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# Introduction

This document contains summary of email discussion to agree further details of the RRC-based solution for small data transmission in INACTIVE:

* [POST112-e][551][SDT] Common aspects between CG and RACH (ZTE)

Scope: Get input on: (+) RACH configuration – (preamble groups, TB sizes?), (+) Subsequent SDT transmission and indication, (+) SDT vs non SDT selection (Thresholds and order of selection), (+) Switching between CG-SDT and RA-SDT, (+) Cell Reselection handling

Output: Report, set of agreeable proposals

**Deadline for company comments:**

To allow sufficient time to summarise and submit the summary and proposals to the upcoming meeting, the following deadline for company comments is proposed:

**Wed Jan 13th 0700 UTC**

**Discussion summary**

* TBD

# Discussion

## Details of RACH configuration for RA-SDT

The following agreement was reached at RAN2#112e:

|  |
| --- |
| As a baseline, the RACH resource i.e. (RO+preamble combination) is different between SDT and non-SDT  - If ROs for SDT and non SDT are different, preamble partitioning between SDT and non SDT is not needed.  - If ROs for SDT and non SDT are same, preamble partitioning is needed |

Based on the above agreement, the network will know about the SDT cause after receiving msg1.

It should be noted that msg1 also indicates the size of the msg3/msgA payload (via the selected preamble group). Currenlty there are two different payload sizes allowed and these are indicated by selecting either preamble group A or preamble group B.

Further to the above, it should also be noted that segmentation of the DRB data is allowed and hence, if not all data fits within the first UL message then the network can schedule the rest of the data during the subsequent data transmission phase.

Keeping the above aspects and agreements in mind, the first question is whether we should allow more than 2 preamble group sizes for SDT and if so how many more shall be allowed.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Q 2.1.1: For RA-SDT (i.e. 2-step and 4-step RACH) how many preamble groups shall be configured?**  **Option A: 2 (i.e. no change to the existing number)**  **Option B: more than 2 (specify how many with justification)** | | | |
| **Company** | **Option A/**  **Option B (number)** | **Company comments and justification** | **Rapporteur summary** |
| ZTE | Option A | We think option A is simple and sufficient. Given the fact that segmentation is possible for the data and also the fact that subsequent data transmission phase is enabled, we think optimizing the system for the packet size of the first UL packet is not really necessary. 2 different sizes for the first UL packet provides enough flexibility for the network to manage the overhead vs coverage implications for the first UL message. On top, there is also an additional threshold on the total size of the first UL packet that could be used for SDT, so, this provides the network with enough tools to configure the correct size for the first UL data packet and group A and group B can be reused without introducing a new preamble group for RA-SDT |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Comments Summary:** | | | |
| **Proposals:** | | | |

## Subsequent data transmission and indication

For the subsequent data transmission, one question is what happens when new UL traffic arrives (either for the DRBs that are configured for SDT or for other DRBs). Companies have noted that there will be no SR resources during the subsequent data transmission phase. If this is the case, then a BSR would be triggered and this should subsequently trigger RACH if there are no UL resources available. Companies are invited to comment on this understanding and whether any enhancements are needed for this scenario.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Q 2.2.2: Do companies agree that for RA-SDT and CG-SDT during the subsequent data transmission if new data arrives (either for the SDT DRBs or for other DRBs), BSR shall be triggered, which will inturn trigger RACH when there are no UL resources?** | | | |
| **Company** | **Yes/No (explain)** | **Company comments and justification** | **Rapporteur summary** |
| ZTE | Yes | We think we can reuse the existing principles in this case and RACH should be triggered. MSG3 in this case should contain the BSR indicating the data for radio bearers that are not subject to SDT and based on this, the network can perform full RESUME. |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
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|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Comments Summary:** | | | |
| **Proposals:** | | | |

## SDT vs non-SDT selection and switching

Currently the following precedures are executed by the UE before RACH procedure:

* Carrier selection (UL/SUL)
* RA-type selection
* Preamble group selection
* RACH preamble selection (randomly within the selected preamble group)

In case of SDT, we have to understand how the overall procedure works.

It seems we could reuse the procedure for carrier selection as this needs to be done apriori to ensure the correct carrier is selected between SUL and UL. i.e. upon initiating the SDT procedure, the UE shall perform the carrier selection between UL/SUL following procedures as normal.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Q 2.3.1: Do companies agree upon initiating SDT, the UE first performs carrier selection as per legacy procedure?** | | | |
| **Company** | **Yes/No (explain)** | **Company comments and justification** | **Rapporteur summary** |
| ZTE | Yes | Since the correct UL carrier needs to be selected based on coverage, the carrier selection needs to happen before the other procedures. |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Comments Summary:** | | | |
| **Proposals:** | | | |

Subsequent to the above, selection between CG-SDT and RA-SDT needs to be performed.

As agreed at the last meeting, the CG resources are associated with SSBs and the *UE selects one of the SSB with SS-RSRP above the threshold and selects the associated CG resource for UL data transmission*. Thus, in order to select the CG-SDT, the there should be at least one SSB above the configured RSRP threshold with CG resources configured on this SSB. Further, given that the CG resources are configured in dedicated signalling, it can be assumed that these resources shall be used when these are valid. So, the criterion for selecting between RA-SDT and CG-SDT seems to be simply whether there are any associated CG resources that are valid and are above the RSRP threshold. Thus the following question is asked:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Q 2.3.2: Do companies agree that If an SSB with SS-RSRP above a configured threshold with associated valid CG resource exists, the CG-SDT is chosen, otherwise UE proceeds to RACH procedure?** | | | |
| **Company** | **Yes/No (explain)** | **Company comments and justification** | **Rapporteur summary** |
| ZTE | Yes | Our understanding is that if valid CG-SDT resources exist then they have to be selected (since these are provided dedicatedly to the UE). So, we think if an SSB with SS-RSRP above a configured threshold with associated valid CG resources exist then they should be chosen. Note that the validity criteria for the CG-SDT resources should be satisfied for this to be applicable and these criteria are being discussed separately in email discussion #550. |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
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|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
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|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Comments Summary:** | | | |
| **Proposals:** | | | |

If CG-SDT is chosen, then the UE will proceed with CG-SDT, but if RA-SDT is chosen, then the UE needs to then continue with RACH procedure and select the RA-type (between 2-step and 4-step RA). For this purpose an RSRP threshold is used in legacy (Rel-16) procedure (i.e. the *msgA-RSRP-Threshold*). So, the next question is whether RACH type selection can be performed (i.e. between 2-step and 4-step RACH) using the legacy procedure.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Q 2.3.3: Do companies agree that if RACH procedure is initiated for SDT, the UE first performs RACH type selection as in legacy (i.e. Rel-16)?** | | | |
| **Company** | **Yes/No (explain)** | **Company comments and justification** | **Rapporteur summary** |
| ZTE | Yes | Both 2-step and 4-step RACH may have SDT configured and hence the UE may select the appropriate RACH procedure based on the legacy RACH type selection mechanisms. |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
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|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Comments Summary:** | | | |
| **Proposals:** | | | |

After selecting the specific RACH type, the UE has to select the RACH resource. If RACH resources for SDT exist for the selected RACH type, then the question is whether a further RSRP criterion is needed for the UE to be able use the SDT RACH resources. There are two options possible:

**Option 1: An RSRP threshold is configured to select between SDT and non-SDT RACH resources:**

* If RSRP is below the configured threshold then UE performs normal RACH procedure (i.e. Non-SDT and normal RESUME procedure will be initiated)
* If RSRP is is above the configured threshold then UE proceeds with RACH using SDT RACH resources and the RA-SDT procedure can continue

**Option 2: There is no further RSRP threshold for selection between SDT and non-SDT RACH resources:**

* In this option, UE proceeds with RACH using the SDT RACH resources and SDT procedure will continue

Companies are invited to comment on the above procedure and whether they prefer option 1 or option 2

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Q 2.3.4: Which option do companies prefer for RACH rsource selection after selecting the RACH type?**  **Option 1: A further RSRP threshold is configured to select between SDT and non-SDT RACH resources or**  **Option 2: There is no further RSRP threshold for selection between SDT and non-SDT RACH resources**  Please explain your choice with comments and justificaiton | | | |
| **Company** | **Option 1 /**  **Option 2** | **Company comments and justification** | **Rapporteur summary** |
| ZTE | Option 2 | We think option 2 is sufficient. The only implication of the option 2 is that the MSG3/MSGA size allows at least transmission of the CCCH message. The rest of the contents can be transmitted during the subsequent data transmission phase. Since this is no different to the legacy RACH procedure, we think there is no need to have an additional RSRP threshold to select between SDT and non-SDT at this stage anymore. |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
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|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Comments Summary:** | | | |
| **Proposals:** | | | |

The final aspect to discuss is whether it is allowed to switch different modes (i.e. CG-SDT <-> RA-SDT and vice versa or SDT <-> non-SDT and vice versa). In Rel-16, once the RACH type is selected the same RA-type is kept until a configured number of times. Further, even after RA-type changes (from 2-step to 4-step RACH), the payload size is kept the same (to avoid rebuilding of the MAC PDU). So the question is whether companies want to support any schemes potentially requiring the rebuilding of MAC PDU in case of SDT.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Q 2.3.5: Do companies think that any switching options requiring rebuilding of MAC PDU included in the first UL message are needed for SDT?** | | | |
| **Company** | **Yes (please explain) /**  **No** | **Company comments and justification** | **Rapporteur summary** |
| ZTE | No | We think rebuilding of MAC PDU need not be supported. Both the RACH CG mechanisms will allow multiple HARQ retransmissions as part of the triggered procedure and this should be sufficient. So, once the UE selects a given mechanism between RA-SDT and CG-SDT, it shall use the same for the rest of the procedure (i.e. no switching is allowed) |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
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|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Comments Summary:** | | | |
| **Proposals:** | | | |

## Handling of T319 like timer

In R2-2009189, some discussion on cell reselection took place. Further, we have agreed that a new timer is defined for failure detection (and it is FFS whether the functionality will be similar to T319 or if it will be restarted after every UL/DL).

If the timer is restarted after every UL/DL, basically we will need a new mechanism and then the actual length of the SDT phase is up to the network (i.e. the network can keep the UE in SDT phase for as long as it wants by scheduling data in UL/DL). On the otherhand if a T319 like timer is used, then the maximum length of the SDT phase has an upper bound and the assumption is that any transaction that takes longer should use full RESUME and this is similar to what was used in case of EDT in LTE.

Based on the online discussion at RAN2#112, it seems the views on this topic are fairly split and it might be good to understand the motivations from various companies to see if we could proceed one way or the other in this regard. So, the following question is asked to see if some clarity on the topic can be achieved on the technical aspects. Please provide details in justification so that techinal views on both side are well understood.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Q 2.4.1: Which option do companies prefer for handling of the new timer?**  **Option 1: Extended T319 like timer**  **Option 2: Timer restarted after each UL/DL**  **Please provide further technical justification for your views** | | | |
| **Company** | **Option 1**  **/**  **Option 2** | **Company comments and justification** | **Rapporteur summary** |
| ZTE | Option 1 | We think option 1 is simple and sufficient (as seen from the LTE-PUR). It should be noted that the target use cases for SDT are for applications that generate short and infrequent data. The subsequent data transmission phase is only there to cover any left over data after the first initial message and any associated upper layer feedback in DL. We should not aim to design a mechanism that could potentially keep the UE indefinitely in the SDT phase. So a time bounded SDT phase (including the subsequent data transmission phase), seems more appropriate to cover these kind of applications and we think this is sufficient and no further enhancements are needed. Starting and restarting the timer will result in a lot more complexity and is also may result in error cases due to missed signalling or scheduling messages etc. |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
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|  |  |  |  |
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|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Comments Summary:** | | | |
| **Proposals:** | | | |

# Conclusion and proposals
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