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## 3.2 Definitions

For the purposes of the present document, the terms and definitions given in TR 21.905 [1], in TS 36.300 [2] and the following apply. A term defined in the present document takes precedence over the definition of the same term, if any, in TR 21.905 [1] and TS 36.300 [2].

**BH RLC channel**: an RLC channel between two nodes, which is used to transport backhaul packets**.**

**Boundary IAB-node:** as defined in TS 38.401 [4].

**CAG Cell**:a PLMN cell broadcasting at least one Closed Access Group identity.

**CAG Member Cell**:for a UE, a CAG cell broadcasting the identity of the selected PLMN, registered PLMN or equivalent PLMN, and for that PLMN, a CAG identifier belonging to the Allowed CAG list of the UE for that PLMN.

**CAG-only cell**: a CAG cell that is only available for normal service for CAG UEs.

**Cell-Defining SSB**: an SSB with an RMSI associated.

**Child node**: IAB-DU's and IAB-donor-DU's next hop neighbour node; the child node is also an IAB-node.

**Conditional Handover (CHO**): a handover procedure that is executed only when execution condition(s) are met.

**CORESET#0**: the control resource set for at least SIB1 scheduling, can be configured either via MIB or via dedicated RRC signalling.

**DAPS Handover**: a handover procedure that maintains the source gNB connection after reception of RRC message for handover and until releasing the source cell after successful random access to the target gNB.

**Downstream**: Direction toward child node or UE in IAB-topology.

**Early Data Forwarding**: data forwarding that is initiated before the UE executes the handover.

**gNB**: node providing NR user plane and control plane protocol terminations towards the UE, and connected via the NG interface to the 5GC.

**IAB-donor**:gNB that provides network access to UEs via a network of backhaul and access links.

**IAB-donor-CU**: as defined in TS 38.401 [4].

**IAB-donor-DU**:as defined in TS 38.401 [4].

**IAB-DU**: gNB-DU functionality supported by the IAB-node to terminate the NR access interface to UEs and next-hop IAB-nodes, and to terminate the F1 protocol to the gNB-CU functionality, as defined in TS 38.401 [4], on the IAB-donor.

**IAB-MT**: IAB-node function that terminates the Uu interface to the parent node using the procedures and behaviours specified for UEs unless stated otherwise. IAB-MT function used in 38-series of 3GPP Specifications corresponds to IAB-UE function defined in TS 23.501 [3].

**IAB-node**: RAN node that supports NR access links to UEs and NR backhaul links to parent nodes and child nodes. The IAB-node does not support backhauling via LTE.

**Intra-system Handover**:Handover that does not involve a CN change (EPC or 5GC).

**Inter-system Handover**:Handover that involves a CN change (EPC or 5GC).

**Inter-donor partial migration:** Migration of an IAB-MT to a parent node underneath a different IAB-donor-CU while the collocated IAB-DU and descendant IAB-node(s), if any, are terminated at the initial IAB-donor-CU. The procedure renders the said IAB-node as a boundary IAB-node.

**Late Data Forwarding**: data forwarding that is initiated after the source NG-RAN node knows that the UE has successfully accessed a target NG-RAN node.

**MSG1**: preamble transmission of the random access procedure for 4-step random access (RA) type.

**MSG3**: first scheduled transmission of the random access procedure.

**MSGA**:preamble and payload transmissions of the random access procedure for 2-step RA type.

**MSGB**:response to MSGA in the 2-step random access procedure. MSGB may consist of response(s) for contention resolution, fallback indication(s), and backoff indication.

**Multi-hop backhauling**: Using a chain of NR backhaul links between an IAB-node and an IAB-donor.

**ng-eNB**: node providing E-UTRA user plane and control plane protocol terminations towards the UE, and connected via the NG interface to the 5GC.

**NG-C**: control plane interface between NG-RAN and 5GC.

**NG-U**: user plane interface between NG-RAN and 5GC.

**NG-RAN node**: either a gNB or an ng-eNB.

**Non-CAG Cell**: a PLMN cell which does not broadcast any Closed Access Group identity.

**NR backhaul link**: NR link used for backhauling between an IAB-node and an IAB-donor, and between IAB-nodes in case of a multi-hop backhauling.

**NR sidelink communication**: AS functionality enabling at least V2X communication as defined in TS 23.287 [40], between two or more nearby UEs, using NR technology but not traversing any network node.

**Numerology**: corresponds to one subcarrier spacing in the frequency domain. By scaling a reference subcarrier spacing by an integer *N*, different numerologies can be defined.

**Parent node**: IAB-MT's next hop neighbour node; the parent node can be IAB-node or IAB-donor-DU

**PLMN Cell**: a cell of the PLMN.

**SNPN Access Mode**: mode of operation whereby a UE only accesses SNPNs.

**SNPN-only cell**: a cell that is only available for normal service for SNPN subscribers.

**SNPN Identity:** the identity of Stand-alone NPN defined by the pair (PLMN ID, NID).

**IAB Topology:** The unison of all IAB-nodes and IAB-donor-DUs that terminate the F1 interface and/or RRC interface at the same IAB-donor-CU.

**Transmit/Receive Point:** Part of the gNB transmitting and receiving radio signals to/from UE according to physical layer properties and parameters inherent to that element.

**Upstream**: Direction toward parent node in IAB-topology.

**V2X sidelink communication**: AS functionality enabling V2X communication as defined in TS 23.285 [41], between nearby UEs, using E-UTRA technology but not traversing any network node.

**Xn**: network interface between NG-RAN nodes.
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## 4.7 Integrated Access and Backhaul

### 4.7.1 Architecture

Integrated access and backhaul (IAB) enables wireless relaying in NG-RAN. The relaying node, referred to as *IAB-node*, supports access and backhauling via NR. The terminating node of NR backhauling on network side is referred to as the *IAB-donor*, which represents a gNB with additional functionality to support IAB. Backhauling can occur via a single or via multiple hops. The IAB architecture is shown in Figure 4.7.1-1.

The IAB-node supports the gNB-DU functionality, as defined in TS 38.401 [4], to terminate the NR access interface to UEs and next-hop IAB-nodes, and to terminate the F1 protocol to the gNB-CU functionality, as defined in TS 38.401 [4], on the IAB-donor. The gNB-DU functionality on the IAB-node is also referred to as *IAB-DU*.

In addition to the gNB-DU functionality, the IAB-node also supports a subset of the UE functionality referred to as *IAB-MT*, which includes, e.g., physical layer, layer-2, RRC and NAS functionality to connect to the gNB-DU of another IAB-node or the IAB-donor, to connect to the gNB-CU on the IAB-donor, and to the core network.

The IAB-node can access the network using either SA mode or EN-DC. In EN-DC, the IAB-node connects via E-UTRA to a MeNB, and the IAB-donor terminates X2-C as SgNB (TS 37.340 [21]).



Figure 4.7.1-1: IAB architecture; a) IAB-node using SA mode with NGC; b) IAB-node using EN-DC

All IAB-nodes that are connected to an IAB-donor via one or multiple backhaul hops and controlled by this IAB-donor form a directed acyclic graph (DAG) topology with the IAB-donor as its root (Fig. 4.7.1-2). In this DAG topology, the neighbour node of the IAB-DU or the IAB-donor-DU is referred to as the *child* node and the neighbour node of the IAB-MT is referred to as the *parent* node. The direction toward the child node is referred to as *downstream* while the direction toward the parent node is referred to as *upstream*. The IAB-donor performs centralized resource, topology and route management for its IAB topology.



Figure 4.7.1-2: Parent- and child-node relationship for IAB-node
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### 4.7.3 User-plane Aspects

#### 4.7.3.1 Backhaul transport

The IAB-DU's IP traffic is routed over the wireless backhaul via the BAP sublayer. The BAP sublayer is specified in TS 38.340 [31]. In downstream direction, upper layer packets are encapsulated by the BAP sublayer at the IAB-donor-DU and de-encapsulated at the destination IAB-node. In upstream direction, upper layer packets are encapsulated at the IAB-node and de-encapsulated at the IAB-donor-DU. IAB-specific transport between IAB-donor-CU and IAB-donor-DU is specified in TS 38.401 [4].

On the BAP sublayer, packets are routed based on the BAP routing ID, which is carried in the BAP header. The BAP header is added to the packet when it arrives from upper layers, and the BAP header is stripped off when the packet has reached its destination node. The selection of the packet's BAP routing ID is configured by the IAB-donor-CU. The BAP routing ID consists of BAP address and BAP path ID, where the BAP address indicates the destination node of the packet on the BAP sublayer, and the BAP path ID indicates the routing path the packet should follow to this destination. For the purpose of routing, each IAB-node and IAB-donor-DU is further configured with a designated BAP address.

On each hop of the packet's path, the IAB-node inspects the packet's BAP address in the BAP routing ID carried in the BAP header to determine if the packet has reached its destination, i.e., matches the IAB-node's BAP address. In case the packet has *not* reached the destination, the IAB-node determines the next hop backhaul link, referred to as *egress* link, based on the BAP routing ID carried in the BAP header and a routing configuration it received from the IAB-donor-CU.

For each packet, the IAB-node further determines the egress BH RLC channel on the designated egress link. For packets arriving from upper layers, the designated egress BH RLC channel is configured by the IAB-donor-CU, and it is based on upper layer traffic specifiers. Since each BH RLC channel is configured with QoS information or priority level, BH-RLC-channel selection facilitates traffic-specific prioritization and QoS enforcement on the BH. For F1-U traffic, it is possible to map each GTP-U tunnel to a dedicated BH RLC channel or to aggregate multiple GTP-U tunnels into one common BH RLC channel. For traffic other than F1-U traffic, it is possible to map UE-associated F1AP messages, non-UE-associated F1AP messages and non-F1 traffic onto the same or separate BH RLC channels.

When packets are routed from one BH link to another, the egress BH RLC channel on the egress BH link is determined based on the mapping configuration between ingress BH RLC channels and egress BH RLC channels provided by the IAB-donor-CU.
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### 4.7.4 Signalling procedures

#### 4.7.4.1 IAB-node Integration

The IAB-node integration procedure is captured in TS 38.401 [4].

#### 4.7.4.2 IAB-node Migration

The IAB-node can migrate to a different parent node underneath the same IAB-donor-CU. The IAB-node continues providing access and backhaul service when migrating to a different parent node.

The IAB-MT can also migrate to a different parent node underneath another IAB-donor-CU. In this case, the collocated IAB-DU and the IAB-DU(s) of its descendant node(s) retain F1 connectivity with the initial IAB-donor-CU. This migration is referred to as *inter-donor partial migration*. The IAB-node is referred to as a *Boundary IAB-node*. After inter-donor partial migration, the F1 traffic of the IAB-DU and its descendent nodes is routed via the BAP layer of the topology to which the IAB-MT has migrated.

Inter-donor partial migration is only supported for SA-mode.

The intra-donor IAB-node migration and inter-donor partial migration procedures are captured in TS 38.401 [4].

#### 4.7.4.3 Topological Redundancy

The IAB-node may have redundant routes to the IAB-donor-CU(s).

For IAB-nodes operating in SA-mode, NR DC can be used to enable route redundancy in the BH by allowing the IAB-MT to have concurrent BH links with two parent nodes. The parent nodes may be connected to the same or to different IAB-donor-CUs, which control the establishment and release of redundant routes via these two parent nodes. The parent nodes' gNB-DU functionality together with the respective IAB-donor-CU obtain the role of the IAB-MT's master node and/or secondary node. The NR DC framework (e.g., MCG/SCG-related procedures) is used to configure the dual radio links with the parent nodes (TS 37.340 [21]).

The procedures for establishment of topological redundancy for IAB-nodes operating in SA-mode are captured in TS 38.401 [4].

IAB-nodes operating in NR-DC may also use one of the legs for BH connectivity with an IAB-donor and the other leg for access-only connectivity with a separate gNB that does not assume IAB-donor role. The IAB-donor can have the MN or the SN role. The IAB-node may exchange F1-C traffic with the IAB-donor via the backhaul link and/or via the access link with the gNB. In the latter case, the F1-C messages are carried over NR RRC between IAB-node and gNB and via XnAP between gNB and IAB-donor. For F1-C traffic via the access link, SRB2 is used in case the gNB has the MN role, and split-SRB2 is used in case the gNB has the SN role. In the case of split-SRB2, the network configures the primary path to the SCG. The IAB-MT should always use this primary path for all RRC messages regardless of whether they contain F1-C information or IAB-unrelated information.

IAB-nodes operating in EN-DC can exchange F1-C traffic with the IAB-donor via the MeNB. The F1-C message is carried over LTE RRC using SRB2 between IAB-node and MeNB and via X2AP between MeNB and IAB-donor.

The procedures for establishment of redundant transport of F1-C for IAB-nodes using NR-DC and EN-DC are captured in TS 37.340 [21] and TS 38.401 [4].

#### 4.7.4.4 Backhaul RLF Recovery

When the IAB-node using SA-mode declares RLF on the backhaul link, it can migrate to another parent node underneath the same IAB-donor-CU. Alternatively, the IAB-MT can perform RLF recovery to another parent node underneath a different IAB-donor-CU. In the latter case, the collocated IAB-DU and the IAB-DU(s) of its descendant node(s) retain the F1 connectivity with the initial IAB-donor-CU in the same manner as for *inter-donor partial migration*.

The BH RLF recovery procedures are captured in TS 38.401 [4]. BH RLF declaration for IAB is handled in clause 9.2.7 of the present document.
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### 6.11.1 Services and Functions

The main service and functions of the BAP sublayer include:

- Transfer of data;

- Routing of packets to next hop;

- Determination of BAP destination and BAP path for packets from upper layers;

- Determination of egress BH RLC channels for packets routed to next hop;

- Differentiating traffic to be delivered to upper layers from traffic to be delivered to egress link;

- Flow control feedback and polling signalling;

- BH RLF detection indication, BH RLF recovery indication, and BH RLF indication.

### 6.11.2 Traffic Mapping from Upper Layers to Layer-2

In upstream direction, the IAB-donor-CU configures the IAB-node with mappings between upstream F1 and non-F1 traffic originated at the IAB-node, and the appropriate BAP routing ID, next-hop BAP address and BH RLC channel. A specific mapping is configured:

- for each F1-U GTP-U tunnel;

- for non-UE associated F1AP messages;

- for UE-associated F1AP messages;

- for non-F1 traffic.

Multiple mappings can contain the same BH RLC channel and/or next-hop BAP address and/or BAP routing ID. In case the IAB-MT is NR-dual-connected (SA mode only), the mapping may include two separate BH RLC channels, where the two BH RLC channels are established toward different parent nodes.

In case the IAB-node is configured with multiple IP addresses for F1-C on the NR leg, multiple mappings can be configured for non-UE-associated F1AP messages or UE-associated F1AP messages. The appropriate mapping is selected based on the IAB node's implementation.

These traffic mapping configurations are performed via F1AP. For a dual-connected boundary node, the traffic mapping configuration includes information that allows the boundary node to determine to topology the mapping applies to.

During IAB-node integration, a default BH RLC channel and a default BAP routing ID may be configured via RRC, which can be used for non-F1-U traffic. These default configurations may be updated during topology adaptation scenarios as discussed in TS 38.401 [4].

In downstream direction, traffic mapping occurs internal to the IAB-donor. Transport for IAB-donors that use split-gNB architecture is handled in TS 38.401 [4].

### 6.11.3 Routing, BAP Header Rewriting and BH-RLC-channel Mapping on BAP sublayer



Figure 6.11.3-1: Routing and BH RLC channel selection on BAP sublayer

Routing on BAP sublayer uses the BAP routing ID, which is configured by the IAB-donor-CU. The BAP routing ID consists of BAP address and BAP path ID. The BAP address is used for the following purposes:

1. Determination if a packet has reached the destination node, i.e. IAB-node or IAB-donor-DU, on BAP sublayer. This is the case if the BAP address in the packet's BAP header matches the BAP address configured via RRC on the IAB-node, or via F1AP on the IAB-donor-DU. For a boundary node, which is configured with two BAP addresses, the BAP address in the packet’s BAP header is matched with the BAP address configured by the CU of the IAB topology where the packet has been received.

2. Determination of the next-hop node for packets that have not reached their destination. This applies to packets arriving from a prior hop on BAP sublayer or that have been received from IP layer.

For packets arriving from a prior hop or from upper layers, the determination of the next-hop node is based on a routing configuration provided by the IAB-donor-CU via F1AP signalling or a default configuration provided by the IAB-donor-CU via RRC signalling. This F1AP configuration contains the mapping between the BAP routing ID carried in the packet's BAP header and the next-hop node's BAP address.

Table 6.11.3-1: Routing configuration

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| BAP routing ID | Next-hop BAP address |
| Derived from BAP packet's BAP header | Egress link to forward packet |

The IAB-node resolves the next-hop BAP address to a physical backhaul link. For this purpose, the IAB-donor-CU provides the IAB-node/IAB-donor-DU with its child-node's BAP address via F1AP, and it provides the IAB-node with its parent-node's BAP address via RRC. For a boundary node, the routing configuration also indicates the topology it applies to. The BH link to the next-hop node and the next-hop BAP address belong to the IAB-topology of the CU that provided the RRC configuration of the BH link to that next-hop node.

The IAB-node can receive multiple routing configurations with the same destination BAP address but different BAP path IDs. These routing configurations may resolve to the same or different egress BH links.

In case the BH link resolved from the routing entry is considered *unavailable* for this packet, the IAB-node may perform local rerouting as defined in TS38.340 [31], i.e., select another BH link by considering only the packet’s BAP address and by disregarding the packet’s BAP path ID. In this manner, the packet can be delivered via an alternative path as defined in TS 38.340 [31].

A BH link may be considered *unavailable* in case the BH link has RLF.A parent BH link may be considered *unavailable* after a BH RLF detection indication has been received on this parent BH link and before a subsequent BH RLF recovery indication has been received.

A single-connected IAB-node, that has migrated from a source to a target parent node, may consider the BH link to the source parent *unavailable* for UL packets of descendent nodes.

For DL traffic, a BH link may be considered *unavailable* due to congestion derived from flow-control feedback information, as defined in TS 38.340 [31].

For a boundary node, the routing configuration may carry information on the topology the configuration applies to.

The IAB-node may rewrite the BAP routing ID in the packet’s BAP header under the following circumstances:

A packet is routed between two topologies by a boundary IAB-node as defined in TS 38.401[31]. In this case, the BAP routing ID carried by the received BAP PDU is allocated by the IAB-donor-CU of the ingress topology, while the BAP routing ID carried by the transmitted BAP PDU is allocated by the IAB-donor-CU of the egress topology.

An upstream packet is locally re-routed to a different IAB-donor-DU than indicated by the destination in the BAP header of the received packet. The rewritten BAP header carries the BAP address of the alternative IAB-donor-DU and the BAP path ID for a path to this alternative IAB-donor-DU. BAP header rewriting for upstream inter-IAB-donor-DU local rerouting is only applied if neither routing nor local re-routing without header rewriting resolve to an available BH link.

For inter-topology routing, the BAP header rewriting configuration is configured via F1AP, and it includes the ingress BAP routing ID, the egress BAP routing ID, and it indicates the egress topology:

Table 6.11.3-2a: BAP header rewriting configuration

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Ingress BAP routing Id | Egress BAP routing Id | Egress topology indicator |
| BAP routing ID carried in the BAP header of received BAP PDU | BAP routing ID carried in the BAP header of transmitted BAP PDU | Indicates the egress topology. |

For upstream inter-donor-DU re-routing, the BAP header is rewritten with the BAP routing ID contained in the routing entry that was selected for re-routing.

Details of BAP header rewriting are defined in TS 38.340 [31].

When routing a packet from an ingress to an egress BH link, the IAB-node derives the egress BH RLC channel on the egress BH link through an F1AP-configured mapping from the BH RLC channel used on the ingress BH link. The BH RLC channel IDs used for ingress and egress BH RLC channels are generated by the IAB-donor-CU. Since the BH RLC channel ID only has link-local scope, the mapping configurations also include the BAP addresses of prior and next hop:

Table 6.11.3-2b: BH RLC channel mapping configuration

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Next-hop BAP address | Prior-hop BAP address | Ingress RLC channel ID | Egress RLC channel ID |
| Derived from routing configuration | Derived from packet's ingress link | Derived from packet's ingress BH RLC channel | BH RLC channel on egress link to forward packet |

The IAB-node resolves the BH RLC channel IDs from logical channel IDs based on the configuration by the IAB-donor-CU. The IAB-MT obtains the BH RLC channel ID in the RRC configuration of the corresponding logical channel. The IAB-DU obtains the BH RLC channel ID in the F1AP configuration of the BH RLC channel.

For a boundary node, the BH RLC channel mapping configuration also indicates the topology of the ingress and of the egress link.

*Next Modification*

#### 9.2.3.4 Conditional Handover

##### 9.2.3.4.1 General

A Conditional Handover (CHO) is defined as a handover that is executed by the UE when one or more handover execution conditions are met. The UE starts evaluating the execution condition(s) upon receiving the CHO configuration, and stops evaluating the execution condition(s) once a handover is executed.

The following principles apply to CHO:

- The CHO configuration contains the configuration of CHO candidate cell(s) generated by the candidate gNB(s) and execution condition(s) generated by the source gNB.

- An execution condition may consist of one or two trigger condition(s) (CHO events A3/A5, as defined in [12]). Only single RS type is supported and at most two different trigger quantities (e.g. RSRP and RSRQ, RSRP and SINR, etc.) can be configured simultaneously for the evalution of CHO execution condition of a single candidate cell.

- Before any CHO execution condition is satisfied, upon reception of HO command (without CHO configuration), the UE executes the HO procedure as described in clause 9.2.3.2, regardless of any previously received CHO configuration.

- While executing CHO, i.e. from the time when the UE starts synchronization with target cell, UE does not monitor source cell.

CHO is also supported for the IAB-MT in context of intra- and inter-donor IAB-node migration and RLF recovery.

CHO is not supported for NG-C based handover in this release of the specification.

*Next Modification*

### 9.2.7 Radio Link Failure

In RRC\_CONNECTED, the UE performs Radio Link Monitoring (RLM) in the active BWP based on reference signals (SSB/CSI-RS) and signal quality thresholds configured by the network. SSB-based RLM is based on the SSB associated to the initial DL BWP and can only be configured for the initial DL BWP and for DL BWPs containing the SSB associated to the initial DL BWP. For other DL BWPs, RLM can only be performed based on CSI-RS. In case of DAPS handover, the UE continues the detection of radio link failure at the source cell until the successful completion of the random access procedure to the target cell.

The UE declares Radio Link Failure (RLF) when one of the following criteria are met:

- Expiry of a radio problem timer started after indication of radio problems from the physical layer (if radio problems are recovered before the timer is expired, the UE stops the timer); or

- Expiry of a timer started upon triggering a measurement report for a measurement identity for which the timer has been configured while another radio problem timer is running; or

- Random access procedure failure; or

- RLC failure; or

- Detection of consistent uplink LBT failures for operation with shared spectrum channel access as described in 5.6.1; or

- For IAB-MT, the reception of a BH RLF indication received from its parent node.

After RLF is declared, the UE:

- stays in RRC\_CONNECTED;

- in case of DAPS handover, for RLF in the source cell:

- stops any data transmission or reception via the source link and releases the source link, but maintains the source RRC configuration;

- if handover failure is then declared at the target cell, the UE:

- selects a suitable cell and then initiates RRC re-establishment;

- enters RRC\_IDLE if a suitable cell was not found within a certain time after handover failure was declared.

- in case of CHO, for RLF in the source cell:

- selects a suitable cell and if the selected cell is a CHO candidate and if network configured the UE to try CHO after RLF then the UE attempts CHO execution once, otherwise re-establishment is performed;

- enters RRC\_IDLE if a suitable cell was not found within a certain time after RLF was declared.

- otherwise, for RLF in the serving cell or in case of DAPS handover, for RLF in the target cell before releasing the source cell:

- selects a suitable cell and then initiates RRC re-establishment;

- enters RRC\_IDLE if a suitable cell was not found within a certain time after RLF was declared.

When RLF occurs at the IAB BH link, the same mechanisms and procedures are applied as for the access link. This includes BH RLF detection and RLF recovery.

The IAB-DU can transmit a BH RLF detection indication to its child nodes in the following cases:- The collocated IAB-MT is single-connected and initiates RRC re-establishment from BH RLF;

- The collocated IAB-MT is dual-connected and initiates RRC re-establishment due to either BH RLF on both CGs or BH RLF on MCG when no fast MCG recovery is configured;

- The collocated IAB-MT is dual-connected, detects BH RLF on a BH link, and cannot perform UL re-routing to for any traffic. This includes the scenario of an IAB-node operating in ENDC or NRDC, which uses only one link for backhauling and has BH RLF on this BH link.

- The collocated IAB-MT is single connected and has received a BH RLF detection indication from its parent node.

- The collocated IAB-MT is dual connected, it has received a BH RLF detection indication from a parent node, and there is no remaining backhaul link that is unaffected by the BH RLF condition indicated.

Upon reception of the BH RLF detection indication, the child node may perform local rerouting for upstream traffic if possible.

If the IAB-DU has transmitted a BH RLF detection indication to a child node and the collocated IAB-MT’s subsequent RRC re-establishment is successful, or if the collocated IAB-MT receives a BH RLF recovery indication from a parent node, the IAB-DU transmits a BH RLF recovery indication to this child node.

Upon reception of the BH RLF recovery indication, the child node should revert the actions triggered by the reception of the previous BH RLF detection indication.In case the RRC reestablishment procedure fails, the IAB-node may transmit a BH RLF indication to its child nodes. The BH RLF detection indication, BH RLF recovery indication and BH RLF indication are transmitted as BAP Control PDUs.

*End of Changes*

# Annex (not part of the specification) - collection of RAN2 agreements on NR IAB enhancements WI

Cyan highlight – agreement captured in this running CR

No highlight – agreement with no direct impact on specifications

## RAN2#117-e agreements

**Type-2/3 RLF indication**

* Type-2/3 indication MAY be propagated, if the situation in the node doing the propagation is such that all BAP links are affected by the condition (e.g. single connected) (additional decision if to propagate or not can be left for implementation).
* Type-2/3 indication is not propagated if the situation in the node doing the propagation is such that some BAP links are un-affected by the condition (e.g. dual connected).
* For the 2 above agreements, no stage-3 impact is foreseen.
* For Type-2/3 indication in any case there is no routing information included.
* The Rel-16 term “BH RLF indication” is used for type-4 indication in Rel-17.
* Clarification: Successful CHO triggered by RLF is a triggering condition for type-3 indication (in addition to legacy reestablishment). This is already sufficiently covered by existing Stage-2 text.
* RAN2 does not have specific concerns about RAN3’s WA that upon migration/HO failure, the buffered RRC message is still transferred to the child node.
* RAN2 agrees with RAN3 that RAN3’s solution 1 for latency reduction should not be applied for CHO.

**BAP routing**

* We go with Option c (if we find that some config is needed we include also Option b), where 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, and 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.
* RAN2 leave the signalling details to RAN3 on open issue BAP#2 and #3 (ref R2-2203934).
* For the flow control feedback triggered local re-routing, the re-routing is performed on routing IDs level.
* As in R16, the trigger conditions (not the propagation) for type 2/3 will be captured in BAP spec. rather than in RRC spec., with just some general descriptions.
* Add new F1AP signalling to directly disable the inter-donor-DU re-routing. The new IE applies to all routing entries.

**MAC**

* Align terminology with RAN1: use Toffset,2 as the designation for the content of the Case-7 timing offset MAC CE (instead of the currently used Tdelta\_Case7).
* Rename this MAC CE to “Case-7 timing advance offset MAC CE” and have it in a separate clause 6.1.3.y, thereby reverting the clause 6.1.3.21 to its original content.
* Keep the description of both MAC CEs (Timing Delta MAC CE, and the Case-7 timing offset MAC CE) in the same clause (5.18.18).
* (O2) For the case of Padding BSR when logicalChannelGroup-IABExt-r17 is configured, Report Extended Short Truncated BSR in lieu of Extended Long Truncated BSR, if the number of padding bits cannot include the fixed size of 256 LCGi plus subheader of the Extended Long Truncated BSR;

**UE capabilities**

* No need to split UE capability further for different local re-routing trigger conditions.
* No need to differentiate “inter-donor CU routing” UE capability between “inter-donor CU partial migration” and “inter-donor CU routing for topology redundancy”.
* No UE capability is defined for Rel-17 intra-donor DU local re-routing.
* Define a new separate UE capability for BAP header rewriting-based re-routing (including inter-donor DU local re-routing and inter-donor CU re-routing) as optional UE capability for IAB-MT.

## RAN2#116bis-e agreements

**Type-2/3 RLF indication**

* Type-2 indication by a dual-connected node is triggered when the node detects BH RLF on a BH link and it cannot perform re-routing for any traffic, i.e. NR RLF for ENDC scenario, (FFS UP Link RLF for CPUP split scenario 1).
* For these cases, the Type-2 indication is handled in the same way as for the case when both links goes down.
* FFS whether Type-2 is propagated further (for all its cases)
* Execution of local re-routing of all affected traffic among re-routable traffic upon BH RLF is not mandatory for a node capable of local re-routing. This can be revisited if there is a severe issue.
* For a dual-connected node, e.g., configured with CP-UP split/NR-DC/EN-DC, type-2 indication is triggered when all the CG(s) providing F1-over-BAP fail.
* Not sufficient support that Type-2 indication triggered by a single-connected node includes routing information (such as unavailable routing IDs).
* RAN2 does not specify suspending routing data to a parent node in case of receiving type-2 indication.
* No network configurability on triggering/propagation of type-2/3 indication is needed.
* RAN2 to not support any other triggers for reverting actions triggered by a previous Type 2 BH RLF Indication than reception of type-3 indication
* RAN2 to deprioritize discussion on the case where failure of first BH link had triggered type-2 indication (but not re-establishment) and there happens a failure on other link prior to the recovery of the first BH link, yielding re-establishment, which then triggers another type-2 indication (e.g., FFS this is a valid case whether to handle/prevent the second type-2 indication.)
* Type-3 indication is triggered upon successful CHO executed during re-establishment or upon successful RRC setup complete as a result of re-establishment.
* NO need to introduce a successful RRC setup complete during re-establishment as triggering condition of type-3 indication. (It is already clear in the current spec that RRC re-establishment is considered successful if RRC setup initiated during re-establishment is successful).
* FFS if successful CHO executed during re-establishment should be captured as an explicit triggering condition of type-3 indication or if genetic condition “upon recovery” from BH RLF is sufficient.
* No further clarification on the triggering condition of type-3 indication is needed for successful re-establishment ending with RRCReestablishemntComplete.
* If further propagation of type-2 indication is supported, further propagation of type-3 indication should be supported, such that a node propagates received type-3 indication, if it previously propagated received type-2 indication.
* If further propagation of type-2 indication is not supported, further propagation of type-3 indication is not supported.
* If type-2 indication does not contain any routing information Type-3 indication does not include any routing information.
* If type-2 indication contains routing information, Type-3 indication includes corresponding routing information, indicating recovered destinations or routing ID(s).
* FFS whether to use a new name “BH RLF recovery failure indication” for type-4 indication from Rel-17, and whether it should be made applicable to Rel-16
* RRC re-establishment to a different IAB-donor-CU should not be introduced as triggering condition of type-4 RLF indication.

**CP-UP separation**

* The network is allowed to configure the primaryPath to SCG for the IAB-MT
* The IAB-MT should always follow the primary path configuration for all the RRC messages, regardless of whether F1-C information or IAB-unrelated information are contained

**BAP routing**

* For each topology, the BAP address is configured to the boundary node by the CU of that topology via RRC (may need to check different scenarios).
* In the Routing configuration: A BH link and the corresponding next-hop BAP address belong to the topology of the CU that provided the configuration of that BH link and next-hop BAP address.
* FFS if The routing entry is associated by configuration with the topology the entry applies to, e.g. by an explicit indicator.
* The header rewriting configuration is provided via F1AP.
* FFS if The header rewriting configuration to include an indicator, which identifies either the egress topology, or the ingress topology, or the traffic direction (RAN2 to select one of these three options).
* For the two scenario of inter-topology routing and intra-to-inter-topology re-routing, there is only one header rewriting for a packet, where the header rewriting entry includes the BAP routing ID of the packet’s ingress topology and the BAP routing ID of the packet’s egress topology.
* 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)
* For inter-topology routing, the header rewriting configuration to include information that allows the boundary node to determine either the egress topology, or the ingress topology, or the traffic direction of a header-rewriting entry (selection of one of these expected). RAN3 to handle the St3-related aspects.
* The BH RLC CH mapping configuration of the boundary node includes information for the boundary node to differentiate mappings based on ingress topology and egress topology.
* The UL mapping configuration to include information for the boundary node to determine the egress topology of each UL mapping entry.
* In configurations, the topology is referred to as “F1-terminating CU’s topology” vs. “non-F1-terminating CU’s topology”. The terms “F1-terminating CU” and “non-F1-terminating CU” to be defined in St2 spec.
* Determination/execution of header rewriting is handled by the BAP TX entity.
* The routing configuration to include information that allows the boundary node to determine the topology each routing entry applies to. RAN3 to decide on St3-related aspects.

**MAC**

* LCP priority levels range extension is NOT pursued in this Release.
* Baseline: For IAB-MTs supporting Extended BSR formats, use exclusively the Extended formats for padding BSR by fully mirroring the legacy padding BSR procedure (use the Extended equivalents of all formats therein).
* FFS whether to report Extended Short Truncated BSR in lieu of Extended Long Truncated BSR if the number of padding bits cannot include the fixed size of 256 LCGi plus subheader of the Extended Long Truncated BSR.
* RAN2 should focus on 2 new timing modes (Case-6 timing and Case-7 timing) for Desired guard symbols and Provided guard symbols, as well as on the Case-7 timing offset (deprioritizing work on other MAC CEs until further input from RAN1/RAN4 is received).
* New MAC CEs are introduced to indicate desired/provided number of symbols for the Case-6 and Case-7 timings.
* A new MAC CE is introduced to indicate the Case-7 Timing Offset.

**UE capabilities**

* Confirm to define a new UE capability for LCG Extension in MAC-ParametersCommon as optional UE capability for IAB-MT.
* Define a new UE capability (1 bit) for ‘BH RLF detection indication and BH RLF recovery indication’ as optional UE capability for IAB-MT.
* Define a new UE capability ‘f1c-OverNR-RRC’ as optional UE capability for IAB-MT. The parent IE of this UE capability is NRDC-Parameters under UE-NR-Capability.
* Define a new UE capability for BAP header rewriting based inter-donor CU routing as optional UE capability for IAB-MT.
* The single UE capability is used for all UL local re-routing trigger conditions.
* Define a new type of feature group for LCG extension.
* Reuse ‘RLF handling’ FG for BH RLF detection and recovery indication in Rel-17 eIAB feature list section.
* Define a new type of feature group for F1-C over NR RRC.
* Following open issues of Rel-17 eIAB UE capability are FFS:
* FFS UE capability for Rel-17 intra-donor DU local-rerouting and inter-donor DU re-routing.
* FFS whether need to differentiate the capability between “inter-donor CU partial migration” and “inter-donor CU routing for topology redundancy”
* FFS the feature group for BAP header rewriting based inter-donor CU routing
* FFS the feature group for local rerouting

## RAN2#116-e agreements

**MAC**

* Support of Extended BSR by an IAB-MT is an optional capability.
* The same format is adopted for Extended Long and Extended Long Truncated BSR.
* Reserved values from the one-octet eLCID space are used to identify new Extended BSR formats.
* Extended LCG space (max 256 LCGs) shall also apply to pre-emptive BSR.
* Extended pre-emptive BSR format shall be identical to the Extended Long BSR format.
* When the Extended BSR is configured, the selection between Extended BSR and legacy BSR is not left to IAB-MT implementation.
* When the Extended BSR is configured, if the maximum LCGID among the configured LCGs is 7 or lower, legacy format is always sent; otherwise the Extended format is sent.
* The following format is adopted for Extended Long and Extended Long Truncated BSR: Fixed size of 256 LCGi followed by variable number of (fixed size) Buffer Size fields; related buffer size field is added only when the corresponding LCG bit is set to 1 in the bitmap.
* RAN2 will not attempt standardizing buffer size calculation for Rel-17 pre-emptive BSR, nor make any further effort to standardizing triggering of Rel-17 pre-emptive BSR.

**Type-2/3 RLF indication**

* Type 2 indication by dual-connected node is triggered when the node initiates RRC re-establishment resulting from BH RLF on both CGs or BH RLF on MCG with no fast MCG recovery.
* A node can transmit type-3 indication if re-establishment is successful. FFS whether to specify a detailed condition for success of re-establishment, e.g., successful transmission of RRC reestablishment complete. FFS whether to also include additional triggering condition such as successful transmission of ReconfigurationComplete, which is for the case the node initiates re-establishment and selects a CHO candidate cell and hence performs CHO successfully.
* A node can transmit type-3 indication only if it previously sent type-2 indication, i.e., type-3 indication cannot be triggered without triggering type-2 indication previously.
* Upon reception of type-2 indication, the node should perform local re-routing if possible.
* Upon reception of type-3 indication, the actions (e.g. local re-routing) triggered upon reception of a previous type-2 indication should be reversed, if possible.
* FFS if Type 2 indication by dual-connected node can be triggered when the node detects BH RLF on any BH and it cannot perform re-routing for affected traffic (if agreed see R2-2111539 for more details)
* For triggering condition of type-2 indication by a single-connected node, initiation of RRC re-establishment is a sufficient condition to trigger type-2 indication.
* If option 2) is chosen in P1 (i.e. dual-connected node triggers type 2 indication when the node detects BH RLF on any BH link) and option 2 is chosen in P7 (i.e. Received type-2 indication is further propagated),  type-2 indication sent by a single-connected node includes routing ID information indicating which routing IDs are not available. FFS whether inclusion of routing ID can be omitted in some cases. Otherwise, type-2 indication sent by a single-connected node does not carry any further information related to BH RLF.
* Conditional mobility is not triggered by reception of type-2 indication.
* For the need of further propagating received type-2 indication, FFS which option to take:
* Option 1) Received type-2 indication is not propagated further (unless a normal type-2 triggering condition is met).
* Option 2) Upon reception of type-2 indication, the node should further propagate type-2 indication to the child if it has no alternative path available.
* RAN2 does not specify UL transmission constraints (e.g. SR/BSR) to a node receiving the type-2 indication, i.e., whether the node can transmit uplink transmission is left to implementation of the node and also up to scheduling policy of a node transmitting the type-2 indication. FFS whether we need to add a Note in stage-2/3 CR.
* [032] RAN2 does not specify that IAB-support indicator is toggled by reception of type-2 indication, i.e., when how to set IAB-support indicator it is up to implementation. FFS whether we need to add a Note in stage-2/3 CR.
* To agree that the following terms are used:
  + Type-2:  “BH RLF detection indication”,
  + Type-3: “BH RLF recovery indication” , and
  + Type-4: FFS whether “BH RLF recovery failure indication” or existing name “BH RLF indication”

**CP-UP separation**

* The configuration of F1-C traffic on the indication of the the leg(s) used for transferring the F1-C traffic is configured to IAB-MT by a new field , e.g., f1c-TransferPath-r17 ENUMERATED {MCG, SCG, both}.
* As long as the BH RLC CH for F1-C on the indicated Cell Group is configured (the CG is indicated by the field f1c-TransferPath-r17), IAB node can be aware of whether to use F1-C transferring over BH or F1-C transferring over RRC, i.e. F1-C-over-BAP is selected as long as BH RLC CH for F1-C on the indicated CG is configured.
* It is not necessary for IAB-node to be aware whether the gNB allows “F1 over BAP” or only allows “F1-C over RRC” during cell (re)selection, in case the gNB broadcasts iab-Support.
* ONLY SRB2 is used for F1-C transport in CP/UP-separation scenario 1.
* ONLY split SRB2 is used for F1-C transport in CP/UP-separation scenario 2
* FFS if For IAB-MT’s RRC message that carries F1-C/F1-C related traffic, the IAB-MT use split SRB2 via SCG in scenario 2 if f1c-TransferPath-r17 indicates ‘SCG’ or ‘both’ regardless of the primaryPath configuration. FFS on how to capture this in specs.
* FFS if In case the split SRB2 RRC message contains both F1-C traffic and other information unrelated to IAB, the IAB-MT follows the configuration of F1-C transfer path (if configured) to transmit this RRC message.

**On Topology adaptation enhancements**

**Inter Topology Routing**

* Go with B, including the following:
  + If BAP address matches, deliver to upper layer;

Else:

* + If routing ID matches rewriting table, perform the header rewriting;
  + perform routing and mapping to BH RLC CH.
* For downstream, the boundary node is able to identify/differentiate the traffic routed from inter-topology vs. the traffic routed from intra-topology, based on the ingress link.
* For downstream at the boundary node, for any received data from inter-topology identified by the ingress link:
* The data is delivered to upper layer, if the BAP address in the header is same as the boundary node BAP address configured in the topology of the ingress link (of this packet); otherwise, the data is determined as to be header rewritten (assumes support only of topology where decedent nodes belong to same topology).
* (This requires that traffic not terminated at the boundary node should not use the BAP address in header same as the boundary node BAP address configured in the topology of the ingress link.)
* Perform the header rewriting based on the configured rewriting table, and then perform routing and mapping to BH RLC CH.
* For upstream at the boundary node, for any received data from lower layer:
* We may keep the ingress BAP text of R16 (that is intended for donor DU but general in Stage-3), i.e. if the BAP address in header match the boundary node BAP address configured in the topology of the ingress link, deliver to upper layer.
* The data is determined as to be header rewritten and perform the header rewriting accordingly, if routing ID in header matches any “previous routing ID” in the rewriting table; and then perform routing and mapping to BH RLC CH.

**Intra topology**

* For Upstream, The pre-condition/criteria of “BAP header rewriting for re-routing” is that there is no available next hop found based on BAP routing ID and based on BAP address in the routing table (e.g. due to BH RLF, congestion or type2 indication, etc.), as in R16.
* Will have rewriting mapping configuration(s) Old routing ID to New routing ID that limits the possible rewriting (for all cases of re-writing), details FFS

## RAN2#115-e agreements

**Organizational**

* R2 assumes that the UE need to be able to treat the separate resources as different cells on L1.
* LS is agreeable with the addition of the above assumption. Can consider one more round of details checking.

**On Enhancements to improve topology-wide fairness multi-hop latency and congestion mitigation**

* The length of LCG to be extended to 8 bits (i.e., at most 256 LCGs).
* New Short (Truncated) BSR format to specified that has a fixed size and consists of an 8-bit LCG ID field and an 8-bit Buffer Size field.
* Exclude P1

**On Topology adaptation enhancements**

* A configured threshold of available buffer size based on flow control feedback is used to determine the congestion, for the purpose of local re-routing.
* For intra-CU cases, Support inter-donor-DU re-routing at least in the scenarios of NR-DC among donor-DUs, inter-donor-DU recovery and inter-donor-DU migration.
* Support inter-CU re-routing, i.e. IAB-node re-routes the data to its original donor-CU via the alternative BAP path over the topology in target CU.
* For inter-donor-DU re-routing, support the “previous routing ID to new routing ID” BAP header rewriting.
* RAN2 to further discuss the open issues for inter-CU routing:
  + What’s the BAP address added in BAP header in the first topology (i.e. the BAP address of ingress data at the boundary node);
  + How to differentiate the concatenated traffic and non-concatenated traffic;
  + How to determine whether a data should be delivered to upper layer (for downstream);
  + How to determine whether the BAP header of a data should be rewritten (i.e. whether being routed to another topology or its own topology).
* As baseline, support the 1:1 and N:1 mapping from “previous routing ID” to “new routing ID” for BAP header rewriting at the boundary node, in inter-CU routing.
* As baseline, support the 1:1 and N:1 mapping from “ingress BH link + ingress BH RLC ID” to “egress BH link + egress BH RLC ID” for bearer mapping at the boundary node, in inter-CU routing.

## RAN2#114-e agreements

**On Topology adaptation enhancements**

* RAN2 preference is to support inter-topology routing via BAP header rewriting based on BAP routing ID option 4
* Assume that the IAB-donor will configure (alternative) egress links that can be used at local re-routing (at least with same destination, FFS same routing ID)
* Local re-routing based on flow control feedback is allowed based on certain value of available buffer size. FFS further details. (Current hbh fc is for DL traffic.
* NR DLInformationTransfer and ULInformationTransfer messages can be enhanced to transfer F1-C related packets in CP/UP separation.
* A new IE named DedicatedInfoF1c can be defined to transfer F1-C related packets via NR RRC message
* F1-C over RRC and F1-C over BAP should not be supported simultaneously on the same parent link.
* The trigger to generate a type 2 RLF indication is at RLF detection. FFS whether for both: single and dual connection cases.
* The trigger for type 3 RLF indication transmission is successful recovery after BH RLF. FFS whether for both: single and dual connection cases.
* Type 2 and Type 3 BH RLF Indications are transmitted via BAP Control PDU.
* Upon reception of the type-2 indication, the IAB node does not initiate RRC re-establishment.
* If an IAB node with dual parents (via DC) receives type-2 BH RLF indication from one parent, IAB-node may trigger a local re-routing to the other parent. The detail of local re-routing and whether/how the action on type-2 indication is configurable is FFS.

## RAN2#113bis-e agreements

**On Enhancements to improve topology-wide fairness multi-hop latency and congestion mitigation**

* LCG range to be extended for IAB-MT. Size of LCG and enhancements to BSR are FFS

**On Topology adaptation enhancements**

* The use cases for IAB-MT CHO should be migration and RLF recovery.
* RAN2 should have a common solution for intra-CU/intra-DU CHO and intra-CU/inter-DU CHO.
* condEventA3 and condEventA5 are applicable to IAB-MT
* FFS if other CHO execution condition is needed (e.g. whether type 2 RLF indication can be used as trigger)
* SRB2 can be used for F1-C transport in CP/UP-separation scenario 1 (FFS other cases)
* Split SRB2 can be used for F1-C transport in CP/UP-separation scenario 2 (FFS other cases)

## RAN2#113-e agreements

**On Enhancements to improve topology-wide fairness multi-hop latency and congestion mitigation**

* RAN2 will not further discuss ways of evaluating success of any fairness mechanisms that may be introduced, beyond the already agreed definition of topology-wide fairness and its variants.
* Chair: On the agreed issues below, the agreement doesn’t mean that we have agreed that there need to be a solution for it in R17. Furthermore, liberal interpretation of the text is ok.
* ISSUES: eIAB work on topology-wide fairness will focus on the following issues
* IF-1: The scheduler of an IAB node does not have all the information needed (e.g. link quality across multiple hops) to make appropriate upstream or downstream scheduling decisions which take into account the overall route link quality (such as e.g. using downstream link quality measurements to adjust the scheduling weights so as to achieve proportional fairness for different bearers/RLC channels across multiple child-IAB nodes)
* IF-2: Congestion conditions on BH RLC channels carrying UE bearers with same or similar QoS requirements can be unbalanced and some channels may even be congested, thereby leading to some users experiencing longer latency and violating fairness requirement.
* IF-4: IAB node cannot give more resource to those BH RLC CHs that aggregate more bearers and/or carry bearers with higher load per bearer (i.e. IAB node cannot give more resource to those BH RLC CHs with higher aggregate load)
* ISSUES: In the first instance, eIAB work on multi-hop latency will focus on the following issues:
* IL-1: IAB node cannot help ensure that overall or remaining PDB is met for a packet (e.g. by prioritizing bearers with higher number of hops), as it does not have a latency reference for the packets being scheduled, resulting in packets with the same QoS requirement ending up with different latency
* IL-2: IAB node may need to report joint buffer status for LCHs which have rather differing QoS requirements, due to the current (Rel-16) limit on the number of LCGs
* IL-3: Buffer size calculation for pre-emptive BSR may differ for nodes of different vendors as it is left to implementation in Rel-16
* IL-5: The CU is unable to put bearers with lower PDB on routes with less congestion risk (higher resource efficiency) or which are RLF-free
* IL-6: The CU is unable to configure routing based on actual (real-time) latency per BH RLC channel

**On Topology adaptation enhancements**

* RAN2 to discuss CHO and start with intra-donor CHO until RAN3 has made progress on inter-donor IAB-node migration.
* R2 confirm the intention Rel-16 CHO is / can be used for IAB-MT (FFS whether any modification is needed).
* R2 assumes that Rel-16 specification is the baseline for the configuration of default route, IP address(es) and target path for intra-donor CHO.
* RAN2 to support type-2/3 RLF indication (FFS specified behavior(s) TS impact, FFS details).
* Type-2 RLF indication may be used to trigger local rerouting
* Type-2 RLF indication may be used to trigger deactivation of IAB-supported in SIB
* Type-2 RLF indication may be used to trigger deactivation or reduction of SR and/or BSR transmissions
* Local rerouting can be triggered by indication of hop-by-hop flow control. Further details, e.g., on trigger information, trigger conditions, role of CU configuration, are FFS.
* RAN2 considers inter-donor-DU local rerouting to be in scope

## RAN2#112-e agreements

**On Enhancements to improve topology-wide fairness multi-hop latency and congestion mitigation:**

* R2 assumes Rel-17 IAB work will not define any new end-user QoS metrics on top of the existing 5G QoS framework.
* Rel-17 IAB work will comprise agreeing on a definition of topology-wide fairness.
* Topology-wide fairness provides mechanisms for the management of QoS so that the required QoS is met across the topology, regardless of where a UE attaches to the IAB network. Variants of this definition is not precluded. FFS how the success of such mechanisms is evaluated.
* RAN2 will not discuss enhancements to DL E2E flow control without input from RAN3
* FFS if RAN2 will deprioritize splitting data of a radio bearer into two or more paths (RAN3 agreements to deprioritize Multi-Route Support with data split in IAB)

**On Topology adaptation enhancements:**

* Consider enhancements to topology adaptation that improve:
  + Robustness, e.g., to rapid shadowing,
  + service-interruption,
  + load balancing among different IAB-nodes, IAB-donor-DUs and IAB-donor-CUs, and
  + reduction in signaling load.
* RAN2 to discuss enhancements to RLF indication/handling with the focus on the reduction of service interruption after BH RLF.
* CHO and potential IAB-specific enhancements of CHO is on the table.
* DAPS and potential IAB-specific enhancements of DAPS is not precluded for now (but as there is no PDCP it is not clear how to support DAPS).
* For message bundling, RAN2 at least wait for more progress to be made in RAN3 on topology adaptation procedures.
* RAN2 to discuss local rerouting, including the benefits over central route determination, and on how topology-wide objectives can be addressed.