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# Introduction

|  |
| --- |
| **CB: # 39\_IAB\_TopoRed****- (QC)****F1 can be established before or after the boundary node becomes redundantly connected. Neither option is precluded.****For a dual-connected IAB-node, F1 can be terminated at the MN or the SN. Neither of these two options is precluded.****decide if either option 5 or one of options 3a, 3b, 4 be supported; decide among options 3a, 3b and 4.** **liaise RAN2 on its decision for/against option 5 and its preferences among options 3a, 3b and 4, if applicable** **F1-terminating donor to pass egress BH RLC CH ID(s) for DL traffic and ingress BH RLC CH ID(s) for UL traffic to the non-F1-terminating donor.****- (CATT)****Confirm whether the F1-C is able to send via donor path in CP-UP separation after F1 setup procedure.****If F1-C is able to send via both paths in CP-UP separation, then MN decides which leg (MN or SN) transmits F1-C in R17 for both scenarios.****If F1-C is able to send via both paths in CP-UP separation, F1C-over-RRC for non-donor and F1C-over-BAP for donor is reasonable.****If F1-C is able to send via both paths in CP-UP separation, RAN3 discusses introducing an indication about which leg (MN or SN) transmits F1-C in UL. And whether this indication sends to IAB-DU via a RRC message or F1AP message****MN decides which NR-RAN (MN or SN) performs as a donor. MN should inform IAB node about who is the donor (MN or SN) via RRC and trigger F1 setup procedure****MN decides whether CP-UP separation or inter-donor redundancy****F1-termination donor CU sends QoS with BH RLC CH granularity to non-F1-termination donor CU for BH RLC CH allocation.****support option 4 and option 5. Details are FFS.****- (Nok)****OAM configures IAB-DU with a set of parameters (e.g. the Donor-CU IP address and IAB-DU parameters). When the IAB is dual-connected with 2 Donors, the MN is selected as the Donor, and OAM configures IAB with a set of parameters related to MN.** **use RRC to inform the IAB about the leg for F1-C traffic transfer.** **BH Information IE need to be enhanced to differentiate the parent node, e.g. when both parent nodes have same BAP address allocated by different IAB-donor-CU.** **both Donors allocate the BAP address to the boundary IAB node and descendant IAB nodes.** **Introduce a new XnAP procedure to support inter-Donor routing.****consider option 4 as a solution for address collision in inter donor TR.** **- (SS)****Common st2 for all options****Prefer option 1****- (ZTE)****adopt option 1 and option 3a.****F1-terminating donor provides the following information of the migrated F1-U tunnel to the non-F1-terminating donor for the establishment of BAP routing via the target path:****- the identity of the F1-U tunnel****- QoS parameters of the DRB delivered via the F1-U tunnel****- routing ID of the F1-U tunnel****- (Fuj,Len,Moto,LG)****Prefer option 4****- (LG)****The scenario is needed, i.e, “when the F1 interface is established after IAB-MT of the access IAB node is connected with two parent nodes connected to two donors (the inter-donor topology redundancy is not established yet)”****For the case above, MN determines the F1 termination point for the IAB node.****- (HW)****Prefer option 5; option 4 is FFS****For bearer mapping at the boundary node, RAN3 agree to adopt IP header to egress BH RLC ID mapping.****F1-U terminating CU determines the QoS requirement division among the two topology segmentation, for inter-donor routing case. Details of how to achieve the QoS division are FFS, pending progress on the inter-donor routing and BH RLC CH mapping at the boundary node.****Liaise RAN 2 to discuss the following issues:****- Whether one or two BAP addresses should be allocated to the boundary node for inter-donor routing.****- The BAP address in BAP header added by the access node and IAB-donor-DU, for the inter-donor routing traffic (e.g. the BAP address of the real destination or that of the boundary node).** **- For upstream traffic, how boundary node to differentiate the traffic to be further routed in CU1’s topology from the traffic to be routed to CU2’s topology;****- Chair: seems support for options 1, 3a, 4, 5? If agreeable that opt1 (OAM-based) is not precluded, concentrate discussion among 3a, 4, 5? WA to go for 4? If st2 is common for all options, attempt st2 TP****- note LS**(QC - moderator)Summary of offline disc [R3-212679](file:///C%3A%5Ctemporary%5CUsers%5Cghampel%5CAppData%5CLocal%5CTemp%5CTemp1_RAN3_112-e_agenda_with_Tdocs20210514_1403.zip%5CInbox%5CR3-212679.zip) |

This CB#34 discussion has two phases:

**Phase 1: Identify potentially achievable agreements for online discussion.**

**Phase 2: TBD**

The deadline for Phase 1 is Thursday, May 20, 23:59:59 UTC. This allows the moderator to prepare some proposals on Friday for Monday’s online session.

The deadline for Phase 2 is the same as for all email discussions, i.e., Tuesday, May 25, 12:00:00 UTC.

*Disclaimer:*

*The moderator has tried to capture the most relevant issues of the contributions above. For some of them, the moderator has expanded the discussion, e.g., to alert companies to underlying assumptions, interdependences, and potential inconsistencies with prior agreements. To keep discussion within reasonable size, several aspects discussed in contributions could not be included, especially if they were very detailed or dependent on the convergence on superseding issues.*

# For the Chairman’s Notes

Propose the following:

…

# PHASE 1: Discussion

## 3.1 Reply LS from RAN1 on inter-donor topological redundancy

RAN1 states in reply LS R3-211412:

|  |
| --- |
| Question from RAN3“In both scenarios, the boundary IAB node, i.e., IAB3 in the figure, is simultaneously connected to the two parent nodes (i.e., IAB1 and IAB2) belonging to two different donors (i.e., donor 1 and donor 2). Since it may require the work in RAN1, RAN3 would like to get RAN1’s advice on whether this can be supported in Rel-17.”Regarding the Question, RAN1 agreed that both inter-donor multi-parent scenarios (Scenario 1 and Scenario 2) can be supported in Rel-17 with RAN3 specification support for inter-donor coordination of* H/S/NA resource configurations of the IAB-DU of the dual-connected node, and
* DL/UL resource configurations of the parent DUs and the IAB-MT of the dual-connected node.

**ACTION:** RAN1 would like to ask RAN3 to take the above into consideration in future work. |

The moderator believes that this is an encouraging response. Details on inter-donor coordination of HSNA and DUF configurations are discussed in CB#42.

**Q1: Do you have any comments on RAN1’s reply LS?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company  | Comments |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 3.2 Fundamental issues on CP-UP separation vs. topological redundancy

a) Donor support on CU

For CP-UP separation we distinguish between donor vs. non-donor. Obviously, the non-donor needs to have some IAB-functionality so that it can forward F1-C traffic via RRC/Xn. In the last meeting(s), it was acknowledged that the non-donor node may actually support donor functionality for other IAB-nodes. This makes things more complicated since the selection between inter-donor redundancy and CP-UP separation may depend on the CU’s donor-support.

To make our lives easier, we could simply assume that every IAB-capable CU supports full donor functionality as well as “non-donor functionality” needed for CP-UP separation. Otherwise, we would have to differentiate between two grades of IAB-capable nodes.

**Q2a. Do you agree that all IAB-capable CUs can support full donor functionality as well as “non-donor functionality” needed for CP-UP separation? If not, please explain.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company  | Yes/No | Comments |
| QCOM | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

b) F1-C uses BAP and RRC over same parent link

For CP-UP separation, do we allow that *both* F1-C-over-BAP and F1-C-over-RRC can be used over the *same* parent link? Note that this issue did not arise in Rel-16 ENDC but is a potential option for NRDC.

R3-211942 (Samsung) believes it does not make a lot of sense to have both options available on the same parent link.

**Q2b: For CP-UP separation, do we allow that *both* F1-C-over-BAP *and* F1-C-over-RRC can be used over the *same* parent link?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company  | Yes/No | Comments |
| QCOM | No | F1-C-over-RRC is supposed to provide redundancy to F1-C-over-BAP. There is no redundancy gain if it is use over the same link.  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

c) NRDC established before vs. after F1

In last meeting, we already had the discussion if NRDC can be established before F1.

R3-211942 (Samsung) proposes that NRDC can be established before F1 since DC could already be used for OAM interactions before the IAB-DU is launched.

R3-211801 (CATT) and R3-211893 (Nokia) indicate implicit support for this scenario since they discuss which node, MN or SN, should be the F1-termination point in this case.

R3-212384 (LGE) and R3-211741 (QC) also believe that this scenario should be supported.

**Q2c: Can NRDC be established before F1C?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company  | Yes/No | Comments |
| QCOM | Yes | There are benefits from ENDC before F1C is added as pointed out by Samsung. There may be other reasons. We should not unnecessarily constrain deployment flexibility.  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

d) Path selection for F1-C in case of CP-UP separation

In case of CP-UP separation, F1-C can be routed via BAP and/or via RRC. The question arises which of donor or non-donor selects the transport path to be used for F1-C (and F1-C establishment), and how this is communicated to the IAB-node. Note that this needs to be decided for scenario 1 and scenario 2.

R3-212415 (Huawei) proposes that RAN3 discuss this matter.

R3-211801 (CATT) proposes that RAN3 discuss if this is done via RRC.

R3-211893 (Nokia) proposes that the donor should inform the IAB-node via RRC.

**Q2d: In case of CP-UP separation, which node selects the transport path to be used for F1-C (and F1-C establishment), and how this is communicated to the IAB-node? Please differentiate between CP-UP separation scenario 1 and scenario 2.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company  | Comments |
| QCOM | As for Rel-16 ENDC, the donor selects the path for F1-C establishment.  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 3.3 F1-C is established before NRDC

a) F1-termination point

Multiple companies believe that in case F1 is established before NRDC, the MN will be the F1 termination point.

**Q3a: Do you agree that in case F1 is established before NRDC, the MN will be the F1 termination point?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company  | Yes/No | Comments |
| QCOM | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

b) Selection of inter-donor redundancy vs. CP-UP separation

R3-211801 (CATT) and R3-211942 (Samsung) propose that when F1 is established before NRDC, the MN should decide if inter-donor redundancy and/or CP-UP separation is used.

**Q3b: In case F1 is established before NRDC, which node should determine the use of inter-donor redundancy vs. CP-UP separation? How would this be communicated to the other nodes?**

**Note: There is interdependence with Q2a, i.e., support of donor functionality on SN, and Q2b, i.e., if both types of transport can be supported on the same parent link.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company  | Comments |
| QCOM | The MN should decide. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 3.4 F1-C is established after NRDC

a) Selection of inter-donor redundancy vs. CP-UP separation

In case F1 is established *after* NRDC and both MN and SN support donor functionality, it needs to be decided if inter-donor redundancy and/or CP-UP separation is used. Based on this decision, MN and SN can establish BAP and RRC transfer path(s) for the establishment of F1-C.

R3-211801 (CATT) proposes that MN decides whether CP-UP separation or inter-donor redundancy is adopted in this case.

Other companies do not address this issue.

**Q4a: If F1 is established after NRDC and both MN and SN support donor functionality, which node determines if CP-UP separation and/or inter-donor redundancy is used? How is this communicated to the other nodes?**

**Note that this decision is a prerequisite for the establishment of BAP and RRC transfer path and therefore needs to occur *before* the establishment of F1-C.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company  | Comments |
| QCOM | The MN should decide and inform the SN when requesting SCG addition. The IAB-node can derive this decision based on configurations it receives. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

b) Selection of F1 termination point

In case F1 is established after NRDC and only one of MN or SN supports donor functionality, the donor node will be the F1 termination point.

In case both, MN and SN, support donor functionality, either of the two nodes can be the F1 termination point, while the other node can support redundancy or CP-UP separation. In case CP-UP separation is used, only the designated F1-termination point will establish BAP while the other node will establish the RRC transfer path for F1-C. In case redundancy is used, both MN and SN with establish BAP.

The question arises which node decides if MN or SN should be the F1-termination point?

R3-211801 (CATT) and R3-212384 (LGE) propose that the MN decides the F1 termination point, and that it should inform IAB node about this decision via RRC.

R3-211893 (Nokia) proposes that this selection is done by the IAB-node through OAM: The IAB-node reports, e.g., parent-cell information to OAM upon which OAM configures the CU’s IP address on the IAB-node. The moderator emphasizes that such OAM-based solution is certainly supported but out-of-scope.

R3-211942 (Samsung) proposes that the IAB-node determines based on SIB1 which of the parents support IAB and selects the corresponding CU for F1 termination. In case one of the parents does not indicate IAB support, the corresponding CU is the non-donor for CP-UP separation. If both parents support IAB, it is up to IAB-node implementation to select one of them for F1 establishment.

The moderator believes that this solution works for redundancy where both legs have BAP established. However, it won’t work for CP-UP separation, since MN and SN cannot establish BAP or RRC transfer path unless they know which of the two has been selected as F1 termination point.

**Q4b: If F1 is established after NRDC and both MN and SN support donor functionality, which node determines the F1 termination point (1) in case redundancy has been selected and (2) in case CP-UP separation has been selected? How is this decision communicated to the other nodes?**

**Note that for CP-UP separation, this decision is a prerequisite for the establishment of BAP vs. RRC transfer path and therefore needs to occur *before* the establishment of F1-C.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company  | Comments |
| QCOM | The MN should select the F1 termination point when deciding CP-UP separation vs. redundancy. It should include this decision when informing the SN about the selection between CP-UP separation and redundancy.As in ENDC, the F1 termination point configures the L2-paths to the IAB-node (i.e. Xn/RRC and/or BAP) and it will inform the IAB-node via RRC on which of these two paths should be used for F1 establishment.  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 3.5 CU IP address determination

a) How does the IAB-node know the CU’s (outer and inner) IP address?

R3-211893 (Nokia) proposes that via OAM.

**Q5a: How does IAB-node know the CU’s (outer and inner) address for F1-C establishment?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company  | Comments |
| QCOM | OAM-based solution doesn’t scale very well. We discussed this already in Rel-16 for parent node selection. The CU could inform the IAB-node on its IP address(es) via RRC.  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 3.6 Inter-donor redundancy: Topology issues

a) F1-termination point of boundary and descendant nodes

The following issues were raised on the F1 termination point for boundary and descendant nodes:

R3-211942 (Samsung) and R3-212165 (Lenovo) propose that the F1 termination point of these nodes should be the same.

R3-211942 (Samsung) proposes that the F1-termination point of these nodes should not change.

The moderator believes that these proposals may collide prior assumptions and agreements as shown in Figure 1:

* Fig 1a: The redundantly connected IAB-node-1 and its descendent IAB-node-2 have Donor-CU1 as their F1 termination point. IAB-node-3 has Donor-CU2 as F1 termination point.
* Fib 1b: Due to its deteriorating BH link, IAB-MT-3 is migrated to Donor-CU1 with IAB-node-1 as new parent node. At this point, IAB-DU-3 still has its F1-termination point at Donor-CU2.
* Fig 1c: IAB-DU-3’s F1 termination point is migrated to Donor-CU2. At this point, boundary and descendant nodes have the same F1 termination point.



**Figure 1: F1 termination point of descendant nodes before after IAB-node migration**

Based on this scenario, the following options can be identified:

**Option 1:** Boundary and descendent nodes can have different F1 termination.

**Option 2:** Boundary and descendent nodes must have the same termination point with the implication that:

**Option 2a:** Inter-donor IAB-node migration into the subtree of a redundantly connected node cannot be terminated at IAB-MT migration in case the IAB-DU has a different F1 termination point as the boundary node.

**Option 2b:** Inter-donor IAB-node migration/recovery to the subtree of a redundantly connected node is not supported if the IAB-DU has a different F1 termination point as the boundary node.

**Q6a: Which of the above options 1, 2a or 2b should be supported? Please explain.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company  | Options 1, 2a or 2b | Comments |
| QCOM | 1 | It is certainly not attractive to have multiple boundary points chained up, but at should be supported for at least some intermediate time frame until the DU has been migrated.  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

b) Multi-donor redundancy

R3-212415 (Huawei) proposes that redundancy across more than 2 donors as show in Figure 2 should be deprioritized.



 **Figure 2: IAB topology redundancy across multiple donors**

The moderator believes that the complexity in Fig.2 is primarily associated with the chain of boundary nodes rather than with the involvement of more than two donors. Figure 3, for instance, shows a few scenarios with two or three donors. In some of them, the boundary nodes reside in different branches (3a and 3b) which should be rather uncritical. Complexity seems to increase, when boundary nodes are chained up (3c and 3d). This, however, can also happy for the 2-donor scenario (3d).



**Figure 3: Various multi-donor scenarios**



**Figure 4: IAB-node migration resulting in topology redundancy across multiple donors**

Further, the scenario of IAB-node migration into the subtree shown in Fig. 1 may also occur for three donors (Fig. 4). In case IAB-node migration is terminated at the IAB-MT migration, the scenario will end up with topological redundancy across 3 donors.

Based on the Figures 3 and 4, the moderator would like to receive some feedback if any of these scenarios should be precluded, the criteria for precluding a scenario, and how such preclusion would be enforced in the deployment.

**Q6b: Please provide feedback on scenarios in Figures 3 and 4:**

* **Which of the multi-donor scenarios in Fig. 2 and 4 should be supported?**
* **What are criteria for a scenario to be precluded?**
* **How would these criteria be enforced by RAN? Does this require specification?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company  | Comments |
| QCOM | All scenarios in Fig. 3 and 4 should be supported. Defining mechanisms to preclude some scenarios makes things only more complicated than they already are. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 3.7 Inter-topology transport

a) Inter-topology BAP routing options

There has been a lot of discussion in contributions on this topic. RAN3 should at least decide if option 5 vs. options 3a, 3b and 4 should be supported. Selection among options 3a, 3b and 4 is technically in RAN2 realm.

The moderator believes that it would be beneficial for RAN3 to agree on a *preferred* option among 3a, 3b and 4 to make progress. This may help RAN2, which has just started to think about inter-donor redundancy.

The contributions provide the following views:

R3-211801 (CATT) proposes option 4 and 5.

R3-211893 (Nokia) proposes option 4.

R3-211942 (Samsung) proposes to NOT use option 5.

R3-212039 (ZTE) proposes option 3a.

R3-212048 (Fujitsu) proposes option 4.

R3-212165 (Lenovo) proposes option 4.

R3-212384 (LGE) proposes option 4

R3-212415 (Huawei) supports 5, potentially also options 4

In an RAN2 email discussion and in RAN contributions, option 4 generally received the majority support. RAN3 contributions are in line with this tendency. To make progress, the moderator proposes that RAN3 deprioritizes option 5 and agrees on option 4 as the preferred candidate.

**Q7a: Do you agree that option 5 is deprioritized, and option 4 is RAN3’s preferred candidate? Should RAN2 be liaised on RAN3’s decision on this matter?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company  | Yes/No | Comments |
| QCOM | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

b) Number of BAP addresses and traffic differentiation at boundary node

R3-211893 (Nokia) proposes that the boundary node has two BAP addresses, one for each topology, and that each donor configures the IAB-node with a BAP address.

R3-212415 (Huawei) raises the issue of the number of addresses at the boundary node, and how the boundary node should differentiate traffic (1) for itself, (2) to be forwarded in the same topology, (3) to be forwarded to the other topology. They propose that RAN3 should ask RAN2 to resolve it.

The moderator believes that:

* Both, RAN2 and RAN3, should have a solid understanding of this matter. RAN3 should therefore have this discussion and potentially share their views with RAN2.
* BAP addressing and criteria for traffic differentiation at the boundary node depend on the inter-topology BAP routing option selected.
* The handling of these issues is actually rather simple. To make progress, the moderator outlines a baseline below on how this could work. Companies are asked to provide feedback.

**Moderator’s view: Baseline on the number of BAP addresses assigned to the boundary node:**

* For option 3a, all IAB-nodes including the boundary node have only one global address which is {BAP address assigned by one CU + CU ID}.
* For option 4 and option 5, the boundary node needs (at least) one BAP address in each topology, which is assigned by the respective donor. This is necessary to avoid BAP address collision since each donor manages its own BAP name space in its own topology.

**Moderator’s view: Baseline on traffic differentiation at the boundary node:**

* For option 3a, the boundary node routes traffic based on {BAP address + CU ID} using the same routing principals is in Rel-16.
* For option 4, the boundary node distinguishes traffic in the following manner:
	1. Packets for the boundary node itself carry the boundary-node’s BAP address assigned for the topology where the packet arrives.
	2. Packets to be forwarded without header rewriting carry a BAP address of the destination node for the topology, where the packet arrives.
	3. Packets to be forwarded with header rewriting need to carry a BAP address that is unique within the topology, where the packet arrives, i.e., it cannot be used by any other IAB-node in that topology. It could be the same address as that of the boundary node. In this case, the BAP path ID would be used to differentiate between of 1) and 3).
* For option 5, the boundary node distinguishes traffic in the following manner:
1. Packets for the boundary node itself carry the boundary-node’s BAP address and IP address assigned for the topology where the packets arrive.
2. Packets to be forwarded without header rewriting carry a BAP address of the destination node for the same topology where the packet arrives.
3. Packets to be forwarded with header rewriting carry the BAP address of the boundary node, but the IP address of the destination node. The BAP sublayer will pass the packet up to the IP layer, which will perform IP routing using IP-to-BAP mapping as presently defined for the donor-DU.

Option 3b has not been discussed here since no company seems to support it.

**Q7b: Do you agree with the moderator’s baseline description of BAP addressing and traffic differentiation at the boundary node? If not, why not? What is missing? What is wrong? “NO” will only be considered if accompanied by proper explanation.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company  | Yes/No | Comments |
| QCOM | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

c) Granularity of QoS information to be transmitted from F1-terminating to non-F1-terminating donor.

RAN3 agreed in last meeting:

To support the bearer mapping across two topologies at the boundary IAB node, the non-F1-termination donor CU needs to provide the ingress BH RLC CH ID(s) for DL traffic and egress BH RLC CH ID(s) for UL traffic to the F1-termination donor CU.

The issue to be addressed is what information the F1-terminating donor needs to provide to the non-F1-terminating donor before.

Contributions have established two different options: The F1-terminating donor provides:

**Option 1: Ingress BH RLC CH info for UL traffic and egress BH RLC CH info DL traffic.**

**Option 2: F1-U GTP-U tunnel information for all F1-U to be migrated.**

R3-211801 (CATT), R3-211741 (QC) and R3-212165 (Lenovo) are in favor of option 1.

R3-211942 (Samsung) and R3-212039 (ZTE) are in favor of option 2.

The moderator wants to emphasize that both options allow traffic offload with granularity of F1-U tunnel.

The moderator sees some problems in option 2, and would like to receive feedback from companies. Figure 5 shows an example for option 1 on top and option 2 at the bottom. In this example, red and pink F1-U tunnels are migrated, but the orange F1-U tunnel remains at the initial path.

In option1, the F1-terminating donor (CU1) forwards the green RLC CH info to the non-F1-terminating donor (CU2), upon which CU2 returns the blue RLC CH info. Blue and green RLC channels are matched 1:1 at the boundary node. In this manner, offloaded traffic will have the same bearer mapping in topology 2 as in topology 1.

In option 2, the F1-terminating donor (CU1) forwards F1-U information to the non-F1-terminating donor (CU2), upon which CU2 returns the blue RLC CH info. This allows CU2 to determine its own bearer mapping. In Figure 5, it ends up with **two** RLC channels (blue and purple) in topology 2 that need to be mapped to **one** RLC channel (green) in topology 1. This implies that the boundary node needs to support “bearer-remapping”. **How would this be done?**

R3-212048 (Fujitsu) proposes that the F1-terminating node indicates an egress BH RLC CH it at the boundary node to the non-F1-terminating node and if 1:1 bearer mapping is required. This still keeps the issue of bearer remapping for N:1-mapped bearers.

R3-212415 (Huawei) proposes that the bearer mapping at the boundary node is based on IP header information. This would only work for BAP routing option 5.



**Figure 5: Granularity of QoS info exchanged between donors**

**Q7c: Which of options 1 or 2 do you prefer:**

**Option 1: F1 terminating donor sends BH RLC CH info to non-F1-terminating donor.**

**Option 2: F1 terminating donor sends F1-U GTP-U tunnel info to non-F1-terminating donor.**

**In case of option 2, please indicate how bearer remapping should occur at the boundary node.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company  | Option 1 or Option 2 | Comments |
| QCOM | 1 | We believe that option 2 adds unnecessary complexity and signaling overhead.In case many companies prefer option 2, we are open to have both options supported.In option 2, bearer remapping at the boundary node can be achieved by including the BAP routing ID into the ingress-to-egress BH RLC channel dependent on. As a result, the F1-terminating donor may have to reconfigure the F1’s BAP routing IDs so that they can be mapped to the fine-granular BH RLC CHs (blue and purple) sent by the non-F1-terminating donor.  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

d) Inter-donor coordination

This is on new Xn procedures for inter-donor coordination.

R3-211893 (Nokia) proposes: Since IAB-DU on dual-connected IAB-node has only one F1-C to one donor, a new Xn procedure is needed for inter-donor routing and traffic mapping.

R3-211942 (Samsung) proposes that such Xn procedures should use non-UE associated signaling. The reason is that the non-F1-terminating donor has no context of the UEs.

R3-211942 (Samsung) further proposes that inter-donor coordination procedures for inter-donor topological redundancy should contain: 1) Inter-donor Context Setup procedure, 2) Inter-donor Context Modification Request procedure, 3) Inter-donor Context Modification Required procedure, 4) Inter-donor Context Release procedure.

**Q7d: Do you agree that:**

* **A new procedure is introduced for inter-donor routing and traffic mapping,**
* **This procedures is non-UE-associated,**
* **The procedure includes Context Setup, Context Modification Request, Context Modification Required and Context Release procedures.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company  | Yes/No | Comments |
| QCOM | See comment | We agree on the introduction of a new non-UE associated procedure. We are not yet certain about the specific messages proposed. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

e) Boundary-node IP addresses:

R3-211942 (Samsung) proposes that the boundary node obtains an independent set of IP addresses from F1-terminating and non-F1-terminating node.

**Q7e: Do you agree that the boundary node obtains an independent set of IP address from F1-terminating and non-F1-terminating donor?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company  | Yes/No | Comments |
| QCOM | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
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