**3GPP TSG-RAN WG2 Meeting #116-bis-e R2-22xxxxx**

**E-meeting, January 17 – 25, 2022**

**Agenda item:** 8.4.1

**Source:** Qualcomm Incorporated (Rapporteur)

**Title:** [AT116bis-e][049][eIAB] BAP Routing (Qualcomm)

**Document for:** Discussion

# 1 Introduction

This document captures:

* [Post116bis-e][079][eIAB] Open Issues (Qualcomm)

 Scope: Determine if Company input by Pre117-e discussions shall be used, and how many / which Pre-discussions shall be done. Capture Open Issues not captured in the CR email discussions and suggest how to treat. [After finalization, Merge open issues from other discussions into a WI OI list (OI for which company input is invited in some way shall be listed in the WI-list).

 Intended outcome: Open Issues list, and organization of Pre117-e Company input discussions for the WI.

 Deadline: Short.

The deadline is Friday Jan 28 0800 UTC.

# Discussion

All issues identified in the other Post116bis-e discussions need to be addressed and are not separately captured here.

## Update of ST2

We need to update ST2 38300 and 37400. This discussion should include latest agreements as well as RAN3’s BL CR on 38.300 in R3-221230. Further, all editor notes need to be addressed.

**This could be done via email discussion.**

**Q1: Are there other aspects related to ST2 TSs to be considered? Do you agree that email discussion is sufficient?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment**  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## MAC

Please provide comments related to MAC in the MAC-related thread.

The rapporteur noticed that the following MAC CE requested by RAN1 in R2-2200095 still needs to be handled:

*“Signaling from an IAB-node/IAB-donor to a child node indicating beams of an the child IAB-DU in the direction of which simultaneous operation is restricted.”*

**This could be done via email discussion.**

**Q2: Any comments on the MAC CE related to RAN1 agreement above? Do you agree that email discussion would be sufficient?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment**  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## BAP

Please provide comments related to BAP in the BAP-related thread.

We need to further address the FFS from the agreement of this meeting:

* Referring to previous agreement “*Will have rewriting mapping configuration(s) Old routing ID to New routing ID that limits the possible rewriting (for all cases of re-writing)*”: It is FFS whether for upstream there would be a configuration optimization such that the “New Routing ID” is the same for all entries (a.k.a. default routing ID)

The following options for the optimization of rewriting mappings for UL inter-donor-DU re-routing have been proposed in prior meetings/discussions:

**Option a:** No optimization, i.e.,inter-donor-DU re-routing uses configurations of (Ingress BAP routing ID, Egress BAP routing ID)-pairs. For this option, we need to resolve the ambiguity between re-routing and inter-topology routing for a boundary node as discussed during [AT116bis-e][049][eIAB].

**Option b:** Rewriting mapping for inter-donor-DU re-routing is based on a default egress BAP routing ID(s) configured for each parent link.

**Option c:** Rewriting mapping for inter-donor-DU re-routing is based on the BAP routing IDs included in the routing entries configured for each parent.

**Option d:** Others.

**This could be done via email discussion.**

**Q3: Any comments on this topic? Do you agree that email discussion would be sufficient?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment**  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## RLF indication

The rapporteur believes that we have exhausted this topic. The type-2/3 RLF indications were supposed to provide performance optimization during BH RLF recovery. This performance optimization is already small since BH RLF recovery is expected to be a rare *and* short event.

So far, the only purpose of this indication we agreed to capture on ST2 was local UL re-routing. This, obviously, only applies if the child node is dual connected. We further watered this down by not making it mandatory even if available. We could not agree to propagate this type-2 indication, which means that it cannot benefit any dual-connected descendent node further down the tree. We further could not agree to capture any other purposes of the type-2 indication in the spec.

The remaining open issues only relate to corner cases and further optimizations, e.g., partial re-routing, adding information on the type-2 indication, etc. The rapporteur does not believe that any further discussion would lead to convergence on the remaining matters or would add benefit to an already critically slimmed down feature.

For these reasons, we can stop ST2 discussions on type-2/3 RLF indication. Remaining issues can be included in St3 discussions (BAP and RRC).

**Q4: Any comments on this topic?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment**  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## RAN3 efforts

RAN3 agreed to proceed with solution 1 for latency reduction of intra-donor topology adaptation. RAN3 informed RAN2 about this solution in LS in R2-2106948. RAN2 replied with potential concerns in LS in R2-2109108.

Related to solution 1, RAN3 further agreed in this meeting:

**CHO combined with solution#1 is not addressed by RAN3 unless requested by RAN2.**

RAN2 should discuss RAN2-related aspects of RAN3’s solution 1.

**This could be done via email discussion.**

**Q5: Any comments on this topic? Other RAN3 topics to be discussed in RAN2? Do you agree that email discussion would be sufficient?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment**  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Other issues

Please indicate if there are any other issues which need discussion and have not been captured above, e.g., related to:

* CP-UP separation
* UE capabilities
* Topology adaptation
* Others

**Q6: Any aspects missed? Do you believe that these aspects can be discussed via email discussion?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment**  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 3 Summary

…