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# 1. Introduction

This document summarizes the discussion of the following offline discussion.

* [POST130][507][XR] PDCP running CR and open issues (LGE)

Scope:

* Update and review the CR
* List open issues related to the CR

Intended outcome:

* Running CR for endorsement in the next meeting
* List of open issues for discussion at the next meeting

Deadline: Long

# 2. Contact information

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | E-mail |
| LG Electronics | SeungJune Yi | seungjune.yi@lge.com |
| CATT | Hao Xu | xuhao@catt.cn |
| Futurewei | Yunsong Yang | yyang1@futurewei.com |
| Vivo | Chenli | Chenli5g@vivo.com |
| Ofinno | Hsin-Hsi Tsai | htsai@ofinno.com |
| Samsung | Vinay Kumar Shrivastava | shrivastava@samsung.com |
| Nokia | Sunyoung Lee | sunyoung.lee@nokia.com |

# 3. Comments to the PDCP running CR v00

Companies are invited to list their comments on v01, using comment identifier (company ID and number), e.g. LGE001. The rapporteur will provide update based on the comments in proper time.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Comment identifier | Section | Comments and/or change suggestions | Rapporteur resolution |
| CATT001 | 3.1 | **PDU Set remaining time**: the shortest remaining time till *discardTimer* expiry among the PDCP SDUs belonging to the PDU Set.  We think the description on “ A among B “, A and B should be the objects in the same level. Similar description in TS 38.3223 is as below. Hence it is suggested to revised it as :  **PDU Set remaining time**: the shortest remaining time till *discardTimer* expiry among the **remaining time of** PDCP SDUs belonging to the PDU Set.  -----------------------------------------------------------------------------  - compile a PDCP SN gap report as indicated below by:  - setting the FDC field to the smallest COUNT value among the COUNT values associated with the discarded PDCP SDU(s); | Thanks. Included in v01. |
| FW001 | 5.x | In both paragraphs, “if the remaining time till *discardTimer* expiry becomes less than the [xxx] for the PDCP SDU for which the corresponding PDCP Data PDU has already been submitted to lower layers”, between the time that the PDU is submitted to lower layers and the moment that the “if” condition is satisfied, it is possible that the PDU has been delivered successfully by lower layers and the successful delivery has been confirmed by lower layers (e.g., by indication). The question is for such PDU whether we still want to the PDCP entity to indicate to lower layers that the condition for remaining-time-based auto-retx or polling is met. If not, maybe we can change the above highlighted text to the following:  for which the corresponding PDCP Data PDU has already been submitted to lower layers and for which successful delivery has not been confirmed by lower layers | Thanks. Included in v01 with slight modification (and 🡪 but). |
| V001 | 5.15 | For the purpose of single entry MAC delay status reporting, the transmitting PDCP entity shall consider the following as delay-critical PDCP data volume:  …  For the purpose of multiple entry MAC delay status reporting, the transmitting PDCP entity shall evaluate the delay-reporting PDCP data volume in ascending order of *dsr-ReportingThreshold*, and consider the following as delay-reporting PDCP data volume associated with the i:th *dsr-ReportingThreshold*: | Thanks. Included in v01. |
| **Put your comments in the next section** | | | |

# 4. Comments to the PDCP running CR v01

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Comment identifier | Section | Comments and/or change suggestions | Rapporteur resolution |
| OF001 | 5.x | To be consistent between two conditions:  …   * indicate to lower layers that the condition for remaining-time-based RLC polling is met for the corresponding PDCP Data PDU. |  |
| SS001 | 3.1, 5.15 | As in present definition of non-delay-reporting PDCP SDU, it is not uniquely associated with i:th *dsr-ReportingThreshold* and therefore, it is suggested to append as below to make it distinct and definite.  **Non-delay-reporting PDCP SDU**: a non-delay-reporting PDCP SDU associated with the i:th *dsr-ReportingThreshold* is a PDCP SDU that will be transmitted prior to any of the delay-reporting PDCP SDUs associated with the i:th *dsr-ReportingThreshold* but not prior to any of the delay-reporting PDCP SDUs associated with the i-1:th *dsr-ReportingThreshold*.  Further, if definition for non-delay-reporting PDCP SDU is specified as above, the procedural part can be simplified (yellow highlighted text can be omitted)  If *dsr-ReportNonDelayCriticalData* is configured, the transmitting PDCP entity shall further consider the following as delay-reporting PDCP data volume associated with the i:th *dsr-ReportingThreshold*:  - the non-delay-reporting PDCP SDUs associated with the i:th *dsr-ReportingThreshold* for which no PDCP Data PDUs have been constructed, and are not considered as delay-reporting PDCP data volume associated with any of the k:th *dsr-ReportingThreshold* where k < i;  - the PDCP Data PDUs that contain the non-delay-reporting PDCP SDUs associated with the i:th *dsr-ReportingThreshold* and have not been submitted to lower layers, and are not considered as delay-reporting PDCP data volume associated with any of the k:th *dsr-ReportingThreshold* where k < i. |  |
| N001 | 5.x | [Editorial] In the last bullet point, ‘the’ is missing :  - indicate to lower layers that the condition for remaining-time-based RLC polling is met for the corresponding PDCP Data PDU. |  |

# 5. Open issues

…

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Comment identifier** | **Section** | **Comments** | **Rapporteur resolution** |
| (Open Issue)-SS001 | 5.16.1 | 5.16.1 Transmit operation For UM DRBs and AM DRBs configured by upper layers to send a PDCP SN gap report in the uplink (*sn-GapReport* in TS 38.331 [3]), the transmitting PDCP entity shall trigger a PDCP SN gap report when:  - PDCP SDU(s) are discarded as specified in clause 5.3; and  - there is at least one stored PDCP SDU(s) which is associated with a COUNT value larger than the COUNT value associated to the discarded PDCP SDU(s); and  - the discarded PDCP SDU(s) have not been submitted by any RLC entity to lower layers.  In legacy R18, upon receiving a discard indication for a RLC SDU from PDCP, a RLC SDU is either fully submitted to lower layer, or fully discarded at RLC (when no segment is submitted to lower layer).  With R19 AM RLC enhancements (i.e. *stopReTxDiscardedSDU*), we can have a new scenario where an RLC SDU has been incompletely submitted (in the form of SDU segment) to the lower layer, when becomes obsolete upon receiving the discard indication from PDCP. Such SDUs will never be delivered to the receiving PDCP entity, and end up with being discarded at the receiving side of AM RLC entity after *t-RxDiscard* expiry. However, based on the legacy triggering conditions of PDCP SN gap report, there will be no report triggered for such SDUs, and hence, the receiving PDCP entity has no chance to know about the discard status for such incompletely submitted SDUs. This causes the reoderering delays to creep in.  Therefore, with R19 AM RLC enhancements in place, we have an issue about the highlighted legacy phrase “the discarded PDCP SDU(s)” in the third condition as it does not address the new scenario. More precisely, for R19 specifications, the third condition should be enhanced to “**at least one byte for the discarded PDCP SDU(s) have not been submitted by any RLC entity to lower layers**” while triggering a PDCP SN gap report.  The benefit is that the PDCP SN gap report can early and accurately notify more discard information to the peer receiving PDCP entity and it will prevent unnecessary re-ordering delay.  In our view, it is worthwhile that this issue is considered an open issue and companies can discuss in next meeting. |  |