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# Introduction

The following email discussion has been planned during RAN2#115 for the issues with integrity assistance data.

* [Post116-e][509][SDT] CG open issues (Huawei)

 Scope: Discuss the remaining CG stage 2 open issues and take into account RAN1 agreements including no L1 feedback

 Deadline: Long

This questionnaire intends to address the remaining issues on CG-SDT.

# Contact Information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Contact: Name (E-mail) |
| LG Electronics | SeungJune Yi (seungjune.yi@lge.com) |
| Samsung | Anil Agiwal (anilag@samsung.com) |
| ZTE | Hu Huang (huang.he4@zte.com.cn) |
| Sharp | Chongming Zhang (Chongming.zhang@cn.sharp-world.com) |
| OPPO | Xue Lin (linxue@oppo.com) |
| CATT | Chandrika Worrall (chandrika@catt.cn) |
| Lenovo | Joachim Löhr (jlohr@lenovo.com) |
| ASUSTeK | Erica Huang (Erica\_Huang@asus.com) |
| InterDigital | Faris Alfarhan (faris.alfarhan@interdigital.com) |
| Nokia | Chunli Wu (Chunli.wu@nokia-sbell.com) |
| Qualcomm | Ruiming Zheng (rzheng@qti.qualcomm.com) |
| Fujitsu | Ohta, Yoshiaki (ohta.yoshiaki@fujitsu.com) |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | YinghaoGuo (yinghaoguo@huawei.com) |
| Intel | Ansab Ali (ansab.ali@intel.com) |
| Xiaomi | Yumin Wu (wuyumin@xiaomi.com) |
| Ericsson | Henrik.enbuske@ericsson.com |
| vivo | Yitao Mo (yitao.mo@vivo.com) |
| Spreadtrum | Lifeng Han (Lifeng.Han@unisoc.com) |
| China Telecom | Jincan Xin (xinjc@chinatelecom.cn) |
| NEC | Maxime.Grau@emea.nec.com |

# Discussion

TA aspects for CG-SDT

### RSRP-based TA validation

In the previous R2 meetings, we have agreed that RSRP-based TA validation shall be applied for CG-SDT. However, it is still not clear whether this criterion for TA validation is applicable for both initial transmission and subsequent transmissions, including subsequent transmission on CG, DG for new transmission and retransmission and PUCCH transmission.

During the last R2 meeting, we have also agreed that retransmission on CG should at least supported for initial transmission.

|  |
| --- |
| * At least for initial transmission we will have a mechanism to allow the UE to transmit the message again. FFS for retransmission for subsequent.
 |

The understanding from the moderator is that after initial transmission, since the network and UE are already able to establish transmission, the TA validation can be totally took over by the network, e.g., by sending TAC MAC CE. Then, there is no need for the UE-side RSRP-based TA validation anymore.

The moderator would like to ask the following question on whether TA validation is needed for subsequent transmission on CG.

###### Question1: Do companies agree that RSRP-based TA validation should only be applicable for initial SDT transmission and its retransmission?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| LG | No | We think TA validation is performed only for initial transmission (i.e. not for its retransmission). |
| Samsung | No | RSRP-based TA validation is not needed for retransmission. |
| ZTE | Yes | We agree with moderator’s explanation that after initial UL transmission TA maintanence is up to network. However, whether to use CG for subsequent transmission or not depends on the outcome of Q7 below. In addition, if this is the case (i.e. RSRP-based TA is only used for initial UL transmission), then the RSRP-based TA can be stopped when ever normal TAT is started (and it can be restarted upon receiving RRCRelease with CG-SDT config), and we don’t need to maintain the RSRP-based TA during SDT, in which case we can avoid to maintain two TA timer simultaneously. |
| Sharp | No | RSRP-based TA validation is enough for initial transmission but not for its retransmission.If the TA is no longer valid within the retransmission, we think it could depend on T319-like timer expiry to terminate the procedure.  |
| OPPO | No | If RSRP change is the only TA validation criteria configured for CG-SDT (i.e., SDT-TAT is not configured), we think this RSRP-based TA validation shall be applied for all the transmissions at least before UE receives response from network with TAC. |
| CATT | No | RSRP-based TA validation is applied for initial transmission and not applied to retransmission of the initial transmission to keep the procedure simple. |
| Lenovo | No | Agree with others |
| ASUSTeK | No | Agree with others. |
| Interdigital | No | TA validation is performed only for initial transmission during CG vs. RA selection, not for retransmissions |
| Nokia | No with comment | We are fine with RSRP-TA validation only performed once at SDT initiation. CG-SDT TAT should still be maintained before NW response though and if it expires and CG-SDT resource would be released then retransmission on the CG can no longer be performed. |
| Qualcomm | - | The question is unclear. If asking whether RSRP-based TA is applied for the retransmission of initial transmission, it seems not needed.  |
| Fujitsu | No | Not sure if the question reflects the intention of the modelator. As moderator points out, after initial transmission, the TA validation can be totally took over by the network, e.g., by sending TAC MAC CE. Then, there is no need for the UE-side RSRP-based TA validation anymore. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Before the network successfully receives the uplink message, when the network can send TAC MAC CE to the UE, the UE still should evaluate TA by itself. This applies for both intial transmission and retransmission.  |
| Intel | No but with comment | At least for retransmission using CG, the TA validity should still be applicable. In our understanding, if the TA validity criteria is not met, the UE should not be allowed to use CG-SDT resources for subsequent transmissions.  |
| Xiaomi |  | We have the same confusion as raised by Qualcomm. |
| Ericsson | No | We think that the UE should do TA validation for every SDT CG transmission (and retransmission if CG is used, if agreed). This may be needed in general for fulfilling the RAN4 requirements |
| vivo | No | The RSRP-based TA validation is only evaluated when initializing the SDT procedure. |
| Spreadtrum | No | We think RSRP-based TA validation is only applied for initial SDT transmission, but not for the retransmission of it. |
| China Telecom | No | RSRP-based TA validation is only applied for initial transmission, not for its retransmission. |
| NEC | No | RSRP-based TA validation for initial transmission is sufficient. |

###### Question1 Summary:

The majority of the companies think that RSRP-based TA validation is only needed for initial CG-SDT transmission. In particular

* LG, SS, Sharp, CATT, Lenovo, Asustek, Intel, Interdigital, Nokia, Fujitsu, vivo, spreadtrum, China Telecom, NEC thinks that RSRP-basde TA validation is only needed for initial CG-SDT transmission but not needed for the retransmission of initial CG-SDT transmission. (a.k.a., its retransmission)
* OPPO thinks that RSRP-based TA validation is needed until the UE receives a TAC
* Ericsson thinks that the UE should do TA validation for every SDT CG transmission
* ZTE and HW think that RSRP-based TA validation is needed for both initial transmission and its retransmission
* Qualcomm and Xiaomi feel confused

Based on the above, we propose the following

**Proposal1: RSRP-based TA validation is only applicable for initial CG-SDT and not needed for retransmissinon of the initial CG-SDT. (15/20)**

In the legacy spec, for the cell measurement consolidated from SSB, the following is specified, take SSB for an example:

|  |
| --- |
| 1> for each cell measurement quantity to be derived based on SS/PBCH block:2> if *nrofSS-BlocksToAverage* is not configured in the associated *measObject* in RRC\_CONNECTED or in the associated entry in *measIdleCarrierListNR* within *VarMeasIdleConfig* in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE; or2> if *absThreshSS-BlocksConsolidation* is not configured in the associated *measObject* in RRC\_CONNECTED or in the associated entry in *measIdleCarrierListNR* within *VarMeasIdleConfig* in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE; or2> if the highest beam measurement quantity value is below or equal to *absThreshSS-BlocksConsolidation*:3> derive each cell measurement quantity based on SS/PBCH block as the highest beam measurement quantity value, where each beam measurement quantity is described in TS 38.215 [9];2> else:3> derive each cell measurement quantity based on SS/PBCH block as the linear power scale average of the highest beam measurement quantity values above *absThreshSS-BlocksConsolidation* where the total number of averaged beams shall not exceed *nrofSS-BlocksToAverage*, and where each beam measurement quantity is described in TS 38.215 [9]; |

It can be seen from the part highlighted in yellow that the case when none of the SSB is above the threshold is considered. When the highest beam is below the configured threshold, the beam with the highest measurement quantity value is taken as the cell measurement.

For SSB-based TA validation, we need to ask the same question for the subset of beams for TA validation

###### Question2: Do companies agree that when the highest beam measurement is below the configured threshold, the beam with the highest beam measurement value is used for TA validation?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| LG | No | If none of the SSB is above the threshold, the TA validation is failed for CG-SDT, and the UE should not perform CG-SDT procedure. |
| Samsung | No | We can simply use the average of N best SSBs for RSRP based TA avalidation. |
| ZTE | Yes | But in this case the TA is invalid anyway, so, it seems no further checks are needed.  |
| Sharp | No | Regarding to the case, the CG-SDT should not be initiated. |
| OPPO | No | The RSRP of highest N SSBs can still be used. |
| CATT | No | when the highest beam measurement is below the configured threshold, it means none of the SSB’s RSRP is above the configured threshiold. And in RAN2#115e-meeting, it was agreed that: |
| Lenovo | No  | For the RSRP-based TA validation it was agreed in RAN2#116 that the highest N SSBs of all SSBs actually transmitted as indicated in SIB1 is used for RSRP based TA validation. Therefore we can simply follow this agreement and don’t need any other RSRP reference definition |
| ASUSTeK | No | We agree with Samsung and OPPO. |
| InterDigital | No | If the measured SSBs are all below the threshold, the TA is considered invalid and the UE should uses RA-based SDT. This is inline with previous agreements:“For initial CG transmission, UE does not select any SSB if none of the SSBs’ RSRP is above the RSRP threshold.”“If none of the SSBs’ RSRP is above the RSRP threshold of CG-SDT criteria in the type selection phase, UE should select RA-SDT if RA-SDT criteria is met” |
| Nokia | No | Agree with others |
| Qualcomm | No | Same view with InterDigital. We already have enough agreements. |
| Fujitsu | No | As per the current understanding, CG-SDT procedure should abort. However, indeed it may be worth considering the beam with the highest beam measurement value is used for TA validation as the above existing procedure. |
| Huawei, HiSIlicon | Yes | One thing that needs to be noted is that the threshold for beam consoliation is different from that for SSB selection, or at least R1 has not agreed that they are the same  RAN1 has also made the following agreement in R1#105.* The SSB subset for RSRP based TA validation is determined at least based on a configured absolute RSRP threshold.

So, it is possible that even if there are beams above the SSB selection threshold, but it is still below the SSB consolidation threshold.  |
| Intel | No | We agree with LG that for transmissions using CG resources, if the configured threshold is not met, UE should not be able to perform CG-SDT. |
| Xiaomi | No | Agree with others |
| Ericsson | No | Agree w LG. |
| vivo | Yes | From the UE implementation perspective, when performing TA validation, anyway, one or more than one L1-RSRP of SSB(s) within a SSB subset will be used. If the best beam is not used for TA validation, does it mean that the UE should only use the secondary beam for TA validation? It sounds strange.  |
| Spreadtrum | No | If none of the SSB’s RSRP is above the threshold, CG-SDT will not be selected. |
| China Telecom | No | Agree with others. |
| NEC | No | We agree with other companies that in this case, the TA would become invalid. |

###### Question2 Summary:

Based on the comments received, all the companies replied no except for

* HW, ZTE, VIVO replied with Yes
	+ HW thinks that the threshold for SSB selection and SSB consolidation is different

Based on the comemtns above, we propose

**Proposal2: RAN2 should further discuss if the thresholds for SSB selection and SSB subset selection for TA-validation are different and the highest beam measurement is below the configured threshold, whether the beam with the highest beam measurement value is used for TA validation**

### Relationship between CG-TAT and legacy TAT

In the following, we discuss the remaining issues for how the CG-TAT and legacy TAT should be handled when there is CG-SDT.

It is possible that RA can be triggered during CG-SDT, e.g., no uplink grant or no SSB above the RSRP threshold. When RACH is triggered, agreements during the last meeting show that legacy TAT should be reused for the TA received during the RACH procedure.

* The legacy TAT (i.e. timeAlignmentTimerCommon in SIB) is used for UL timing maintenance during RA-SDT procedure. (21/23)
* The legacy TAT (i.e. timeAlignmentTimerCommon in SIB) starts/restarts when RAR TAC or TAC MAC CE is received, regardless of SDT procedure. No spec change is needed. (23/23)
* CG-SDT resource is not released even if the legacy TAT expires. (23/23)

Then, at this time, the CG-SDT-TAT may also be running. Also, the received uplink timing advance by RACH procedure may not be the same as the TA for CG-SDT, since it is more updated. The moderator would like to ask the question below on the NTA maintenance for CG-SDT.

###### Question3: Do comapanies agree that the UE should maintain a CG-SDT-N\_TA for CG-SDT, which can be different from the legacy N\_TA?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| LG | No | Why N\_TA values are different for legacy TAT and CG-SDT-TAT? We think a single N\_TA is used for both legacy TAT and CG-SDT-TAT.[Rapp] The NTA can be different for RACH procedure triggered during CG-SDT. For example, SSB below the threshold or SR. During the RACH procedure, should the UE use the NTA previously maintained for CG-SDT for msg3, or the TA received in the RAR? If the answer is the TA received in RAR, obviously, we need to maintain another NTA for the RACH procedure, which can be the legacy NTA in the spec.  |
| Samsung | No | single N\_TA is used for both legacy TAT and CG-SDT-TAT |
| ZTE | No | The actual timing advance would be independent of whether CG-SDT is used or not. So, it seems we don’t really need to maintain two separate N\_TAs. In general, the TA timer can be different (since it is used for different purposes) but the N\_TA should be the same (since it is used for calculating the timing advance which is the same). |
| Sharp | No | We think there is only a common N\_TA for either legacy RA or CG-SDT. It is weird to allow different N\_TA value for legacy RA and CG-SDT in the same cell.According to TS38.133, *N*TA for PRACH is defined as 0. So the maintained N\_TA will not impact the initiation of RA. |
| OPPO | Comments | In this case, NTA received in RAR shall be maintained by UE, but we think CG-TAT-NTA shall also be stored before the contention is resolved for RACH. Similar issue has been addressed in LTE PUR transmission by introducing temporary NTA in case that RACH procedure is not completed successfully. Section 5.4.7.2 of TS 36.321 can be referred to:- upon considering a Random Access procedure successfully completed:- start or restart the *pur-TimeAlignmentTimer*, if configured;- indicate to upper layers that the Timing Advance value has been adjusted;- if a temporary NTA has been stored, delete the stored temporary NTA.- upon considering a Random Access procedure unsuccessfully completed, if a temporary NTA has been stored:- set the NTA to the stored temporary NTA;- delete the stored temporary NTA. |
| CATT | No | We don’t see that is not necessary. |
| Lenovo | No | When UE initiates the CG-SDT procedure it uses the N\_TA value which was maintained from RRC\_CONNECTED state. In the legacy when performing a RACH procedure whether N\_TA is determined based on RAR TAC depends on whether TAT is running or not. Hence if we follow this procedure, UE would only apply the TAC received in RAR when TAT-SDT is not running. Otherwise UE keeps the N\_TA used for the CG-SDT. In general we think that UE only needs to maintain a single N\_TA value. The only issue is how this N\_TA is updated.  |
| ASUSTeK | No | A common N\_TA is enough. |
| InterDigital | No | Same N\_TA is maintained for both procedures. |
| Nokia | No | Agree with others. CG-SDT-TAT is only for initial CG validation. After received NW response, legacy TA management works as already agreed, and it is under NW control. Even if CG resource is not released but it is not usable without valid TA when legacy TA expires, RA can still be used as already agreed. Not clear why we maintain two TAT after the NW response. It would complicate the procedure. |
| Qualcomm | No | Single NTA should be maintained for both legacy TAT and CG-TAT. |
| Fujitsu | No | We share the views above. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | This seems to be an issue for the existing MAC spec. when the contention resolution is not successful for the RACH the procedure, the spec says the follows:1> when a Timing Advance Command is received in a Random Access Response message for a Serving Cell belonging to a TAG or in a MSGB for an SpCell:2> if the Random Access Preamble was not selected by the MAC entity among the contention-based Random Access Preamble:3> apply the Timing Advance Command for this TAG;3> start or restart the *timeAlignmentTimer* associated with this TAG.2> else if the *timeAlignmentTimer* associated with this TAG is not running:3> apply the Timing Advance Command for this TAG;3> start the *timeAlignmentTimer* associated with this TAG;3> when the Contention Resolution is considered not successful as described in clause 5.1.5; or3> when the Contention Resolution is considered successful for SI request as described in clause 5.1.5, after transmitting HARQ feedback for MAC PDU including UE Contention Resolution Identity MAC CE:4> stop *timeAlignmentTimer* associated with this TAG.2> else:3> ignore the received Timing Advance Command.So, it only says that we should stop the timer. But didn’t say how to maintain the NTA. When that RACH procedure is triggered in the middle of the CG-SDT procedure, the NTA value has already been applied when the RAR is received. But when the RAR is intended to another UE, the NTA is wrong and there is no way to revert to the previous NTA anymore. So, in this case, it is better to maintain a separate CG-SDT NTA for the UE, similar to that we have a separate CG-SDT timer, so that the TA value will not be over-written then the wrong RAR is received.  |
| Intel | No | We do not see any reason why it has to be configured differently for CG-SDT |
| Xiaomi | No | The UE does not need to maintain two NTA’s, we only need to consider how to manage the TAT timer. |
| Ericsson | No | This requires a situation for where a UE is performing CG SDT and e.g. the NW updates the N-TA.CG TAT should be updated upon the reception of a TA update if there is no ongoing RA procedure. We assume that time alignment maintenance is still a single procedure at the UE side. |
| vivo | No | As the UE cannot perform RA-SDT and CG-SDT simultaneously, there is no need to maintain two Nta. Note that maintaining two Nta would also incur functional imapcts on PHY spec. |
| Spreadtrum | No | A common N\_TA is used for both. |
| China Telecom | No | Single N\_TA should be maintained for both legacy TAT and CG-TAT. |
| NEC | No | It does not seem necessary to have two different N\_TA since only one should be correct. Also, we agree with Sharp that N\_TA for RACH is 0 anyway so (valid or invalid) N\_TA for CG-SDT does not affect RACH procedure. |

###### Question3 Summary:

Most of the companies think that only a single NTA is needed that we don’t need to introduce another CG-SDT-NAT, in particular

* OPPO mentions that in legacy PUR, a temporary NTA is introduced to address the problem of un-successful contention resolution in RACH. This understanding actually answer “yes” to the question and same understaidng as HW
* Lenovo thinks that there should be only a single NTA, but it should be further studied how the NTA is updated during RACH and after.

Based on the answers above, we propose the following:

**Proposal3: No additional NTA is defined for CG-SDT procedure. (18/20)**

During RAN2#116, the following proposal has been made by the email discussion during the meeting [1]:

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 24: Postpone the issue to the next meeting: whether and when to start/restart TAT-SDT if RAR TAC is received during legacy RA procedure.** |

Then, at successful RACH completion , it should be discussed whether the CG-SDT-NTA should be updated to the value of NTA if it has been confirmed that the UE is the intended UE at successful RACH completion. The moderator would like to ask the following question.

###### Question4: Do companies agree that the UE should apply the N\_TA maintained for legacy RACH to CG-SDT-N\_TA and stop maintaining N\_TA at successful RACH completion?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| LG | Comments | We think N\_TA is common for both legacy TAT and CG-SDT-TAT. In addition, we are wondering why the UE stops maintaining N\_TA at successful RACH completion. We think the UE should maintain N\_TA at successful RACH completion because UE may be moved to RRC\_CONNECTED. |
| Samsung | Comments | single N\_TA is used for both legacy TAT and CG-SDT-TATThe N\_TA is as per the latest TA command. |
| ZTE | Not needed | We don’t think we need two different N\_TAs. When the UE goes to INACTIVE with CG-SDT configuration (i.e. upon receiving RRCRelease), then the UE shall save the current N\_TA value (in the UE stored configuration) and use it for the CG-SDT session. If RACH procedure is initiated during SDT, then the N\_TA will be initialiesed during the RACH procedure and will be used accordingly. |
| Sharp | Comments | As commented in Q3, there is one common N\_TA maintained for either legacy RACH or CG-SDT. After successful RACH completion, the N\_TA could have been updated and should be maintained and applied to the CG-SDT.  |
| OPPO | Comments | Only one NTA can be maintained by UE. After RACH is completed successfully, UE shall maintain the NTA received in RAR and retart SDT-TAT. |
| CATT | No | We think single N\_TA value is used for both RA procedure and CG-SDT procedure. |
| Lenovo |  | See Question 3. We assume that UE only maintains a single N\_TA value. Question should be whether UE applies the TA command received in RAR or not. In the legacy UE ignores the TAC in RAR (CBRA) for cases that TAT is running. So the question is whether UE should update the N\_TA while CG-SDT-TAT is running. |
| ASUSTeK | No |  |
| InterDigital | Comments | Same N\_TA is maintained for both procedures. |
| Nokia | No | Legacy TA maintenance procedure applies. No separate CG-SDT-N\_TA needed. |
| Qualcomm | No | Single NTA should be maintained for both legacy TAT and CG-TAT. |
| Fujitsu | No | We share the view above. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Intel | No (See comment) | We assume that N\_TA value maintained is the same for legacy TAT and CG-SDT TAT. Then, we are not sure why the UE stops maintaining it upon RACH completion. |
| Xiaomi | No |  |
| Ericsson | No | The UE has likely a valid CG configuration at legacy RA completion, as TA is achieved. In our understanding TA is in genral not “reset” at RA completion and can thus be used for CG configuration validation. We still think the UE uses the CG-SDT-TA timer when performing SDT. |
| vivo | No | As per Q3, there is no need to maintain two Nta. |
| Spreadtrum | No | A common N\_TA is maintained. |
| China Telecom | No | Single N\_TA is used for both legacy TAT and CG-TAT. |
| NEC | No | At successful RACH completion, maintain single N\_TA common to either (or both, as discussed in Q5) legacy and/or CG-SDT TATs. |

###### Question4 Summary:

Based on the result of question3, most of the companies think that the NTA should continue to be maintained. But since in question3, most of the companies already think that no additional NTA is needed, there is no need to formulate proposal for this question..

Another issue is how should we handle the CG-SDT-TAT and legacy TAT at successful RACH completion. Since a new value for the NTA is applied and the TA is updated, it seems to be reasonable to restart the timer at this time. For legacy TAT, the moderator thinks that it is reasonable to stop the timer since we have already got the ongoing CG-SDT-TAT. Similar UE behaviour has also been seen in on-demand SI request in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE. When contention resolution is successful for odSIB, legacy TAT is stopped, since it is no longer needed.

###### Question5: Do companies agree that the CG-SDT-TAT should be restarted and the legacy TAT can be stopped at successful RACH completion ?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| LG | No | CG-SDT-TAT: restart the CG-SDT-TAT at successful RACH completion.Legacy TAT: does not stop at successful RACH completion, same as legacy. |
| Samsung |  | For CG-SDT procedure* Agree to restart the CG-SDT-TAT at successful RACH completion
* Agree to not stop legacy TAT as in legacy
 |
| ZTE | It depends(on whether CG-SDT is allowed for subsequent data) | Firstly we want to clarify per our comment above that the question is mainly about what happens when the TAC is received from the network (this may happen with or without a RACH procedure – so we should decouple this discussion from RACH completion). If CG-SDT is only used for initial UL message (i.e. not for subsequent transmission), then the overall procedure is simpler (and is similar to LTE-PUR). In this case, the CG-SDT-TAT can simply be stopped after the successful acknowledgement of the first UL message. On the otherhand, if CG-SDT is also used for subsequent data phase, then we need to decide how to handle the CG-SDT-TAT and legacy TAT. The point is that when TAC is received, the TAT timer would be restarted. The issue is that the initial value of CG-SDT-TAT and legacy TAT can potentially be different. Also, the actions upon expiry of each of these timers is also different. Then it seems that we may need to maintain both timers if we allow CG-SDT to be used for subsequent data transmission as well. This seems to complicate the overall procedure a bit.  |
| Sharp | Yes with comments | Regarding to the CG-SDT-TAT, it should be restarted upon the TA COMMAND is received in an successfully completed RA procedure in the cell where the CG-SDT is received.Regarding to the legacy TAT, if the the RA is initiated within a CG-SDT procedure, we think it could be stopped when the RA is successfully completed to avoid the unnecessary behaviour of legacy TAT expiry, e.g. “flush all HARQ buffers for all Serving Cells;”. Otherwise, the TAT is not stopped as legacy. |
| OPPO | Yes | It is redundant to use two timers to maintain TA. |
| CATT | comments | There are 2 different cases:Case 1: the UE performs RA during CG-SDT and remains in RRC\_INACTIVE:The CG-SDT-TAT should be resrated when RAR is received as legacy TAT. And legacy TAT should also be started.Case 2: the network indicates the UE go to RRC\_CONNECTED when RA at successful RACH completion:In this case, we agree to stop CG-SDT-TAT and keep legacy TAT running. |
| Lenovo | Yes with comments | We think that there should be only one TA timer used at a time, i.e. either CG-SDT-TAT or legacy TAT. Hence when RACH procedure is performed during CG-SDT, legacy TAT is started upon reception of TAC in RAR (this was already agreed). We agree with the moderator that CG-SDT-TAT is restarted at successful reception of the RACH procedure. We also think that legacy TAT can be stopped. Otherwise UE would need to maintain two different TAT(s) and the UE behaviour would need to be defined for all the different cases based on the status of such two timers. |
| ASUSTeK | No | Does not restart the CG-SDT-TAT at successful RACH completion. The restart of CG-SDT-TAT can be handled by TAC from NW.Does not stop the legacy TAT at successful RACH completion, same as legacy. |
| InterDigital | No | CG-SDT-TAT: restart the CG-SDT-TAT whenever a TA command is received.Legacy TAT: does not stop at successful RACH completion, same as legacy. |
| Nokia | No | No need to maintain CG-SDT-TAT after NW response. TA is under NW control with legacy procedure with legacy procedure. |
| Qualcomm | No | The behaviour could be different whether UE is still in RRC\_INACTIVE or enters into connected state. If UE is going to connected state, legacy TAT is used at the successful RACH completion, same as legacy. |
| Fujitsu | Too early | First of all, it seems that companies have different views on the role of CG-SDT-TAT. According to RAN2#112-e agreement, CG-SDT-TAT is introduced to maintaint UL timing alignment:15 A new TA timer for TA maintenance specified for configured grant based small data transfer in RRC\_INACTIVE should be introduced.On top of this agreement, RAN2#116-e agreement has been reached.8. The legacy TAT (i.e. timeAlignmentTimerCommon in SIB) starts/restarts when RAR TAC or TAC MAC CE is received, regardless of SDT procedure. No spec change is needed. (23/23)With these agreements, the current situation is ambiguous in that:(1) Companies with understanding that both CG-SDT-TAT and legacy TAT are used for UL timing alignment during CG-SDT seem to think that two timers are redundant so that the legacy TAT needs to be stopped in this case.(2) Companies with understanding that CG-SDT-TAT is only used for CG resource validation seems to think that the legacy TAT needs to be kept running as legacy in this case.We suggest to have common understanding in RAN2 on what is the role of CG-SDT-TAT before making conclusion. |
| Huawei, HiSIlicon | Yes |  |
| Intel | No (see comment) | We have similar comment as ZTE, i.e. it depends on the resolution to Question 7. If we do not allow CG-SDT for subeqeuent UL transmissions, then we can simply assume that the CG-SDT TAT timer is stopped after the initial UL msg is acked, i.e. not relationship to RACH procedure.Regardless, for the legacy TAT, it does not need to be changed from legacy. |
| Xiaomi | No | Does not restart the CG-SDT-TAT at successful RACH completion. The restart of CG-SDT-TAT can be handled by TAC from NW.Does not stop the legacy TAT at successful RACH completion, same as legacy. |
| Ericsson | No | See Q4. The CG-TAT can be (re)started due to maintained timing advance time carried over from the legacy RA completion. |
| vivo | No | We agree to restart the CG-SDT-TAT after contention resolution, which aligns with the design principle for LTE PUR. For the legacy TAT, no new behavior is needed. |
| Spreadtrum | No |  |
| China Telecom | No | If the UE remains in RRC\_INACTIVE, the CG-SDT-TAT should be restarted at successful RACH completion. If the UE enters into RRC\_CONNECTED, the CG-SDT-TAT can be stopped, and legacy TAT is used. |
| NEC | Yes | We would rather not have two timers running at the same time.We agree with other companies that behaviour in specific cases, e.g. RA procedure within a CG grant or RACH completion with indication from NW to go to RRC\_CONNECTED, need to be clarified. |

###### Question5 Summary:

Regarding CG-SDT timer and legacy TAT

* LG, SS, CATT, ASUSTek, IDC, Nokia, Qualcomm, Xiaomi, vivo, Ericsson, ZTE, Intel think that we should maintain the two timers at successful RACH completion during CG-SDT and legacy TAT should still continue
	+ In particular, xiaomi thinks that CG-SDT-TAT should not be restarted
	+ The others think that CG-SDT-TAT should be restarted
* OPPO, Sharp, NEC, Lenovo, Huawei think that it is redundant to use two timers to maintain TA
* Fujitsu thinks that we should first clarify on the role of CG-SDT-TAT
* Spreadtrum think that the CG-SDT-TAT should not be restarted and the legacy TAT continues at successful RACH completion

In addition,

* ZTE and Intel think that this is dependent on the discussion on whether to allow subsequent transmission on CG-SDT. If it is not allowed, CG-SDT-TAT can be stopped at ack of the initial CG transmission
* CATT , China Telecom, and QC also think that when the UE receives RRCResume during successful RACH, the UE should maintain legacy TAT and discard CG-SDT-TAT.

In addition, CATT thinks that when the UE receives RRCresume in msg4/B during, UE should stop CG-SDT-TAT and keep the legacy TAT.

**Proposal4: Keep the two timers at successful RACH completion for RACH during CG-SDT: (a) re-start the CG-SDT-TAT; and (b) not to stop the legacy TAT. (12/20)**

### UE procedure at the expiry of CG-SDT-TAT

Another issue we think that should be discussed is what the behavior is after expiry of CG-SDT-TAT. In previous meeting RAN2 agreed to release CG configuration upon expiry of CG-SDT-TAT but for other behavior like those for *timeAlignmentTimer* as mentioned below which is still unclear.

|  |
| --- |
| 1> when a *timeAlignmentTimer* expires:2> if the *timeAlignmentTimer* is associated with the PTAG:3> flush all HARQ buffers for all Serving Cells;3> notify RRC to release PUCCH for all Serving Cells, if configured;3> notify RRC to release SRS for all Serving Cells, if configured;3> clear any configured downlink assignments and configured uplink grants;3> clear any PUSCH resource for semi-persistent CSI reporting;3> consider all running *timeAlignmentTimer*s as expired;3> maintain NTA (defined in TS 38.211 [8]) of all TAGs. |

The moderator upon expiry of CG-SDT-TAT, the MAC entity shall clear configured grant for SDT, flush HARQ buffers. Since at this time, the configuration for CG-SDT has already be released, including the CG-TAT configuration, there is no point anymore to still maintain the NTA for CG-SDT.

###### Question6: Do companies agree that UE should (a) clears all SDT configured grant, (b) flushe HARQ buffer and (c) stop maintaining CG-SDT-NTA upon expiry of CG-SDT-TAT?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| LG | No | We agree with (a) and (b). However, for (c), we think NTA should be maintained, as in legacy. |
| Samsung | No | Agree with a) and b) |
| ZTE | Also depends | If the CG-SDT timer is only used in initial UL transmission phase, we think the expiry of CG-SDT-TAT after initial UL transmission and before the acknowledgement is received for the first UL message is a real corner case. Hence, if this happens, we think the UE can just declare SDT failure. The alternative is to fallback to RA-SDT, but this may be even more complex since this needs interaction with RRC layer and may also have impacts to common RACH procedure which seems not nice!  |
| Sharp | Yes for (a) and (b)No for (c) | For N\_TA, it could be maintained, as legacy. |
| OPPO | Partially yes | We agree with a).For c), we also support to follow legacy, i.e., maintain NTA. For b) and c), a case is observed that network may want to schedule retransmission for the first UL while CG-SDT-TAT expires. If NTA is maintained and the buffer where the MAC PDU of the first UL data is stored is not flushed, it is still possible for network to provide a TAC MAC CE to start/restart a timer for TA maintainance and then indicate the retransmission. |
| CATT | No | Same view as LG and Samsung. |
| Lenovo | No | We agree with a) and b). For c) the reason why we maintain N\_TA even when TAT is expired in legacy, is that NW could start the TAT by sending TAC MAC CE |
| ASUSTeK | No | Agree for (a) (b), not for (c). |
| InterDigital |  | Agree with a) and b) |
| Nokia | Comment | CG-SDT-TAT should only be used for CG validation for initial transmission/retransmission. Upon CG-SDT-TAT expiry, CG is released and CG-SDT can no longer be used. |
| Qualcomm | No | Agree with a) and b) |
| Fujitsu | Too early | We suggest to have common understanding in RAN2 on what is the role of CG-SDT-TAT before making conclusion. |
| Huawei, HiSIlicon | Ok for (a) and (b) | Ok for (a) and (b) |
| Intel | See comment | In case subsequent UL transmissions using CG-SDT are not supported and the CG-SDT TAT expires, this seems more like a SDT failure scenario.If subsequent UL transmissions using CG-SDT are indeed supported, a) and b) can be supported. For c), we think it is more appropriate to follow the legacy TAT behavior, i.e. UE maintains the N\_TA. |
| Xiaomi | No | Agree with a) and b) |
| Ericsson | Comment | Agree with a) and b). For NTA c) we think that as we have no valid CG configuration, there is not real use of maintaining CG-SDT-NTA. Fine to adopt legacy in specs. In general although this does not render the CG-SDT configuration usable. |
| vivo | No | We are fine with Option a) and Option b). Additionally, the SDT CG resources can be released at both MAC and RRC levels in this case.  |
| Spreadtrum | No | Ok with a and b. |
| China Telecom | No | Agree with a) and b) |
| NEC | No | We agree with LG and Samsung. |

###### Question6 Summary:

* LG, SS, Sharp, CATT, Lenov, ASUStek, IDC, HW, Xiaomi, Ericsson, VIVO, Spreadtrum, China Telecom think that (a) and (b) are agreeable
* OPPO agrees with (a) and not with (b) and (c)
* ZTE, Intel think it depends on whether subsequent CG transmission is supported
* Fujitsu thinks it is to early to discuss

Based on the comments above, we propose the following:

**Proposal5: Upon expiry of CG-SDT-TAT , UE should (a) clears all SDT configured grant, (b) flushes HARQ buffer and (c) continue to maintain NTA.**

## CG retransmission

During R2#116e, the following agreement has been made on L1-ACK:

|  |
| --- |
| [R2-2111219](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cpanidx%5COneDrive%20-%20InterDigital%20Communications%2C%20Inc%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%20RAN%5CTSGR2_116-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2111219.zip) Reply LS on the physical layer aspects of small data transmission (R1-2110661; contact: ZTE) RAN1 LS in Rel-17 NR\_SmallData\_INACTIVE-Core To:RAN2=> Assumption that we won’t have L1 feedback as a functionality. Discuss subsequent and autonomous CG transmissions with email discussion.  |

Then, during RAN1#107, the issue has been discussed in R1 again and R1 couldn’t reach consensus on this again.

|  |
| --- |
| R1-2112782 Reply LS on the physical layer aspects of small data transmissionRAN1 still cannot reach consensus on separate non-initial BWP and explicit L1 ACK feedback for CG-SDT. |

During the last R2 meeting, it was also agreed that a confirmation is needed at least for initial transmisison.

|  |
| --- |
| 9. The UE is allowed to initiate subsequent UL data transmission only after the reception of confirmation of initial transmission from the gNB |

The above means that some acknowledgement is needed, different than L1-ACK as this could not be agreed in R1.

During RAN2#116, discussion has also taken place on this and the main options that were mentioned were by using a MAC CE or by network issuing a DG. It should be noted that a MAC CE as an acknowledgement is not new and this has been used for RACH-less handover in LTE by sending a MAC CE with C-RNTI to the UE.

While another option is by DG scheduling a new transmission for the same HARQ process, some companies think that DG is already enough; and other thinks that if subsequent transmission on CG is supported, it enhances efficient usage of CG-SDT by not wasting the resource. Note that previously we have already agreed on using CG-SDT for subsequent new trnamission.

###### Question7: Do companies think which option can be adopted for subsequent new transmission on CG-SDT?

* ***OptionA: Revert the previous agreement: subsequent new transmission on CG-SDT is not supported.***
* ***OptionB: Stick to the previous agreement: subsequent new transmission on CG-SDT is supported. For the acknowledgement in subsequent CG-SDT, downselect from the following options:***
	+ ***OptionB1: Imlicit ACK by dynamic scheduling of uplink new transmission (no spec change is needed)***
	+ ***OptionB2: MAC CE for acknowledgement***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Options** | **Comments** |
| LG | B2 | Subsequent transmission can be performed by either DG or CG. If the network wants to rely on CG for subsequent transmission, the network can just send MAC CE without any UL grant. Else, if the network wants to rely on DG for subsequent transmission, the network can provide dynamic UL grant after sending MAC CE.  |
|  |  | Reagrding the following agreement: The UE is allowed to initiate subsequent UL data transmission only after the reception of confirmation of initial transmission from the gNB.* For the acknowledgment/confirmation of initial UL transmission during SDT, PDCCH addressed to SDT-RNTI is sufficient.

For subsequent UL data transmission using CG-SDT, Option B1 is sufficient. |
| ZTE | Option A | Considering the current status in RAN1, we think without L1 feedback it is a bit cumborsume to support CG-SDT for subsequent transmission. Further, as noted above, the maintanece of TAT and CG-SDT-TAT and the interaction between these two gets complicated if we allow CG-SDT for subsequent new transmissions. The main issue as explained above by the moderator is as follows: * UE transmits a new transmission in subsequent CG resource. The network successfully receives it but there is no L1 feedback. Since there is no way for the UE to know the successful reception, the UE will retransmit. The only way to suppress such continuous retransmissions is:
	+ Either to support some MAC CE based ACK or
	+ Provide a new DG to suppress the retransmission (even if there is nothing to send UL, such DG will be needed)

We think defining a new MAC CE just for this ACK case is overly complex and comes with too much overhead. If DG is necessary to supress retransmission, then it seems DG can be used for the the transmissions in the first place anyway. It is also unclear how the DG will interact with the configuredGrantTimer in this case (i.e. will the configuredGrantTimer be stopped when receiving this DG or something else??). So, it is not clear why we need CG for subsequent + DG just to provide ACK (when DG could simply have been used in the first place). Based on the above analysis, and given the current situation with lack of L1 feedback, we think the best way forward is to simply use option A and this seems to significantly simplify the overall CG-SDT procedure.  |
| Sharp | B2 |  |
| OPPO | Option B1 |  |
| CATT | B1 | We think defining one new MAC CE will introduce too much specification impacts and want to keep the spec simple. |
| Lenovo | B1 | We should stick to the earlier agreement that CG PUSCH or DG PUSCH can be used for subsequent UL transmissions. NW can implicitly ACK a previous transmission by sending a initial DG for the same HARQ process.  |
| ASUSTeK | B1 with comment | NW can also implicitly ACK a previous transmission by sending a DL assignment (e.g., for TAC), as discussed in Q9. |
| InterDigital | B1 | The usefulness of CG-SDT becomes low if it is only limited to a single TB. DG can be used to acknowledge a CG transmission, and new data that arrives after that can use CG-SDT for subsequent new TBs.  |
| Nokia | B1 | It should work like legacy. CG timer expiry means the process can be used again for new transmission. Requiring MAC CE for acknowledgement for each TB does not make any sense.Fine with A as well. It would revert many other agreements as well though. |
| Qualcomm | B1 | B2 MAC CE casus too much overhead and complexity. Implicit ACK by DG is good enough. |
| Fujitsu | B1 | B1 will work. RAN2 should confirm that B1 is the baseline. Other mechanism should be discussed if RAN2 sees any problem with B1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | B1 |  |
| Intel | Option A with comments | Firstly, we think it would be good to clarify what “subsequent new transmissions” means. We assume this refer to the case AFTER the initial UL transmission via CG-SDT has been successfully acknowledged by the gNB and the UE has new data to transmit. However in our response below we address both scenarios in relation to UL transmission: case (1) for initial UL transmission via CG-SDT and case (2) for subsequent new UL transmission.For initial UL transmission via CG-SDT (case (1)), it may be acknowledged by the NW with the dynamic scheduling via C-RNTI/CS-RNTI. Then, for any subsequent new UL data (case (2)), we think it would make the procedure very much simplified if we only rely on NW scheduling. Practically speaking, we do not expect the NW to configure CG with such short periodicity that there are several CG occasions within a given SDT session. In addition, the lack of explcit feedback in the form of L1 ack means that the only real option is by way of MAC CE, which we agree with ZTE seems overkill for this purpose. We assume that the network can anyway schedule UL transmissions/retransmission via C-RNTI/CS-RNTI. Therefore we support that subsequent new UL transmission on CG-SDT is not supported (i.e. Option A). |
| Xiaomi | B1/B2 | For B1, it is too early to say “*no spec change is needed*”. From our understanding, we need to use the ACK to stop the CG-SDT timer.  |
| Ericsson | B1 | Straightforward solution that can be used with no or limted impact.  |
| vivo | B1 | For simplicity, we can use the existing DCI scheduling (excluding NR-U DFI) for confirmation. |
| Spreadtrum | B1 |  |
| China Telecom | B1 | Introducing one new MAC CE will introduce too much specification impacts. |
| NEC | B1 |  |

###### Question7 Summary:

For the comments received

* LG, and Sharp, MAC CE for acknowledgement should be introduced
* ZTE and Intel thinks we should not support subsequent transmission on CG
* Oppo, CATT, Lenovo, Asustek, IDC, Nokia, QC, Fujitsu, Huawei, Ericsson, VIVO, Spreadtrum, China Telecom, NEC
* Xiaomi is ok with either B1/B2, and think it is too early to say that no spec change is needed for B1

Based on the comments above, we propose the following:

**Proposal6: Stick to the previous agreement: subsequent new transmission on CG-SDT is supported. Support implicit ACK by dynamic scheduling of uplink new transmission for the same HARQ process. (16/20)**

During R2#116, R2 has made an agreement that we shall at least support retransmission on CG-SDT for initial transmission. Similarly as specified for URLLC, the HARQ process ID is determined by the time domain characteristics of the CG occasion and the UE uses the same HARQ process for retransmission. However, an open question that has to be answered is whether the same retransmission scheme can be reused for CG transmissions during subsequent data pahse of SDT.

|  |
| --- |
| * At least for initial transmission we will have a mechanism to allow the UE to transmit the message again. FFS for retransmission for subsequent.
* The UE uses/selects the same HARQ process for retransmission
 |

The discussion has been briefly taken on this during online discussion. Some companies thought that the UE behaviour between initial transmission and subsequent transmission should be aligned and that this creates no additional specification complexity. On the other hand, some other companies indicated the retransmissions are only needed for initial transmission since the initial transmission is more important in order for the gNB to detect the UE in the first place.

###### Question8: Do companies agree that we need to support retransmission on CG-SDT resource for subsequent CG-SDT transmission?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| LG | Yes | We prefer the same behavior for both initial transmission and subsequent transmission. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes, if we go with option B1 or B2 for Q7 | Assuming we allow CG-SDT for subsequent transmissions, we think allowing retransmissions for failure case is not a problem since in this case there will be NACK via CS-RNTI. However, the problem is with supressing these retransmissions for the successful case as explained above since there is no ACK in this case.  |
| Sharp | No | We think the retransmission for subsequent transmission could rely on dynamic grant. |
| OPPO | No | Considering that the calculation on the HARQ process ID for liscensed band is reused for CG-SDT, it may not be efficient to perform retransmission since the CG resource with same HARQ process ID appears in periodicity. |
| CATT | comments | Our question is how to trigger retransmission for CG-SDT. Unlike IIoT in Rel-16, the UE can’t find that the transmission has failed. So the mechanism to trigger autonomous retransmission is based on timer, like Rel-16 NR-U. if NR-U mechanism is reused to trigger retransmission on CG-SDT resource, some mechanism is needed to stop the timer. So we think the same mechanism as licensed band in RRC\_CONNECTED is used for subsequent CG-SDT transmission, i.e. network based retransmssion. |
| Lenovo |  | No strong opinion. However if there are no issues found with supporting (autonomous) retransmission for subsequent UL data, then we should have one common UE behaviour rather than supporting some functionality only for the initial SDT transmission.  |
| ASUSTeK |  | Whether to support retransmission on CG-SDT resource for subsequent transmission can be discussed after we decide the mechanism for retransmission on CG-SDT resource for initial CG-SDT. |
| InterDigital | Yes | To confirm, if this question is addressing whether a subsequent new TB can be transmitted again on the CG (e.g. if no response form the network), then in that case yes we support it and it shouldn’t be different from the UE behaviour of the initial TB. Retransmissions after receiving a response from the network, however, should be based on DGs. |
| Nokia | No | See above. Supporting retransmission on CG-SDT resource would require explicit NW feedback even if the TB has been successfully decoded which increases the NW overhead and makes CG rather useless if every transmission on CG requires a dynamic grant response. For initial transmission, the NW can anyway response the UE with e.g. TA MAC CE. |
| Qualcomm | No | Retransmission in subsequent transmission phase is by DG.  |
| Fujitsu | B1 | B1 will work. RAN2 should confirm that B1 is the baseline. Other mechanism should be discussed if RAN2 sees any problem with B1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Based on the currenet MAC spec, this can be easily supported |
| Intel | See comment | We think this depends on the resolution to Q7. In our view, whether or not subsequent transmissions using CG-SDT are supported should be addressed first.If subsequent trannsmissions using CG-SDT are supported, then we assume the same mechanism as for retransmission of the initial UL msg can be supported as well. |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | No | The NW would in case of retransmissions anyway benefit from link adaptation for cases where the UL is bad. This would make it possible to shorten the procedure duration and simplify the procedure. The alternative would be a MAC CE for retransmission indications, timer handling issues or autonomous retransmissions with unnecessary complexity and HARQ process handling for rarer use cases when SDT durations are short. We assume retransmissions can be handled by DG. See other input. |
| vivo | Yes | The DL radio condition may become poor during the CG-SDT procedure, supporting autonomous retransmission on SDT-CG resources helps to improve robustness.  |
| Spreadtrum | No | CG retansmission can rely on DG. |
| China Telecom | Yes |  |
| NEC |  | No strong view, DG can be used for retransmission. |

###### Question8 Summary:

For the comments received,

* LG, SS, ZTE, Lenovo, IDC, Fujitsu, HW, Intel, Xiaomi, vivo, China Telecom, think that we should support retransmisson on CG for subsequent CG transmission
	+ Lenovo supports it under the condition that if there is no issue found
* Sharp, OPPO, Nokia, QC, Ericsson,spreadtrum, CATT do not support.
	+ CATT does not know how the retransmission can be triggered
* Asustek thinks that it should be determined after retransmission for initial transmission
* NEC has no strong view

**Proposal7: Support retransmission on CG-SDT resource for subsequent CG-SDT transmission. (11/18)**

Another mechanism to enable the acknowledgement is by subsequent downlink transmission. In the previous meetings, we have agreed on multiple HARQ process for CG-SDT and subsequent uplink data trnamission should only happen after the reception of confirmation for initial transmission. Then, it should be investigated, whether for initial transmission, any downlink transmission after the initial trnamission can serve as an implicit ACK. The moderator thinks that the subsequent DL transmission after initial CG-SDT can serve as implicit ACK, since there is only one ongoing HARQ process; while this does not hold for subsequent uplink transmission, since there might be multiple HARQ process.

###### Question9: Do companies think that subsequent downlink transmission can serve as an implicit acknowledgement for initial CG-SDT but not for subsequent CG-SDT?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **options** | **Comments** |
| LG | No | We don’t want to associate DL with UL. In addition, the downlink transmission cannot be served as an acknowledgement for subsequent CG-SDT because multiple HARQ processes can be used for subsequent transmission. We want to have same behavior for both initial transmission and subsequent transmission. |
| Samsung | See comments | Reagrding the following agreement: The UE is allowed to initiate subsequent UL data transmission only after the reception of confirmation of initial transmission from the gNB.* For the acknowledgment/confirmation of initial UL transmission during SDT, PDCCH addressed to SDT-RNTI is sufficient.
 |
| ZTE | Yes | For initial transmission there can be no response from the network unless the network successfully receives the initial UL message from the UE. Hence any network response can be treated as an implicit ACK for the first UL message and until the UE receives such ACK it can restransmit (e.g. based on a timer). For subsequent transmissions such assumption cannot be made because the network can always sechedule the UE (both in UL and DL) and such scheduling cannot be assumed as ACK for the CG-SDT transmission in subsequent resource. This is the problem with lack of L1 ack for subsequent transmissions.  |
| Sharp | No | We prefer a explicit ACK as discussed in Q7. |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes  | This question is related to Q7. We think this is simple.  |
| Lenovo |  | Agree with Samsung |
| ASUSTeK | Yes |  |
| InterDigital |  | DG with NDI toggled can serve as a mean to acknowledge the TB, per existing specs. If that is not sufficient, PDCCH addressed to SDT-RNTI can be used for the initial transmission. |
| Nokia | Yes with comment | Any PDCCH addressing to the UE could serve the purpose as NW response to initial transmission. |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Fujitsu | Yes | Based on the answer to Q7. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes | Agree with ZTE that for initial UL transmission via CG-SDT, we can rely on the NW response as ACK or NACK. However, for subsequent CG-SDT, as per our explanation in Q7 above, we do not think it can be relied upon as an acknowledgement.  |
| Xiaomi | Yes with comments | We think that a DCI scheduling a new transmission for either DL or UL can be used as the ACK. |
| Ericsson | Comments | The complexity in implicitly linking (some) DL transmissions and associated HARQ process handling in UL is not worthwhile the effort. Having a PDCCH linked to the same HARQ process would cater for this |
| vivo | No | As multiple initial CG-SDT transmissions can be performed, it is likely that some TBs can be successfully received while some cannot. In this case, the NW may schedule DL data. From the UE perspective, it is not good to assume ACK for all the initial transmissions.  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| China Telecom | Yes |  |
| NEC | Yes | Same view as in Q7. |

###### Question9 Summary:

For the comments received:

* LG, Sharp, vivo, thinks it should not be an implicit ACK when DL is received for initial CG-SDT
* ZTE, SS, OPPO, CATT, ASUSTek, Lenovo,IDC, NOKIA, QC, Fujitsu, Huawei, Intel, Xiaomi, spreadtrum china telecom, NEC, thinks that it can be an implicit ACK
	+ SS, Lenovo thinks that this is already implied by the previous agreement
* Ericsson thinks that there is a complexity to link the downlink with the uplink ACK and think the ACK should be indicated by DG for new transmission

Based on the comemnts above, we propose the following

**Proposal8: Subsequent downlink transmission can serve as an implicit acknowledgement for initial CG-SDT but not for subsequent CG-SDT. (16/20)**

Another question is on the usage of configured grant timer. In Release-15, when configured grant timer expires, new uplink transmission using a configured grant is possible on the same HARQ process, while when the timer is running, new transmissions via configured grant cannot use this HARQ process. In R16 NRU, CG retransmission timer (CGRT) was introduced whose duration is shorter than that of CGT, so that multiple CG retransmssions controlled by the CGRT can take place within the duration of the CGT.

For CG-SDT, we would like to ask the question that whether CGT can be reused for preventing new uplink transmissions from using the same HARQ process.

###### Question10: Do companies agree that configuredGrantTimer is reused for CG-SDT for prohibiting the HARQ process for new uplink transmissions?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **options** | **Comments** |
| LG | Not sure | We don’t think the legacy CGT is needed for CG-SDT. The retransmission of CG-SDT is controlled by a new CG-SDT timer, and retransmission can be stopped by acknowledgement. We think the only reason to keep CGT for CG-SDT is easy implementation in the specification, but we are wondering whether it is that critical. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| ZTE | No  | For the initial UL message we can rely on CG-SDT timer and when this timer expires, the UE can retransmit autonomously on the same HARQ process. If we don’t allow subsequent CG-SDT, then it seems we don’t need to use this timer anymore and the overall procedure is simplified again. If we do use CG-SDT for subsequent transmission phase, then we need discussion on how to indicate successful reception of UL CG transmission first.  |
| Sharp | Yes | It could be reused as legacy. |
| OPPO | Comments | We think the function of CGT is necessary for subsequent new transmissions on CG. But we are wondering whether CGT and CG-SDT timer can be combined to one timer. |
| CATT | Yes  | We think after the initial transmission of CG-SDT, the transmission between the network and the UE has been setup, the network is aware of the UE. Then, the same mechanism as that in RRC\_CONNECTED can be reused. |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| ASUSTeK | Yes |  |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Fujitsu | Yes | As legacy |
| Huawei, HiSIlicon | Yes | Can work similar to NRU. Both under un-reliable link, but when the CGT expires, the UE can perform new transmission |
| Intel | See comment | If we do not allow subsequent transmissions via CG-SDT (as previously explained), this timer does not seem necessary. If subsequent transmissions via CG-SDT are supported, it can be reused. |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes | Depends on the number of HARQ processes in use and the period duration between CG occasions. A configuredGrantTimer could be optionally configured depending on what CG configurations are used. If retransmission on CG then this may be useful. |
| vivo | Yes | The SDT WID explicitly tells that the existing type-1 CG mechanism should be resued. So we should stick to the WID and no BIG technical issues are found currently.Transmission of UL data on pre-configured PUSCH resources (i.e. reusing the configured grant type 1) |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| China Telecom | Yes |  |
| NEC | Comments | We have introduced CG-SDT timer for PDCCH monitoring, but it is not clear whether this timer is per HARQ progress or per UE. If it is per HARQ progress, then it is possible to reuse the CG-SDT timer. Otherwise, it seems that we need configuredGrantTimer which is per HARQ progress for CG-SDT. |

###### Question10 Summary:

For the comments receives:

* SS, Sharp, OPPO,CATT, Lenovo, ASUSTek, IDC, Nokia, QC, Fujitsu, HW, xiaomi, Ericsson, Vivo, SPreadtrum, China Telecom, Intel thinks that CGT is reused for CG-SDT for prohibiting the HARQ process for new uplink transmission. In particular
	+ OPPO wonders whether CGT and CG-SDT-Timer can be combined
* ZTE, Intel thinks it is not needed if we don’t allow subsequent transmission on CG
* NEC thinks that if CG-SDT-timer is per HARQ process, we don’t need CGT.
* LG is not sure

Based on the comments received above, we propose the following:

**Proposal9: ConfiguredGrantTimer is reused for CG-SDT for prohibiting the HARQ process for new uplink transmissions. (17/19)**

### Considerations on CG-SDT timer

During RAN2#116e, the following agreements have been reached for the CG-SDT timer.

|  |
| --- |
| * The “CG-SDT timer” starts at the first “valid” PDCCH occasion from the end of the CG-SDT PUSCH transmission. The first “valid” PDCCH occasion is defined in RAN1
* The “CG-SDT timer” can be started/restarted during for initial and subsequent transmissions
* The UE restarts the “CG-SDT timer” at least:
	+ upon the PUSCH retransmission indicated by the CS-RNTI PDCCH
	+ after each CG-SDT transmission
* The “CG-SDT timer” stops at least:
	+ When the UE receives RRC feedback messages (e.g. RRCResume, RRCSetup, RRCRelease and RRCReject)
 |

With the agreements above, it is useful to determine how the UE should handle the CG-SDT timer when C-RNTI is received, since we have already agreed previously that subsequent CG-SDT can be based on dynamic grant. Note that the above agreement is for the UE to restart the timer **when PUSCH is transmitted**. Also note that for legacy releases, CGRT is restarted when PDCCH addressed to C-RNTI is received. Another aspect is how to handle the timer when CS-RNTI is received for CG retransmission. In legacy, the CGRT is restarted when PDCCH addressed to CS-RNTI is received. With the stopping of the timer, the UE does not need to monitor PDCCH for a certain HARQ process thus power can be saved.

###### Question11: Do companies agree that the CG-SDT timer should be stopped when PDCCH addressed to C-RNTI and CS-RNTI is received?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| LG | No | As replied to Q7, we prefer to have MAC CE as an acknowledgement. Then, the CG-SDT Timer should be stopped when the acknowledgement MAC CE is received. |
| Samsung | yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Sharp | No | CG-SDT timer could keep running and be restarted. It is not clear for us the benefit to stop the CG-SDT except for the RRC feedback messages. |
| OPPO | No | In our understanding, CG-SDT timer is configured per HARQ process. If the PDCCH addressed to C-RNTI/CS-RNTI is used to indicate a successful transmission of the corresponding HARQ process, the timer can be stopped, otherwise, it shall keep running. |
| CATT | Yes | We think the function of the CG-SDT is to trigger autonomous retransmission, which is similar to CGRT. And CGRT will be stopped when PDCCH addressed to C-RNTI and CS-RNTI is received. |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| ASUSTeK | No | We have agreed that the timer is restarted after each PUSCH transmission in CG-SDT. It is no need to stop the timer upon receiving C-RNTI/CS-RNTI. |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes with comment | Possible to reuse configuredGrantTimer though, then everything works like legacy with conditions added for auto retx for initial transmission. Not clear if we need another timer. |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Fujitsu | Too early | It seems that companies have different understanding of the role of CG-SDT. We suggest to have common understanding on what the rold of CG-SDT is. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Same as legacy. The timer can be re-started when PUSCH is transmitted.  |
| Intel | No | It seems we are still not clear on the overall functionality of this timer. Assuming RAN2 does not support subsequent new tranmissions via CG-SDT, we do not think this timer is needed. Instead, a single timer for declaring SDT failure common for both RA-SDT and CG-SDT should be defined, which can be sufficient for detecting SDT failuire.On the other hand, if RAN2 does support subsequent new transmissions via CG-SDT (as per Q7), then CG-SDT timer (on top of the SDT failure detection timer) will be needed. In summary for this case, this CG-SDT timer would be needed and reception of PDCCH to C-RNTI/CS-RNTI can act as a stop condition. |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | No | Unclear on timer use currently.See replies to earlier Q’s. We assume the NW may issue retransmission grants as a simple solution and as the retransmission should occur quite soon after receiving the PDCCH there is no large gain in battery saving. It can be assumed also that the battery saving optimization like these in general is not noticeable.Our view is that the CGSDT timer runs as long as needed to allow DG for subsequent or retransmissions. If it is stopped after the DCI and started upon transmission of PUSCH, there is really a short time it is stopped and energy savings minimal. |
| vivo | No | We think this CG-SDT is similar to the DRX Onduration timer or DRX RTT retransmission timer. It should be restarted if the new transmission is scheduled by C-RNTI PDCCH.  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| China Telecom | Yes |  |
| NEC | Yes |  |

###### Question11 Summary:

Among the comments received,

* LG, Sharp, OPPO, ASUStek, Intel, Ericsson, VIVO think that CG-SDT timer should not be stopped when PDCCH addressed to C-RNTI and CS-RNTI is received
* SS, ZTE, CATT, Interdigital, Nokia, QC, Lenovo, HW, Xiaomi, Spreadtrum, China Telecom, NEC thinks it should be stopped
* Fujitsu thinks it is too early to decide

Based on the comments above, we propose the following

**Proposal 10: CG-SDT timer should be stopped when PDCCH addressed to C-RNTI and CS-RNTI is received (12/19)**

### SSB selection for CG-SDT

During the previous R2 meetings, we agreed that UE shall perform SSB selection for initial transmission, while leaving that for subsequent transmission for CG-SDT as FFS:

|  |
| --- |
| 3. For initial CG transmission, UE does not select any SSB if none of the SSBs’ RSRP is above the RSRP threshold. FFS if re-evaluation for every CG transmission is necessary |

Furthermore, as mentioned above, at least for initial transmission, retransmission can happen on CG-SDT resources. However, we have also agreed in the last meeting that CG retransmission should have the same HARQ process id as the new transmission in order to enable soft combining in the network side.

Then, if we allow for SSB reselection for subsequent uplink transmission, it is also possible that the CG configuration and CG occasion associated with the SSB is also changed. Since we have also agreed that HARQ process id is determined by the time domain characteristics of the CG occasion. Then, question arises on whether the UE can use the same HARQ process when SSB is reselected.

Based on the understanding of the moderator, when multiple CG configurations are configured, it is up to the network’s judgement to configure the range of the HARQ process id for each CG configuration. Then, by network implementation, different CG configurations can be configured with the same range of HARQ process ids. Then, even if SSB reselected and the mapped CG configuration/occasion is changed, the UE is still able to find the CG occasion with the same HARQ process id. This is allowed by NRU with the following note in R16, but not allowed for URLLC



###### Question12: Do companies agree that HARQ process id can be shared between different CG configurations such that when SSB is reselected, the HARQ process id can be the same for retransmission as initial CG-SDT transmission?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| LG | Comments | First, we don’t think SSB re-evaluation for every CG transmission is needed, because the time gap between initial transmission and retransmission is not that large and the RSRP would not change much during the short time gap. Note that we already agreed that “During the subsequent new CG transmission phase, for the purpose of CG resource selection, UE re-evaluates the SSB for subsequent CG transmission.”. We think SSB re-evaluation for every initial transmission is enough.Secondly, regardless of SSB re-evaluation, we think the HARQ process ID should be same for retransmission as initial transmission. |
| Samsung | Comments | Agree that re-evaluation of initial transmission is enough. Not needed to retransmission. |
| ZTE | No  | We need to first discuss whether we allow UE to select retransmission resource from different CG configuration. We think this is is not needed. For the case where there are many SSB within the cell, then the CG-SSB period will be quite long if there is only one CG occasion per CG period. To address this issue, we have 3 alternatives:Alt1：have multiple CG occasion per CG periodAlt2：have a shorter CG period,Alt3：have multiple CG configuration interleaving on time domain associated to different SSB.For the three alternatives above, alt2 seems the simplest one (i.e. by NW implementation). If alt2 is not sufficient based on the majority view, then we can take one from alt1 and alt 3. Alt 1 has less impact on RAN2 but have some impact on RAN1; Alt3 has impact on RAN2 only (HARQ process derivation). Based on the above, we prefer alt2. Then, it is up to network configuration to allow sufficient CG resources within one CG configuration to indicate the selected SSB. If there is no consensus on this issue, the consequence could be that the UE may need to wait for multiple CG period for the CG occasion associated to the SSB selected (although this is a bit restrictive, it may still work for CG-SDT which aim to support the stationary UE without requirement on latency).  |
| Sharp | - | We think the HARQ process ID should be same for retransmission as initial transmission, but we don’t see SSB re-evaluation is necessary for retransmission. So the question here is not existing. |
| OPPO | No |  |
| CATT | No | We think the HARQ process ID should be the same between retransmission and initial transmission. But since the HARQ process ID is calculated by timing for SDT, we think the HARQ process ID is not shared between different CG configrautions like IIoT in Rel-16. |
| Lenovo |  | We agree with LG/Samsung that evaluation is sufficient for initial CG transmissions. HARQ process ID should be always same for initial transmission and associated retransmissions. |
| ASUSTeK | No | Agree with CATT. |
| InterDigital | No | Agree with LG/Samsung |
| Nokia |  | We do not support retransmission on CG-SDT resource, however for HARQ process ID configuration, no restriction is needed esp. if one of the use case of multiple CG configuration is for different SSBs, no need to have HARQ process hard split for different SSBs.SSB reselection does not necessarily mean switch to different CG configuration though since single CG can be configured with multiple SSBs. |
| Qualcomm | No | Same view with LG and Samsung. |
| Fujitsu | No | For NRU, the re-evaluation makes sense given that there may be LBT failure which causes latency. For SDT, such a latency may not occur, so that it may not be so beneficial.In addition, it should be noted that the UE is in RRC\_INACTIVE, where battery saving is important. To save the battery life, non-beneficial function and procedure would be out of scope. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | The issue is mainly, if SSB is reselected to a different SSB, whether the same HARQ process can be used. This can be solved by the NRU solution that HARQ process is shared between different CG configurations |
| Intel | See comment | We agree that the HARQ process ID has to be the same for initial transmission and retransmission. However, we are not sure about the relationship with SSB evaluation. Moreover the question seems to also address/include reference to different CG configurations that might be in used. To better respond the remaining open questions, further clarification might be required. |
| Xiaomi | See comment | We think that the HARQ process ID should be the same for both initial transmission and retransmission. |
| Ericsson | Comment | HARQ process for transmission and retransmission should be the same. For this scenario in Q11, we think the behaviour from URLLC should be sufficient and that the use of the timer can accommodate this. |
| vivo | No | We think the use case mentioned by the rapporteur does not exist. Currently, RAN1 has agreed that multiple DM-RS resources within one CG configuration will be used for SSB association. We don’t see the need to associate different SSBs with multiple CG configurations.Support multiple DMRS resources per CG configuration when single layer PUSCH transmission is assumed, and each DMRS resource could be mapped to the same or different SSB(s) |
| Spreadtrum | No  | Agree with LG/Samsung. |
| China Telecom | See comment | We think the HARQ process ID should be the same between retransmission and initial transmission. |
| NEC | Comment | We agree with LG, SSB re-evaluation is (more than) enough per transmission, let alone per retransmission. |

###### Question12 Summary:

Among the comments received, the opinions are rather diversed. However, considering the status of question13, there seem to be no need to disucss this.

No proposal is formulated for this proposal.

Then, based on the discussion above, the moderator would like to ask the following question on whether SSB reselection should be performed for retransmission on initial CG-SDT message.

###### Question13: Do companies agree that SSB can be reselected for the retransmission for initial message over CG-SDT resource under the condition that the corresponding CG configuration allows transmission using the same HARQ process ID?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| LG | No | See our reply to Q12. |
| Samsung | No |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Sharp | No |  |
| OPPO | No |  |
| CATT | No | The time between new transmission and retransmission might not be too long. So the channel condtion will be stable. Then, the benefits of reselction of SSB for retransmission are marginal. |
| Lenovo | No | We don’t see a need for this.  |
| ASUSTeK | Yes | SSB can be reselected for retransmission when the last selected SSB is not qualified. |
| InterDigital | No |  |
| Nokia  | No | No auto retransmission over CG-SDT resource. |
| Qualcomm | No | It is unclear for us why UE should perform SSB reselection for retransmission of the initial CG-SDT message. |
| Fujitsu | No | As Q12. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | We can not ignore the case when SSB changes between different CG transmissions |
| Intel | No | For retransmission of the same initial UL msg, we do not think the duration is long enough that SSB needs to be reevaluated |
| Xiaomi | No |  |
| Ericsson | Comment | Unlikely scenario for where the selected SSB is no longer usable. If a MAC CE is assumed for feedback (e.g. ACK) for initiating a retransmission, this has to be received before SSB change etc.As we assume DG for Re-Tx this is in general not needed to specify. |
| vivo | Yes | The UE should be allowed to select a good SSB at any time.  |
| Spreadtrum | No |  |
| China Telecom | No |  |
| NEC | No |  |

###### Question13 Summary:

Among the comments received,

* LG, SS, sharp, Oppo, CATT, Lenovo, IDC, Nokia, QC, Fujitsu, Intel, Xiaomi, Ericsson, spreadtrum, China Telecom, NEC think that we don’t need to perform SSB reselection for CG-retransmission
* ZTE, Asustek, HW, Vivo, think we can do it.

Based on the comments above, we propose the following

**Proposal11: Do not perform SSB reselection for retransmission on CG (16/20)**

CG-SDT fallback

During the previous RAN2 meetings, we have made the following agreement regarding the fallback/switching from CG-SDT to legacy RACH or RA-SDT

R2#115

|  |
| --- |
| * During subsequent CG transmission phase (i.e. after the UE has received response from NW) UE can initiate at least legacy RACH procedure (e.g. trigger due to no UL resources). No MAC PDU rebuilding is required. FFS if the RA-SDT RA resources can be used for subsequent data.
	+ At least the following conditions are agreed: (1) no qualified SSB when the evaluation is performed; (2) when TA is invalid; (3) when SR is triggered due to lack of UL resource
* During the subsequent new CG transmission phase, for the purpose of CG resource selection, UE re-evaluates the SSB for subsequent CG transmission. FFS what happens if no SSBs are valid or if no sample is available
 |

Based on the above, we have agreed that for subsequent CG-SDT transmission, the UE can trigger legacy RA when there is no SSB above the RSRP threshold. It should be further investigated whether RA-SDT resource can be used when there are no SSB available for subsequent new transmission.

###### Question14: Do companies think that the UE should use RA-SDT resources when there are no SSB available for subsequent new transmission?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| LG | No | We already agreed that if there is no SSB available during subsequent transmission, the UE relies on legacy RA procedure. We think this would not happen frequently, and don’t want to introduce another mechanism.  |
| Samsung | No | Legacy RA procedure using non SDT RA resources is applied |
| ZTE | Yes (if CG is used for subsequent transmissions) | Depends on outcome of Q7 see above.  |
| Sharp | No | Legacy RA procedure is enough. |
| OPPO | No | In our understanding, there is no technical issue to use RA-SDT resources. But considering the complexity to select among different RACH resources, it is suggested to restrict to legacy RACH resources. |
| CATT | No | Legacy RA procedure can be used. |
| Lenovo | No  | In principle it would be also possible to use RACH-SDT for cases that there is no SSB above the configured threshold. However we don’t see much benefit compared to legacy RA procedure for this case. Therefore for simplicitly, we think that UE use trigger legacy RA procedure. |
| ASUSTeK | Yes | We think no technical reason to not allow this. It’s benefitial for UE to use available resource. |
| InterDigital | Yes | This seems to come for free, as RA-SDT resources are already configured. |
| Nokia | No  | Otherwise the RSRP would need to be checked again during subsequent transmission phase which might make the specification more complicated without much gain compare to just use normal RA resource. It is currently only checked upon initation of the SDT procedure. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | As RAN2 has agreed, UE performs legacy RACH when there are no SSB available for subsequent new transmission. It is up to UE to select either RA-SDT resource or non RA-SDT resource to perform RACH. |
| Fujitsu | Yes | Subsequent transmission can be carried out by RA-SDT, so that the UE can still keep RRC\_INACTIVE mode, instead of RRC\_CONNECTED. There is not complexity of carrying out RA-SDT. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Comes for free |
| Intel | Yes | For the case when subsequent UL transmission via CG-SDT are allowed, if the UE is triggering legacy RA, it is ok to utilize RA-SDT resources in this case. |
| Xiaomi | No | Legacy RA procedure is enough. |
| Ericsson | No | This scenario was decided already. UE does legacy RA to obtain a grant. Even if it is in principle possible to use RA-SDT resources (but not sending a new RRCResumeRequst only CRTI and data plus possibly BSR), we prefer to stick with legacy.  |
| vivo | No | In this case, SR can be triggered, which may subsequently trigger the legacy RA procedure (using legacy RA resources). |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | It is beneficial for keeping UE in INACTIVE state to perform data transmission. |
| China Telecom | No | Legacy RA procedure is enough. |
| NEC | No | We prefer to use legacy RA resources in this case. |

###### Question14 Summary:

Among the comments received,

* LG, Samsung, Sharp, OPPO, CATT, Lenovo, Nokia, Xiaomi, Ericsson, VIVO, China Telecom, NEC, think we don’t need to use RA-SDT resource when no SSB above the threshold
* ZTE, Asustek, IDC, QC, Fujitsu, HW, Intel, Spreadtrum, think we can use it

Based on the comments above, we propose the following

**Proposal12: UE does not use RA-SDT resources when there are no SSB available for subsequent new transmission. (12/20)**

CS-RNTI

During RAN2#115, the following agreement was made:

|  |
| --- |
| * CS-RNTI based dynamic retransmission mechanism can be reused for CG-SDT. FFS whether CS-RNTI is the same one as the one previously configured in RRC\_CONNECTED or a new CS-RNTI one is provided to the UE
 |

It should be noted that UE is not always configured with CS-RNTI while it is in RRC Connected mode. Therefore, it seems that CS-RNTI configuration in RRCRelease message is necessary.

###### Question15: Do companies agree that CS-RNTI for CG-SDT is provided to the UE in RRCRelease message?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| LG | Yes | If the UE is not configured with CG in CONNECTED, then the UE may not have CS-RNTI. In this case, the CS-RNTI should be provided to the UE in RRCRelease message. But the provision of CS-RNTI is not mandatory (i.e. the UE can keep the CS-RNTI used in CONNECTED), and we want to change the text as “CS-RNTI **can be** provided”. |
| Samsung | Yes | Simple approach would be to always configure CS-RNTI in RRC Release. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes  | Otherwise, the UE can’t figure out new transmission and retransmission via NDI bit. |
| Lenovo | Yes | Needs to be anyway supported. |
| ASUSTeK | Yes with comment | Agree with LG. As proposal 20 in [Post115-e][509], the CS-RNTI for CG-SDT can be the same as the one configured in RRC\_CONNECTED or provided via RRCRelease message. |
| InterDigital | Yes, but | Only if the UE was not configured with CG in connected mode |
| Nokia | Yes | Can be optionally configured if no CS-RNTI allocated before. |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Fujitu | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes | We have the same view as LG that while it can be provided in RRCRelease msg, the UE can use the one configured while in RRC\_CONNECTED if it was previously configured. |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes | Adopt legacy principle and suggestion from LG is good. |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| China Telecom | Yes |  |
| NEC | Yes |  |

###### Question15 Summary:

Among the comments received, all the companies replied Yes,

Based on the comments above, we propose the following

**Proposal13: CS-RNTI for CG-SDT is provided to the UE in RRCRelease message.(20/20)**

UL carrier selection

For legacy RACH in R15, UL carrier selection is performed for each RACH transmission and its retransmissions. For subsequent transmission on CG-SDT, we need to confirm on whether UL carrier reselection is needed in this phase, in addition to the initial CG-SDT transmission.

###### Question16: Do companies think the UE should perform UL carrier reselection for subsequent CG-SDT transmission over CG-SDT resources?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| LG | No | We think UL carrier selection is performed before SDT procedure is initiated, as discussed in common session. |
| Samsung | No | For legacy RACH, UL carrier is performed only when RA procedure is initiated. It is not performed for every RA attempt during the RA procedure.UL carrier selection at the beginning of SDT procedure as agreed earlier is enough, |
| ZTE | No | Once the initial UL message is received, the UE shall not switch to different UL carrier.  |
| Sharp | No |  |
| OPPO | No |  |
| CATT | No | To keep it simple, it is not necessary to perform UL carrier reselection for subsequent CG-SDT transmission over CG-SDT resources. |
| Lenovo | No | UE should do UL carrier selection for the initial SDT message.  |
| ASUSTeK | No |  |
| InterDigital | No |  |
| Nokia | No | In legacy, UL carrier selection is only performed at RA initiation. |
| Qualcomm | No |  |
| Fujitsu | No | It should be noted that the UE is in RRC\_INACTIVE, where battery saving is important. To save the battery life, non-beneficial function and procedure would be out of scope. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | This is different from RACH procedure. for RACH procedure, RACH transmission and retransmission are resitrcted to a single UL carrier. While for here, the question is for different subsequent new transmissions.  |
| Intel | No |  |
| Xiaomi | No |  |
| Ericsson | No | This is part of the initialization of the procedure not per transmission. |
| vivo | No | We have agreed that UL selection is done before CG-SDT initialization (i.e. UL carrier selection is performed before CG-SDT selection.). Then UE has no chance to reselect the UL carrier again. |
| Spreadtrum | No |  |
| China Telecom | No |  |
| NEC | No |  |

###### Question16 Summary:

Among the comments received, only one company replied with Yes

Based on the comments above, we propose the following

**Proposal14: UE does not perform UL carrier reselection for subsequent CG-SDT transmission over CG-SDT resources (19/20)**

For legacy RACH in R15, once UL carrier is selected, the UE continues RACH on that specific UL carrier and does not perform UL carrier selection again during the same RACH procedure. The moderator would like to confirm with companies whether the same should be applied for CG-SDT transmission.

Note that the question below is dependent on the question for whether to allow autonomous transmission for subsequent CG transmission. If retransmission for CG-SDT is performed by dynamic grant, this question does not apply.

###### Question17: Do companies agree that once a UL carrier is selected for a specific CG-SDT transmission (including both initial and subsequent CG-SDT transmission), the UE should perform autonomous retransmission on the same uplink carrier?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| LG | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes  | It is not necessary to reselect carrier for autonomous retransmission. |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| ASUSTeK | Yes |  |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes | UL carrier selection only at SDT initiation. |
| Qualcomm | - | If retransmission for CG-SDT is performed by dynamic grant, this question does not apply. UL carrier is selected at the SDT initiation phase only. |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes | In our view, a typical SDT session is “short” enough that reevaluation/reselection of the UL carrier does not seem needed. |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | No | Agree with QCWe have not agreed on autonomous retransmissions and that must be discussed first.🡪 In any case the selected UL carrier should not be changed during an ongoing SDT procedure. |
| vivo | Yes | Same as NR-U CG retransmission. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| China Telecom | Yes | China Telecom |
| NEC | Yes |  |

###### Question17 Summary:

Among the comments received, most of the companies think that the CG transmission should happen on the same uplink carrier as when it is selected. Ericsson and QC think that DG does not apply. And E// thinks that this is dependent on the discussion for whether to support retransmission for subsequent CG-SDT.

The moderator would like to emphasize that this question is asked regarding subsequent CG transmission, not by DG. And of course this is dependent on whether we support retransmission for subsequent CG transmission.

Based on the comments above, we propose the following

**Proposal15: Once a UL carrier is selected for a specific CG-SDT transmission, the UE should perform autonomous retransmission on the same uplink carrier. (19/20)**

CG-SDT configurations

In the LS from R1, the following question has been asked by R1 twice in the LSs

|  |
| --- |
| R1-2112782 Reply LS on the physical layer aspects of small data transmissionRAN1 would like to ask RAN2 for feedback on whether there is restriction on candidate values of CG period. |

Therefore, companies are invited to answer the following question:

###### Question18: Do companies think there is any restriction on the candidate values of CG period?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| LG | No |  |
| Samsung | No |  |
| ZTE | No | We don’t see any restriction from RAN2 perspective.  |
| Sharp | No |  |
| OPPO | No |  |
| CATT | No |  |
| Lenovo | No |  |
| ASUSTeK | No |  |
| InterDigital | No |  |
| Nokia | No |  |
| Qualcomm | No |  |
| Fujitsu | No | We don’t see use cases for CGO per CGP. The target use case of SDT is small data and UE is in INACTIVE. Simple resource allocation is enough. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No |  |
| Intel | No |  |
| Xiaomi | No |  |
| Ericsson | No | For the UE-Cases intended for SDT, one should support longer periods between CG occasions. At least a range with larger values should be added. |
| vivo | No | We fail to see the motivation. |
| Spreadtrum | No |  |
| China Telecom | No |  |
| NEC | No |  |

###### Question18 Summary:

Among the comments received, all companies replied NO. Based on the comments above, we propose the following

**Proposal16: There is no restriction on the candidate values of CG period (20/20)**

In the R1 LS, the following has also been indicated:

|  |
| --- |
| Multiple CG occasions per CG period* RAN1 cannot reach consensus on whether to support multiple CG occasions per CG period
* Note that the CG PUSCH with multiple DMRS is considered as one CG occasion.
 |

Thus, we would like also to ask the following question;

###### Question19: Do companies think that multiple CG occasions can be configured per CG period?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| LG | No |  |
| ZTE | No | We think a short period can be used instead (as explained in Q 12) |
| Sharp | No |  |
| OPPO | No | If it refers to one CG configurations, the answer is no.  |
| CATT | No | We have supported multiple CG configurations for SDT, so there is no necessity to support multiple CG occasions per CG period. |
| Lenovo | Yes | If the intention is to support multiple CG occasions per CG period in order to allow subsequent UL data transmission on CG resources we think that the answer should be yes.  |
| ASUSTeK | No |  |
| InterDigital | Yes | This can be up to network configuration. The network may need to configure different occasions within a period for different SSBs or HARQ processes. |
| Nokia | No | In principle, multiple beams can be configured per period. But current configuration can be reused with shorter period. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | The multiple CG occasions map to different SSBs. |
| Fujitsu | No/Yes | We don’t see use cases for CGO per CGP. The target use case of SDT is small data and UE is in INACTIVE. Simple resource allocation is enough. Having said that, indeed this can be up to NW implementation. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No |  |
| Intel | Yes | We support multiple CG occasions for CG-PUSCH configurations. The main motivation is to reduce latency, especially when only 1 DMRS resource is configured in CG-PUSCH configuration. The design can reuse that for MsgA PUSCH |
| Xiaomi |  | No strong view, but we would prefer not to change much in the resource allocation calculation in the MAC for CG. |
| Ericsson | No | This may be beneficial, but to our understanding, RAN1 will not have much time to discuss further functionality for SDT. RAN1input |
| vivo | No | We don’t see the motivation for multiple CG occasions as DM-RS resources can be used for the SSB association (as per the following agreement). Basically, a DM-RS resource can include <sequence, CDM group (at most 3 groups), port (at most 12 ports), scrambling ID (at most 65535 IDs)>. Then there are sufficient DM-RS resources for the SSB association. We don’t see the need to use multiple CG occasions unless massive UL MU-MIMO is expected by the NW. * Support multiple DMRS resources per CG configuration when single layer PUSCH transmission is assumed, and each DMRS resource could be mapped to the same or different SSB(s)
	+ FFS if multi-layer PUSCH transmission is supported for CG-SDT
	+ FFS any limitation on the DMRS configuration if multiple CG PUSCH occasions per CG period is supported
 |
| Spreadtrum | No |  |
| China Telecom | No |  |
| NEC | No | Multiple CG configurations with separately configured occasions is sufficicient. |

###### Question19 Summary:

Among the comments received,

* LG, ZTE, Sharp, Oppo, CATT, ASUSTek, Nokia, QC, Fujitsu, HW, Ericsson, VIVO, Spreadtrum, China Telecom, NEC think that we don’t need to support it
* Lenovo, IDC, QC, Intel think that multiple CG occasions can be configured per CG period
* Fujitsu, Xiaomi is not sure

Based on the comments above, we propose the following

**Proposal17: Do not support multiple CG occasions per CG period. (14/18)**

Any other issues

For the following open question, companies are invited to input any other issues relating to CG-SDT. We may consider to address these issues in the future meetings by contribution.

###### Question20: Do companies think there are other issues relating to CG-SDT?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | We think there are no other issues, but if we want to allow CG-SDT to also for subsequent transmissions, it seems we may have to discuss a few open issues further as noted above. In the interest of time, we think we should make such simplification to ensure that the CG-SDT feature is stabilized quickly at the next meeting.  |
| Lenovo | 1. RAN2 should discuss whether UE in RRC\_INACTIVE configured with CG-SDT is required to maintain its uplink timing alignment as in RRC\_CONNECTED, i.e. UE in RRC\_INACTIVE (gradually) adjusts its uplink timing when there is a DL timing difference observed by the UE. This is somehow related to Question 6.As seen from TS 38.133, up to and including NR Rel-16, a UE is required to maintain timing alignment for its UL transmission when it is in connected state, i.e. in RRC\_CONNECTED state; however UE is not required to maintain its uplink timing alignment in the inactive state (RRC\_INACTIVE). Up to Rel-17 it makes sense since UE is not performing any uplink transmission except PRACH. However, with the introduction of SDT, it actually makes also sense that UE maintains its uplink timing alignment in RRC\_INACTIVE, in particular for the case of CG-SDT. Since UE performs UL transmission, e.g. CG PUSCH, in RRC\_INACTIVE without a prior random access, it is beneficial for the timing accuracy if UE maintains its uplink timing alignment also in RRC\_INACTIVE when being configured with CG-SDT resources and a TAT timer. Maintaining uplink timing alignment means that UE in RRC\_INACTIVE (gradually) adjusts its uplink timing when there is a DL timing difference observed by the UE, e.g. UE autonomously adjusts its uplink timing in order to follow the DL timing reference. It is assumed that a UE in RRC\_INACTIVE (configured for CG-SDT) has a NTA value, e.g. last or most-recent NTA value used in RRC\_CONNECTED before being released to RRC\_INACTIVE. The UE would store and maintain NTA when being released to RRC\_INACTIVE. If the UE for example moves further towards the cell edge, the received downlink timing arrives at a certain amount of time later than the previous reference downlink timing. The UE may change the NTA to a NTA,adjusted accordingly based on the new downlink timing.2. The pre-configured CG resources can be considered as dedicated resources. And the small data transmission is configured per DRB. It means there are allocated resources for SDT if the arrival data corresponds to the configured DRB which is allowed to perform SDT. If the legacy UAC is performed and the UE is barred for the SDT, the dedicated resources are wasted. Therefore, it is better to consider the access attempt as allowed if the pre-configured CG resources are configured for SDT and the arrival data corresponds to the configured DRB which is allowed to perform SDT. |
| Intel | One aspect that has not yet been discussed in detail is on the provision of assistance information to the network for CG-SDT. Similar to LTE, we think providing this information to the gNB when the UE is in RRC\_CONNECTED can be useful in informing if the UE is interested in performing SDT and request CG configuration accordingly. We think the contents of *PURConfiguationRequest* message from LTE can be considered as baseline (at least including *requestedNumOccasions* and *requestedPeriodicityAndOffset*). |
| vivo | 1. If autonomous retransmission is supported, we should further investigate whether power ramping should be supported. 2. We should further check when to store and initialize the CG-SDT resources. |

###### Question20 Summary:

Among the comments received, with some comments from the moderator:

* ZTE thinks there are still some open issues if we support subsequent transmission on CG
* Lenovo thinks that we should discuss
	+ Whether the UE should maintin uplink timing alignment in RRC\_INACTIVE for CG-SDT
	+ Whether UAC should be applicable when CG-SDT is used for the DRB configured for SDT
* Intel thinks that we should discuss wheter assistance information is needed for CG-SDT.
	+ Understanding from the moderator is that this has been discussed before. Nevertheless, it still needs to be discussed since no agreement is made previously.
* VIVO thinks that we should discuss
	+ Whether power ramping is needed for autonomous retransmission
	+ Initialization of CG-SDT process
		- The current MAC spec initializes the CG-SDT resource when it is received in the RRCRelease message, same as legacy. This can be bought up in the running CR discussion if issue is found

Based on the comments above, we propose the following

**Proposal18: RAN2 continues the discussion on CG-SDT on the following aspects**

* **Open issues for supporting subsequent transmission on CG**
* **Whether the UE should maintin uplink timing alignment in RRC\_INACTIVE for CG-SDT**
* **Whether UAC should be applicable when CG-SDT is used for the DRB configured for SDT**
* **Wheter CG-SDT assistance information similar to PUR is needed for CG-SDT**
* **Whether power ramping is needed for autonomous retransmission**

# Conclusions

**Proposal1: RSRP-based TA validation is only applicable for initial CG-SDT and not needed for retransmission of the initial CG-SDT. (15/20)**

**Proposal2: RAN2 should further discuss if (a) the thresholds for SSB selection and SSB subset selection for TA-validation are different and (b) the highest beam measurement is below the configured threshold, whether the beam with the highest beam measurement value is used for TA validation**

**Proposal3: No additional NTA is defined for CG-SDT procedure. (18/20)**

**Proposal4: Keep the two timers at successful RACH completion for RACH during CG-SDT: (a) re-start the CG-SDT-TAT; and (b) not to stop the legacy TAT. (12/20)**

**Proposal5: Upon expiry of CG-SDT-TAT , UE should (a) clears all SDT configured grant, (b) flushes HARQ buffer and (c) continue to maintain NTA.**

**Proposal6: Stick to the previous agreement: subsequent new transmission on CG-SDT is supported. Support implicit ACK by dynamic scheduling of uplink new transmission for the same HARQ process. (16/20)**

**Proposal7: Support retransmission on CG-SDT resource for subsequent CG-SDT transmission. (11/18)**

**Proposal8: Subsequent downlink transmission can serve as an implicit acknowledgement for initial CG-SDT but not for subsequent CG-SDT. (16/20)**

**Proposal9: ConfiguredGrantTimer is reused for CG-SDT for prohibiting the HARQ process for new uplink transmissions. (17/19)**

**Proposal 10: CG-SDT timer should be stopped when PDCCH addressed to C-RNTI and CS-RNTI is received (12/19)**

**Proposal11: Do not perform SSB reselection for retransmission on CG-SDT (16/20)**

**Proposal12: UE does not use RA-SDT resources when there are no SSB available for subsequent new transmission. (12/20)**

**Proposal13: CS-RNTI for CG-SDT is provided to the UE in RRCRelease message. (20/20)**

**Proposal14: UE does not perform UL carrier reselection for subsequent CG-SDT transmission over CG-SDT resources (19/20)**

**Proposal15: Once a UL carrier is selected for a specific CG-SDT transmission, the UE should perform autonomous retransmission on the same uplink carrier. (19/20)**

**Proposal16: There is no restriction on the candidate values of CG period (20/20)**

**Proposal17: Do not support multiple CG occasions per CG period. (14/18)**
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