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# Introduction

This paper is to trigger the following email discussion for delivery mode 1 MBS after RAN2#114e meeting.

* [Post114-e][072][MBS] Delivery Mode 1 PTM PTP operation (OPPO)

Scope: Including: The need of PTM deactivation/activation at the UE, PTM PDCP/RLC initialization, packet loss at PTM PTP switch

Intended outcome: Report.

Deadline: Long

The topic will focus on delivery mode 1 PTM PTP operation based on anchor PDCP architecture (i.e. separate PDCP for PTM and PTP is not considered in this email discussion) with following topics. The PTP/PTM switching only focus on intra-cell PTP/PTM switching, i.e. inter-cell PTP/PTM switching due to mobility is not considered in this email discussion.

* PTP/PTM switching due to RRC configuration
* Dynamic PTP/PTM switching and packet loss
* MRB PDCP/RLC initialization due to MRB setup or PTM/PTP switching

**Figure 1: Split Bearer Like Architecture for PTP/PTM Dynamic Switch**

The deadline of the email discussion phase 1 is: 20th July, 2021.
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# Discussion

## ***Issue 1: PTP/PTM switching due to RRC configuration***

In RAN2#113 meeting, RAN2 agreed that MRB may include both PTP and PTM. In RAN2#113bis meeting, RAN2 agreed that split-MRB is configured with PTM leg and PTP leg.

* Confirm P1 P2 P3 (assume that MRB may include both PTP and PTM)
* Assuming a split-MRB (as agreed during the online session) configured with a PTM leg and PTP leg, the usage of the PTP leg cannot be deactivated (i.e. the UE needs to always monitor C-RNTI) after the necessary split-MRB configuration.
* Assuming a split-MRB (as agreed during the online session) configured with a PTM leg and PTP leg, it is FFS whether the usage of the PTM leg of the split-MRB may be subject to activation or deactivation and the details of such.

According to the current agreements, the common understanding is that one MRB can be configured with PTM only or PTP only or both PTM and PTP. The RRC signaling, i.e. RRCReconfiguration message, can be used to reconfigure the MRB from one type to other type, e.g, from PTM only to split.

**Rapporteur understanding:** One MRB can be configured with PTM only or PTP only or both PTM and PTP. The bearer type can be changed from one to other via RRC signaling, e.g. reconfigure the bearer type from PTM only or PTP only to split.

**Q1a: Do companies agree the rapporteur’s understanding about the MRB configuration?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?  (Yes or No) | Comments |
| MediaTek | No | There may be a confusion on the MRB configuration. Specific to MRB, the switch between PTM and PTP may be performed via dynamic switch as discussed at Issue 2. It is unclear why we need both RRC based switch and dynamic switch.  In addition, there may be a possibility to configure the reception of the MBS session via DRB. Then the RRC based switch may be needed to switch the DRB to MRB or vice versa.  For dynamic switch based on the split MRB model, the RRC based configuration should be also supported to different cases as discussed in this section. |
| Samsung | Yes, but | PDCP status report can be transmitted via uplink logical channel. For PTM only MRB, uplink logical channel does not exist. It’s not possible to transmit the status report.  [OPPO] yes, thanks for your comments. 😊 |
| Nokia | Yes and No | Yes, we agree that RRC signalling can be used to switch from one configuration to another (as always).  No, we disagree with how the cases are depicted: 1) PDCP status reports are another issue (reliability) and should not be mixed up in this discussion; 2) all cases involve MRB; 3) not sure why PTM deactivation is listed for Case 3.  [OPPO] thanks for your comments, I revised this part and we call it “bearer type change”. 😊 |
| Ericsson | Yes and No | RRC reconfiguration of a bearer is always supported. The cases here are mixing bearer change with bearer handling with deactivation and PDCP receiver status. We prefer not to call this “switching” as such. To us the switch is still a scheduling decision as a base line.  [OPPO] thanks for your comments, I revised this part and we call it “bearer type change”. 😊 |
| OPPO | Yes | 1. For MRB configuration, RRC signalling can always configuration or reconfiguration the MRB with PTM only or PTP only or both. |
| CATT | Yes | (2)For “One MRB can be configured with PTM only or PTP only or both PTM and PTP.”, it is well aligned with the endorsed 38.300 running CR,caluse 16.x.3.   |  | | --- | | * For multicast session, gNB provides the following one or more MRB configuration(s) to the UE: * MRB with one RLC-UM or RLC-AM entity for PTP transmission; * MRB with one RLC-UM entity for PTM transmission; * MRB with two RLC-UM entities, one RLC-UM entity for PTP transmission and the other RLC-UM entity for PTM transmission as described in section 16.x.5.4; * MRB with two RLC-UM entities, one RLC-AM entity for PTP transmission and the other RLC-UM entity for PTM transmission as described in section 16.x.5.4; |   (2)Agree with that the bearer type can be changed from one to other via RRC signaling. |
| Kyocera | Yes | We agree with Samsung and the rapporteur’s change that after the switching to PTM-only the UE cannot send PDCP Status Report.  We agree with Ericsson and the rapporteur’s change that RRC reconfiguration is not for “switching” but rather for “bearer type change”. |
| ZTE | Yes | We agree with the latest version from rapporteur:  - One MRB can be configured with PTM only or PTP only or both PTM and PTP. The bearer type can be changed from one to other via RRC signaling, e.g. reconfigure the bearer type from PTM only or PTP only to split.  (Although one should be aware that “split bearer” and “bearer type change” are not 100% aligned with the original definition in the specs in 38300/37340)  (We think it is fine to call such RRC reconfig based switch as one of the switch mechanism as what we were aiming at since the WID. The WID tended to have a solution of “switching” in AS layer compared that in service layer in legacy system. To differentiate that from split MRB based dynamic switching, maybe we can call that RRC based switching instead of bearer type change which has already got its own scenario and specific/precise definition) |
| NEC | Yes | Agree the MRB may have two legs, PTP/PTM only or both. And RRC can be used to switch/reconfigure/addition of legs. |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | No (we think the related description is not clear) | An MRB is a split RB. Upon the establishment of an MRB, both the PTM leg and the PTP leg are configured for the MRB. The PTP leg can’t be deactivated while the PTM leg can be activated or deactivated. The bearer type of the MRB (split like RB) CAN NOT be changed (both legs are configured).  But during the MBS data transmission, only PTP leg, only PTM leg or both legs can be really used. The leg really used for the MBS data transmission can be dynamically changed or configured by RRC signalling.  In the other word, during the MBS data transmission, only PTP mode, only PTM mode or both modes can be really used. The mode really used for the MBS data transmission can be dynamically changed or configured by RRC signalling.  Therefore, we think the related description needs to be updated as below.  **Rapporteur understanding:** One MRB are configured with both the PTM leg and the PTP leg. But the leg (mode) really used for the MRB data transmission can be changed dynamically or by RRC signaling. In detail, only PTP leg (only PTP mode)，only PTM leg (only PTM mode) or both legs ( both modes) can be used for the MRB data transmission. The leg (mode) type can be changed from one to another dynamically or via RRC signaling, e.g. reconfigure the leg (mode) type from only PTM leg (only PTM mode) or only PTP leg (only PTP mode) to both legs (both modes). |
| Futurewei | Yes and No | Yes, bearer type change can be done through RRC signalling.  No, PDCP status report and dynamic activation/deactivation of PTM don’t need to be part of bearer type change procedure. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes with comment | Yes to the understanding that MRB bearer type change based on RRC signalling. |
| TCL | Yes | Bearer type change can be done via RRC signalling. |
| Fujitsu | Yes | \* We put our comment based on the new revision to question.  Yes, bearer type change should be done by RRC signalling. |
| Apple | Yes | We agree the “switch” is the bear type change, and NW can use RRC reconfiguration to reconfigure the MRB to one of the three bearer types as follows:   1. PTP only 2. PTM only 3. Split MRB with both PTP leg and PTM leg.   For the PDCP status report, it cannot be supported via the PTM only MRB configuration. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Yes, bearer type can be changed through RRC signalling procedure.  Bearer can be configured as PTM only, PTP only and both PTP + PTM. When both PTM + PTP legs are configured, dynamic switching does not need any type of RRC signalling and is scheduling decision. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | Bearer type change should be done through RRC signalling. |
| LGE | Yes | Yes, we agree with rapporteur understanding. The bearer type can be changed by RRC signalling, and it can be considered as a bearer type change or a bearer modification.  Of course, an MRB should be configured with both a PTM leg and a PTP leg for dynamic PTM/PTP switching. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | The bearer type of MRB can be changed from one to another via RRC signaling, which should be a common understanding. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | The beater type change of MRB via the RRC reconfiguration should be supported as the baseline solution. |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes | Changing of Bearer type by RRC signalling should be supported. |
| CMCC | Yes | Yes, one MRB can be configured with PTM only or PTP only or both PTM and PTP, and it could be change from one type to another with RRC Reconfiguration. And in our understanding, MRB is a type of radio bearer associated with MBS session, different from DRB associated with PDU session, so we are not sure of the description of bearer type change, since there’s also MRB to DRB change. |

During bearer type change, there may be data loss in the following cases:

Case 1: Reconfiguration between PTP only and PTM only;

Case 2: Reconfiguration from split MRB to PTM only or PTP only;

Case 3: Reconfiguration from PTM only to split MRB with PTM deactivation if RAN2 agree the PTM deactivation state can be configured in RRC signaling;

The PDCP status report from UE side is useful to reduce the data loss. So the PDCP can be indicated to perform reestablishment via RRC signaling, and PDCP status report will be triggered. However, it is not clear what kind of RLC will be configured for PTM RLC and PTP RLC, i.e. DL only RLC or both DL RLC and UL RLC. If DL only RLC is configured for PTP or PTM, it is impossible to transfer PDCP status report to the network for the UE even if the PDCP reestablishment is triggered.

|  |
| --- |
| RLC-Config ::= CHOICE {  am SEQUENCE {  ul-AM-RLC UL-AM-RLC,  dl-AM-RLC DL-AM-RLC  },  um-Bi-Directional SEQUENCE {  ul-UM-RLC UL-UM-RLC,  dl-UM-RLC DL-UM-RLC  },  um-Uni-Directional-UL SEQUENCE {  ul-UM-RLC UL-UM-RLC  },  um-Uni-Directional-DL SEQUENCE {  dl-UM-RLC DL-UM-RLC  },  ...  } |

**Q1b: What is the opinion on the RLC configuration for PTP RLC and PTM RLC, i.e. DL only or both?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | PTP UM RLC🡺DL only or both?  PTP AM RLC🡺DL only or both?  PTM UM-RLC🡺DL only or both? | Comments |
| OPPO | PTP UM RLC🡺DL only  PTP AM RLC🡺both DL and UL  PTM UM-RLC🡺 DL only | We have no strong view on the UM RLC. I am fine if majority companies think the PDCP status report should be supported and it results in both DL RLC and UL RLC are configured. |
| CATT |  | Our opinions are below:  1. It seems reconfiguration from PTP only to split MRB is missed here. suggest to consider the case 4 below,  Case 4: Reconfiguration from PTP only to split MRB.  2. We think PDCP status report could be triggered to reduce data loss. But PDCP reestablishment is not mandatory in all cases.  3. For RLC mode, we propose:  - RAN2 should support: DL only RLC UM for PTM, and RLC AM for PTP;  - FFS if support 1 DL RLC UM+1 UL RLC UM for PTP. |
| Kyocera | PTP UM RLC 🡪 DL only or both  PTP AM RLC 🡪 both DL and UL  PTM UM RLC 🡪 DL only | We think RLC-AM should be configured with bi-directional, while we assume it’s NW implementation how to configure RLC-UM for PTP. We think it’s straightforward that PTM is only configured with uni-directional DL. |
| ZTE | PTP RLC (AM):  - both DL and UL (for sure)  PTP RLC (UM):  - DL only (when UM is good enough)  - both (feedback beneficial even for UM where minimization of loss is needed)  PTM RLC (UM)  - DL only. | Agree with Kyocera.  We shall allow enough flexibility from network to configure the MRB for different services. |
|  |  |  |
| NEC | PTP UM RLC🡺DL only  PTP AM RLC🡺both DL and UL  PTM UM-RLC🡺 DL only | 1: Agree to add case 4 of reconfiguration from PTP only to split MRB  2: PDCP status report can’t be re-established very often other than the case of handover, otherwise the signalling overhead, UE processing delay are unaccepted.  3: RAN2 is suggested to introduce PTP RLC AM leg only re-transmits the RLC PDU that PTM RLC UM leg have not received. |
| Futurewei | PTP AM RLC 🡪 both DL and UL  PTP/PTM UM RLC 🡪 DL only | We should follow the existing principle:   * If reliability is required, RLC AM is applied; * If reliability is not required, RLC UM is used.   There is no need of a new, mixed mode of supporting reliable transmission with RLC UM. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | PTP UM RLC -> DL only  PTP AM RLC -> both DL and UL  PTM UM-RLC -> DL only | Whether we need PTP UM RLC in the UL can be FFS |
| Samsung | PTP UM RLC🡺DL only  PTP AM RLC🡺 bidirectional  PTM UM-RLC🡺 DL only | no need to configure bi-directional RLC for UM MRB  For AM RLC, bi-directional links are inevitable at least for RLC status report. |
| Fujitsu | PTP UM RLC 🡺 DL only  PTP AM RLC 🡺 both DL and UL  PTM UM RLC 🡺 DL only | For UM RLC, it depends on if PDCP SR is supported, but we are not sure why lossless would be achieved in UM RLC. As RAN2 extensively discussed, reliability would be achieved by AM RLC. |
| Apple | PTP:   1. PTP AM RLC-> UL and DL 2. PTP UM RLC -> DL only 3. PTP UM RLC -> UL and DL   Note: for UL part is for PDCP status report transmission.  PTM:   1. PTM UM RLC-> DL only | Agree with Kyocera and ZTE that RRC configuration should provide enough flexibility for the different MBS services.  For the split-MRB or PTP only MRB configuration, bidirectional UM RLC entity (for the PTP leg) can be used for the PDCP status report transmission, which is helpful for the reliable MBS transmission. |
| Qualcomm | PTP RLC AM -> both DL and UL  PTP RLC UM -> DL only/both DL+UL  PTM RLC UM -> DL only | Agree with Kyocera comments.  Reason for supporting configuration of both DL + UL for PTP RLC UM is when gNB changes configuration from PTM RLC UM to PTP, UE can be configured to report PDCP status report to avoid duplication in PTP leg. This is similar to DAPS HO case of RLC UM, which allows UE to report PDCP status report . |
| Spreadtrum | PTP UM RLC 🡺 DL only  PTP AM RLC 🡺 both DL and UL  PTM UM RLC 🡺 DL only | For RLC AM mode, bi-directional RLC is needed for the reliability. |
| LGE | PTP UM RLC -> DL only  PTP AM RLC -> both  PTM UM-RLC -> DL only | PDCP SR is needed for mobility case from PTP AM RLC to PTP AM RLC, so PTP AM RLC needs to be configured with both DL and UL. For PTP UM RLC and PTM UM RLC, they may be configured with DL only considering that MBS traffic is DL only. In addition, when PTP is configured with UM RLC and high reliability is not required, it is not needed to provide feedback for loss recovery at reconfiguration. |
| Huawei,HiSilicon | The PTM RLC entity which is RLC UM only should be DL only.  The configuration of PTP RLC can be up to network implementation, and there is no need to further restrict the configuration, i.e. can be either bi-directional or uni-directional. |  |
| Xiaomi | PTP UM RLC 🡪 DL only or both  PTP AM RLC 🡪 both DL and UL  PTM UM RLC 🡪 DL only |  |
| Sony | PTP UM RLC -> DL only  PTP AM RLC-> UL and DL  PTM UM RLC-> DL only |  |
| Sharp | PTP UM RLC🡺DL only or both  PTP AM RLC🡺both DL and UL  PTM UM-RLC🡺 DL only |  |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | 1. We agree with CATT to add “Case 4” 2. We think MRB is a split like RB with a PTM leg and a PTP leg per UE. The bearer type of MRB can’t be changed because MRB is a split like RB. But the leg(s)/mode(s) really used for the MRB data transmission can be changed.   The sentence “ The bearer type can be changed ……” will lead to a misunderstanding that an MRB with only PTM leg or only PTP leg per UE can be configured, which is against with the following agreements.  Assuming a split-MRB (as agreed during the online session) configured with a PTM leg and PTP leg, the usage of the PTP leg cannot be deactivated (i.e. the UE needs to always monitor C-RNTI) after the necessary split-MRB configuration.  Assuming a split-MRB (as agreed during the online session) configured with a PTM leg and PTP leg, it is FFS whether the usage of the PTM leg of the split-MRB may be subject to activation or deactivation and the details of such.   1. We think the description of 4 cases can be updated as below to clarify the fact that we are discussing the leg/mode type change not the bearer type change.   During the leg/mode type change, there may be data loss in the following cases:  Case 1: Reconfiguration between PTP only and PTM only  Case 2: Reconfiguration from both PTM and PTP to PTM only or PTP only  Case 3: Reconfiguration from PTM only to both PTM and PTP  From our side, the MRB with the PTM leg (mode) deactivation can be considered as the MRB with only PTP leg (mode).  Case 4: Reconfiguration from PTP only to both PTM and PTP   1. Our suggestion on the RLC configuration for MRB is listed as below.   PTP UM RLC->DL only or both  PTP AM RLC->both  PTM UM RLC->DL only |  |
| CMCC | PTM UM-RLC -> DL only  PTP AM-RLC -> both  PTP UM-RLC -> both | We agree to add case 4 of changing PTP only to split MRB.  It is straightforward that PTM could be only be configured with un-directional DL and for PTP, we prefer to provide more flexibility for gNB configuration, bi-direction UM RLC of PTP leg could be used for PDCP status report, to minimize the data loss. |

**Q1c: If both DL and UL RLC entity are configured for PTM or PTP, do companies agree the PDCP entity re-establishment requested by upper layer is used to trigger PDCP status report for data loss reduction purpose?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?  (Yes or No) | Comments |
| OPPO | Yes | We have no strong view on it. I am fine if majority companies think the PDCP status report should be supported and it results in both DL RLC and UL RLC are configured. |
| CATT | No | We should discuss the trigger of PDCP status report case by case, for example, PDCP reestablishment is not needed for the cases that reconfiguration from PTM only to split MRB, and vice versa. For the cases that reconfiguration between PTP and PTM/split MRB, we need to wait for security mechanism from SA3. |
| Kyocera | Yes, but | We think Rel-15 behaviour is to trigger a PDCP Status Report for “AM DRB” when the upper layer requests either the PDCP entity reestablishment or the PDCP data recovery, which should be applicable as the baseline for MBS.  We’re not sure why “UM DRB” in MBS can trigger a PDCP Status Report as similar with Rel-16 uplink data switching, but we’re open if companies think it’s necessary. |
| ZTE | Yes | Depending on network decision and available configurations (based on result of Q1b). Again, we shall allow enough flexibility from network to configure the MRB. |
| NEC | No | As our answer in Q1b, PDCP re-establishment other than handover doesn’t make any sense. |
| Futurewei | No | There is no need of a new, mixed mode of supporting reliable transmission with RLC UM. If reliability is required, RLC AM should be applied.  It doesn’t seem feasible for PTP only to PTM only bearer type change to avoid data loss anyway. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Fujitsu | No | We don’t consider the case that both DL RLC and UL RLC entity are configured for PTM or PTP. We only assume that DL RLC and UL RLC entities are configured for PTP. In this case, PDCP SR can be triggered as Rel-15. |
| Apple | Yes | For PTP RLC AM entity, when NW triggers the PDCP reestablishment, the UE’s behaviour is same as legacy for the unicast transmission. |
| Qualcomm | No | Without PDCP re-establishment, PDCP status report can be triggered.  Note that PDCP status report can be reports in following cases:  *For AM DRBs configured by upper layers to send a PDCP status report in the uplink (statusReportRequired in TS 38.331 [3]), the receiving PDCP entity shall trigger a PDCP status report when:*  *- upper layer requests a PDCP entity re-establishment*  *- upper layer requests a PDCP data recovery;*  *- upper layer requests a uplink data switching;*  *- upper layer reconfigures the PDCP entity to release DAPS and daps-SourceRelease is configured in TS 38.331 [3].*  *For UM DRBs configured by upper layers to send a PDCP status report in the uplink (statusReportRequired in TS 38.331 [3]), the receiving PDCP entity shall trigger a PDCP status report when:*  *- upper layer requests a uplink data switching.* |
| Spreadtrum | No | We think the both DL and UL RLC entity are only configured for PTP, PDCP entity re-establishment is not needed. |
| LGE | No | PDCP re-establishment is not proper for triggering PDCP SR for data loss reduction purpose because it’s mainly introduced for security change. If PDCP SR for data loss reduction during bearer type change is supported by many companies, we think that data recovery would be proper for that purpose or new trigger can be introduced. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes, but | First, we believe that PDCP SR is useful in some cases of bearer type change to reduce the potential packet loss, e.g. reconfiguration from PTM-only to PTP-only.  On the other hand, whether PDCP SR is triggered by PDCP re-establishment or others can be further discussed. |
| Xiaomi | Not sure | We agree to trigger PDCP SR for the PTM. However whether the PDCP reestablishment procedure is reused can be discussed further. |
| Sony | No | We should wait for security inputs from SA3. The need for PDCP SR should be discussed separately and agree that PDCP reestablishment is not the only condition for triggering PDCP SR. |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech |  | 1. **Both DL and UL RLC entities are configured for the PTM leg are impossible. Only one UM RLC entity for DL is used for the PTM leg.** 2. **The specific PDCP reestablishment cases may be clarified more clearly for the answer to be made.**   The PDCP entity in UE is connected to both the PTM leg and the PTP leg.  When at least the PTP mode is activated for the MRB data transmission, the PDCP entity submits the PDCP status report based on the legacy procedure.  From only PTP to only PTM or from both modes to only PTM, the PDCP status report can be triggered. The NACK-ed PDCP PDU can be retransmitted with the PTP leg until all NACK-ed PDCP PDUs are correctly received by UE. Then the PTP leg is not used by gNB to transmit the new MRB data to UE. |
| CMCC | Yes, but | PDCP status report could be triggered if both DL and UL RLC entities are configured, and it helps to reduce the data loss.  But, the trigger for PDCP status report could be discussed case by case, in some case, data switching like in DAPS may be more suitable. |

## ***Issue 2: Dynamic PTP/PTM switching and packet loss***

In RAN2#113bis meeting, dynamic PTM/PTP switch is supported for a split MRB bearer (type) with a common (single) PDCP entity. So only both PTM and PTM leg are configured, the dynamic PTM/PTP switch can be supported. The PTP leg cannot be deactivated and FFS for PTM leg.

* Dynamic PTM/PTP switch is supported for a split MRB bearer (type) with a common (single) PDCP entity.
* Assuming a split-MRB (as agreed during the online session) configured with a PTM leg and PTP leg, the usage of the PTP leg cannot be deactivated (i.e. the UE needs to always monitor C-RNTI) after the necessary split-MRB configuration.
* Assuming a split-MRB (as agreed during the online session) configured with a PTM leg and PTP leg, it is FFS whether the usage of the PTM leg of the split-MRB may be subject to activation or deactivation and the details of such.

Some companies wonder whether the dynamic PTM/PTP switching is transparent or not to UE. If so, the UE will monitor both G-RNTI and C-RNTI for MBS reception. Some companies think if PTP leg is used for the UE’s MBS transmission, the UE should stop monitoring G-RNTI for UE power saving purpose. Some proponents also propose to use MAC CE or DCI to indicate the PTM leg deactivation or activation.

On the other hand, if dynamic PTM/PTP switching is transparent to UE, the PTM RLC window may discard some valid MBS data by mistake as pointed out by some companies. If gNB uses PTP leg to transmit MBS data and there is no PTM deactivation command to UE, the UE will continue to receive the MBS data from PTM leg. Due to the bad channel condition, the PTM RLC may not receive data from MAC layer for a long time and the RLC state variables will not change. After that there may be a valid packet received, but the newly received packet may be discarded, e.g if the SN of the newly received packet meets (RX\_Next\_Highest – UM\_Window\_Size) <= SN < RX\_Next\_Reassembly although this is not an out-of-date packet. In this case the RLC reception window of the PTM leg will not be updated.

|  |
| --- |
| 5.2.2.2.2 Actions when an UMD PDU is received from lower layer When an UMD PDU is received from lower layer, the receiving UM RLC entity shall:  - if the UMD PDU header does not contain an SN:  - remove the RLC header and deliver the RLC SDU to upper layer.  - else if (RX\_Next\_Highest – UM\_Window\_Size) <= SN < RX\_Next\_Reassembly:  - discard the received UMD PDU.  - else:  - place the received UMD PDU in the reception buffer. |





**Q2: Do companies agree to support PTM leg deactivation when switching to PTP? And which signaling is used?**

**Option 1: Do not support PTM deactivation and dynamic PTM/PTP switching is transparent to UE. If option 1 is chosen, please clarify how to address the RLC window un-synchronization issue as clarified above.**

**Option 2: Support PTM deactivation based on MAC CE.**

**Option 3: Support PTM deactivation based on DCI.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?  (option 1,2,3) | Comments |
| MediaTek | Op-2 | We think the PTM deactivation and dynamic PTM/PTP switching should be notified to the UE. MAC CE is preferred as we foresee the information would be not affordable by DCI. |
| Samsung | Option 1 | From the operation perspective, RRC-based MRB type change to PTP only (or legacy DRB) is equivalent to deactivation of PTM RLC. We do not need to have duplication function.  Regarding RLC window un-synchronization would occur only if UE is not able to receive RLC UM data on PTM leg. In this case, the configuration of PTM RLC is no longer needed, so release of the PTM RLC by RRC signalling can be simply used.  Also, dynamic deactivation requires RRC-based switching even if we have another fast mechanism (i.e. MAC CE or DCI). |
| Nokia | Option 1 | If the PTM performance is so bad that no packets are received for a full receive window, surely PTM should be removed by RRC. Thus, this is not a valid issue to worry about.  On the possible gains, how much the UE will benefit depends on PDCCH configuration (CORESET/SS) where DCI scrambled with G-RNTI scheduling PDSCH for a group can be transmitted. This should be assessed in RAN1 but not in isolation from existing mechanisms to control PDCCH monitoring (DRX, SPS, CA activation…). Until then, no new mechanism should be introduced to limit complexity and avoid specifying something that will never be implemented. |
| Ericsson | Option 1 | We think the dynamic switch is a scheduling decision and think that optimising the segmentation case for PTM is not bringing any useful benefit but rather complexity instead. If the reliability for PTM cannot be met, PTP should be used and as we already (before switching) have packet losses, the switch/deactivation itself does not need optimization. |
| Shanghai Jiao Tong University | Option 2 | We think PTM leg deactivation should be supported to avoid the RLC window un-synchronization issue. And L2 signalling (e.g., MAC CE) can be used.  Release of the PTM RLC by RRC signalling will introduce transmission latency when the UE needs to be switched back to PTM. |
| NERCDTV | Option 2 | We think PTM deactivation should be supported to avoid the RLC window un-synchronization issue. And release of the PTM RLC by RRC signalling is not suitable if the UE was switched to PTP temporarily due to temporary bad channel condition.  And MAC CE is preferred for PTM deactivation |
| OPPO | Option 2 | Even if there is no data lossless requirement, we think it is better to have the solution for low data loss. So RLC window un-synchronization issue should be addressed. Furtermore, the UE power consumption should also be considered especially in NR network. |
| CATT | Option 2 or 3 | We think PTM deactivation indication is necessary. For split MRB bearer, the transmission on PTM leg may be deactivated by gNB temporally. We have no strong preference for option 2 or option 3. Option 3 should be decided by RAN1. |
| Kyocera | Option 2 | We prefer to have the deactivation of PTM-leg via MAC CE. |
| ZTE | Option 2 | 1. Explicit signaling is needed.   - UE power consumption is our main concern. For a group of UE with each can have its own unicast services of different traffic characteristics, it will be hard or impossible to have the PTM transmission DRX aligned with per UE DRX.  - And for each UE to monitor a separate DRX of PTM transmission inevitably increase the power consumption.  - Note: efforts in attempting to de-scramble a G-RNTI is low only when UE wakes up for both C-RNTI and G-RNTI. The reality however is DRX of each transmission (among per UE C-RNTI and per group G-RNTI) wont be perfectly overlapped.   1. No strong view, but MAC CE is of greater flexibility. |
| NEC | Option 1 | We think even the PTP leg is configured in addition to the PTM leg, the PTM transmission is still ongoing, so it is still unnecessary to mandate the network to deactivate the PTM leg.  Given the PTP leg and PTM leg have separate RLC entities, the receiving windows of two RLC entities un-synchronization won’t bring any problem. |
| Futurewei | Option 1 | If there’d be issue of RLC window de-synchronization, RRC signaling should be used to reconfigure PTM RLC entity through bearer type change.  It is not clear what benefit there would be to use MAC CE or DCI to address the RLC de-synchronization issue – as discussed by the rapporteur, it’d take a long period of time of no PTM reception, during which a RRC reconfiguration could be done in time to resolve the issue. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Option 2 | First, MAC CE based PTP/PTM switch is different from bearer reconfiguration based on RRC signalling, wherein PDCP reestablishment is needed.  Secondly, once PTM is deactivated, UE will stop monitoring the corresponding G-RNTI, and will stop operating the corresponding DRX operation, assuming C-RNTI and G-RNTI have different DRX operations. It benefits the power saving.  We think activating/deactivating the PTM leg could be essentially about start/stop monitoring the relevant G-RNTI. |
| TCL | Option 2,3 | Explicit signalling is beneficial to power saving. |
| Fujitsu | Option 1 | We are not sure if the gain of the dynamic switching.  Comment to Options 2 and 3: Both options work, but Option 2 needs RAN1 work and probably need new DCI formant. The specification development effort is not predictable, which would be avoided. |
| Apple | Option 2,3 | We donot think the RLC window desync is a big issue, but the PTM deactivation of the split-MRB is good for the UE power saving, especially when UE is required to receive the PTM but is not in UE specific DRX active time. |
| Qualcomm | Option 2 | We agree that when both PTM+PTP legs are configured, dynamic switching is possible and is transparent to UE. PTM RLC UM de-sync may happen only when UE is unable to receive PTM leg for very long period of time.  When both legs are configured, we should allow flexibility for NW to deactivate PTM leg to avoid usage of unnecessary frequent (and is not fast) RRC signalling to change bearer configuration.  Between Option 2 and 3, we prefer MAC-CE over DCI based due to high reliability. |
| Spreadtrum | Option 2 | Explicit signaling is needed to indicate UE to stop monitoring the corresponding G-RNTI which is beneficial for power saving. Between Option 2 and 3, we prefer MAC-CE. |
| LGE | Option 1 | For UE power saving, gNB can reconfigure the MRB as PTP only when transmission over PTP gets stable after dynamic PTM/PTP switching.  For RLC SN de-synchronization in PTM, we think it is not an important issue. SN is used only for RLC segmentation in PTM UM and segmentation may be infrequent. Also, data are expected to be received over PTP when channel condition of PTM is too poor to receive packets for long time. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2 or its variants | The benefit of dynamic switch based on split MRB is that the gNB can adapt the delivery mode (PTP or PTM) to the dynamic channel condition, since using RRC signalling would inevitably increase the latency.  The RLC window un-synchronization issue is valid to us. Although it may not happen often, but once it happens the packets would be consecutively discarded.  It should be noted that the gNB may not be able to know how many packets a UE can still receive via the PTM leg when the PTM leg is not used for the UE (no HARQ feedback for the UE in PTM leg). It would be difficult to rely on the gNB to de-configure the PTM leg via RRC.  If we cannot reach a consensus to deactivate PTM, we should at least specify a way to allow the UE to keep up with the pace of others. |
| Xiaomi | Option 2 | Deactivating the PTM reception is better for UE power saving. Compared with Option 3, Option 2 is preferred as the MAC CE is more reliable than the DCI. |
| Sony | Option 1 | We think RRC signaling should be the baseline and dynamic switching should be addressed once the basic design is clear. |
| Sharp | Option 2 | Eexplicit indication of deactivation of PTM is benefit for power saving and can avoid SN de-syc issue at PTM leg. |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | Option 2 or a new option | Option 1 is a feasible option. But we prefer to option 2.  Maybe a new option can be used as below.  Option 4: gNB decides whether or not to deactivate the PTM leg. If gNB decides to deactivate the PTM leg, the PTM deactivation command and the PTP activation command are sent to UE altogether by RRC signalling or MAC CE or DCI. We think RRC signalling/MAC CE is better than DCI.  The consideration from us is listed as below.  If the PTP leg is not only used for the MRB data retransmissions, the PTM leg can be deactivated by gNB to reduce power consumption by UE.  The gNB’s decision on the deactivation of the PTM leg depends on the related information and can be considered as an implementation problem.  If gNB decides to deactivate the PTM leg, the PTM deactivation command and the PTP activation command are sent to UE altogether by RRC signalling or MAC CE or DCI. Therefore, if UE can use PTP to receive the MRB data, it means that both the PTM deactivation command and the PTP activation command are received correctly by UE. |
| CMCC | Option 2 or 3 | In case PTP and PTM are both configured, it is beneficial to activate/deactivate PTM leg to adapt the different channel condition, and it is benefit for UE power saving. We have no strong preference for Option 2 or 3. |

If option 2 or 3 is chosen, and if PTM activation command is not received by the UE, the UE will not start G-RNTI monitoring. However, the gNB will stop PTP leg transmission if gNB activates the PTM leg for the UE. So the UE will not be able to receive MBS data anymore.

If PTM deactivation command is not received by the UE, the UE will keep monitoring G-RNTI. The gNB will start PTP leg transmission after it deactivates the PTM leg. The UE has no problem to receive the MBS data but will waste more power. So the next question is whether the PTM deactivation/activation command needs feedback or confirmation from UE side?

**Q3: Do companies agree the PTM deactivation/activation command need feedback or confirmation from UE side and how?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?  (Yes/No) | Comments |
| MediaTek | No | The feedback may cause unnecessary uplink signalling storm from the involved UEs. |
| Samsung | No for Option 2, Yes for Option 3 | For Option 2 (MAC CE), HARQ ACK can be used as FB. No other feedback is needed.  For Option 3 (DCI), HARQ ACK may be needed. |
| Nokia | - | The problems and corresponding mechanisms to solve them are specific to dynamic activation/deactivation. This demonstrates that dynamic activation/deactivation increases complexity. Yet the gains are yet to be shown. |
| Ericsson | No | We agree with Nokia. Also, the UE anyway monitors for its C-RNTI and the effort in attempting to descramble a G-RNTI is very low. If anything is transmitted in UL (UL-SCH) like MAC CE, there is already reliability mechanisms in place. |
| Shanghai Jiao Tong University | No | HARQ ACK can be used for MAC CE. No new feedback is needed. |
| NERCDTV | No | HARQ ACK can be used for MAC CE. No new feedback is needed. |
| OPPO | No | No strong opinion, it is up to network to ensure PTM A/D command is received by UE. |
| CATT | - | Agree with Samsung. No for option 2. For option 3 (DCI for PTM deactivation), it should be decided by RAN1 on whether the feedback is needed. |
| Kyocera | No | We think the feedback is not needed as same with the existing SCell Activation/Deactivation MAC CE for CA, in case of Option 2 (with MAC CE). |
| ZTE | No | Also, what if it is fine to miss such command?  Network will have to be aware of the reception quality anyway, especially for PTM transmission. |
| NEC | No | HARQ ACK can be used for MAC CE. No new feedback is needed. |
| Futurewei | Yes | If MAC CE or DCI based PTM deactivation/activation command is used, feedback or confirmation from UE side is needed. Otherwise, it defeats the purpose of using them to avoid RLC window de-synchronization. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | depends | If the PTM deactivation is unicast to UE, then we have HARQ already. If the PTM deactivation is multicast to a number of UEs, and the HARQ feedback is not enabled, then maybe some confirmation is needed (although it does not seem a reasonable way of deactivating PTM). |
| TCL | No | Limited gain with high complexity. |
| Fujitsu | No | MAC CE: HARQ ACK is enough.  DCI: Need RAN1 consultation. |
| Apple | No | Feedback is not needed for Option 2. For Option 3, it needs to consult with RAN1. |
| Qualcomm | No for Option2. | Same view as Samsung and Kyocera.  For MAC-CE solution, already HARQ feedback mechanism can be used to provide feedback and no additional L2 feedback needed. |
| Spreadtrum | No | HARQ ACK can be used for MAC CE. |
| LGE | No | We support option 1 of Q2. No signalling and feedback are required for option 1 of Q2.  Even if act/deact command is used, we think additional feedback is not needed. As other companies mentioned, HARQ ACK can be used. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | Agree with some of others that HARQ feedback seems sufficient. |
| Xiaomi | No | If MAC CE is used for the PTM activation/deactivation, the HARQ feedback is sufficient. |
| Sony | No |  |
| Sharp | No | We can rely on HARQ ACK. |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | No | If option 1 for question 2 is selected, the current question is useless.  If option 2 is selected, no extra feedback is needed.  If option 4 for question 2 (option 4 is suggested by us for question 2, see the detailed description of our answer to question 2) is selected, the current question is also useless because the PTM deactivation command and the PTP activation command are bundled together, sent to UE with the same RRC signalling/MAC CE/DCI and then confirmed with the same method. |
| CMCC | No | Agree with other companies, HARQ feedback could be used for Option 2, while Option 3, it should be decided by RAN1. |

If the UE switches to PTP and stop PTM monitoring immediately upon receiving PTP/PTM switch command, the data loss may occur because of the packets in the air of the PTM leg.

To ensure reliability, some companies propose to receive MBS data via PTM and PTP simultaneously for a period of time during PTP/PTM switching. Meanwhile, some other companies propose to retransmit these packets via the new leg (i.e. PTP leg). Same as the handover case, PDCP status report can be used to indicate the retransmission during PTP/PTM switching.

The common understanding is that PTP is never deactivated and PTM may be deactivated. The data loss may happen only when the PTM leg is deactivated.

To reduce the data loss, there are 3 options to address the issue.

**Option 1:** PDCP status report is triggered from UE side in case of PTM-to-PTP switch **with PTM deactivation**.

**Option 2.1**: Up to gNB implementation to ensure the PTM data delivery completed between PTP/PTM switching and PTP/PTM switching command delivery.

**Option 2.2**: The UE starts a timer after PTP/PTM switching command reception, and the UE deactivate PTM leg after the timer expires.





For option 2.1, it is simple and UE will execute the command immediately when received. The UE does not need to distinguish whether the command is for PTM activation or deactivation to decide whether to start the timer or not.

**Q4: Which option do companies prefer to address the data loss issue due to PTM-to-PTP switch with PTM deactivation?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?  (option 1,2.1,2.2) | Comments |
| MediaTek | Op-1 | We think UE PDCP status report should be anyway needed during dynamic switch. This is also connected to our answer to Quesiton-9. |
| Samsung | Option 2.1 but | Option 1 is almost same as MRB type change from split to PTP only. So, we do not need any duplicate function.  Option 2-1 is the simplest but it can be discussed after we agree any dynamic deactivation. |
| Nokia | - | If PTM itself cannot be lossless (RLC UM), it does not make sense to try to make the switch lossless. What we should aim at is to minimise the losses. |
| Ericsson | - | Agree w Nokia. As we already (before switching) have packet losses, the switch/deactivation itself does not need optimization.  We do not think any switch command is needed as the switch is transparent to the UE. This is simplest in all regards. |
| OPPO | Option 1 and option 2.1 | To reduce data loss, it is more efficient to use both option 1 and option 2.1 together to reduce the data loss for MBS. |
| CATT | Option 1 | For the multicast with high Qos requirement, PTM/PTP switching is used to avoid data loss. In this case, data loss should also be minimized during PTM/PTP switching. We see benefit to retransmit missing data in PTP leg according to PDCP status report. |
| Kyocera | Option 1 | We understand this email discussion does not discuss the mobility case, but RAN2 agreed “*R2 aim to support lossless handover for MBS-MBS mobility for service that requires this (TBD which detailed scenario but at least PTP-PTP)*”. So, we think the lossless handover for the UE with Split MRB deactivating PTM-leg is the case. In this sense, we think the lossless switching from PTM-leg to PTP-leg should be supported for the preparation of lossless handover, and PDCP Status Report (i.e., Option 1) is straightforward for this purpose. |
| ZTE | Option 1 and option 2.1 | Always good to allow network to minimize the loss, and whether PDCP Status report is enabled shall be of network decision.  Note: enabling PDCP Status report does not mean no packet loss at all. |
| NEC |  | Agree with Nokia/Ericsson, the simple switch between PTM to PTP doesn’t need any optimization. |
| Futurewei | None | Agree with Nokia and Ericsson. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Option 1 | For dynamic PTM-PTP switch, in order to support loss-less, UE can send PDCP Status Report to network upon PTM deactivation.  Since RLC UM is used for PTM, the network is not aware whether all the UEs have received the packets successfully. Not sure it can be resolved by gNB Implementation. |
| TCL |  | Agree with Nokia and Ericsson. |
| Fujitsu | None | Agree with Nokia and Ericsson. PDCP SDUs are not buffered in case of PTM and UM RLC since lossless is not supported. Retransmission is not possible when switching from PTM to PTP. |
| Apple | Option 1 and Option 2.1 | Lossless switching is required for the high reliability MBS service, and both Option 1 and Option 2.1 can work well to reduce the packet loss during the switching.  Whether to enable the PDCP SR could up to NW configuration. |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 | Agree with CATT and Kyocera comments. |
| Spreadtrum | Option 2.2 | In option2.2, UE can receive data via PTM and PTP simultaneously before timer expires which can minimize the data loss. |
| LGE | None | Agree with Nokia.  In addition, we think that losses during PTM transmission should be distinguished from losses due to dynamic PTM/PTP switching. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 1 or Option 2.1 | The PDCP retransmission via PTP leg is to avoid the consecutive packet loss during the PTM-to-PTP switch due to missing the PTM reception, which is in the same sense of PDCP status reporting and retransmission during handover. This can be compatible with RLC UM, as long as the PDCP SNs are synchronized.  On the other hand, gNB implementation to complete the transmission via PTM is also workable in some cases if the PTM delivery is still feasible (may not be efficient). |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 | We think that switching from PTM to PTP is to avoid the packet loss via the PTM leg, when the PTM leg is not reliable any more. Then the PDCP SR is needed. RAN2 can discuss further whether the PDCP SR for the PTM-to-PTP switch is configurable, like the handover. |
| Sony |  | Agree with Nokia and Ericsson |
| Sharp | Option 1 | PDCP status report is a simple way to address the data loss issue. But the need of PDCP status report when switching PTM to PTP should configured by gNB. |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | Option 1 or Option 2.1 |  |
| CMCC | Option 1 and option 2.1 | Anyway PDCP status report is helpful to reduce data loss. And it’s good if the network could minimize the data loss, which is a simple solution. |

## ***Issue 3: MRB PDCP/RLC initialization due to MRB setup or PTM/PTP switching***

In NR MBS, PDCP entity is common for PTM and PTP and PTM leg is used for multiple UEs. It means for the UE later joins in the multicast session, the initial values for each state variables cannot always be “0” as legacy unicast, regardless of whether the first received MBS data comes from PTM-leg or PTP-leg. For the same reason, the PTM RLC is also for multiple UEs and RLC state variables cannot always be “0” too.

**PDCP reception**

For PDCP entity, only when MRB is setup, the PDCP state variables need to be set.

|  |
| --- |
| The receiving PDCP entity shall maintain the following state variables:  a) RX\_NEXT  This state variable indicates the COUNT value of the next PDCP SDU expected to be received. The initial value is 0, except for sidelink broadcast and groupcast, and for SRBs configured with state variables continuation. For NR sidelink communication for broadcast and groupcast, the initial value of the SN part of RX\_NEXT is (x +1) modulo (2[*sl-PDCP-SN-Size*]), where x is the SN of the first received PDCP Data PDU. For target SRB configured with state variables continuation, the initial value is the value stored in PDCP entity for the corresponding source SRB. For source SRB configured with state variables continuation, the initial value is the value stored in PDCP entity for the corresponding target SRB.  NOTE: It is up to UE implementation to select HFN for RX\_NEXT as such that initial value of RX\_DELIV should be a positive value.  b) RX\_DELIV  This state variable indicates the COUNT value of the first PDCP SDU not delivered to the upper layers, but still waited for. The initial value is 0, except for sidelink broadcast and groupcast, and for SRBs configured with state variables continuation. For NR sidelink communication for broadcast and groupcast, the initial value of the SN part of RX\_DELIV is (x – 0.5 × 2[*sl-PDCP-SN-Size*–1]) modulo (2[*sl-PDCP-SN-Size*]), where x is the SN of the first received PDCP Data PDU. For target SRB configured with state variables continuation, the initial value is the value stored in PDCP entity for the corresponding source SRB. For source SRB configured with state variables continuation, the initial value is the value stored in PDCP entity for the corresponding target SRB.  c) RX\_REORD  This state variable indicates the COUNT value following the COUNT value associated with the PDCP Data PDU which triggered *t-Reordering*. For target SRB configured with state variables continuation, the initial value is the value stored in PDCP entity for the corresponding source SRB. For source SRB configured with state variables continuation, the initial value is the value stored in PDCP entity for the corresponding target SRB. |

Only RX\_NEXT and RX\_DELIV need to be set with values when MRB is setup. In [2][3], there are 3 options provided for setting the PDCP state variables.

**Option 1: The COUNT values of these variables are indicated by the gNB [2]**

For this option, the gNB has to explicitly send the COUNT values of RX\_NEXT and RX\_DELIV to the UE when the network configures the MRB, and the UE can establish the PDCP entity of the MRB with the indicated COUNT values. In this option, there does not seem to be a need to indicate different values for RX\_NEXT and RX\_DELIV, i.e. a single COUNT value can be applied to both variables initially.

**Option 2: The SN parts of COUNT values of these variables are set according to the SN of the first received packet and the HFN by UE implementation (similar to sidelink) [2]**

This option works similarly to sidelink broadcast and groupcast, where no explicit signalling is needed. The UE sets the SN part of RX\_NEXT to the SN of the first received packet and sets the SN part of RX\_DELIV to (the SN of the first received packet - 0.5 × 2[*sl-PDCP-SN-Size*–1]), and the HFN part is left to UE implementation. This option is simple but may lead to HFN desynchronization between the UE and the gNB. For sidelink, as HFN is not used (no AS security for sidelink), the HFN desynchronization is not an issue at all. But if security for MBS is agreed by SA3 to be performed at RAN, this option cannot work, as the full COUNT value should be the input of security protection and needs to be aligned between UE and gNB.

**Option 3: The SN part of COUNT values of these variables are set according to the SN of the first received packet and the HFN indicated by the gNB [2]**

This option can be seen as the combination of option 1 and option 2.

**Q5: Which options do companies prefer to initialize the PDCP state variables, i.e. RX\_NEXT and RX\_DELIV?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?  (option 1/2/3) | Comments |
| MediaTek | Op-2 |  |
| Samsung | Option 1 | We think Option 2 does not work when PDCP security is used. SA3 TR 33.850 already captured this and SA3 is still discussing. We shall not exclude PDCP security at this time.  Also, Option 2 has an inherit problem, i.e. “RX\_DELIV = RX\_NEXT – 0.5\*Window” always trigger T-reordering at the beginning of reception. But most of packets with COUNT between RX\_DELIV and RX\_NEXT will not be received. Depending on size of T-reordering, there will be hundreds of millisecond of delay. In V2X, it cannot be avoided at all because there was no RRC signalling whereas MBS has an RRC signalling for MBS configuration. Thus, we can simply use this RRC signalling to avoid unnecessary reordering delay by configuring appropriate PDCP state variables. |
| Nokia | 1 or 3 | No strong preference between 1 & 3 as long as COUNT is synchronised.  Option 2 is not preferred due to its inherent limitations. |
| Ericsson | 1 or 3 | With a preference to Opt 1. Option 2 we agree w Samsung and Nokia. |
| OPPO | Option 3 | For option 1, we think it is hard for network to make sure the first received data’s SN is network configured SN.  For option 2, we think it is hard or complex for UE to achieve HFN. For security concern, we think it is better to configure the HFN by network for UE.  For option 3, it is easy to achieve for both network and UE. |
| CATT | Option 1 or 3 | No strong preference for option 1 or 3 since they can reach same purpose. |
| Kyocera | Option 1 or 3 | We prefer Option 3, while we’re fine with Option 1. For Option 3, we assume the signalling of HFN is a bit timing-tolerant, compared to one for COUNT (i.e., Option 1) which may need to synchronize tightly with the current PTM transmission.  For Option 2, we see the issue pointed out by Samsung and other companies. |
| ZTE | Option 2 | Option 2 as WA/baseline, we can always come back if option 2 does not work (e.g., in case of AS layer ciphering is needed therefore HFN sync between network and UE is needed) |
| NEC | Option 3 | Compared to option 1, SN doesn’t have to be sent by dedicated signalling. |
| Futurewei | Option 3 | Option 3 balances the security need and synchronization requirement at HFN level instead of SN level. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Option 3 | HFN can be indicated by gNB. SN can be implied by the first received packet anyway, so it seems no need for gNB to indicate explicitly. |
| TCL | Option 3 | HFN is necessary and can be indicated by gNB. |
| Fujitsu | Option 2 or 3 | It is straightforward that the SN part of COUNT values is set according to the SN of the first received packet. For HFN, existing specification would be the starting point, but need to check the security risk with SA3. |
| Apple | Option 1 or 3 | HFN and COUNT should be sync between gNB and UE for security handling. |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 or 3. | We share same view as Samsung, Apple and Nokia commented. |
| Spreadtrum | Option 3 | Compared with option 1, SN can be indicated by the packet header implicitly. So we prefer option 3. |
| LGE | Option 1 | With option 1, UE can be explicitly informed with the initial values for receiving PDCP PDUs which gNB tries to send after the MRB configuration. Considering that the current PDCP specification can configure a PDCP entity (for SRB) with state variables continuation, option 1 seems more aligned with that. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | All acceptable | Those options are all workable (except option 2 in case RAN based security is agreed in SA3).  However, if we go with option 1 or option 3, we need to further discuss how COUNT/HFN are delivered to the UE, as the latency of RRC signalling may make these values unsynchronized between gNB and UE, especially for HFN around the incremental point. |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 or 3 | We have the same understanding as Samsung. |
| Sony | Option 1 or 3 |  |
| Sharp | Option 2 or 3 | We should wait for SA3’s conclusion on security. If RAN-based security is not needed, option 2 is preferred for that it has no signalling overhead. Otherwise, option 3 is preferred. |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | Option 1 or option 3 | Both option 1 and option 3 can work no matter the Uu security is needed or not. The selection between these two options can take Q6 into account.  If option 1 is agreed, Q6 can be solved automatically.  If option 3 is agreed,   * If the data lossless reception for Q6 is agreed, a new parameter “SN\_Offset” can be added for option 3 to set the SN of RX\_DELIV according to the following formal:   SNforRX\_DELIV=(SNforFirstPacket-SN\_Offset) mod Window\_Size  Where SNforRX\_DELIV is the initial value of the SN of RX\_DELIV, SNforFirst Packet is the SN of the first received packet by UE, SN\_Offset>=0 is used to solve Q6, Window\_Size is the size of the reordering window, and SN\_Offset can be signalled to UE by gNB or set by UE itself. If SN\_Offset is needed, we prefer to set SN\_Offset  If Q6 needs to be solved, we prefer to option 1. Otherwise, we prefer to option 3. |
| CMCC | Option 3 | Slightly prefer option 3, since SN could be achieved via the received packet and HFN is more latency tolerant. |

Due to out-of-order delivery from RLC to PDCP, after the UE’s PDCP received “the first packet”, the packets with SNs sent before “the first packet” will be discarded by the UE even if they have been correctly received, which may cause some data loss at MRB setup.

|  |
| --- |
| - if RCVD\_COUNT < RX\_DELIV; or  - if the PDCP Data PDU with COUNT = RCVD\_COUNT has been received before:  - discard the PDCP Data PDU; |

RAN2 may need to discuss whether this is an issue to be addressed. If yes, the RX\_DELIV can be set to a value smaller than the SN of the first received packet containing an SN to allow earlier packets to be received.

**Q6: Do companies agree to address the data loss issue when setting PDCP state variables to the SN of the first received packet for MRB configuration, if yes, how?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?  (Yes/No) | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes | The restriction of “if RCVD\_COUNT < RX\_DELIV” at PDCP layer can be removed for the reception of the packets for MRB. |
| Samsung | Yes but | Conclusion of Q5 (if at least one option is adopted) automatically resolve this issue. All options of Q5 assume configuration of RX\_DELIV < RX\_NEXT. So, RCVD\_COUNT<RX\_DELIV should be discarded anyway. |
| Nokia | - | Obviously, we need to ensure that not starting from 0 will not trigger discarding packets but that should easily be solved. We did not say “yes” because Q6 seems to assume that Option 2 is already agreed. |
| Ericsson | No | At session start (ongoing stream), there will anyway be missing data from the stream itself and thus we do not need any complex mechanism in this very brief transient phase. |
| OPPO | Yes | Even if there is no data lossless requirement, we think it is better to have the solution for low data loss. It is better to set RX\_DELIV smaller than RX\_NEXT controlled by network. |
| CATT | No | Agree with Ericsson that We do not need a complexity mechanism, simply using the SN of the first received packet to construct the RX\_DELIV is simple and sufficient. |
| Kyocera | Yes, but | We assume Q6 intends Option 2 and Option 3 in Q5, since it says “*when setting PDCP state variables to the SN of the first received packet*”. If it’s the case, we’re wondering how the network controls the state variables in the UE precisely.  We have similar view with Ericsson that the UE late joining an ongoing MBS session will miss some data anyway. If it happens in e.g., video streaming, we don’t need to care of this case since the missed data is not so important. However, we’re wondering if it’s really the same for e.g., firmware download, whereby the integrity of whole file is important. In this case, we’re wondering if some sort of file/data recovery may need to be worth considering.  On the other hand, if the missing data happens during the “switching” or “bearer type change”, we assume the data recovery can be done by PDCP Status Report, if PTP-leg is available. |
| ZTE | No | Agree with Ericsson.  Some tips:  - the earlier the App starts, the fewer packets get lost;  - your packets are not yours before you start the App,  - conclusion: no worries, there is no packet loss ^^  Also, it application does ask for no loss of single packet:  - UE should have joined the multicast earlier or  - there can be FEC in application layer or  - it should be unicast since the beginning.  We have millions ways out. No worries again. |
| NEC | No | We can leave it to UE implementation, it is unnecessary to specify the solution. |
| Futurewei | No | Small packet loss at the beginning of an MBS session wouldn’t cause much degradation of MBS experience that could be perceived by a user. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Maybe no | We understand this is only about the initial PTM reception, maybe no need for over optimization. No strong view. |
| Fujitsu | No | We have the same views with companies that think No. |
| Apple | No | Our understanding is same as other companies that we can just resolve the initial variable setting issue (e.g. according to the first received packet), and it’s unnecessary to have further optimization. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | We share same view as Kyocera and Samsung.  We must try to avoid data loss as much as possible. |
| Spreadtrum | No |  |
| LGE | No | We supported option 1 for Q5. We think there is no need to address this kind of issue with option 1 of Q5.  Even for setting PDCP state variables to the SN of the first received packet, we think there would be very few packet losses caused by RLC out-of-order delivery at PDCP initialization if any. As NEC mentioned, it is unnecessary to specify a solution. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | First, Q6 is indeed based on option 2 and option 3 in Q5.  In case option 2/3 is agreed in Q5, we believe it is beneficial to have a solution to avoid packet loss, because:  1/ PDCP window initialization happens not only when the application is just started, but also when the serving cell changes and the source and target gNBs are not synchronized in PDCP SNs. Note that the same procedure would be also used for delivery mode 2, i.e. broadcast. We should avoid unnecessary packet loss from specification point of view, if it is not difficult.  2/ The use cases for multicast is unnecessarily only linear streaming which can tolerate the missing of some initial packets, but also services which require high reliability like V2X.  Given that there is already a mechanism specified for sidelink V2X, we would like to copy/paste it to MBS as well. It doesn’t seem difficult or complicated to do so. |
| Xiaomi | No | We share the same view with Ericsson. |
| Sony | No | Agree with Ericsson |
| Sharp | No strong view, but | This issue is only may happen at initialization phase, we may not need to have such optimization. |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | Q6 is related to the option of Q5. | We think Q5 and Q6 can be considered altogether.  If Q6 needs to be solved, we prefer to option 1 for Q5.  Otherwise, both option 1 and option 3 for Q5 are OK from our side. Option 3 may be better. |
| CMCC | No | Share similar view with other companies thinking NO, packets missing in the initial phase is acceptable, it may be solved by UE implementation. |

**RLC reception**

There are two cases where the RLC reception window at the PTM leg needs to be initialized or updated:

* when the UE is just configured with an MRB;
* When the MRB is switched from PTP to PTM.

In RAN2#114 meeting, RAN2 agreed that PTM RLC will not support AM RLC. So for PTM RLC state variables initialization will only be UM RLC. The RLC UM state variables are listed below.

|  |
| --- |
| Each receiving UM RLC entity shall maintain the following state variables:  a) RX\_Next\_Reassembly – UM receive state variable  This state variable holds the value of the earliest SN that is still considered for reassembly. It is initially set to 0. For groupcast and broadcast of NR sidelink communication, it is initially set to the SN of the first received UMD PDU containing an SN.  b) RX\_Timer\_Trigger – UM *t-Reassembly* state variable  This state variable holds the value of the SN following the SN which triggered *t-Reassembly*.  c) RX\_Next\_Highest– UM receive state variable  This state variable holds the value of the SN following the SN of the UMD PDU with the highest SN among received UMD PDUs. It serves as the higher edge of the reassembly window. It is initially set to 0. For groupcast and broadcast of NR sidelink communication, it is initially set to the SN of the first received UMD PDU containing an SN. |

First, when the UE is just configured with an MRB, the PTM RLC window is generally similar to the PDCP window. The simplest way would be to apply the behaviour from sidelink broadcast/groupcast, i.e. set RX\_Next\_Reassembly and RX\_Next\_Highest according to the first received packet containing an SN.

If the MRB is switched from PTP to PTM and PTM is deactivated before, the PTM RLC window initialization is generally similar to the PTM RLC window initialization when MRB is configured.

For UM RLC, only when RLC SDU is segmented, there is SN attached in UMD RLC PDU. The key point of RLC UM mode is that the data loss is allowed. So the UE can discard the RLC PDU if the first received RLC PDU does not contain a complete RLC SDU or the RLC PDU does not contain the first segment, i.e. set the RLC state variables to the initial value 0.

**Option 1:** Initialize the PTM RLC entity for an MRB configuration, or when an MRB is switched from PTP to PTM and PTM is deactivated before, the value of RX\_Next\_Highest and RX\_Next\_Reassembly can be set to initial value, i.e. 0.

**Option 2:** Initialize the PTM RLC entity for an MRB configuration, or when an MRB is switched from PTP to PTM and PTM is deactivated before, the value of RX\_Next\_Highest and RX\_Next\_Reassembly can be set to the SN of the first received packet containing an SN, like sidelink broadcast/groupcast. Note that enhancements to this option to reduce the packet loss can be further discussed based on Question 9.

**Q7: Which option do companies prefer to address the PTM RLC entity initialization for an MRB configuration?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?  (option 1/2) | Comments |
| MediaTek | Option-2 |  |
| Samsung | Option 2 or | Alternatively, RRC configuration can deliver initial RLC variables. |
| Nokia | 1 | As we understand it, Option 1 is the current behaviour.  The problems and corresponding mechanisms to solve them are specific to dynamic activation/deactivation. This demonstrates that dynamic activation/deactivation increases complexity. Yet the gains are yet to be shown. |
| Ericsson | 1 | As the switch is triggered by losses or QoS is not met for PTM, discarding a first received PDU seems like not an important issue to resolve. We are not sure segmentation is common for a PTM stream as this would possibly increase the loss rate etc. |
| OPPO | Option 2 | For option 1, there is RLC window un-synchronization issue as discussed in Q2. In order to reduce the data loss, option 2 is better. |
| CATT | Option 2 | Option 1 doesn’t work as it cause mismatch between lower edge of TX window and RX side, when UE start to receive a MBS session which is ongoing. |
| Kyocera | Option 2 | We agree the rapporteur’s analysis that RLC UM allows some data loss, and we think Option 1 is the same behaviour with LTE SC-PTM. However, we think the simple optimization to minimize the data loss is useful. For further data recovery, we wonder if PDCP Status Report can also be used, if PTP-leg is available. |
| ZTE | Option 2 |  |
| NEC | Option 2 | It seems if we set the initial value of RX\_Next\_Highest and RX\_Next\_Reassembly to initial value, i.e. 0, the RLC window un-synchronization issue comes again. |
| Futurewei | Option 2 | We have the understand that this question is related to PTM RLC entity initialization for an MRB configuration, i.e., during a MRB type change. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Option 2 | We can simply use similar principle as in SL. |
| TCL | Option 2 |  |
| Fujitsu | Option 2 | It is straightforward that the SN is set according to the SN of the first received packet. |
| Apple | Option 2 |  |
| Qualcomm | Option 2 | Same view as CATT, Samsung and others supporting Option 2. |
| Spreadtrum | Option 2 |  |
| LGE | Option 2 | We think that option 1 (initialized to 0) has possibility of discarding all RLC PDUs containing RLC SDU segments whose SNs are between UM\_Window\_Size and 2^[sn-FieldLength] -1.  Assuming that 6 bit SN is configured and the current SN of a PTM is 40, if RX\_Next\_Reassembly and RX\_Next\_Highest are initialized to ‘0’ by option 1, RLC PDUs with SN of x (40<= x < 63) will be discarded until RLC PDU with SN of 0 is received according to 5.2.2.2.2 of TS38.322. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2 | Agree with most companies that option 1 doesn’t work, and we can simply reuse the solution in sidelink broadcast/multicast. |
| Xiaomi | Option 2 |  |
| Sony | Option 2 | Agree with Samsung that alternatively RRC configuration can deliver values for initial RLC variables |
| Sharp | Option 2 | Option 2 can reduce the data loss. |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | Option 2 | The state variable initialization method for the PDCP entity for MRB can be reused for the state variable initialization of the PTM RLC entity for MRB. |
| CMCC | Option 2 |  |

**Q8: Should the same PTM RLC entity initialization procedure be applied to PTM leg when an MRB is switched from PTP to PTM and PTM was deactivated before, as the case of MRB configuration?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?  (Yes/No) | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Samsung | (Yes) but too early | It depends on conclusion on Q2. If we go with Option 1 for Q2, nothing is necessary here. |
| Nokia | - | The problems and corresponding mechanisms to solve them are specific to dynamic activation/deactivation. This demonstrates that dynamic activation/deactivation increases complexity. Yet the gains are yet to be shown. |
| Ericson | - | Agree w Nokia. See other responses in scheduling decision/transparent to UE. |
| OPPO | Yes | We also agree it depends Q2. But it is not clear how to align the RLC state variables between UE and network if there is no data reception via PTM leg for a long time due to bad channel condition. |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| NEC | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | Yes | We don’t think anything special is needed for dynamic activation/deactivation. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | (Yes) but too early | Similar view as Samsung |
| Fujitsu | None | It depends on conclusion on Q2. |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| LGE | - | Agree with Nokia. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | It is indeed related to Q2. |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | Yes | Agree that Q8 is related to Q2. If PTM deactivation is supported for Q2, we think the answer to Q8 is “Yes”. |
| CMCC | Yes |  |

In [2][4], companies mentioned the data loss issue when initialize the RLC window. Due to out-of-order delivery from MAC/PHY to RLC, after the UE received “the first packet”, the packets with SNs sent before “the first packet” will be discarded by the UE (according to the highlighted part above) even if they have been correctly received, which may cause some data loss at each switch from PTP to PTM. RAN2 may need analyze whether this is an issue to be addressed. If yes, the RX\_Next\_Reassembly can be set to a value smaller than the SN of the first received packet containing an SN to allow earlier packets to be received [2].

**Q9: Do companies agree to address the data loss issue when setting RLC state variables to the SN of the first received packet containing an SN for MRB configuration or PTP-to-PTM switch, if yes, how?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?  (Yes/No) | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes | We think that the data loss issue as discussed could be valid. However, we are wondering if we can just allow this data loss at RLC layer. We assume that we can apply data recovery mechanism at PDCP layer (e.g. with some necessary data retransmission based on the status report from the UE) to handle such data loss. This means that the PTP leg can not be teared down immediately during PTP-PTM switch. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Nokia | No | The problems and corresponding mechanisms to solve them are specific to dynamic activation/deactivation. This demonstrates that dynamic activation/deactivation increases complexity. Yet the gains are yet to be shown. |
| Ericsson | No | Agree w Nokia |
| OPPO | Yes | Even if there is no data lossless requirement, we think it is better to have the solution for low data loss. It is better to set RX\_Next\_Reassembly smaller than RX\_Next\_Highest controlled by network. |
| CATT | No | It does not make sense to consider this as anyway UE may not start to receive the MBS data from the beginning of the data transmission. |
| Kyocera | Yes, but | In dynamic switching from PTP-leg to PTM-leg case, we assume PDCP layer handles the data recovery (e.g., with PDCP Status Report), and PTP-leg compensates the missing packets on PTM-leg, i.e., the UE receives data from PTP-leg and PTM-leg simultaneously during a certain period, in case PTP-leg is configured with AM mode. On the other hand, if the PTP-leg is configured with UM mode, we assume the data loss is acceptable.  In RRC reconfiguration from PTP-only to PTM-only, we assume the data loss is acceptable as well, since PTM can be only configured with UM mode. |
| ZTE | No | Basically we don’t think data loss after initial configuration or during mode switch is a problem.  As our answer in Q4, PDCP SR can be enabled for certain services is minimization of loss is indeed needed.  For others, data loss is fine:  - application layer that FEC/other mechanisms in application layer are very common for MBS.  - If data loss is not acceptable, mode switching to PTM shall not be applicable in the first place |
| NEC | No | The data loss should be considered after the UE joint the MBS service. |
| Futurewei | No | According to current RAN2 agreement. data loss is anyway tolerated on PTM leg. Hence, there is no need of optimization to reduce data loss during the short period of dynamic switch between PTM and PTP. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Maybe no | We understand this is only about the initial PTM reception, maybe no need for over optimization. No strong view. |
| Fujitsu | No | We have the same views with companies that think No. |
| Apple | No |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | It is useful to reduce data loss. |
| LGE | No | There would be very few packet losses caused by out-of-order delivery if any. It is unnecessary to specify a solution. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | It is related to discussion of other Questions. |
| Xiaomi | No |  |
| Sony | No |  |
| Sharp | No |  |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech |  | We have no obvious tend.  We think the same processing for the receiving PDCP entity can be reused for the receiving PTM RLC UM entity.  That is, the same processing for Q6 can be reused for Q9.  If the data loss shall be solved, the following processing can be taken.  RX\_Next\_Highest can be set to the SN of the first received packet containing an SN.  RX\_Next\_Reassembly can be set according to the following formula:  RX\_Next\_Reassembly=(SNforFirstPacket-SN\_offset)mod UM\_Windown\_Size  **Where** SNforFirstPacket is the SN of the first received packet containing an SN, SN\_offset is used to solve Q9, SN\_offset can be signalled to UE by gNB or set by UE itself.  We think if Q9 needs to be sovled, SN\_offset can be sent to UE by gNB. |
| CMCC | No |  |

There are also two cases where the RLC reception window at the PTP leg may need to be initialized or updated:

* when the UE is just configured with an MRB;
* When the MRB is switched from PTM to PTP.

No matter which cases, the PTP leg is UE specific, the PTP reception window can be set to initial value, i.e. 0.

**Q10: Do companies agree to PTP reception window can be set to initial value, i.e. 0, due to MRB configuration?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?  (Yes/No) | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes | gNB can send RLC PDU from SN0. |
| Nokia | Yes | In our understanding, this is the current behaviour. |
| Ericsson | Yes | We assume this is not a “switch” as such but a bearer initiation. |
| OPPO | Yes | PTP is UE specific, it is reasonable to set the RLC state variables to 0 as legacy when PTP RLC is configured. |
| CATT | Yes | No optimization is needed here. |
| Kyocera | Yes | We assume the current unicast behaviour can be applied. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| NEC | Yes | PTP is UE specific. |
| Futurewei | Yes | RLC reception should be initialized as before during RRC MRB configuration. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |  |
| TCL | Yes |  |
| Fujitsu | Yes | As current behaviour. |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | This is existing unicast behaviour. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| Chendu TD Tech, TD Tech | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |

**Q11: Should the same PTP RLC entity initialization procedure be applied to PTP leg when an MRB is switched from PTM to PTP, i.e. PTP reception window can be set to initial value, i.e. 0?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?  (Yes/No) | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Samsung | No | PTP is not deactivated at all. Resume of RLC SN has no problem. |
| Nokia | No | Agree with Samsung. |
| Ericsson | No | Agree w Samsung. |
| OPPO | Yes or no | No strong view, it is feasible to set the PTP RLC state variables to 0 or continue to use history value when switching to PTP. If history value is used for PTP RLC, it is complex for the network to remember which SN is the start value to use when switching to PTP. |
| CATT | No | Agree with Samsung. |
| Kyocera | Yes, but | We tend to agree with Samsung, in case of dynamic switching from PTM-leg to PTP-leg, i.e., no initialization is needed for “switching”.  On the other hand, we wonder if the reception window should be set to the initial value, in case of RRC reconfiguration from PTM-only to PTP-only (i.e., “bearer type change”), which is same with Q10 above. |
| ZTE | No | We have already agreed that “the usage of the PTP leg cannot be deactivated”. Just leave the PTP as legacy, and nothing needs to be done. |
| NEC | No | PTP RLC AM RLC SN can be resumed. |
| Futurewei | No | PTP leg is never deactivated, and existing DTCH behaviour should be maintained. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | No |  |
| TCL | No |  |
| Fujitsu | No | Agree w Samsung. |
| Apple | No |  |
| Qualcomm | No | Agree with Samsung |
| Spreadtrum | No | Agree with Samsung. |
| LGE | No | We think that there is no reason to apply an initialization procedure to PTP leg at switching from PTM to PTP because PTP leg cannot be deactivated. Furthermore, dynamic PTM/PTP switching is transparent to UE. So, additional signalling/procedure needs to be introduced for that. It’s unnecessary. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | It doesn’t seem to be necessary. |
| Xiaomi | No |  |
| Sony | Yes/No | No strong view |
| Sharp | No | PTP cannot be deactivated, so the state variables are maintained. |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | No | There’s no need to reinitialize the related state variables. |
| CMCC | No | Agree with Samsung. |

# Conclusions

Based on the discussion above, we propose:
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# Agreements

## ***RAN2#114***

* RLC-AM is not supported for PTM (for MBS R17 WI).

## ***RAN2#113bis***

* For a given UE, if the MRB’s QoS requirements are not met via PTM, switching to PTP with RLC-AM shall be supported.

Agreements

Chair: NOTE that the below agreements are only based on architecture decisions so far. The reliability discussion not concluded yet i.e. other cases than RLC UM + RLC UM. PTM PTP switch for such other cases is FFS

* Dynamic PTM/PTP switch is supported for a split MRB bearer (type) with a common (single) PDCP entity.
* As a baseline, no new UE based signalling is introduced to support gNB switch decision (e.g. PDCP SR for high reliability is still TBD)
* Assuming a split-MRB (as agreed during the online session) configured with a PTM leg and PTP leg, the usage of the PTP leg cannot be deactivated (i.e. the UE needs to always monitor C-RNTI) after the necessary split-MRB configuration.
* Assuming a split-MRB (as agreed during the online session) configured with a PTM leg and PTP leg, it is FFS whether the usage of the PTM leg of the split-MRB may be subject to activation or deactivation and the details of such.

## ***RAN2#113***

* Confirm P1 P2 P3 (assume that MRB may include both PTP and PTM)
* For the case that both PTM and PTP are RLC-UM, configuration with No L2 ARQ and with PDCP anchored PTM – PTP switching shall be supported (e.g. for services that would typically be configured with RLC UM for unicast).

## ***RAN2#112***

* whether any SDAP header is needed.
* (Working assumption) no SDAP functions other than “mapping from QoS flows to radio bearers” and “transfer of user plane data” are supported for MBS. FFS whether to support QoS flows to radio bearers remapping.
* In general: RAN2 wait for SA3’s progress for discussing security issues. TBD whether we need to send LS to SA3.
* RoHC (at least U-mode) can be configured for NR MBS bearers. This is applicable for Mcast, assume this is applicable also to broadcast.
* RoHC is located at PDCP.
* The reordering and in-order delivery function in PDCP is supported for NR MBS.
* The following PDCP functions are also supported for NR MBS: transfer of data; maintenance of PDCP SNs; duplicate discarding. Other PDCP functions are FFS.
* RLC AM is supported for PTP transmission of NR MBS.
* RLC UM is supported for PTP transmission of NR MBS.
* RLC UM is supported for PTM transmission of NR MBS.
* RLC TM is not supported for PTP transmission of NR MBS.
* RLC TM is not supported for PTM transmission of NR MBS.
* FFS for PTM if multiplexing/de-multiplexing of different logical channels are to be supported in MAC for NR MBS.

## ***RAN2#111***

* For a UE, gNB dynamically decides whether to deliver multicast data by PTM or PTP (Shared delivery)
* FFS which layer(s) handles reliability (in general), inorder delivery / duplicate handling, and it is FFS how it works at PTM PTP switch.