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# Introduction

The discussion handles:

|  |
| --- |
| * [Post112-e][066][eIAB] Topology Adaptation (QC)   Scope: Starting from previous outcomes, centred around the identified / agreed issues, find an agreeable mapping of candidate solution and issue, and analysis of the candidate solution for the issue (e.g. Effectiveness, Gains, Drawbacks). Details also as proposed in [Post112-e][030]. Include at least/Prioritize CHO, type-2/3 RLF indications, local rerouting (and the potential alternatives to those, if any). Intermediate deadlines by Rapporteur.  Intended outcome: Report, collect individual input, in a uniform “format”, and centred around issues, pave the way for meeting discussion and agreement.  Deadline: Long |

The email discussion has two parts.

* **Part 1:** technical discussion on problems/issues that need to be solved, potential enhancements that address these issues, and assessment of efficacy and shortcomings of these enhancements.

**Deadline: December 23rd, 23:59 UTC**.

* **Part 2:** deriving concrete proposals from the technical discussion.

**Deadline: January 12th 11:00 UTC.**

As a reminder, the following agreements have been achieved in TSG RAN2 Meeting #112e:

|  |
| --- |
| * Consider enhancements to topology adaptation that improve:   + Robustness, e.g., to rapid shadowing,   + service-interruption,   + load balancing among different IAB-nodes, IAB-donor-DUs and IAB-donor-CUs, and   + reduction in signaling load. * RAN2 to discuss enhancements to RLF indication/handling with the focus on the reduction of service interruption after BH RLF. * CHO and potential IAB-specific enhancements of CHO is on the table. * DAPS and potential IAB-specific enhancements of DAPS is not precluded for now (but as there is no PDCP it is not clear how to support DAPS). * For message bundling, RAN2 at least wait for more progress to be made in RAN3 on topology adaptation procedures. * RAN2 to discuss local rerouting, including the benefits over central route determination, and on how topology-wide objectives can be addressed. |

# Phase I: Identification of issues and associated solutions

We consider the following topics with high priority:

* CHO
* Type 2/3 RLF indication
* Local rerouting

Other topics can be discussed with lower priority.

For the first three and potentially further topics, a variety of enhancements has already been discussed before. Further enhancements may be proposed in this discussion. For each enhancement, we want to understand:

1. *What is the technical problem/issue the enhancement aims to resolve?*
2. *How does the enhancement address this issue?*
3. *Assessment of the enhancement with respect to the problem:* 
   1. *How effective is the enhancement in addressing the problem?*
   2. *What are the shortcomings of the enhancement?*
   3. *Are there alternative ways to solve the problem, and how would they work?*
   4. *How much better is the proposed enhancement over these alternatives?*

There may be multiple enhancements proposed for each of the above topics, which need to be separately analyzed.

**Note: This is a technical discussion. There will be no poll. One view may overrule all others, e.g., if it identifies a significant technical problem, or if it provides an elegant solution to an issue considered too complex by everybody else.**

## 2.1 CHO

Rel-16 CHO represents an alternative procedure to Rel-15 Xn-handover and Rel-15 RRC-reestablishment procedures. For IAB, the corresponding *inter-donor* Xn handover and *inter-donor* RRC reestablishment procedures are still under discussion in RAN3. Until RAN3 has made further progress, RAN2 can discuss CHO for *intra*-*donor* IAB-node migration.

Based on prior discussion, there seems to be the notion that Rel-16 CHO can be readily applied to the IAB-MT. It is not clear, however, how Rel-16 CHO would work in conjunction with Rel-16 IAB-node migration, which involves more than the migration of the IAB-MT.

For that reason, the rapporteur proposes the following baseline for IAB CHO, which does *not* require any new signaling messages or IEs. This baseline also addresses concerns raised during prior email discussions on the principal benefits of CHO over RRC reestablishment for IAB.

**Baseline CHO for intra-donor IAB-node migration:**

1) Problem/issue to be addressed: The CU-controlled IAB-node migration procedure may fail when the IAB-MT’s radio link deteriorates very quickly. RLF recovery via RRC Reestablishment is available, but it has rather long interruption time. These problems have been identified for access links in Rel-16, and they equally apply to backhaul links.

2) Enhancement: Combine Rel-16 CHO for IAB-MT with Rel-16 IAB-node migration using off-the-shelf signaling procedures and IEs, in the following manner:

* The IAB-donor performs early preparation of candidate cells on the target IAB-DU for the IAB-MT using the signaling defined for Rel-16 intra-donor IAB-node migration together with CHO-related IEs.
* The IAB-MT is configured with CHO for the target IAB-DU cell including the IAB-related information defined for Rel-16 IAB-node migration as well as all trigger information defined for Rel-16 CHO.
* The IAB-MT’s CHO execution follows the same procedure as defined in Rel-16.
* Configuration of BAP routing, BH RLC channels and DL mapping on the target path to the candidate IAB-DU may occur at the same time as the early preparation of the candidate cells. This is up to CU implementation.
* Migration of UEs and descendent nodes occurs *after* CHO completion as defined for Rel-16 intra-donor IAB-node migration and Rel-16 intra-donor RLF recovery.

3) Assessment of enhancement:

1. Efficacy of enhancement: The interruption time improvement for the BH link is the same as for an access link. The configuration of the backhaul on the target path can be performed early and will not add to the interruption time. Migration of descendent nodes after CHO completion will consume the same time as for Rel-16 IAB-node migration and RLF recovery.
2. Shortcomings: During early preparation, the target DU usually performs reserves resources. For BH, this means that a lot of resources may need to be reserved for BH RLC channels even though BH RLF is a rare event.
3. Alternative solution: RLF recovery via RRC Reestablishment.
4. Delta over alternative solution: Same relative improvement as for access link.

**Q1: Please identify potential problems/issues with this baseline, propose potential enhancements and assess efficacy/shortcomings of these enhancements with respect to the problem/issue identified.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **Qualcomm** | 1. Problem: During early preparation, the target DU usually reserves resources for the UE. For IAB, this implies that a lot of resources may need to be reserved for BH RLC channels even though BH RLF is a rare event.  2. Enhancement: The target-DU may waive resource reservation for CHO-based preparation.  3. Assessment:   1. Efficacy of enhancement: Addresses the problem. 2. Shortcomings: There may be no resources available when the CHO is executed. This situation, however, is the same when Rel-16 RRC Reestablishment is used instead of CHO. Further, this shortcoming was never considered a serious problem for BH RLF recovery via RRC Reestablishment. 3. Alternative solution: None 4. Delta over altnerative solution: N/A. |
| **Kyocera** | 1. Problem: During the BH RLF at the parent IAB-node (including BH RLF detection, recovering and recovery failure), CHO cannot be triggered at the concerned IAB-node (i.e., child) since CHO Events A3/A5 do not work due to the radio condition between the concerned IAB-node and the parent is still good. In addition, when BH RLF Indication (i.e., Type 4) is received, CHO is still not triggered unless the IAB-node selects a CHO candidate cell.  2. Enhancement: The IAB-node triggers CHO execution when it receives BH RLF Indication (Type 4). FFS if Type 2 in section 2.2 below, if introduced.  3. Assessment:  a) Efficiency of enhancements: Addresses the problem.  b) Shortcomings: There is no shortcoming observed; it’s no harm for the IAB-MT to be handed over to a different cell by CHO, since the IAB-MT will anyway initiate RRC Reestablishment when it receives Type 4 BH RLF Indication, if CHO is not configured. In case Type 2 BH RLF Indication is considered for CHO triggering, we think it needs careful consideration in terms of too aggressive recovery and/or the relationship with local rerouting triggering (if introduced).  c) Alternative solution: RRC Reestablishment  d) Delta over alternative solutions: The donor-controlled BH RLF recovery is provided, e.g., the target cell(s) is deterministic. Also, the interruption time is minimized due to the skip of cell selection process and the prepared resources for CHO as identified in the rapporteur’s summary above. |
| **CATT** | 1.Problem: The UEs and descendant nodes need to perform Rel-16 RLF recovery after CHO completion of the migration node which lead to interruption between migration node and its child nodes. Therefore, service interruption cannot be avoided even though CHO for the migration IAB-node is introduced.  2. Enhancement：Early preparation for descendant IAB-nodes can be considered combined with CHO for the migration IAB node.  3.Assessment：  a) Efficiency of enhancements: Addresses the problem  b) Shortcomings: Resource reservation for child nodes associated with reserved CHO resource for IAB node is considerable.  c) Alternative solution: Child nodes perform RRC Reestablishment procedure after RLF.  d) Delta over alternative solutions: the interruption time is minimized. |
| **Ericsson** | **1. Problem:** RAN2 did not introduce any restriction in Rel.16 to the use of CHO for IAB. According to RRC specification, it is possible to configure an IAB node with CHO, and such node can trigger a CHO upon incurring an RLF and also upon receiving a BH RLF indication from the parent node.  CHO was not introduced in Rel.16 to handle RLF recovery, rather to make the handover more robust. In fact, CHO relies on reserving resources in multiple targets for all the time until the handover is executed by the UE. Since the IAB node is not moving and the only problem that can occur is an RLF, that would imply that the target node would need to keep resources reserved for undefined amount of time, given that the RLF is an unpredictable event. This would then imply a tremendous amount of resource wastage and extra network capacity that an operator would need to plan for.  If it is assumed that the resource reservation may be waived as hinted by QC, then it is not clear how the CHO procedure would work. CHO in fact implies that the UE sends an RRCReconfigurationComplete to the target, not an RRCReestablishmentRequest. If the target has not reserved resources for it how can that work? The IAB node would attach to the target, even though the target has not really admitted yet this IAB node. So the target might eventually release the IAB node, or handover it again. Additionally, the target does not know anything about the IAB node contexts as well as the contexts of the other served IAB nodes and UEs. The context would need to be fetched from the source. So what would be the advantage in the interruption time? What would be the advantage in terms of reduced signaling?  **2. Enhancement: RLF recovery via enhanced RRC Reestablishment (early context fetch)**  The source needs to early prepare the target and inform the target about the UEs/IABs contexts that may be involved in the migration. In this way, at least the target does not need to fetch all the contexts from the source. The IAB node upon selecting this target node for reestablishment, it sends an RRCReestablishmentRequest (not RRCReconfigurationComplete as for CHO). That allows the target to determine whether this IAB node can be admitted or not.  **3. Assessment:**   1. **Efficacy of enhancement:** Reduced interruption time for context fetch, and hence for reestablishment. No need for overdimensioning the capacity of target CU and overprovisioning radio resources, as CHO would imply. 2. **Shortcomings:** Needs potential high amount of signaling to fetch the context and update it. Note however, that such signaling is present also in the CHO-based solution 3. **Delta over CHO:** No need for resource reservation, and overdimensioning target capacity and resources. If resource reservation is assumed to be waived, the CHO solution implies that the IAB node connects to the target CU without being really admitted, since the IAB node sends RRCReconfigurationComplete when CHO is triggered. This can be avoided with the proposed solution. |
| **Samsung** | **We assume rapporteur suggest to use the genuine RRC based CHO procedure where there is no preconfiguration on DU related configurations (which was done via F1AP signaling in legacy). Based on this assumption, We agree with rapporteur in most of aspects of baseline CHO.**  **BTW, even preparation may involve large resource reservation at the target DU for BH RLC channels, we think that the resource occupancy situation could be different for each DU. The DU near leaf node would have less resource occupancy while ones near donor node might have congested. Therefore we don’t need to block CHO in IAB but at least applying CHO could be upto DU’s decision.**  **Regarding Ericsson’s proposal, we think this is almost same as legacy RRCReestablishment procedure except context fetch. Even with context fetch, as rapporteur commented, still Du might not admit the migrating IAB node due to the required resource amount. The case using CHO also can handle the not admitting case by RRCrelease or HO command after CHO complete msg (i.e., RRCReconfigurationComplete).** |
| **Intel** | 1. Problem: Reserved resource increased as the number of prepared candidate target IAB node increases for this RLF IAB node and its descendant child IAB nodes/UEs;  2. Enhancement: Early prepare candidate target IAB node configuration in source IAB node; The candidate target IAB node may also not reserve all resources for CHO-based preparation;  3. Assessment:     a) Efficiency of enhancement: Address the problem;     b) Shortcomings: As mentioned by QC, there might be no resource available during migration from target node. However, considering RLF is a rare event, this may not be a severe issue;     c) Alternative solutions: N/A     d) Delta over alternative solutions: N/A |
| **Huawei** | **1. General:**  We agree the intra-donor case could be a good starting point. But, the design should have the compatibility to inter-donor case.  We’d better not to jump into a rush conclusion on “which does not require any new signaling messages or IEs”.  **2. Enhancement:**  In the solution, we need to clarify if multiple IAB-MT can be configured with CHO in the same CU.  If the IAB specific configuration at the target path is configured as early preparation, do we assume the whole topology of this IAB-MT (together with its descendant IAB-node and UEs) has to migrate upon CHO triggered? With no clear expectation of the target topology, CU may not be able to configure the BAP routing, etc. So, we need further discuss on the IAB specific configuration later. This is related to the “Migration of UEs and descendent nodes occurs *after* CHO completion”. We are not ready to agree on the enhancement itself, but fine to discuss the issue/behaviors of descendant node/UE in details. Also, CU implementation could handover the descendant node/UE before IAB-MT performing CHO.  **3. Assessment:**  For “a lot of resources may need to be reserved for BH RLC channels”, we need to clarify that the so-called “reserved” is only some configuration, rather than some radio resource. |
| **LG** | 1. Problem: In IAB network, unnecessary topology adaptation should be minimized. For this reason, it is expected that stringent CHO execution conditions would be configured to the IAB nodes. Such stringent CHO execution conditions would make execution of configured CHO more difficult. If CHO is used for a fast recovery from RLF as already supported in Rel-16, the IAB MT may end up with sending a RRC re-establishment request without triggering CHO to a candidate cell. As a consequence, CHO candidate cells may remain unused, which makes CHO less attractive in IAB networks.  2. Enhancement: Triggering of CHO upon RLF is made easier. For instance, the IAB MT is allowed to execute CHO if the candidate cell meets a relaxed criterion.  3. Assessment:   1. Efficacy of enhancement: Addresses the problem. 2. Shortcomings: To make this enhancements work, resource reservation issue in CHO should be addressed together, e.g. by delayed preparation of resources for CHO as suggested by QC.  On the other hand, we understand the concern from Ericsson that it is not clear how the target nodes would determine the handover configuration to be sent to the UE within CHO configuration, without executing actual preparation. To address the concern, the target node may decide to provide a *conservative* target cell configuration resulting from some admission control policy based on conservative assumption on the available resources for the moment of CHO execution. 3. Alternative solution: RRC Re-establishment 4. Delta over altnerative solution: N/A. |
| **Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell** | 1. Problem: In our view there is no evident problem identified with the CHO baseline. Some (same) probability of a failure is equally possible for regular case (not for IAB). RLF indication from the parent being the CHO trigger seems to be already possible with current specification (see also [AT112-e][031][eIAB] Topology Adaptation). 2. The advance reservations (or skipping the reservations) of resources for the target path can be **left for implementation**. 3. Assessment: 4. Efficacy of enhancement: Addresses the problem by implementation. 5. Shortcomings: N/A. 6. Alternative solution: IAB-tailored requirements. 7. Delta over alternative solution: Ease implementation by not putting IAB specific requirements towards available standardized solutions |
| **ZTE** | **1. Problem: whether to reserve resources for the BH RLC channels of the migration IAB node MT. We think it can be up to target IAB DU’s implementation. Target IAB DU may at least pre-configure the BH RLC channels with non GBR QoS requirements. For the BH RLC channels with GBR QoS requirement, target IAB DU may not accept all of them if they require a large data volume. For the intra-donor CU migration, the donor CU has full knowledge of the QoS requirement of the BH RLC channels/UE DRBs of the migration IAB node, descendant IAB nodes and UEs, it can also reconfigure the BH RLC channels after the migration IAB node completes the CHO procedure. Nevertheless, it is not necessary to explicitly prohibit the target IAB DU to reserve resource for the BH RLC channels of the migration IAB node during CHO.**  **2. Problem: whether and how to trigger the CHO for descendant IAB node and UEs.**  **Since donor CU does not which IAB node may suffer channel deterioration in advance, donor CU may prepare the CHO configuration for both migration IAB node and descendant IAB nodes. The CHO configuration may contain the target cells from either migration IAB DU or other IAB DU.**  **If the migration IAB node perform intra-donor-DU HO, the descendant IAB node and UE could keep the connection with migration IAB node without triggering CHO. Donor CU only need to reconfigure the BH RLC channels and BAP routing entries for descendant IAB node after migration IAB node completes the CHO.**  **On the other hand, if the migration IAB node perform inter-donor-DU HO, the descendant node need to be configured with default BH RLC channel, default BAP routing ID, and new IP address from the new donor DU. These configurations could be delivered to descendant IAB nodes after the migration IAB node completes the CHO. Alternatively, these configuration may be delivered to descendant IAB nodes as part of the CHO configuration. However, how to trigger the CHO of descendant IAB node in this scenario should be considered since the channel condition between descendant IAB node and migration node does not deteriorate, for example, the migration IAB node may send indication to descendant IAB node to trigger the CHO.** |

## 2.2 RLF indication/handling

RAN2 agreed to discuss enhancements to RLF indication/handling with the focus on the reduction of service interruption after BH RLF. In prior email discussions, many companies shared the view that type 2/3 RLF indications could reduce service interruption after BH RLF. As a reminder, these indications are defined as:

**Type 2 – “Trying to recover”:** Indication that BH link RLF is detected, and the child IAB-node is attempting to recover from it.

**Type 3 – “BH link recovered”:** Indication that the BH link successfully recovers from RLF.

The following behaviors to type-2 RLF indication were proposed:

* Local rerouting to alternative paths (this will be discussed here, not in local rerouting section),
* Early RLF reestablishment,
* Early measurement of neighboring cells for potential re-establishment
* Trigger of CHO execution (this will be discussed here, not in CHO section)
* Discontinuation/reduction of UL scheduling requests

The prior discussions did not emphasize on the problems/issues the type-2 RLF indication together with any of these behaviors would address, how effective the solution would be and what shortcomings it might have.

The following questions aims to illuminate these aspects for the solutions already proposed. Companies can discuss additional problem/solution scenarios with proper assessment.

**Q2: Please specify potential problems/issues associated with Rel-16 RLF indication (type-4), the potential enhancements to address each of these problems/issues and assess the efficacy/shortcomings of these enhancements with respect to the problem/issue identified.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm 1 | 1) Problem: In Rel-16 IAB, lower tier IAB-nodes underneath an BH RLF point cannot select an alternative UL path they might have since they do not know about the upstream BH RLF.  2) Enhancement: Type 2 indication is used to trigger local rerouting to redundant paths available. The type-2 indication is immediately propagated downstream upon reception so that all descendant nodes can quickly switch to alternative paths.  3) Assessment:   1. Efficacy of solution: Very high since redundant paths can be used to keep BH running. Also, the CU can perform controlled topology adaptation of descendant nodes which is faster than autonomous RLF recovery. 2. Shortcomings of solution: Nothing obvious. 3. Alternative solution: IAB-DU *above* the BH RLF point informs the CU about the RLF. In response, the CU uses the redundant paths to lower tier nodes underneath the RLF point to reconfigure the BH routes. 4. Delta over alternative solution: Both solutions accomplish the same. Type 2 indication may be faster. |
| Qualcomm 2 | 1) Problem: Lower tier IAB-nodes underneath BH RLF point could perform RRC reestablishment as soon as BH RLF has been declared and therefore quickly regain backhaul connectivity, but they do not learn about the BH RLF failure since type-4 indication propagates very slowly.  2) Enhancement: Type 2 indication is used to trigger RRC Reestablishment.  3) Assessment:   1. Efficacy of solution: In case the IAB-node would have to eventually perform RLF recovery, such recovery can be triggered must faster via type-2 than type-4 indication. This implies that the indication is quickly propagated hop-by-hop. 2. Shortcomings of solution: The solution may cause uncontrolled, catastrophic behavior if type-2 indication is flooded across the subtree since all nodes simultaneously try to recover. This may have adverse effects on recovery time. Also, type-3 and type-4 indications would be ineffective since all nodes have already disconnected from their former parents after reception of type-2 indication. 3. Alternative solution: Keep Rel-16 solution based on type-4 indication. 4. Delta over alternative solution: Type-4-triggered RRC Reestablishment is better behaved and should not be replaced by type-2 RRC Reestablishment. |
| Qualcomm 3 | 1) Problem: The IAB-node recovering via RRC Reestablishment may select a former descendent node as the new parent. This should be avoided if the former descendant node does not have BH connectivity, e.g., via an alternative path.  2) Enhancement: The receiving node of type-2 indication mutes IAB-supported indicator in SIB1. To be effective, type-2 indication needs to be immediately forwarded upon reception.  3) Assessment:   1. Efficacy of solution: Works perfectly. 2. Shortcomings of solution: Nothing obvious. 3. Alternative solution: Solutions have been proposed, where the recovering node has detailed topology information of the subtree and can therefore proactively avoid connection attempts at the former descendent. Alternatively, future target cells are preconfigured for each node via CHO. 4. Delta over alternative solution: The alternative solutions are much more complex. The CHO-based solution has several shortcomings. |
| **Kyocera 1** | 1) Problem: During the BH RLF at the parent IAB-node (including BH RLF detection and recovering, i.e., before Type 4 BH RLF Indication), the upstream data cannot reach the donor, i.e., the parent may not send UL grant by flow control or even if the IAB-node (i.e., child) is allowed to transmit, the parent cannot forward the data anyway. The IAB-node cannot perform the local rerouting since it’s not its BH RLF, i.e., the parent’s BH RLF.  2) Enhancement: The IAB-node triggers the local rerouting when it receives Type 2 BH RLF Indication.  3) Assessment:   1. Efficacy of solution: Addresses the problem, if the alternative route is available. 2. Shortcomings of solution: There is no shortcoming observed. We think, however, RAN2 should discuss the overall pictures on relationship of flow control, local rerouting and CHO/RRC Reestablishment, if any. 3. Alternative solution: RRC Reestablishment or CHO triggered by Type 2 BH RLF Indication. 4. Delta over alternative solution: The interruption time can be minimized since the local rerouting is expected to be faster than the alternative solutions. |
| **Kyocera 2** | 1) Problem: During the BH RLF at the parent IAB-node (including BH RLF detection and recovering, i.e., before Type 4 BH RLF Indication), the parent does not send UL grant by flow control. The IAB-node may nevertheless continue sending the scheduling requests, which causes interference.  2) Enhancement: The IAB-node avoids sending SR after it receives Type 2 BH RLF Indication.  3) Assessment:   1. Efficacy of solution: Addresses the problem. 2. Alternative solution: Maybe nothing. 3. Delta over alternative solution: Void. |
| **Ericsson** | 1. **Problem:** Child IAB node is not aware that the parent IAB node has declared RLF or that it is has recovered from an RLF. 2. **Enhancement:** Enabling a parent node to transmit a type-2/type-3 RLF indication to the child. No need to specify child actions. 3. **Assessment:**    1. **Efficacy of solution:** The only thing the child MTs should do is to avoid transmitting data and stop the L2-related timers for retransmissions or discarding data, or triggering failures. This will avoid overflooding of buffers and, in the worst case, losing data if an RLF is really declared. This functionality can be left to the IAB node implementation.    2. **Shortcomings:** No specific drawback, at least if the child actions are left unspecified.   We note however that other actions such as local re-routing, triggering CHO, or RLF triggering are not justified for type-2 for instance. Such actions may end up in ping-pong situations and massive signaling load, for example in case a BH RLF type is then generated. RAN2 needs to remember that IABs carry the load of many UEs, so any massive move of this load will create a huge impact in the network. |
| **Samsung** | 1. Local rerouting : we have the same view with QC1  2. early RRC reestablishment: we have the same view with QC2  3. -Early measurement of neighboring cells for potential re-establishment  1) shortcomings or merit of the solution: since measurement is unclear, the assessment can be different by the definition of measurement. As we understand, upon receiving type 2 indication, MT will do some early measurement. However there is no information on how this measurement can be configured. For example, which measurement object and reportConfig combination is used. If the early measurement in this solution simply means cell selection, then this can have the merit to have less interruptoin time due to omitting cell selection when RLF recovery at parent node is finally failed.  4. trigger of CHO execution  1) operation: if child node receives type 2 indication and there is no available link with other parent node, then there would be no network controlled mobility possible except CHO-like one since RRC msg is not guaranteed to be delivered through this serving cell. We think UE-based mobility i.e., RRC Re-establishment is suboptimal since there is no topology information considered and no consideration of the degree of resource reservation availability in cell selection procedure as the initial step of RRC Re-establishment procedure. Compared to this, CU always can indicate the optimal target cell by considering radio link status and load status through CHO preparation procedure. Moreover CHO obviously has less service interruption time than RRC reestablishment. |
| Intel | 1. Problem: During the BH RLF of the parent IAB node, other IAB nodes except its immediate child nodes have no visibility of the scenario of RLF it is experiencing. They may try to access this parent IAB node, leading to failure accessing to IAB network.  2. Enhancement: a. the failed IAB node modifies system information to bar access to new IAB nodes or UEs; b. the RLF indication (Type2) also includes information about ancestor nodes that have failed  3. Assessment:  a) Efficacy of solution: address the problem and reduce failure of RRC reestablishment or handover  b) Alternative solution: Type 4 RLF indication includes failed ancestor nodes information and bar access to new IAB nodes or UE after receiving radio link failure recover fail  c) Delta over alternative solution: with alternative solution, the child IAB node or UE may waste resource to prepare/measure the path to IAB node experiencing RLF (recovering or failed to recover) |
| **Huawei** | **1. General**  We should have some consensus on the child behaviors (at least one agreeable behavior) before we agree to introduce the indications.  **2. Enhancement**  “Early RLF reestablishment” is implementation.  “Early measurement of neighboring cells for potential re-establishment” is implementation and is already allowed now.  “Discontinuation/reduction of UL scheduling requests” this is parent IAB-DU implementation, since BSR/SR from child node does not cause much efforts/bad consequence. |
| **LG** | 1) Problem: Current BH RLF indication is too slow. The child nodes below the failed point cannot take any proactive actions such as re-routing or parent rreselction until such a late indication is finally received. Consequently, there is a long interruption. Such bad news should spread much earlier.  2) Enhancement:  Type2 indication is used to inform the child nodes upon the BH failure detected by the parent.  Type3 indication is used to inform the child nodes upon the recovery from BH failure.  Regarding the behavior of nodes receiving type2 indication:   * For child MTs configured with DC, the reception of the indication clearly motivates re-routing of upstream from the problematic path to another path. There is no gain from not doing that. For this reason, it would be good to specify this behavior for receiving nodes configured with DC. * For child nodes with a single connectivity, upon reception of the indication, however, we do not think that triggering of a parent reselection via early re-establishment or CHO would be always beneficial. In case the parent BH recovery fails, such an early parent reselection by child MT(s) is considered beneficial. However, if this is another case where the parent’s BH happens to get recovered quickly via, e.g. CHO, such an early parent reselection is in fact no better than doing nothing in terms of signaling as well as interruption. 2. Given these observations, we think it is not desirable to specify a single behavior for all these variations. Instead, it would be better to define the behavior by network control, i.e. donor should be able to configure the behavior on the reception of the indication. Whether this control should be made visible in specification or not requires another discussion. Regarding how fast or how far the indication should propagate from the origin: * We think topological stability should be considered important. For more stable topology, it would be good to localize the impact of the BH failure to the close neighbor nodes so that the other topological not close to the failed BH remain unchanged, whenever possible. To this end, the propagation of the type2/3 indication may need to be restricted to local children nodes, rather than far deeper nodes. For instance, the type2 indication propagates only one hop from the origin. This restriction would also help the child nodes easily avoid making a loop path towards the failed BH, since the failed point is already visible to the child nodes. Along this, we do not think muting IAB support indicator in SIB1 is not essential.   Regarding the behavior of nodes receiving type3 indication:   * For child MTs configured with DC, the reception of the indication clearly motivates reverting back to the original path. * For child nodes with a single connectivity, whether there is any gain with this indication is largenly dependen on the behavior upon reception of type2 indication. If type2 indication has already resulted in reselection of a parent by a child node, there is no point of sending this indication, because the previous child is not a ‘child’ any longer. Else if a child node is still connected to the original parent, the reception of the indication by the child node may stop on-going action for parent reselection such as CHO evaluation.   3) Assessment:   * Efficacy: Address the problem * Shortcoming: not clear as long as the receiving node’s behavior is controlled. * Alternative solution:   + Instead of type2 indication, IAB-DU above the BH RLF point can inform the CU about the RLF, but the CU may not be able to reach the child nodes of the IAB node(MT) that has detected the BH RLF in case the child nodes have a single connectivity toward the IAB node (parent). And this alternative solution is much slower.   + Instead of type3 indication, after the recovery of the BH failurem, IAB-CU can issue command for reverting back to the original path or for suspending proactive parent resleection-related actions, to the concerned nodes. However, this is much slower. |
| **Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell** | **1) Problem:**Rel-16 RLF indication is only sent to child nodes. See details in 2.3 |
| **ZTE** | 1) Problem: It is possible that the CU is not informed about the BH RLF from the IAB-DU *above* the BH RLF point timely. So the donor CU may not update the BH routing configuration at donor DU and thus a lot of downstream data packet may be buffered at the IAB-DU above the BH RLF point.  2) Enhancement: Upon reception of Type 2 indication in a link, the dual-connected IAB-node can report this type of indication through another available link.  3) Assessment:   1. Efficacy of solution: Address the problem. 2. Shortcomings of solution: None. 3. Alternative solution: The CU is informed about the BH RLF from the IAB-DU *above* the BH RLF point. 4. Delta over alternative solution: Type-2 indication based RLF report is more quickly to keep CU informed of the BH RLF. |

## 2.3 Local rerouting

Rel-16 supports local rerouting by the IAB-node in the case of BH RLF. R2#112e agreed to discuss local rerouting, including the benefits over central route determination, and on how topology-wide objectives can be addressed.

In prior email discussions, many companies felt that conditions for local rerouting should be relaxed. Not much progress was made on converging on the scenarios where local rerouting would be beneficial.

The following question aims to identify specific problem scenarios for Rel-16 route selection.

**Q3: Please specify problem scenarios for Rel-16 route selection, elaborate on conditions for local route selection that could address these issues, assess efficacy and shortcoming of the solution, and consider potential alternative. Please also discuss how the node can ensure that the locally selected route has no downstream problems.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | 1) Problem: The egress link of the configure route has high load while alternative routes to the same destination have much lower load (note that this is different from congestion as it may already apply before congestion occurs).  2) Enhancement: The node is allowed to select an alternative link based on the relative load difference between configured route and alternative route. The trigger conditions and the alternative routes may be configured by CU-CP.  3) Assessment:   1. Efficacy: The solution balances the load on the local node. This is certainly helpful if there is only one more BH hop underneath. 2. Shortcomings of enhancement: It is not clear how the local node knows about downstream route conditions. Therefore, the CU-CP should be able to restrict local route selection to a subset of routes where the necessary conditions can be met. 3. Alternative solution: The CU-CP itself reconfigures routes based on load reports. 4. Delta over alternative solution: Small. The CU-CP based reconfiguration may be a little slower, but it may also make better decisions since it has visibility of the available capacity/load on the alternative paths. |
| **Kyocera** | 1) Problem: The IAB-donor is expected to have the topology-wide knowledge, e.g., congestion on a route, and may want to switch a route to an alternative path temporary, or vice versa. Rel-16 mechanism involves a lot of signalling including F1-AP messaging, just for a routing configuration update.  2) Enhancement: The IAB-donor can instruct an IAB-node whether to do the local rerouting.  3) Assessment:   1. Efficacy of solution: Addresses the problem. 2. Alternative solution: Full routing configuration update as in Rel-16. 3. Delta over alternative solution: Signalling load reduction and faster load balancing are expected since the routing configuration does not need to be updated for performing the local rerouting, if alternative path(s) is already included. |
| **CATT** | 1.Problem: R16 IAB-network only consider long-term congestion reduction. When current route is congested, IAB-node can’t switch to available alternative route by local rerouting.  2.Enhancement：R17 IAB support local rerouting triggered by HBH flow control feedback.  3.Assessment：  a) Efficiency of enhancements: Addresses the problem.  b) Shortcomings: It's not globally optimal.  c) Alternative solution: IAB rerouting by the donor CU reconfiguration signaling.  d) Delta over alternative solutions: Improve load balance and resource efficiency in a semi-dynamic and timely way. |
| **Ericsson** | 1. **Problem:** Egress link is becoming congested or IAB node receives a packet with an unknown BAP routing ID (this can happen in case the child has done local rerouting upon RLF declaration in one link) 2. **Enhancement:** The CU configures the IAB node with a signaling that configures the IAB node with rules to perform local routing. RAN2 should discuss such rules, e.g. congestion-based rules.  The CU also configures the rules for selecting an alternative link towards the same destination, e.g. on the basis of radio conditions. 3. **Assessment:**     1. Efficacy: More timely load balancing decision    2. Shortcomings: Decentralizing the routing decision will reduce the ability of the CU to take more accurate decisions when an overload situation occurs. A centralized solution allows to better control the load and configure the network in a way that it can commit to the QoS requirements of the traffic carried by the network. |
| Samsung | SCENARIO #1  1) Problem: The egress link of the configured route has high delay (incurred e.g. by high load and/or poor radio conditions and/or congestion further down the line) while alternative routes to the same destination have lower delay.  2) Enhancement: The node is allowed to select an alternative link based on the relative delay difference between configured route and alternative route, possibly based on a pre-configured threshold linked to PDB (e.g. remaining PDB, or discard PDB). A node may decide which of the allowed routes traffic should take based on delay incurred thus far. For instance, a packet may come with an expiry time on BAP layer, and/or with a number of hops it needs to traverse to a destination. Alternatively, such PDB-related parameters may be configured by the CU.  3) Assessment:   1. Efficacy: The solutions helps meet the required PDB. 2. Shortcomings of enhancement: Over time a deviation may emerge from CU-configured paths. To avoid this feedback is needed from intermediate nodes. 3. Alternative solution: The CU itself reconfigures routes based on reports from IAB nodes. 4. Delta over alternative solution: Significant. The delay incurred by CU-based reconfiguration may have a detrimental impact especially for latency-critical services. Additionally, CU may not have immediate/up-to-date visibility of local radio links and any congestion beginning to form as well as status of local buffers.   SCENARIO #2 [items 1) and 2) same as for input from QC, but our assessment differs]  1) Problem: The egress link of the configured route has high load while alternative routes to the same destination have much lower load (note that this is different from congestion as it may already apply before congestion occurs).  2) Enhancement: The node is allowed to select an alternative link based on the relative load difference between configured route and alternative route. The trigger conditions and the alternative routes may be configured by CU-CP.  3) Assessment:   1. Efficacy: The solution balances the load on the local node. The node learns about downstream route conditions based on reports from further down the chain on the occupancy of buffers for data. Reporting could be done per route ID, similar to existing Rel-16 DL HbH flow control feedback, but extended to descendent nodes. 2. Shortcomings of enhancement: Over time a deviation may emerge from CU-configured paths. To avoid this feedback is needed from intermediate nodes. Or, the node could be restricted by the CU to a sub-set of alternatives, minimizing the frequency and size of feedback. 3. Alternative solution: The CU itself reconfigures routes based on load reports. 4. Delta over alternative solution: Significant. The CU based reconfiguration may is slower, and it cannot make better decisions since its visibility of the available capacity/load on the alternative paths is not up-to-date (for this to be true, significant reporting overhead needs to be incurred). |
| Intel | 1. Problem: Centralized routing via IAB donor CU have longer rerouting latency, and topology-wide impact can be considered as trigger condition for local rerouting.  2. Enhancement: Trigger condition of local rerouting may consider fairness/congestion/load balance/etc, allowing flexibility of rerouting  3. Assessment:     a) Efficacy of solution: Address the problem and reduce rerouting latency     b) Shortcomings: the rerouting results need to be updated to IAB donor CU or configured by IAB donor CU in advance     c) Alternative solutions: routing decision from IAB donor CU     d) Delta over alternative solutions: The alternative solution loses flexibility of routing and sacrifices latency especially to paths with poor performance (e.g. packet loss, unfair, etc) |
| **Huawei** | **Problem**:  In case primary path is going to/already become bad/unworkable (e.g. congested, or suffering RLF), IAB-node should be allowed to use the backup path. This would make the local re-routing useful upon BH link congested or ascendant BH link RLF.  However, the re-routing should be only used to handle some unexpected situation, rather than to select the best path for optimization. So, IAB-node self-selects the best path based on some factors like load or delay is not necessary. |
| **LG** | 1) Problem: When the parent IAB node receives a flow control feedback, even though there is an alternative route to the same destination, according to the Rel-16 IAB, the parent IAB node cannot re-route packets to this alternative route. Also, the parent IAB node have to hold all packets related to the flow control feedback until the congestion problem in the child IAB node is resolved because there is an entry matched to both BAP address and BAP path ID of the packet and no BH RLF occurs. This can generate another congestion problem in the parent IAB node after receiving a flow control feedback from the child IAB node.  2) Enhancement: Local re-routing is allowed in more cases, e.g., the parent IAB node receives a flow control feedback from the child IAB node. The alternative routes may be configured by the IAB donor CU.  3) Assessment:   1. Efficacy: This enhancement can avoid another congestion problem in the parent IAB node after receiving a flow control feedback and packets can be serviced without unnecessary buffering delay. 2. Shortcomings of enhancement: Nothing obvious. 3. Alternative solution: Routing table update by the IAB donor CU. 4. Delta over alternative solution: The alternative solutions may generate frequent routing table updates and need much more signalling overhead. This also may not aovid large buffering delay. |
| **Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell** | **1) Problem:**Rel-16 RLF indication is only sent to child nodes. Because of this, downstream data can run into a dead end due to RLF to child node(s) such that no downlink hop toward the destination is available, and in such a case there is nothing that allows either re-routing of such data from the dead-end node, or re-transmitting and re-routing from an ancestor node of the dead-end node.  **2) Enhancement:** uplink indication that certain BAP destinations have become unreachable. Reception of such an indication allows re-routed retransmissions by the parent node, if it has alternative routes available, or else forwarding the indication further to grandparent node(s).  **3) Assessment:**  a) Efficacy of solution: Allows re-routing of downstream data still buffered by an ancestor node of the dead-end node.  b) Shortcomings of solution: Does not help with downstream data no longer buffered by an ancestor node.  c) Alternative solution: Downstream packets that are undeliverable are returned to a parent node with an indication that they were undeliverable.  d) Delta over alternative solution: Less transmission hops for the re-routed data, but may not ensure delivery of all data. |
| **ZTE** | 1) Problem: when the IAB node detects congestion/RLF over one egress link path, it may re-routed the data packet to other egress link. However, if all the traffic delivered over the congested/RLF path are re-routed to the backup path, the backup path may become congested. In addition, during the re-routing, it is possible that the backup path also happens RLF/congestion. It is possible that the data packet would be re-routed multiple times, which may cause the routing loop and the PDB requirement could not be satisfied.  2) Enhancement: It is necessary to consider which traffic should be re-routed to keep network load balance. For example, IAB node select the re-routing packet which has higher priority or lower remaining PDB. On the other hand, it is necessary to restrict the number of re-routing times.  3) Assessment:     a) Efficacy of solution: Address the problem and avoid ping-pong issue.     b) Shortcomings: donor CU need to configure IAB node the packet re-routing criteria.     c) Alternative solutions: all the traffic is re-routed via backup path.     d) Delta over alternative solutions: The selective packet re-rotuing could achieve better load balance. |
| **ZTE** | **1) Problem: the ingress filtering is usually applied as security measure to protect the network from address spoofing. If ingress filtering is enabled, inter-donor DU packet re-routing could not be supported.**  **2) Enhancement: donor CU may indicate the IAB node/donor DU whether the inter-donor DU re-routing is allowed. If yes, during UL packet local re-routing, the destination BAP address should be considered when selecting backup path. Otherwise, the destination BAP address could be ignored for the re-routing path selection.**  **3) Assessment:**  **a) Efficacy of solution: Address the inter-donor DU re-routing problem.**  **b) Shortcomings: donor CU need to configure IAB node whether the inter-donor DU re-routing is allowed.**  **c) Alternative solutions: inter-donor DU re-routing is not allowed.**  **d) Delta over alternative solutions: inter-donor DU re-routing could be supported when ingress filtering is disabled.** |

## 2.4 Others

Companies are given the opportunity to discuss other topics in this subsection. The same format should be adhered to as for the topics above.

**Q4: Please specify the problem for a specific topic, elaborate on the solution/enhancement to address this problem, and assess this solution/enhancement with respect to efficacy, shortcoming and how it compares to alternative solutions.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **Ericsson** | **1. Problem:** Achieve load balancing without massive reconfigurations, with limited signaling overhead, and avoiding ping-pong effects that HO-based load balancing solutions would imply. Overdimensioning the target of CU is also a problem that should be avoided.  **2. Solution:** Dual-protocol stack approaches such as DAPS-like approach or multi-MT.  This solution implies:   * To have a dual protocol stack, i.e. one protocol stack controlled by one CU and a second protocol stack controlled by a second CU for inter-CU case, or both controlled by the donor CU for intra-CU. No need of much coordination between these CUs. * UE/MT contexts can remain in the first CU alleviating the needs of extra resources in a second CU * Only the node subject to load balancing, i.e. IAB node-3 in the figure below, needs to be reconfigured. The served IAB nodes or UEs do not need to be reconfigured. This substantially diminishes the signaling load and increases the robustness of the procedure. * Data is re-routed using rules provided by the CU. * Since both protocol stacks are maintained, there is no service interruption in neither DL or UL.     **3. Assessment:**   1. Efficacy: Avoid massive reconfigurations, limited signaling overhead, no ping-pong effects that HO-based load balancing solutions would imply. No need to overdimension the target. 2. Delta over alternative solutions: This solution is superior to CHO or any discussed so far e.g. Dual Connectivity, see efficacy analysis above. It hence fulfills all goals of this WI and has minimum standardization impact 3. Shortcomings: In case a DAPS-like solution is adopted, a specific “dual IAB protocol stack” (DIPS) terminology needs to be introduced to avoid confusion with the legacy DAPS. The legacy DAPS is based on PDCP. The DIPS is based on dual BH RLC channels operations. One BH RLC channel used for communication with one parent, and the second BH RLC channel with the other parent. Note also that for the load balancing use case, there seems to be no need to introduce reordering/discarding functionality at the BAP layer as it is in PDCP. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 3 Phase II: Agreeable mappings of issues/solutions

## 3.1 CHO

Phase 1 emphasized on CHO for **intra**-donor topology adaptation.

In Phase 1, the following issues have been raised with respect to the “baseline procedure” defined by the rapporteur, which combines Rel-16 CHO procedure with Rel-16 intra-donor IAB-node migration procedure:

1. Several companies raised concerns that due to early preparation, the target DU would have to reserve a lot of resources for BH RLC CHs, which may not be used for a long time. Two of these companies therefore propose to waive resource reservation. Four companies believe this is up to implementation. One company believes resource reservation cannot be waived. One company believes resource reservation is based on configuration.
2. Three companies believe the descendant nodes would have to go into BH RLF recovery when CHO is triggered at the migrating IAB-MT, and therefore, they should also be configured with CHO. One of these companies propose to use Type-4 indication as a trigger.
3. One company believes the CU cannot perform early configuration of the backhaul for CHO since it does not know how the target topology will look like at the time when CHO is executed.
4. One company believes that the triggering conditions for IAB CHO should be relaxed.
5. One company believes there is significant interruption time in order to fetch the contexts of all descendant IAB-MTs/UEs and proposes to enhance RRC Reestablishment with early context fetch.
6. One company supports the rapporteur’s recommendation to start with the intra-donor CHO problem before addressing inter-donor CHO, but they emphasize that the solution should be extendable to inter-donor CHO.

**Rapporteur’s view:**

Multiple replies indicate that companies did not sufficiently understand and/or did not agree with the “baseline procedure” proposed by the rapporteur. Further, the large number of issues raised in this discussion indicates that there is no straightforward way to apply Rel-16 CHO to IAB even though some companies claim that this is the case. The rapporteur therefore believes that a baseline to use CHO for IAB needs to be established in a more incremental manner.

**Intra- vs. inter-donor CHO:** While the rapporteur proposed to stay with INTRA-donor CHO, many replies referred to INTER-donor migration aspects. The rapporteur would like to emphasize that:

* For INTRA-donor RLF recovery procedure, descendant nodes and UEs do NOT perform RRC Reestablishment. This means, that we do NOT have to discuss RRC Reestablishment for INTRA-donor CHO either.
* For INTRA-donor migration procedure, UEs and descendent MTs do NOT have to switch cells. This means that we do NOT have to discuss this topic for INTRA-donor CHO either.
* There is NO context transfer in INTRA-donor IAB-node migration of RLF recovery CHO/Reestablishment, and therefore we do NOT have to disucss this for INTRA-donor CHO either.

The rapporteur believes it will be rather impossible to make progress on INTER-donor CHO if we cannot even converge on INTRA-donor CHO. Further, RAN3 is still defining inter-donor IAB-node migration and RLF recovery. It seems we want to first converge on starting the discussion with INTRA-donor CHO problems.

**Proposal 1: RAN2 to discuss intra-donor CHO until RAN3 has made progress on inter-donor IAB-node migration.**

**Q1: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **Fujitsu** | **No strong view. Coordination on the work plan between RAN2 and RAN3 may be needed.** |
| **Huawei** | Prefer to make the proposal clear.  **Proposal 1: RAN2 to discuss CHO and start from the intra-donor CHO until RAN3 has made progress on inter-donor IAB-node migration.** |
| **Intel** | We are ok with the proposal as such.  However, the first point emphasized by rapporteur is not clear to us. IAB-MT can declare RLF either it is experiencing RLF or it receives RLF indication. It is not clear the descendant nodes and UEs is under which IAB node in the first point. If it refers to descendant nodes and UEs of IAB nodes experiencing RLF, the direct child node will perform RRC re-establishment. In this case, the statement is not accurate. |
| **CATT** | **Agree to focus on intra-donor CHO. However, we agree “**UEs and descendent MTs do NOT have to switch cells**” but note it is not a mandatory configuration. That is, even in intra-donor CHO, the cell(s) controlled by IAB DU is possible to be changed.** |
| **ZTE** | Agree with Huawei’s proposal. |
| **Samsung** | We support P1. |
| **Futurewei** | Generally, we are fine to postpone discussion of CHO for the inter-donor case pending RAN3’s progress.  Regarding enhancements for the intra-donor case, the rapporteur and several companies have raised the issue of resource reservations and admission control. Although we agree that this seems like a reasonable issue to discuss, we also agree with Nokia, ZTE, and others that reservation of resources (or lack thereof) seems to be an implementation issue. We are not aware of a requirement to reserve resources for CHO being defined anywhere in the spec. Furthermore, if there is a desire to optimize some signalling procedures to enhance flexibility regarding admission control, this would seem to be within the scope of RAN3, rather than RAN2. |

**Summary:**

6 out of 7 companies supported the spirit of P1. 1 of the 7 companies proposed a slight rewording. 1 company did not have a strong view.

The rapporteur is fine with the rewording of the proposal.

**Proposal 1’: RAN2 to discuss CHO and start with intra-donor CHO until RAN3 has made progress on inter-donor IAB-node migration.**

**CHO execution:** Since there is uncertainty on how to handle early preparation, resource reservation and/or migration of descendent nodes, we should try to at least converge on the support of the condition-based handover execution.

**Proposal 2: IAB to support autonomous HO execution by the IAB-MT based on configured conditions, e.g., as defined for Rel-16 CHO.**

**Q2: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **Fujitsu** | **We support this proposal.** |
| **Intel** | We agree with the proposal as long as it does not preclude new execution conditions to be included. |
| **CATT** | **Support** |
| **ZTE** | **Agree** |
| **Samsung** | **We support P2.** |
| **Futurewei** | If the IAB-MT is simply following what was defined in Rel-16 CHO, can’t that already be supported? Perhaps it would be more correct to simply rephrase this as an observation rather than a proposal. |

**Summary:**

4 out of 5 companies supports P2. One company believes that P1 could be stated as an observation.

The rapporteur believes that conditional handover execution should be considered separately since other aspects of the Rel-16 CHO procedure are controversial.

**Proposal 2: IAB to support autonomous HO execution by the IAB-MT based on configured conditions, e.g., as defined for Rel-16 CHO.**

**Early resource reservation:** The rapporteur believes that this issue needs more discussion. Further, RAN2 should first converge on the principal solution and then decide if it requires specification or if it can be done via implementation. The following options are considered:

Option 1: Use early preparation with resource reservation as defined for Rel-16 CHO.

Option 2: Perform resource reservation at the time of CHO execution.

Based on Phase-1 replies, the following sub-options can be considered:

Option 2a: CHO ends with RRC Reconfiguration Complete. In this case, a mechanism for resource reservation and admission control needs to be provided.

Option 2b: CHO ends with RRC Reestablishment. This requires enhancement of the Rel-16 CHO procedure

**Proposal 3: RAN2 to discuss resource reservation in the context of conditional handover execution by IAB-MT including impact on signaling, e.g., using RRC Reestablishment vs. RRC Reconfiguration Complete.**

**Q3: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **Ericsson** | **In our understanding, this issue should be discussed before any other proposal on CHO. In particular, RAN2 should discuss whether resource reservation can be waived or not, since there seems to be no real consensus on that yet.**  **If resource reservation cannot be waived, then the CHO solution can work with no major problem. If it can be waived, then an RRC Reestablishment procedure (with the IAB node transmitting RRCReestablishmentRequest) can be used. These are two separate solutions which implies different signaling procedures and that should be discussed before progressing on anything else.**  **Hence, RAN2 should discuss whether both a CHO-based solution and an RRCReestablishment-based solution are allowed, or if only one of them should be specified.** |
| **Sony** | No, we think option 1 is a viable option and further optimisation can be left for implementation.  We also share the view to separate the discussion between CHO optimisation and other enhancements like CHO+RLF/re-establishment. In our understanding, there is only one proposal for enhancement of CHO execution phase i.e. allow event A4 (and not type 4) event for load balancing purpose and it is missing in the rapporteur summary somehow. |
| **Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell** | We prefer not to mix CHO and RRC Reestablishment, i.e. CHO is successfully completed with RRCReconfigurationComplete. In CHO case, HO preparation with admission control should be done normally. The resource reservation in the target DU is up to network implementation. |
| **Fujitsu** | **In our opinion, the resource reservation for IAB-MTs/UEs can be same as Rel-16 CHO, or can be up to the gNB implementation. Option 2a and 2b may have more impact on the specification.** |
| **Huawei** | We also prefer to first clarify whether the so-call resource reservation issue is valid or not, before jump into the solution. We wonder why this is an IAB specific issue, but not an issue in R16 CHO design. We should trust the CU implementation on the prediction of when RLF will happen based on measurement report. BTW, if we start from single IAB-MT CHO, it seems not so much resource will be reserved. |
| **CATT** | **Option 1 is baseline. Option 2 is not clear for us.** |
| **ZTE** | As we mentioned in phase 1 discussion, we think the resource reservation should be supported. Whether the resource is actually reserved or not can be up to target IAB DU’s implementation. Target IAB DU may at least pre-configure the BH RLC channels with non GBR QoS requirements. For the BH RLC channels with GBR QoS requirement, target IAB DU may not accept all of them if they require a large data volume. For the intra-donor CU migration, the donor CU has full knowledge of the QoS requirement of the BH RLC channels/UE DRBs of the migration IAB node, descendant IAB nodes and UEs, it can also reconfigure the BH RLC channels after the migration IAB node completes the CHO procedure. Nevertheless, it is not necessary to explicitly prohibit the target IAB DU to reserve resource for the BH RLC channels of the migration IAB node during CHO. |
| **Samsung** | Option 1 is baseline.  For option 2, we think resource reservation amount at the target node at CHO preparation doesn’t need to be the exactly same as the sum of all the descendant IAB nodes and UEs of migrating node. Target node can reserve some minimal resource at the CHO preparation. And CU can further configure some of UEs and descendant IAB nodes to be handed over using subsequent RRCReconfiguration msg at the target node if there is still not enough amount of resources at the target node (DU) after CHO completion. The configuration at the target node given for CHO execution (CondRRCReconfig) can be one for minimal resource usage, e.g., default radio configuration. In this context, we think waiving reservation of full amount of resource is possible at the target node (DU). And this can be done via implementation.  If CHO ends with RRC Reestablishment (which means MT sends RRCReestablishmentRequest msg to the target node as in Ericsson comment), that is just legacy RRCReestablishment procedure, not a new CHO modification. Target node cannot distinguish “sending RRCReestablishmentRequest as CHO end” and normal RRC Reestablishment procedure. And if we don’t configure CHO due to not enough resource at the target DU, then MT will do RRE. |
| **Futurewei** | No  As discussed in the response to Q1 above, we are not aware of any requirement for CHO resource reservation in the spec. Procedures involving admission control are in the scope or RAN3, and not RAN2. Of course if RAN3 decides to enhance some procedure(s), and this requires some signalling support from RAN2 (e.g. Option 2a), we can consider this issue at the appropriate time (i.e. business as usual).  Regarding Option 2b, we do not see why it might be appropriate for an IAB-MT to perform an RRC Reestablishment as part of the CHO procedure. It’s not at all clear why this would be better than the MT responding to the target cell with an RRC Reconfiguration Complete. |

**Summary**

1 out of 9 companies (Ericsson) believes RAN2 should first discuss if resource reservation would be necessary or could be waived.

8 out of 9 companies believe that support of resource reservation should be handled via implementation as it is the case for Rel-16 CHO.

The rapporteur initiated this discussion since he recognized the problem raised by Ericsson. The replies indicate that everybody else seems to be fine with the implementation-based solution provided by Rel-16 CHO. The rapporteur’s initial version of P3 is therefore unnecessary. P3 can be reworded as below.

1 out of 9 companies (Sony) claimed they missed the discussion on the support of A4 events for CHO. The rapporteur has not included this issue since he believed that agreement on a CHO baseline needed to be achieved first, and since A4 events were already included in [AT#112e] email discussion on the CHO topic and did not find a lot of support.

**Proposal 3: Rel-16 CHO is baseline procedure for IAB-MT.**

**Configuration of target path:** The claim was made that the early configuration of the target path may have no benefits since the topology may have changed before CHO is executed. The rapporteur believes that this is a valid point since the early configuration also includes new IP addresses and default routes, which need to be included in the RRC Reconfiguration message.

**Proposal 4: RAN2 to discuss configuration of default route, IP addresses and target path for intra-donor IAB-node migration using conditional handover execution.**

**Q4: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell** | **We prefer preconfiguration of default route, IP address and target path for intra-donor IAB node migration, also in case of CHO. If the target path or donor-DU changes, a new updated CHO RRCReconfiguration should be sent to the IAB-node.** |
| **Huawei** | We believe those configuration can be configured after IAB-MT’s CHO, which means they may not be included in the early configuration, but in the RRC Reconfiguration after CHO procedure. We may need to start from the very baseline configuration to avoid this becoming too complicated. |
| **CATT** | Default configuration by RRC is supported by Rel-16 RRC specification. |
| **ZTE** | We think it is necessary to include the default BH RLC channel, default BAP routing ID, and new IP address into the CHO configuration, which could accelerate the F1-C configuration update when inter-DU HO happens. |
| **Samsung** | Same view as Huawei. |

**Summary**

2 out of 5 companies are in favor of pre-configuring default route, IP address and target path for CHO.

2 out of 5 companies believes this configuration can occur after IAB-MT’s CHO execution.

1 out of 5 companies this configuration should follow Rel-16 RRC specification.

There is obviously no common ground. If we followed Rel-16 specification, IP addresses and default route may be included in the CHO RRC Reconfiguration, while the target path can be configured at any time (based on implementation). Rel-16 specification does not preclude reconfiguration of IP addresses and default route after HO execution. The rapporteur therefore believes that Rel-16 specification for IAB-node migration could serve as the baseline for the configuration of default route, IP address and target path for intra-donor CHO. This would accommodate all the companies’ views. This would only address intra-donor CHO and would have to be revisited for inter-donor CHO.

**Proposal 4’: Rel-16 specification to be baseline for the configuration of default route, IP address(es) and target path for intra-donor CHO.**

## 3.2 RLF indication/handling

The following issues/enhancements for Rel-16 RLF indication have been discussed:

1. Four companies believe a type-2 indication can trigger local rerouting on descendant node. One of these companies believes that this should be restricted to the child nodes. Another company believes that local rerouting should not be used in this case since it causes massive load movement within the network.
2. Three companies believe that a type-2 indication should not trigger re-establishment to avoid chaos in the topology. One of these companies supports CHO based on receiving type-2 indication. A fourth company believes that early re-establishment is up to implementation. A fifth company believes that the benefits of triggering CHO or re-establishment may depend on the scenario. A sixth company believes that triggering CHO/re-establishment could be supported but it incurs long interruption time.
3. One company believes that a receiving node of type-2 indication should mute IAB-supported indication in SIB1 to avoid being selected by an upstream node recovering from RLF. A second company believes that this issue is not essential. A third company believes that the node that attempts RLF recovery should bar access to new IAB-nodes/UEs.
4. One company believes that a receiving node of type-2 indication should stop sending SRs to reduce interference. A second company thinks that reducing SRs is up to implementation.
5. One company believes that type-2 indication shall trigger early measurements at the receiving node to speed recovery if the parent’s recovery fails. Another company thinks this is up to implementation and is already supported.
6. One companybelieves that RLF indications should also go upstream to parent/ancestor nodes. Another company believes that the IAB-DU above the RLF point could inform the CU about RLF upon which the CU reconfigures the BAP routes. A third company believes it is faster instead that a descendant node with DC informs the CU about RLF upon receiving a type-2 indication.

**Rapporteur’s view:**

**Type-2 indication triggers RLF recovery/CHO execution:** One aspect relates to using type-2 vs. type-4 indication to trigger CHO execution and/or RLF recovery of descendent node. The trade-off is between faster recovery due to the earlier transmission of type-2 vs. slower recovery due to the chaos created by simultaneously recovery attempts by many nodes. There is a wide range of options that could be considered:

* Option 1: Reception of type-2 does not permit CHO execution and/or RLF recovery
* Option 2: Reception of type-2 only permits CHO execution of the child node only.
* Option 3: Reception of type-2 only permits CHO execution and RLF recovery of the child node only.
* Option 4: Reception of type-2 only permits CHO execution of the entire subtree.
* Option 5: Reception of type-2 permits CHO execution and/or RLF recovery of the entire subtree.

It seems companies’ views are spread all over these options. Leaving the trigger condition up to IAB-node implementation is certainly not desirable since it would lead to unpredictable network behavior. The rapporteur proposes to resolve this issue by making this trigger behavior configurable.

**Proposal 5: RAN2 to support CHO execution and/or RLF Recovery as a configurable behavior in response to the receiving of type-2 RLF indication.**

**Q5: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **Kyocera** | We’re fine with Proposal 5 in general. However, we still think CHO execution upon reception of Type 4 BH RLF Indication is useful for combined operation with local rerouting as in Proposal 6, so it can be configurable by the donor, i.e., adding the choice of Type 4 on top of Proposal 5. |
| **Ericsson** | **We are not ready to agree to this, since there is no consensus on it yet from the phase-1 discussion.**  **First of all, we have not agreed yet on the type-2 RLF indication, and the details around the triggering conditions. It is weird to start discussing child actions before discussing when and how the type-2 RLF is triggered by the parent.**  **Second, this proposal does not reflect the phase-1 discussion. There are companies that believe that triggering CHO upon type-2 RLF indication might have some drawbacks. Such comments cannot be ignored especially at this early stage of the WI.**  **Additionally, in the remainder of this section there are other proposals to address the same issue. That may just cause redundant specification efforts in RAN2 to specify different procedures to solve the same problem.** |
| **Sony** | No. We don’t think CHO execution based on type-2 RLF indication is necessary as it may impose long interruption time. |
| **Sharp** | We agree on Proposal 5 but have sympathy to Kyocera’s comment about Type 4. UE needs to take some action upon receiving Type 4 anyway (otherwise it loses connections), and it is reasonable to trigger CHO if configured. |
| **Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell** | We should first agree on details of type-2 RLF indication. For instance, if only an indication “trying to recover” is sent also when only the SCG of an IAB node in DC fails, both CHO and/or RLF recovery seems excessive. |
| **Fujitsu** | **We are fine with Proposal 5.**  **In addition, type-3 RLF indication may also trigger CHO execution and/or RLF Recovery, when the parent node recovers to another donor CU successfully. In this case, the child node performs CHO and/or RLF recovery to update the configuration from the new CU, especially on keys.** |
| **Huawei** | RLF recovery based on type 2 indication is not acceptable, which is conflict with R16;  “**as a configurable behavior**” actually means we support both. Before discussing the configuration, we should first discuss if this is really needed. |
| **Intel** | We support the proposal. Moreover, we also think Type 4 can be another choice of CHO execution, in case the IAB node experiencing RLF recovered after sending type-2 RLF indication. It can reduce frequent topology changes. Hence, we propose to **add**:  Proposal 5a: RAN2 to support CHO execution and/or RLF Recovery as a configurable behavior in response to the receiving of type-4 RLF indication. |
| **CATT** | **Option 2 with other condition, such as a new criterion of neighbor cell channel condition. Only when the IAB node can select a cell with enough good channel condition, the CHO can be perfromed.**  **RLF recovery is not needed. First, it is very possible for the child IAB node to re-establish to the same cell without other optimization. Second, RLF recovery will incur time interruption and possible data loss of the child node even if the IAB node is recovery successfully.** |
| **ZTE** | We need to first reach a consensus on whether or not the behavior (in response to receiving type-2 RLF indication) can be supported in some cases, before discussing whether the behavior is configurable or not.  Actually, we do not think CHO is a good behavior in response to receiving type-2 indication, the reasons are as follows. IAB-node which detects RLF may successfully recover to the same parent or the same IAB-donor. If CHO is performed upon receiving type-2 RLF indication, the topology of descendant nodes and UEs may change unnecessarily, leading to unstable network behavior. In a word, we do not support CHO being a behavior in response to type-2 RLF indication. |
| **Samsung** | We support P5.  **Regarding type 4 reception and its triggering of CHO, this is already specified in Rel-16. If MT is configured with attemptCondReconfig, and has RLF (same as receiving type 4 from its parent), then it will do cell selection, and if the selected cell is the one of Cho candidate target, then it will do CHO to that selected cell. So no need to further discuss this.**  **Rather considering faster recovery case (receiving type 2 triggering CHO) seems appropriate.”** |
| **Futurewei** | No  We don’t think it is reasonable for a type-2 report to trigger a CHO or RLF recovery. It is very likely that this indicates a transient event, and that the radio link will recover. If type-2 reports trigger CHO or RLF recovery, we can anticipate a lot of unnecessary HOs and reestablishments, resulting in a very unstable IAB network. |

**Summary:**

5 out of 12 companies support P5, i.e., to make CHO execution and/or RLF Recovery a configurable behavior in response to type-2 reception. Various additions were proposed on top of P5.

4 out of 12 companies do not support this proposal.

1 out of 12 companies wants to further differentiate P5.

1 out of 12 companies wants to have agreement on transmission of type-2 RLF indication before discussing any behavior by the receiving node.

1 out of 12 companies wants to discuss the information carried on type-2 RLF indication first.

There were a few additional proposals:

* Provide finer differentiation between RLF recovery and CHO execution. The replies to Q5 do not indicate that such finer differentiation would overcome the principal lack of consensus.
* First agree on a blank type-2 RLF indication before discussing behavior. A blank type-2 RLF indication provides a free pass to use this indication as a trigger for RLF-recovery/ CHO execution via implementation, which would not provide any mean for activation/deactivation by the CU. This is certainly not a reasonable WF in sight of the strong technical concerns some companies raised in phase 1 to this behavior.
* Discuss information to be carried on type-2 RLF indication first. This is just one manner to make RLF-recovery/CHO-execution configurable.

In summary, there is no consensus on if type-2 RLF indication can be used as a trigger for RLF recovery and/or CHO execution. There is also no consensus to make such behavior configurable. Making th behavior implementation-based is not an option based on a the strong objection in phase 1 by some companies for technical reasons.

**Proposal 5: -/-**

**Type-2 indication triggers local rerouting:** Companies’ views on this behavior are spread between beneficial and detrimental.The rapporteur believes that simulation would be necessary to properly assess the benefit of this behavior. In absence of such assessment, the controversy can be resolved by making the support for local rerouting upon type-2 indication configurable.

**Proposal 6: RAN2 to support local rerouting as a configurable behavior in response to the receiving of type-2 RLF indication.**

**Q6: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **Ericsson** | **Same comment as to P5.**  **Too early to discuss this given that we have not even agreed yet to have a type-2 RLF indication.** |
| **Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell** | **We should first agree on details of type-2 RLF indication. For instance, if only an indication “trying to recover” is sent also when only the SCG od an IAB node in DC fails, local re-routing is probably unnecessary for the traffic using functional MCG.** |
| **Fujitsu** | **We are ok with this proposal. In fact, we want to have a broader proposal. We think that Type-4 RLF indication can also trigger local rerouting at child node with DC, before its recovery finishes. For example, when a child node receives Type-4 indication from SCG, it can do local rerouting to MCG while initiating the SCG failure information procedure.** |
| **Huawei** | Fine with proposal, if we delete “as a configurable behavior”, which can be discussed later. |
| **CATT** | Support |
| **ZTE** | Similar to the comments for proposal 6, we need to first reach consensus on whether the local rerouting in response to receiving type-2 RLF indication is needed before discussing whether the behavior is configurable or not. |
| **Samsung** | We support P6. |
| **Futurewei** | We can see some value to this proposal, so we are willing to discuss it further. We are not sure if local-routing needs to be configurable though or can this just be left to IAB node implementation. It seems more useful to configure the triggering and transmission of type-2 RLF indications rather than the behavior of the receiving node. |

**Summary:**

4 out of 8 companies supports P6, i.e., to make local rerouting a configurable behavior in response to type-2 reception.

2 out of 8 companies want to have agreement on triggering and transmission of type-2 RLF indication before discussing any behavior by the receiving node.

1 out of 8 companies wants to first discuss if local rerouting should be a behavior by the receiving node.

1 out of 8 companies wants to discuss the information carried on the type-2 indication.

There were a few alternative proposals:

* First agree on a blank type-2 RLF indication before discussing behavior. A blank type-2 RLF indication provides a free pass to use this indication as a trigger for local rerouting via implementation, without mean for deactivation by the CU.
* First agree if local rerouting should be a behavior. This was already discussed in phase 1 and there was no consensus.
* First discuss information to be carried on type-2 RLF indication. Again, it is not clear to the rapporteur how we can discuss information to be carried on the indication if we do not have consensus on what the indication is supposed to achieve.

In summary, there is no consensus if type-2 RLF indication can be used as a trigger for local rerouting. There is also no consensus to make such behavior configurable.

We could allow implementation-based rerouting based on type-2 RLF indication. Obviously, such implementation-based behavior cannot be activated/deactivated by the CU.

**Proposal 6: Type-2 RLF indication can be used to trigger local rerouting based on implementation.**

**Type-2 indication triggers muting of “IAB-supported” in SIB:** This behavior blocks access attempts by UEs and IAB-nodes, in particular by former ancestor IAB-nodes that try to recover from the upstream BH RLF. While two companies support this behavior, one believes it is non-essential. The rapporteur proposes the same WF as above, i.e, making the muting of “IAB-supported” upon type-2 indication configurable.

**Proposal 7: RAN2 to support muting of “IAB-supported” in SIB as a configurable behavior in response to the receiving of type-2 indication.**

**Q7: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **Ericsson** | **Same comment as above.**  **Additionally, this solution is explicitly supported by only one company.** |
| **Sony** | **No. We think this is configurable behaviour is not necessary.** |
| **Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell** | **We should first agree on details of type-2 RLF indication. For instance, if only an indication “trying to recover” is sent also when only SCG of an IAB node is DC fails, muting of “IAB supported” seems excessive.** |
| **Huawei** | Not yet. This can be purely IAB-DU implementation. |
| **Intel** | We agree with the proposal. In addition, similar as proposal 5, we think we should also discuss whether type-4 indication can be used to trigger muting IAB-support in SIB. |
| **CATT** | Not support. |
| **ZTE** | We think it can be up to IAB-DU’s implementation. It is not necessary to configure it. |
| **Samsung** | We support P7. |
| **Futurewei** | No. This could be left to implementation. |

**Summary:**

2 out of 9 companies supports P7, i.e., to make muting of IAB-supported a configurable behavior in response to type-2 reception.

5 out of 9 companies believe that this behavior does not have to be configurable, e.g., can be left up to implementation.

2 out of 9 companies want to have agreement on triggering and transmission of type-2 RLF indication before discussing any behavior by the receiving node.

There is no support for P7. Some companies believe that this behavior could be left up to implementation.

**Proposal 7: Type-2 RLF indication can be used to trigger deactivation of IAB-supported in SIB based on implementation.**

**Type-2 indication triggers reduction of SR/BSR transmissions:** One company supports this behavior; another believes it should be up to implementation. Overall, it would be nice to have predictable behavior among all nodes in the topology. The rapporteur therefore proposes to make the reduction of SR/BSR transmissions upon type-2 indication configurable.

**Proposal 8: RAN2 to support reduction of SR/BSR transmissions as a configurable behavior in response to the receiving of type-2 RLF indication.**

**Q8: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **Ericsson** | **Same comment as above.**  **Additionally, this solution is explicitly supported by only one company.** |
| **Sony** | **No. We think this is configurable behaviour is not necessary.** |
| **Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell** | **We should first agree on details of type-2 RLF indication. For instance, if only an indication “trying to recover” is sent also when only SCG of an IAB node is DC fails, reduction of SR/BSR transmission seems excessive.** |
| **Fujitsu** | **We think this can be up to the gNB implementation.** |
| **Huawei** | No. This is really one optimization, which can be discussed later after we have agreed at least one child node behavior for type 2 indication. |
| **CATT** | **IAB DU can decrease UL resource allocation when experiencing RLF recovery no matter whether SR/BSR is transmitted from child node or not.** |
| **ZTE** | We think it can be up to IAB-DU’s implementation. It is not necessary to configure it. |
| **Samsung** | Do not support. |
| **Futurewei** | No, this is not needed. The interference generated by transmission of SR/BSR should not be that significant. |

**Summary:**

7 out of 9 companies believe that reduction of SR/BSR as a behavior to type-2 RLF indication should not be configurable. Several of these companies believe that this behavior should be left up to implementation.

2 out of 9 companies wants to have agreement on triggering and transmission of type-2 RLF indication before discussing any behavior by the receiving node.

There is not enough support for P8. Some companies believe that this behavior could be left up to implementation.

**Proposal 8: Type-2 RLF indication can be used to trigger deactivation of reduction of SR and/or BSR transmissions based on implementation.**

**Propagation of type-2 indications:** The propagation of type-2 indication has not been fully addressed by most of the Phase-1 replies. The rapporteur therefore believes that more discussion is necessary.

**Proposal 9: RAN2 to discuss propagation of type-2 RLF indication.**

**Q9: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
|  |  |
| **Ericsson** | **Same comment as above.** |
| **Huawei** | We may need to first conclude the behaviors at its child node, and then discuss the propagation. |
| **CATT** | Not support |
| **Samsung** | Do not support. |
| **Futurewei** | No  We don’t see any strong justification to propagate type-2 RLF indications. |

**Summary:**

1 out of 5 companies does not support propagation of type-2 RLF indication.

2 out of 5 companies do not want to discuss propagation of type-2 RLF indication.

1 out of 5 companies does not want to discuss propagation of type-2 RLF indication before agreeing on the behaviors at the child node.

1 out of 5 companies wants to have agreement on triggering and transmission of type-2 RLF indication before discussing any behavior by the receiving node.

Based on these replies, the rapporteur questions the need of type-2 RLF indication. The principal idea of this indication is to rapidly inform the descendant node about upstream RLF conditions so that they can perform some action that is beneficial to network performance. In questions 5 to 8, companies could not agree on any of such beneficial behavior. In question 9, companies cannot even agree to discuss propagation of this indication. The rapporteur believes that RAN2 should not support signaling messages that have not purpose and whose propagation cannot be discussed.

**Proposal 9’: If RAN2 cannot agree on any purpose of type-2 RLF indication it should be deprioritized.**

## 3.3 Local rerouting

The following problem scenarios/solutions for local rerouting have been discussed:

1. Most companies think that local rerouting may be useful to balance loads across egress links and/or to alleviate congestion on an egress link.
   1. Three companies believe that local rerouting can be triggered at a node upon receiving a HbH flow control feedback. One of these companies proposes to extend the feedback to report info of descendant nodes per route ID.
   2. Two companies believe that the CU should configure the trigger conditions for local rerouting at the IAB-node. A third company suggests that it is up to the CU whether to enable/disable local rerouting at the node.
   3. Several companies believe that the CU should configure/restrict the alternative routes for local rerouting.
2. One company proposes that RLF indications are sent upstream to trigger local rerouting at parent/ancestor nodes.
3. One company proposes to enable local rerouting for packets that carry unknown BAP routing IDs.
4. One company proposes that the CU indicates to the IAB-node whether inter-donor-DU rerouting is allowed based on whether ingress filtering at the donor-DU is enabled/disabled.
5. Two companies propose that a node reroutes packets of high-priority/latency-critical services, generally based on the delay-difference b/w routes and PDB info carried by the packets. A 3rd company believes delay should not be a factor for local-rerouting.
6. One company proposes to enable local rerouting to achieve fairness.

**Rapporteur’s view:**

There is the feeling that centrally configured rerouting is slow and creates a lot of signaling overhead compared to local rerouting. It was acknowledged by some companies that local route decisions can *only* account for downstream route conditions if the IAB-node has obtained information about the downstream route conditions via hop-by-hop signaling. This information transfer creates additional overhead.

**Local rerouting based on congestion:**

If local-rerouting is based on congestion, hop-by-hop flow control is already in place and can therefore provide indication on downstream congestion. Further, CU-based rerouting in response to congestion is presently not supported since the CU-CP is not aware of the IAB-node’s congestion conditions.

**Proposal 10: RAN2 to support configuration of local rerouting based on congestion indication by hop-by-hop flow control.**

**Q10: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **Kyocera** | We don’t object to Proposal 10, but we’re still not sure how the local rerouting with the HbH congestion indication can address the topology-wide objectives as RAN2 agreed. We think it’s possibly needed to be discussed first whether the alternative path is selected by the IAB-node implementation as in Rel-16 or can be configured by the donor as Rel-17 enhancement.  In addition, we’re wondering whether the local rerouting is performed immediately upon reception of the congestion indication or after a certain time like TTT (Time-to-trigger for measurement reporting). We’re also wondering whether the congestion indication in Proposal 10 only intends the existing flow control feedback or something new. |
| **AT&T** | **We think the proposal should be reworded as “RAN2 to support triggering of local rerouting based on congestion indication by hop-by-hop flow control”.**  **Typically, configuration is something that is performed by the CU-CP. The point of local rerouting is to not involve the CU-CP. Also, we believe that whether or not local rerouting is performed immediately upon reception of the local congestion indication or after a certain time can be left up to implementation.** |
| **Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell** | **The proposal is unclear. We think it should be discussed first what kind of flow-control feedback could qualify as a congestion indication? We are concerned that varying assumptions on that feedback format would easily result in a very loose restrictions for local re-routing.** |
| **Fujitsu** | We are ok with this proposal. However, we think another case as several companies have pointed out in phase 1 - The egress link of the configured route has high load while alternative routes to the same destination have much lower load – should also be considered for trigger of local rerouting. This happens at a congested node, before a HbH flow control feedback is sent out. |
| **Huawei** | Minor rewording: (Please note we don’t have the per hop “congestion indication”, it is only flow control feedback)  **Proposal 10: RAN2 to support local rerouting triggered by indication of hop-by-hop flow control, based on CU configuration** |
| **CATT** | Support |
| **ZTE** | If all the traffic delivered over the congested path are re-routed to the backup path, the backup path may become congested. It is necessary to consider how to avoid the ping-pong issue. |
| **Samsung** | Support in principle. Agree with AT&T about the rewording needed. We also understand Nokia’s concerns but think this proposal is just the baseline and that further work will answer some of Nokia’s valid questions. |
| **Futurewei** | Generally, agree with AT&T’s view on the value of rewording the proposal text.  Huawei’s proposed wording is more technically more correct. We also support the inclusion of “based on CU configuration”. Therefore, we prefer Huawei’s wording of the proposal. |

**Summary**

7 out of 9 companies support the proposal, some of them after a slight rewording.

1 out of 9 companies is concerned about congestion on the alternative path due to local rerouting.

1 out of 9 companies wants to first discuss what kind of flow-control feedback should be used to trigger local rerouting.

Other issues raised:

* Uncertainty if HBH flow control is sufficient to address topology-wide performance objectives.
* Can CU restrict selection of local rerouting based on congestion.
* Time to trigger of local rerouting after HBH flow control indicates congestion.
* Local rerouting due to load difference should also be permitted, even in absence of congestion.

There seems to be support for local rerouting based on congestion using hop-by-hop flow control feedback for triggering. However, there are various issues that need to be discussed such as trigger information, trigger conditions, role of CU configuration, etc.

**Proposal 10: Local rerouting can be triggered based on hop-by-hop flow control feedback. Further details, e.g., on trigger information, trigger conditions, role of CU configuration, are FFS.**

**Inter-donor-DU local rerouting:**

Inter-donor-DU local rerouting was not supported in Rel-16 due to concerns of ingress filtering on the wireline network when packets have mismatching source IP address. For Rel-17, RAN3#110 agreed:

**Inter-donor-DU local re-routing in Rel-17 IAB should be supported; details are FFS**

Assuming that such ingress filtering is not applied, RAN2 should discuss how inter-donor-DU local rerouting should be supported. Please discuss this aspect in contributions to RAN2# 113e.

**Proposal 11: RAN2 to discuss on how to support inter-donor-DU local rerouting.**

**Q11: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **CATT** | **Agree to discuss.**  **In UL, inter-DU means two BAP addresses associated with the two DUs. RAN2 and RAN3 should discuss how to perform re-routing considering the different destinations.** |
| **Samsung** | **Agree to discuss further.** |

**Summary**

2 out of 2 companies support the proposal.

**Proposal 11: RAN2 to discuss solutions for inter-donor-DU local rerouting.**

**Local rerouting based on upstream type-4 indication:**

This topic could be discussed in this section on local rerouting or the prior section on RLF indication/handling. Since the prior section relates to type-2 indication, we will include the discussion on upstream type-4 indication here. The rapporteur believes that more discussion is necessary on this topic. Please also discuss this feature in contributions to RAN2# 113e

**Proposal 12: RAN2 to discuss local rerouting based on type-4 indication transmitted in upstream direction.**

**Q12: Please provide feedback on this proposal. Silence is interpreted as agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **Ericsson** | **What is the type-4 indication in upstream? First it should be discussed the need (if any) of the type-4 indication in upstream.** |
| **Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell** | **Categorization of a child-link failure with the same types as previously discussed for parent-link RLF (types 2-4) seems ill-defined and therefore unnecessary. For instance, type 4 indicates RLF-recovery failure – in case of child link, what is that recovery? Similarly with type 2, what would “trying to recover” mean?**  **For this reason, the definition of when a BAP destination is unreachable can be based on the case(s) where Rel-16 BAP allows local re-routing in downlink, i.e. when no next-hop egress link toward the destination “is available”.** |
| **Fujitsu** | **Don’t support. The necessity of upstream type-4 indication is unclear.** |
| **Huawei** | It seems “upstream type-4 indication” should be “upstream congestion/flow-control indication”. |
| **CATT** | Not support. With this proposal, “**type-4 indication transmitted in upstream direction**” should be introduced first. |
| **ZTE** | It is suggested to first clarify the necessity of upstream type-4 indication. |
| **Samsung** | Same concerns as Nokia. |
| **Futurewei** | Similar to other companies, we are not very clear what is meant by “type-4 indication transmitted in upstream direction”.  Perhaps the rapporteur meant that an IAB node could use the reception of a type-4 RLF indication as a trigger for upstream local routing? |
| **Convida** | **We share the same view with other companies, type-4 indication in upstream needs to be clearly defined.** |

**Summary**

There was no support for P12. Further, several companies were uncertain on the definition of type-4 indication in upstream direction.

**P12: -/-**

**Local rerouting based on delay:**

This is handled in [Post112-e][065].

**Local rerouting based on fairness:**

This is handled in [Post112-e][065].

**Local rerouting for unknown BAP routing IDs:**

This is already supported in Rel-16 IAB.

## 3.4 Others

The following problem scenarios/solutions has been discussed:

One company believes that DAPS-based or multi-MT solutions can be used to achieve load balancing without massive reconfigurations, with limited signaling overhead, avoiding ping-pong effects that HO-based load balancing solutions would imply, and/or overdimensioning of the target CU.

The rapporteur believes that DAPS was primarily defined to reduce handover interruption. The rapporteur has the impression that companies supporting DAPS for IAB also primarily focused on reduction of interruption time rather than load balancing.

Multi-MT was already included in post RAN2#111 IAB email discussions. There was significant controversy on the amount of specification work necessary. Some companies believed it could be done via implementation via other saw a tremendous specification effort. The rapporteur believes that more clarification is necessary on multi-MT. Supporters of multi-MT may therefore provide contributions on this topic to RAN2#113.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **Ericsson** | We disagree with Rapporteur´s comment.  DAPS was designed to reduce the handover time and CHO to make the handover more robust. Neither of these solutions were designed in Rel.16 for handling RLF failures or load balancing. If the rapporteur means that a DAPS-like solution is not suitable because the original purpose of DAPS is different, the same reason applies for CHO. In any case, that comment is irrelevant for the discussion. As outlined in the WID, load balancing is part of the objective of this WI (as also enforce in RAN2#112 agreements) and RAN2 should study ways to achieve this objective.  We think that “multi-MT” or “DAPS for IAB” has neither been discussed enough nor concluded that there is a lot of specification effort. First, it cannot be implementation specific because both CUs need to agree on the terms of the load balancing as well as the way to reach nodes. This is common to any solution even for the RLF case. Second, those companies which claim that there is extensive specification work should provide concrete examples since we see a really limited specification work. The only thing the MT has to do is to set up two independent protocol stacks. That requires residual specification work. Further, RAN3 has started working on “DAPS for IAB” (see e.g. LS R3-207184), therefore RAN2 will anyhow need to discuss it.  Additionally, the scope of the email discussion is about “find an agreeable mapping of candidate solution and issue, and analysis of the candidate solution for the issue (e.g. Effectiveness, Gains, Drawbacks)”, rather than agreeing on the need of a specific solution. Therefore, we would like to invite the rapporteur to attain to the scope of this email discussion and consider “multi-MT”/”DAPS for IAB” as a possible solution to solve the issue of load balancing and RLF (which both are part of the WID).  We therefore propose to discuss this topic:  **Proposal: RAN2 to discuss “multi-MT” and “DAPS for IAB” as possible solutions to address load balancing (this includes RLF too).** |
| **Interdigital** | **We support the proposal from Ericsson** |

**Summary**

The rapporteur emphasizes that load balancing is a central topic of IAB. CU-controlled intra-donor load balancing is supported in Rel-16 IAB via NR DC, and inter-donor load balancing is currently discussed in RAN3 for Rel-17. Load balancing via local rerouting (based on congestion indication) has been addressed in this email discussion. The topic of load balancing is therefore well covered.

Prior email discussions included DAPS and multi-MT. In last RAN2 meeting, we agreed that:

“DAPS and potential IAB-specific enhancements of DAPS is not precluded for now (but as there is no PDCP it is not clear how to support DAPS).”

There was no agreement related to multi-MT, which reflected the little support it had received in the prior email discussion.

In the present email discussion, only one Ericsson proposed discussion of DAPS for IAB for load balancing. Ericsson admits that this is a new use case for DAPS which was initially designed to improve handover latency. Since DAPS for load balancing might not have been considered by many companies, the rapporteur suggests to include it for discussion in the context of this new use case.

**Proposal 13: RAN2 do discuss “DAPS for IAB” as a possible solution to address load balancing.**

# 4 Conclusion

**4.1 CHO**

Since RAN3 still works on inter-donor IAB-node migration, there was strong support to discuss intra-donor CHO in the meantime:

**Proposal 1’: RAN2 to discuss CHO and start with intra-donor CHO until RAN3 has made progress on inter-donor IAB-node migration.**

While the discussion circled around the handling of resource reservation for CHO, there was strong support to at least support the CHO execution for the IAB-MT.

**Proposal 2: IAB to support autonomous HO execution by the IAB-MT based on configured conditions, e.g., as defined for Rel-16 CHO.**

The discussion on resource reservation for CHO ended up with strong support in favor for using Rel-16 CHO as the baseline:

**Proposal 3: Rel-16 CHO is baseline procedure for IAB-MT.**

While the configuration of default route, IP address(es) and target path received controversial views, they could all be accommodated via implementation within the Rel-16 specification:

**Proposal 4’: Rel-16 specification to be baseline for the configuration of default route, IP address(es) and target path for intra-donor CHO.**

**4.2 RLF indication/handling:**

The discussion focused on type-2 RLF indication, which is triggered upon RLF detection. Multiple purposes were proposed for this indication. There was no agreement on the support of any of these purposes. There was not agreement to make them configurable, either. There was no interest to discuss propagation of type-2 RLF indication.

The behavior of the indication and its propagation could be based on implementation. This, however, should only apply to behaviors, which find principal support. In case such behaviors cannot be identified, the rapporteur proposes to deprioritize type-2 RLF indication.

**Proposal 5: -/-**

**Proposal 6: Type-2 RLF indication can be used to trigger local rerouting based on implementation.**

**Proposal 7: Type-2 RLF indication can be used to trigger deactivation of IAB-supported in SIB based on implementation.**

**Proposal 8: Type-2 RLF indication can be used to trigger deactivation or reduction of SR and/or BSR transmissions based on implementation.**

**Proposal 9’: If RAN2 cannot agree on any purpose of type-2 RLF indication it should be deprioritized.**

**4.3 Local rerouting**

There was strong support for local rerouting to congestion, where hop-by-hop flow control can ensure sensible selection of alternative routes. There was still a lot of uncertainty about remaining details.

**Proposal 10: Local rerouting can be triggered by indication of hop-by-hop flow control. Further details, e.g., on trigger information, trigger conditions, role of CU configuration, are FFS.**

There was agreement that inter-donor DU local rerouting should be discussed.

**Proposal 11: RAN2 to discuss solutions for inter-donor-DU local rerouting.**

There was no support at all to discuss local rerouting in upstream direction based on type-4 indication. We don’t need to explicitly agree on anything here.

**Proposal 12: -/-**

**4.4 Others**

One company proposed to discuss DAPS in the context of load balancing. It may be worth pursuing this proposal since RAN2 agreed that DAPS is not yet from the table, and since the use case of load balancing may not have been considered for DAPS.

**Proposal 13: RAN2 do discuss “DAPS for IAB” as a possible solution to address load balancing.**