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# 1 Introduction

This document captures the outcome of the following email discussion:

* [Post115-e][092][MBS] Remaining User plane issues (Lenovo)

       Scope: Determine and address MBS Remaining UP issues

       Intended outcome: Report with open issues, and proposed resolutions as far as reasonable.

       Deadline: Long

Please provide your comments for phase I before 10/15/2021 23:59 UTC and for phase II before 10/21/2021 23:59 UTC.

Phase I: progress on identified issues and potential agreements

* Expected outcome: List of identified issues and potential agreements

Phase II: progress on agreeable proposals

* Expected outcome: agreeable proposals

# 2 Discussion

Rapporteur encourages the participating delegates to provide their contact information in this table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Contact: Name (E-mail) |
| OPPO | wangshukun@oppo.com |
| Qualcomm | Prasad Kadiri ([pkadiri@qti.qualcomm.com](mailto:pkadiri@qti.qualcomm.com)) |
| Kyocera | masato.fujishiro.fj@kyocera.jp |
| Ericsson | Henrik.enbuske@ericsson.com |
| Futurewei | Hao.bi@futurewei.com |
| Samsung | Sangkyu Baek (sangkyu.baek@samsung.com) Vinay Kumar Shrivastava (shrivastava@samsung.com) |
| Nokia | benoist.sebire@nokia.com |
| ZTE | Tao QI (qi.tao3@zte.com.cn) |
| CATT | zhourui@catt.cn |
| TCL | Suzanna.zhang@tcl.com |
| Xiaomi | Yumin Wu (wuyumin@xiaomi.com) |
| Sharp | Fangying.xiao@cn.sharp-world.com |
| Spreadtrum | Lifeng.han@unisoc.com |
| Intel | Yujian Zhjang (yujian.zhang@intel.com) |
| Fujitsu | [ohta.yoshiaki@fujitsu.com](mailto:ohta.yoshiaki@fujitsu.com) |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Zhenzhen Cao ([caozhenzhen@huawei.com](mailto:caozhenzhen@huawei.com)) |
| vivo | yitao.mo@vivo.com |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Mingzeng Dai (daimz4@lenovo.com) |
| MediaTek | Xiaonan.Zhang@mediatek.com |
| ETRI | kimjh@etri.re.kr |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | [limei.wei@td-tech.com](mailto:limei.wei@td-tech.com) |
| CMCC | liuxiaoman@chinamobile.com |
| LGE | sj117.kim@lge.com |

## 2.1 PDCP handling for RRC configured MRB bearer type change

**PDCP entity for RRC based MRB bearer type change**

In RAN2#115e, regarding RRC configured MRB bearer type and bearer type change, the following agreements were made [1]:

* In RRC signalling, one MRB can be configured with PTM only or PTP only or both PTM and PTP. Whether PTM, PTM+PTP or PTP-only can be changed from one to other via RRC signaling.
* In RRC signalling, Support DL only UM RLC configuration for PTM, both DL and UL AM RLC configuration for PTP, DL only UM RLC configuration for PTP, FFS both DL and UL UM RLC configuration for PTP.
* FFS whether PDCP SR can be triggered due to bearer type change in RRC signaling and FFS how to trigger PDCP SR if need.

There are two ways to realize bearer type change between PTM-only MRB, PTP-only MRB, and split MRB (‘both PTM and PTP’ as mentioned in chairman agreements) as following:

- Option 1: Separate PDCP entities are used for PTM-only MRB, PTP-only MRB, and split MRB.

- Option 2: Common PDCP entity is used for PTM-only MRB, PTP-only MRB, and split MRB.

The option 1 has more spec impact e.g. it needs new functionalities in SDAP layer such as re-ordering, retransmission for service continuity. Option 2 can reuse the existing PDCP functions as much as possible. The assumption is that both PTP and PTM use the same security scheme (pending to SA3)

**Rapporteur understanding:** A common PDCP entity is used for bearer type change between PTM-only MRB, PTP-only MRB and split MRB assuming that both PTP and PTM use the same security scheme (pending to SA3)

**Q1: Do companies agree that a common PDCP entity is used for bearer type change between PTM-only MRB, PTP-only MRB and split MRB?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | In case of switching between MRB and DRB, PDCP will not be common and RRC signalling based switching need to be supported. |
| Kyocera | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes | But it is not clear what the separate PDCP entities. During the lifetime of the bearer, PDCP entity cannot change and only re-establishment may happen. We think Option 1 is not feasible. |
| Nokia | Yes | Note that at RAN2#113bis, we already agreed “*Dynamic PTM/PTP switch is supported for a split MRB bearer (type) with a common (single) PDCP entity.*” |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| TCL | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes | Same view as Nokia. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Anyway, one bearer is associated with one PDCP entity. After the bearer type change, the original PDCP entity can be reused (some operations may be needed, e.g. re-establishment or recovery). |
| vivo | Yes | In our understanding, this question had already been discussed in [Post113-e][054][MBS17]. And we should stick to the achieved agreement as mentioned by Nokia. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes | Common PDCP entity allows the PDCP layer to perform reordering and retransmission for service continuity. The legacy architecture in unicast and split-DRB can be reused. |
| ETRI | Yes |  |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| LGE | Yes |  |

**Summary:** All companies agree that a common PDCP entity is used for bearer type change between PTM-only MRB, PTP-only MRB and split MRB.

**Proposal 1 (23/23): A common PDCP entity is used for RRC based MRB bearer type change between PTM only MRB, PTP only MRB and split MRB.**

**PDCP entity reestablishment**

In case of PDCP anchor change, e.g. during handover, PDCP entity reestablishment is usually configured and performed. During PDCP entity reestablishment, the UE shall reset the RoHC protocol if d*rb-ContinueRoHC* is not configured, apply new security algorithm and keys, and reset PDCP variables for UM DRB. For a MRB, the PDCP anchor change is also possible e.g. during handover with RRC based bearer type change. However, security algorithm and key may not be relevant which is pending to SA3. And the initial values PDCP variables needs special handling as discussed in the section 2.2. The remaining issue is whether ROHC protocol can be reset if *RoHC continuity* is not configured.

**Rapporteur understanding:** NW should have the flexibility to decide whether to configure *RoHC continuity for the MRB* or not during handover or RRC based MRB bearer type change*.* In this case, PDCP entity reestablishment should be allowed if *RoHC continuity* is not configured for the MRB during handover or RRC based MRB bearer type change.

**Q2: Do companies agree that PDCP entity reestablishment is allowed if RoHC continuity is not configured for the MRB during handover or RRC based MRB bearer type change.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes | We assume PDCP entity re-establishment is a network decision and perhaps there is no need to spend too much time on agreeing possible triggers on the network side. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| TCL | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Intel | See comments | We agree that network has the flexibility to configure whether PDCP reestablishment is performed *during handover*. However for RRC based MRB bearer type change, we don’t see the need to perform PDCP reestablishment since PDCP anchor is not changed in this scenario. |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes | The legacy behavior can be reused. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | We agree with Nokia’s view that PDCP entity re-establishment is a network decision. |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| ETRI | Yes |  |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| LGE | Yes with comments | Security change is not expected during RRC based MRB bearer type change. PDCP entity reestablishment is not required for RRC based MRB bearer type change. |

**Summary:** all companies agree that PDCP entity reestablishment is allowed for MRB during handover with PDCP anchor relocation. Two companies thinks that PDCP entity reestablishment is not required for RRC based MRB bearer type change without PDCP anchor relocation. From rapporteur’s point of view, when to configure PDCP entity re-establishment is a network implementation.

**Proposal 2 (23/23): PDCP entity reestablishment is allowed for the MRB during handover or RRC based MRB bearer type change, if RoHC continuity is not configured. When to configure PDCP entity re-establishment is a network implementation.**

**PDCP data recovery for RRC based MRB bearer type change**

In case of PDCP anchor is unchanged and RoHC continuity is configured of a MRB, PDCP reestablishment is not necessary. Instead, PDCP data recovery can be performed during RRC based MRB bearer type change.

In current PDCP specification, PDCP data recovery may be performed for AM DRBs, as specified in section 5.5 of TS 38.323:

*For AM DRBs, when upper layers request a PDCP data recovery for a radio bearer, the transmitting PDCP entity shall:*

*- perform retransmission of all the PDCP Data PDUs previously submitted to re-established or released AM RLC entities in ascending order of the associated COUNT values for which the successful delivery has not been confirmed by lower layers, following the data submission procedure in clause 5.2.1.*

There are several cases for MRB bearer type change, e.g. PTM only -> PTP RLC AM; PTP RLC AM -> PTM only and etc. For PTM only -> PTP RLC AM, the issue is the PTM transmission is RLC UM only and the transmitting PDCP entity is unable to know the successful delivery status in lower layers for the UE. For PTP RLC AM -> PTM only, the issue is that PTM transmission is for a group of UEs, and it is not efficient to perform PDCP data recovery via PTM retransmission for an individual UE.

**Rapporteur understanding:** Since MBS data is DL only and the PDCP data recovery is specified from transmitting PDCP entity point of view, it’s easier to leave it up to gNB implementation on how to perform PDCP data recovery for MRB bearer type change.

**Q3: Do companies agree that it is up to NW implementation on how to perform PDCP data recovery for MRB bearer type change?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | Yes with comments | It’d be more clear to state that there is no specs support for PDCP data recovery during MRB bearer type change. |
| Samsung | - | PDCP data recovery of PDCP spec is how UE performs retransmission when security key is unchanged. Even in unicast, what gNB will do is purely up to NW implementation without any configuration in an RRC message, e.g. gNB follows the exactly same PDCP data recovery as UL or performs a modified proprietary behaviour. Thus, considering DL-only MBS data, an indication of PDCP data recovery for MRB is not necessary at all. |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| TCL | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Intel | - | PDCP data recovery is not applicable to MRB bearer type change. |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes | Again, we can follow the legacy behavior. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| ETRI | Yes |  |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| LGE | Yes | We agree with Samsung. |

**Summary:** all companies seem agree that it is up to gNB implementation on how to perform PDCP data recovery for MRB bearer type change and there is no extra standard effort.

**Proposal 3 (23/23): It is up to gNB implementation on how to perform PDCP data recovery for RRC based MRB bearer type change and there is expected that no extra standard effort.**

**PDCP SR for RRC based MBR bearer type change**

In order to minimize the data loss during bearer type change, it is beneficial to support PDCP status reporting once the MRB bearer type is changed. Considering a bidirectional PTP leg is required to transmit the PDCP status report, the PDCP status report could be triggered if the new MRB has a bidirectional PTP leg, e.g. when a PTM-only MRB is changed to a PTP-only MRB of RLC AM, or a PTM-only MRB is changed to a split MRB with RLC AM PTP leg. NW is required to configure a bidirectional PTP leg for PDCP status reporting.

**Rapporteur understanding:** For MRB configured by upper layers to send a PDCP status report in the uplink (field *statusReportRequired* in PDCP-Config IE in RRC), the receiving PDCP entity shall trigger a PDCP status report in case of MRB type change. NW is required to configure a bidirectional PTP leg (e.g. either PTP-only MRB or split MRB) if *statusReportRequired* is provided.

**Q4: Do companies agree with the following statement for PDCP SR for MRB bearer type change:**

**- In order to minimize the loss during MRB bearer type change, it is beneficial to support PDCP status reporting once the MRB bearer type is changed;**

**- For MRB configured by upper layers to send a PDCP status report in the uplink (field *statusReportRequired* in PDCP-Config IE in RRC), the receiving PDCP entity shall trigger a PDCP status report in case of MRB type change;**

**- NW is required to configure a bidirectional PTP leg (e.g. either PTP-only MRB or split MRB) if *statusReportRequired* is provided. It is up to network in which case *statusReportRequired* is configured.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Yes | In last RAN2 meeting, RAN2 agreed that:   * In RRC signalling, Support DL only UM RLC configuiration for PTM, both DL and UL AM RLC configuiration for PTP, DL only UM RLC configuiration for PTP, FFS both DL and UL UM RLC configuiration for PTP.   Whether it means that both DL and UL UM RCL configuration for PTP is supported.  We support both DL and UL UM RCL configuration for PTP and also support the PDCP status report due to bearer type change for data loss reduction purpose and the flexibility of RRC configuration should also be allowed. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | For PTP RLC UM, we should allow both DL and UL UM RLC configuration to allow UE to report PDCP Status Report. |
| Kyocera | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | No | No real benefit in PDCP SR from an already lossy (not lossless) PTM MRB. For bearer changes between bearers using RLC AM this may be beneficial in some cases, and we are open to have this as an configurable option similar to legacy. |
| Futurewei | No | As in legacy PDCP operation, PDCP SR is supported on PTP leg only if RLC AM is configured on PTP leg. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Maybe | An SR is currently sent (when configured) upon PDCP re-establishment, data recovery and data switching for RLC AM, and data switching for RLC UM. RLC AM seems therefore well covered already. For RLC UM, we would need one new trigger or specify data recovery.  In general, it is fine to try to minimise losses with minimum added complexity, but lossless operation does not make sense since PTM itself is not lossless as pointed out by Ericsson. |
| ZTE | Yes | Loss reduction (not lossless) is helpful during bearer type change. |
| CATT | Yes | PDCP status report can be triggered when MBR type change happens with statusReportRequired is set to true, and it can be sent on PTP UM leg. |
| TCL | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes | Whether SR is triggered or not should be based on NW configuration but not always triggered when MRB bearer type is changed. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Intel | No | There are mainly three cases of MRB type change:  1) PTM only <-> PTP only  2) PTM only <-> Split MRB  3) PTP only <-> Split MRB  For case 1) and 2), given that RLC UM is used for PTM, there is no need to achieve lossless switching.  For case 3), since PTP RLC AM leg is maintained during switching and RLC status report can be used, there is no need for PDCP status report. |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Reducing packet loss during bearer type change is essential for use cases which require high reliability such as V2X. PDCP status report is beneficial as the network can make sure which packets to retransmit based on the PDCP status report after bearer type change. Without PDCP SR and the corresponding retransmissions from the network side, there can be consecutive packets lost, which is not acceptable.  We also agree with most of others that the behaviour can be largely fulfilled by existing specification and the additional efforts is minimum.  It is ok to clarify that PDCP SR is a configurable option for MRB. |
| vivo | Yes with comments | For the first statement, we think PDCP status reporting should be supported only if the target MRB bearer configuration including the configuration for the PTP leg (e.g. UM PTP or AM PTP). For UM PTP, it is up to NW's decision to configure bidirectional UM RLC.  We are fine with the second/third bullet. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | PDCP SR is useful for minimizing data loss for MRB bearer type change.  It is expected that there is not much standard impact to support PDCP SR for MRB bearer type changes with bearer using RLC UM. PDCP SR has already be supported for RLC UM in case of uplink data switching for DAPS handover. |
| MediaTek | Yes | UE should be triggered for PDCP status report during bearer type change when uplink logical channel is configured. |
| ETRI | No | It is unclear whether PDCP SR, which used to support PTP RLC AM, is still useful for PTM MRB. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes | We support to introduce the PDCP status reporting during MRB bearer type is changed upon the field statusReportRequired in PDCP-Config IE is configured. |
| LGE | No | We don’t think that the receiving PDCP entity shall trigger a PDCP status report in case of MRB type change. PDCP SR can be triggered when nw set recoverPDCP and statusReportRequired as true. This can be supported only for bearer type change to an MRB type which contains PTP RLC AM leg. |

**Summary:** 17/23 companies support PDCP SR for RRC based MRB bearer type change. 5/23 companies do not support PDCP SR for RRC based MRB bearer type change, but some companies can accept that PDCP SR is a configurable option for RRC based MRB bearer type change.

**Proposal 4 (17/23):**

**- In order to minimize the loss during MRB bearer type change, NW may configure UE to send a PDCP status report for the MRB bearer type change;**

**- For MRB configured by upper layers to send a PDCP status report in the uplink (field *statusReportRequired* in PDCP-Config IE in RRC), the receiving PDCP entity shall trigger a PDCP status report in case of MRB type change;**

**- NW is required to configure a bidirectional PTP leg (e.g. either PTP-only MRB or split MRB) if *statusReportRequired* is provided. It is up to network in which case *statusReportRequired* is configured.**

**PDCP SR trigger(s) for RRC based MRB bearer type change**

The existing triggers of PDCP status report are specified as in TS 38.323:

*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 requests a PDCP entity reconfiguration and the associated RLC entity is released for a radio bearer.*

Some companies think that when bearer type change among PTM-only MRB, PTP-only MRB, and split MRB, one issue is that the PDCP status report may not be triggered according to existing triggers due to:

a) The PTM can only be configured as RLC-UM mode.

b) The PDCP entity re-establishment may not be needed e.g. the security may not be needed for PTP-only MRB as well.

c) The PDCP data recovery is not applicable to RLC-UM mode.

Some companies have different understanding. If we agree to apply PDCP data recovery or PDCP entity re-establishment for any MRB bearer type change, the PDCP data recovery indicator or PDCP entity re-establishment indicator as configured by RRC can be reused for triggering PDCP SR. in other words, the legacy triggers of PDCP SR as ‘upper layer requests a PDCP data recovery’ or ‘upper layer requires a PDCP entity re-establishment’ can be reused.

**Q5: Companies are invited to provide their view on the following options:**

- Option 1: New trigger(s) of PDCP status report should be defined for MRB bearer type change? If option 1 is preferred, please provide your views on what the new trigger(s) should be.

- Option 2: The legacy triggers of PDCP SR as ‘upper layer requests a PDCP data recovery’ or ‘upper layer requires a PDCP entity re-establishment’ are reused for MRB bearer type change.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred option** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Option 1 | In DAPS HO, new trigger for PDCP status report is introduced for both AM and UM RLC.  ========  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.  ========  So it is better to define new trigger for both AM and UM RLC and it will not impact legacy trigger application.  For the bearer type change due to RRC configuration, it is possible to configuration indication from network to trigger PDCP SR. However, for dynamic PTP/PTM switching, it is transparent to UE and it is up to UE to evaluate dynamic PTP/PTM switching happening.  So we think the new trigger can be “PTP/PTM switching detection indication from lower layer”. |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 | Since existing conditions are limited to RLC AM, PDCP Re-establishment cases, instead of using legacy conditions, it is clean approach to specify new trigger for MRB switching based on RRC signalling procedure. |
| Kyocera | Option 1 | We prefer Option 1 since we think the specification should allow PDCP Status Report also for UM MRBs. |
| Ericsson | Option 1, comment | If PDCP SR trigger is needed, a a new trigger will be required. This can be based on legacy in general. However, we are not sure this is useful from PTM, see Q4 |
| Futurewei | Option 2 | The legacy PDCP SR trigger can be reused in RRC based bearer type change, involving PDCP re-establishment and data recovery. |
| Samsung | Option 2 | Bearer type change is triggered by RRC signalling. PDCP SR can be triggered together with bearer type change. The legacy mechanism can be reused. We do not see any big reason to have a new triggering. |
| Nokia | Option 2 | We do not see the need for new triggers given our answer to Q4. |
| ZTE | Option 2 | Legacy RRC PDCP SR trigger can be reused however shall be extended to include UM MRB. |
| CATT | Option 1 | The new trigger can be “upper layer indicates bearer type change for MRB” |
| TCL | Option 1 | A new trigger will be required for RLC UM due to bear type change. |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 | It will be clean from the specification to have a new trigger to support PDCP SR for RLC UM. |
| Sharp | Option 1 | If we decided to support SR for UM MRB, new trigger condition should be defined. |
| Spreadtrum | Option 2 | Legacy PDCP SR trigger can be reused in RRC based bearer type change. |
| Intel | None | As in our reply to Q4, we don’t think PDCP status report should be triggered during MRB type change. In addition, as indicated in our reply to Q2 and Q3, there is no need to perform PDCP reestablishment for MRB bearer type change, and PDCP data recovery is not applicable for MRB. |
| Fujitsu | Option 2 | Probably, it’s better to first discuss if RAN2 support PDCP SR for UM MRB. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | option 2 (extended to UM as well) | We assume that the intention of this question is to ask if the legacy PDCP data recovery indicator or PDCP entity re-establishment indicator as configured by RRC can be reused for triggering PDCP SR, that we think is possible.  At the same time, in the PDCP procedure is limited to AM RB, that we think is unnecessary, and extension to UM as well is needed.. |
| vivo | Option 2 | For MRB bearer change, we think the handling of PDCP SR is similar to the existing data recovery mechanism. Thus, there is no need to introduce a new trigger in PDCP spec and we think the legacy RRC PDCP SR trigger can be reused. Further, RAN2 is suggested to discuss whether PDCP SR is also applied to UM MRB (i.e. PTP with UM RLC) in this case. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Option 1 | It will be more clean to have a new trigger for RLC UM MRB such as ‘upper layer requests MRB bearer type change’. |
| MediaTek | Option 1 | For handover case, the motivation of bearer type change is from network. In this case, RRC configuration like PDCP data recovery or PDCP entity re-establishment can be used as the trigger of PDCP SR.  For cases when channel conditions get worse and data loss occurs, the motivation of bearer type change or dynamic switch is from UE. PDCP SR should be triggered automatically by UE without indications. |
| ETRI | Option 1 | It will be required the new trigger for bearer type change. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Option 1 or option 2 | Two options are ok from our side. It seems option 1 is simpler. |
| CMCC | Option 1 | Although Bearer type change is triggered by RRC signalling and PDCP SR can be triggered together with bearer type change, it can avoid the ambiguity of the specification if the new triggered is added into the triggering list. |
| LGE | Option 2 | PDCP SR can be triggered for an MRB which has PTP RLC AM leg by legacy triggers. We do not see the need to have a new trigger. |

**Summary:** 13/23 companies are fine with option 1, while 10/23 are fine with option 2 and one company does not like any option.

**Proposal 5: If PDCP SR is supported for RRC based MRB bearer type change, it is FFS on whether the legacy triggers of PDCP SR (as ‘upper layer requests a PDCP data recovery’ or ‘upper layer requires a PDCP entity re-establishment’) are reused or new trigger(s) of PDCP status report should be defined.**

## 2.2 Initial value of PTM PDCP state variables

**Initial HFN synchronization**

The initial value of PTM PDCP state variables was discussed and the following agreement was made:

* For PTM PDCP state variables setting while configured, 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.

It was agreed that the HFN is indicated by the gNB, if needed. It is not clear enough whether HFN is needed to be indicated. The HFN may be used for1) security and 2) PDCP SR. Whether HFN is used for security purpose is pending to SA3. In the PDCP status report, FMC (First Missing Count) in included for indicating the COUNT value of the first missing PDCP SDU within the reordering window. As discussed in the section 2.1, PDCP SR may be triggered for RRC based MRB type change. In this case, the initial value of HFN should be indicated by the gNB. On the other side, some companies think that the HFN value of FMC in PDCP the SR is not essential since the NW can ignore the HFN value in the PDCP SR and deduce the correct HFN value for PDCP retransmission.

**Q6: Companies are invited to provide their view on whether the initial value of HFN should be indicated by the gNB in condition that RAN2 agree that PDCP SR is performed during RRC based MRB bearer type change.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Yes | HFN should be indicated by network. |
| QC | Yes | We prefer network to provide HFN value. |
| Kyocera | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes. | No strong view but slight preference to providing HFN from NW |
| Futurewei | Yes | HFN can be indicated by network, if PDCP SR is configured. |
| Samsung | Yes | HFN value is included in FMC field of PDCP SR message. By using received HFN, gNB is able to check if HFN desynchronization happened. Without the initial HFN value, gNB cannot check this. Thus we see that signalling of HFN is beneficial. |
| Nokia | - | We do not understand the relevance of the question since we already agreed that HFN will be provided. |
| ZTE | No | HFN indication from network will result in ambiguity of Count/HFN if PDCP SN is about to be flipped or just flipped as mentioned in Q7.  HFN is only useful if AS security is needed which however is still not determined. This is why we have only agreed that HFN is indicated from gNB “if needed”. |
| CATT | Yes | We agree HFN should be indicated to UE as it is used in PDCP SR. However, PDCP SR may not only be used for RRC based MRB bearer type change. |
| TCL | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes | RAN2 already agreed to allow the gNB to indicate the HFN. And this is to support the PDCP COUNT indication in the PDCP SR. |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Intel | - | The question is not so clear. Our understanding is that RAN2 has agreed that gNB can indicate HFN. From specification point of view, RAN2 just needs to design related signalling. |
| Fujitsu | Yes | According to the agreement. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | The HFN may be misleading as it may be provided near the time when wrapping around occurs.  Actually HFN desynchronization does not affect normal transmission as in V2X (security in RAN has been excluded by SA3) and gNB can simply ignore the HFN value in PDCP SR and deduce the right PDCP PDUs for retransmission. Besides, the PDCP SR in LTE does not contain HFN value and the reason that NR uses FMC instead of FMS is just to unify the PDCP SR format. |
| vivo | Comments | We think we should firstly wait for SA3 input regarding MBS security before discussing the issue related to HFN. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes | HFN needs to be indicated by the network since COUNT is necessary for PDCP functions |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| LGE | Yes |  |

**Summary:** 19/22 companies agrees that the initial value of HFN of a MRB is indicated by gNB and some companies think that it has already been agreed in last meeting. 2/22 companies do not think the initial value of HFN should be indicated by gNB. 1 company would like to wait for SA3 progress.

**Proposal 6 (19/22): the initial value of HFN is indicated by the gNB in condition that RAN2 agrees that PDCP SR is performed during RRC based MRB bearer type change.**

If the initial value of HFN is indicated by gNB, as mentioned during online discussion, there may be HFN desynchronization issue. Due to propagation delay, UE processing delay and misalignment transmission between gNB-CP and gNB-UP (e.g. since the RRC configuration is provided by gNB-CP while the SN in the PDCP header is added by gNB-UP, there is extra timing misalignment between CP/RRC configuration and UP/data transmission in case of gNB-CP and gNB-UP split architecture), the UE may receive the initial HFN after the SN wrapping around while the gNB sent it before the SN wrapping around. Then the UE uses indicated HFN in the RRC signalling as the initial HFN, however, the real HFN should be HFN+1, in which case HFN desynchronization between UE and gNB happens.

[3] pointed it out that one may argue that the state variables can be determined by V2X rule using the first received packet. However, V2X mechanism inherits reordering delay by the intentional SN gap generation between RX\_DELIV and RX\_NEXT, which is set because of absence of any reordering information. In Uu interface between gNB and UE, this unnecessary reordering delay can be avoided by gNB to provide the initial values appropriately. As shown in Figure 1, the reordering delay occurs at every beginning of MRB configuration, which is roughly hundreds of milliseconds and definitely redundant degradation.



**Figure 1. Issue of HFN desynchronization between UE and NW for a MRB due to SN wrapping around**

**Q7: If the initial value of HFN is indicated by gNB, do companies think HFN desynchronization between UE and NW can happen, and if yes, whether the HFN desynchronization should be solved by standardization and how?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | HFN desynchronization should be solved by standardization.  The solution can be discussed in next meeting. |
| Qualcomm | It can happen. Prefer to have spec based solution even if it is not 100% ideal solution. |
| Kyocera | Yes, the HFN desynchronization may happen between the UE and the NW.  It’s FFS whether the HFN desynchronization needs to be solved by the standards, since we assume there will be some implementations to avoid the issue, e.g., the gNB does not indicate HFN just before/after SN wrap around and/or the UE may notice the possibility of SN wrap around by the SN of receiving data (i.e., the UE may add one to the HFN indicated by the gNB.  Though, we think the signalling design should minimize the timing gap between the HFN provisioning and the data, as in the following question. |
| Ericsson | We are not sure this is an issue that cannot be handled by implementation. |
| Futurewei | The possibility of HFN desynchronization can be taken into account when network configures bearer type change; and it is a factor to determine if PDCP SR is required. |
| Samsung | It would be good to provide reference SN value for the initial HFN. Alternatively, just providing initial set of RX\_DELIV and RX\_NEXT is a possible option. |
| Nokia | Rare event that should be handled by network implementation. |
| ZTE | If HFN indication brings only trouble (e.g. endless network implementation that increases network complexity), why are we still discussing about it here?  From network vendors’ perspective, we don’t think such HFN indication and the related solutions of HFN de-sync are needed. |
| CATT | Too early to discuss. The question is based on an assumption that HFN is indicated via RRC signalling. But we have not decide how to indicate HFN to UE, RRC signalling is only one of the option on the table as in Q8. |
| TCL | Handled by network implementation. |
| Xiaomi | We are open to discuss this issue, and prefer to have a standard solution. |
| Sharp | We think this issue can handled by NW implementation. |
| Spreadtrum | The HFN desynchronization should be handled by network implementation. |
| Intel | Whether there is HFN desynchronization issue depends on the solution to indicate the HFN. See our reply to Q8 below. |
| Fujitsu | This issue can be handled by smart NW implementation on the HFN indication timing. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes, the issue can happen.  Considering that the HFN is not really necessary and may cause this issue, it is better to follow legacy mechanism as in V2X, i.e. HFN is not considered. |
| vivo | We agree the mentioned HFN desynchronization issue may happen. And we prefer to have a specified solution. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We slightly prefer to solve SFN desynchronization issue by standardization. |
| MediaTek | HFN desynchronization may happened and should be solved by standardization. Since HFN needs to be indicated by network, maybe initial HFN and SN can be indicated together to UE. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | We think the question may happen. The standard solution may be needed. |
| CMCC | Based on our analysis, HFN desynchronization could be a rare case, and it could be solved by UE and gNB implementation as in unicast does. |
| LGE | A standard solution is preferred. As Samsung mentioned, providing reference SN may be considered. |

**Summary:** it seems no majority view. Some companies thinks that HFN desynchronization should be avoided by network implementation, while some companies prefer to have a standard solution to solve the HFN desynchronization issue. From rapporteur’s point of view, in order to make a progress and considering the time limitation in release 17, we can make a WA that the HFN desynchronization should be avoided by network implementation.

**Proposal 7 (11/22): WA: If the initial value of HFN is indicated by gNB, HFN desynchronization between UE and NW should be avoided by NW implementation, thus no specification imapct**

In the 38.331 running CR [6], there is an FFS:

*Editor’s note: If needed (pending SA3 conclusion on secuirty and/or RAN2 conclusion on PDCP SR), HFN should be indicated by the gNB for PTM PDCP state variables setting (FFS whether via RRC or other means).*

There are three possible options to support the indication of initial value of HFN by gNB:

- Option 1: the initial value of HFN is indicated by RRC signalling, e.g. in the *PDCP-Config* IE.

- Option 2: the initial value of HFN is indicated by a new PDCP control PDU.

- Option 3: the initial value of HFN is indicated in the PDCP header of PDCP PDU.

Option 1 may have HFN desynchronization issue as discussed above. Option 2 may relieve the HFN desynchronization issue, but it cannot solve the issue completely and it requires PTP transmission for the transmission of the PDCP control PDU. Option 3 needs extra overhead in PDCP header.

**Q8: If the initial value of HFN is indicated by gNB, companies are invited to provide their view on the options to support the indication of initial value of HFN by gNB.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred option** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Option 1 | In RRC signalling. |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 or 2 |  |
| Kyocera | Option 2 | As commented in Q7, we think the signalling design should minimize the timing gap between the HFN provisioning and the data. In this sense, Option 2 and Option 3 are the viable options, while we slightly prefer Option 2 since less standardization effort is expected.  We wonder if Option 2 really needs PTP transmission, since we assume there is no limitation to send PDCP Control PDU via G-RNTI. |
| Ericsson | Option 1 | Desync. HFN across HFN borders can be handled by gNB |
| Futurewei | Option 1 | If HFN is signalled, network should have sufficient confidence that it is received by the UE. |
| Samsung | Option 1 | We think one-shot indication of HFN is sufficient. |
| Nokia | 1 or 2 |  |
| ZTE | None | Another example of HFN indication overhead. |
| CATT | Option 2 or 3 | We have concern on the HFN desync issue caused by option 1. |
| TCL | 1 or 2 |  |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 |  |
| Sharp | Option 1 or 2 |  |
| Spreadtrum | Option 1 | RRC signalling is sufficient. |
| Intel | Option 2 | We prefer Option 2 as there is no HFN desynchronization issue. |
| Fujitsu | Option 1 | RRC signaling is the most reliable over the air. The new PDCP SR in Option 2 may not work in case when transmission error occurs over the air. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2 or Option 3 | If a solution is really needed, option 2/3 should be considered to avoid the HFN de-sync issue. |
| vivo | Option 1/2 | Generally, we think both the control plane solution (Option 1) and user plane solution (Option 2/3) can be studied. If user plane solution is adopted, we prefer to introduce a new PDCP control PDU, which can minimize the impact of the data receiving, compared with Option 3. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Option 1 |  |
| MediaTek | Option 1 |  |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Option 2 or 3 |  |
| CMCC | Option 1 |  |
| LGE | Option 1 | Regarding option 2 and option 3, network needs to send additional packets including HFN which may be unnecessary for already joined UEs when a UE newly joins in PTM. This will increase overheads. In addition, it is concerned that packets which contains the initial HFN can be missed. |

**Summary:** 15/22 companies are fine with option 1, 9/22 companies are fine with option 2, 3/22 companies are fine with option 3, and one companies does not like any of options.

**Proposal 8 (15/22): If the initial value of HFN is indicated by gNB, the initial value of HFN is indicated by RRC signalling, e.g. in the *PDCP-Config* IE.**

**PDCP window initialization**

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. Similarly, for MRB, the initial value of the SN part of RX\_NEXT is (x +1) modulo (2[*PDCP-SN-Size*]), where x is the SN of the first received PDCP Data PDU.

**Q9: Do companies agree that for multicast MRB, the initial value of the SN part of RX\_NEXT is (x +1) modulo (2[*PDCP-SN-Size*]), where x is the SN of the first received PDCP Data PDU?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| TCL | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes | The sidelink solution can be reused. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| LGE | Yes |  |

**Summary:** all companies agree Q9.

**Proposal 9 (22/22): for multicast MRB, the initial value of the SN part of RX\_NEXT is (x +1) modulo (2[*PDCP-SN-Size*]), where x is the SN of the first received PDCP Data PDU.**

According to the current specs (TS 38.323), 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; |

During email discussion [2], some companies think the issue do not need to be addressed and think that UE late joining an ongoing MBS session will miss some data anyway. And it can be up to UE implementation to handle it.

On the other side, as summarized in [5], some companies indicated that such packet loss was intolerable, since RAN2 agreed that the UE can be released to RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE when there is no data. When there is new data coming, the UE would enter RRC\_CONNECTED again and initiate PDCP entity, so ***packet loss would happen for each time when the UE enters RRC\_CONNECTED***.

In order to avoid packet loss, some companies proposed RX\_DELIV can be set to a value before RX\_NEXT (i.e. SN of the first received PDU), which is similar to sidelink broadcast/groupcast. This operation enables UE to receive the packet which SN smaller than the SN of the first received packet to prevent packet loss caused by out of order transmission.

**Q10: Companies are kindly invited to provide their preference on the options:**

* Option 1: the initial value of RX\_DELIV is set to a value before RX\_NEXT, e.g. the initial value of the SN part of RX\_DELIV is (x – 0.5 × 2[*PDCP-SN-Size*–1]) modulo (2[*PDCP-SN-Size*]), where x is the SN of the first received PDCP Data PDU, which is similar to sidelink broadcast/groupcast;
* Option 2: the initial value of RX\_DELIV is set to the same as RX\_NEXT.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option1/2** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Option 1 | For data loss reduction purpose, we can do it in R17. |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 |  |
| Kyocera | Option 1 | We think the V2X solution can be reused easily. Just to make the formula clearer, we wonder if “(x – 2[PDCP-SN-Size–2]) modulo (2[PDCP-SN-Size])” is better, i.e., 0.5 = 2^-1. |
| Ericsson | Option 2 | We do not think anything is needed as there in most cases will be missed packet in any case. |
| Futurewei | Option 1 | V2X scheme can be reused to accommodate out-of-order PDCP PDUs. |
| Samsung | Option 1 | Since out-of-order reception may occur in NR MBS due to HARQ retx, reordering timer needs to be started. |
| Nokia | Option 2 | Already discussed after the last meeting. A better starting point should have been the outcome of that discussion:  “*There are 7 companies support to address the data loss issue and think anyway we should try to reduce data loss as much as possible. There are 15 companies object to address the data loss issue and think UE late joining an ongoing MBS session will miss some data anyway.*”  And then simply ask if any companies have changed their mind.  Anyway, could be left to UE implementation. |
| ZTE | Option 1 | No strong view, option 2 works well too. |
| CATT | Option 1 | OK to reuse the V2X solution. Two cases are to be considered,  1. For UE later joining an ongoing session, missing some data at initial phase is not a big issue, as anyway UE has missed the transmitted data before UE joining in.  2. For the multicast deactivation case, when UE resume the multicast reception after receive the group notification on the session activation, it make sense to avoid data loss at the initial phase as the COUNT before deactivation and after reactivation should be continuous. |
| TCL | Option 2 |  |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 |  |
| Sharp | Option 1 or left to UE implementation |  |
| Spreadtrum | Option 2 |  |
| Intel | Option 1 | Considering PDCP operation is common for all MBS services including services require high reliability, we agree with reusing sidelink approach to avoid packet loss due to out of order delivery from lower layers. |
| Fujitsu | Option 2 | Similar view as Nokia. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 1 | Prefer to reuse V2X mechanism, but if there is a concern, we can also leave it to UE implementation as long as RX\_DELIV is set to a value before RX\_NEXT, i.e. the exact value of RX\_DELIV is up to UE. |
| vivo | Yes | The sidelink solution can be reused. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Option 1 | It could be beneficial to reuse the solution for V2X to minimize the data loss. |
| Mediatek | Option 1 | The initial value of RX\_DELIV should be set to a value before RX\_NEXT. Specific value can be discussed in the next meeting. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Option 1 | No strong intention. Option 2 is also Ok from our side. |
| CMCC | Option 2 | Firstly, we think Option 1 has an inherit issue, i.e., “RX\_DELIV = RX\_NEXT – 0.5\*Window” always trigger T-reordering at the beginning of reception, however, most of packets with COUNT between RX\_DELIV and RX\_NEXT will not be received.  Secondly, we agree with the view that for UE later joining an ongoing session, missing some data at initial phase is not a big issue, as anyway UE has missed the transmitted data before UE joining in. Hence, the necessary to address the data loss issue in this case is not obvious. |
| LGE | Option 2 | There would not be many packets received out-of-order in MBS. |

**Summary:** 15/22 companies prefer option 1 and 7/22 prefer option 2.

**Proposal 10 (15/22): the initial value of RX\_DELIV is set to a value before RX\_NEXT, e.g. the initial value of the SN part of RX\_DELIV is (x – 0.5 × 2[*PDCP-SN-Size*–1]) modulo (2[*PDCP-SN-Size*]), where x is the SN of the first received PDCP Data PDU.**

## 2.3 Ethernet header compression for MRB

In RAN2#115e, it was confirmed that

* ROHC O/R-mode can be used for MRB, for cases when feedback path is available (UL RLC). R2 assumes the detailed operation is up to implementation and expect no further optimizations to be needed.

However, during discussion of 38.331 running CR [6], whether ethernet header compression should be supported for MRB was raised. From moderator’s view, it is straightforward to reuse the existing EHC for MRB without additional standard effort and it could be beneficial to extend MBS use cases and scenarios.

**Q11: Do companies agree with that EHC can be used for MRB for cases when feedback path is available (UL RLC) and it is expected that no further optimizations are needed?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| Samsung | No | No strong view. But EHC mainly targeted for IIOT is not necessary for MBS. |
| Nokia | No | Availability of feedback path and compression gains based on the worst UE always are both questionable. EHC is not practically feasible. |
| ZTE | Yes | Multicast over Ethernet environment is common and useful. |
| CATT | No | EHC was introduced in Rel-16 for TSN and is used to compress the Ethernet packets which may be not suitable to MBS. |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Fujitsu | Yes | Can be up to implementation if EHC would be used or not. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes | if Ethernet is also applied to MBS, we are fine to extend the EHC function to MBS. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | It is straightforward to reuse the existing EHC for MRB without additional standard effort and it could be beneficial to extend MBS use cases and scenarios. |
| MediaTek | No | Share the same view with CATT |
| ETRI | Yes |  |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| LGE | No | We think MBS relies on IP multicast rather than Ethernet. |

**Summary:** 17/22 companies agree that EHC can be used for MRB while 5/22 companies disagree.

**Proposal 11 (17/22): EHC is supported for MRB for cases when feedback path is available (UL RLC) and it is expected that no further optimizations are needed.**

## 2.4 Initial value of PTM RLC state variables

Regarding the initial value of PTM RLC state variables, it was agreed that

* Initialize the PTM RLC entity for an 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.

For groupcast and broadcast of NR sidelink communication, RX\_Next\_Highest is initially set to the SN of the first received UMD PDU containing an SN.

Similarly, for MRB PTM RLC entity, the RX\_Next\_Highest is initially set to the SN of the first received UMD PDU containing an SN.

**Q12: Do companies agree that for multicast PTM, the RX\_Next\_Highest is initially set to the SN of the first received UMD PDU containing an SN?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes | But what is the difference compared to current agreement? |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| TCL | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | To Nokia: the current agreement just says ‘according to’ which seems not so accurate for the specific initial value.  *Initialize the PTM RLC entity for an 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* |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| ETRI | Yes |  |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| LGE | Yes |  |

**Summary:** all companies (23/23) agree with Q12.

**Proposal 12 (23/23): for multicast PTM, the RX\_Next\_Highest is initially set to the SN of the first received UMD PDU containing an SN**

As summarized in [5], if the value of RX\_Next\_Reassembly and RX\_Next\_Highest are set to the same value, the same packet loss issue as PDCP may occur. That is, due to out-of-order delivery, 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 when the UE joins the MBS reception. RAN2 also agreed that the UE can be released to RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE when there is no data. When there is new data coming, the UE would enter RRC\_CONNECTED again and initiate PDCP entity, ***so packet loss would happen for each time when the UE enters RRC\_CONNECTED***.

While some companies suggest the same method as the PDCP, i.e., RX\_Next\_Reassembly should be set to a value smaller than the SN of the first received packet containing an SN. Some papers suggest that this part of packet loss can be left to PDCP, or not to optimize possible initial packet loss and indicate that when UE joins an ongoing MBS session delivered through UM RLC mode, the initial loss should be acceptable.

**Q13: Companies are kindly invited to provide their preference on the options:**

* **Option 1**: For multicast PTM, the initial value of RX\_Next\_Reassembly is set to a value before RX\_Next\_Highest.
* **Option 2**: For multicast PTM, the initial value of RX\_Next\_Reassembly is set to the same as RX\_Next\_Highest.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred Option** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Option 1 | For data loss reduction purpose, no matter it is late join or not. |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 |  |
| Kyocera | - | We have no strong view. We think it’s not a critical issue since it only happens in RLC UM mode, while we also think it’s better to minimize the packet loss as long as a minimum standardization effort is expected. |
| Ericsson | Option 2 | See earlier Qs |
| Futurewei | Option 1 |  |
| Samsung | Option 1 |  |
| Nokia | Option 2 | Could be left to UE implementation. |
| ZTE | Option 2 | No strong view. Both work. |
| CATT | Option 1 |  |
| TCL | Option 2 |  |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 or 2 | Can be left to UE implementation. |
| Sharp | Option 1 or left to UE implementation |  |
| Spreadtrum | Option 2 |  |
| Intel | Option 2 | As multicast PTM is using RLC UM only, initial loss is acceptable. |
| Fujitsu | Options 1 or 2 | Both work, but the question is which would be specified in 38.323. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 1 | To avoid the data loss, the initial value of RX\_Next\_Reassembly should be set before RX\_Next\_Highest. It is possible to leave the exact value of RX\_Next\_Reassembly to UE implementation. |
| vivo | Option 2 | The issue of the date loss mentioned above will not happen frequently, it is not urgent to solve it. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Option 1 | Option 1 is beneficial for 1) new joining UEs 2) the UE state transition from RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE to RRC\_CONNECTED. |
| MediaTek | Option 2 | We think at least data loss issue should be left to PDCP (and refer to Q10). |
| ETRI | Option 2 |  |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Option 1 |  |
| CMCC | Option 2 | Similar view as that in initial value setting in PDCP |
| LGE | Option 2 | There would not be many packets received out-of-order in MBS. |

**Summary: 12/23 companies are fine with option 1 and 13/23 companies are fine with option 2.**

**Proposal 13: FFS for multicast PTM, the initial value of RX\_Next\_Reassembly is set to a value before or the same as RX\_Next\_Highest.**

In the running CR [6], there is an FFS

*FFS whether some explicit indication is needed for the UE to know that an RLC entity is configured for PTM transmission.*

As discussed in Q13, the initial value of RX\_Next\_Highest and RX\_Next\_Reassembly are different for PTM RLC entity (the initial value is set according to the SN of the first received packet) and PTP RLC entity (the initial value is set as 0). From this point of view, the UE need to know which RLC entity is configured for PTM or PTP transmission. It would be better to have an explicit indication for UE to know that an RLC entity is configured for PTM transmission or PTP transmission.

**Q14: Do companies agree that an explicit indication is needed for the UE to know that an RLC entity is configured for PTM or PTP transmission?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred Option** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Yes | We are confused about the FFS in RRC running CR and the Q14, the RLC entity for both PTM and PTP are explicit configured in RRC and UE will know it. The LCID will be used to distinguish the PTP RLC or PTM RLC. |
| Qualcomm |  | If PTM RLC entity logical channel space is reserved, then there is no need to have explicit indicator. If LCID space is shared between DTCH and MTCH then some explicit indicator is needed. |
| Kyocera | - | We share the comments from OPPO and Qualcomm, and we think it depends on the outcome of Q17. |
| Ericsson | No | The handling in an RLC entity should be implicitly clear from receiving the MRB configuration (LCH-Id etc) |
| Futurewei | No | It should be already clear from RRC configuration that separate RLC entities are configured for PTM and PTP transmissions.  As in legacy, LCID is used to determine LCH of a received MAC subPDU. |
| Samsung | Yes | Initial values setup are different among PTM and PTP. |
| Nokia | - | Whether it can be implicitly derived from the configuration or needs to be explicitly signalled depends on a number of other factors (Q10, Q13 and Q17) |
| ZTE | No | Agree with Nokia.  For now we prefer no explicit indication is needed. |
| CATT | - | Agree with companies above that it can be implicitly indicated via the LCID value. |
| Xiaomi |  | Agree with Qualcomm. |
| Sharp |  | Same view a Qualcomm. |
| Spreadtrum |  | Agree with Qualcomm. |
| Intel | No explicit indication | UE can know whether the RLC entity is PTM or PTP at least from associated MAC/PHY configuration. |
| Fujitsu | No | Similar view as Qualcomm. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes/No | Whether an explicit indicator is needed seems to be depending on how LCID space is shared between DTCH and MTCH or whether there are special configuration configured for the PTM RLC leg. This can be discussed further. |
| vivo | No | In our understanding, whether an RLC entity is used for PTP/PTM transmission can be derived based on the RB/RLC configuration (e.g. the association between group common RNTI and RLC configuration, or the LCID value). |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes/No | We tend to agree with Qualcomm and Huawei. If LCID space is shared between DTCH and MTCH then some explicit indicator is needed. |
| MediaTek | No | RLC entity configuration should be indicated by RRC. Other details can be refer to Q17 |
| ETRI |  | Agree with Qualcomm. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | No | The RLC entity for PTM and the RLC entity for PTP use different logical channels. |
| CMCC | - | We share the comments from OPPO and Qualcomm, and we think it depends on the outcome of Q17. |
| LGE |  | How to configure MBS session, MRB, logical channels for MRB, G-RNTI and their relationships have not been discussed much. At this moment it’s not clear how UE knows which RLC entity is for PTM or PTP within an MRB. We’re open to discuss it including use of an explicit indication. |

**Summary:** Q14 relies on the discussion on LCID space. We can keep the FFS on this stage and no proposal is made.

## 2.5 RLC handling for RRC based MRB bearer type change

There are two main scenarios regarding RLC entity handling:

1. Split MRB <-> PTM only/PTP only MRB
2. PTM only <-> PTP only

For the case 1) RRC based bearer type change between split MRB and PTM only/PTP only MRB, it would be straight forward to use RLC entity establishment/release procedure to establish/release RLC entity. For example, when a split MRB is reconfigured to PTM only MRB, the RLC entity of PTP transmission should be released. When a PTP only MRB is reconfigured to a split MRB, the RLC entity of PTM transmission should be established.

For the case 2 RRC based bearer change between PTM only and PTP only, whether RLC entity re-establishment should be performed should be discussed. Since the PTM transmission can only be RLC-UM and PTP transmission can be RLC-AM, it wsuld be better not to perform RLC entity re-establishment. Instead, it could be simpler to perform RLC entity release and establishment. For example, when a PTM only MRB is reconfigured to a PTP only MRB, the RLC entity of PTM only MRB should be released and a new RLC entity should be established for PTP only MRB.

**Q15: Do companies agree that the RLC entity release and/or establishment procedures are performed during RRC based MRB bearer type change for PTM only <-> PTP only?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | No | Not sure how this is simplified. I.e RLC entity release and then RLC entity establishment. UE anyway need to reset and discard SDUs etc. |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| TCL | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Sharp | No | Same view as Ericsson. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | Since the PTM transmission can only be RLC-UM and PTP transmission can be RLC-AM, it would be better not to perform RLC entity re-establishment. Instead, it could be simpler to perform RLC entity release and establishment. |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| ETRI | Yes |  |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| LGE | Yes |  |

**Summary:** 21/23 companies’ answer is Yes wile 2/23 companies’ answer is no.

**Proposal 14 (21/23): the RLC entity release and/or establishment procedures are performed during RRC based MRB bearer type change for PTM only <-> PTP only.**

## 2.6 Bidirectional RLC configuration for PTP

There is remaining FFS on whether unidirectional or bidirectional UM RLC should be configured for PTP: **FFS both DL and UL UM RLC configuration for PTP**.

From rapporteur point of view, it can leave it to NW implementation to decide whether to configure a bidirectional UM RLC or DL only UM RLC for PTP transmission.

**Q16: Do companies agree that it is up to NW implementation to configure bidirectional UM RLC or DL only UM RLC for PTP transmission?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | If PDCP Status Report is configured by network then NW is expected to configure DL/UL RLC UM for PTP. |
| Kyocera | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | No | The rapporteur seems to assume UL UM RLC is already supported for PTP MBS bearer. If UL UM RLC is specified, it is up to network implementation if it is configured. However, since there is no UL data in MBS service, there is no need to specify UL UM RLC for MBS bearer. Not specifying UL UM RLC will simplify R17 specs works. |
| Samsung | No | Considering MBS use case, there is no UL data. So bi-directional UM RLC is not necessary. We don’t need to bring additional test case for useless option. |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes | Agree with rapporteur (i.e., leave it to network decision), the key issue here lies in Q4 |
| CATT | Yes | No need to limit the PTP UM to DL only. And it seems no extra effort is needed as this is to follow the unicast UM. |
| TCL | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Intel | No | We don’t think bidirectional UM RLC entity is useful for MBS since there is no uplink traffic. Therefore the possible configuration for UM PTP is DL only UM RLC. |
| Fujitsu | Yes | In the RAN2#115-e meeting, it was agreed that ROHC O/R mode can be used for MBS, for cases when feedback path is available. The NW should be able to configure bidirectional UM RLC or DL only UM RLC for PTP transmission at least for selecting ROHC mode (O/R mode or U-mode only). |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Bi-directional UM RLC is needed for header compression in case UM PTP is configured and feedback is required, e.g. for O-mode and R-mode ROHC. |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | We do not see any extra effort to support bi-directional RLC-UM. No need to make any limitation from standardization point of view. |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| ETRI | No | Agree with Samsung and Intel |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes | Although there is no UL data, PDCP SR in case of RLC UM requires UL RLC entity. |
| LGE | No | There may be no need for UM RLC for PTP transmission because no UL data is expected as mentioned. |

**Summary:** 18/23 companies agree that it is up to NW implementation to configure bidirectional UM RLC or DL only UM RLC for PTP transmission, while 5/23 companies disagree and do not think that bidirectional UM RLC entity is useful.

**Proposal 15 (18/23): bidirectional UM RLC configuration is supported for PTP transmission and it is up to NW implementation to configure bidirectional UM RLC or DL only UM RLC for PTP transmission.**

## 2.7 LCID ID Related Issues

**LCID space for multicast PTM**

n RAN2#115e, it was agreed that

* FFS whether to share common LCID space for Multicast PTM and Unicast DTCH. FFS How many PTM LCIDs to be reserved if separate space is used.

Proponents of shared LCID space between Multicast PTM and DTCH/DRB argue that in order to distinguish whether MAC SDUs in a MAC PDU by PTP retransmission in PHY are for MTCHs or DTCHs, the LCIDs for multicast MTCHs should be configured differently to LCIDs for DTCHs for a UE, which basically means that they should share a same LCID space. However, some companies think that HARQ soft combination are performed by L1 before identifying LCID other than using LCID. And separate LCID space enables simplified management of LCID allocation.

In RAN1#104, it was agreed that

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, if ACK/NACK based HARQ-ACK feedback is supported for PTM scheme 1, and if initial transmission for multicast is based on PTM transmission scheme 1, support retransmission(s) using PTP transmission.   * The HARQ process ID and NDI indicated in DCI is used to associate the PTM scheme 1 and PTP transmitting the same TB. |

In RAN1#105e, it was agreed that

|  |
| --- |
| For HARQ process management, further study whether/how to differentiate the HARQ process ID used for PTP (re)transmission for unicast and PTP retransmission for multicast. |

Above RAN1 agreement implies that the NW may need to allocate proper HARQ process ID and NDI so that the UE can distinguish PTP re-transmissions of MRB from DTCH/DRB. However, it seems RAN1 has not reached a firm agreement so far.

From Rapporteur perspective, both common LCID space and separate LCID space are possible solutions and HARQ soft combining is still possible even if separate LCID space is reserved. Whether separate LCID space can work relies on RAN1’s discussion on how to differentiate the PTP retransmission for PTM from unicast DTCH.

[Rapporteur]: it seems companies are not on the same page of definition of common and separate LCID spaces. As proposed in contributions the definitions are:

Common LCID space: LCIDs of PTP MRB/unicast DRB and PTM MRB are in the same LCID pool, in which a same LCID value cannot be used twice for both PTM MRB and PTP MRB/Unicast DRB.

Separate LCID space: LCIDs of PTP MRB/DRB and PTM MRB are in different LCID pool, in which a same LCID value can be used for twice for both PTM MRB and PTP MRB/Unicast DRB.

**Q17: Companies are invited to provide their preference on common LCID space or separate LCID space for Multicast PTM and Unicast DRB.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Common or separate LCID space** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Separate LCID space | 1. For common PDCP anchor-based architecture, it is reasonable to use a separate LCID space (i.e. the LCID for PTM and unicast are overlapped.) for PTM leg and unicast. 2. For PTP for PTM retransmission case, the LCID for PTP will share the same LCID space as RAN2 agreed. It is not clear whether the LCID is one for both PTM and PTP. If yes, we think the separate LCID is also OK and the PTP leg will share the LCID with DRB and the other part of LCID overlapped with unicast will not be used. |
| Qualcomm | Separate LCID space | LCID is used to uniquely identify RLC entity. In case of PTM RLC leg, G-RNTI based initial transmission and C-RNTI based Re-transmissions are transmitting same MAC TB and there is no issue of soft combining. Shared LCID space for MTCH and DTCH is not a requirement for HARQ soft combining.  MTCH is meant for group of UEs and DTCH is meant for UE specific. It is clean approach to have separate LCID space for MTCH and DTCH. |
| Kyocera | Separate LCID space | We see the future proofing, e.g., if Rel-18 will support SFN (among gNBs). |
| Ericsson | Separated/reserved | For a split bearer the LCID pertaining to the PTM RLC bearer is simpler to be separated/reserved as it ideally is common for a group of UEs. We think this also can accommodate soft combining pending RAN1 discussion. |
| Futurewei | Separate LCID space | Not sure if companies share similar understanding of “common vs. separate” LCID space. In our view, separate LCID space means that LCIDs of PTM and PTP transmissions don’t overlap. As in legacy system, LCID is used to determine the LCH of a received MAC subPDU. |
| Samsung | Separate LCID space |  |
| Nokia | Common LCID space | The following was already agreed at the last meeting:   * Multicast PTP and Unicast DTCH/DRB share common LCID space.   Common LCID space simplifies (HARQ) retransmission handling and allows multiplexing MRB PTP and unicast DRB in the same MAC PDU. Let us consider the following example (assuming the same HARQ process):  C-RNTI transmission indicating new data  Successful reception by the UE and HARQ ACK  G-RNTI transmission  UE fails to decode DCI and reports NACK  Network retransmits using C-RNTI  UE must assume that it missed the initial transmission because it successfully decoded TB for this HARQ process and NDI is not set but the UE does not know whether the initial transmission has been done with C-RNTI or G-RNTI.  If the LCID is same for PTP MRB/DRB and PTM MRB then the UE (MAC) does not know to what RLC entity to pass MAC SDU. |
| ZTE | Common (i.e., PTP MRB/DRB and PTM MRB share the same LCID space) | It seems companies are not on the same page of definition of common and separate LCID space, to us:  - common LCID space, LCHs of PTP MRB/DRB and PTM MRB are in the same LCID space, and the values of each is different to others.  - separate LCID space. LCHs of PTP MRB/DRB and PTM MRB are in different LCID space, which means the values of each can be the same.  We support common LCID space from UE perspective as it is the same MAC entity, fair enough to say a common LCID space for a MAC entity. |
| CATT | Separated LCID space | Separate LCID space can be used to identify the RLC entity. Regarding HARQ process soft combination, we think we leave this issue to RAN1. |
| Xiaomi | Separate LCID space |  |
| Sharp | Separate LCID space |  |
| Spreadtrum | Separate LCID space |  |
| Intel | Wait for RAN1 | As rapporteur noted that RAN1 is still discussing how UE can distinguish PTP re-transmissions of MRB from DTCH/DRB from HARQ process’s point of view. If this can be differentiated, then the issue mentioned by Nokia might not be a concern, and separate LCID space can be used. Otherwise usage of common LCID is beneficial to handle the missing of PDCCH which schedules initial transmission, as pointed out by Nokia. So we prefer to wait for RAN1 progress. |
| Fujitsu | Separate LCID space?? | If “separate LCID space” means LCIDs of PTM and PTP transmissions don’t overlap. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Common LCID space | Companies really have different understanding on the definition of common LCID space and separate LCID space. We generally agree with the definition from ZTE:  1/ common LCID space means that PTP and PTM LCHs are sharing the same LCID space and their values are unique;  2/ Separate/independent LCID space means that PTP and PTM LCHs are using independent LCID space and their values can be the same.  The issue mentioned by Nokia is valid in case of separate LCID spaces. In order to avoid this issue, the LCIDs for multicast MTCHs should be configured differently to LCIDs for DTCHs for a UE, which means a common LCID space. |
| vivo | Separate LCID space | In our understanding, LCID indices 1~32 can be used to identify an LCH belonging to DTCHs for DRBs, or DTCHs for multicast PTP transmission, or MTCHs for multicast PTM transmission. And then the network should guarantee that the LCIDs allocated for those LCHs shall be separate and individual. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Common LCID space | Agree with Huawei and Nokia that companies have different understanding on the definition. As rapp, I added some definition in the text for clarifications.  As mentioned by some companies above, we can leave the issue to RAN1. RAN2 can wait for RAN1 progress first. |
| MediaTek | Separated LCID space | In our understanding, Separated LCID space means DTCH and MTCH are not in the same LCID space, which the LCID of DTCH and MTCH can be overlapped. On the contrary, common LCID space means DTCH and MTCH use a same LCID space and have different values of LCID.  Separated LCID space can be used because MTCH and DTCH can be identified by different RNTI. Even if there is PTM HARQ retransmitted PDU scrambled by C-RNTI, it can still be identified by the same HARQ process id with PTM PDU.  Since PTP and unicast shared a common LCID space, and LCID for PTM is per MBS service. If common LCID space is used between multicast PTM and unicast DTCH, it means LCIDs will be shared between UEs and MBS services. This may have impacts to legacy unicast and LCID space may be extend. |
| ETRI | Separate LCID space |  |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Separate LCID space |  |
| CMCC | Separate LCID space |  |
| LGE | Separate LCID sapce |  |

**Summary:** since companies have different understanding on the definition of common/separate LCID space, rapporteur would like to have further discussion on Phase II.

**Q18: If separate LCID space is used, how many PTM LCIDs should be reserved?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Companies’ views** |
| OPPO | 32 as unicast. |
| Qualcomm | 32 |
| Kyocera | At most 32, as similar to LTE MBSFN. |
| Ericsson | Can be decided later but aim for similarities with legacy. |
| Futurewei | No strong view, legacy unicast number can be baseline. |
| Samsung | 8 is practically large. |
| CATT | 32 |
| Xiaomi | 32 |
| Sharp | 32 |
| Spreadtrum | 32 |
| Intel | This is related to the maximum number of logical channels per G-RNTI, and can be discussed later. |
| Fujitsu | Fine with 32 (in case of “separate” LCID space). |
| vivo | 32 as legacy. No spec changed is needed in our opinion. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | 32 seems a reasonable value range. |
| MediaTek | 32 as legacy unicast |
| ETRI | 32 |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Reuse the size of the LCID space for unicast session ( size: 32) as baseline because the same service types are supported by NR MBS.  More than 32 can be considered because the 1:N mapping between G-RNTI and MBS sessions may be supported. |
| CMCC | 32 |
| LGE | We think that number of PTM LCIDs should be defined based on how many MBS services can be provided in a cell. In LTE SC-PTM, the maximum number of SC-MTCHs in one cell is 1024. We think that NR MBS needs to support at least 1024 MTCHs. |

**Summary:** 32 are preferred by more companies.

**Proposal 16: If separate LCID space is used, 32 LCIDs are reserved for PTM.**

**eLCID for multicast PTM**

If common LCID space is used for Multicast PTM and Unicast DRB, many LCIDs can be consumed because LCIDs used for unicast cannot overlap with LCIDs used for Multicast PTM. From this perspective, eLCID may need to be supported.

**Q19: If common LCID space is used, do companies agree that eLCID is also applied to MRB PTM.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | No | No necessary. |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Yes | We think it’s beneficial, if common LCID space is used. |
| Ericsson | Yes | Should be supported |
| Futurewei | Yes | Not sure if companies share similar understanding of “common vs. separate” LCID space. In our view, separate LCID space means that LCIDs of PTM and PTP transmissions don’t overlap. As in legacy system, LCID is used to determine the LCH of a received MAC subPDU. Hence, more LCID may be needed to support PTM transmission. |
| Samsung | Yes | Agree with the rapporteur. If common LCID space is used, eLCID is inevitable. |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes | eLCID can be supported no matter which option, e.g., common or separate LCID space, is applied. |
| CATT | Yes | But it seems there is no need to specify anything on this as eLCID is a common function, it can be used by any feature or not, it can be up to NW implementation. |
| TCL | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Fujitsu | Yes?? | If “common” LCID space means many LCIDs are consumed. |
| Huawei | No | Currently eLCIDs are not used for RLC channel but only for MAC CEs.  Multicast is just a way of data delivery, which doesn’t increase the need of LCIDs. Note that even the legacy LCID space has not been fully used.  If an agreement is needed, we can say: eLCID is also applied to MAC CEs for MRB PTM (FFS MTCHs). |
| vivo | Yes | It seems the eLCID can be combined with MBS without specific normative work. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | As mentioned by Huawei, eLCID may be applied to MAC CEs for MRB PTM at least. |
| ETRI | Yes |  |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Wait for the decision on whether or not the LCID space sharing is supported. |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| LGE | Yes |  |

**Summary:** 20/23 companies agree eLCID should be used for MRB PTM. However, one companies thinks that eLCID can only be used for MAC CEs.

**Proposal 17: (20/23) If common LCID space is used, eLCID is applied to MRB PTM.**

## 2.8 one-to-many mapping between G-RNTI and MBS sessions

At RAN2#114 it was decided to support one-to-one mapping between G-RNTI and MBS session while leaving other mapping options FFS. A 1:1 mapping between G-RNTI and MBS session benefits the power consumption in the UE as it ensures the UE does not need to receive and decode MBS sessions it is not interested of. On the other hand, this results in complexity in the number of G-RNTIs that each UE needs to receive. Managing restrictions while keeping delay short and efficiency high will be difficult for the network [8]. Compared with the agreed one-to-one mapping between G-RNTI and MBS sessions, supporting one-to-many mapping between G-RNTI and MBS sessions may not introduce additional specification work. the mapping between G-RNTI and MBS sessions can be up to the network implementation based on specific deployment scenario, and there is no need to discuss and specify any restrictions for such mapping [9].

**Q20: Do companies agree to support one-to-many mapping between G-RNTI and MBS sessions assuming that this does not introduce additional specification work and adds flexible configuration for various deployment scenarios?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | No | In R17, we can only consider the basic case and only support one to one mapping between G-RNTI and MBS session. For the one to many mappings, we can consider it in R18.  Furthermore, whether there more cases that UE need to receive more MBS session simultaneously? |
| Qualcomm | Yes | In IIoT cases, often UEs are required to receive multiple services. It is more efficient for UE to receive multiple services by monitoring single G-RNTI and we do not see any specification complexity as well. It is upto network configuration, which services can be mapped to same G-RNTI. |
| Kyocera | No | We understand one-to-may mapping is allows flexibility from the NW point of view, but we assume it’s not optimal for UE power saving. |
| Ericsson | - | No strong view, however think this can up to gNB to use reasonably depending on Use Case (multiple services) |
| Futurewei | Yes | Not sure there is much benefit of limiting one-to-one mapping between G-RNTI and MBS session. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes | Does not restrict network behaviour to also use one-to-one mapping. |
| ZTE | No |  |
| CATT | - | OK to support it if the assumption is no additional specification work is needed, even though there is no clear motivation to support this in R17. |
| TCL | Yes | Agree with Nokia. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | Can be left to the gNB implementation. |
| Sharp | Yes | It can left for NW implementation and UE does not need to distinguish it is a 1-1 or 1-m mapping. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | It should be up to the gNB configuration. |
| Intel | No | One-to-multiple mapping between G-RNTI and MBS session should not be supported due to following reasons: 1) one UE cannot identify packets from the unified G-RNTI if it only receives a subset of MBS services mapped to this single G-RNTI; 2) Network may lose the advantage of scheduling with G-RNTI, if G-RNTI is mapped to multiple MBS session while each UE is registered to different combination of MBS services. |
| Fujitsu | Yes | Can be left to the gNB implementation and no there is no specification impact. |
| Huawei | Yes | Mapping between G-RNTI and MBS sessions can be up to network implementation. |
| vivo | Yes | Additionally, this kind of implementation helps to reduce UE’s PDCCH detection hypothesis when all the UEs are interested in the same MBS services. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | We can leave it to gNB implementation. |
| MediaTek | No |  |
| ETRI | - | No strong view, but OK to support it if the additional specification work is not required. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Yes |  |
| CMCC | No | It may cause scheduling restriction due to the combination of different MBS services and it is not power efficiency from UE point of view. |
| LGE | Yes |  |

**Summary:** 14/23 companies agree to support one-to-many mapping between G-RNTI and MBS sessions, 6/23 companies disagree, and 3/23 companies have not strong view.

**Proposal 17 (14/23): one-to-many mapping between G-RNTI and MBS sessions is supported and it is assumed that this does not introduce additional specification work.**

## 2.9 MBS DRX related issues

In RAN2#115e, the following agreements were made for multicast DRX:

* For multicast PTM transmission, Multicast DRX pattern is configured on a per G-RNTI basis (i.e. independent of legacy UE-specific DRX for unicast 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
* Multicast long DRX support is baseline for PTM. FFS whether to support optional short DRX or not.
* The Multicast Long DRX operation has to support the following parameters which are similar to the UE-specific DRX for unicast, where the last two parameters are needed if the HARQ- feedback is enabled:

- drx-onDurationTimerPTM

- drx-InactivityTimerPTM

- drx-LongCycleStartOffsetPTM

- drx-SlotOffsetPTM

- drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerDLPTM

- drx-RetransmissionTimerDLPTM

* For NR Broadcast, the DRX pattern is configured per G-RNTI.
* For NR Broadcast, DRX configuration includes: drx-onDurationTimerPTM, drx-SlotOffsetPTM, drx-InactivityTimerPTM, drx-CycleStartOffsetPTM.

**CG-PDCCH/G-RNTI and UE specific PDCCH/C-RNTI monitoring**

In RAN1#106e meeting, RAN1 reached a conclusion that

|  |
| --- |
| Conclusion:  The specification impact of having a new Type-x CSS for GC-PDCCH in RRC\_CONNECTED state can be studied and discussed further. |

That means that the PTM transmission is much possible to have a specific CSS. That means that the PTM transmission may very likely apply a specific CSS. In other words. GC-PDCCH/G-RNTI and UE specific PDCCH/C-RNTI may very likely apply different search spaces. Then, whether a UE needs to always monitor UE specific PDCCH/C-RNTI in Multicast DRX active time needs to be discussed. For a UE, the data transmission may have:

- PTM transmission, that is over GC-PDCCH scrambled by G-RNTI;

- PTP for PTM HARQ retransmission, that is over UE specific PDCCH scrambled by C-RNTI;

- PTP transmission and unicast transmission, that is over UE specific PDCCH scrambled by C-RNTI.

One possible issue is how the UE monitors UE specific PDCCH/C-RNTI in active time of multicast DRX:

- **Option 1:** the UE monitors UE specific PDCCH/C-RNTI when either *drx-onDurationTimerPTM* or *drx-InactivityTimerPTM* or *drx-RetransmissionTimerDLPTM* are running.

- **Option 2:** the UE monitors UE specific PDCCH/C-RNTI only when *drx-RetransmissionTimerDLPTM* is running. For example, when *drx-onDurationTimerPTM* and *drx-InactivityTimerPTM* are running but *drx-RetransmissionTimerDLPTM* is not running, the UE does not monito UE specific PDCCH/C-RNTI.

- **Option 3:** the UE monitors UE specific PDCCH/C-RNTI only during unicast DRX’s active time. Unicast DRX’s RTT timer can be started when PTP retransmission is expected.

**Q21: Companies are invited to provide their view on the options of how a UE monitors UE specific PDCCH/C-RNTI for possible PTP HARQ retransmission of PTM retransmission in active time of multicast DRX.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | None | We confused about the question, the UE monitor UE specific PDCCH/C-RNTI based on unicast DRX without considering the MBS DRX. The MBS DRX and unicast DRX are independent. |
| Qualcomm | Option 2 | In our view, new type X CSS used for GC-PDCCH scheduling. DCI format used for GC-PDCCH and PDCCH are not same. So, for C-RNTI based scheduling, UE has to monitor USS. During *drx-onDurationTimerPTM* or *drx-InactivityTimerPTM* timers running, GNB is expected to schedule Initial Transmissions using GC-PDCCH and no need for UE to monitor legacy UE specific USS/C-RNTI. |
| Kyocera | None | We share the same view with OPPO, i.e., the MBS DRX and unicast DRX are independent. So, we don’t think these should be mixed together, although we assume it’s possible these two independent active times may be overlapped. |
| Ericsson | - | We think the agreement is clear: “For multicast PTM transmission, Multicast DRX pattern is configured on a per G-RNTI basis (i.e. independent of legacy UE-specific DRX for unicast transmission).” |
| Futurewei | - | MBS DRX and unicast DRB can be done independently, and their active time periods are controlled by network configuration and operation. |
| Samsung | Option 3 | PTP retransmission is based on UE specific PDCCH addressed by C-RNTI, so we need to define this for unicast DL RTT and ReTx timers for multiple retransmission. Then, the UE can just monitor C-RNTI during unicast DRX’s active time, irrespective of MBS DRX status. In this context, we think Option 3 is a clean option.  Also, PTM initial transmission with C-RNTI is not needed. We think Option 1 is not needed. |
| Nokia | - | Agree with Oppo, Ericsson and Futurewei |
| ZTE | Option 1 | Why not if needed?  Allow UE to monitor PTP transmission (for DRB, PTP of MRB, or even SRB/UL grant) is beneficial for better network scheduling flexibility and lower scheduling latency. |
| CATT | - | Agree with companies above that it is clear that MBS DRX and unicast DRX are independent. |
| TCL | - | Agree with companies above: MBS DRX and unicast DRX are independent. |
| Xiaomi |  | We prefer to follow the LTE baseline, i.e. the MBS DRX does not impact the UE monitoring of the C-RNTI PDCCH. |
| Sharp | Option 3 | MBS DRX and unicast DRX are independent and the unicast DRX is applied to MBS PTP. So, in order to trigger UE to monitor C-RNTI for retransmission via PTP of a transmission via PTM, Unicast DRX’s RTT timer needs to be started. Otherwise, UE may not monitor C-RNTI for the retransmission if the two independent active times do not overlapped. |
| Spreadtrum | Option 3 | MBS DRX and unicast DRX are independent.  The unicast DRX needs to be modified for the PTP of PTM HARQ retransmission. |
| Intel | Option 3 | PTP retransmission can occur under two scenarios: 1) PTP initial transmission; 2) PTM initial transmission (PTM transmission scheme 1 in RAN1). Hence, we suggest option 3 to be revised into:  “the UE monitors UE specific PDCCH/C-RNTI only during unicast DRX’s active time. Unicast DRX’s RTT timer can be started when PTP retransmission for either PTP initial transmission or PTM initial transmission is expected.” |
| Fujitsu | Option 3 | But it is better to first discuss if MBR DRX and unicast DRX are independent. |
| Huawei | Option 3 or 2 | The agreement mentioned by Ericsson means that the multicast PTM DRX should be independent from the unicast DRX, that is correct.  On the other hand, the unicast DRX operation may be affected by the multicast PTM transmission, considering the C-RNTI based retransmission. This issue has been discussed for several meetings, so I guess it is already clear to everyone.  If C-RNTI based retransmission for PTM packets is enabled, it is not reasonable to wait the unicast DRX-ON opportunity to perform C-RNTI based retransmission, and if we do so, it largely disables such function in case there is no unicast data transmission. So we think C-RNTI monitoring has to be activated when UE fails to receive PDSCH for PTM scheduling such as ways proposed in option 2 or option3.  Regarding on the options, we slight prefer option3 as it would be better if the UE could maintain legacy unicast DRX mechanism, i.e. monitor C-RNTI only during unicast DRX’s active time. In order for the UE to receive the DCI scheduling retransmission by PTP transmission which is initially transmitted by PTM, unicast DRX should enter active time after UE fails to receive PDSCH for PTM scheduling/MBS SPS transmission. |
| vivo | Option 2 | As L1 level PTM/PTP HARQ retransmission can be supported, to facilitate retransmission scheduling, it seems a spontaneous logic to supporting C-RNTI PDCCH monitoring for L1 PTP HARQ retransmission when *drx-RetransmissionTimerDLPTM* is running. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Option 2/3 | The MBS data transmission may include:  - case 1: PTM transmission, that is over GC-PDCCH scrambled by G-RNTI;  - case 2: PTP for PTM HARQ retransmission, that is over UE specific PDCCH scrambled by C-RNTI;  - case 3: PTP transmission and unicast transmission, that is over UE specific PDCCH scrambled by C-RNTI.  It is clear that case 1 uses MBS DRX and case 3 uses unicast DRX. However, it is not clear for case 2. And the current agreements made in last meeting only cover case 1 and case 3.  According to RAN1’s discussion, a new type X CSS will be used for GC-PDCCH, which means that GC-PDCCH and UE specific PDCCH apply different search spaces. Option 2 and 3 have better power saving performance than option 1.  Option 3 seems mixing up the multicast DRX operation and unicast DRX operation, which also needs some standard effort. Whether and how to use drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerDLPTM and drx-RetransmissionTimerDLPTM in option 3 needs further discussion. |
| MediaTek | Option 2/3 | At least Option 1 is not needed because PTM initial transmission is always scrambled by G-RNTI.  No strong preference between option 2/3. |
| ETRI | Option 3 | Agree with Intel |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Option 2 | UE needs to monitor C-RNTI for the possible retransmission of a PTM TB over PTP mode.  PTM DRX’s RTTI timer may be different from Unicast DRX’s RTT timer of UE. Furthermore, different UEs may have different DRX configurations.  Option 3 seems not suitable because PTM DRX’s RTTI timer and Unicast DRX’s RTT timer may usually be different. |
| SJTU | Option 3 | Agree with companies above: MBS DRX and unicast DRX are independent.  The unicast DRX needs to be modified considering the PTP HARQ retransmission of PTM. |
| CMCC | Option 2 | RAN1 agreed to perform PTP retransmission for a PTM transmission, therefore UE need to monitor C-RNTI in Multicast DRX active time. |
| LGE | Option 3 | UE monitors UE specific PDCCH/C-RNTI for PTP and unicast during unicast and PTP DRX’s active time. PDCCH for PTP retransmission can be monitored in the same way. If DRX for PTP works without considering PTP retransmission, there may be large latency for PTP retransmission. If DRX’s RTT timer for PTP and unicast can be started when PTP retransmission is expected, PTP retransmission can be performed on time. |

**Summary:** Since the issue was further clarified during email discussion, Rapporteur would prefer to have a further discussion on Phase II.

**Short DRX cycle and DRX Command MAC CE**

There are following FFSs have been identified:

* FFS whether to support optional short DRX or not.
* FFS to support DRX Command MAC CE for MBS DRX [10].

**Q22: Companies are invited to provide their view on whether to support optional short DRX cycle for multicast DRX?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Not support | We can not see the necessary to support the short DRX. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Depending on traffic pattern and latency requirements, short DRX will be helpful. This allows UE to get into short duration sleep , wakeup quickly and enables to reduce UE power consumption. Example: Short DRX can be very useful to provide MCPTT (Voice) type of services using Multicast mode. Since Short DRX is optional, it is upto NW to configure based on application traffic pattern and latency requirements. |
| Kyocera | No | We don’t see the benefit of short DRX in MBS traffics. |
| Ericsson | Probably no | We do not expect a strong benefit of having a short DRX for the type for MBS, which is in the DL only. Furthermore, the short DRX may be optional for the UE, and it is not clear how that would work with this group DRX. |
| Futurewei | No | It doesn’t seem critical in MBS. |
| Samsung | No | We think it’s not clear how gNB deduces there is a short interruption in data flow. Even if it is possible, the gain of the short cycle is not clear. |
| Nokia | Support | Useful for mission critical services (e.g. MC PTT). |
| ZTE | Probably no. | Beneficial since MBS in Rel-17 is not GBR only, however prefer not support short DRX to reduce complexity. |
| CATT | No | Short DRX cycle is beneficial to the traffic which is sporadic, for example, interaction messages. The UE can wake up with shorter periodicity to monitor potential DL transmission to improve the latency performance. However, in MBS, the characteristic of traffic is stable without obvious volatility. So the benefits of short DRX in MBS are marginal. |
| Xiaomi | No | We prefer to reduce the UE complexity of not supporting many short-DRX(s) per service. |
| Spreadtrum | No | It is not necessary to introduce the short DRX. |
| Intel | No |  |
| Fujitsu | Yes | It can be up to gNB implementation. gNB can configure if short DRX would be used. However, it is also ok with no support of short DRX. |
| Huawei | No | Besides what others mentioned above, introducing short DRX cycles to PTM may cause mismatch between different UEs of a group in case some UEs may fail to decode PTM scheduling, and would cause more problems. |
| vivo | No | we think the short DRX cycle is generally intended for time-varying arrival intervals of burst data. For the typically multicast service (e.g. video streaming), we assume the traffic characteristic is predictable. In this sense, the short cycle parameters might be not essential for multicast PTM transmission. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Probably no | We have no strong opinion. In order to reduce complexity, it could be better not to support short DRX for MBS. |
| MediaTek | Yes | Shared the same view with Qualcomm. |
| ETRI | Yes | It’s optional and useful for some use cases. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Yes | We think it’s better to support short DRX cycle for PTM bearer of MBS session. But the corresponding IE can be “optional” to give the network the flexibility to adjust the DRX configuration for different MBS service types. |
| SJTU | Yes | It’s useful for some use cases, such as MCPTT (Voice) type of services using Multicast mode. Since Short DRX is optional, it is up to NW to configure it or not. |
| NERCDTV | Yes | Shared the same view with Qualcomm. |
| CMCC | - | No strong view, depend on the traffic pattern of MBS service. |
| LGE | No |  |

**Summary:** 14/23 companies prefer not to have short DRX cycle for multicast DRX, 8/23 companies prefer to have short DRX cycle for multicast DRB, and 1 company have no strong view.

**Proposal 18 (14/23): short DRX cycle is not supported for multicast DRX.**

**Q23: Companies are invited to provide their view on whether to support DRX Command MAC CE for multicast DRX.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Not sure | In R16, dual DRX is introduced and the DRX command is common for both DRX group.  We are not sure how to impact the spec if we support DRX command for MBS DRX. |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Yes | We’re fine to support DRX Command MAC CE, for UE power saving. |
| Ericsson | Not sure | In any case we need to clarify how the DRX command works when MBS is configured. It would be odd if the DRX command would only put the unicast DRX to sleep? |
| Futurewei | No | The benefit doesn’t seem significant, while there are complexity risks. |
| Samsung | No | We think it’s not clear how gNB deduces there is a short interruption in data flow. Even if it is possible, the gain is not clear |
| Nokia | Yes | Only if Short DRX is agreed. |
| ZTE | Not sure. | “multicast DRX” itself is vague, lets deal with previous questions first. |
| CATT | No | DRX MAC CE command is used to indicate the UE to go to sleep. It is helpful to reduce power consumption especially when the network is aware of there is no downlink transmission. However, it has been agreed that one-to-one mapping between G-RNTI and MBS session. So one question is that when the UE received DRX MAC CE command indicated by one DCI which is scrambled by one G-RNTI, how to define the UE behavior?  One option is stop PDCCH monitoring for the corresponding G-RNTI. But if there are multiple MBS sessions, the network has to send multiple DRX MAC CE commands. This brings higher consumption on PDCCH. So this option is not acceptable.  The other option is to stop PDCCH monitoring for all MBS sessions. But the MBS sessions for different UEs may be different. If the other UEs stopsPDCCH monitoring for all MBS sessions after receiving one DRX command MAC CE, they may lost MAC PDUs for other ongoing MBS sessions. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | We think this is beneficial when the gNB wants to temporarily suspend a MBS service transmission due to high traffic load. |
| Spreadtrum | Not sure | It seems the benefit is not significant. |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Fujitsu | Yes | It can be up to gNB implementation. gNB can send DRX MAC CE if DRX would be used. However, it is also ok with no support of short DRX. |
| Huawei | No | Not essential. |
| vivo | Yes | It is beneficial for UE power saving under the case that there are no available MBS packets for a short moment. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Not sure | We may need to discuss that   1. whether the current DRX MAC CE is applied to multicast DRX or not; 2. whether new DRX MAC CE should be introduced for multicast DRX; and whether it is per-G-RNTI basis or it is common for all multicast DRX operations. |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| ETRI | Yes |  |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Yes | During the past RAN2 meetings, the no-data duration of a multicast session exists. Making UE into RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE is possible solution. Another possible solution is to reconfigure the DRX cycle of the PTM bearer of the MBS session with a larger DRX period. Therefore DRX MAC CE is needed. |
| SJTU | Yes | It is useful for power saving when MBS packets arrive in low frequency. And it should be further studied whether new DRX MAC CE should be introduced for multicast DRX, and whether it is per-G-RNTI basis or it is common for all multicast DRX operations. |
| NERCDTV | Yes | It is beneficial for UE power saving. gNB can send DRX MAC CE if DRX would be used. |
| CMCC | Not sure | Though it may help to UE power saving, it is not clear how to use. |
| LGE | No | The gain does not seem much. |

**Summary:** according to the feedback from companies, rapporteur prefer to have further discussion in phase II.

**Timers setting in case of HARQ ACK/NACK feedback**

As discussed in [7], when HARQ ACK/NACK feedback is configured, it is possible that gNB may configure UE specific PUCCH resources in different slots. In Unicast DRX, UE starts HARQ RTT timer after PUCCH NACK transmission. In case of Multicast HARQ ACK/NACK feedback, to align the start of RTT timer for each Multicast UE (due to different timing of PUCCH resources for different UEs), it is desirable to have a common HARQ RTT start timer. The key reason to have common start time for RTT timer is to align DL DRX Re-transmission timer for all UEs which enables the gNB to trigger re-transmission within common DL RTT Re-transmission timer.

In case of ACK/NACK feedback based on UE specific PUCCH resources, to align start time of HARQ RTT timer for multiple UEs, we can consider following options.

**Option 1:** gNB may configure RTT and DL Re-transmission timer to take different UE feedback time into account as gNB implementation.

**Option 2:** gNB may indicate UEs to start RTT timer at the end of GC-PDCCH/GC-PDSCH reception and UEs still trigger RTT timer after UE specific PUCCH resource based NACK transmission, while RTT timer counts from multicast group GC-PDCCH/GC-PDSCH reception.

**Option 3:** UEs start RTT timer at the end of GC-PDCCH/GC-PDSCH reception.

**Q24: For Multicast HARQ ACK/NACK feedback using UE specific PUCCH resources, companies are asked which option should be adopted.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option 1/2/3** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | None | We agree that PUCCH resource is configured per UE. However, the network can configure the PUCCH resource only for MBS feedback for UE aligned among UEs in this MBS group. Anyway, it is up to network implementation. |
| Qualcomm | Option 2 | It is key to have RTT timer start for all Multicast UEs is aligned. If UEs start RTT timer after UE specific PUCCH transmission, different UEs will have different time instances of RTT timer expiry and DL Re-Transmission timers will not be aligned. This can cause some UEs missing DL HARQ Re-Transmissions. |
| Kyocera | (Option 1) | We have no strong view, but we assume it can be handled by NW implementations. |
| Ericsson |  | Not sure any solution is required |
| Futurewei | None | No need of any solution, unless requested by RAN1. |
| Samsung | Option 3 | We prefer to have a common mechanism for three possible cases: 1) UE-specific ACK/NACK 2) NACK-only FB 3) No FB.  Since there is the case that no feedback resource is configured, or feedback is disabled Option 1 is not feasible for this case.  Option 3 is the simplest option.  Option 2 is unnecessarily complicated and it is actually same as Option 3 (as triggering RTT timer means nothing and RTT timer start needs to be done at GC-PDCCH/PDSCH reception)  Also, we assume this question is only for the case that PTM retransmission is expected (or configured). If PTP retransmission is expected, we assume unicast DRX timer can be started.  For example:  PTP Retransmission is expected (or configured):  - UE receives GC-PDCCH - start unicast RTT timer  - UE receives PDCCH (PTP ReTx) - start unicast RTT timer  PTM Retransmission is expected (configured):  - UE receives GC-PDCCH - start PTM RTT timer  - UE receives GC-PDCCH (PTM ReTx) - start PTM RTT timer |
| Nokia | Option 1 / None | In our opinion, Option 1 is similar to none. |
| ZTE | Option 1. |  |
| CATT | - | Common start time for RTT timer is simple, but it is up to NW implementation. |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 |  |
| Sharp | Option 1 | We think this could be handled by NW implementation. |
| Spreadtrum | Option 1 |  |
| Intel | Option 1 | This could be realized by network implementation by considering different UE’s situation. |
| Fujitsu | Option 1/3 | Option 1 can leave NW configuration freedom. Option 3 provides common mechanism. |
| Huawei | Option 3 | In some cases, the gNB may have difficulties to configure proper values to take into account PUCCH configurations of different UEs. If a solution is needed, we think option 3 is much simpler than option2. |
| vivo | Option 1 | This option is a practical NW implementation without spec impact. It should be allowed. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Option 1/None |  |
| MediaTek | Option 1/2 |  |
| ETRI | None | It is up to NW implementation. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Option 3 |  |
| CMCC | Option 1 |  |
| LGE | Option 1 / None | We agree with Nokia.  In addition, it’s for PTM retransmission. PTP retransmission can be handled in different manner. |

**Summary:** 16/22 companies prefer option 1 or none solution.4/22 companies are fine with option 3. 2/22 companies support option 2**.**

**Proposal 19 (16/22): it is up to network implementation on how to configure DL RTT and Re-transmission timer of multicast DRX in case of multicast HARQ ACK/NACK feedback using UE specific PUCCH resources.**

**Timers setting in case of NACK only feedback**

For group common PTM Multicast HARQ PUCCH resources (NACK only feedback), the same group of UEs have aligned HRAQ RTT and DL Re-Tx timer configuration. HARQ RTT timer counting starts from end of common PUCCH resource based NACK transmission.

**Q25: Do companies agree that for group common PTM Multicast HARQ PUCCH resources (NACK only feedback), the same group of UEs have aligned HRAQ RTT and DL Re-Tx timer configuration. HARQ RTT timer counting starts from end of common PUCCH resource based NACK transmission (i.e. same as Unicast DRX behaviour)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Alternatively, we can have common solution for Q24 and Q25. i..e in case of Multicast DRX, RTT timer can start from GC-PDCCH/GC-PDSCH independent of ACK/NACK based or NACK only based mechanism. |
| Kyocera | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| Samsung | No | We prefer to have a common mechanism for three possible cases: 1) UE-specific ACK/NACK 2) NACK-only FB 3) No FB configured or disabled FB.  Option 3 in Q24 can be applied for this case.  Also, we’d like to clarify the scenario with common PUCCH resources (NACK only FB): In this scenario, NW cannot know which UEs reported NACK and require for retransmission. Thus in this scenario, we assume how to support PTM retransmission, not PTP retransmission. |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Fujitsu | Yes | This is MBS, so that common mechanism for group UEs look good from gNB perspective. |
| Huawei | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes | In this case, NW typically would use L1 PTM HARQ retransmission for a group of UEs. In this sense, we don’t see the need to introduce UE-specific operations. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| ETRI | Yes |  |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| LGE | Yes |  |

**Summary:** 22/23 companies agree the Q25**.**

**Proposal 20 (22/23): For group common PTM Multicast HARQ PUCCH resources (NACK only feedback), the same group of UEs have aligned HRAQ RTT and DL Re-Tx timer configuration. HARQ RTT timer counting starts from end of common PUCCH resource based NACK transmission (i.e. same as Unicast DRX behaviour).**

## 2.10 PDCP/RLC configuration for broadcast

In [4], it is proposed that PDCP is need for supporting unidirectional DL RoHC functionality, re-ordering function, duplicating detection/discarding for a broadcast MRB. And in the running CR [6], there are FFS:

- For broadcast, it is FFS whether sn-FieldLength (for RLC) and pdcp-SN-SizeDL parameters are configurable or predefined in specifications (related UE capabilities should be considered).

- Editor’s note: For broadcast, it is FFS whether t-Reassembly (in RLC configuration) and t-Reordering (in PDCP configuration) are needed, e.g. considering whether out of sequence reception can happen as there is no HARQ feedback for broadcast.

- Editor’s note: For broadcast, it is FFS whether ROHC, when enabled by the network, has a predefined configuration or ROHC parameters are configurable by the network.

From rapporteur point of view, it is straightforward to support PDCP related functionalities including unidirectional DL RoHC functionality, re-ordering function, duplicating detection/discarding as well as RLC segmentation function for broadcast MRB.

**Q26: Companies are invited to provide their view on for broadcast MRB, whether *sn-FieldLength* (for RLC) and *pdcp-SN-SizeDL* parameters are configurable or predefined in specifications.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Yes | We are fine to both configurable and predefined. No strong opinion. |
| Qualcomm | May be pre-defined |  |
| Kyocera | Yes | We slightly prefer these parameters are configurable. |
| Ericsson | Yes | Default parameters can be predefined with configuration optionally provided. |
| Futurewei | Pre-defined | Not sure there is much benefit to make them configurable with additional signalling overhead. |
| Samsung | No | Considering limited size of MCCH, we think pre-configured value is better. |
| Nokia | Yes | Agree with Ericsson. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes | Agree with Ericsson. |
| TCL | Yes | Agree with Ericsson, Nokia and CATT. |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Intel | Configurable | We think network can have the flexibility to configure the SN length. |
| Fujitsu | Yes | Agree with Ericsson. |
| Huawei | configurable with default values | Agree with Ericsson. |
| vivo | Pre-defined | Similar to the LTE mechanism, default sn-FieldLength (for RLC) and pdcp-SN-SizeDL can be predefined for broadcast. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | Agree with Ericsson. |
| MediaTek | Yes | Agree with Ericsson. |
| ETRI | Yes | Agree with Ericsson. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Yes | Agree with Ericsson |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| LGE | Pre-defined |  |

**Proposal 21: for broadcast MRB, the *sn-FieldLength* (for RLC) and *pdcp-SN-SizeDL* parameters are predefined with configuration optionally provided.**

**Q27: Companies are invited to provide their view on for broadcast MRB, whether t-Reassembly (in RLC configuration) and t-Reordering (in PDCP configuration) are needed.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Not sure | We are not sure whether it is useful when UE support to receive the MBS data from non-serving cell. |
| Qualcomm | May be yes | Strictly speaking, not necessary but to keep same implementation, we can allow to use timers and configure differently for Broadcast and Unicast. |
| Kyocera | Yes | We slightly prefer to have these configurations. |
| Ericsson | Maybe | Not really required but can be considered to cover future Use Cases or overload. Complexity for supporting this is limited. |
| Futurewei | Not needed | Not sure there is much benefit to make them configurable with additional signalling overhead. |
| Samsung | No | If out-of-order reception does not occur, such timer values do not need to be configurable. |
| Nokia | Maybe | Segmentation requires *t-reassembly* but could be left to UE implementation in case of broadcast.  Out of order delivery from RLC requires *t-reordering.* Not needed if only one HARQ process is always configured (pending RAN1 discussion). |
| ZTE | Yes | There might be multiple HARQ process with different property, e.g., SPS, or QoS (blind re-transmission).  In case of multiple HARQ process, to ensure higher bandwidth utilization, such multiple HARQ process could result in out of order delivery.  Therefore PDCP reordering is needed. |
| CATT | Maybe not | For broadcast MRB, there is no HARQ retransmission and L2 retransmission, so it seems that out-of-order does not happen. |
| Xiaomi | Maybe | This depends on whether the broadcast MBS would support multiple HARQ processes and HARQ retransmission. |
| Spreadtrum | Maybe yes | If out-of-order reception will occur, these configurations are needed. |
| Intel | Both timer can be pre-defined to 0 ms. | It is expected that in Rel-17, HARQ feedback for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE is not defined by RAN1, therefore HARQ might not be applicable for broadcast mode. So *t-Reassembly* and *t-Reordering* can be pre-defined to 0 ms. |
| Fujitsu | Yes | Perhaps, supporting t-Reassembly and t-Reordering can minimize specification impact because of just reusing existing procedure. |
| Huawei | Yes for T-Reassembly,  No for t-reordering | T-Reassembly is needed as segmentation is possible at the transmitter side and at the receiver side reassembly is needed. T-reordering is not needed as out-of-order will not happen at MAC/PHY for broadcast given that there is no feedback and retransmission. |
| vivo | Comments | If out-of-order reception happens, the *t-reassembly* and *t-reordering* timer may be needed. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Maybe | t-Reassembly is needed for RLC segmentation and reassemble.  The need of t-Reordering is depending on whether multiple HARQ process is supported for broadcast or not. |
| MediaTek | Not sure | HARQ is not supported for broadcast at least in R17. Maybe we can consider it in R18. |
| ETRI | Maybe not | Out-of-order reception does not occur for broadcast MRB. However, if HARQ/L2 retransmission is introduced, these configurations are needed. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech |  | Agree with Huawei |
| CMCC | Maybe not | Out-of-order reception does not happen since HARQ/L2 retransmission is not supported in broadcast. |
| LGE | Not needed | Pre-defined value can be used for t-Reassembly (in RLC configuration). We think that PDCP re-ordering function is not needed. |

**Proposal 22: for broadcast MRB, the t-Reassembly (in RLC configuration) are predefined with configuration optionally provided. FFS on t-Reordering (in PDCP configuration).**

**Q28: Companies are invited to provide their view on for broadcast MRB, whether ROHC, when enabled by the network, has a predefined configuration or ROHC parameters are configurable by the network.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Yes | We are fine to both configurable and predefined. No strong opinion. |
| Qualcomm | May be pre-defined |  |
| Kyocera | Yes | We slightly prefer ROHC parameters are configurable. |
| Ericsson | Yes | Default parameters can be predefined with configuration optionally provided. |
| Futurewei | Pre-defined | Not sure there is much benefit to make them configurable with additional signalling overhead. |
| Samsung | Pre-defined | Efficient for smaller-size of MCCH |
| Nokia | Yes | Agree with Ericsson. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes | Agree with Ericsson. |
| TCL | Yes | Agree with Ericsson, Nokia and CATT. |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Intel | Configured by network | Our understanding is that ROHC U mode can be use for broadcast MRB, and gNB can configure *maxCID* and ROHC profiles. Given that uplink is not available for broadcast mode, some ROHC profiles in TS 38.323 Table 5.7.1-1 might not be applicable e.g. profile 0x0006 (TCP/IP). |
| Fujitsu | Yes | Agree with Ericsson. |
| Huawei | configurable with default values | Agree with Ericsson. |
| vivo | Yes, Pre-defined | ROHC configuration is highly related to the UE capability, i.e. the supported ROHC profiles and the maximum number of supported CID. Then, considering that broadcast service is oriented to different UEs, it may be difficult for NW to configure suitable ROHC parameters, especially in the case that the UE capability is not reported. Thus, it is better to predefine ROHC configuration. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | Agree with Ericsson: Default parameters can be predefined with configuration optionally provided |
| MediaTek | Yes | Agree with Ericsson. |
| ETRI | Yes |  |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Yes | Agree with Ericsson |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| LGE | Pre-defined |  |

**Proposal 23: for broadcast MRB, when enabled by the network, RoHC parameters are predefined with configuration optionally provided.**

## 2.10 HARQ, Group Common SPS and CFR

Since RAN1 is actively discussing these topics, Rapporteur suggests to wait for RAN1 discussion conclusion.

## 2.11 other issues

**Q29:** Besides the issues listed above, are there any other issues which need to be discussed in this email discussion.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Other issues which need to be discussed** |
| Kyocera | Related to section 2.2, we wonder how PDCP layer handles the data packets, when the UE receives the packets before the HFN initialization (e.g., discarding these packets?), and also wonder if it’s an issue to be discussed.  [Rapporteur]: it is related to the discussion on HFN initial value. Perhaps, we can wait for the concussion on HFN initial value first. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | 1. Can MCCH specific SIB (just as SIB20 in LTE) be area specific, which means MCCH has the same configuration in a cell group. For example, the cell group consists of cells of the same Gnb-DU. UE has no need to read the MCCH specific SIB in a new cell within the area and acquire MCCH directly in the new cell. 2. Can MBS service continuity specific SIB (just as SIB15 in LTE) be area specific? 3. Can the PTM bearer of an MBS session be area specific, where UE can use the configuration information of the PTM bearer of the MBS session in the source cell to receive the same MBS session in the target cell at the edge of the source cell? 4. For the content of MCCH change notification, can N extra bits with each bit associated with a MBS type/group be used to indicate which MBS type/group has configuration updated to reduce the power consumption in UE?   [Rapporteur]: above issues seem CP related and out of scope of this email discussion. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 3 Phase I Conclusion

Based on the discussion, we firstly have a set of potential proposals for RAN2 agreements:

**PDCP handling for RRC based MRB bearer type change:**

**Proposal 1 (23/23): A common PDCP entity is used for RRC based MRB bearer type change between PTM only MRB, PTP only MRB and split MRB.**

**Proposal 2 (23/23): PDCP entity reestablishment is allowed for the MRB during handover or RRC based MRB bearer type change, if RoHC continuity is not configured. When to configure PDCP entity re-establishment is a network implementation.**

**Proposal 3 (23/23): It is up to gNB implementation on how to perform PDCP data recovery for RRC based MRB bearer type change and there is expected that no extra standard effort.**

**Proposal 4 (17/23):**

**- In order to minimize the loss during MRB bearer type change, NW may configure UE to send a PDCP status report for the MRB bearer type change;**

**- For MRB configured by upper layers to send a PDCP status report in the uplink (field *statusReportRequired* in PDCP-Config IE in RRC), the receiving PDCP entity shall trigger a PDCP status report in case of MRB type change;**

**- NW is required to configure a bidirectional PTP leg (e.g. either PTP-only MRB or split MRB) if *statusReportRequired* is provided. It is up to network in which case *statusReportRequired* is configured.**

**Proposal 5: If PDCP SR is supported for RRC based MRB bearer type change, it is FFS on whether the legacy triggers of PDCP SR (as ‘upper layer requests a PDCP data recovery’ or ‘upper layer requires a PDCP entity re-establishment’) are reused or new trigger(s) of PDCP status report should be defined.**

**Initial value of PTM PDCP state variables**

**Proposal 6 (19/22): the initial value of HFN is indicated by the gNB in condition that RAN2 agrees that PDCP SR is performed during RRC based MRB bearer type change.**

**Proposal 7 (11/22): WA: If the initial value of HFN is indicated by gNB, HFN desynchronization between UE and NW should be avoided by NW implementation, thus no specification impact.**

**Proposal 8 (15/22): If the initial value of HFN is indicated by gNB, the initial value of HFN is indicated by RRC signalling, e.g. in the *PDCP-Config* IE.**

**Proposal 9 (22/22): for multicast MRB, the initial value of the SN part of RX\_NEXT is (x +1) modulo (2[*PDCP-SN-Size*]), where x is the SN of the first received PDCP Data PDU.**

**Proposal 10 (15/22): the initial value of RX\_DELIV is set to a value before RX\_NEXT, e.g. the initial value of the SN part of RX\_DELIV is (x – 0.5 × 2[*PDCP-SN-Size*–1]) modulo (2[*PDCP-SN-Size*]), where x is the SN of the first received PDCP Data PDU.**

**Ethernet header compression for MRB**

**Proposal 11 (17/22): EHC is supported for MRB for cases when feedback path is available (UL RLC) and it is expected that no further optimizations are needed.**

**Initial value of PTM RLC state variables**

**Proposal 12 (23/23): for multicast PTM, the RX\_Next\_Highest is initially set to the SN of the first received UMD PDU containing an SN**

**Proposal 13: FFS for multicast PTM, the initial value of RX\_Next\_Reassembly is set to a value before or the same as RX\_Next\_Highest.**

**RLC handling for RRC based MRB bearer type change**

**Proposal 14 (21/23): the RLC entity release and/or establishment procedures are performed during RRC based MRB bearer type change for PTM only <-> PTP only.**

**Bidirectional RLC configuration for PTP**

**Proposal 15 (18/23): bidirectional UM RLC configuration is supported for PTP transmission and it is up to NW implementation to configure bidirectional UM RLC or DL only UM RLC for PTP transmission.**

**LCID ID Related Issues**

**Proposal 16: If separate LCID space is used, 32 LCIDs are reserved for PTM.**

**Proposal 17: (20/23) If common LCID space is used, eLCID is applied to MRB PTM.**

**one-to-many mapping between G-RNTI and MBS sessions**

**Proposal 17 (14/23): one-to-many mapping between G-RNTI and MBS sessions is supported and it is assumed that this does not introduce additional specification work.**

**MBS DRX related issues**

**Proposal 18 (14/23): short DRX cycle is not supported for multicast DRX.**

**Proposal 19 (16/22): it is up to network implementation on how to configure DL RTT and Re-transmission timer of multicast DRX in case of multicast HARQ ACK/NACK feedback using UE specific PUCCH resources.**

**Proposal 20 (22/23): For group common PTM Multicast HARQ PUCCH resources (NACK only feedback), the same group of UEs have aligned HRAQ RTT and DL Re-Tx timer configuration. HARQ RTT timer counting starts from end of common PUCCH resource based NACK transmission (i.e. same as Unicast DRX behaviour).**

**PDCP/RLC configuration for broadcast**

**Proposal 21: for broadcast MRB, the *sn-FieldLength* (for RLC) and *pdcp-SN-SizeDL* parameters are predefined with configuration optionally provided.**

**Proposal 22: for broadcast MRB, the t-Reassembly (in RLC configuration) are predefined with configuration optionally provided. FFS on t-Reordering (in PDCP configuration).**

**Proposal 23: for broadcast MRB, when enabled by the network, RoHC parameters are predefined with configuration optionally provided.**

The following questions are proposed to have further discussion on Phase II:

**Q17: Companies are invited to provide their preference on common LCID space or separate LCID space for Multicast PTM and Unicast DRB.**

**Q21: Companies are invited to provide their view on the options of how a UE monitors UE specific PDCCH/C-RNTI for possible PTP HARQ retransmission of PTM retransmission in active time of multicast DRX.**

**Q23: Companies are invited to provide their view on whether to support DRX Command MAC CE for multicast DRX.**

# 4 Phase II

**common LCID space or separate LCID space**

As discussed in Phase II, it seems companies are not on the same page of definition of common and separate LCID spaces. As proposed in contributions the definitions are:

**Common LCID space:** LCIDs of PTP MRB/unicast DRB and PTM MRB are in the same LCID space, in which LCID value are different for PTM MRB and PTP MRB/Unicast DRB.

**Separate LCID space:** LCIDs of PTP MRB/DRB and PTM MRB are using independent LCID space, in which LCID value can be same for PTM MRB and PTP MRB/Unicast DRB.

Some companies prefer to use a reserved LCIDs. It is also not clear that Using a reserved LCID should be a solution of common LCID space or separate LCID space.

It could be better the companies can provide the detailed solution for clarification.

**Q30: Companies are invited to provide their view on the definitions of common LCID space and separate LCID space for PTM MRB and PTP MRB/Unicast DRB and their preferred solution on LCID space.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Multicast DRX operation for PTP of PTM HARQ retransmission**

It seems that some companies are confused by the Q21 during phase I discussion. Rapporteur Rapporteur would prefer to have a further discussion on Phase II.

Rapporteur fully agrees that MBS DRX and Unicast DRX are independent, which have been agreed in last meeting:

***=> For multicast PTM transmission, Multicast DRX pattern is configured on a per G-RNTI basis (i.e. independent of legacy UE-specific DRX for unicast transmission)***

The intention of Q21 is only for MBS DRX and it is not relevant to unicast DRX. The MBS data transmission may include:

- case 1: PTM transmission, that is over GC-PDCCH scrambled by G-RNTI;

- case 2: PTP for PTM HARQ retransmission, that is over UE specific PDCCH scrambled by C-RNTI;

- case 3: PTP transmission and unicast transmission, that is over UE specific PDCCH scrambled by C-RNTI.

It is clear that case 1 uses MBS DRX and case 3 uses unicast DRX. However, it is not clear for case 2. And the agreements made in last meeting only cover case 1 and case 3.

For case 2 PTP for PTM HARQ retransmission, there are three options (taking the option 3 provided by Samsung into account):

-   Option 1: the UE monitors UE specific PDCCH/C-RNTI when either drx-onDurationTimerPTM or drx-InactivityTimerPTM or drx-RetransmissionTimerDLPTM are running.

-   Option 2: the UE monitors UE specific PDCCH/C-RNTI only when drx-RetransmissionTimerDLPTM is running. For example, when drx-onDurationTimerPTM and drx-InactivityTimerPTM are running but drx-RetransmissionTimerDLPTM is not running, the UE does not monitor UE specific PDCCH/C-RNTI.

-   Option 3: the UE monitors UE specific PDCCH/C-RNTI only during unicast DRX’s active time. Unicast DRX’s RTT timer can be started when PTP retransmission is expected.

**Q31: Companies are invited to provide their view on the options of how a UE monitors UE specific PDCCH/C-RNTI for possible PTP HARQ retransmission of PTM retransmission in active time of multicast DRX.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**DRX Command MAC CE for multicast DRX**

Regarding DRX command MAC CE for multicast DRX, there are three options according to Phase I discussion:

**Option 1:** the legacy DRX command MAC CE is applied to multicast DRX, which means a common DRX command MAC CE is used for unicast DRX and multicast DRX.

**Option 2a:** introduce a new DRX command MAC CE for all multicast DRX operations

**Option 2b:** introduce a new DRX command MAC CE per multicast DRX operation (i.e. per G-RNTI basis)

**Option 3:** neither legacy DRX command MAC CE nor new DRX command MAC CE is used for multicast DRX, i.e. no DRX command MAC CE for multicast DRX.

**Q32: Companies are invited to provide their preferred options on DRX command MAC CE for multicast DRX.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
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FFS.
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