[92-e-17-IAB-WI] - Version 0.0.5
RAN

3GPP TSG-RAN Meeting # 92-e RP-211522

Electronic Meeting, June 14-18, 2021

Agenda Item: 9.7.2.6

Title: Report of email discussion [92-e-27-IAB-WI]

Source: Email discussion moderator (Qualcomm)

Document for: Discussion and decision

1 Introduction

This email discussion covers RP-211218 and RP-211200 related to NR_IAB_enh. RP-211200 includes a WID revision with a new RAN4 objective for the performance part. RP-211218 proposes deprioritization in certain areas and of certain options for RAN2.

2 RP-211200 - New RAN4 performance objective

RP-211200 [1] holds a WID revision, which includes a new RAN4 objective for the performance part (underlined bold, below):

4.2 Objectives of Performance part WI

NOTE: Leave empty if the WI proposal does not contain a RAN performance part.

- Specification of RRM performance requirements for Rel-17 enhancements.

- Specification of demodulation performance requirements for Rel-17 enhancements.

- Specification of conformance testing requirements for Rel-17 enhancements

2.1 Initial round: Feedback on RAN4 performance objective

Feedback Form 1: Do you agree with the adoption of this WID objective in the performance part? If not, can you propose a rewording that might be acceptable?

1 – Ericsson LM

We agree.

2 – AT&T We support the new objective.
3 – Apple GmbH We Agree
4 – vivo Mobile Communication Co. Agree
5 – T-Mobile USA Inc. Agree
6 – Fujitsu Limited Agree
7 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd Agree
8 – Nokia Corporation yes, we agree
9 – ZTE Corporation Yes, we agree.
10 – InterDigital Germany GmbH agree

2.2 Intermediate round: Feedback on RAN4 performance objective

Summary on question: Do you agree with the adoption of this WID objective in the performance part? If not, can you propose a rewording that might be acceptable?

10 of 10 companies agree. There is consensus that the specification of conformance testing requirements for Rel-17 enhancements should be added as objective to the performance part of the WID. This is captured in Proposal 1 below.

Proposal 1: Rel-17 IAB WID to include the specification of conformance testing requirements for Rel-17 enhancements as WID objective in the performance part.

Feedback Form 2: Do you agree with Proposal 1?

1 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd Agree
2 – Samsung R&D Institute UK We support this proposal which is also RAN4 consensus
3 – ZTE Corporation Agree
4 – Verizon UK Ltd Agree
5 – Ericsson LM Agree.
6 – LG Electronics Inc. Agree
7 – Rakuten Mobile Agree
8 – Nokia Corporation Agree

Flag to RP-211200: WID update RP-211200 has been flagged by Huawei with the following comment:

For the RRM parts, all the core requirements and performance test cases are captured in the dedicated spec for IAB (38.174), hence there is no need to include 38.133 anymore.

If companies agree on the removal of TS 38.133 from the WID (see proposal 2), the moderator will initiate a WID update in RP-92, which has 38.133 removed. If there is no agreements the issue can be discussed in RAN4 and picked up in RP-93

Proposal 2: TS 38.133 to be removed from Rel-17 IAB WID.

Feedback Form 3: Do you agree with Proposal 2?

1 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd Agree
2 – Samsung R&D Institute UK IAB RRM requirement is captured in TS38.174 since Rel-16, which means TS38.133 will not be impacted for Rel-17 IAB enhancement as well. Hence we are fine to remove TS38.133 in the list of impacted TS.

3 – Ericsson LM Agree.
4 – LG Electronics Inc. Agree
5 – ZTE Corporation Agree
6 – Rakuten Mobile Agree
7 – Nokia Corporation Agree

2.3 Intermediate round summary

There is consensus on proposals 1 and 2. The moderator will initiate a revision of RP-211200, which will not include TS 38.133.

Proposal 1: Rel-17 IAB WID to include the specification of conformance testing requirements for Rel-17 enhancements as WID objective in the performance part.

Proposal 2: TS 38.133 to be removed from Rel-17 IAB WID.

The moderator believes that this topic of the email discussion can be closed.

3 RP-211218 - Deprioritization of RAN2 topics

RP-211218 discusses reduction of WI scope with respect to RAN2 objectives. The contribution holds the following proposal:

Proposal: RAN plenary to give guidance to RAN2 Rel.17 IAB work to focus efforts on Topology Adaptation (TA) enhancements and Duplexing enhancements and to deprioritize following enhancement areas/options:

- Topology-wide fairness, latency reduction and congestion control

- DAPS-like solution for IAB topology adaptation

- IAB specific enhancements for CHO

The moderator believes that some clarification is needed on this proposal:

- The proposal recommends that RAN2 focuses on topology adaptation enhancements while deprioritizing DAPS-like solution and IAB-specific enhancements for CHO. The latter two features, however, do represent

topology adaptation enhancements.

- The proposal recommends that RAN2 deprioritizes fairness/latency/congestion, while the contribution's discussion endorses further support for LCG range extension, which was agreed as part of fairness/latency/congestion enhancements.

- Clarification is needed on topics agreed by RAN2 that fall under both, topology adaptation as well as fairness/latency/congestion, e.g., congestion-based local rerouting.

- The proposal recommends that RAN2 focuses on duplexing enhancements. However, there have hardly been any contributions to RAN2 on duplexing enhancements, and most of them recommend waiting for RAN1 progress.

The moderator believes that:

- RAN2 work on duplexing enhancements need not be discussed here since this is primarily in RAN1 scope.

- RAN2 will handle ongoing and future requests from other RAN WGs (e.g. RAN1/3) related to this WI.

- RAN2 may probably want to continue working on features, where agreements have been achieved, which includes:

(1) LCG range extension

(2) Type 2/3 RLF indication

(3) Local rerouting based on flow-control feedback

- RAN2 may probably want to continue working on enhancements, which were explicitly requested by RAN3, which includes:

(4) Inter-donor-DU rerouting

(5) CP-UP separation

(6) Inter-topology routing

RAN2 has extensively discussed many other enhancements related to:

(a) Topology-wide fairness, latency reduction and congestion control.

(b) Topology-adaptation, including DAPS and CHO.

Little or no progress has been made for these enhancements. Downscoping, if any, should probably begin with topics.

In the following, companies are asked if TSG RAN guidance on the prioritization of RAN2 efforts would be helpful at the present point in this WI. Assuming that TSG RAN guidance would be helpful, companies are asked about specific enhancements to be deprioritized based on RP-211218.

3.1 Initial round: Feedback TSG RAN guidance to RAN2

Feedback Form 4: Do you believe that TSG RAN guidance on the prioritization of RAN2 efforts would be helpful at the present point in this WI?

1 – Ericsson LM

We think guidance from RAN plenary would be beneficial.

2 – AT&T

High-level guidance at a topic level may be beneficial. However, the prioritization of sub-topics and detailed objectives is probably best left to the WG-level to work out.

3 – Apple GmbH

We agree that a general guidance on this topic is useful by RAN plenary.

4 – vivo Mobile Communication Co.

We agree RAN plenary guidance may be helpful.

5 – T-Mobile USA Inc.

We agree RAN plenary guidance would be beneficial

6 – Samsung Electronics Co.

We agree RAN plenary guidance would be beneficial

7 – Fujitsu Limited

Generally yes. However for this specific WID at this point, some progress has been made in various sub-topics. It is better for WG to work out the prioritization on the sub-topics of the objectives.

8 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd

While we agree that RAN guidance could be helpful, in general, we think RAN2 chair can also progress the work in terms of deciding which topics is likely to get consensus.

9 – Nokia Corporation

Yes, we see that RAN guidance would be beneficial in order to ensure timely and quality specification completion for Rel-17 IAB enhancements, especially when considering the current RAN WG workload situation.

10 – ZTE Corporation

Yes, we see benefits of RAN guidance on how to proceed the RAN2 IAB topics.

11 – LG Electronics Inc.

Yes. Considering RAN2 situation and discussion so far, we think that RAN plenary guidance would be beneficial and detailed guidance/prioritization is needed at least for fairness/latency/congestion.

12 – InterDigital Germany GmbH

Yes we agree

13 – HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.

[Huawei, HiSilicon] The guidance may be common to RAN2 and RAN3. NOTE that RAN3 topics seem even more overloaded.

Some guidance like "RAN3 should prioritize the essential features, and deprioritize the enhancement. RAN2 should first complete the already agreed features, rather than open more enhancement discussion."

We do agree the detailed prioritization should be done in WGs-level.

The intention should be to prioritize the scope rather than to require more TU allocation.

Feedback Form 5: Should TSG RAN recommend deprioritization of IAB-specific enhancements for CHO?

1 – Ericsson LM

Yes.

2 – AT&T

No. We believe the benefits of CHO for IAB have been established since Rel-16 and the work can be managed at the WG-level.

3 – Apple GmbH

No. We feel that this work should be managed at the working group level.

4 – vivo Mobile Communication Co.

Yes.

5 – T-Mobile USA Inc.

Yes

6 – Samsung Electronics Co.

No, even though the progress is a bit slow, we can keep the work scope for the issue for now.

7 – Fujitsu Limited

No. CHO for IAB has drawn great interests in both RAN2 and RAN3. It is beneficial for topology adaptation performance.

8 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd

Yes. While CHO itself is useful for IAB, IAB specific enhancements for CHO is not essential. Currently, there are three open issues for IAB-specific enhancements for CHO. 1) Execution condition: is not essential to introduce new event as IAB-node should follow what is designed for normal UE. For 2) migrating IAB-node-DU change and 3) descendant IAB-nodes configurations, both enhancements will introduce a lot of

impact and overhead to signaling procedure. Considering the limited TU, it is suggested to deprioritize IAB-specific enhancements for CHO.

9 – Nokia Corporation

Yes. We note it is discussed in RAN2 that defined in Rel-16 CHO mechanism consists a good and appropriate baseline that can be applied to IAB, with no IAB-specific triggers. While there is no conclusion yet, that work on potential IAB-specific enhancements (e.g. triggers, configuration strategies) are not priority in Rel-17, we believe such recommendation would help in directing work towards other objectives driven by RAN3 requirements (BAP routing, CU/UP separation). Since their fulfilment will mandate RAN2 specification changes, focus should be put there.

10 – LG Electronics Inc.

Yes. We can live without IAB-specific enhancement for CHO in Rel-17.

11 – InterDigital Germany GmbH

No, but we should review in September

Feedback Form 6: Should TSG RAN recommend deprioritization of DAPS-like solution for IAB?

1 – Ericsson LM

Yes.

2 – AT&T

Yes. Given the scope of work for a DAPS-like solution for IAB is still not clear, it may be beneficial to recommend deprioritization for the topic to free up additional TUs for other objectives.

3 – Apple GmbH

Agree considering that the scope and direction is still not clear, de-prioritization of this topic is ok.

4 – vivo Mobile Communication Co.

Yes.

5 – T-Mobile USA Inc.

Yes

6 – Fujitsu Limited

Yes.

7 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd

Yes. DAPS-like solution was proposed in RAN3 to reduce service interruption during inter-donor migration. However, there's no conclusion for normal procedure of inter-donor migration in RAN2 yet. Hence, it is proposed to deprioritize DAPS-like solution for IAB.

8 – Nokia Corporation

Yes. DAPS-like solution is meant for mobility enhancement feature minimizing the interruption of data transmission during HO. For DAPS-like, the underlying assumptions and requirements for the configurations to provide two simultaneous connections are similar to Dual Connectivity. While the purpose of minimizing interruption can be achieved by Dual Connectivity, we believe there is no critical need to define alternate solution for the same purpose. Especially, once the intended outcome would require RAN1 work on mechanism for simultaneous uplink transmissions in DC, as well as extended RAN2 efforts on BAP entity handling in DC.

9 – ZTE Corporation

Yes, DAPS-like solution has been discussed in RAN2 several times with little progress. People have different point of views on the use cases of DAPS-like solution. Some companies think it is only used for service continuity while other companies think it is mainly used for load balance. This leads to different design considerations on the DAPS-like solution. It seems hard to converge on this issue soon. Based on this situation, it is suggested to deprioritize the DAPS-like solution in RAN2.

10 – LG Electronics Inc.

Yes. Even though RAN2 has discussed several times, many things are still unclear and it seems hard to be converged.

11 – InterDigital Germany GmbH

Yes

12 – HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.

[Huawei, HiSilicon] Yes, but... The intention is fine, but, RAN2/3 has no clear definition on “DAPS-like”. Maybe we could say “Use the NR-DC rather than DAPS-like for dual-donor connectivity”.

Feedback Form 7: Should TSG RAN recommend deprioritization of fairness/latency/congestion EXCEPT LCG range extension, RLF indication and local rerouting based on flow-control feedback?

1 – Ericsson LM

Yes, but we would like to emphasize that the RAN2 agreement on flow-control feedback is limited to downlink.

2 – AT&T

No, we don’t believe TSG RAN should weigh-in on the prioritization of different solutions related to fairness/latency/congestion and it should be left to the WGs to work out. At this stage in the WI different solutions have been well-defined and discussed, so the issues with the solutions are not related to WI scope or inter-WG coordination. Rather, progress needs to be made in down-selecting alternatives and reaching consensus on details - which is business-as-usual for WGs at the mid-point of a WI.

3 – Apple GmbH

We disagree considering that the overall list of problem statements for this item have been agreed by the working group. Also, a couple of solutions have also been agreed. However, we do agree that given the

considerable size of the solution space some down-scoping is needed but that is a very different effort from completely de-prioritizing the a major part of the WID scope for RAN2.

4 – vivo Mobile Communication Co.

Agree for fairness, but for latency and congestion.

5 – T-Mobile USA Inc.

Yes

6 – Samsung Electronics Co.

No, we can leave the issues for now, and can revisit at the next plenary depending on the progress in RAN2.

7 – Fujitsu Limited

No. Fairness/latency/congestion are major RAN2 topics in WID. We don't think it is suitable to de-prioritize these topics especially given that RAN2 is the leading WG for this WI.

8 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd

No, RAN2 can discuss and down-select solution in next RAN2 meeting.

9 – Nokia Corporation

RAN2 has already agreed LCG range extension and additional RLF indications. Completing the specifications regarding those is expected to be still done, and thus, will already consume TUs. Otherwise the objectives with no or little progress on technical merits can be de-prioritized, incl. local rerouting based on flow-control feedback.

10 – MediaTek Inc.

R2 chairman: Topology-wide fairness, latency reduction and congestion control is the type of objective that is typically difficult - this is not surprising. There has been many solutions on the table, and every solution seems to have actively objecting companies. From Chair perspective there hasn't really been any attempt yet to decide yet on what to include, so RP prioritization would be better at RP-93 or RP-94. On Topology adaptation, proposals of DAPS-like is associated with lots of confusion, currently PDCP support is key, and there is no PDCP for BH channels, and Dual connection for intra-frequency would mainly impact R1R4. R2 has already concluded that "DAPS-like" is too vague and need to be replaced with more concrete proposal if to be addressed at all, so RP decision to not address "DAPS-like" would be consistent with current status in RAN2. On the possibility to have CHO adaptation to IAB, the modification on the table is the potential trigger, which is a limited change. At current stage I don't clearly see why RP would prioritize this aspect at this stage when decisions has not really been attempted yet. Note that Rel-17 IAB cmp to the avg Rerl-17 WI is "stage-2 centric". I.e. while it seems relatively small in R2 w.r.t. CR impacted/added lines many parts are complex on network level and requires significant time to digest and discuss.

11 – LG Electronics Inc.

Yes.

There are so many solutions on the table for fairness/latency/congestion, but all solutions are still very controversial in RAN2 and very low progress has been made so far. Note that no progress on fairness/latency/congestion was made in the last RAN2 meeting. In this situation, if RAN2 determines which issues/-solutions on fairness/latency/congestion are deprioritized, we think that same discussion and arguments which already raised before will be repeated unnecessarily and it is very difficult to be converged in next RAN2 meeting. So, at least for fairness/latency/congestion, we believe that the constructive way is to focus on already agreed issues, i.e., LCG range extension, RLF indication and local rerouting based on flow-control feedback, and have RAN plenary recommendation to deprioritize other issues on fairness/latency/congestion.

12 – ZTE Corporation

No. We have spent a lot of time on the issue identification and solution categorization of fairness, latency and congestion control. The next step is to select the appropriate solutions. It is suggested to wait and see the relevant progress in the next RAN2 meeting. If the progress is still slow, we may dicuss whether to de-prioritize it in the next plenary meeting.

13 – InterDigital Germany GmbH

No We don't think it is suitable to de-prioritize these topics especially given that RAN2 is the leading WG for this WI.

14 – HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.

[Huawei, HiSilicon] Only LCG extension belongs to, while RLF indication and local re-routing does not belongs to the "fairness/latency/congestion" objective.

For the "fairness/latency/congestion" objective, we'd better say "RAN2 should prioritize the work on the already agreed features, i.e. LCG extension, for fairness/latency/congestion".

Feedback Form 8: Should TSG RAN recommend deprioritization of any of LCG-range extension, RLF indication and/or local rerouting based on flow control feedback?

1 – Ericsson LM

No, we think this contradicts agreements in RAN2. For example RAN2 agreed to enhance LCG and work on local routing on flow control feedback and type 2/3 RLF.

2 – AT&T

No - RAN2 has already made sufficient progress on these topics.

3 – Apple GmbH

No. The solutions have already been agreed from RAN2 perspective and sufficient progress has been achieved on this topic within the WG.

4 – vivo Mobile Communication Co.

No, this is not inline with RAN2 progress.

5 – Samsung Electronics Co.

No, we share the view with many others that RAN2 already made good progress on the issue, so do not see the need of downscoping.

6 – Fujitsu Limited

No. RAN2 has already made progress on these topics.

7 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd

No, RAN2 can discuss and down-select solution in next RAN2 meeting.

8 – Nokia Corporation

RAN2 has already agreed LCG range extension as additional RLF indications. Completing the specifications regarding those can be still done. Otherwise the objective can be de-prioritized, incl. flow-control for re-routing.

9 – LG Electronics Inc.

No. These three topics have already made sufficient progress as addressed by other company.

10 – ZTE Corporation

No. RAN2 has reached several agreements on these issues. It is not necessary to de-prioritize them.

11 – InterDigital Germany GmbH

No

12 – HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.

No

Feedback Form 9: Is there any other recommendation or guidance TSG RAN could provide to RAN2 to make progress?

1 – AT&T

If progress in the next WG meeting continues to be insufficient for fairness/latency/congestion topics, RAN2 may want to formally inform RAN Plenary of the detailed objectives which are at risk and ask RAN Plenary to weigh-in at RAN#93e.

2 – Apple GmbH

Though we agree that there have been a lot of solutions proposed for the issue list at hand, from our view not enough discussion has been done on the technical merits/demerits of each solution. Instead of whether a specific solution should be up to network implementation, or standardized, a discussion on the true technical merits of the proposals need to be made. We suggest taking this back to the working group for further discussion.

3 – Nokia Corporation To help the completion of the specifications timely and with quality general guidance could be to prioritize the RAN2 parts for the RAN3 and RAN1 agreed features.

3.2 Intermediate round: Feedback TSG RAN guidance to RAN2

Summary on question: Do you believe that TSG RAN guidance on the prioritization of RAN2 efforts would be helpful at the present point in this WI?

- 7 of 12 companies believe that such guidance would be helpful.

- 3 of 12 companies believe only high level guidance should be given and RAN2 itself should work out the details.

- 2 of 12 companies believe that RAN2 itself should be able to determine prioritization of efforts.

- RAN2 Chairman: From Chair perspective, there hasn't really been any attempt yet to decide on what to include, so RP prioritization would be better at RP-93 or RP-94. Note that Rel-17 IAB compared to the average Rel-17 WI is "stage-2 centric", i.e., while it seems relatively small in R2 w.r.t. CR impacted/added lines, many parts are complex on network level and require significant time to digest and discuss.

The moderator: While most companies believe that some feedback would be helpful, there is no clear consensus on what this feedback should contain (e.g., just level, or specific recommendations). Based on the RAN2 Chairman's feedback, RAN2 is already in the process of prioritizing the many features that have been discussed.

The moderator believes that high-level guidance to RAN2 has only limited valuable since RAN2 is already in the process of down-scoping its long list of features. However, a proposal is provided here as a baseline for some high-level guidance to RAN2. Please provide feedback and potentially rewording.

Proposal 3: RAN2 to attempt deprioritization of efforts for Rel-17 IAB.

Feedback Form 10: Do you agree with Proposal 3?

1 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd Agree
2 – ZTE Corporation Agree
3 – Verizon UK Ltd Not sure if this is useful, may be better to come back to the topic at RP-93
4 – InterDigital Germany GmbH agree

5 – Ericsson LM Agree
6 – LG Electronics Inc. Agree
7 – Rakuten Mobile Agree
8 – Nokia Corporation agree although it would have been even more helpful if RAN provides guidance
9 – vivo Mobile Communication Co. Agree

Summary on question: Should TSG RAN recommend deprioritization of IAB-specific enhancements for CHO?

- 6 of 11 companies believe IAB-specific enhancements for CHO should be deprioritized.

- 5 of 11 companies believe they should not be deprioritized.

- RAN2 Chairman: On the possibility to have CHO adaptation to IAB, the modification on the table is the potential trigger, which is a limited change. At current stage I don't clearly see why RP would prioritize this aspect at this stage when decisions have not been really attempted yet.

The moderator: There is no clear preference in either direction. Also, some of the changes discussed seem to be minor and could therefore be easily accommodated. The moderator does not believe that RP-92 will agree on any guidance on this issue.

Summary on question: Should TSG RAN recommend deprioritization of DAPS-like solution for IAB?

-12 of 12 companies believe DAPS-like solution should be deprioritized. One company emphasizes that "DAPS-like" is not clearly defined, and that therefore, RP-92 guidance should aim to prioritize NR-DC rather than deprioritize DAPS-like solutions.

- RAN2 Chairman: R2 has already concluded that "DAPS-like" is too vague and need to be replaced with more concrete proposal if to be addressed at all, so RP decision to not address "DAPS-like" would be consistent with current status in RAN2.

The moderator: There is consensus among companies that DAPS-like solutions for IAB should be deprioritized. According to RAN2 Chair, this consensus is consistent with current RAN2 status. However, there is presently no explicit agreement in RAN2 to deprioritize "DAPS-like" solutions, which means that companies may still write contributions and expect discussions related to this term. The discussion on "DAPS-like" solutions further affects RAN3, where it has started and which invited RAN2 to discuss the matter. RAN3 may therefore expect feedback from RAN2 on this topic, which implies at least some more work in both WGs.

The moderator believes that RP-92 guidance to deprioritize ”DAPS-like” solutions could stop any discussion in both WGs on IAB-related enhancements that include aspects of Rel-16 DAPS. The moderator does not believe that such guidance should prioritize NRDC since this does not imply deprioritization of discussions on ”DAPS-like”.

Proposal 4: Rel-17 IAB to deprioritize discussions on ”DAPS-like” solutions for IAB.

Feedback Form 11: Do you agree with Proposal 4?

1 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd Agree
2 – ZTE Corporation Agree
3 – Verizon UK Ltd Agree
4 – InterDigital Germany GmbH agree
5 – Ericsson LM Agree.
6 – LG Electronics Inc. Agree
7 – Rakuten Mobile Agree.
8 – Nokia Corporation Agree
9 – vivo Mobile Communication Co. Agree

Summary on question: Should TSG RAN recommend deprioritization of fairness/latency/congestion EXCEPT LCG range extension, RLF indication and local rerouting based on flow-control feedback?

- 3 of 12 companies support deprioritization.

- 3 of 12 companies support some level of deprioritization.

- 4 of 12 companies believe that this should be handled by RAN2.

- RAN2 Chairman: Topology-wide fairness, latency reduction and congestion is the type of objective that is typically difficult - this is not surprising. There has been many solutions on the table, and every solution seems to have actively objecting companies. From Chair perspective there hasn't really been any attempt yet to decide on what to include, so RP prioritization would be better at RP-93 or RP-94.

The moderator: There is no support for a blank deprioritization of this WID objective at RP-92. The issue can be revisited in RP-93/94.

Summary on question: TSG RAN recommend deprioritization of any of LCG-range extension, RLF indication and/or local rerouting based on flow control feedback?

- 12 of 12 companies believe that none of these features should be deprioritized.

The moderator: There is agreement that RAN2 should continue working on these features. Therefore, no guidance is necessary by RP-92.

Summary on question: Is there any other recommendation or guidance TSG RAN could provide to RAN2 to make progress?

- Revision of objectives should occur at RP-93/94.

- It should be left up to WGs to prioritize features.

- RAN2 should primarily focus on RAN1/3-related efforts.

The moderator: There is no new aspect that has not been addressed above.

3.3 Intermediate round summary

There was rough consensus on proposal 3.

- 8 of 9 companies agree with this proposal. 1 of these companies would like to see guidance for RAN2.

- 1 of 9 companies believes this matter should be revisited in RP#93.

The moderator believes that proposal 4 provides some guidance for RAN2. Further, the matter can certainly be revisited in RP#93.

Proposal 3: RAN2 to attempt deprioritization of efforts for Rel-17 IAB.

There was consensus on proposal 4.

Proposal 4: Rel-17 IAB to deprioritize discussions on "DAPS-like" solutions for IAB.

The moderator believes that this topic of the email discussion can be closed.

4 Final Summary

The following four proposals have been made:

Proposal 1: Rel-17 IAB WID to include the specification of conformance testing requirements for Rel-17 enhancements as WID objective in the performance part.

There was consensus on proposal 1. RP-211200 already includes this objective.

Proposal 2: TS 38.133 to be removed from Rel-17 IAB WID.

There was consensus on proposal 2. The moderator will initiate a revision of RP-211200, where TS 38.133 is removed.

Proposal 3: RAN2 to attempt deprioritization of efforts for Rel-17 IAB.

The was rough consensus on proposal 3. 8 out of 9 companies support this proposal. 1 out of 9 companies would like to see the matter revisited in RP#93, which is certainly possible.

Proposal 4: Rel-17 IAB to deprioritize discussions on ”DAPS-like” solutions for IAB.

There was consensus on proposal 4.

5 References

[1] RP-211218, Potential reduction of the scope of Rel-17 IAB enhancements, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, 3GPP TSG-RAN Meeting #92, 14 – 18 June 2021

[2] RP-211200, Revision to WID on IAB enhancements, Qualcomm Inc, Samsung, 3GPP TSG-RAN Meeting #92, 14 – 18 June 2021