**3GPP TSG-RAN2 #116bis-e R2-220xxxx**

**Electronic meeting, January 17th – 25th 12**

**Agenda item:**‎x.xx

**Source:** CATT

**Title:** Report of [Post116-e][088][UDC] UDC initial discussion (CATT)‎

**Document for:** Discussion and Decision

# 1 Introduction

This document is for the report of the following discussion

* [Post116-e][088][UDC] UDC initial discussion (CATT)

Scope: To align companies’ understanding regarding which parts of the UDC functionality directly follows LTE mechanism, which parts shall be adapted based on NR characteristics (if any), and what is the target of each such adaptation (if any). The discussion may include stage-3 examples to illustrate the points discussed.

Intended outcome: Report

Deadline: Long

The reminder of this contribution is organized as the following.

* Section 2 provides Rapporteur’s general analysis on NR UDC functionality including potential issues to be discussed due to NR characteristics. Section 3 provides specification impact analysis and modification examples may be provided in later phase. Section 4 contains the summary.

The discussions are planned in two phases:

* In Phase 1, companies’ views/comments are collected, on the generally analysis and potential open issues in section 2 (i.e., do they agree to those issues or do they see any other issues that need to be discussed) and also on spec impact analysis in section 3. The deadline for Phase 1 is end of Dec. 8th, 2021, UTC time.
* In Phase 2, companies’ views/comments are collected regarding how to address the issues that have been identified through Phase 1 discussions and how to modify the specifications. The deadline is end of Dec.16th, 2021, UTC time.

Participants are invited to leave their contact information in the table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Delegate name** | **Email address** |
| CATT | Erlin Zeng | erlin.zeng@catt.cn |
| LG | Geumsan Jo | Geumsan.jo@lge.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 2 General analysis on NR UDC Functionality

### Phase 1

The purpose of this section is to analyse from high level the NR UDC functionality, and identify

* which parts directly follow the LTE UDC mechanism, and
* which parts need further discussion and clarification.

The functionalities are divided as the following

1. PDCP aspects
2. UDC configuration
3. UDC operation in RRC re-establishment procedure
4. Release of UDC configuration in different cases
5. UDC operation in mobility procedure
6. Split Bearer
7. RAN3 impacts.
8. UE capability for UDC

In Table 1, some analysis in R2-2111067‎ is reused. In the table, the parts with TBD mean that some further discussions are needed (i.e. adaptation due to NR characteristics should be considered). Note that these points are not for the sake of optimization which does not belong to the WID scope, but it aims at clarification and easy inclusion of UDC to all the related NR specifications.

**Table 1 Functionality analysis**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **parts of NR UDC functionality** | **Analysis** |
| PDCP aspects | * **UDC protocol**: defines the compression algorithm of UDC; * **Configuration of UDC**: defines the configuration procedure for UDC as well as the initialization of the dictionary buffer of UDC; * **UDC header**: defines the format of UDC header; * **Pre-defined dictionary**: in UDC, pre-defined dictionary can be applied to improve the compression efficiency; * **UDC buffer reset**: when the compression buffer and de-compression buffer are not synchronized, the compression buffer is reset for resynchronization; * **UDC feedback procedure**: the network can figure out whether UDC decompression succeeds or not by checking UDC checksum error. Hence, UDC feedback procedure enables feedback, i.e. UDC feedback packet, from the network in case of the out of synchronization happens to trigger UDC buffer reset procedure; * **UDC PDU format definitions**: defines the PDU format for UDC with 12 bits PDCP SN and 18 bits PDCP SN. In NR, SDAP is introduced for mapping between QoS flow and DRB. But it is TBD whether SDAP header and SDAP control PDU should be compressed by UDC; * **PDCP reordering**: gNB implementation ensures that UDC decompression is after PDCP reordering. * **UDC continuity** : whether support UDC continuity in NR which can follow ROHC continuity mechanism can be TBD. * **Relationship with ROHC and EHC:** UDC is not configured simultaneously with ROHC or EHC for the same radio bearer. |
| UDC configuration | * UDC only is configured when reconfiguration with sync or the first *RRCReconfiguration* message after RRC connection re-establishment. |
| UDC operation in RRC re-establishment procedure | * Reset compression buffer for UDC bearer. |
| Release of UDC configuration in different cases | * RRC reconfiguration with sync; * RRC reestablishment procedure; * Conditional reconfiguration with sync; * RRC resume procedure; |
| UDC operation in mobility procedure | * **UDC in DAPS** (**TBD**): whether UDC can be used during DAPS HO in NR should be clarified. In LTE UDC, it is not applied for DAPS. * **UDC in CHO:** UDC configuration is released when conditional reconfiguration with sync is executed. |
| Split bearer | * **UDC for split bearer** (**TBD**): it should be clarified whether UDC can be applied to split bearer. |
| RAN3 impacts | * **UDC impacts on E1** (**TBD**): if supporting CU-CP/UP splitting, E1 would be impacted to transmit UDC configuration from CP to UP. |
| UE capability for UDC | * Support UDC and pre-defined dictionary capabilities |

**Question 1-1: Do you agree the parts without TBD can easily follow the LTE mechanism?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes or No | Comments if any |
| LG | Comments | It is difficult to say whether we can easily follow the LTE mechanism or not. Each function should be carefully checked whether it is supported for NR. |
| CATT | Yes | Intention is to check from high level which functionalities can follow those of LTE UDC, e.g., compression algorithm, checksum, pre-defined dictionary, handling for failure etc.. Detailed specification changes can be discussed in a later stage, once views have been aligned from high level. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Some further clarifications on potential issues in table 1 (i.e. TBD) are discussed below.

**Issue 1: Whether UDC is applied to SDAP header and SDAP control PDU?**

In NR, SDAP has been introduced. There may be two types of SDAP PDUs, i.e. SDAP data PDU and SDAP Control PDU. It has specified that ciphering and header compression are not applied to SDAP header and SDAP control PDU (see TS 38.323). Whether UDC is applicable to SDAP header and SDAP control PDU should be discussed. If companies agree this is an issue to be discussed, two alternatives can be considered:

Alt 1: UDC is applicable to SDAP header and SDAP control PDU.

Alt 2: UDC is not applicable to SDAP header and SDAP control PDU.

The rapporteur prefers Alt2 which follow the existing mechanism that ciphering and header compression are not applied to SDAP header and SDAP control PDU.

**Question 1-2: Do you agree UDC is not applied to SDAP header and SDAP control PDU?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | New issues to be discussed if any |
| LG | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Issue 2: UDC PDU format**

Since SDAP is introduced in NR, its header location should be decided, i.e. whether it is located before or after UDC header should be discussed. Two formats can be considered:

Option 1: the SDAP header is located after UDC header which is illustrated as following:



Option 2: the UDC header is located after SDAP header which is illustrated as following:



Note: this issue may be related to issue 3.3-1.

This issue is related to issue 1. If UDC is not applied to SDAP header, option 2 format can be used.

**Question 1-3: Do you agree option 2 is used as the UDC PDU format?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | New issues to be discussed if any |
| LG | Yes | Similar to ROHC and EHC header. |
| CATT | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Issue 3: UDC continuity**

In NR Rel-15, it has been agreed to support ROHC continuity in case of resuming an RRC connection or reconfiguration with sync, when the PDCP termination point is not changed and the *fullConfig* is not indicated (see TS 38.331). This is helpful to reduce the radio resource consumption. Although LTE UDC does not support continuity, some companies see the benefits of UDC continuity in NR. So it is suggested to discuss whether we can follow ROHC mechanism in NR UDC.

**Question 1-4: Do you agree to support UDC continuity in NR which reuses ROHC continuity mechanism?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | New issues to be discussed if any |
| LG | No | We want to keep the UDC simple to be aligned with allocated TU. |
| CATT | Yes | In our view, UDC continuity is beneficial to improve the resource efficiency. Since we follow the similar mechanism of ROHC continuity, we believe the work load is quite limited.  We can check what the companies’ views are. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Issue 4: Applicability of UDC in DAPS**

In LTE mobility enhancement WI, whether UDC is applied to DAPS was not discussed sufficiently but just shown hands to see companies’ views to save discussion time and suggested to consider it in NR UDC. So in LTE, UDC is not applied to DAPS. The simple way is follow LTE UDC that NR UDC is not applied to DAPS.

**Question 1-5: Do you agree NR UDC is not applied to DAPS like LTE UDC?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | New issues to be discussed if any |
| LG | Yes | We want to keep the UDC simple to be aligned with allocated TU. |
| CATT | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Issue 5: Applicability of UDC to split DRB**

In LTE UDC, the impact to 37.340 is not discussed and considered. But in NR, it should be checked. In 37.340, for ROHC, there is one clarification “In MR-DC, ROHC (as described in TS 36.323 [15] and TS 38.323 [16]) can be configured for all the bearer types.” In LTE, ROHC is not applied to split DRB and UDC followed the same as ROHC although UDC can be applied to split DRB from technical point of view. But in NR, ROHC is extended to apply to all bearer types. For NR UDC, it also can follow ROHC, i.e. UDC is extended to apply to all bearer types. Since it follows ROHC mechanism which is different in NR and LTE, it can be discussed as one open issue which belongs to the part of adaptation due to NR characteristics. So it is proposed to discuss whether to apply NR UDC to split DRB.

**Question 1-6: Do you agree NR UDC can be applied to split DRB?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | New issues to be discussed if any |
| LG | No | We want to keep the UDC simple to be aligned with allocated TU. |
| CATT | Yes | We think it beneficial to apply UDC to the split bearer.  We can follow the mechanism of ROHC for split bearer. These might impact some specs but in our view the work load should be not too much.  We can check what the companies’ views are. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Issue 6: CU-CP and CU-UP splitting**

E1AP provides the signalling between gNB-CU-CP and gNB-CU-UP. And the Bearer Context Setup procedure is used to allow the gNB-CU-CP to establish a bearer context in the gNB-CU-UP. In the procedure, the gNB-CU-CP sends the BEARER CONTEXT SETUP REQUEST message to the gNB-CU-UP. Introduction of UDC configuration may require changes to E1 as well. This may need RAN3 further work. If companies think the scenario should be supported, LS can be sent to RAN3 when we identify parameters of UDC configuration.

**Question 1-7: Do you agree NR UDC is also applied to the scenario of CU-CP and CU-UP splitting, i.e. E1 interface should be involved?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Detailed comments |
| LG | No | We want to keep the UDC simple to be aligned with allocated TU. |
| CATT | Yes | CU-CP and CU-UP slitting scenario is one typical scenario in NR. Therefore, we think UDC should be supported in this scenario. We suggest to send LS to RAN3 after UDC configuration content is clear. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Other issues**

**Question 1-8: Do you see any further issues to be discussed for NR UDC? Please explain more about the identified issues.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Detailed comments |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Phase 2

TBD

# 3 Specification impacts analysis

The purpose of this section is to align from high level companies’ views regarding which specifications are impacted and how.

## 3.1 TS 38.300

### Phase 1

Table 2 provides some analysis on the potential specification impacts to TS 38.300.

**Table 2 Spec impact analysis for 38.300**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Specification | Parts that follow the LTE mechanism | Additional impacted parts due to NR |
| TS 38.300 | * + Adding abbreviation of UDC;   + Adding UDC function in PDCP;   + Changing the protocol figures to allow UDC in uplink compression. | N.A. |

With the analysis, Rapporteur hasn’t seen any further impacts due to NR UDC to TS 38.300.

**Question 1-9: Do you agree with spec impact analysis in Table 2? Do you see any other impacts to TS 38.300?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Additional impacts if any |
| LG | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Phase 2

TBD

## 3.2 TS 38.306

### Phase 1

Table 3 provides some analysis on the potential specification impacts to TS 38.306.

**Table 3 Spec impact analysis for 38.306**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Specification | Parts that follow the LTE mechanism | Additional impacted parts due to NR |
| TS 38.306 | Adding UDC abbreviation and corresponding capability definition. | N.A. |

Rapporteur hasn’t seen any further impacts due to NR UDC to TS 38.306.

**Question 1-10: Do you agree with spec impact analysis in table 3? Do you see any other impacts to TS 38.306?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Additional impacts if any |
| LG | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Phase 2

TBD

## 3.3 TS 38.323

### Phase 1

Table 4 provides some analysis on the potential specification impacts to TS 38.323.

**Table 4 Spec impact analysis for 38.323**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Specification | Parts that follow the LTE mechanism | Additional impacted parts due to NR |
| TS 38.323 | Additions/changes related to the following   * + UDC protocol.   + Configuration of UDC   + UDC header.   + Pre-defined dictionary.   + UDC buffer reset.   + UDC feedback procedure   + UDC function in RRC re-establishment procedure: reset compression buffer for RLC AM mode;   + ~~Configuration with ROHC and EHC: limitation that UDC is not configured simultaneously with ROHC or EHC for the same radio bearer.‎~~   + Clarification, if necessary, that gNB implementation ensures that UDC decompression is after PDCP reordering. ‎ | * + Whether UDC is applied for SDAP header and SDAP control PDU   + UDC PDU format addressing SDAP header location   + UDC continuity if needed |

**Question 1-11: Do you agree with spec impact analysis in table 4? Do you see any other impacts to TS 38.323?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Additional impacts if any |
| LG | No | It is difficult to say whether we can easily follow the LTE mechanism or not. Each function should be carefully checked whether it is supported for NR.  In addition, we think following two bullets are not relevant for PDCP specification.  o Configuration with ROHC and EHC: limitation that UDC is not configured simultaneously with ROHC or EHC for the same radio bearer.‎ 🡪 The configuration limitation should be specified in RRC not in PDCP.  o Clarification, if necessary, that gNB implementation ensures that UDC decompression is after PDCP reordering. ‎🡪 Network implementation should not be specified in PDCP specification. |
| CATT | Yes, and see comments | Firstly, we agree with LG’s comment about the limitation on configuration with ROHC and EHC. We’ve updated this part, so that this bullet is now move to 38.331 section (see highlighted modifications in the tables).  Then, for LG’s comment on reordering related clarification, we can discuss if it is necessary to specify in the spec and if needed then consider where to capture it. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Phase 2

TBD

## 3.4 TS 38.331

### Phase 1

Table 5 provides some analysis on the potential specification impacts to TS 38.331.

**Table 5 Spec impact analysis for 38.331**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Specification | Parts that follow the LTE mechanism | Additional impacted parts due to NR |
| TS 38.331 | Additions/changes related to the following   * + UDC configuration;   + Release UDC configuration in: * RRC reconfiguration with sync; * RRC reestablishment procedure; * Conditional reconfiguration with sync; * RRC resume;   + Configuration with ROHC and EHC: limitation that UDC is not configured simultaneously with ROHC or EHC for the same radio bearer.‎ | Applicability of UDC in DAPS if needed  UDC continuity if needed |

**Question 1-12: Do you agree with spec impact analysis in table 5? Do you see any other impacts to TS 38.331?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Additional impacts if any |
| LG | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes | Adding the limitation on configuration with ROHC and EHC in the table. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Phase 2

TBD

## 3.5 TS 37.340

### Phase 1

Table 6 provides some analysis on the potential specification impacts to TS 37.340.

**Table 6 Spec impact analysis for 37.340**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Specification | Parts that follow the LTE mechanism | Additional impacted parts due to NR |
| TS 37.340 | N.A. | Applicability of UDC to split DRB if agreed |

**Question 1-13: Do you agree with spec impact analysis in table 6? Do you see any other impacts to TS 37.340?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Additional impacts if any |
| LG | No | We think UDC is not configured for split DRB. Then, there should be no specification impacts on 37.340. |
| CATT | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Phase 2

TBD

## 3.6 TS 38.463

### Phase 1

Table 7 provides some analysis on the potential specification impacts to TS 38.463.

**Table 7 Spec impact analysis for 38.463**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Specification | Parts that follow the LTE mechanism | Additional impacted parts due to NR |
| TS 38.463 | N.A. | Potential E1 impacts |

**Question ph1-14: Do you agree with spec impact analysis in table 7?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Additional impacts if any |
| LG | No | We think UDC is not configured for CP/UP split case. Then, there should be no specification impacts on 38.463. |
| CATT | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Phase 2

TBD

## 3.7 Other TS impacted?

### Phase 1

**Question ph1-15: Do you see any other specification impacted? If any, please provide more details.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Additional spec impacts if any |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Phase 2

TBD

# 4. Conclusions

TBD
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