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# Introduction

**CB: # 4\_DirectDataFwd\_DCtoSA**

**- Adopt option 2a for EN-DC/MR-DC to SA handover scenario which could support scenario 1, 2 and 3? CATT, Qualcomm, CMCC**

**- Agree option 3a as way forward for handover from EN-DC/MR-DC to SA i.e. the target node decides direct forwarding path availability between the source SN and the target node? Agree the following in order to support direct forwarding: The source MN provides the source SN ID to the target node; The target node provides the direct data forwarding availability indication to the source MN? Samsung, Huawei, ZTE, Verizon Wireless**

**- Solution down-selection, try to close this topic**

**-Provide CRs if agreeable**

(Samsung - moderator)

Summary of offline disc [R3-222393](file:///E%3A%5C3GPP%20Standardization%5CRAN3%5CRAN3%23115-e%5Cdraft%5CCB%20%23%204_DirectDataFwd_DCtoSA%5CInbox%5CR3-222393.zip)

It is proposed to divide the discussion into two phases:

- Phase 1: try to conclude a solution for the issue in 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3

 Deadline: Please provide your views before end of Wednesday Feb. 23 UTC time

- Phase 2: discuss the CRs

 Deadline: tbd pending on the outcome of Phase 1

# For the Chairman’s Notes

**Propose to agree the following:**

**NR SA to MR-DC connected to 5GC Handover or SN change:**

**Agree the CR in R3-222607 to replace the agreed CR in R3-220674.**

**Direct data forwarding from MR-DC to NR SA HO in Scenario 1 and Scenario 2**

**Agree the compromised WF for MR-DC to NR SA HO in scenario 1 and scenario 2:**

 **- For EN-DC to SA, use option 3a**

 **- For intra-5GS MR-DC to SA, use option 2a**

R3-222746 rev of R3-222488 (NGAP CR), agreed

R3-222745 rev of R3-222487 (S1AP CR), agreed

R3-222743 rev of R3-222004 (XnAP CR), agreed

R3-22xxxx rev of R3-222272 (stage 2 CR), agreed

**Scenario 3**

**For scenario from NR SA to EN-DC handover in Scenario 3:**

* **Source NG-RAN node doesn’t include Direct Forwarding Path Availability IE Handover Required message for handover from NR SA to EN-DC in scenario 3.**
* **The same as scenario 1 and scenario 2, it should be the target SN to decide whether direct forwarding path is available between the source NG-RAN node and the target SN**

**TNL address allocation for handover to EN-DC**

R3-222489 (S1AP CR), **agreed**

R3-222490 (X2AP, CR), **agreed**

To be continued on Scenario 3.

# Discussion (2nd Round)

## TNL address allocation for handover to EN-DC

IP address spaces (or sub-network) can be different for intra-system (X2-U) or inter-system or can be different for X2 and S1. Based on this assumption, RAN3 agreed the CR for handover to NG-RAN node in R3-214450, [R3-216097](file:///E%3A%5C%5C3GPP%20Standardization%5C%5CRAN3%5C%5CRAN3%23114-e%5C%5Cagenda%5C%5CInbox%5C%5CR3-216097.zip), R3-216096.

For handover to EN-DC, in order to let target to assign appropriate TNL address for data forwarding from the source in the following two scenarios, the target node who is responsible for assigning the TNL address needs to know inter-system or intra-system, direct or indirect.

Case A: LTE to EN-DC

Case B: NR to EN-DC

To support this, the proposal is to include

* Direct Forwarding Path Availability IE in the source eNB to the target eNB transparent container.
* Handover Type IE in the X2AP SGNB ADDITION REQUEST message.

With above change, the target eNB and en-gNB could assign corresponding TNL address for direct data forwarding from the source node i.e.

For intra-system and direct data forwarding, the IP address space for X2-U is used.

For inter-system and direct data forwarding, the IP address space for Xn-U is used.

For indirect data forwarding, the IP address space for S1-U is used.

Ericsson has questioned “Not sure why the direct forwarding path availability will be needed. Handover type should be sufficient to select the forwarding tunnel endpoint.” For indirect data forwarding, only know the handover type is not enough, because IP address space for S1-U should be assigned. That’s why we agreed to transmit Direct Forwarding Path Availability from 5GC to the target NG-RAN node for intra-5GS handover.
With the clarifications for first round and above, let check whether companies are fine to support the CR in **R3-222299 and R3-222230 [2][3].**

**Q1: Are you fine with the proposal and the CR in R3-222299 and R3-222230 after the clarification?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Samsung | Yes. As other scenarios has been agreed. All scenarios should be covered. |
| Ericsson | Still not convinced for the *Direct Forwarding Path Availability* IE. I agree that X2-U and Xn-U have may use different IP spaces. But for X2-U and S1-U? This is the same system. Was the *Direct Forwarding Path Availability IE* added only becauseNG-U and Xn-U addresses may use different IP spaces? |
| Samsung | Clarification to Ericsson:There are the following scenarios and TNL address allocation:1. Intra-system, Direct => TNL address for X2-U
2. Inter-system, Direct => TNL address for Xn-U
3. Inter-system, Indirect => TNL address for S1-U
4. Intra-system, Indirect => TNL address for S1-U

If the target only knows Handover Type and not know Direct/Indirect, the target eNB cannot differentiate 2) and 3) and may not assign TNL for Xn-U for 2) or may assign Xn-U for 3), right?For your question “Was the *Direct Forwarding Path Availability IE* added only becauseNG-U and Xn-U addresses may use different IP spaces?” Yes, R3-216096 was added for this purpose. |
| Huawei | Not yet. In order to differentiate 1) and 4), or differentiae 2) and 3), this may have impact on the legacy LTE system, for which there is no issue for a long decade. So we don’t see the need to introduce new mechanisms for LTE.  |
|  |  |

**Moderator summary**

**After the clarification, other companies are fine for the CRs. One company still has concern. The reason is that this may impact LTE. This is to support handover from NR to EN-DC or LTE to EN-DC. It is EN-DC related and for Rel-16. RAN3 already made many changes for LTE specification in order to support EN-DC. Based on this, let to proceed to agree the two CRs.**

**Q2: If you think there are other scenarios that should be considered as well, pls indicate it below.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Direct data forwarding from EN-DC to NR SA HO in Scenario 1 and Scenario 2

NGAP CR is in R3-222488 to support EN-DC to SA handover with Option 3a.

XnAP CR is in R3-222004 to support intra-5GS MR-DC to SA handover with Option 2a

Stage 2 CR in R3-222272 to describe the support of direct data forwarding between EN-DC/MR-DC and SA in 37.340.

**Q3: Any comments on the CRs?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Ericsson | **XnAP:*** Node ID: No need to clarify the scenario in both procedural text and semantics description. Prefer to keep semantics description simple (or even blank, as the IE is self-explanatory).
* Direct path availability: Is semantics description needed? Procedural text is probably enough. In NGAP, there is no semantics description for this IE

**NGAP:*** “as specified in TS37.340” It seems that 37.340 only describes what is supported or not, but not how it is done. Maybe it is better to remove the reference to stage-2 in the procedural text
* It seems that many changes are related to intra-system, when the agreement is to have option 3a for EN-DC to SA handover only
 |
| Samsung | I have updated NGAP CR reflecting E/// and HW’s comments. Also, the procedure text in NGAP CR should be to S1AP for supporting inter-system handover from EN-DC to SA. CR for S1AP has been updated and uploaded to the draft folder.For the Node ID in XnAP CR, yes, it’s better not to have many description, it may be used for other purpose in the future. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Discussion (1st Round)

## TNL address allocation for handover to EN-DC

The operator may configure different IP address spaces for X2-U and Xn-U (e.g. IPv4 for X2-U and IPv6 for Xn-U, or X2-U is deployed on the legacy LTE transport network).

In the following two scenarios, the target eNB and en-gNB should assign corresponding TNL address for direct data forwarding from the source node. E.g. TNL address for X2-U in case A, TNL address for Xn-U in case B.

Case A: LTE to EN-DC

Case B: NR to EN-DC

In [1][2][3], two problems were identified for supporting direct data forwarding for handover in the above two scenarios:

* Problem 1: The target eNB does not know Direct Forwarding Path Availability between the source node and the target eNB. Only the source RAN node and the core network knows direct data forwarding or indirect data forwarding.
* Problem 2: The target SN is not aware of EPS to EPS handover or 5GS to EPS handover. Only the target M-eNB knows such information. The target M-eNB knows the handover is intra-system handover or inter-system based on the Handover Type IE.

To solve the two problems, the proposal is to include

* Direct Forwarding Path Availability IE in the source eNB to the target eNB transparent container.
* Handover Type IE in the X2AP SGNB ADDITION REQUEST message.

With above change, the target eNB and en-gNB could assign corresponding TNL address for direct data forwarding from the source node.

**Q1: Do you agree the proposal?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Samsung | Yes.Otherwise, the target eNB and en-gNB cannot assign corresponding TNL address for direct data forwarding.  |
| Nokia | No.IPv4 and IPv6 can be allocated in parallel and sent in the same TNL address info. Our understanding is that other applications are part of the discussion on the dynamic ACL.[Samsung] From your response, it seems more clarification is needed.This issue is not related with ACL discussion.Similar issue has been discussed for handover to NG-RAN. RAN3 agreed to let the target NG-RAN node (or target CU-UP) to know two information (direct data forwarding or indirect data forwarding, inter-system handover or intra-system handover). The purpose of the two information is to let target NG-RAN node (or target CU-UP) assign corresponding TNL address for data forwarding. The CR was agreed in R3-214450, [R3-216097](file:///E%3A%5C%5C3GPP%20Standardization%5C%5CRAN3%5C%5CRAN3%23114-e%5C%5Cagenda%5C%5CInbox%5C%5CR3-216097.zip), R3-216096. Philippe.G handled the topic. Better to check with Philippe. G. The proposal is to solve the same issue in different scenarios. |
| Huawei | No so far.Our concern is that for the first proposal (to allow the target eNB to differentiate the direct or indirect), the existing eNBs deployment has already its own solutions to tackle this, no need to introduce new solutions for legacy LTE case. [Samsung] Proposal 1 will not impact legacy LTE eNB. The IE will be defined as optional. So if you have a implementation based method, the IE can be ignored.  |
| Qualcomm | FFSIt is not clear why target eNB/en-gNB assign different tunnel for different source (gNB, eNB, PGW). If it is related with ACL as Nokia said, we need to study further and take dynamic ACL discussion into consideration.[Samsung] Pls kindly check our clarification to Nokia. The same issue has been discussed in the “Direct Data Forwarding Between NG-RAN and E-UTRAN: E1 Aspects”. We are trying to cover other scenarios for the same issue. |
| ZTE | Agree with Samsung |
| Ericsson | Yes for the Handover Type. IP address spaces (or sub-network) can be different for intra-system (X2-U) or inter-system even if only IPv4 or only IPv6 is used on both sides.Not sure why the direct forwarding path availability will be needed. Handover type should be sufficient to select the forwarding tunnel endpoint.[Samsung] I would like to clarify why direct forwarding path availability is needed.For intra-system and direct data forwarding, the IP address space for X2-U is used.For inter-system and direct data forwarding, the IP address space for Xn-U is used.For indirect data forwarding, the IP address space for S1-U is used. With the same reason, we agreed the CR in [R3-216097](file:///E%3A%5C%5C3GPP%20Standardization%5C%5CRAN3%5C%5CRAN3%23114-e%5C%5Cagenda%5C%5CInbox%5C%5CR3-216097.zip), R3-216096 for handover to NG-RAN.Hope it is clear. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Moderator Summary:**

**Based on the feedbacks, it seems there are some misunderstanding on the proposal. The proponent made more clarifications. Let’ check in the second round whether companies are fine with the proposal after the clarification.**

**Q2: If the answer to Q1 is yes, any comment on the CR in R3-222299 and R3-222230 [2][3]**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## NR SA to MR-DC connected to 5GC Handover or SN change

The CR for TS38.423 in R3-220674 have been agreed at last RAN3#114bis-e meeting for supporting direct forwarding from NR SA to MR-DC connected to 5GC or during SN change.

It was observed that the new format in 9.2.2.aaa was not needed, since the existing *Global NG-RAN Node ID* IE can be used.

A CR in R3-221976[4] was submitted to replace the agreed CR in R3-220674.

**Q3: Do you agree** **R3-221976 to replace the agreed CR in R3-220674?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Samsung | Yes.  |
| Nokia | Yes |
| Huawei | Yes, thanks Nokia for pointing out this.  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |
| ZTE | Yes |
| Ericsson | Yes |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Moderator Summary:**

**R3-221976 is revised to R3-222607 to remove the change on change.**

**Proposal 1: Agree the CR in R3-222607 to replace the agreed CR in R3-220674.**

## Direct data forwarding from EN-DC to NR SA HO in Scenario 1 and Scenario 2

The following agreements have been made for handover from EN-DC to SA.

EN-DC to NR SA Handover:

direct data forwarding is possible between the source SN and the target NG-RAN node.

The source SN or the target NG-RAN node has information on the direct forwarding path between itself and neighboring nodes

The open question is whether the source SN or the target node decides direct forwarding path availability between the source SN and the target node for handover from EN-DC to SA. There are the following two options:

Option 2a: The source SN decides direct forwarding path availability between the source SN and the target node.

The source MN queries the source SN to get this information. The source MN transmits the information to the SMF. The SMF further transmits the information to the target node.

Option 3a: The target node decides direct forwarding path availability between the source SN and the target node. The target node transmits the information to the source in target node to source node transparent container.

The signaling flow for Option 2a:



Figure 1: The signaling flow for Option 2a:

The signaling flow for Option 3a:



Figure 2: The signaling flow for Option 3a:

**Q4: Is option 2a or option 3a your preferred solution for direct data forwarding from EN-DC to SA NR?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Samsung | Option 3aThere are two benefits of Option 3a:1. The same principle is used for NR SA to EN-DC handover and for EN-DC to NR SA handover i.e. the target node decides direct forwarding path availability with the SN.

The solution for NR SA to EN-DC handover has been agreed. In the agreed solution, the source node sends the source node ID to the target and the target decides direct forwarding path availability between the SN and the source.Option 3a use the same principle, the source node sends the source SN ID to the target and the target node decides direct forwarding path availability with the source SN.1. The benefits of Option 3a is that the existing overall handover signaling flow is not impacted.

While for Option 2a, a new procedure is inserted between Handover Required and Handover Command message. New state machines have to be designed in implementation. Currently, the Source MeNB is waiting for Handover Command message after sending out Handover Required message.The main argument for Option 3a is based on Scenario 3. To support scenario 3, both Option 2a and Option 3a should be enhanced. The current solution as it is cannot work. Technically, there is no blocking point for supporting scenario 3 no matter Option 2a or Option 3a is concluded.To support scenario 3, one solution should be used. In [9], it was proposed to further split scenario 3 to two cases and use more than one solution for scenario 3 which bring additional complexity. If scenario 3 should be supported, both directions i.e. NR SA to EN-DC and EN-DC to NR SA should be supported, not only consider the direction from EN-DC to SA. With above clarification, it could be observed that Option 3a has benefits without drawback. While Option 2a introduce additional procedure in overall handover signaling flow and use different principles for two directions.  |
| CATT | Option 2aNormally, we first discuss scenarios that should be supported and then make decision on solutions for all supported scenarios. Here, we would like to adopt the similar procedure.On the scenarios, we have already agree to support scenario 3 if there is no big specification impact with the existing solutions in last RAN3 meeting. To facilitate the discussion, scenario 3 is further divided into 2 sub-scenarios.Scenario 3a: MN has no direct forwarding while SN has direct forwarding. At the same time, only flows/DRBs terminated in SN node needs to do data forwarding.Scenario 3b: MN has no direct forwarding while SN has direct forwarding. At the same time, flows/DRBs terminated in both MN node and SN node needs to do data forwarding.It is obvious that option 3a could support neither scenario 3a nor scenario 3b unless introduce extra impact to CN node. The impact to spec is significant. What’s more, with current option 3a, if there is no indirect data forwarding path available in core network, data forwarding between source SN and target node could not be supported in option 3a even there is direct path between source SN and target node.Then for option 2a, obviously, in scenario 3a,it could support direct data forwarding between source SN and target node without any extra effort. In scenario 3b,if the source MN and source SN belong to the same vendor, it is still possible to support direct data forwarding between source MN and target node via implementation, i.e. MN could forwards the data to SN via implementation and then SN forward to the target node directly. However, if the source MN and source SN belong to different vendor, then further Xn impact on top of current option 2a is foreseen to support scenario 3b.It depends on the group whether further enhancement on option 2a is acceptable.In summary, the current option 2a could support scenario 1,2,3a in all cases and also scenario 3b by implementation. On the other hand, current option 3a could only support scenario 1 and 2.With that,we propose to adopt option 2a which applied to all scenarios. |
| Nokia | Neutral, either solution is technically feasible. One may note that querying SN before a HO was challenged in other discussions (e.g. in the one on SCG UHI) as delaying the HO. We don’t think it is a problem though, especially that such querying is simple.[CATT]:As we stated in previous discussion, the query on direct data forwarding availability is completely different with query of SN UHI.For query of direct data forwarding availability, it could be implemented after HANDOVER REQUIRED message is sent which would not delay the Ho procedure. While the query of SN UHI has to be done before the HO which may delay the HO procedure.The figure 1 above already provide the signaling flow for option 2a. |
| Huawei | Option 3a. Same view as Samsung. But for option 2, as CATT further explained about the procedure, it seems to us this is new sequence flow. We would rather to stick to the legacy sequence flow (before the handover procedure to query the SN configuration for delta configuration if any need).[CATT]:I could not quite understand the comments here.Of course,if delta configuration is needed,it is natural to query the SN configuration before handover.In this case,there is no extra efforts to query the information on direct data forwarding availability.The signaling flow here is that in case delta configuration is not needed,the query procedure on direct data forwarding availability could be initiated after handover procedure since this information is used only after the source MN receives handover command message.And note the above statement only applied to EN-DC to SA handover.For MR-DC to SA handover,since anyway the source MN needs to query the data forwarding proposal on SN termincated flows/DRB,query of direct data forwarding availability could be realized via the same message.About the potential way forward, see our answer to next question. |
| Qualcomm  | Option 2aAs CATT said, if we consider scenario 3 together, option 2a is a common solution. In option 3a for scenario 3, indirect data forwarding may be established but not used.[Samsung] why indirect data forwarding tunnel will be establishment but not used? |
| ZTE | Agree with Samsung. Prefer a unified solution for NR SA to EN-DC handover and for EN-DC to NR SA. Anyway, there is scenario, e.g. delta config no enabled, option 2a needs to introduce new sequence flow.  |
| Ericsson | Prefer option 3a. But both options are technically feasible. |
| CMCC | Option 2a, we prefer a unified solution for all scenarios, not scenario specific.  |
|  |  |

**Moderator Summary:**

**Four companies support option 3a**

**Three companies support option 2a.**

**1 company is neutral.**

**The view is still split.**

If down selection of the two options cannot be achieved, a possible compromised way forward is as follow:

* For EN-DC to NR SA handover, Option 3a is used.
* For MR-DC connected to 5GC to NR SA handover, Option 2a variant (SgNB modification procedure before handover required message) is used.

The rational for this compromise is based on the existing differences between inter-system handover and intra-system handover.

For inter-system handover from EN-DC to NR SA, SgNB modification procedure between source MeNB and source SgNB is not needed. Because the source MeNB doesn’t need to contact with the source SgNB currently. In order to not increase the handover latency and not impact the overall handover signaling flow, Option 3a is appropriate.

For intra-system handover from MR-DC connected to 5GC to NR SA, SN modification procedure between the source NG-RAN node and source SN may be needed in case of e.g. for getting the Qos flow to DRB mapping for SN terminated bearers or for delta configuration. In the two cases, SN modification procedure before Handover Required message may be needed. So for intra-system handover from MR-DC connected to 5GC to NR SA, option 2a variant could be used.

**Q5: Is this compromise way forward acceptable for your company?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Samsung | Considering the reasons explained above, we can accept the compromised way forward.  |
| CATT | Yes. To make progress, we could accept the compromise |
| Nokia | Strange… The motivation to enable 2a for MR-DC to NR SA is that the MN-initiated modification may still be needed. Fine, but it is not sure. So, if this is the only reason, what if the modification is not needed? [CATT]:It is definitely needed.We have the principle that data forwarding for SN terminated PDU session is decided by SN itself in MR-DC.This is why in 37.340 it is captured that before HO procedure,MN would ask for the data forwarding proposal towards SN via SN modification procedure.So,for MR-DC,if there is SN terminated PDU session for the UE,there would be a SN modification procedure before HO to query on data forwarding related proposal which could be used for query on direct data forwarding availibilty as well.Can the 3a be still used then?I’m don’t think using the MN-initiated modification is a problem, but there has to be a better motivation for agreeing two different solutions to the same problem…[Samsung] For EN-DC to NR SA handover, modification procedure is not needed. There is no such requirement. For Solution 3a, only a new IE in *the source NG-RAN node to target NG-RAN node transparent container* and a new IE in the *target NG-RAN node to source NG-RAN node container* are needed. The existing handover signaling flow is enough (no new procedure or message is inserted in the handover signaling flow).For intra-5GS MR-DC to SA handover, modification procedure is needed in some scenarios e.g. to get the Qos flow to DRB mapping in the SN, for delta configuration. This is the existing difference between EN-DC to SA and intra-5GS MR-DC to SA handover. Based on this existing difference, the compromised solution was proposed. For one scenario, only one solution, not two. i.e.For EN-DC to SA, solution Option 3aFor intra-5GS MR-DC to SA, solution Option 2a. |
| Huawei | Yes, agree with the moderator’s way forward.  |
| Qualcomm | Yes, agree with the compromise and WF. |
| ZTE | Yes |
| Ericsson | This WF looks like the compromise from last meeting, when 2 solutions for the same issue was proposed. As this is not a critical issue (see responses to next question) we prefer not to agree 2 solutions when 1 is sufficient.[Samsung] The compromise at last meeting is to support both solutions i.e. Solution 3a for EN-DC to SA and intra-5GS MR-DC to SA Solution 2a for EN-DC to SA and intra-5GS MR-DC to SA For supporting above, the stage 3 CR to Xn/X2/NG/S1 are needed.The WF proposed by the moderator at this meeting:Solution 3a for EN-DC to SASolution 2a for intra-5GS MR-DC to SATo support this WF in above two scenarios, only CRs to NG and Xn are critical. For one scenario, only one solution, not two |
| CMCC | Yes, agree with the compromise and WF. |

**Moderator Summary:**

**Six companies agree the compromised WF.**

**One company have thought the compromised WF is the same as that for last meeting. Actually the two proposed WFs are different. So the moderator gave more clarifications.**

**1 company will think more.**

**Proposal 2: Agree the compromised WF for MR-DC to NR SA HO in scenario 1 and scenario 2:**

 **- For EN-DC to SA, use option 3a**

 **- For intra-5GS MR-DC to SA, use option 2a**

**Review the CRs in the second round.**

If down selection of the two options cannot be achieved and the compromised way forward is not acceptable for your company, any other idea for moving forward?

**Q6: If down selection of the two options cannot be achieved and the compromised way forward is not acceptable for your company, any other idea for moving forward?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Nokia | This issue is not critical. It is not a problem that blocks Rel.16 implementation, routing via the MN is always possible. So, if RAN3 cannot agree a single solution, this problem shall be suspended until a consensus is reached. |
| Ericsson | Agree with Nokia |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Scenario 3 (MN has no direct forwarding, SN has direct forwarding)

The scenario 3 had been marked with FFS as follows. This is applicable both for EN-DC to NR SA handover, and NR SA to EN-DC handover.

***- Scenario 3 (FFS): MN has no direct forwarding, SN has direct forwarding***

At RAN3#114bis-e meeting, there were the following working assumptions for scenario 3 as below:

WA: Support direct data forwarding from the source NG-RAN node to the target SN in scenario 3. Continue to discuss the solutions. Whether the WA will be changed to the agreement is depending on the specification impact.

WA: Support direct data forwarding from the source SN to the target NG-RAN node in scenario 3. Continue to discuss the solutions. Whether the WA will be changed to the agreement is depending on the specification impact.

### Inter-system handover from NR SA to EN-DC

In inter-system handover from NR SA to EN-DC case, the open point for scenario 3 is the specification impact to support direct data forwarding from the source NG-RAN node to the target en-gNB in the following scenario.

* Source NG-RAN node has no direct data forwarding path with the target eNB
* Source NG-RAN node has direct data forwarding path with the target en-gNB

In this case, the source NG-RAN node should not include the Direct Forwarding Path Availability IE in the NG-AP Handover Required message because direct forwarding path is not available between the source NG-RAN node and the target MeNB. The source NG-RAN node does not know whether the target MeNB will add a secondary node and which SN will be added when Handover Required message is sent. Therefore, the source NG-RAN cannot determine whether it has direct path to the target SN before initiating the handover.

**Observation 1: Source NG-RAN node doesn’t include** **Direct Forwarding Path Availability IE Handover Required message for handover from NR SA to EN-DC in scenario 3.**

The consequence is that it should be the target SN to decide whether direct forwarding path is available between the source NG-RAN node and the target SN (the same as scenario 1 and scenario 2).

**Observation 2: The same as scenario 1 and scenario 2, it should be the target SN to decide whether direct forwarding path is available between the source NG-RAN node and the target SN.**

**Q7: Do you agree with observation 1 and observation 2?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Samsung | Yes.  |
| CATT | Yes |
| Nokia | Yes for Obs.1For Obs.2, it is correct only in case the HO concerns SN-terminated bearers. If there are MN-terminated bearers, the target SN will not be even aware of them and can’t decide (nor can help) any forwarding.[Samsung] You are right. If there is no SN terminated bearers, then we don’t need to consider/discuss whether direct data forwarding path is available between the source and the SN. |
| Huawei | Yes. But we don’t want solutions impacting the CN.  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |
| ZTE | Yes |
| Ericsson | Yes |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Moderator Summary**

**For scenario from NR SA to EN-DC handover in Scenario 3:**

* **Source NG-RAN node doesn’t include Direct Forwarding Path Availability IE Handover Required message for handover from NR SA to EN-DC in scenario 3.**
* **The same as scenario 1 and scenario 2, it should be the target SN to decide whether direct forwarding path is available between the source NG-RAN node and the target SN**

The AMF/SMF/MME doesn’t receive Direct Forwarding Path Availability IE from the source side. Without any additional information, the MME will ask the SGW to assign indirect data forwarding tunnel when the MME receives Handover Request Acknowledge message. The SMF will ask UPF to assign indirect data forwarding tunnel.

So if the target SN decides that direct forwarding path is available between the source NG-RAN node and the target SN, the information should be informed to the MME/SMF. Otherwise, the indirect data forwarding tunnel will be assigned in core network and transmitted to the source NG-RAN node.

**Observation 3: After the target SN decides that direct forwarding path is available between the source NG-RAN node and the target SN, the Direct Forwarding Path Availability information should be informed to MME/SMF from the target side in order to support direct data forwarding from the source NG-RAN node to the target SN.**

**Q7: Do you agree with observation 3?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Samsung | Yes. Otherwise, direct data forwarding from the source NG-RAN node to the target SN cannot be achieved. Because indirect data forwarding tunnel will be assigned by core network node and transmitted to the source NG-RAN node. |
| CATT | Technically it works. However, it depends on whether we would like to support the scenario with the impact to CN. |
| Nokia | No. As discussed above, it addresses a very specific scenario where only SN-terminated bearers are handed over. Obs.3 does not discuss other HO scenarios.[Samsung] We agree with you in general i.e. if scenario 3 needs to be supported, then all cases in scenario 3 should be supported, not only consider one particular case.Observation 3 is also valid for the case if there are both MN terminated bearers and SN terminated bearers. |
| Huawei | Observation is correct. But we don’t want solutions impacting CN for this particular case (as commented by Nokia).  |
| Qualcomm | We also prefer not to impact CN. |
| ZTE | Yes |
| Ericsson | No. Prefer not to support this very specific scenario if CN is impacted |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Moderator Summary:**

**No common understanding on this observation.**

There are two ways for supporting direct forwarding in scenario 3:

Option 1: For MN terminated bearers, indirect data forwarding is used i.e. source NG-RAN node -> UPF-> SGW->target MN.

For SN terminated bearers, direct data forwarding is used i.e. source NG-RAN node -> target en-gNB.

Option 2: For MN terminated bearers, indirect data forwarding is from source NG-RAN node -> target en-gNB -> target MeNB

 For SN terminated bearers, direct data forwarding is used i.e. source NG-RAN node -> target en-gNB.

For SN terminated bearers, there is no difference for the two options. The difference is for MN terminated bearers.

**Q8: which option is reasonable in your understanding?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Samsung | It should be option 1. For MN terminated bearers, it’s strange to forward data from source NG-RAN node to the target SN then to the target MN.If option 2, to support data forwarding from source NG-RAN -> target SN-> target MN, there are additional complexity over X2. E.g. the target MN should send the E-RAB list terminated at the target MN which has been accepted for data forwarding to the target SN to request data forwarding tunnel, then the target SN assigns data forwarding tunnel between source NG-RAN node and target SN for both MN terminated bearers and SN terminated bearers. The target SN sends those data forwarding tunnel information to the target MN.If option 1, the target sends an indicator to the core network for SN terminated bearers. Then core network node could skip to assign indirect data forwarding tunnels. |
| CATT | It seems both of the options could work. If we would like to consider update our spec to further support SA to ENDC/MR-DC scenario, it could be further discussed. |
| Nokia | Opt. 1 seems, at least at the first glance, technically correct.Opt. 2 is technically wrong. As far as we know, data forwarding for MN-terminated bearers can only be done between MNs (i.e. it can’t be done via the SN, which may be released at time). RAN3 would need to accept the general principle that data forwarding can be done via the SN. |
| Huawei | Both options will have impact on the CN. And Option2 will have additional signaling for data forwarding of MN terminated bearers via the SN. So our view is that this scenario 3 in this direction should be dropped.  |
| Qualcomm | Option 2.To support forwarding MN data via SN, we need some X2 signaling enhancement as Samsung said. The SN internal processing (e.g., data forwarding for a E-RAB not terminated in SN) could be up to implementation.Option 2 has no core network impact. Source node can simply indicate direct forwarding path available to CN. |
| ZTE | Option 1 |
| Ericsson | None. Both options have CN impact (because source node does not know if SN will be added by target MeNB, see observation 1). Option 2 has additional impact on legacy data forwarding |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Moderator Summary:**

**No common understanding.**

### Inter-system handover from EN-DC to SA

In inter-system handover from EN-DC to NR SA case, the open point for scenario 3 is the specification impact to support direct data forwarding from the source SN to the target NG-RAN node in the following scenario.

* Source eNB has no direct data forwarding path with the target NG-RAN node
* Source en-gNB has direct data forwarding path with the target NG-RAN node

It’s better to use the same principle for scenario 3 as scenario 1 and scenario 2. The specification impact can be evaluated after the solution for scenario 1 and scenario 2 is concluded in 3.3. Therefore, the moderator propose to evaluate the specification impact for scenario 3 after the solution for scenario 1 and scenario 2 are concluded in phase 1.

# Conclusion, Recommendations [if needed]

If needed
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