

3GPP TSG-RAN Meeting # 91-e

Electronic Meeting, March 16-26, 2021

RP-210869: Moderator's summary for email discussion [91E][31][SDT_scope]

Agenda item: 9.7.11

Source: Moderator (ZTE Corporation)

Document for: Information

1 Introduction

In this email discussion summary, we aim to collect the views on issues raised in the following tdocs submitted to RAN#91e:

[1] RP 210428, Motivation for revision of Rel-17 WID for NR Small Data, InterDigital, Apple, CATT, China Telecom, Huawei, HiSilicon, Intel Corporation, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Nokia, NTT Docomo, OPPO, Qualcomm, Sony, Spreadtrum, vivo, Xiaomi, ZTE corporation, Sanechips

[2] RP 210488, Views on Rel-17 NR Positioning And SDT WIDs, Ericsson, Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd

[3] RP 210509, Considerations on Context Fetch scenarios for NR SDT, Ericsson

[4] RP 210331, Revised WID on NR small data transmissions in INACTIVE state, ZTE Corporation, Sanechips

Specifically, the discussion will be on the following aspects:

- Support of positioning reporting during SDT
- Support of SDT without anchor relocation

2 Initial round discussion

2.1 SDT for positioning reporting

The SDT WI (RP-201305) notes that transmission of positioning information from INACTIVE state is a useful scenario:

*"Specific examples of small and infrequent data traffic include the following use cases:
... Traffic from wearables (periodic positioning information etc)"*

At RAN2#113-e, the following working assumption was made regarding the support of positioning information for SDT:

Working assumption

1. Support configuring of SRB1 and SRB2 for small data transmission for carrying RRC and NAS messages.
2. Upon initiating RRC Resume procedure for SDT initiation (i.e. for first SDT transmission), the UE shall also resume SRB2 that is configured for SDT, in addition to SDT DRBs that are configured for SDT
3. RAN2 recommends to include SRB2 in WID

In addition, RAN2 also agreed the following for support of SDT during INACTIVE state:

The following procedures are recommended for normative work for DL positioning methods in RRC_INACTIVE:

- Reporting of DL-PRS measurement and/or location estimate performed in RRC_INACTIVE when the UE is in RRC_INACTIVE.
- The reporting of DL-PRS measurement and/or location estimate performed in RRC_INACTIVE when the UE is in RRC_INACTIVE is enabled by enhancing small data transmission in RRC_INACTIVE. (Details of the use of SDT to be studied in the WI phase)

In [1], the following observations were made:

Observation 1: Transmission of positioning information in INACTIVE can be enabled by small data transmission framework

Observation 2: The procedures associated with configuring and resuming SRB2 enables CP data delivery within SDT framework and comes at no additional specification work

Based on the above observations, the co-sourcing companies of the tdoc in [1] propose to update the SDT WID to clarify that positioning information can be included during SDT. The changes to the WID are captured in [4] and given the observation 2, this comes with no additional scope or new TUs in the WID.

On the other hand, in [2], the following observations are made:

— NG-RAN Node may not have any insight to what payload is sent on SRB2 (e.g. other than positioning), there is value in studying how this impact the ability to make suitable resource allocation and how to handle load (RA and CG).

— SRB2 vs DRB configured w SDT may have separate triggers and priority (data volume etc) which introduces value in studying how LCP and multiplexing is impacted.

— If lower latency for signaling PRS measurements is the main motivator, it has already been shown in RAN2 that subsequent data in SDT (i.e more than one Tx in a single SDT procedure) is less

efficient than legacy transition to connected (two or more Tx). (result of that the payload for positioning measurement is typically large messages)

— Security/ key handling for subsequent Tx in SDT has not been resolved in RAN2 (a question to SA3 was delayed as the SDT procedure itself is not yet entirely defined).

— Failure handling for when a payload has been submitted in MAC but for where the UE fails in it's attempt. It is unclear what and if special handling of SRB2 is needed.

— LMF involvement in SDT (Preferably only for low accuracy (QoS)), the LMF allows the usage of SDT for positioning.

And the following proposal was made:

Proposal from [2]: The WI scope for SDT is maintained (i.e. no addition of support for SRBs).

So, the proposal in [2] seems to assume that support of SRBs is not within the scope of the current WI, however, the moderator would like to note that the RAN2 already agreed that at least SRB1 will anyway be resumed and messages can be transmitted over SRB1 already during the SDT phase (along with SRB0). So, the open question seems to be about SRB2.

Based on the above status, companies are invited to answer the following questions:

Feedback Form 1: [Mod] Q1: Do companies agree that SDT is useful for reporting positioning information and hence agree with the RAN2 working assumption to support configuring of SRB1 and SRB2 for small data transmission for carrying RRC and NAS messages? (Yes/No)

Item	Company	Comments
1	InterDigital Inc.	Yes
2	Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd	Yes
3	Xiaomi Communications	Yes. The issues observed for the SRB2 seem also valid for DRB. We consider that the SRB2 SDT can be completed together with the DRB SDT.
4	Futurewei Technologies	Yes
5	LG Electronics Inc.	Maybe. The design target of SDT is small and infrequent data, which may not require low latency and high reliability. If the positioning data does not require low latency and high reliability, the SDT could be useful. Otherwise, SDT would not be suitable.
6	QUALCOMM JAPAN LLC.	Yes
7	CATT	[CATT] Yes.

Item	Company	Comments
8	Guangdong OPPO Mobile Telecom.	Yes
9	Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd	No. In short, the positioning information is not small in most cases, so it is not appropriate for the "small" data transmission. That is, to report the positioning information would result multiple transmissions in SDT, and then, it would take longer latency than to report it after performing the normal state transition. In addition, given very limited TUs, we do not want to expand the scope of the WI which always brings additional discussion in the working group.
10	MediaTek Inc.	Yes
11	DOCOMO Communications Lab.	[Docomo] Yes
12	Rakuten Mobile, Inc	Yes.
13	Nokia Corporation	Yes
14	Ericsson LM	No. It depends on the size of the positioning messages.
15	ZTE Corporation	[ZTE] Yes.
16	vivo Mobile Communication Co.,	[vivo] Yes. As per the POS WI agreement, we think it is natural to allow NAS-level positioning information transmission via the SDT procedure.
17	HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.	[Huawei, HiSilicon] Yes

Feedback Form 2: [Mod]: Please provide any further comments or views on Q1 and in general, any views on positioning support for SDT

Item	Company	Comments
1	InterDigital Inc.	<p>Currently, in connected mode, measurement reports are transmitted in NAS. For INACTIVE mode positioning, NAS messaging (via SRB2) should be supported for reporting positioning measurements since INACTIVE mode positioning is beneficial for reduction of power consumption.</p> <p>Precluding transmission of SRB2 in SDT do not seem justified from a pure protocol perspective.</p> <p>Regarding the concern in [2] about the size of the positioning report, SDT framework already supports a “small data volume” usage threshold, where the UE only uses small data resource if the volume is less than the configured threshold, and transitions into connected mode otherwise. It’s up to the network how to configure this threshold. Should the NW wish to have large positioning reports transmitted in connected mode, the data volume threshold can be configured accordingly.</p>
2	Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd	As discussed in RP-192412 (RANP email discussion on SI Scope), we see benefits to support positioning for INACTIVE. To achieve low latency while still enjoy power consumption gain, SDT is needed.
3	Xiaomi Communications	The NAS message within SRB2 should be transparent to the SDT procedure. Maybe this should be clarified in the WID to avoid too many unnecessary enhancements. As companies are raising concerns on which NAS messages would be included in the SRB2 SDT, we consider that RAN2 should avoid complicating the UE implementation and the specification too much by differentiating different NAS messages in the SRB2 SDT.
4	Futurewei Technologies	We are not convinced of the issues raised in [2]. And we see the extension of SDT to SRB2 quite straight forward.
5	LG Electronics Inc.	As explained in Q1, the benefit of supporting positioning for SDT depends on the characteristics of positioning data. So, the question is; what kind of positioning data we are aiming for SDT?
6	QUALCOMM JAPAN LLC.	Agree to InterDigital comment above.
7	CATT	[CATT] According to the discussion for supporting positioning in inactive state, at least measurement results can be reported in inactive via SDT to achieve low positioning latency. So it is benefit to extend SDT to SRB2.
8	Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd	Reply to InterDigital, since we have threshold for SDT, and the positioning information is not small in most cases, then it would always require normal state transition, then why do we make effort for the unused scenarios?
9	MediaTek Inc.	We see the benefit and support the RAN2 working assumption, i.e. using SDT to transfer positioning information using SRB2. We consider the standard work is straight forward, e.g. adding several words.

Item	Company	Comments
10	DOCOMO Commu- nications Lab.	[Docomo] Agree with InterDigital comments. We also think that work for supporting SRB2 should be straightforward.
11	Nokia Corpora- tion	We agree with InterDigital's comments and see that this work has on minimal impact on RAN2 workload.
12	Ericsson LM	We have outlined our views on this matter in RP-210488. The Rel-17 positioning work is targeting high accuracy which means the messages are larger than what is suitable for SDT. Additionally the main power saving for the UE is <i>performing</i> the measurement in RRC_INACTIVE, the <i>reporting</i> is secondary. Finally adding support for a control plane in SDT increases the scope and jeopardizes completion of the release.
13	ZTE Cor- poration	<p>1) Size of the positioning information: Firstly, the SDT size is fully configurable. Of course, only those payload sizes that are suitable for SDT will be allowed for SDT by the network. <u>This is true not just for positioning, but also for any information.</u> Depending on the configuration of the report, the positioning information will have a variable size and we think majority of applications will generate small payloads suitable for SDT. Secondly, most of the positioning reports are short one shot information sent infrequently to the network. This is exactly the target application for SDT and hence it seems precluding such applications for SDT seems not logical.</p> <p>2) Scope of the WID and additional work in RAN2: As noted above, enabling SRB1 has already been agreed by RAN2 regardless of this discussion. So, SRB2 is simply another type of signalling radio bearer and enabling this would require no additional effort as pointed out above. Enabling SRB2 simply provides a means for radio level prioritisation between different messages carried over SRBs. Precluding SRB2 seems not justified even from the pure protocol handling perspective (as ability to have radio level prioritisation between RRC messages needs to be kept).</p>
14	vivo Mobile Commu- nication Co.,	[vivo] Considering that the size reduction of positioning information has been studied in POS WI, we think using SDT for positioning information reporting becomes more feasible and useful. Besides, the positioning data basically is a kind of user data but just encapsulated in NAS message mapping to SRB2. From UE perspective, we cannot find out any additional specific issues of SRB2 management during SDT in terms of RB configuration/resumption/failure handling/resource allocation.
15	HUAWEI TECH- NOLO- GIES Co. Ltd.	[Huawei, HiSilicon] SDT serves as transport service provided by the lower layer to the upper layers. Either it is SRB or DRB makes no difference for SDT. Supporting transporting of positioning measurement and location estimate in RRC_INACTIVE is beneficial for power saving as we have agreed in the positioning session in RAN2.

Feedback Form 3: [Mod] Q2: Keeping in mind that transmissions over SRB1 (and SRB0) are already enabled within the SDT scope, do you agree that supporting SRB2 within the scope of SDT WI is possible with no additional work in RAN2? (Yes/No)

Item	Company	Comments
1	InterDigital, Inc.	Yes
2	Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd	Yes
3	Futurewei Technologies	Yes
4	LG Electronics Inc.	If positioning data requires low latency and high reliability, some additional works may be needed.
5	QUALCOMM JAPAN LLC.	Yes
6	CATT	[CATT] Yes.
7	Guangdong OPPO Mobile Telecom.	OPPO: how to understand "no additional work in RAN2"?, does it mean the current agreements made for DRB will be applied for SRB2, is it correct understanding?
8	Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd	We cannot say 'yes' at the moment. People will always find a new issue if we extend the scope, as observed in the past (like 2-step CFRA in RAN2)...
9	MediaTek Inc.	Yes.
10	Rakuten Mobile, Inc	Yes.
11	Nokia Corporation	yes
12	Ericsson LM	We think the first statement is a bit of a stretch. The current WID does not explicitly say anything about supporting DRBs and/or SRBs, but the term "UP data transmission" is used. SRBs are typically not part of the user plane, but the control plane. If support for SRB2 is added to the SDT WI additional work is needed.

Item	Company	Comments
13	ZTE Corporation	Yes. To clarify, some comments above seem to be because of some misunderstanding of this WID objective. It should be noted that "UP data transmission" is only mentioned in the RACH based schemes in the WI. This is because CP transmission is already possible for RACH (with 2-step RACH) - so, for RACH what is needed on top is the UP transmissions. Note that one could also argue that at least for CG-SDT, the current WID allows CP transmission then (since there is no restriction about UP transmission in that objective) ?? The point is that the radio bearer used for transport at radio level should be up to RAN2 and this can be either DRB or SRB and this should not really be restricted one way or the other and the WID doesn't intend to do this.
14	vivo Mobile Communication Co.,	[vivo] No, but we think the additional workload is quite trivial. Specifically, an RRC-level flag to tell whether SRB2 is allowed in SDT may be needed. Apart from this, we don't see any other necessary normative work.
15	HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.	{Huawei, HiSilicon} In short, yes. Changes would still be needed, e.g. resuming SRB2 configured with SDT at the time of RRCResume. However, we don't think there would be large changes to the specs.

Feedback Form 4: [Mod]: Please provide details on what additional effort is needed to enable SRB2 (if any) and why this needs additional work (e.g. additional TUs in RAN2)?

Item	Company	Comments
1	InterDigital, Inc.	No additional TUs are required as nothing specific needs to be designed for transmitting SRB2 over the SDT framework. Many aspects of the related procedures required to transmit DRBs and SRB1 securely have been agreed. Since the procedure for SRB2 is similar to SDT-DRB or SDT-SRB1, resuming SRB2 in SDT for sending data with integrity protection/encryption has no additional complexity compared to SDT DRBs. Thus, transmission of SRB2 data comes for free by reusing the SDT framework without any need to tailor anything specific.
2	Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd	We think that additional work to enable SRB2 on top of DRB and SRB1 support is negligible as SDT deal with RBs that are common for SRB and DRB. Therefore, NO additional TU is required.
3	Futurewei Technologies	No additional TU is needed.
4	LG Electronics Inc.	Additional TU may not be required. However, if positioning data requires low latency and high reliability, SDT design may need to consider this aspect.
5	QUALCOMM JAPAN LLC.	No additional TU needed. It is just to reuse SDT mechanism available for DRBs.

Item	Company	Comments
6	CATT	[CATT] Agree with other companies, no additional TU is needed.
7	Guangdong OPPO Mobile Telecom.	OPPO: the intention is trying to reuse the framework for DRB, thus no extra efforts are expected.
8	Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd	As indicated in 0488, at least triggering aspect for the control plane should be discussed further, and we cannot say that the impact would be negligible at the moment. It is contradictory to say that we do not need additional TU while some aspects should be discussed/considered during the discussion.
9	MediaTek Inc.	No additional TU is needed.
10	Nokia Corporation	No additional TU is needed.
11	Ericsson LM	How to prioritize SRB2 compared to other DRBs for example. NW has to be able to configure support for SDT and the granularity of support (and multiplexing with DRBs) must be discussed which will take time.
12	ZTE Corporation	None of the additional work mentioned is specific to "SRB2"! Note that since SRB1 is already allowed, multiplexing between SRBs and DRBs has anyway to be sorted within the WI and this is not specific to SRB2. Regarding triggering, of course it has to be agreed that SRB2 also can be configured for SDT and this is exactly what RAN2 agreed (i.e. the WA at last meeting). So, asking for more TUs or increased scope just for SRB2 seems not justified.
13	vivo Mobile Communication Co.,	[vivo] No additional TU is required. Currently, it is agreed that SDT can be triggered on a per DRB basis. To further allow SRB2-SDT, in our understanding, the additional work is only to introduce a new flag to indicate whether SRB2 with pending positioning data is allowed to trigger SDT. Then the current SDT framework for SDT-DRB can be fully reused and no specific technical issues are observed.
14	HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.	[Huawei, HiSilicon] Same view as almost all the companies here, i.e. that no additional TU is required

Feedback Form 5: [Mod] Q3: Finally, please provide your comments on the changes proposed to the WID in [4], if any

Item	Company	Comments
1	InterDigital Inc.	We agree with the changes proposed to WID
2	Futurewei Technologies	We are fine with the changes.

Item	Company	Comments
3	LG Electronics Inc.	If SRB2 is decided to be supported, we think just replacing “UP data” to “UL data” is enough. We don’t see the need to add the NOTE.
4	QUALCOMM JAPAN LLC.	We support the update in [4].
5	CATT	[CATT] We are fine with the update in [4].
6	Guangdong OPPO Mobile Telecom.	OPPO: we’re fine with the changes
7	MediaTek Inc.	We support update in [4].
8	DOCOMO Communications Lab.	[Docomo] Fine with the changes.
9	Nokia Corporation	We agree with the proposed changes.
10	Ericsson LM	Simply adding a note does not cut it. If RAN#91 decides to add support for SRB2 we should be open and add the corresponding objectives and not hide it in a note.
11	ZTE Corporation	The added note clarifies the scope so that the work can proceed. It is not clear to us what additional objective is needed to cover the work other than the clarifications in the updated WID.
12	vivo Mobile Communication Co.,	[vivo]We agree with the revised WID.
13	HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.	[Huawei, HiSilicon] We agree with the changes proposed to the WID update.

2.2 SDT without anchor relocation

The WI for SDT has objectives to support SDT with and without anchor relocation for the RACH based solution. In [4] it was claimed that the support of SDT without anchor relocation will bring more latency by signalling exchange between network nodes and cause unnecessary complexity to the network and it was proposed to remove the support of the no-anchor relocation case for SDT.

It should be noted that the no-anchor relocation case would avoid the unnecessary path switch and the associated signalling for each and every small data packet.

Further, RAN3 had some initial discussion on the overall SDT framework and made the following WA (see R3-211280):

WA1: The existing Retrieve UE Context procedure can be reused for both with and without anchor relocation scenarios with possible enhancements, which will be discussed later.

So far there has been only 1 RAN3 meeting and based on the above WA in RAN3, it seems that RAN3 is planning to discuss this further during the WI phase.

Based on the above, companies are invited to answer the following question:

Feedback Form 6: [Mod] Q4: Do companies agree that RAN can wait for RAN3 to progress according to the RAN3 WA noted above (i.e. keep the no-anchor relocation within the scope of the WID)? (Yes/No)

Item	Company	Comments
1	InterDigital, Inc.	Yes, RAN can wait for further progress in RAN3. If complex optimization are required to support it, SDT without anchor relocation can be removed from the scope.
2	Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd	Yes
3	Futurewei Technologies	Yes, we should let RAN3 proceed further on technical discussions.
4	LG Electronics Inc.	We share the view from the InterDigital. If complex optimization are required to support it, SDT without anchor relocation can be removed from the scope.
5	QUALCOMM JAPAN LLC.	We should let RAN3 discuss in the next meeting(s) as they agreed already. RAN can wait.
6	CATT	[CATT] Yes. RAN can wait for RAN3's progress.
7	Guangdong OPPO Mobile Telecom.	OPPO: yes, we wait for RAN3 progress
8	Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd	We are fine to keep the current scope as it is, and wait for the RAN3 progress.
9	MediaTek Inc.	We support WA1 and keeping current scope. We can wait for RAN3 to finalize their discussion.
10	DOCOMO Communications Lab.	[Docomo] Yes

Item	Company	Comments
11	Nokia Corporation	yes
12	Ericsson LM	As explained in our contribution (RP-210509) we propose to remove support of context fetch without anchor relocation. Doing so would save time, mostly in RAN3, also to avoid further LS back and forth between the groups.
13	ZTE Corporation	Yes, we think we can wait for RAN3 progress.
14	vivo Mobile Communication Co.,	[vivo]Yes, we think it is a bit early to discuss this topic in RAN based on the current RAN3 progress.
15	HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.	[Huawei, HiSilicon] Yes. RAN3 can continue the progress on RA-SDT without anchor relocation

Feedback Form 7: [Mod]: If your answer to Q4 is "No", please elaborate further on why RAN intervention is necessary before RAN3 has a chance to discuss this further per the WA made by RAN3.

Item	Company	Comments
1	Ericsson LM	As explained in our contribution RAN3 has been involved in LS exchange with RAN2 and it does not seem a clear scenario with benefits for this objective has been identified. Complicated solutions were proposed however. The TUs can be spent better elsewhere.

2.3 Initial round summary

- Q1: Majority of companies agree that SDT is useful for reporting positioning information and hence agree with the RAN2 working assumption to support configuring of SRB1 and SRB2 for SDT for carrying RRC and NAS messages (15/17)

- Q1 comments: The two companies that had concerns for the support of SRB2 for SDT indicated that positioning information may not be small and felt that supporting SRB2 will increase the scope and jeopardizes completion of the work item. However, other companies (i.e. 13 out of 15) pointed out that additional work is either trivial or comes for free as part of supporting SRB1 and DRBs.

- Q2: Majority of companies (12 out of 14) think that there is no need for extra TUs to support this work. The rapporteurs understanding is that even the other two companies are not actually arguing for more TUs anyway.

- Q3: Apart from one company others seem to agree that the revised WID is fine (12 out of 13)

- Q4: Majority view (14 out of 15) is that RAN3 should be allowed to progress the work for SDT without anchor relocation and no RAN plenary intervention is needed right now

3 First intermediate round discussion

3.1 SDT for positioning reporting

Based on the feedback from the initial round, it seems the majority view is to approve the changes to the WI as proposed in RP 210331. In order to take into account the comments to ensure RAN2 work scope is not expanded, the following proposal is made and this could be discussed as part of the second round of discussion.

Proposal 1: Approve the revised WID as proposed in RP-210331 without introducing new TUs for RAN2 or in any other WG

Companies are invited to provide their views on the above proposal.

Feedback Form 8: Is proposal 1 agreeable? (Yes/No, please add any further details on what could be acceptable if the answer is "No")

Item	Company	Comments
1	InterDigital, Inc.	Yes
2	Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd	Yes
3	QUALCOMM JAPAN LLC.	Yes
4	Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd	Yes with condition: since no companies wanted to add additional TUs for the item, we could have the following additional sentence in the (new) NOTE 3 in RP-210331: " <u>Special handling for SRB1 and SRB2 is not the scope of this WI</u> ".
5	LG Electronics Inc.	Yes. And ok with Samsung's suggestion.
6	vivo Mobile Communication Co.,	Yes.
7	ZTE Corporation	Yes
8	HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.	[Huawei, HiSilicon] Yes

Item	Company	Comments
9	MediaTek Inc.	Yes.
10	Motorola Mobility Germany GmbH	[Lenovo, Motorola Mobility] - Yes
11	Ericsson LM	<p>We don't support this change, but we realize we are quite alone. Trying to be more constructive, here are some comments to improve the WID:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NOTE 3 is ambiguous, why the use of "should"? • Why the use of a note in the first place? If the intention to support SDT on SRB0, SRB1, SRB2 and DRBs (subject to per-bearer network configuration), why not write that explicitly? Add it after the line "Focus of the WID should be..." <p>We also support the intention behind the proposal from Samsung, but we are not sure it is the correct way to capture that intention. It is not clear what "special handling" is referred to. We do support the notion that the same configuration mechanisms agreed for DRBs also apply to SRBs for example.</p>
12	Sony Europe B.V.	Yes
13	Rakuten Mobile, Inc	Yes
14	Nokia Corporation	Yes

3.2 SDT without anchor relocation

Based on the majority view, in the initial round, it seems we can keep the WID scope as it is for the no-anchor relocation scenario. So, the following proposal is made:

Proposal 2: No change to the WID scope for SDT without anchor relocation. RAN3 can progress this issue as per the WA made in RAN3.

Feedback Form 9: Is proposal 2 agreeable? (yes/no, further comments if "No")

Item	Company	Comments
1	InterDigital Inc.	Yes
2	Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd	Yes
3	QUALCOMM JAPAN LLC.	Yes

Item	Company	Comments
4	Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd	Yes
5	LG Electronics Inc.	Yes
6	vivo Mobile Communication Co.,	Yes
7	ZTE Corporation	Yes
8	HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.	[Huawei, HiSilicon] Yes
9	MediaTek Inc.	Yes.
10	Motorola Mobility Germany GmbH	[Lenovo, Motorola Mobility] - Yes
11	NEC Telecom MODUS Ltd.	Yes. RAN3 can progress as per WA1 (R3-211280).
12	Rakuten Mobile, Inc	Yes
13	Nokia Corporation	Yes

3.3 First intermediate round summary

On Proposal 1: Approve the revised WID as proposed in RP-210331 without introducing new TUs for RAN2 or in any other WG

- Again majority of companies seem to support this proposal (12 out of 14)
- There is willingness to proceed towards discussion of possible wording that may be agreeable to the 2 companies that have some concerns on proposal 1
- Common view of all companies is to have no new TUs for this anyway

On Proposal 2: No change to the WID scope for SDT without anchor relocation. RAN3 can progress this issue as per the WA made in RAN3

- All (13) companies that responded agree with the above proposal.
- So, the moderator believes that this can be agreed (i.e. no change to the WID for the SDT without anchor relocation and we can consider this thread of discussion as closed)

4 Second intermediate round

Based on the feedback in the first intermediate round, it seems we can now focus only on the SDT for positioning reporting. So, this round will only discuss this aspect.

4.1 SDT for positioning reporting

As noted above, there seems to be some willingness to discuss the detailed wording and with this in mind, we could try to converge on a version that could have consensus.

The following seem to be agreeable/preferable:

- No new TUs in any WG
- Convert the note into a more normative text to avoid ambiguity
- Capture the message that the work on SRBs shall reuse the work done for DRBs to avoid any need for "special handling"

With these in mind, the moderator believes that the following wording could be acceptable:

Table 1: Possible text for the updated WID

<p>Focus of the WID should be on licensed carriers and the solutions can be reused for NR-U if applicable.</p>
--

<p><i><u>Specify configuring of SRB1 and SRB2 for small data transmission to transmit RRC messages and to transfer NAS messages via SRB2 in RRC_INACTIVE state (e.g. to carry positioning information) by reusing the framework for DRBs.</u></i></p>
--

The draft with the above wording is stored in the drafts folder (/tsg_ran/TSG_RAN/TSGR_91e/Inbox/Drafts/[91E][31][SDT_scope]). The proposal now is to check whether this is acceptable.

Feedback Form 10: Is the wording suggested in the revised WID (in drafts folder) acceptable? (You can directly save a new draft in the drafts folder with any updates if necessary)

Item	Company	Comments
1	Ericsson LM	The wording can be simplified. Is there a point in mentioning RRC and NAS explicitly? We propose the following addition instead: Specify configuring of SRB1 and SRB2 for small data transmission to transmit RRC messages and to transfer NAS messages via SRB2 in RRC_INACTIVE state (e.g., to carry positioning information) by reusing the framework for DRBs.
2	ZTE Corporation	Yes. (and we are fine with the revised wording suggested by Ericsson above)
3	InterDigital Inc.	The simplified wording suggested by Ericsson is good for us, as the essence of the addition is to specify SRB1 and SRB2 for SDT.
4	Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd	We are also fine with the wording suggested by Ericsson.
5	QUALCOMM JAPAN LLC.	Ericsson's modification looks good to us.
6	LG Electronics Inc.	We are fine with Ericsson's suggestion.
7	Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd	We are fine with Ericsson's modification. Thank you Eswar!
8	CATT	[CATT] We are also fine with Ericsson's wording. Thanks.
9	Sony Europe B.V.	The wording proposed by Ericsson looks fine.
10	Motorola Mobility Germany GmbH	[Lenovo, Motorola Mobility] - We also support Ericsson's updated wording.
11	MediaTek Inc.	We are also ok with the Ericsson's simplified wording.
12	Nokia Corporation	Ericsson's update proposal looks good to us.

4.2 Second intermediate round summary

It seems there is consensus on the new wording below for the WID update:

Specify configuring of SRB1 and SRB2 for small data transmission in RRC_INACTIVE state by reusing the framework for DRBs.

An updated WID per above is saved in the drafts folder and it is recommended to agree this version.

With this we can close this NWM thread.

5 Final summary

The following aspects were discussed in this thread:

- SDT for positioning reporting
- SDT without anchor relocation

Conclusion:

Based on the discussions, companies are willing to agree the latest version of the WID located in the drafts folder (Inbox/Drafts/[91E][31][SDT_scope]/)