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# Introduction

This contribution provides the summary for the following offline discussion:

**CB: # SDT4\_Others**

**- How to handle non-SDT data during SDT procedure?**

**- How to select CCCH solution/DCCH solution? Waiting for RAN2 progress or sending LS to RAN2?**

**- How to handle ROHC continuity in** [**R3-220103**](file:///D%3A%5C3GPPmeeting%5C202201%20RAN3%20114bis%20e%5CTSGR3_114bis-e%5CInbox%5CDrafts%5CCB%20%23%20SDT4_Others%5CInbox%5CR3-220103.zip)

**- Common issues for both RA-SDT and CG-SDT**

**- Capture agreements and open issues, provide TPs if agreeable**

(CATT - moderator)

Summary of offline disc [R3-221086](file:///D%3A%5C3GPPmeeting%5C202201%20RAN3%20114bis%20e%5CTSGR3_114bis-e%5CInbox%5CDrafts%5CCB%20%23%20SDT4_Others%5CInbox%5CR3-221086.zip)

For the Phase-I discussion, you’re kindly requested to provide your comments before **0:00 UTC Friday, January 21.**

Base on the outcome of the phase I, phase II may be needed to further discuss the content of the draft LS and the TP.

# For the Chairman’s Notes

Please capture the following proposals in the chairman notes for agreement:

**The following proposals could be agreeable:**

**Proposal 1: to support ROHC continuity functionality, continue ROHC need to be provided from CU-CP to CU-UP for SDT DRB, and the detail impact to RAN3 could be continued the next meeting.**

* **It’s FFS to reuse legacy IE in PDCP configuration or add new IE to transfer Continue ROHC info from CU–CP to CU-UP.**
* **It’s FFS whether there’s any other impact to RAN3, e.g. Xn? Stage 2?**

**Proposal 2: Handling of UL non-SDT during SDT is pending to RAN2, no RAN3 work for now.**

**Proposal 3: turn the WA “WA: when applying Way 2 for SDT without anchor relocation, RAN3 assumes the anchor could move the UE back to RRC Inactive by using RRCRelease message.” to the agreement.**

**Proposal 4: The receiving gNB could resume the RRC connection for the DL non-SDT during SDT with anchor relocation.**

**The following items including TP and LS out to be further worked in 2nd round:**

* **It’s agreed to reply the LS to RAN2 on continue ROHC, the details of the LS will be further discussed in the 2nd round.**
* **The stage 2 TP to support DL non-SDT during SDT with anchor relocation will be further checked in 2nd round.**
* **Whether and how to send an LS to RAN2 on DL non-SDT will be further discussed in 2nd round.**

# Discussions (Phase-I)

## On ROHC continuity

In the LS from RAN2 [1], RAN2 agreed that the ROHC continuity function for SDT DRB can be configured as applicable for either the same cell where the RRC connection was suspended or the whole RNA.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall descriptionIn RAN2#116-e, RAN2 discussed ROHC continuity function for SDT DRB, which requires the PDCP entities in the UE and network to continue the ROHC header compression protocol for SDT DRB (i.e. keep the ROHC context) in different SDT procedures. RAN2 agreed that the ROHC continuity function for SDT DRB can be configured as applicable for either the same cell where the RRC connection was suspended or the whole RNA. The relevant agreement was made as follows,

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement:**For SDT, ROHC continuity functionality can be configurable between the cell and RNA. Send LS to RAN3 |

Actions**To RAN3****ACTION:** RAN2 respectfully asks RAN3 to take the above information into account when discussing the support of SDT.  |

In the contribution [2], RAN3 impact is analyzed and the following assumptions are provided:

* No RAN3 impact is foreseen to support the cell based ROHC continuity for SDT DRB.
* No RAN3 impact is foreseen to support the RNA based ROHC continuity for SDT DRB, in case the UE initiates SDT in the cell under the anchor gNB, or the UE initiates SDT in the cell out of RNA.
* In case in case RNA based ROHC continuity is configured, if the UE initiates the SDT in the new cell under the new serving gNB within the RNA, the last serving gNB should make decision to use without anchor relocation.

In the contribution [7][8][9], it’s proposed to add a new IE to indicate the ROHC continuity in E1AP BEARER CONTEXT MODIFICATION REQUEST message.

#### Q1: Do you agree to add a new IE to indicate the ROHC continuity in the E1AP BEARER CONTEXT MODIFICATION REQUEST message?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| CATT | Yes | Seems useful to indicate the CU-UP whether ROCH continuity should be applied for the UE. |
| ZTE | Yes | It is needed according to the LSin. |
| Intel Corporation | Yes | We are fine to add new IE for ROHC continuity, but we prefer to add into *DRB To Modify List* of 9.3.3.11 *PDU Session Resource To Modify List*.  |
| Huawei | No | We wonder if it is ok to reuse the legacy *Continue ROHC* IE in the *PDCP Configuration* IE-> *ROHC Parameters*, which is per DRB configuration.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IE/Group Name** | **Presence** | **IE type and reference** | **Semantics description** |
| **Choice ROHC Parameters** | M |  |  For more information see *PDCP-Config IE* in TS 38.331 [10]. |
| >ROHC |  |  |  |
| **…** |  |  |  |
| >>Continue ROHC | O | ENUMERATED(true, …) | See description of drb-ContinueROHC inTS 38.331 [10] |

 |
| China Telecom | yes | According to the LS from RAN2, this new IE is needed |
| LGE | Yes | Based on RAN2 LS, a new IE is needed |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | No | Same view with Huawei.  |
| Google | No | Not sure if the “Continue ROHC” IE should be included here. Should not it be like non-SDT bearers? (A similar question Q7 is also in CB# SDT3\_CGbased.) |
| Qualcomm | Need further disc | Have the same thought as Huawei. Do we need anything here that is specific to SDT? Assuming also no relocation. |
| Samsung  | Yes  | Detailed signaling design can be considered together with the resume of SDT bearers |
| Nokia | OK | In principle OK but need to discuss the IE. |
| E/// | No | ROHC continuity can be configured nowadays. Is there any special handling for SDT? Seems not |

**Moderator’s summary:**

12 companies provided the views to this question

* 6/12 companies agree to add new IE in E1 to indicate Continue ROHC,
* 4/12 companies think the existing ROHC configuration in PDCP configuration could be reused, nothing new need to be specified.
* 2/12 companies suggest to further discuss the IE.

According to the companies’ views as above, we see *continue ROHC* need to be indicated towards CU-UP for SDT DRB(s).

On how to provide Continue ROHC, there’re three options on the table:

* Use new IE:
	+ Add new IE dedicated for SDT in BEARER CONTEXT MODIFICATION REQUEST message, as proposed in [8][9].
	+ Add new IE in *DRB To Modify List* of 9.3.3.11 *PDU Session Resource To Modify List*, as Intel proposed.
* Reuse the legacy *Continue ROHC* IE in the *PDCP Configuration* IE-> *ROHC Parameters* as HW proposed.

By reusing the legacy IE in PDCP configuration, it should be feasible, but which may require gNB-CU-CP to provide the mandatory info in the PDCP configuration for each SDT DRB in case UE resumes for SDT. If we use new IE, PDCP configuration does not necessarily to be provided to the gNB-CU-UP for SDT.

According to the current situation, the moderator would propose to continue the discussion on E1 impact to support continue ROHC in the next meeting, the three options on the table could be taken as the starting point.

**Proposal: Continue ROHC need to be provided from gNB-CU-CP to gNB-CU-UP for SDT DRB. Due to the E1 impact, it’s FFS to reuse legacy IE in PDCP configuration or add new IE.**

Except the potential E1 impact as above, do you see any other RAN3 impact to support the cell-based and RNA-based ROHC continuity?

#### Q2: Do you see any other RAN3 impact (except the E1 part) to support the cell-based and RNA-based ROHC continuity?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| CATT | No, if any stage 2 impact should be considered. | We agree with the assumptions provided in [2], there’s no stage 3 impact to support cell-based ROHC continuity and RNA-based ROHC continuity. When RNA-based ROHC continuity is configured for the UE, and UE resumes in the different gNBs within the RNA, the anchor should be kept for SDT transmission to support ROHC continuity.Add some texts/restriction in the stage 2, or leave it to implementation, either way is fine with us. |
| ZTE | No |  |
| Intel Corporation | No, but | It would be good to clarify how NW handles ROHC continuity when the UE resumes on new Gnb (within RNA) but SDT without anchor relocation cannot be used. There may be a case that new Gnb may not support SDT without anchor relocation. Like ZTE mentioned below, one possible option could be to limit ROHC continuity when RNA is controlled by only one Gnb. Another option could be to make the anchor (knowing new Gnb does not support no anchor relocation) release the UE and make it legacy resume.  |
| Huawei | No | When RNA-based ROHC continuity is configured for the UE, and UE resumes in the different gNBs within the RNA resumes in the different gNBs within the RNA, the preferred solution is the anchor shall make decision not to relocate the UE context (i.e without anchor relocation), and handle the SDT transmission to support ROHC continuity. Another option is that the anchor Gnb ends the SDT procedure and de-configure the ROHC continuity for UE via the *RRCRelaese* message. |
| China Telecom | No |  |
| LGE | No |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | No | It is network implementation on RoHC continuity, that is similar with RoHC continuity configured in handover. We assume it can only be supported in case PDCP is not relocated.  |
| Google | No |  |
| Qualcomm | No |  |
| Samsung  | No |  |
| Nokia | Probably on Xn | In relation with RA SDT come back, we need assistance information from target Gnb to anchor Gnb to inform if without anchor relocation is not possible so that anchor Gnb can release the UE. |
| E/// | No |  |

**Moderator’s summary:**

12 companies attended the discussion,

11/12 companies assumes there’s no extra RAN3 impact to support continue ROHC funcitionality, among of the 11 companies, 2 companies still wonders whether need to specify something about network behaviors, e.g. how NW handles ROHC continuity when the UE resumes on new gNB (within RNA) but SDT without anchor relocation cannot be used.

1/12 company wonders whether some Xn impact is needed.

On whether the stage 2 and Xn would be impacted on ROHC continuity for SDT, the moderator would like to further check in the next meeting, together with the E1 impact.

**Proposal: whether there’s any impact to the stage 2 and Xn is FFS.**

According to the discussion of Q1 and Q2, it seems we could reply the LS to RAN2 to indicate the RAN3 progress on support of ROHC continuity functionality.

#### Q3: Do you agree to reply the LS to RAN2 to indicate the RAN3 progress on support of ROHC continuity functionality?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| CATT | Yes | We could indicate RAN2 the ROHC continuity functionality could be supported with/without RAN3 impact (pending to the discussion of Q1 and Q2). |
| ZTE | Yes | From the LSin, it seems that RNA can include both one gNB and multiple gNBs. In case of RNA with multiple gNBs, when the UE sends the UL SDT data, because it cannot know whether anchor relocates or not, then it cannot correctly configure ROHC.So that, ROHC continuity functionality shall be supported between the cell and RNA controlled by one gNB.We shall reply LS to RAN2 to confirm that for SDT, ROHC continuity functionality can be configured with both the cell and RNA controlled **by one gNB.** |
| Intel Corporation | Yes | With E1 support, we can get consultation from RAN2 on what would be the desired behavior when the UE (configured ROHC continuity) resumes on new gNB and but SDT without anchor relocation cannot be performed in NW side.  |
| Huawei | Yes | We could indicate RAN2 the ROHC continuity functionality could be supported with/without RAN3 impact (pending to the discussion of Q1 and Q2).See the possible solutions in response to Q2. |
| China telecom  | yes | Agree with Intel. |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |  |
| Google | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Could be | In principle ok, but depends partly on Q1. For sure we could clarify the covered scenario and hence the question from Intel. |
| Samsung  | Yes | RAN3 can show our concern as mentioned by ZTE and Intel |
| Nokia | Yes | Good to check with RAN2 indeed the case brought by ZTE and Intel. |
| E/// | Neutral | A reply LS can be sent, but first we need to clarify the scenario and solution, for example, as ZTE said. For Intel’s question, we think such scenario/UE behavior should be first raised by RAN2.  |

**Moderator’s summary:**

12 companies attended the email discussion, and all agreed to reply the LS to RAN2.

**Proposal: It’s agreed to reply the LS to RAN2 on continue ROHC, the details of the LS will be further discussed in the 2nd round.**

## Switch from SDT to non-SDT

### UL non-SDT

On how to handle the UL non-SDT data during SDT transmission, contribution [2] provides some analysis on CCCH solution in case of UL non-SDT data arrival, and showed the view that the CCCH based solution is feasible from RAN3 point of view, and there’s no RAN3 stage 3 impact is foreseen. It’s also suggested to send the LS to RAN2 to show the RAN3 analysis.

As the solutions for UL non-SDT are still under discussion in RAN2, and we are not requested to evaluate the solutions, thus, the moderator believes how to support that is pending to RAN2. We will start the RAN3 work, if needed, after RAN2 concluded on the solution in Uu interface.

#### Q4: Do you agree handling of UL non-SDT during SDT transmission is pending to RAN2?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| CATT | Yes | CCCH/DCCH solutions for UL non-SDT are totally in RAN2 scope, we should not touch this for now. When RAN2 have made some progress, we could further evaluate the selected solution, whether there’s any impact to our interfaces. |
| ZTE | Yes | RAN2 is still discussing this issue, we can wait for RAN2 progress. |
| Intel Corporation | Yes | No need to discuss CCCH vs DCCH in RAN3. Wait for RAN2 progress.  |
| Huawei | No | Considering that it was questioned whether there is any RAN3 impact for CCCH solutions in the question (Q7) in RAN2 email discussion R2-2200026, it’d better for us to discuss the RAN3 impacts for CCCH-based solution from RAN3 point of view. |
| China Telecom | yes | RAN2 are discussing CCCH/DCCH solution. So we can wait the LS/outcome from RAN2. |
| LGE | Yes | RAN2 is already discussing this issue. Wait for RAN2 decision |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | It would be better to wait for RAN2 progress first.  |
| Google | Yes | Wait for RAN2 decision |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| E/// | Yes | Patiently wait. |
| Samsung  | Yes | This is RAN2 issue. |
| Nokia | Yes | Agree with moderator’s suggestion. |

**Moderator’s summary:**

12 companies attended the discussion, 11/12 believed the support of UL non-SDT during SDT is pending to RAN2, 1/12 company thought we should evaluate whether there’s any RAN3 impact to support CCCH solution.

To follow the majorities, it’s proposed not to work on UL non-SDT at this stage.

**Proposal: Handling of UL non-SDT during SDT is pending to RAN2, no RAN3 work for now.**

### DL non-SDT

In the last RAN3 meetings, we discussed how to DL non-SDT during SDT transmission in case of SDT with/without anchor relocation.

Also two solutions were discussed：

* Way 1: sending *RRCResume* message during SDT session.
* Way 2: sending RRCRelease message to end SDT session first, and then another RRC Resume procedure is triggered for anchor relocation.

Based on the discussion, the following WA is achieved:

WA: when applying Way 2 for SDT without anchor relocation, RAN3 assumes the anchor could move the UE back to RRC Inactive by using RRCRelease message.

For SDT with anchor relocation, we almost reached the consensus in the last meeting that way 1 could be applied, and there’s no stage 3 impact is identified. In this case, the full UE context has been allocated to the new receiving gNB during SDT, it’s easier and more efficient to move the UE to RRC Connected state directly by sending a RRCResume message to the UE.

To make further progress, the moderator would like to check do you agree to apply the way 1 for non-SDT transmission during SDT with anchor relocation.

#### Q5: For DL non-SDT, do you agree the way 1 could be applied for SDT with anchor relocation case, and there’s no stage 3 impact identified?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| CATT | Yes | For SDT with anchor relocation case, of course the way 2 could also be applied, i.e., the new gNB sends the UE to inactive by generating the RRCRelease.As the full UE context has been allocated to the new receiving gNB during SDT transmission, it’s easier and more efficient to move the UE to RRC Connected state directly by sending a RRCResume message to the UE. Furthermore, there’s no stage 3 impact is foreseen. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Intel Corporation | Yes |  |
| Huawei | Yes |  |
| China Telecom | Yes |  |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |  |
| Google | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| E/// | Yes |  |
| Samsung  | Yes  |  |
| Nokia | Yes |  |

**Moderator’s summary:**

12 companies attended the discussion, all of the companies agreed that the way 1 could be used to transfer DL non-SDT during SDT with anchor relocation.

**Proposal: the receiving gNB could resume the RRC connection for the DL non-SDT during SDT with anchor relocation.**

Corresponding stage 2 TPs are provided in [3] and [5] to support DL non-SDT during SDT with anchor relocation. Companies are encouraged to provide the views on the way of the stage 2 work.

#### Q5bis: If the answer to Q5 is yes, whether and how to proceed with the stage 2 work?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| CATT | Yes | It’s better to have a overall flow for DL non-SDT during SDT transmission. For now, we could focus on the way 1 for SDT with anchor relocation case, the overall procedure in [5] could be taken as the start point.The overall procedure for way 2 for SDT without anchor relocation case still pending to the discussion of Q6 and Q7. |
| ZTE | Yes | Agree with CATT |
| Intel Corporation |  | Slightly prefer to go with Lenovo’s way to add one sentence description. We think non-SDT arrival during SDT with anchor relocation is not worth a new overall flow.  |
| Huawei |  | For DL non-SDT arrival, we agree with Intel. There is no need to have a new call flow and this can be captured by adding a short description. |
| China Telecom |  | Agree with Intel |
| LGE |  | Agree with Intel |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |  | Agree with Intel |
| Google |  | Agree with Intel |
| E/// |  | Agree with Intel |
| Samsung  |  | Prefer to have an overall flow chart, and [5] can be considered as starting point. |
| Nokia |  | Slightly prefer CATT way and add the without anchor relocation case later.  |

**Moderator’s summary:**

11 companies attended the email discussion,

7/11 companies prefer to have a simple sentence in stage 2 to support DL non-SDT during SDT with anchor relocation,

4/11 companies prefer to have an overall flow.

To follow the majorities, suggest taking [3] as starting point to support DL non-SDT during SDT with anchor relocation.

**Proposal: Take [3] as starting point to support DL non-SDT during SDT with anchor relocation.**

For SDT without anchor relocation, it’s proposed to turn the following WA to the agreement [3] [5].

WA: when applying Way 2 for SDT without anchor relocation, RAN3 assumes the anchor could move the UE back to RRC Inactive by using RRCRelease message.

#### Q6: Do you agree to turn the above WA to the agreement?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes | RAN2 already agreed with it. |
| Intel Corporation | Yes |  |
| Huawei | Yes |  |
| China Telecom | yes |  |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |  |
| Google | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | This can be seen as an early completion of the stage 2 flow  |
| E/// | Yes |  |
| Samsung  | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes |  |

**Moderator’s summary:**

12/12 companies agreed to turn the below WA to the agreement.

WA: when applying Way 2 for SDT without anchor relocation, RAN3 assumes the anchor could move the UE back to RRC Inactive by using RRCRelease message.

**Proposal: turn the WA “WA: when applying Way 2 for SDT without anchor relocation, RAN3 assumes the anchor could move the UE back to RRC Inactive by using RRCRelease message.” to the agreement.**

In case of way2 as above is agreed, how to trigger the UE to initiate another RRC Resume procedure after *RRCRelease* is discussed in [3] [5], the two possible options were provided:

* Option 1: Use RAN paging to trigger the following-up RRC resume procedure after UE is moved to Inactive state.
* Option 2: Add specific cause value or Indication in *RRCRelease* message to indicate UE to trigger the follow-up RRC resume procedure.

The option 1 is feasible without any stage 3 impact. The option 2 could save the paging procedure, while it may have some impact to *RRCRelease* message, which should be decided in RAN2.

Therefore, it’s proposed to send the LS to RAN2 in [3] [5] for further evaluation the possible solutions, the similar draft LS to RAN2 are provided in [4] [6].

#### Q7: Do you agree to send the LS to RAN2 to further evaluate which option is preferred on triggering of the follow-up RRC resume procedure after RRCRelease for non-SDT transmission?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| CATT | Yes | As been discussed in [5], both of the options are feasible. Option 1totally reuses the legacy procedures. Option 2 could save the unnecessary RAN paging procedure, which could speed up the transmission of the DL non-SDT, however the impact to RRCRelease is pending to RAN2.Thus, LS is needed to request RAN2 to further evaluate the potential options on triggering another RRC Resume procedure. |
| ZTE |  | If we agree with option 1, then it has no RAN3 impact (legacy procedure). If we agree with option 2, it also has no RAN3 impact because the IE is as container to UE included in RRCRelease message.So, in our view, we do not need to send LS to RAN2, because both option and option 2 have no RAN3 impact. |
| Intel Corporation | No | Both options are feasible, but we think this is a purely RAN2 issue.  |
| HW |  | Option 2 has the benefit that it can reduce unnecessary RAN paging and the associated paging overhead which is within RAN 3 scope. Hence if option 2 is preferred by RAN3, then RAN3 can send an LS to RAN2 with the recommendation for adopting option 2 indicating the paging overhead reduction benefit. |
| China telecom | yes | Agree with CATT. Both options are feasible. Here we are also support to send a LS to RAN2. |
| LGE | Yes | Agree with Huawei. We also think Option 2 can reduce the Xn RAN paging. But, whether to adopt Option 2 is pending to RAN2 decision. So, a LS to RAN2 is needed. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | We don’t think it is a purely RAN2 issue. It is network issue for downlink non-SDT data arrival. It makes sense to send an LS to RAN2. |
| Google |  | Option 1 works. A LS to RAN2 is only necessary if RAN3 shows a clear interest in improving the procedure  |
| Qualcomm | No | Agree with both Intel and Google (and ZTE). This is fundamentally a RAN2 issue, companies can bring up their views in RAN2. Of course both UE and gNB get impacted in some sense (i.e. implementation behaviour, and RRC signalling), but this does not mean we need to send an LS. |
| E/// | No | Option 1 has no impact to RAN3. Option 2 is a pure RAN2 issue and there is discussion on DL data arrival in RAN2. |
| Samsung |  | For option 1, some RAN3 impacts can be foreseen, e.g., the RAN paging message is sent from last serving gNB-CU to serving gNB-CU. However, this RAN paging message may not tell which UE is paged (the paging UE ID in RAN PAGING message, i.e., full I-RNTI, is unknown to serving gNB if the UE sends the RRCResumeRequest message by including short I-RNTI) so that the serving gNB-CU should page the UE in all cells controlled by itself. So, it is better to let last serving gNB to indicate the paged UE ID in RAN PAGING message. For option 2, this depends on when such RRCRelease message is sent to the serving gNB. If the RRCRelease is sent during the context fetch procedure, this option requires the RRCRelease update at the serving gNB. In this sense, we cannot simply say there is no RAN3 impact at this moment. However, before carrying out RAN3 discussion, RAN2 progress is needed on the selection between two options. |
| Nokia | No | Wait RAN2 progress. |

**Moderator’s summary:**

4/12 companies support to send the LS to RAN2.

2/12 companies agree to send the LS to RAN2 with condition, i.e. option 2 is preferred in RAN3.

5/12 companies think it’s pure RAN2 issue, which could be brought to RAN2.

1/12 company thought both options may have impact to RAN3.

**Proposal: Further discuss in 2nd round whether and how to send an LS to RAN2 on DL non-SDT.**

## Others

#### Q8: Please specify if anything is missed above.

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

# Discussions (Phase-II)

### Continue ROHC

Based on the discussion in Q1~Q3, it’s agreed to reply the LS to RAN2.

For the content of the reply LS, it seems we could confirm the functionality could be supported in RAN3, and we could raise our assumptions/questions to RAN2.

Intel raised a good question in Q3 discussion, i.e. “What would be the desired behavior when the UE (configured ROHC continuity) resumes on new gNB and but SDT without anchor relocation cannot be performed in NW side.”

And based on the companies input, the moderator wonders could such case be avoided by good implementation of the anchor gNB? Because everything is decided in the anchor, i.e. configure RNA for the UE, configure ROHC continuity for the UE, and make decision whether to relocate the anchor for RA-SDT. Some example ways of implementation are provided below:

* If the anchor configures RNA based ROHC continuity for the UE, and configures RNA with more than one gNBs, it should keep the anchor for SDT transmission to align with the ROHC continuity with UE as mentioned in [2].
* Another way is when the anchor gNB decides to configure RNA-based ROHC, it may configure the RNA limit to the anchor gNB, e.g. as a cell list within the anchor gNB. In this case, there’s no issue to support RNA based ROHC continuity for SDT transmission.

Which means if the anchor may not be able to / or would not like to keep the anchor for RA-based SDT, it should configure RNA-based ROHC with a small RNA (within the anchor gNB), or configure cell-based ROHC to the UE (no restriction to the RNA configure).

To make life easier, the moderator would propose to take the draft LS in [2] as the start point, and add the Intel’s question also.

Companies are kindly invited to check the draft LS in the draft folder, and provide views as below. Any refinement to the draft LS is appreciated.

#### Q9: Companies are invited to provide your views or suggestions on the draft reply LS? Refinement of the draft LS is appreciated.

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

### DL non-SDT

For the TP work to support DL non-SDT in case of SDT with anchor relocation, could you agree to take [3] as start point to support DL non-SDT during SDT with anchor relocation.

#### Q10: Companies are invited to provide your views on the TP to support DL non-SDT during SDT with anchor relocation.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments/refinements to the TP |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

For the LS

As the DL non-SDT during SDT is triggered from NW side, and the overall procedure is being discussed in RAN3, and we reached the consensus to Release the RRC connection and trigger another RRC Resume for the DL non-SDT (see discussion in Q6).

On how to trigger another RRC resume after RRC release, two options are discussed. Obviously, the option 2 has some advantage compared to the option 1 as has been discussed in [3][5].

* Option 1: Use RAN paging to trigger the following-up RRC resume procedure after UE is moved to Inactive state.
* Option 2: Add specific cause value or Indication in *RRCRelease* message to indicate UE to trigger the follow-up RRC resume procedure.

Thus, it’s reasonable to send an LS to RAN2, to indicate our decision on DL non-SDT, and request for the further work on the specification to support the option 2.

The moderator would like to revise the draft LS from [6], to clearly indicate our progress for DL non-SDT and our preference on how to trigger the follow-up RRC resume procedure.

Companies are kindly invited to check the draft LS in the draft folder, and provide views as below. Any refinement to the draft LS is appreciated.

#### Q11: Companies are invited to provide your views or suggestions on the LS reply? Refinement of the draft LS is appreciated.

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

# Conclusion, Recommendations [if needed]

If needed.
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