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# Introduction

This document contains summary of email discussion to collect comments on the RRC/MAC modelling for SDT:

* [Post114-e][505][SData] RRC/MAC modeling and RRC running CR (ZTE)

**Scope:**

Phase 1: Modeling discussion for RRC/MAC Review running stage 2 CR

i. Feedback on existing modelling used by the running CRs

ii. Identify any issues with the current modelling and any potential changes

iii. Updated running CRs can be provided based on the outcome of this discussion

Phase 2: Review running RRC CR after some agreements from phase 1

**Intended outcome:** CR ready to be endorsed in RAN2115-e

**Deadline for company comments on the modelling issues:** Monday 26th July

**Discussion summary**

* TBD

# Discussion

For the triggering of SDT, a number of conditions were agreed in the previous meetings. We need to agree how to split the specification of these conditions between MAC and RRC. In the latest RRC (R2-2105927) and MAC (R2-2105032) running CRs submitted to RAN2#114-e, the following split has been implemented:

RRC determines whether the pending UL data/NAS message(s) are mapped to SDT RB(s).

MAC performs all other checks

* Data volume threshold check
* SDT RSRP threshold check
* Determining whether to use RA-SDT or CG-SDT
	+ CG resource validation
	+ RA resource validation

The overall modelling between MAC and RRC hance is as depicted in Figure below (reproduced from R2-2105847):

 

Figure 1: Overall modelling of MAC and RRC for determining SDT vs non-SDT (see R2-2105847)

So, according to the above modelling, once RRC determines that all the pending UL data/NAS message(s) are mapped to SDT RB(s), the remaining checks to determine the initial SDT vs non-SDT selection are performed in MAC. The first question is to check whether there are any issues with the above modelling.

|  |
| --- |
| According to the latest RRC and MAC running CRs, **once RRC determines that all the pending UL data/NAS message(s) are mapped to SDT RB(s), the remaining checks to determine the initial SDT vs non-SDT selection are performed in MAC**. Q1: Is the above split between RRC and MAC acceptable? * In the comments, companies can highlight any issues and provide any alternative split between RRC and MAC explaining the reasons for the change.
 |
| Company | Comments on the modelling and any identified issues and provide alternative split between RRC/MAC (if there is an issue) |
| CATT | We have identified the following issues:1. If Data volume calculation is calculated at MAC, how to estimate the data volume before transmission if PDCP/RLC MAC header are taken into account.Rapp: As highlighted by others, data volume calculation will require some AS layer to be aware of the buffered data (even for suspended RBs). Then it seems this question is not really dependent on which spec (i.e. which AS layer) we write the calculation in. Whether it is RRC or MAC or SDAP etc, the same question exists. For now the assumption is that this is left to UE implementation (and hence specifiying this in MAC is equally valid as it is in any other AS layer). So, propose to make no changes to this. 2. CG validation will check whether TAT is running. If TAT is defined in RRC, there will be layer interactions. This is not yet captured in the figure above.Rapp: Agree. There should be no issue to move this to MAC (note that this also requires some inter layer interaction – e.g. MAC needs to be aware of when the configuration is updated for CG-TAT, but this can be minimized by the way it is currently written in MAC spec). So, we can move the handling of this to MAC. 3. When SDT condition is not satisfied, MAC should indicate to RRC. Then, RRC performs legacy RRC Resume procedure. It is not reasonable for MAC directly goes to legacy Resume procedure. Whether the legacy resume procedure is initiated or not should be decided by RRC.Rapp: Agree with the statement. But this is how it is currently implemented already. So, no changes are needed as far as I can see. 4. The agreement from RAN2#112 is that “For both RACH and CG based solutions, upon initiating RESUME procedure for SDT initiation (i.e. for first SDT transmission), the UE shall re-establish at least the SDT PDCP entities and resume the SDT DRBs that are configured for small data transmission (along with the SRB1). FFS for non-SDT DRBs.”However the flow chart above has not captured this correctly in our understanding. According to the flow chart above, MAC indicates RRC whether SDT is selected after SDT selection performed at MAC layer. Afterward, RRC will perform SDT initiation procedure including resuming SDT RBs, applying PDCP/RLC/MAC configurations and etc.After selection of SDT, MAC should inidicate RRC and CG-SDT/RA-SDT should be performed after resuming all SDT RBs by RRC..We have modified the figure as below to capture point 3 and 4 above. Rapp: The above picture seems to capture the overall interaction in a better way and seems to be aligned with current RRC and MAC implementation. So, no changes are needed in the specs. But, we can acknowledge the above detailed description for better understanding. Slight modification in the picture proposed per below (e.g. clarify that data arrival could be for SDT “RBs” and there may be other checks in RRC too). Please see below. |
| Intel | In our understanding, RRC or MAC cannot determine whether there is UL data in suspended RBs. Moreover, RRC or MAC cannot differentiate whether the UL data belongs or not to SDT RBs or the amount of data on SDT RB waiting to be conveyed. If this level of operations were specified, SDAP layer is the best to determine them while UE is in RRC\_INACTIVE. Rapp: It is unclear why SDAP could be aware of something that RRC and MAC is not aware of. It seems this is all internal implementation in the UE. The point is that AS should be aware of this in the end and which layer(s) are aware of this is a matter of taste. Propose to leave the current modelling as it is (i.e. no changes to SDAP)However it seemed that companies may be OK not to specify how UE detects that there is SDT or non-SDT data in the RBs, or determines if SDT operation can be used (as otherwise, lower layers of UE would need to have knowledge of data belonging to suspended RBs). Therefore all these details could be left up to UE implementation. If so, MAC specification would not introduce any new checks for SDT operation and RRC specification would only define conditions that UE needs to meet in order to start the SDT operation (but defining them as general description of the condition instead than actual new checks from modeling perspective). On summary, UE is allowed to initiate SDT procedure when the list of the different conditions captured in RRC are met.Rapp: So, is the proposal to specify all conditions in RRC? Is there a specific problem if we split the conditions between MAC and RRC as currently proposed. On the otherhand, I see that some companies said below that all can be moved to MAC. Given that either option can work, my preference is to leave it as it is unless we identify reasons why the current split will not work. RAN2 may need to have further considerations on this depending on CT1’s input.Rapp: Okay |
| Google | The split is acceptable to us. We think if all arriving data are mapped to SDT, RRC should indicate SDT data arrival event to MAC. The MAC should select SDT or non-SDT and indicate its selection back to RRC. If MAC selects SDT, RRC submits a resume request to MAC and starts the new T319 timer. When MAC receives data from RRC, MAC initiates its selected procedure. In Fig. 1, if MAC selects legacy resume procedure, it should indicate to RRC. Rapp: Okay |
| NEC | We understand thatone of the intention of data volume calculation performed at MAC layer is to rely on exisiting PDCP/RLC data volume calculation, however, we have the we have some concerns:1. Since the radio bearers configured with SDT are not resumed when perform data volume calculation, we are not sure if the new data can be seen as PDCP SDUs, such that the existing PDCP data volume can be used for to calculated the new data. At RAN2 #114-e, there is some discussion on the modeling of suspended DRBs at the main session [AT114-e][002][NR15] User Plane, it seems companies may have different understanding on the behavior of suspended radio bearer.

Rapp: MAC needs to be aware of the total data volume including that of the suspended data bearers. How this is modelled within the UE is left to UE implementation (nothing more is intended to be specified for this purpose than what is currently captured in MAC spec by the MAC rapporteur). 1. There may be stored data at PDCP and RLC entities (e.g. the data which is not transmissted before UE is released to INACTIVE state), which will be discarded by PDCP/RLC re-establishment upon SDT initialization. However, if the data volume check is performed by MAC before PDCP/RLC re-establishment, how to handle these buffered data? If they are taken account, we can not obtain a correct data volume value.

Rapp: The problem is not clear because the discussion is about the SDT initiation. So, there should not be any issue as mentioned above since any data buffered would have been discarded during the preceeding RRCRelease operation (which includes PDCP suspend). In addition, we also agree with bullet 3 of CATT’s comment, which is when SDT condition is not satisfied, MAC should indicate to RRC, such that RRC can submit RRCResumeRequest message to MAC layer, and start failure detection timer (T319) for non-SDT.Rapp: Agree. This is how the specs are implemented anyway.  |
| OPPO | The issues that need to be further discussed are identified as follows from our side:1. We have not made consensus on whether MAC or AS is capable to calculate a proper data volume, i.e., same as BS, without the radio bearers resumed. If this is not achievable for MAC/AS after further study, we suggest to follow the LTE behavior, i.e., it is up to UE implementation to check the data volume criteria of SDT and the text is specified in RRC.

Rapp: As highlighted above, data volume calculation will require some AS layer to be aware of the buffered data (even for suspended RBs). Indeed it is left to UE implementation how this information is available at AS. This is feasible since similar approach is also applicable in LTE (including for EDT with 5GC). 1. It was agreed that RSRP threshold is used to select between SDT and non-SDT but we did not make it clear whether this RSRP threshold is configured per cell or per carrier (SUL/NUL)? In our understanding, how to configure the RSRP threshold for SDT and non-SDT selection would have impacts on the modeling, i.e., the RSRP checking is performed before or after carrier selection.

Rapp: This will not have impact to RRC vs MAC split since this is all contained in MAC. So, this discussion is left to MAC CR review. 1. The condition to perform carrier selection is not clear in the figure. We can interpret it in two different ways. Option1: UE performs carrier selection when both NUL and SUL are configured; Option2: UE performs carrier selection when both NUL and SUL are configured with SDT resources. If the intention isthe former, we think the next step after carrier selection should be the checking of whether there is SDT resources, which is missed from the figure. Otherwise, for the latter, the description of ‘UE carrier selection for SDT if both NUL and SUL are configured’is not proper. Furthermore, another case regarding how to handle the case that there is only one carrier configured with SDT resources is not considered.

Rapp: This will not have impact to RRC vs MAC split since this is all contained in MAC. So, this discussion is left to MAC CR review. 1. According to the agreements that have been made so far, there are three criteria to determine whether UE can do SDT, namely data volume, radio bearer and RSRP threshold. While we notice that the provided modeling involves the procedures which shall be treated as rescource selection into the SDT intiation stage. We are not sure whether this is acceptable for majority.

Rapp: The above comment is a bit unclear (i.e. what is the change proposed to the modelling of split between RRC and MAC ?). No changes are made to the spec.  |
| Samsung | 1. We prefer to have all checks to determine whether to perform SDT procedure or not in one layer. The interaction (such as indication from RRC to MAC upon data arrival and then from MAC to RRC whether to perform SDT or not) between RRC and MAC is unnecessary. There are two alternative approaches:Approach 1: Define all conditions for SDT in RRC and depending on whether all conditions are met or not, RRC initiate SDT procedure or resume procedure.Approach 2: Define all conditions for SDT in MAC. Upon data arrival, if criteria (as defined in section x/y of TS 38.321) to initiate SDT procedure is met, initiate SDT procedure. Other wise initiate resume procedure. No need of indications between MAC and RRC.We have sligh preference for approach 1. Rapp: Agree that in theory all checks can also be made in MAC. However, this still would need some interaction between MAC and RRC since RRCResume will eventually be triggered by RRC (unless we move everything to RRC as proposed – i.e. approach 1 above). However, some companies seem to prefer to move all checks to MAC. Given this situation, I think we should just leave the existing modelling as it is and comeback to it only if some problem exists with the modelling. |
| LG | 1. Regarding Figure 1, we have similar view with CATT. MAC indicates whether SDT condition is satisfied or not, and RRC makes the final decision whether to perform the legacy resume procedure or SDT procedure. Thus, we think that the following two cases should be considered in the flow chart.
* When SDT condition is not met, MAC indicates to perform legacy RRC resume procedure
* When RRC determines to perform SDT procedure, RRC instructs to MAC to initiate SDT procedure

Rapp: Yes, this is the intention as noted above1. We think that the NAS data does not arrive at AS layer until that the corresponding RB has been resumed. Thus, if RBs configured for SDT are not resumed, MAC layer cannot performs the data volume check. In order to check data volume, RB configured for SDT should be resumed to receive NAS data as following modified figure (based on CATT’s figure).

Rapp: This could be an option (i.e. to resume the RBs up front). However, this would require some additional mechanism then to preclude the MAC to include the data from resumed beearers in case non-SDT selection happens further down the line in the checks. On the other hand with the existing modelling, the assumption is that AS will have knowledge of data volume and this seems to be the assumption also with EDT/5GC. Unless we conclude that such knowledge is not available at AS, it seems the current modelling can work also in NR and in this respect the difference between EDT and NR is not clear. So, propose to keep the current modelling.  |
| ZTE | We think the current modelling is in general fine. * If the SDT RBs are resumed before determining that SDT can be used, then we need additional mechanisms to ensure the SDT data is not actually included in the MSG3/MSGA payload (in case SDT is not eventually chosen). This will further complicate the procedure in MAC and RRC and this is unnecessary in our view.
* In general, we think lower layers can have the visibility of data buffered at upper layers. This is a prerequisite for any scheme and we think how this is visible to lower layers is UE internal implementation that need not be specified.
* We have some sympathy for comments that all the checks can be performed in one layer (i.e. kept in one spec). However, we don’t have strong view on this and we think the current modelling is a good compromise split without extensive interlayer interactions. We don’t think there is really much difference in capturing this in RRC/MAC or in SDAP. However, typically we capture such procedures when executing the RRCResume mainly in RRC. So, we don’t really think SDAP is suitable for this purpose and we prefer to keep SDAP unchanged.

Rapp: keep the current modelling |
| vivo | We share a similar view with Samsung. In Rel-16 PUR, if I remembered correctly, both PUR-TAT and PUR occasion maintenance are firstly modeled in MAC spec. Due to complex inter-lay interaction, all these modelings were moved to the RRC layer finally. Considering the RRC layer is generally used for radio resource control, we also prefer to specify the SDT triggering condition in the RRC layer. An example for SDT modeling is given as follows, Rapp: Agree to move the TAT handling to MAC.  |
| Nokia | In general, we see no big issue with splitting the checking criteria in RRC and MAC. The criteria common to RA-SDT and CG-SDT could already be checked in RRC, e.g. whether the data is from SDT-enabled bearer and RSRP threshold if the threshold is common for them. If any of the common criteria is not met, RRC could already initiate non-SDT directly without request MAC to do the further verification. Other CG/RA specific criteria could be checked in MAC. Rapp: agree with the general comment above. I think currently the RRC and MAC are implemented according to the above intention (?). If to keep all the verifications in one layer, our preference would be in MAC layer since the conditions are mostly MAC oriented.Agree with CATT that if MAC verification fails, it should indicate to RRC. CCCH message is only delivered to MAC after the MAC verification regardless of SDT or non-SDT procedure is to be initiated, so MAC cannot initiate legacy resume by itself. Besides, RRC needs to be aware of which procedure is ongoing.Rapp: Even if we move everything to MAC some interlayer interaction cannot be prevented. So, propose to leave it as it is.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think the proposed modelling is OK in general, with the following comments:1. One thing that will have to be potentially rediscussed is handling of the SDT failure detection timer. In case RAN2 decides the timer should be restarted after each DL/UL transmission, the timer will probably fit better in the MAC layer or there will have to be some indications from MAC to RRC to restart the timer.

Rapp: Needs further discussion. Currently the legacy failure detection timer (i.e. T319) recides in RRC. It would be preferable to keep it in RRC to conform with this convention. 1. When it comes to CG TAT, we think CG TAT should be maintained in MAC layer, together with “regular” TAT (we understand it is already part of the “CG validation success” box in the current modelling). We should also discuss how both CG-TAT and TAT are used during subsequent data phase of the SDT procedure, e.g. do we need to rely on both of them or only a single one (i.e. CG-TAT would be only for initial CG-SDT transmission).

Rapp: Okay to move this to MAC. However, any interlayer interaction as a result (e.g. to start restart the timer upon configuration reception) should be minimized. If CG-TAT expiry directly results in release of CG resource, then there is no real need to check the CG-TAT in CG validation (since anyway the CG resource would have been released). This detail can be finalized in MAC spec later. The depency between CG-TAT and normal TAT would need further consideration (but this detail is all part of MAC spec). 1. We agree with some other companies that updates to the modelling figure are needed to capture that it should be RRC layer which initates legacy resume procedure when the SDT conditions are not satisfied.

Rapp: agree the updated figure above shows the interactions better. But the implementation is already conformant to the new figure proposed. 1. When it comes to the data volume calculation, we think it could be simply clarified that MAC receives this information from PDCP layer (or upper layers in general). We would like to avoid overspecifying this aspect (e.g. specifying that SDT RBs are resumed up front just for the sake of data volume calculation, without knowing whether SDT is possible or not, and potentially re-suspended afterwards).

Rapp: Agree, resuming the RBs and then re-suspending them (or potentially removing the data submitted to MAC from these resumed bearers etc) is complex and can be avoided with the current modelling. So, propose to leave it as it is.  |
| Qualcomm | We have the following comments.1. It is desiable to have as less as possible on the interaction between RRC and MAC layer. Thus, similar to many companies comments, it will be good to have all the condition checking for SDT in one layer. We prefer to do it in MAC layer. Because the parameter or verification procedure such as RSRP threshold, carrier selection and TA timer validation should be in MAC layer, just like the existing legacy RACH procedure. For the data valume threshold checking, we can follow the RRC spec for LTE EDT if needed, in 5.3.3.1b, i.e. *it is up to UE implementation how the UE determines whether the size of UL data is suitable for EDT.*

Rapp: Per above, the current split seems to generally minimize this inter-layer interaction. Propose to leave it as it is hence. 1. Similar view with CATT and Nokia, if MAC verification fails, it should indicate to RRC. It should be RRC layer iniates RRC resume prcoedreu if SDT criteria is not met.

Rapp: Agree with the updated modelling picture with the understanding that the current implementation conforms to this updated modelling already.  |
| Rapporteur Summary | The following points were discussed:* Does the AS have knowledge of upper layer data for RBs that are not resumed? The understanding with the current modelling is that this is feasible.
* Proposals were made to move all the checks to either MAC or to RRC: Although this may be feasible, this will not completely avoid interlayer interaction anyway and there seems to be slight preference on both sides. Propose hence to leave it as it is
* Handling of CG-TAT is proposed to be moved to MAC and this can be agreed
* General update of the overall modelling picture has been provided and this can also be agreed with the understanding that the current running CRs are already implemented accordingly.

[Samsung]: We disagee with the point that interlayer interaction can not be avoided. If we specifiy in RRC that "Upon data arrival, if criteria (as defined in section x/y of TS 38.321) to initiate SDT procedure is met, initiate SDT procedure. Other wise initiate resume procedure.", no interlayer interaction (indications as defined in current modelling) is needed between MAC and PHY. All SDT conditions can be specified in MAC.  |

One further aspect of the modelling is when to resume the RBs configured for SDT. As per the latest RRC running CR (see R2-2105927), the RBs configured for SDT are only resumed after MAC layer performs the data volume check and other relavent checks for SDT vs non-SDT selection and selects the SDT transmission. Companies are invited to comment on whether such modelling is acceptable.

|  |
| --- |
|  According to the latest RRC and MAC running CRs, **the radio bearers configured for SDT are resumed only after the MAC layer performs the data volume check and other relavent checks for SDT vs non-SDT selection and SDT transmission is selected**. Q2: Is the above modelling of the resumption of SDT RBs acceptable? * In the comments, companies can highlight any issues and provide any alternative implementation for the resumption of SDT RBs.
 |
| Company | Comments on when SDT RBs should be resumed in RRC and any alternative proposals (if there is any issue with the current modelling) |
| CATT | Same as our issue1 in Q1. If DRB is not resumed, how to estimate the data volume if the data volume is calculated at MAC layer taken into account PDCP/RLC/MAC headers?Rapp: See comments above.  |
| Intel | See our related views provided in previous question Q1 in relation to how the running CR is done. Based on that, RRC would only capture a single statement with the SDT conditions met and then all SDT RBs could be resumed. In addition, MAC would address the CG/RA and carrier.Rapp: See comments above.  |
| Google | In MAC, because data volume information is available for resumed DRBs, RRC should resume SDT DRBs before MAC uses the information. Otherwise, MAC have no data volume information to select SDT or non-SDT. Rapp: See comments above |
| NEC | We are OK that the SDT radio bearers should be resumsed after the SDT conditions are fulfilled.Rapp: Okay |
| OPPO | UE shall resume SDT RBs once SDT is initiated as the agreement made in RAN2#112e. When and how to intiate SDT is discussed as a part of Q1.For both RACH and CG based solutions, upon initiating RESUME procedure for SDT initiation (i.e. for first SDT transmission), the UE shall re-establish at least the SDT PDCP entities and resume the SDT DRBs that are configured for small data transmission (along with the SRB1). *FFS for non-SDT DRBs. FFS on implicit vs. explicit. FFS on whether we a new Resume cause. FFS on whether we need to deal with suppressing PDCP status report*Rapp: Okay |
| Samsung | Resumption should be performed after making the decision to initiate SDT procedure (i.e. all conditions are met)Rapp: Okay |
| LG | We think there is two option to check data volume. * Optoin 1. NAS calculates the data volume and informs RRC of the calculated data volume.
* Option 2. RBs configured for SDT is reumsed upon SDT data arrival before the data volume check.

In [AT113bis-e][501][SDT] UP SDT open issue, there was a consensus that data volume used for SDT selection criteria is calculated as the total sum of Buffer Size across SDT RBs, and this means that majority companies think that data volume used for SDT can be calculated similar to legacy BS. We thnk Option 2 is more aligned with legacy BS calculation and is acceptable from RAN2 point of view.Rapp: See comments above. Option 2 is okay. The question is about RBs being resumed. Propose to leave it as it is.  |
| ZTE | We agree with Samsung and NEC. We think lower layers should have visibility of data from upper layers. In general we also think that Option 2 above in LG’s reply works. However, we think option 2 is feasible with or without the RBs being resumed. On the otherhand if the SDT RBs are resumed and if SDT is not eventually chosen then the data from these resumed RBs shall removed from the MAC PDU which would have been submitted to lower layers (along with the CCCH message). This in our view will create unnecessary complexity and hence the current modelling is simple and sufficient. Rapp: Okay |
| vivo | We also agree with Samsung and NEC. Additionally, we think it is up to RRC to play the role in checking the SDT triggering conditions, which is similar to LTE EDT and PUR.Rapp: Okay |
| Nokia | Agree SDT RBs should only be resumed after all the SDT verifications are done. Rapp: Okay |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are OK with this modelling. On the data volume calculation issue, we think it is not important which layer calculates the data volume, we just need to clarify this can happen for suspended RBs as it does not make sense to resume the RBs and potentially re-suspend them. Also, we still need to decide whether it is MAC which calculates data volume or the data volume is rather calculated at PDPC/RLC layer (as done currently for BSR) and just indicated to MAC layer.Rapp: Okay |
| Qualcomm | In current MAC spec, MAC eneity shall consider all radio bearers which are not suspended and not clear on whether might consider the radio bearers which are suspended. For the other releavent checks, i.e. RSRP, carrier, for SDT vs. non-SDT selection, they should be performed in MAC layer when data is arrived at upper layer no mater RBs configured for SDT are resumed or not. For the data volume check, similar to our comment in Q1, follow the LTE EDT, i.e. up to UE implmeeation how UE determine whether the size of UL data is suitable for EDT.Rapp: Okay |

Finally, companies are invited to provide any other comments on the modelling aspects between RRC and MAC (apart from Q1/Q2) above in the table below.

|  |
| --- |
| Q3: Are there any other comments/questions on modelling aspects between RRC and MAC (not covered by the scope of Q1/Q2 above)? |
| Company | Comments on any other issues |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Conclusion and proposals

The following points were discussed:

* Does the AS have knowledge of upper layer data for RBs that are not resumed? The understanding with the current modelling is that this is feasible.
* Proposals were made to move all the checks to either MAC or to RRC: Although this may be feasible, this will not completely avoid interlayer interaction anyway and there seems to be slight preference on both sides. Propose hence to leave it as it is
* Handling of CG-TAT is proposed to be moved to MAC and this can be agreed
* General update of the overall modelling picture has been provided and this can also be agreed with the understanding that the current running CRs are already implemented accordingly.

**Proposal 1:**

**The following general modelling between RRC and MAC is adopted:**



**Proposal 2: Handling of CG-TAT is moved into MAC spec**
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