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# Introduction

The following open issues for UE features and capabilities were identified during the related e-mail discussion prior to RAN2#109-e meeting [1]:

* Ethernet header compression

The need for Ethernet padding removal and Ethernet padding addition features is to be confirmed during RAN2#109.

It is FFS whether Ethernet padding removal capability is needed (if its support is confirmed).

It is FFS whether a capability for EHC context continuation and *maxNumberEHC-ContextSessions-r16* are needed (pending the discussion on remaining aspects of EHC).

* TSC scheduling

It is FFS whether “Additional DL SPS periodicities” and “Additional CG periodicities” features require the signalling of maximum value of N supported by the UE.

It is FFS whether a UE supporting [multipleCG-Configs-r16] shall also support lch-ToConfiguredGrantMapping-r16.

* Intra-UE prioritization

It is FFS whether LCH priority-based prioritization covers both data/data prioritization and SR/data prioritization or if separate features are needed.

* PDCP duplication

It is FFS whether “PDCP duplication with more than two RLC entities” feature needs to be separate for UM and AM RLC modes.

Section 2 contains summary of UE capabilities related discussions based on contributions from companies. Section 3 summarizes the proposals while in Section 4 companies are requested to provide their views on the issues. In addition to the aspects originally summarized in [12], also capability related aspects of Ethernet Header compression, as summarized in [13] are considered.

# 2 Accurate reference timing summary

## 2.1 Ethernet Header Compression

The related proposals were summarized as part of Summary on EHC and are not discussed here.

## 2.2 TSC scheduling

### 2.2.1 CG and SPS periodicities

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company (Tdoc) | Proposals | Rationale |
| Qualcomm (R2-2001290) | Proposal 1: Support signalling of maximum value of additional SPS periodicity and additional CG periodicity supported by a UE. | Large number of new CG/SPS periodicities (>9000) are supported in Rel-16. Testing/verification of all new periodicities can be challenging. While configurations with lower values of new SPS/CG periodicities (e.g., less than 10ms) are known to be useful, practical relevance of vast majority of new CG/SPS periodicities is unknown. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell(R2-2001049) | Proposal 3: Support CG periodicities of multiple of 2/7 symbols as a separate capability with a cross-slot boundary capability as a pre-requisite. | The main argument against supporting CG periodicities of multiple of 2/7 symbols were potential issues with resource allocations across the slot boundary and the proposal addresses this issue. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell(R2-2001052) | Proposal 4: Do not introduce further fragmentation for “Additional DL SPS periodicities” and “Additional CG periodicities” features. | In our opinion, it will be very hard for implementers to predict which of the periodicities will be needed in real deployments. In addition, it would limit significantly the scheduling flexibility in the presence of multiple IIOT devices supporting multiple TSC flows. Also, there is currently no dedicated solution for support of ‘non-integer’ TSC periodicities and the only solution is to use overprovisioning. With limited periodicities support at the UE, this task would be very hard. |

Summary:

Considering that only two companies expressed their view on the issue, it is proposed to discuss it further:

**Proposal 1: Discuss whether signalling of maximum value of additional SPS periodicities and additional CG periodicities supported by a UE is required.**

**Proposal 2: Discuss whether to support CG periodicities of multiple of 2/7 symbols as a separate capability with a cross-slot boundary capability as a pre-requisite.**

### 2.2.2 Relation between multipleCG-Configs and lch-ToConfiguredGrantMapping-r16 capabilities

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company (Tdoc) | Proposals | Rationale |
| Ericsson(R2-2000789) | Proposal 1 UE supporting multipleCG-Configs shall also support lch-ToConfiguredGrantMapping. | No separate capabilities are required in this case as multiple CG configurations and LCH to CG mapping would typically be used together anyway. Multiple CG were introduced to handle TSC flows better, for which also the LCH to CG mapping should be used to schedule resources for certain TSC flows deterministically. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell(R2-2001052) | Proposal 6: Keep the requirement that UE supporting multipleCG-Configs should also support lch-ToConfiguredGrantMapping. | It is very important to keep those two features together as otherwise the management of multiple LCHs which are provided with their dedicated CG configuration becomes very cumbersome. It may often be very challenging or even impossible for the network to achieve the intended mapping only by using legacy LCP restrictions. |
| Qualcomm(R2-2001290) | Proposal 2: A UE supporting multiple CG configurations feature need not support LCH-to-CG mapping restriction. | A UE could support multiple CGs without LCP restrictions (e.g., if associated traffic flows have non-overlapping arrivals) or use other LCP restrictions to restrict LCHs using the CGs. |

Summary:

Two companies indicated that UE supporting multipleCG-Configs should also support lch-ToConfiguredGrantMapping while one company has the opposite view. The following proposal is made:

**Proposal 3: FFS if the UE supporting multipleCG-Configs shall also support lch-ToConfiguredGrantMapping.**

## 2.3 Intra-UE prioritization

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company (Tdoc) | Proposals | Rationale |
| CATT(R2-2000115) | Proposal 5: It is not necessary to introduce one new parameter for SR/data prioritization. | Separating the features will also add extra-complexity and specification effort, so it is preferred to keep it a one overall functionality configured with a single parameter. |
| Ericsson(R2-2000797) | Proposal 5 SR/data prioritization is separate configurable feature from data/data prioritization feature. | While similarities and overlap in functionality of these features exist, their purpose and impact on UE MAC multiplexing as well as scheduling and gNB UL reception are quite different, e.g. it is not necessary or even not wanted in some implementations that UE prioritized between potentially overlapping grants for data/data. |
| Qualcomm(R2-2001289) | Proposal 1: SR and data prioritization each have separate RRC configuration parameters and capabilities. | SR vs grant prioritization is a feature distinct from and complementary to grant prioritization, and both can be useful on their own for URLLC traffic. |
| Proposal 6: Once RAN1 has defined feature/capability related to PHY layer prioritization, RAN2 should discuss whether LCH based prioritization can be supported without PHY prioritization. | RAN2 should discuss whether LCH based prioritization can be implemented without PHY prioritization before introducing any such dependence between the two. For instance, PDU suppression of LCH based prioritization can be used without any PHY-layer actions like pre-emption provided Rel-15 timelines for associated grants are followed by the scheduler. |
| Samsung(R2-2001497) | Proposal 3. A single configuration lch-basedPrioritization is used for both 1) Data-Data prioritization and 2) SR Data prioritization. | Both prioritization between grants and a grant and SR are based on the priority value of the logical channels, so we can say that they have a commonality and are similar to each other.  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell(R2-2001052) | Proposal 3: Confirm that lch-PriorityBasedPrioritization-r16 covers both data vs. data and SR vs. data prioritization. | Both prioritization mechanisms are based on comparison of LCH priority of either an LCH carried by a MAC PDU or of an LCH which triggered an SR. At the same time, both of these are equally important when it comes to support of URLLC traffic. In order to avoid too extensive capability fragmentation and specifications complexity, it is proposed to keep those two together. |

Summary:

Some companies seem to mix the issue of separate configurability of data vs. data and SR vs. data prioritization with a capability signalling for those. Two companies (CATT, Samsung) indicate that a single configuration parameter is used, which automatically means these are both a single capability. One company (Ericsson) speaks of separate configurability, but does not refer to capability signalling. Once company (Qualcomm) mentions that both configurability and capability signalling should be separate. One company (Nokia) indicates that these two should be a single capability, but does not mention configurability.

In attempt to reach a common ground, it is proposed to agree on the following proposals:

**Proposal 4: Data vs. data and SR vs. data prioritization are configured separately.**

**Proposal 5: Data vs. data and SR vs. data prioritization are signalled as a single capability.**

It has been also raised by one company that we should wait to see the RAN1 definition of feature/capability for intra-UE prioritization to see whether they should be coupled. It is proposed to keep the current definition as in the current 38.306 CR in [2] and re-discuss after receiving feature descriptions from RAN1.

**Proposal 6: Once RAN1 has defined feature/capability related to PHY layer prioritization, discuss whether LCH based prioritization can be supported without PHY prioritization.**

## 2.4 PDCP duplication

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company (Tdoc) | Proposals | Rationale |
| Qualcomm (R2-2001288) | Proposal 1: PDCP duplication enhancements (support for up to 4 RLC entities, dynamic leg selection, resource efficient PDCP duplication) with RLC entities in mode AM should either- not be supported, or- should be configured for a UE based on a capability signalled by the UE. | PDCP duplication enhancements (support for up to 4 RLC entities, dynamic leg selection, resource efficient PDCP duplication) in scope of this WI are primarily to enhance reliability for use cases requiring low latency and RLC AM mode is not useful for such use cases. Given PDCP duplication enhancements with RLC entities in mode AM don’t add much value, it should be configured for a UE based on a capability to avoid test cases for configurations with limited practical use. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell(R2-2001052) | Proposal 5: Capability of PDCP duplication with more than two RLC entities is common for RLC AM and RLC UM mode. | For two-leg duplication AM and UM modes are not separated and there seems to be no additional complexity of supporting PDCP duplication over RLC AM mode as compared to RLC UM mode. |

Summary:

Only two companies expressed their view and had opposite views.

**Proposal 7: Discuss whether separate capabilities are needed for PDCP duplication with more than two RLC entities for RLC AM and RLC UM mode.**

# 3 Proposals based on Tdoc summary

Based on the summary in section 2, the following proposals are made:

**Proposal 1: Discuss whether signalling of maximum value of additional SPS periodicities and additional CG periodicities supported by a UE is required.**

**Proposal 2: Discuss whether to support CG periodicities of multiple of 2/7 symbols as a separate capability with a cross-slot boundary capability as a pre-requisite.**

**Proposal 3: FFS if the UE supporting multipleCG-Configs shall also support lch-ToConfiguredGrantMapping.**

**Proposal 4: Data vs. data and SR vs. data prioritization are configured separately.**

**Proposal 5: Data vs. data and SR vs. data prioritization are signalled as a single capability.**

**Proposal 6: Once RAN1 has defined feature/capability related to PHY layer prioritization, discuss whether LCH based prioritization can be supported without PHY prioritization.**

**Proposal 7: Discuss whether separate capabilities are needed for PDCP duplication with more than two RLC entities for RLC AM and RLC UM mode.**

# 4 Phase 1: [AT109e][031][IIOT] IIOT UE capabilities

**Question 1: Do you think signalling of maximum value of additional SPS periodicities and additional CG periodicities supported by a UE is required?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes / No** | **Rationale** |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Large number of new CG/SPS periodicities (>9000) are supported in Rel-16. Testing/verification of all new periodicities can be challenging. While configurations with lower values of new SPS/CG periodicities (e.g., less than 10ms) are known to be useful, practical relevance of vast majority of new CG/SPS periodicities is unknown.More granularity in signalling of supported SPS/CG periodicities feature allows UE implementations to focus better on practically relevant use cases, while also leaving the option to support more periodicities. Allowing signalling of maximum value of SPS periodicity and CG periodicity provides one way to introduce such granularity. |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | No | One capability indication is preferred. We don’t see any challenges to implement a large periodicity value at UE. We also wonder if it is true that the testing/verification needs to do for all periodicity values or a test on several random chosen values is sufficient.  |
| Intel | Yes | Agree with Qualcomm’s view. |
| Samsung | Yes | Agree with Qualcomm’s view |
| Nokia | No | The main benefit of introducing periodicities of multiple of N was that it is now possible to support broad set of services. With this approach we would limit the usefulness of this feature and it is hard to predict which periodicities will turn out needed. We also limit to a large extent the potential to address ‘non-integer’ periodicities efficiently. The feature testing design is out of scope of RAN2 and it can be addressed in RAN5, e.g. the way Ericsson is proposing. |
| MediaTek | No? | We see the need for a capability to differentiate between Rel-15 and Rel-16 SPS/CG periodicities (i.e. support of periodicityExt). But we do not see a need to have a maximum supported periodicity value. |
| Huawei | No | We expect that the UEs used of IIOT scenario would be able to inherently support so called maximum value of SPS/CG periodicity as those periodicities are specified in order to fulfil the IIOT service requirements.  |
| LG | Yes/No | Maximum number of additional periodicities = YesMaximum value of additional periodicities = No |
| vivo | Yes | Agree with Qualcomm. |
| CATT | No | Besides above concerns, we wonder if it is realy useful to report such a coarse parameter of “**maximum value of additional SPS/CG periodicities**” |

Summary of Phase 1:

5 companies think UE should signal the maximum number of N for additional periodicities.

6 companies do not think UE should signal the maximum number of N for additional periodicities.

1 company proposes that maximum number of additional periodicities should be signalled

**Proposal 1: Discuss during the next meeting whether signalling of maximum value of additional SPS periodicities and additional CG periodicities supported by a UE is required.**

**Question 2: Do you support allowing CG periodicities of multiple of 2/7 symbols as a separate capability with a cross-slot boundary capability as a pre-requisite?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes / No** | **Rationale** |
| Qualcomm | No | For more flexible CG periodicity, RAN2#107bis already agreed to support CG periodicities of any integer-multiple of one slot. We recommend that this topic is not considered further in Rel-16. This has been discussed several times including at least once online, in an email discussion and a RAN2#108 offline. |
| OPPO | No |  |
| Ericsson | Yes | We wonder if this is a capability discussion, since we haven’t agreed to support this feature yet.*Updates:*During tdoc categorization in the summary preparation, the paper does not include a proposal to support the feature, but a proposal directly related with the capability and so was suggested by us to move here, without us correctly understanding the intention. I think we usually separate the discussion of a support of a feature in the spec from the discussion of a support of a specified feature by a specific UE (through capability indication). We are fine to support this feature in spec if no other impacts are identified. This is a separate capability bit and, if UE indicates by capability that it supports this feature, then this UE also must indicate by capability that it supports cross-slot boundary (i.e., mandatory support)  |
| Intel | No | Agree with Qualcomm. |
| Samsung | No |  |
| Nokia | Yes | We bring this up in this e-mail discussion following Ericsson’s recommendation from the Tdoc summary to handle it under capability discussion. During the previous meeting, it was mentioned that in case the UEs do not support cross-slot boundary scheduling then this causes issues. Hence, in the new proposal, we proposed to make cross-slot boundary scheduling capability a pre-requisite for this one to address those issues.  |
| MediaTek | No | Agree with Ericsson. We should not discuss capabilities for features that are not agreed. |
| Huawei | No | We shall agree on whether or not to support this feature.  |
| LG |  | Agree with Ericsson. Whether to support multiple of 2/7 symbols should be decided first. |
| vivo | No | We have not agreed to support such feature yet. |
| CATT |  | Let’s discuss the feature first (which we support). |

Summary of Phase 1:

Most companies indicate that we should first discuss whether such feature should be supported and that this does not belong to capability discussion.

**Proposal 2: Discuss during the next meeting whether to support allowing CG periodicities of multiple of 2/7 symbols as a separate capability with a cross-slot boundary capability as a pre-requisite.**

**Question 3: Shall the UE supporting multipleCG-Configs also support lch-ToConfiguredGrantMapping**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes / No** | **Rationale** |
| Qualcomm | No | We don’t see the need to couple together multi-CG feature and LCH-to-CG mapping feature. A UE could use multiple CGs without LCP restrictions associated traffic flows have non-overlapping arrivals. Note that for many TSC traffic flows IEEE 802.1Qbv, there may be no jitter in expected arrival times. For such cases, there is no need to use LCP restrictions. |
| OPPO | No | We think multiCG-Config feature could work on the basis of current R-15 LCP restriction. |
| Ericsson | Yes | We believe that no separate capabilities are required in this case as multiple CG configurations and LCH to CG mapping would typically be used together anyway. Multiple CG were introduced to handle TSC flows better, for which also the LCH to CG mapping should be used to schedule resources for certain TSC flows deterministically. |
| Intel | Yes | Agree with Ericsson. |
| Samsung | Yes | Agree with Ericsson |
| Nokia | Yes | We share the views with Ericsson. Proper management of multiple CGs using only legacy LCP restrictions would be very cumbersome and the CGs could get misused. |
| MediaTek | Yes | This is a sensible assumption, as multiple CGs were introduced to separate out different TSC flows. |
| Huawei | Yes | We slightly prefer to couple these two together.  |
| LG | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes | No need to split the two features. |

Summary of Phase 1:

9 companies indicated preference for combining those two features.

2 companies prefer to separate the capabilities with no relation between them.

**Proposal 3: The UE supporting multipleCG-Configs shall also support lch-ToConfiguredGrantMapping.**

**Question 4: Do you agree that data vs. data and SR vs. data prioritization can be configured separately?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes / No** | **Rationale** |
| Qualcomm | Yes | See rationale below. |
| Ericsson | Yes | While similarities and overlap in functionality of these features exist, their purpose and impact on UE MAC multiplexing as well as scheduling and gNB UL reception are quite different, e.g. it is not necessary or even not wanted in some implementations that UE prioritized between potentially overlapping grants for data/data. |
| Intel | No | We prefer that they are configured by the single parameter *lch-basedPrioritization*. |
| Samsung | No | Both Data-Data and SR-Data prioritizations have the same purpose. We do not think separate configuration is needed.  |
| Nokia | Yes | Depending on the service characteristics it may not always be required or even beneficial to have both features turned on. |
| MediaTek | Yes | SR prioritisation may be needed for some SR configurations, but not for others. From that perspective, yes, they can be separately configured. |
| Huawei | No | Don't see a need to separately configure them, given that both of them are used to prioritize URLLC over eMBB. Further, this kind of separation would make MAC procedure more complicated. |
| LG | No | Agree with Samsung. Moreover, having one configuration would be much simpler from the MAC specification point of view. |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| CATT | No | Agree with Samsung. |

Summary of Phase 1:

5 companies think SR vs. data and data vs. data prioritization should be configured separately.

5 companies think SR vs. data and data vs. data prioritization should be configured together.

**Proposal 4: Discuss during this meeting whether data vs. data and SR vs. data prioritization can be configured separately.**

**Question 5: Do you agree that data vs. data and SR vs. data prioritization are signalled as a single capability?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes / No** | **Rationale** |
| Qualcomm | No | SR vs grant prioritization is clearly a feature distinct from and complementary to grant prioritization, and hence should be a separate feature. For instance, SR vs grant prioritization can be used for infrequent aperiodic uplink URLLC traffic flow to prioritize associated SRs over lower priority traffic to ensure low latency delivery of uplink data. An *alternative complementary solution* involves use of configured grant to carry the aperiodic infrequent URLLC traffic and using data/data prioritization to prioritize the configured grant when the URLLC traffic is available.  |
| OPPO | Yes | Both of SR vs grant and grant vs grant employ the logical channel priority for intra-UE prioritization.  |
| Ericsson | Yes | We think some PHY prioritization features are designed together for both cases and one-bit indication is simpler.  |
| Intel | Yes | We prefer a single capability for MAC based prioritization. |
| Samsng | Yes | We prefer a single capability for MAC based prioritization. |
| Nokia | Yes | Even though both features may not be required always at the same time, their design is very similar, so they should be a single capability. This also gives possibility to cover different services efficiently. |
| MediaTek | Yes | We see intra-UE prioritisation as a single feature rather than a collection of different features |
| Huawei | Yes  | See above |
| LG | Yes | We prefer a single capability for MAC based prioritization. |
| vivo | No | Agree with Qualcomm. |
| CATT | Yes | Related to Q4. |

Summary of Phase 1:

9 companies think SR vs. data and data vs. data prioritization should be a single UE capability.

2 companies think SR vs. data and data vs. data prioritization should be separate UE capabilities.

**Proposal 5: Data vs. data and SR vs. data prioritization are signalled as a single capability.**

**Question 6: Do you think separate capabilities are needed for PDCP duplication with more than two RLC entities for RLC AM and RLC UM mode?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes / No** | **Rationale** |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Support for RLC AM will involve more effort than just supporting RLC UM. Further, we don’t expect RLC AM to be common in practise since:* RLC retransmissions are not needed for meeting reliability requirements for industrial use cases when PDCP duplication is used.
* PDCP duplication with RLC entities in mode AM is not needed for use cases requiring low latency. PDCP duplication with RLC entities in mode UM can be used for use cases requiring low latency.
 |
| OPPO | YES | Retransmission of PDU in RLC AM mode seems not workable for IIOT use cases requiring low-latency data transmission services.  |
| Ericsson | No | While the number of RLC entities involved can be up to 4, their internal functionality is not changed/increased. So no more need to differentiate between UM and AM in Rel-16 than in Rel-15. |
| Intel | No | In Rel-15, we don’t have separate capabilities for AM and UM regarding PDCP duplication. Same principle applies to Rel-16. |
| Samsung | No | Agree with Intel and Ericsson |
| Nokia | No | We do not see any additional complexities in supporting RLC AM mode and are against unnecessary capability fragmentation. |
| MediaTek | No | Do not see a strong reason to differentiate between RLC AM and RLC UM modes |
| Huawei | No | First RLC AM and UM themselves are mandatory. In Rel-15, PDCP duplication didn’t have separate capabilities for UM and AM. We don’t a strong need to make them separate. |
| LG | No |  |
| vivo | No |  |
| CATT | No |  |

Summary of Phase 1:

2 companies think separate capabilities are needed for PDCP duplication with more than two RLC entities for RLC AM and RLC UM mode.

9 companies think a single capability is needed for PDCP duplication with more than two RLC entities for RLC AM and RLC UM mode.

**Proposal 6: A single capability for PDCP duplication with more than two RLC entities covers both RLC AM and RLC UM mode.**

The following issue is proposed to be postponed until RAN1 provides the description of L1 features:

1. **Whether LCH based prioritization can be supported without PHY prioritization.**

The discussion on whether maximum CID value should be configurable took place during the online session and it summary from chairman notes is copied here:

|  |
| --- |
| R2-2000175 Report of email discussion [108#53] [IIOT] EHC remaining issues Huawei, HiSilicon discussion Rel-16 NR\_IIOT-CoreP3- Chair wonder if we should discuss CID- LG think we need to decide fixed or variable size. - Chair wonders if the overhead is very significant. CATT think yes, and think we could go for small fixed size. QC support CATTs view. Samsung agree with CATT as well. - MTK think that in addition to small fixed size it could be useful to have a second size. - Oppo are ok with fixed size but think “large” size is needed. Think that in ROHC size is 14 or 17.- Docomo think that SA hasn’t concluded how many devices are connected to a UE so > 1 octet CID may be needed. - Intel think CID size need to be “large”. - Nokia could be ok to compromise and have two sizes.- ZTE think the no of devices doesn’t relate to - LG cannot agree to 2 sizes. * FFS if we have 1 CID size or 2 CID sizes: one byte, two bytes, Configured by RRC
 |

There were concerns for any of the options that has been brought. The main issue with fixed short (1 byte) header was that companies were unsure whether it would allow for sufficient number of contexts. The main issue with fixed long (2 byte) header was the additional overhead. There was also different understanding about whether the CID limitation is per DRB or per UE and it should be noted that if the limitation is per DRB, then the number of contexts a UE can support is increased to potentially sufficient level. It is proposed to consider the following options:

**Option 1: Both 1-byte header and 2-bytes header is supported and the choice depends on RRC configuration.**

**Option 2: Only 1-byte header is supported. EHC compressor/decompressor maintains contexts per DRB, which allows to support additional contexts by configuring additional DRBs.**

**Option 3: Both 1-byte header and 2-bytes header is supported and which one is used depends on the first bit of the CID field, e.g.**

* **If first bit == 0, CID = short (only 1 byte header)**
* **If first bit == 1, CID = long (2 byte header)**

**Option 4: Only 2-byte header is supported.**

It is noted that option 3 was not put on the table previously but is derived from ROHC behaviour. It is put on the table as it does not require additional configurability, which may address the concerns from some companies.

**Question 7: Please indicate your preferred option from the ones mentioned above.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred option** | **Rationale** |
| Qualcomm | 2 or 1 (less preferred) | Simple and flexible enoughWe believe option 3 has significant disadvantage because it introduces variable length headers that cause additional receiver complexity for URLLC traffic. |
| OPPO | Option 1 | Avoid unnecessary complexity |
| Ericsson | Option 4 | This is still FFS and should be part of the EHC email discussion.*Updates:*Our paper showed only marginal loss of compression gain between 1- and 2-byte EHC header. We prefer simple solution with only one format. To handle multiple traffic flows as intended by work item and more combination combined by PCP/DEI fields, we should, therefore, support more than 2^7, and since reserved bits don't seem to be needed, we suggest 2^15 for the CID.  |
| Intel | 4 or 1 (less preferred) | Agree with Ericsson that it might be better to discuss this issue in other email discussions. Nevertheless we provide our views as follows.We add option 4 as our understanding is that the option is not excluded from the online discussion.Our understanding is that since context ID can represent unique combinations of Ethernet header fields: destination address, source address, type/length, and 802.1Q tags, 1 byte header (up to 255 context IDs) is not sufficient. In addition, EHC operation (maintenance of mapping relationship between context ID to Ethernet header fields) is relatively simple compared to ROHC, therefore supporting larger number (i.e. 32767) of EHC contexts does not have much impact to UE complexity.As a compromise, we can also accept option 1, where the header length is configured by RRC instead of dynamic indication (option 3). We share the same view as Qualcomm regarding the complexity of option 3. |
| Samsung |  | Agree with Ericsson it is still FFS. |
| Nokia | Any of options 1, 2 and 3 are OK | We think that 1-byte header needs to be supported for maximum gain. We would like to remind that the possibility to compress to 1 byte was the main advantage mentioned by the companies at the time where the decision between EHC and ROHC was done. At the same time, we cannot assume that 63 contexts will always be sufficient, so we need more. What is offered by option 2 is sufficient in our opinion, but other options are OK as well.  |
| MediaTek | Option 1 (or 2, less preferred) | We do not prefer option 3 for the same reason that QC mentions, i.e. additional receiver complexity. |
| Huawei | Prefer option 1 | We would expect both 1 octet and two octets would work as the compressor can always use the all-zeros CID to skip the compression. On the other hand, supporting both won’t add too much complexity so we suggest to not add restriction.  |
| LG | Option 4,Option 2 | We prefer to have a single format.2 bytes CID header is first preferred, and 1 byte CID header is next preferred. |
| vivo | Option 1 | We think that the configuration should not be changed very frequently. Then the RRC configuration seems sufficient. |
| CATT | Option 2 | A single format is preferred; We don’t find motivation to support such a long CID. And as mentioned by the rapporteur, it is not a real limitation if it is per PDCP entity i.e. per DRB. |

Summary of Phase 1:

* Option 1: 5 companies (first choice), 2 companies (second choice) -> 6 companies in total
* Option 2: 2 companies (first choice), 3 companies (second choice) -> 5 companies in total
* Option 3: 1 company (second choice) -> 1 company in total
* Option 4: 3 companies (first choice) -> 3 companies in total

**Proposal 7: Make the choice between option 1 and option 2 in the second phase of the discussion.**

**Question 8: Do you think it is required for the UE to signal the maximum supported number of EHC contexts? (it may depend on the outcome of Q7 as well)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/ No** | **Rationale** |
| Qualcomm | Yes if option 2 in Q7 selected | If only one byte EHC header is supported, then the capability need not be signalled.If both one and two byte EHC headers are supported, some form of capability signalling becomes important due to the very large number of CIDs accommodated by the two byte option. |
| Ericsson | Yes  | Agree with Qualcomm that if two bytes are supported, some form of capability signalling is needed due to large memory at UE to accommodate large CID space. |
| Intel | Neutral | Given the relatively simple operation of EHC, we don’t think signalling of the maximum number of supported EHC context is necessary. But we don’t have strong opinion on this topic. |
| Nokia | Neutral | We also do not have a strong opinion. As mentioned by Qualcomm, this could be mainly required in case option 1 (I think this is what was meant) in Q7 is chosen. |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Huawei | Yes | This capability signalling would be useful to help UE to manage its memory/storage, for any case in which 2 octets CID length is allowed.  |
| LG | Yes | Similar to ROHC, i.e. maximum number of ROHC context. |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes | With option 2 in Q7, the number of supported CIDs at UE level depends on the number of PDCP entities configured with EHC, so it is better to have a capability on the maximum number of EHC contexts at UE level. |

Summary of Phase 1:

7 companies think UE should indicated maximum number of supported EHC contexts.

2 companies are neutral.

**Proposal 8: UE signals the maximum number of supported EHC contexts as a capability.**

In EHC e-mail discussion the following proposals are mentioned as potentially easy agreements:

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 31: Configuration of a parameters (e.g. drb-ContinueEHC) indicates whether or not EHC is reset at PDCP re-establishment.****Proposal 32: EHC context continue function can be indicted separately for UL and DL, through configuration of parameters, e.g. ul-drb-ContinueEHC and dl-drb-ContinueEHC.** |

**Question 9: Assuming EHC continue function is agreed, do you think we need to specify a capability bit for the support of EHC context continuation upon PDCP re-establishment?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/ No** | **Rationale** |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | No |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Nokia | No | **If this gets agreed, we prefer to assume this is always supported by the UE for EHC.** |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Huawei | Yes | **Slightly prefer to have it. If this one bit is no big cost we can allow this flexibility for UE implementation w.r.t continue (or not) EHC protocol when PDCP is re-established.**  |
| LG | Yes |  |
| vivo | No |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |

Summary of Phase 1:

7 companies think EHC context continuation should be a separate UE capability.

3 companies think EHC context continuation should not be a separate UE capability.

**Proposal 9: A separate UE capability is defined for EHC context continuation.**

Intel’s comment on UE capability *ehc-Profiles-r16* in the draft running CR R2-2001054 (for 38.306) and R2-2001055 (for 38.822). Currently *ehc-Profiles-r16* has the description of “*Indicates that the UE supports Ethernet header compression and decompression according to the indicated profile(s), as specified in TS 38.323 [16].*” Concerns were raised on the mentioning of profiles in email discussion “[108#47][IIOT] UE feature list” (R2-2001053). In the endorsed PDCP running CR for IIoT (R2-2001281), profile for EHC was removed (clause 5.X.1). To avoid inconsistency, it is suggested to rename the capability to *ehc-r16*¸with the description as “*Indicates that the UE supports Ethernet header compression and decompression as specified in TS 38.323 [16].*”

[Rapporteur]: Thank you for the comment, I will take it into consideration when updating the CR.

# 5 Phase 2: [AT109e][031][IIOT] IIOT UE capabilities

The following proposals have a very clear majority of supporting companies (1-3 companies with different view) These proposals are brought for e-mail approval by the companies.

**Proposal 3: The UE supporting multipleCG-Configs shall also support lch-ToConfiguredGrantMapping.**

**Proposal 5: Data vs. data and SR vs. data prioritization are signalled as a single capability.**

**Proposal 6: A single capability for PDCP duplication with more than two RLC entities covers both RLC AM and RLC UM mode.**

**Proposal 8: UE signals the maximum number of supported EHC contexts as a capability.**

**Proposal 9: A separate UE capability is defined for EHC context continuation.**

Please indicate in the table below if you oppose to any of the above proposals. If you do, please propose an alternative considering the views from other companies in Phase 1 of the discussion.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Proposal | Rationale and alternative proposal |
| Qualcomm | 5 | The alternate proposal is of course to have a separate capability data vs. data and SR vs. data prioritization.We encourage companies to note that data vs. data and SR vs. data prioritization are useful for different types of use cases. * Many industrial automation use cases involve periodic deterministic traffic patterns, for which enhancements to CG collisions (ie, Data vs. data prioritization) are more suitable.
* SR vs data prioritization is more useful for use-cases involving aperiodic infrequent URLLC traffic for which reducing delays to “URLLC SRs” is more important.

Having separate capabilities allows UEs targeting one of the above use-cases to only support one of the features. |

The following proposals address the issues that need to be resolved during this meeting for specifications completeness:

**Proposal 4: Discuss during this meeting whether data vs. data and SR vs. data prioritization can be configured separately.**

**Proposal 7: Make the choice between option 1 and option 2 in the second phase of the discussion.**

Since for Proposal 4 there was 50:50 split between the views, it is proposed to handle it during online session.

For Proposal 7 companies are invited to provide their views on the following question below:

**Question 2-1: Please indicate your preferred option for EHC header size:**

**Option 1: Both 1-byte header and 2-bytes header is supported and the choice depends on RRC configuration.**

**Option 2: Only 1-byte header is supported. EHC compressor/decompressor maintains contexts per DRB, which allows to support additional contexts by configuring additional DRBs.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred option** | **Rationale** |
| MediaTek | Option 1 | With 1-byte header, we achieve better compression, while with a 2-byte header, a larger number of contexts can be supported. Whether a large number or a small number of contexts are needed can only be determined at deployment (e.g. is the UE for a single device or connected to multiple devices).It is therefore preferable to us to leave this choice to deployment. It also implies that P8 is necessary (i.e. capability for maximum number of contexts supported by a UE). |
| Qualcomm | 2 (preferred) or 1 |  |
| Huawei | Option 1 | If we use 1-byte header, the number of CIDs might be constrained. Configuring additional DRBs to accommodate needed CIDs sounds added complexity, which could be used in Option 1 instead, i.e. complexity caused by RRC configuration.  |
| LG | 2 |  |
| CATT | Option 2 | 1 byte is enough for Ethernet flows in one DRB. And we don’t expect an IIOT device will require supporting a very large number of other applications on top of Ethernet-based. Therefore it is not necessary that all Ethernet flows are carried by only one DRB, there will likely be other DRBs available to serve Ethernet flows, if needed. Hence the 1-byte header per DRB is sufficient. RRC configuration of different header sizes is not justified at all and overkill to address the variable amount of Ethernet flows. |

The following issues are proposed for postponement until the next meeting:

**Proposal 1: Discuss during the next meeting whether signalling of maximum value of additional SPS periodicities and additional CG periodicities supported by a UE is required.**

**Proposal 2: Discuss during the next meeting whether to support allowing CG periodicities of multiple of 2/7 symbols as a separate capability with a cross-slot boundary capability as a pre-requisite.**
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