BAP packet overhead while we have other choices without doing so.We also want to point out that even if the BAP address collision is solved, there is still problem on path id used in BAP routing. Currently path ids in two topologies are independently assigned by each CU. How to assign or map path id for the cross-topology routing path needs to be addressed. |
| Ericsson | This solution implies extra overhead in the BAP header, and standardization work needed to modify the BAP header. Additionally, whenever this inter-CU functionality is enabled for any IAB node in the CU1 network, all the IAB nodes in CU1 and CU2 need to be reconfigured a provided with a new CU-id, which is certainly not desirable.  In general, the scenario of inter-topology routing should not occur very often, hence RAN2 should aim at minimum standard changes. We also note that the main problem to be addressed in this section is not (only) the “BAP address collision”. Rather, how to properly configure the boundary node, i.e. IAB3, such that it can do the inter-topology routing as depicted in Figure 1a.  **Figure 1b-left**: collisions between donor IAB addresses should be a rare event.  **Figure 1b-center**: we do not believe that there is any problem with that. Even if there is a BAP address collision between an IAB3’s descendant node and other IAB nodes in the CU2, that should not be a problem. CU2/DU2 just needs to forward the traffic coming from CU1 to the boundary node, and then the boundary node can forward the traffic to the intended descendant, according to the routing tables previously configured by CU1. **Figure 1b-right:** The collision event should be rare. As said, the main issue should be how to properly configure the boundary node, i.e. IAB3, such that it can do the inter-topology routing as depicted in Figure 1a. |
| Samsung | This is a workable solution from RAN2 perspective.The obvious flaw of this option is that each packet over the BH link should additionally contain a CU-related identifier. To ensure the uniqueness, CU-related identifier cannot be very short. Thus, this option will result in large additional load over the network. |
| NEC | We also have the concern of increasing the BAP header. BAP header rewriting is preferred. |
| Futurewei | Although this is a feasible approach, we also have similar concerns as other companies regarding additional overhead of a CU specific identifier. However, the more significant concern is the impact to BAP routing functionality, and how the routing configuration may need to be changed at many IAB nodes. |
| Huawei | There could be not so many CUs adjacent. CU ID could be short.Before we go with this approach, an elegant BAP header design should be provided first, to reduce the overhead and impact to BAP header. |
| CATT | May I clarify the problem first? In my understanding, when IAB3 add SCG link to IAB-donor2, CU2 will extend the managed topology to include the path to descendant nodes (IAB4) and UEs connected to IAB3. Even if the BAP addresses of IAB3 and IAB4 are allocated by IAB-donor 1, CU2 will configure unique path ID to the destination node. Background: BAP check whether both BAP address and path ID are matched first and then check if only BAP address is matched. Then if BAP address collision happen, routing ID can be differentiated by path ID theoretically. Of course, if we have to differentiate routing by path ID, local rerouting mechanism will be impacted.   |  | | --- | | TS 38.340  For a BAP Data PDU to be transmitted, BAP entity shall:  - if the BAP Data PDU corresponds to a BAP SDU received from the upper layer, and  - if the BH Routing Configuration has not been (re)configured by F1AP after the last (re)configuration of *defaultUL-BH-RLC-channel* by RRC:  …  - else if there is an entry in the BH Routing Configuration whose BAP address matches the DESTINATION field, whose BAP path identity is the same as the PATH field, and whose egress link corresponding to the Next Hop BAP Address is available:  - select the egress link corresponding to the Next Hop BAP Address of the entry;  …  - else if there is at least one entry in the BH Routing Configuration whose BAP address matches the DESTINATION field, and whose egress link corresponding to the Next Hop BAP Address is available:  - select an entry from the BH Routing Configuration whose BAP address is the same as the DESTINATION field, and whose egress link corresponding to the Next Hop BAP Address is available;  - select the egress link corresponding to the Next Hop BAP Address of the entry selected above; |   For the 3 cases in Figure 1b,   * Case 1: for IAB4, the routing ID to DU1 is (A1, PDU1) which is configured by CU1. CU2 configure routing ID from IAB4 to DU2 as (A1, PDU2). Then IAB3 can deliver the data in correct path based on path ID. It is very rare case both BAP address and path ID are collided. * Case 2: CU2 configure routing ID from DU2 to IAB4 as (A4, PIAB4); the routing ID from DU2 to IAB5 is (A4, PIAB5) which has been configured before. Then IAB2 can deliver data to IAB4 or IAB5 based on path ID. * Case 3: CU2 configure routing ID from DU2 to IAB3 as (A3, PIAB3), and the routing ID from DU2 to IAB2 is (A3, PIAB2). Although it is strange that the BAP address of nextHop equals to current hop, IAB2 can deliver data in correct path based on path ID by implementation.  In summary, BAP address collision is rare case. Even if BAP address collision happens, IAB nodes can deliver data in correct path based on path ID by implementation. For option 3a, extended BAP address will impact BAP PDU format, RRC configuration and F1AP configuration. Both overhead and specification impact are considerable. |
| Intel | Considering one IAB node can be connected to maximum two parent IAB nodes via NR-DC, two CU identifiers would be enough for a single IAB node. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | It is unclear why the CU identifier would need to be **globally** unique (the CU ID needs to be unique within a “cluster” of neighbouring CUs). Since BAP address has to be extended cannot have Rel16 IAB-nodes in the same topology. |
| ZTE | We think this option is workable and it is simple to implement. We only need to define new BAP header to accommodate the identity of donor CU. The identity of donor CU needs further study, e.g. using the gNB ID as donor CU ID or define a new donor CU ID. |

Summary Option 3a:

12 companies replied.

9 companies were concerned about the impact of BAP header extension regarding overhead and standardization effort. There are different views if the extension would have to be large (to make BAP address globally unique) or small (since only two IAB-donor-CUs are involved).

1 company is concerned that Rel-16 and Rel-17 nodes could not be mixed if Rel-17 uses different BAP header.

2 companies believe that there is no collision issue, and hence no header extension is needed.

2 companies believe that a BAP header extension should be considered.

The rapporteur has the following comments:

* BAP address collision needs to be handled even if it is a rare issue. It is actually rather likely since there are only 1024 BAP addresses. Further, OAM-based coordination only works for single-vendor solutions which are out-of-scope.
* The rapporteur does not believe that the overhead due to header extension is an issue in comparison with all the other overhead to be carried from IP, IPsec, UDP, GTP-U etc.
* Additional specification is certainly an issue.
* Combining Rel-16 and Rel-17 IAB-nodes is a separate discussion. However, we should not take steps to unnecessarily preclude it.
* The size of the CU ID strikes a compromise between header overhead and configuration effort. When the CU ID is chosen very small more CU-ID planning effort is required.

### 2.2.4 Option 3b: Routing via unique identity – Separate LCID

In this option, a separate set of BH RLC channels is configured for PDUs that remain in the same topology vs. PDUs that cross into another topology. The IAB-node/IAB-donor-DU further receives a separate set of routing-, bearer-mapping- and UL/DL-mapping configurations for each of these two types of PDUs. The eLCID of the ingress BH RLC channel indicates the routing- and bearer-mapping tables to be used for a PDU. For DL and UL mapping, the tables are selected based on upper layer information (e.g. destination IP header information for DL mapping and F1-related information for UL mapping).

Figure 2 shows how this option is applied to the above example. In this example, IAB-nodes 3 and 4 hold two separate UL routing tables indicated with Tcu1 and Tcu2 for destinations residing in the blue and the green topology, respectively. IAB-node 2 hold separate DL routing and bearer mapping tables for destinations in blue and green topology, respectively. IAB-donor-DU2 hold separate DL mapping and routing tables with respect to both topologies.

Note that in this option, the traffic to different destination topologies cannot share the same BH RLC channel.



**Figure 3: Option 3b - Topology differentiation based on LCID and topology-specific routing-/UL-/DL- tables**

What needs to be done:

* A CU Id is added to each routing-, bearer-mapping-, UL/DL-mapping-, BAP-address- and BH-RLC-CH configuration. This allows the nodes to create topology-specific tables and BH RLC Channels. It allows the IAB-node to associate its BAP address with a specific topology.
* The DU stores the mapping between (e)LCID for each BH RLC channel and the CU Id to select routing and bearer mapping tables based on ingress RLC channel.
* DL PDUs are only matched to the local BAP address if they are destined for the same topology (i.e. are received from BH RLC CH with same CU ID as the locally configured BAP address). This needs to be captured in the BAP specification.

**Q3b: Please provide feedback, comments, e.g., on open issues or aspects missing, if any, on option 3b.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| LG | BAP address collision should be very rare due to following reasons:Normally, the donor CU1 and donor CU2 would be controlled by one operator. In addition, considering that the current length of BAP address is 10bits and this can cover 1024 IAB nodes, we think that proper network configuration can avoid this BAP address collision. So we doubt whether BAP address collision is a valid problem. |
| Fujitsu | It seems to be workable. The limitations are: 1) the restriction of the BH RLC channel usage; 2) the boundary IAB node, its descendant IAB nodes and IAB nodes on the redundant path have to maintain two sets of routing tables (more configuration overhead). |
| Ericsson | This solution requires a lot of coordination between CU1 and CU2 to negotiate the new LCIDs such that there is no ambiguity across the two topologies. Additionally, similar to the previous approach, all the IAB nodes in CU2 need to be reconfigured with new set of LCIDs and routing tables to reach the boundary node and the descendants. Also the descendant nodes need to be reconfigured with new LCIDs/routing table to communicated with the DU2. Since the scenario of inter-donor routing should not occur often, RAN2 should aim at a simple solution and minimum standard changes. |
| Samsung | This is a workable solution from RAN2 perspective.This option results in the following issues:Reduce the eLCID space for the topology offering loading offloadingIn this option, the eLCID space applicable for own traffic in topology 2 has to be shrunk since some eLCIDs have to be reserved for the nodes in topology 1 (e.g., IAB node 3&4). Moreover, the available eLCID space for the nodes in topology 2 will be reduced with the increase in the number of nodes with traffic offloading from topology 1 to topology 2.Cause LCID wasteNormally, if two traffic flows have similar QoS requirement, they can be aggregated together and transmitted via the same BH RLC CH. However, in this option, if two traffic flows with similar QoS requirement belong to different topologies, two separate LCIDs have to be assigned. For example, in Fig. 3 (middle), for the BH link between donor DU2 and IAB node 2, LCID=i serves traffic towards IAB node 4, and LCID=j serves traffic towards IAB node 5. Because those two traffic flows belong to different topologies, two different LCIDs have to be assigned, even though those two traffic has the same QoS requirement and can be aggregated into one logical channel. Thus, this option results in LCID waste.In addition, this option requires multiple routing table configurations, each of which is referring to one single topology. |
| Futurewei | This approach seems rather messy and is probably even more complex to implement in the spec than Option 3a. E/// and SS have raised several potential issues with this approach above. Also, it seems that the LCID space would somehow need to be partitioned between the two CUs. It’s not so clear how this would work. Would the partitioning be defined by OAM? If so, then it is not clear that this approach is any different than Option 1, other than having significantly more spec impact. |
| Huawei | Not prefer. This is more like to use the “set ID of BH RLC” to indicate the CU ID. Also, it requires separate routing table configurations. It brings much spec impact to BAP. Not sure how it works in local re-routing. |
| CATT | Based on option 3b, eLCID space may need to be extended again. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Routing becomes dependent on ingress BH RLC channel which is not needed in other options. Complicates the routing also in nodes that are not boundary nodes. |
| ZTE | It seems that this option introduces too many specification impacts. Two set of BH RLC channels need to be set up just to differentiate the potential collision of BAP address, which is resource consuming. |

**Summary:**

9 companies participated. There was only limited support for this solution. The following issues were raised:

* Additional configuration of two routing tables.
* Reduction of effective eLCID space.
* Coordination of eLCID between CUs.
* Specification overhead

The rapporteur has the feeling that this solution has not been well understood.

* There is no eLCID coordination necessary between CUs since the IAB-DU itself selects the eLCID. Since the IAB-node receives the CU-ID indicator in the routing configuration, it knows which eLCID it has allocated with respect to each CU.
* There eLCID space may be reduced from 65k to 32k. This means that there are still 32k RLC channels that can be configured on each BH link with respect to each CU ID. The rapporteur does not believe that this is a real issue.
* Admittedly, the main overhead is that supporting separate routing tables for each CU.

### 2.2.5 Option 4: BAP header rewriting based on BAP-routing-ID

In option 4, routing is local to each topology, i.e., BAP address, BAP path ID and BH RLC CH IDs have only local scope and can be reused in each topology. To enable inter-topology routing, the BAP routing ID carried on the BAP header is rewritten by the boundary node. For that purpose, the boundary node holds a mapping table, which maps the BAP routing ID of the PDU arriving from one topology to the BAP routing ID the PDU has to carry in the other topology.

Figure 4 shows how this option is applied to the above example. In this example, the boundary node has a mapping from UL BAP routing ID = (A3, Px) to UL BAP routing ID = (A1, Py) and DL BAP routing ID (A5, Px) to DL BAP routing ID (A4, Py).

Note that in this option, the traffic to different destination topologies can share the same BH RLC channel.



**Figure 4: Option 4 – BAP header rewriting based on BAP routing ID**

What needs to be done (example):

* The boundary node needs to be configurable with a separate BAP address for the second topology.
* The boundary node needs to be configurable with a BAP-header-rewriting table, which maps ingress BAP-routing-ID to egress BAP-routing-ID.
* BAP header rewriting needs to be captured in the BAP specification.
* The boundary node needs to be able to differentiate between PDUs, whose header is to be rewritten, and PDUs that are forwarded to next hop in the same topology or sent to upper layers. It is possible to overload the current BAP routing ID space for this purpose. The boundary IAB-node could, for instance, obtain separate BAP addresses in each topology that are only used for PDUs, whose header is to be rewritten.

**Q4: Please provide feedback, comments, e.g., on open issues or aspects missing, if any, on option 4.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| LG | BAP address collision should be very rare due to following reasons:Normally, the donor CU1 and donor CU2 would be controlled by one operator. In addition, considering that the current length of BAP address is 10bits and this can cover 1024 IAB nodes, we think that proper network configuration can avoid this BAP address collision. So we doubt whether BAP address collision is a valid problem. |
| Fujitsu | While the details need more discussion, this option has the advantage of limiting the configuration to the boundary node. The BAP routing across topologies is transparent to the descendant node(s) and the nodes on the redundant path (i.e., no additional work is needed on top of Rel-16 scheme). |
| Ericsson | This solution requires no coordination between CU1/CU2 and just little reconfigurations. CU2 can provide independently (without coordinating with CU1) the BAP configuration/address to the IAB3, and then inform CU1 about it.Only the IAB3 needs to be reconfigured to communicate with DU2, while the descendant nodes of the boundary node would not be affected at all (no reconfiguration/routing tables update is needed). The new parent nodes controlled by the CU2, just need to get from the CU2 a new destination entry for the IAB3 in the routing table. Hence, unlike the other approaches, just little reconfigurations are required.Regarding Figure 4-left, we do not believe that in UL, the IAB4 needs to change the BAP destination to A3 for the traffic intended to the CU2. It can still use A1 as destination, and then the IAB3 can use the ingress BH RLC channel or the ingress BAP routing ID to re-route the traffic to DU2. |
| Samsung | This is a workable solution from RAN2 perspective.It is unclear to us the potential for overload to the current BAP routing ID space mentioned by Rapporteur. Normally, for UL traffic from boundary/descendant node, the BAP routing ID contains the BAP address of Donor DU1. However, to differentiate PDUs towards topology 2 from the ones towards to topology 1, the donor CU1 can configure BAP routing IDs by including BAP address (e.g., A10) different from donor DU1. Thus, when the boundary IAB node receives PDUs with BAP address of A10, it can know the BAP rewriting should be performed. In this sense, the BAP routing ID space toward donor DU 1 remains the same.In our opinion, this option keeps the same flexibility as the “normal” case, i.e., each donor CU can manage its own topology independently. |
| Futurewei | This approach seems to have potentially the least spec impact, with changes mostly limited to configuration of routing at boundary IAB node, and additional functionality. This disadvantage seems to be that the boundary IAB node has more work to do to those packets whose headers it needs to re-write. An alternative approach could be for end nodes (donor DU 2 and serving IAB node) to concatenate IAB headers, and then the boundary IAB node could simply strip away the outer header rather than re-writing it. However, it’s not very clear that this would be more any more efficient for the boundary node. |
| Huawei | Separate BAP address to the boundary node is still FFS. There could be other approach to identify the traffic for the second topology.Considering we are going to support the inter-donor-DU re-routing, it seems BAP header re-writing (e.g. option 4/5) is inevitable anyway. In addition, “routing ID 1:1 remapping” seems not applicable to the case that two DL traffics using the same path in first topology but designating to different IAB nodes in second topology. |
| CATT | We think the figure 4 is just an example of BAP header rewriting. BAP header rewriting can be used in some other case, such as local rerouting. |
| Intel | This option has less spec impact and it also follows the same routing mechanism as Rel-16. For upstream packets, we also agree with E///, if both IAB donors are configured with the same BAP address, there’s no need to configure destination BAP address of PDUs from IAB node 4 into A3. Packets with destination address as A1 can still be routed to IAB donor 2. One potential drawback is that, if the boundary IAB node has a lot of child nodes and downstream/upstream traffic is also high, the workload of modifying BAP header at the boundary IAB node may be significant. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We distinguish possible variations:  * Each cross-routable destination could be assigned a BAP Routing ID from the space of the other Donor, used for routing from that Donor’s network (not every node need not know about this though) * This alleviates risk of depleting Path-ID space of the boundary node, which may exist in the above description * To keep routing independent of ingress link like it currently is, the header rewriting could always be performed by the last node before the boundary between the two Donor networks (in the above figure, by IAB-DU2 for downstream traffic). |
| ZTE | Based on the description of option 4, the boundary node need to be configured with a remapping table. Meanwhile, the IAB node 4 should be re-configured the routing ID with (A3, Px) for certain F1 traffic when the redundant path is used for load balancing purpose (as shown in the left scenario in Figure 4). Normally, the destination BAP address for uplink traffic should be the donor DU’s BAP address instead of intermediate IAB node’s BAP address. So it is not clear why some companies think that the descendant node does not need to be reconfigured.  On the other hand, if the re-configuration of descendant node is not enabled, the destination BAP address shall still be the address of original donor DU for the UL traffic from IAB node 4. In this case, this option may fail to achieve per-F1-U tunnel level load balancing. For example, F1-U tunnel 1 and F1-U tunnel 2 of IAB-node 4 maybe configured with the same routing ID toward donor DU1 initially. Later, donor CU1 want F1-U tunnel 2 to be routed via the SN. Since the BAP routing IDs of these packets from F1-U tunnel 1 and F1-U tunnel 2 are same, the boundary IAB-node may remap the packet of both F1-U tunnels towards donor DU2, which is contradict with intention of F1-U tunnel granularity adjustment. |

**Summary:**

10 companies participated. The following issues were raised:

* Extra configuration necessary for the boundary node.
* No coordination needed between CUs (which is incorrect).
* Descendant nodes are not affected (this is not entirely correct).
* Inter-topology traffic can carry any BAP address when traveling toward the boundary node (which is not absolutely correct).
* Instead of header rewriting, it should be possible to use BAP header “concatenation” (presumably like MPLS).
* 1:1 mapping for BAP routing IDs may not work (this needs clarification).
* Header rewriting could be performed by the hop before the boundary node (this needs more discussion)

The rapporteur has the feeling that further discussion is necessary. The following clarifications are provided:

* Coordination is needed between CUs to enable mapping of BAP routing IDs used in topology 1 to BAP routing IDs used in topology 2.
* Descendant nodes are affected if some of their traffic is routed via the boundary node while other is not. In this case, the traffic routed via the boundary node needs to carry a different routing ID than the traffic routed through the original topology.
* The BAP header carries a DESTINATION field. For cross-boundary traffic, the BAP address carried in the DESTINATION field should therefore be that of the boundary node since it is the destination in that topology. Even if we relax the interpretation of DESTINATION, the BAP header cannot use a BAP address assigned to a different IAB-node than the boundary node since this would create problems during local rerouting.
* It is possible to use multiple BAP addresses for cross-boundary traffic without actually configuring these BAP addresses on the boundary node.
* **Important**: **Cross-boundary traffic with separate paths or destinations in the destination topology must have different BAP routing IDs assigned in the source topology, even if they use the same paths in the source topology**.

### 2.2.6 Option 5: BAP header rewriting based on IP header

In option 5, routing is also local to each topology, i.e., BAP address, BAP path ID and BH RLC CH IDs have only local scope and can be reused in each topology. To enable inter-topology routing, the BAP routing ID carried on the BAP header is also rewritten by the boundary node. The boundary node also has to carry a separate BAP address in each topology.

Opposed to option 4, the boundary node derives the new BAP routing ID based on IP header information. For both, UL and DL directions, this IP-to-L2 mapping is equivalent to the DL mapping presently conducted at the IAB-donor-DU.

Figure 5 shows how this option is applied to the above example. In this example, the boundary node has a mapping from IP header fields to BAP routing ID = (A1, Py) in UL direction and from IP header fields to BAP routing ID (A4, Py) in DL direction. The IP header fields are not shown here.

Note that in this option, the traffic to different destination topologies can share the same BH RLC channel.



**Figure 5: Option 5 – BAP header rewriting based on IP header**

What needs to be done:

* The boundary node needs to be configurable with a separate BAP address for the second topology.
* The boundary node needs to be configurable with an UL and DL mapping table equivalent to that presently configured on the IAB-donor-DU. The UL mapping table needs to include source IP addresses as selection criteria. Further, discussion is necessary.
* The UL mapping on the access IAB-node needs to be configurable to also set the IPv6 Flow Label and DSCP value on the IP header (as presently supported on the CU-UP).
* This option will have to involve RAN3.

**Q5: Please provide feedback, comments, e.g., on open issues or aspects missing, if any, on option 5.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| LG | BAP address collision should be very rare due to following reasons:Normally, the donor CU1 and donor CU2 would be controlled by one operator. In addition, considering that the current length of BAP address is 10bits and this can cover 1024 IAB nodes, we think that proper network configuration can avoid this BAP address collision. So we doubt whether BAP address collision is a valid problem. |
| Fujitsu | This option involves IP header interpretation at boundary IAB node, which is a big change over R16. This will bring too much work to both RAN2 and RAN3. |
| Ericsson | Similar to the solution above, also this solution requires little signalling from RAN2 point of view. Only the boundary node IAB3 needs to get a new BAP configuration and routing table to operate under CU2. The descendant nodes would not be affected, and the new parent nodes controlled by the CU2 just need to get from the CU2 a new destination entry for the IAB3 in the routing table. Anyhow, since this solution operates at IP layer, RAN2 standardization impact seems also little, and RAN3 should drive it. |
| Samsung | This option is not workable based on Rel-16 design.The boundary node is acted as intermediate IAB node for descendant nodes. In Rel-16 IAB, the protocol stack for both CP and UP are given as below:The two figures show that the intermediate IAB node (i.e., IAB-node 1) does not process the IP headers of the received packets. However, Option 5 requires the boundary node to decode the whole IP header, which requires the design of a new protocol stack for Rel-17 eIAB. |
| Futurewei | Not clear that this approach has any advantage compared to Option 4. The boundary IAB node still needs to rewrite the BAP header so that the packet can be routed in the other topology. On the other hand, the impact to the BAP specification would be increased relative to Option 4. |
| Huawei | As to the configuration to the access node on flow lable/DSCP marking, legacy signalling design can be reused in the Xn message for R16 EN-DC case.We may need the unified solution with the bearer mapping at the boundary node. IP header based routing ID rewriting and bearer mapping is the flexible way.Please note that routing ID based rewriting means multiple traffic using the same path in CU2 has to also use the same path in CU1 (routing IDx=>routing IDy). This gives much restriction on the routing/path configuration in CU’s own topology. |
| CATT | Need prudent evaluation if boundary node is allowed to get IP header information. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Option 5 would allow each CU independently to decide how traffic is mapped to BH channels. While as option 4 is limited to N to 1 channel mapping at the boundary node, It’s not clear why source IP address is needed in UL mapping at the boundary node. |
| ZTE | The IP header read by the boundary IAB-node is the outer IP header. Donor CU 1 needs to know the outer IP header info of the UL/DL packet in order to configure the boundary IAB-node.This option also faces the issue that the boundary node needs to be able to differentiate between PDUs, whose header is to be rewritten, and PDUs that are sent to upper layers. |

**Summary:**

10 companies participated. The following issues were raised:

* Too much work for RAN2/RAN3.
* RAN3 would have to drive this solution since IP is involved.
* Not compliant with Rel-16 protocol stack.
* No benefits over option 4 but more specification impact.
* Option 5 allows having traffic use same BAP path in one topology but different BAP paths in the other topology (this is correct).
* Allows different bearer mapping in each topology.
* Boundary nodes also needs to be configured with IP header information.
* Boundary nodes needs to differentiate which PDUs are forwarded on BAP layer vs. sent to upper layers for IP routing.

The rapporteur has the following comments:

* Indeed, this solution would have to be driven by RAN3.
* It is possible to combine traffic onto one BAP path in one topology while using different paths in the other topology. This is possible since IP header fields (e.g. IPv6 FL) can be used as an additional path identifier.
* Bearer remapping at the boundary node is not restricted to option 5, but it can also be achieved in all other options as well as for any non-boundary IAB-node. One way to achieve bearer remapping is to derive the egress BH RLC channel from ingress BH RLC channel **+ BAP routing ID**.

### 2.2.7 Ranking of options 1, 3a, 3b, 4 and 5

While more discussion will be necessary, the following question gives companies the opportunity to provide a first feedback on their views of these options. We allow each company to rank the above options 3a, 3b, 4 and 5 based on preference.

**Q6: Please rank the options 1, 3a, 3b, 4 and 5 based on your preference. You can leave options unmarked in case you do not support them.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Rank (1, 2, 3 or 4)****Option 1**OAM-based solution | **Rank (1, 2, 3 or 4)****Option 3a** Routing via unique identity: BAP address extended with CU ID | **Rank (1, 2, 3 or 4)****Option 3b** Routing via unique identity: BAP address + separate LCID | **Rank (1, 2, 3 or 4)****Option 4** BAP header rewriting based on BAP routing ID | **Rank (1, 2, 3 or 4)****Option 5** BAP header rewriting based on IP header |
| LG | 1 We think that option 1 should be also on the table and the option 1 is the simplest solution. |  |  |  |  |
| Kyocera | [1] |  | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Fujitsu |  |  | 2 | 1 |  |
| Ericsson | [1] OAM can never be precluded. | - | - | 1 | 2 |
| Samsung | Out of scope for normative work | - | - | 1 | - |
| NEC | [1] OAM can never be precluded. |  | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Futurewei | OAM can not be excluded. However, as SS points out it does not involve any normative work. | 2 | - | 1 | - |
| Huawei | 1 | 3 | - | 2 | 1, in case option1 is not deployed |
| vivo | [1] |  |  | 1 |  |
| CATT | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |
| Intel | 1 | 2 |  | 1 |  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | - | - | - | 1(having least impact on BAP and configurations) | 2 |
| ZTE | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |
| Qualcomm | Out of scope | - | 2 | 1 | 3 |

Summary: Eliminate 3a and 3b. 5 is in RAN3 realm.

RAN2 could recommend one of 4 or 5 to RAN3 and let RAN3 decide?

**Summary:**

14 companies participated. An overall score can be computed by using the following algorithm:

1. Assign a score of (4 – *rank value*) to each field in the matrix above where “-“ flagged fields or empty fields are not considered.

2. The scores for each option are summed up over all companies.

Based on this, the following scores were achieved (total score = 60):

**Option 3a: 8 (13%)**

**Option 3b: 7 (12%)**

**Option 4: 34 (57%)**

**Option 5: 11 (18%)**

Rapporteur’s view: Option 1 is out-of-scope. While there are many open issues for each option, it becomes rather clear that options 3a and 3b do not find a lot of support. Option 4 is the clear winner and in RAN2 territory. However, RAN2 cannot preclude Option 5 which it is in RAN3 territory. The following proposals are made:

**Proposal 3.1: RAN2 to support inter-topology routing via BAP header rewriting based on BAP routing ID (option 4).**

**Proposal 3.2:** **Support for** **BAP header rewriting based on IP header (option 5) is up to RAN3.**

**Proposal 3.3: Liaise RAN3 on the agreements on inter-topology BAP routing.**

**Proposal 3.4: RAN2 to further discuss:**

* **BAP processing at boundary node**
* **Information to be exchanged between CUs to enable BAP header rewriting.**
* **Impact on descendant nodes and IAB-donor DUs**
* **Constraints on BAP addresses and BAP path IDs to be used for cross-boundary traffic.**

### 2.2.8 Bearer mapping at boundary node

The RAN3 agreement:

* + **To support the bearer mapping across two topologies at the boundary IAB node, the non-F1-termination donor CU needs to provide the ingress BH RLC CH ID(s) for DL traffic and egress BH RLC CH ID(s) for UL traffic to the F1-termination donor CU.**

has the implication that ingress-to-egress BH RLC channels are mapped 1:1 at the boundary node. This is the same as applied in Rel-16 IAB at every intermediate IAB-node. One example for three BH RLC channels is shown in Figure 6.



**Figure 6: Example for 1:1 ingress-to-egress RLC channel mapping at boundary IAB-node**

**Q6: Please provide feedback, comments, e.g., on bearer mapping across the boundary node, if any.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Fujitsu | We don’t think that ingress-to-egress BH RLC channels are required to be mapped 1:1 at the boundary node. Anyway, we think the final choice of the inter-topology BAP routing may have impact on the bearer mapping at the boundary node. We may discuss the bearer mapping after the decision on the inter topology BAP routing. |
| Ericsson | We are also not sure that this RAN3 agreement implies a 1:1 mapping of BH RLC channels at the boundary node. We assume the decision is up to CU1 which still is in control of how to map the UL ingress channels to UL egress channels (indicated by CU2) and DL ingress channels (indicated by CU2) to DL egress channels |
| Samsung | At this stage, we can start from 1:1 mapping.In case the Option 4 is selected, the BAP header rewriting configuration can be used by the boundary IAB node to select the correct route for the received packets. After that, the ingress-to-egress BH RLC CH mapping can follow Rel-16 design. |
| Futurewei | Not clear that the RAN3 agreement implies any restriction of RLC channel mapping at the boundary node. Generally, we agree with E///’s comment above. |
| Huawei | Not fully agree “has the implication that ingress-to-egress BH RLC channels are mapped 1:1 at the boundary node.” The R3 agreement only mean the all setup BH RLC information will be shared between CUs. The “ingress RLC to egress RLC at boundary node” solution means the restriction that the multiple bearers aggregated to one BH RLC in CU1 should also be aggregated to one BH RLC in CU2. In that sense, “IP header to egress RLC mapping” should be more flexible. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | RAN3 did not restrict mapping rule. 1:1 channel mapping is feasible as an example, but it should not be taken as a generic requirement implied by the RAN3 agreement. |
| ZTE | Q6 is confusing.We cannot see the 1:1 bearer mapping from the RAN3’s agreement.Several UL ingress BH RLC channel can be mapped to only one egress BH RLC channel towards the secondary parent node. This depends on how donor CU2 establish BH RLC channel for the boundary IAB-node. |

**Summary:**

7 companies participated. Most companies did not see that how the RAN3 agreement would imply 1:1 bearer mapping at the boundary node.

Indeed, the agreement only states what the non-F1-terminating donor reports back, but not what the F1-terminating donor has sent before in opposite direction. This may include information on F1-U tunnels (which would allow bearer re-mapping) or only on BH RLC channels (which would not allow bearer re-mapping). More discussion on this topic is needed in RAN3.

Apart from the information exchanged between CUs, bearer remapping could be supported for all of the above options of inter-topology BAP routing, e.g., by including the BAP routing ID into the selection of the egress BH RLC channel.

Further discussion can follow RAN3 progress on the information exchange between CUs.

# Phase 2

The following proposals have been derived from Phase 1 of this discussion:

**Proposal 0a: RAN2 to discuss how IAB-MT knows, which of the two gNBs in CP-UP separation is non-donor vs. donor, and how the IAB-MT distinguishes between CP-UP separation and inter-donor redundancy.**

**Proposal 0b: RAN2 to discuss if F1-C-over-RRC and F1-C-over-BAP is simultaneously supported on the same parent link.**

Q100: Please provide your views on these high-level proposals.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| LG | For Proposal 0a:  In CP-UP separation scenarios, F1-C uses NR access link via a node (non-donor node) and F1-U uses backhaul link via a node (donor node). We think the NR access link is not for backhaul traffic and does not have BH RLC channels and BAP routing would not be performed on the NR access link. Probably just legacy RLC channels would be configured for this NR access link for F1-C in CP-UP separation.  This means that the IAB-MT can know which of the two gNBs in CP-UP separation should be non-donor or donor based on the configuration on each link. But, both links in inter-donor redundancy would be backhaul link and same idea can be applied to distinguish between CP-UP separation and inter-donor redundancy.  For Proposal 0b:  In our understanding, if a parent link supports F1-C-over-RRC, this means that the parent node does not need to have BAP routing and needs Xn interface to forward the F1-C message to the donor node. However, if a parent link supports F1-C-over-BAP, there should be BAP routing to forward F1-C message to the donor node. Thus, we doubt whether F1-C-over-RRC and F1-C-over-BAP cab be simultaneously supported on the same parent link. |
| Kyocera | We agree with the proposals above in general, while we don’t have strong/concrete view at this point.  Regarding Proposal 0a, we assume the IAB-MT may blindly follow RRC Reconfiguration that indicates the F1-C path such as {MN, SN, Both}, {MCG, SCG, Both} or {SRB2, Split SRB/SRB3 or both}, i.e., without knowing which gNB is the donor. We assume the inter-donor redundancy is BAP’s matter, so the IAB-MT (IAB-node) would follow e.g., the F1 routing configuration which is up to RAN3.  Regarding Proposal 0b, we’re not sure if the simultaneous support (activation) of F1-C-over-RRC and F1-C-over-BAP is really beneficial, but at least we assume the IAB-MT should follow the configuration by the donor, i.e., which scheme is used for F1-C transfer. |
| Samsung | P0a: In Rel-16, default F1-C path is the NR link. However, in Rel-17, both MCG and SCG are NR links. In our understanding, the default F1-C path should be the one with the configuration of BH RLC CH for F1-C, regardless of which node is the donor. We may first need however to discuss whether it is necessary for IAB-MT to ‘distinguish’ between CP-UP separation and inter-donor redundancy, before agreeing this proposal. So, for P0a, we propose the following change which we believe could be agreed now:  **P0a’: In case when not configuring the F1-C transfer path, the IAB-MT uses the link which has the configuration of BH RLC CH for F1-C traffic by default to transmit F1-C traffic.**  P0b: OK to discuss further. After introducing F1-C traffic in RRC message, the SCG in scenario 1 can allow F1-C traffic via both RRC and BH RLC CH, and the MCG in scenario 2 can allow F1-C traffic via both RRC and BH RLC CH. Technically, IAB-MT can choose between F1-C-over-RRC and F1-C-over-BAP, even randomly. However, we think it should be forbidden, by either clarification in specification (e.g., F1-C-over-BAP should be used as long as BH RLC CH for F1-C is configured), or explicit configuration to the IAB-MT. |
| Futurewei | P0a: It is not entirely clear to us why the IAB-MT would need to differentiate a non-donor from a donor. Similar to LG, we believe the IAB-MT will simply follow its configuration. Perhaps it is necessary to distinguish the default F1-C path, as suggested by SS. We think this topic can be discussed further, based on contributions.  P0b: There does not seem to be a technical need to support this approach. However, it may also be rather complicated to avoid it in the spec. Is it necessary to limit/forbid such approaches, or can this be left to implementation? |
| ZTE | For proposal 0a, we think the IAB-MT could tell whether MCG or SCG is non-donor based on the BH RLC channel configuration. If BH RLC channel is not configured for IAB-MT with MCG, MCG should be the non-donor node. Or if BH RLC channel is not configured with SCG, SCG should be the non-donor node.  In Rel-17, we think the F1-C over RRC is only used for the CP-UP separation scenario. If the IAB-MT is not configured with the uplink BH Non-UP Traffic mapping towards either MCG or SCG, it can implicitly derive that it is for CP-UP separation scenario and the F1-C over RRC shall be used to deliver the CP message via non-donor node.  Actually, we think it is not necessary for IAB-MT to distinguish the CP-UP separation and inter-donor redundancy. IAB-MT only need to follow the donor CU’s configuration. If uplink BH Non-UP Traffic mapping towards MCG/SCG is configured, IAB-MT may utilize BH link with MCG/SCG to deliver CP message. If none of them is configured with uplink BH Non-UP Traffic mapping and only one of the CG is not configured with BH RLC channel, IAB-MT use the CG without BH RLC channel configuration to deliver the F1-C message via RRC.  For proposal 0b, we think it does not make sense to support the simultaneous F1-C-over-RRC and F1-C-over-BAP transmission on the same parent link. If F1-C-over-BAP could be used for IAB-MT, why we bother to encapsulate the F1-C into RRC signalling, which may be further encapsulated into F1AP signalling at the parent IAB node? In this scenario, F1-C-over-BAP is more straightforward and should be used exclusively. |

**Proposal 1a: At least, SRB2 can be used for F1-C transport in CP/UP-separation scenario 1.**

Q101: Please provide your views on this proposal for CP-UP separation scenario 1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| LG | Ok. |
| Kyocera | We agree with the proposal above. |
| Samsung | OK. |
| Futurewei | Proposal seems fine to us |
| ZTE | We agree with this proposal. |

**Proposal 2a1: RAN2 to consider SRB3 and split-SRB for scenario 2.**

**Proposal 2a2: RAN2 to discuss if F1-C can use both split-SRB paths in scenario 2.**

**Proposal 2b: When F1-C is sent over SRB3 in scenario 2, an indication to SN is needed to request establishment of SRB3.**

**Proposal 2e: If neither SRB3 nor split-SRB is supported, then scenario 2 cannot be supported.**

Q102: Please provide your views on these proposals for CP-UP separation scenario 2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| LG | Proposal 2a1, and 2e should be fine.  Proposal 2b is also ok to us, but this should be confirmed by RAN3.  For Proposal 2a2, basically legacy split-SRB can use both legs. This means that there is no limitation to use both paths for split-SRB in IAB. However, in split-SRB, the PDCP layer determines transmission path based on data volume and configuration (i.e., *primaryPath* and *DataSplitThreshold*). This should be considered for CP-UP separation with split-SRB. |
| Kyocera | We agree with the proposals above, except for Proposal 2b.  Regarding Proposal 2b, we think it’s up to RAN3, so we’re wondering if RAN2 can really agree it. |
| Samsung | We are OK with P2a1, 2b, and 2e.  With regards to 2a2, this proposal is unclear to us. The UL packet transmission path of split-SRB is determined by the *primaryPath* and *DataSplitThreshold* in PDCP configuration, which purely relies on UL data volume pending for transmission. However, the F1-C transfer path depends on the configuration of F1-C path. Thus, in our understanding, split-SRB cannot well support F1-C transfer by following F1-C path configuration. In this sense, we are unclear on the intention of P2a2. So, we propose to remove it. |
| Futurewei | P2a1, P2b, and P2e seem fine.  Regarding P2a2, we understand the concerns raised by LG and SS, but we wonder if these can not be addressed by appropriate configuration of the split-SRB parameters, and hence left to implementation. |
| ZTE | Agree with proposal 2a1, 2b and 2e.  Regarding proposal 2a2, it should be noted that scenario 2 is for CP/UP separation and only MN has donor functionality. According to the LS from RAN3, the F1-C is only allowed to be transferred via the non-donor node, i.e. SN. So only the path towards the non-donor node should be used for F1-C. |
|  |  |

**Proposal 3.1: RAN2 to support inter-topology routing via BAP header rewriting based on BAP routing ID (option 4).**

**Proposal 3.2:** **Support for** **BAP header rewriting based on IP header (option 5) is up to RAN3.**

**Proposal 3.3: Liaise RAN3 on the agreements on inter-topology BAP routing.**

**Proposal 3.4: RAN2 to further discuss:**

* **BAP processing at boundary node**
* **Information to be exchanged between CUs to enable BAP header rewriting.**
* **Impact on descendant nodes and IAB-donor DUs**
* **Constraints on BAP addresses and BAP path IDs to be used for cross-boundary traffic.**

Q103: Please provide your views on these proposals for inter-topology routing.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| LG | We have concerns on proposal 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4.  As shown yellow highlight below in the LS, RAN3 still have on-going discussion for this issue and Option 1 is still on their table, not precluded yet. This means that if option 1 is supported in RAN3, RAN2 may not need to support and discuss other options. In addition, considering the company’s answers on Q6 above, it seems that option 1 is also very supportive in RAN2. We think that, at least, it is too early to say Proposal 3.1 and Proposal 3.4 at this moment.   |  | | --- | | * + **RAN3 has considered the following options for the BAP routing across two topologies, i.e.,** * **Option 1: OAM based solution** * **Option 3: routing via a new unique identity (e.g., extended BAP address with CU component, separate set of (e)LCIDs)** * **Option 4: BAP header rewriting based on BAP routing ID at, e.g., the boundary node** * **Option 5: BAP header rewriting based on IP header at, e.g., the boundary node (seems to also impact RAN2)** |   Thus, what RAN2 need to do is to send the reply LS to RAN3 with clear RAN2 understanding on this issue, not to make RAN2 agreements for the options like the proposal 3.1 and 3.4. The following description can be included in the reply LS to RAN3.  **“RAN2 understand that if Option 1 (OAM based solution) is supported in RAN3, BAP address collision can be avoided and other options may not need to be discussed in RAN2. However, if option 1 is not supported in RAN3, option 4 (BAP header rewriting based on BAP routing ID at, e.g., the boundary node) is the agreeable option in RAN2, but further discussion is needed for details.”** |
| Kyocera | We agree with the proposals above in general.  We’re wondering if both Option 4 and Option 5 need to be supported, and also wonder if Proposal 3.4 is only for Option 4, in case one of them will be chosen at the end. |
| Samsung | We are ok with P3.1 and P3.3.  For P3.2, we are not sure about its intention. With P3.1 and P3.2 combined, does it mean RAN3 should make final decision between opt 4 and opt 5? We are concerned that RAN3 may not be able to make this decision since RAN3 believe the down-selection should be performed by RAN2. In addition, as commented in PH1, opt 5 introduces the impact to the Rel-16 protocol stack, which is not backwards compatible. Considering the large change and limited support (11 points), opt5 can be down-selected already. Thus, we propose to remove P3.2.  For P3.4, we are fine with the first three bullets for further discussion. The fourth bullet is unclear to us. In our understanding, the intention of opt 4 is trying to avoid imposing the constraint upon the BAP addresses and BAP path ID so that donor 1 and donor 2 can assign the BAP address and BAP path ID independently. In this sense, we proposed to remove the fourth bullet of P3.4. |
| Futurewei | We think it might be too early for RAN2 to agree to support a specific option, based solely on an e-mail discussion. We would like to further progress the discussion based on contributions. Therefore, we would prefer that both option 4 & option 5 be considered FFS at this point. Both options depend on BAP header rewriting by the boundary IAB node, and as such there seems to be a lot of commonality from a RAN2 perspective. And of course, option 1 can not be excluded.  Regarding P3.3, we think it is a bit premature at this stage to send any LS to RAN3.  Regarding P3.4, we have a similar view as SS. The first 3 bullets seem fine, but the 4th bullet can be removed, as it is unclear why BAP addresses and/or path IDs would need to be constrained. Of course, in addition to the first 3 bullets, there may be other issues that are FFS. So companies should feel free to raise any additional issues or concerns in their contributions. |
| ZTE | We also think it is too early to agree this option. As we elaborated in phase 1, not only the boundary node and the descendant node need to be reconfigured with the to support the remapping. It introduces a lot of specification effort and should be avoid. We still think Option 1 and Option 3a should be considered. For Option 3a, it only introduce a new BAP header, which is simple to implement. |

# Conclusion

* …

# References

1. Chairman report, 3GPP RAN TSG WG3 Meeting #111e, Electronic Meeting, Jan 25 - Feb 5, 2021