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# Introduction

This report summarizes the email discussion below that took place after RAN2#115-e meeting:

* [Post115-e][069][MBS] 38300 Running CR (CMCC)

Scope: Update the Stage-2 running CR. Capture R2 115-e agreements.

Intended outcome: Endorsed CR

Deadline: Short 2 (not for RP)

# Reference

# Contact information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Contact Name, Email** |
| Nokia | Benoist Sébire – benoist.sebire@nokia.com |
| Samsung | Sangkyu Baek sangkyu.baek@samsung.com |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Discussion

## Comments on the definition of PTP/PTM transmission

Here companies may provide comments on the running CR.

**Question 1:** Do companies have comments on the current updated definition of PTP/PTM transmission included in the draft running CR?

* PTP Transmission: gNB utilizes UE-specific RLC entity, MAC entity and Physcial layer to individually generate and deliver separate copies of MBS data packets to each UEs independently, and uses PDCCH with CRC scrambled by UE-specific RNTI (e.g., C-RNTI) to schedule UE-specific PDSCH which is scrambled with the same UE-specific RNTI.
* PTM Transmission: gNB utilizes group RLC entity, MAC entity and Physcial layer to generate and deliver copies of MBS data packets to a set of UEs independently and uses group-common PDCCH with CRC scrambled by group-common RNTI to schedule group-common PDSCH which is scrambled with the same group-common RNTI.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Other comments** |
| Nokia | We do not see the need to update the definition. The previous ones were good enough for a Stage 2. The new text is also a bit confusing since on the receiver side, there’s always one dedicated RLC entity. |
| Samsung | The current text still has misalignment among RAN1 definition and RAN2 definition.   * In RAN1, PTP/PTM is distinguished by RNTI, i.e. UE-specific RNTI or group-common RNTI. * In RAN2, path switching is more related to RLC bearer. PTM means PTM RLC bearer and PTP means PTP RLC bearer. For instance, the current 38.300 uses RAN2 definition: “Split MRB: both PTM and PTP.” Here data for PTM RLC can be assigned by C-RNTI.   Our suggestion is to completely separate RAN1 definition and RAN2 definition, e.g. For RAN2 definition, use “PTM RLC/PTP RLC” or for RAN1 definition “PTP transmission/PTM transmission” to avoid the confusion. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Rapporteur’s summary:** <tbd>

**Question 2:** Do companies have other comments on this draft running CR?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Other comments** |
| Nokia | We have a few comments:   1. We don’t understand why SDAP text was removed. This is still performed in DL. 2. Some agreements have been captured that do not belong to the Stage 2 (they should be captured in Stage 3 only):    1. Bearer ID details    2. LCID details    3. List of DRX parameters    4. State variables details 3. DRX-related details deserve its own subclause instead of being described in protocol architecture (or perhaps within 16.x.5.2). 4. Service continuity : we would prefer finishing the ongoing discussion on 304 before trying to capture something to gather the discussion in one place only. |
| Samsung | # 3.1  🡪 In the definition of PTM/PTP, “-“ can be removed. Other running CRs do not have “-“ for definition of PTM/PTP. i.e.:  PTM: Point to Point, PTP: Point to Multipoint  #16.x.3 SDAP functionality  🡪 We should keep SDAP functions. RAN2#115-e agreement is not to have SDAP configuration from RRC perspective. There is still an SDAP function of QF to MRB mapping and data transfer.  #16.x.3 PDCP functionality  - Header compression and decompression using the ROHC protocol, where; ROHC O/R-mode can be used for MRB, for cases when UL feedback path in RLC layer is available;  🡪 We already agreed ROHC U-mode (RAN2#112-e agreement). In RAN2#115-e, ROHC O/R-mode was further agreed. It means no restriction on ROHC configuration. Thus, this newly added part can be removed. Suggestion: remove “where ROHC O/R-mode can be used for MRB, for cases when UL feedback path in RLC layer is available;”  #16.x.3 MRB configuration(s)  MRB with one DL RLC-UM or Bi-directional RLC-AM entity for PTP transmission;  🡪 AM is always bi-directional. No need to specify this. Suggestion: remove “Bi-directional”  #16.x.3 MRB configuration(s)  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;  🡪 “Two RLC-UM entities” looks duplicate. We suggest to remove.  #16.x.3 MRB configuration(s)  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;  🡪 Looks like an error. “two RLC UM entities,” should be deleted.  #16.x.3 MRB configuration(s)  - For PTP transmission, legacy UE-specific DRX pattern for unicast is reused for PTP transmission of NR MBS, which means the UE specific DRX pattern are for both unicast services and the MBS PTP bearer of UE.  🡪 We shouldn’t use ‘legacy …” We propose to use “unicast DRX is used for PTP transmission of MRB, which means..”  #16.x.3 MRB configuration(s)  o drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerDLPTM, needed if the HARQ feedback is enabled  o drx-RetransmissionTimerDLPTM, needed if the HARQ feedback is enabled  🡪 UE can still receive HARQ retransmission when HARQ feedback is not configured or HARQ feedback is disabled. UE would be required these timers in these cases in order to track the timings for HARQ retransmission. We think there is no need to put such conditioning on RTT and ReTx timers. RAN2 agreement also not included any conditioning.  #16.x.3 EN  Editor’s Note: FFS both DL and UL UM RLC configuiration for PTP.  🡪 Change to “configuration”  #16.x.4  - DTCH : A point-to-point channel defined in section 6.2.2 for transmitting traffic data of multicast ;  🡪 This logical channel is also needed to carry PDCP SR in the uplink.  #16.x.4 EN  🡪 Six ENs at the end of 16.x.4 should be updated according to the latest agreement.  # 16.x.5.2  MBS supporting gNBs notify the UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state about a multicast session activation using a group notification mechanism  🡪 Following agreement needs to be captured: It is up to network implementation (e.g. paging repetitions) for addressing scenario of potential notification loss for UEs.  Suggestion: to add “gNBs may use paging repetition to avoid potential notification loss for UEs” in 16.x.5.2.  #16.x.5.3  For an MRB configured PTM, PDCP state variables for PTM is setting while configured, and the SN part of COUNT values of these variables are set according to the SN of the first received packet by the UE and the HFN indicated by the gNB, if needed.  🡪 This is what PDCP spec should capture in state variable section. 38.300 does not have this stage-3 detail. We suggest to remove this.  #16.x.5.3  For an MRB configured PTM, during the initialize the PTM RLC entity for the MRB configuration, the value of RX\_Next\_Highest and RX\_Next\_Reassembly are set according to the SN of the first received packet containing an SN;  🡪 This is what RLC spec should capture in state variable section. 38.300 does not have this stage-3 detail. We suggest to remove this.  #16.x.5.3  F or an MRB configured PTP, RLC state variables of PTP RLC reception window can be set to initial value, i.e. 0, due to MRB configuration.  🡪 This is what RLC spec may capture in state variable section. 38.300 does not have this stage-3 detail. We suggest to remove this  #16.x.5.3  Editor’s Note: When two RLC entities are configured for a MRB for PTP delivery and PTM delivery respectively by RRC, it is FFS whether the state of RLC entity for PTM delivery can be active or deactive and can be dynamically controlled.  🡪 This EN can be deleted, since we agreed in RAN2#115-e  :Will not support PTM deactivation/activation beyond RRC reconfiguration acc to first agreement above (and whatever R1 decides).  #16.x.6.2  Editor’s Note: FFS that RAN1 inputs are needed for to decide about the RNTI and DCI format used for MCCH change notifications.  🡪 Please update as 115e RAN2 agreement: RAN2 waits for RAN1’s final decision on which RNTI/DCI (i.e. Alt1 and/or Alt 2 as identified by RAN1) for MCCH change notification to be adopted.  #16.x.6.2  Editor’s note: FFS whether the possibility of UE missing an MCCH change notification needs to be addressed or can be left to UE implementation.  🡪 Please remove as per 115e RAN2 agreement: Do not specify any mechanism to address the possibility of UE missing an MCCH change notification and it is left to UE implementation. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Rapporteur’s summary:** <tbd>