**3GPP TSG-RAN WG2 Meeting #116-e R2-2111451**

**Electronic Meeting, 1st - 12th November, 2021**

|  |
| --- |
| *CR-Form-v12.1* |
| **CHANGE REQUEST** |
|  |
|  | **37.340** | **CR** |  | **rev** |  | **Current version:** | **16.7.0** |  |
|  |
| *For* [***HELP***](http://www.3gpp.org/3G_Specs/CRs.htm#_blank)*on using this form: comprehensive instructions can be found at* [*http://www.3gpp.org/Change-Requests*](http://www.3gpp.org/Change-Requests)*.* |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Proposed change affects:*** | UICC apps |  | ME | **x** | Radio Access Network | **x** | Core Network |  |

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| ***Title:***  | Running CR to 37.340 for eIAB |
|  |  |
| ***Source to WG:*** | vivo |
| ***Source to TSG:*** | R2 |
|  |  |
| ***Work item code:*** | NR\_IAB\_enh-Core |  | ***Date:*** | 2021-11-15 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Category:*** | **B** |  | ***Release:*** | Rel-17 |
|  | *Use one of the following categories:****F*** *(correction)****A*** *(mirror corresponding to a change in an earlier release)****B*** *(addition of feature),* ***C*** *(functional modification of feature)****D*** *(editorial modification)*Detailed explanations of the above categories canbe found in 3GPP [TR 21.900](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/Specs/html-info/21900.htm). | *Use one of the following releases:Rel-8 (Release 8)Rel-9 (Release 9)Rel-10 (Release 10)Rel-11 (Release 11)…Rel-15 (Release 15)Rel-16 (Release 16)Rel-17 (Release 17)Rel-18 (Release 18)* |
|  |  |
| ***Reason for change:*** | To capture the following RAN2 agreements on NR\_IAB\_enh-Core WI:**RAN2#113bis-e agreements**:* SRB2 can be used for F1-C transport in CP/UP-separation scenario 1 (FFS other cases)
* Split SRB2 can be used for F1-C transport in CP/UP-separation scenario 2 (FFS other cases)
* R2-2100040 LS on CP-UP separation noted

**RAN2#114-e agreements**:* NR DLInformationTransfer and ULInformationTransfer messages can be enhanced to transfer F1-C related packets in CP/UP separation.
* F1-C over RRC and F1-C over BAP should not be supported simultaneously on the same parent link.

**RAN2#116-e agreements**:* The configuration of F1-C traffic on the indication of the the leg(s) used for transferring the F1-C traffic is configured to IAB-MT by a new field, e.g., *f1c-TransferPath-r17* ENUMERATED {MCG, SCG, both}.
* As long as the BH RLC CH for F1-C on the indicated Cell Group is configured (the CG is indicated by the field *f1c-TransferPath-r17*), IAB node can be aware of whether to use F1-C transferring over BH or F1-C transferring over RRC, i.e. F1-C-over-BAP is selected as long as BH RLC CH for F1-C on the indicated CG is configured.
* It is not necessary for IAB-node to be aware whether the gNB allows “F1 over BAP” or only allows “F1-C over RRC” during cell (re)selection, in case the gNB broadcasts *iab-Support*.
* ONLY SRB2 is used for F1-C transport in CP/UP-separation scenario 1.
* ONLY split SRB2 is used for F1-C transport in CP/UP-separation scenario 2
* FFS if For IAB-MT’s RRC message that carries F1-C/F1-C related traffic, the IAB-MT use split SRB2 via SCG in scenario 2 if *f1c-TransferPath-r17* indicates ‘*SCG’* or ‘*both’* regardless of the *primaryPath* configuration. FFS on how to capture this in specs.
* FFS if In case the split SRB2 RRC message contains both F1-C traffic and other information unrelated to IAB, the IAB-MT follows the configuration of F1-C transfer path (if configured) to transmit this RRC message.
 |
|  |  |
| ***Summary of change:*** | Introduction of CP-UP separation support in NR eIAB.  |
|  |  |
| ***Consequences if not approved:*** | CP-UP separation is not supported in NR eIAB. |
|  |  |
| ***Clauses affected:*** | 7.11 F1-C transfer over E-UTRA7.xx F1-C transfer over NR10.10.2 MR-DC with 5GC10.15 F1-C Traffic Transfer |
|  |  |
|  | **Y** | **N** |  |  |
| ***Other specs*** |  | **X** |  Other core specifications  | TS/TR ... CR ... |
| ***affected:*** |  | **x** |  Test specifications | TS/TR ... CR ...  |
| ***(show related CRs)*** |  | **x** |  O&M Specifications | TS/TR ... CR ...  |
|  |  |
| ***Other comments:*** | This Running CR is based on the CR in R2-2108920 endorsed at RAN2#115-e meeting.  |
|  |  |
| ***This CR's revision history:*** |  |

*First Modified Subclause*

## 7.11 F1-C transfer over E-UTRA

In EN-DC, the F1-AP message encapsulated in SCTP/IP or F1-C related (SCTP/)IP packet can be transferred between IAB-donor and IAB-node via E-UTRA, if configured by IAB-donor, as specified in TS 38.331 [4]. When both E-UTRA and NR are configured to transfer the F1-AP message encapsulated in SCTP/IP or F1-C related (SCTP/)IP packet, it is up to the IAB implementation when to select the E-UTRA. SRB2 is used for transporting the F1-AP message encapsulated in SCTP/IP or F1-C related (SCTP/)IP packet between IAB-MT and MN [10], and the F1-AP message encapsulated in SCTP/IP or F1-C related (SCTP/)IP packet is transferred as a container via X2-AP between MN and SN, see TS 36.423 [9].

## 7.XX F1-C transfer in NR-DC

In NR-DC, the F1-AP message encapsulated in SCTP/IP or F1-C related (SCTP/)IP packet can be transferred via BAP sublayer or via SRB between the IAB-node and the corresponding non-F1-termination node (as specified in TS 38.401 [7]), as specified in TS 38.331 [4]. When both MCG and SCG are configured to transfer the F1-AP message encapsulated in SCTP/IP or F1-C related (SCTP/)IP packet, it is up to the IAB implementation for path selection. Two scenarios are supported, as shown in Figure 7.XX-1.



Figure 7.XX-1: F1-C transfer in NR-DC; a) Scenario 1; b) Scenario 2

Scenario 1: IAB-node exchanges F1-AP message encapsulated in SCTP/IP or F1-C related (SCTP/)IP packet with the SN (F1-termination node as specified in TS 38.401 [7]) using NR access link via MN (non-F1-termination node), and exchange F1-U traffic using backhaul link(s) with SN. SRB2 is used for transporting the F1-AP message encapsulated in SCTP/IP or F1-C related (SCTP/)IP packet between IAB-MT and MN (see TS 38.331 [4]), and the F1-AP message encapsulated in SCTP/IP or F1-C related (SCTP/)IP packet is transferred as a container via XnAP between MN and SN, see TS 38.423 [5].

Scenario 2: IAB-node exchanges F1-AP message encapsulated in SCTP/IP or F1-C related (SCTP/)IP packet with the MN (F1-termination node) using NR access link via SN (non-F1-termination node), and exchange F1-U traffic using backhaul link(s) with MN. Split SRB2 is used for transporting the F1-AP message encapsulated in SCTP/IP or F1-C related (SCTP/)IP packet between IAB-MT and SN (see TS 38.331 [4]), and the F1-AP message encapsulated in SCTP/IP or F1-C related (SCTP/)IP packet is transferred as a container via XnAP between SN and MN, see TS 38.423 [5].

The F1-AP message encapsulated in SCTP/IP or the F1-C related (SCTP/)IP packet can be transferred either over BAP sublayer or over SRB, but the two mechanisms cannot be supported simultaneously on the same parent link. The F1-AP message encapsulated in SCTP/IP or the F1-C related (SCTP/)IP packet is transferred over BAP sublayer, if the BH RLC channel used for transferring the F1-C traffic is configured on the cell group indicated for F1-C traffic transfer according to TS 38.331 [4].

 *Next Modification*

### 10.10.2 MR-DC with 5GC

The RRC Transfer procedure is used to deliver an RRC message, encapsulated in a PDCP PDU between the MN and the SN (and vice versa) so that it may be forwarded to/from the UE using split SRB. The RRC transfer procedure is also used for:

- providing a SN measurement report, failure information report, SN UE assistance information or CPC execution completion from the UE to the SN;

- providing MCG failure information from the UE to the MN via the SN and an RRC reconfiguration, or release, or an inter-RAT handover command from the MN to the UE via the SN;

- providing F1-C traffic from an IAB-node to the MN via the SN, or F1-C traffic from the MN to an IAB-node via the SN.

Additional details of the RRC transfer procedure are defined in TS 38.423 [5].

**Split SRB:**



Figure 10.10.2-1: RRC Transfer procedure for split SRB (DL operation)

Figure 10.10.2-1 shows an example signaling flow for DL RRC Transfer in case of the split SRB:

1. The MN, when it decides to use the split SRBs, starts the procedure by initiating the RRC Transfer procedure. The MN encapsulates the RRC message in a PDCP PDU and ciphers with own keys.

NOTE: The usage of the split SRBs shall be indicated in the Secondary Node Addition procedure or Modification procedure.

2. The SN forwards the RRC message to the UE.

3. The SN may send PDCP delivery acknowledgement of the RRC message forwarded in step 2.



Figure 10.10.2-2: RRC Transfer procedure for split SRB (UL operation)

Figure 10.10.2-2 shows an example signaling flow for UL RRC Transfer in case of the split SRB:

1. When the UE provides response to the RRC message, it sends it to the SN.

2. The SN initiates the RRC Transfer procedure, in which it transfers the received PDCP PDU with encapsulated RRC message.

**SN measurement report, failure information report, SN UE assistance information or CPC execution completion:**



Figure 10.10.2-3: RRC Transfer procedure for SN measurement report, failure information report, SN UE assistance information or CPC execution completion

Figure 10.10.2-3 shows an example signaling flow for RRC Transfer in case of the forwarding of the SN measurement report, failure information report, SN UE assistance information or CPC execution completion from the UE:

1. When the UE sends an SN measurement report, failure information report, SN UE assistance information, or CPC execution completion it sends it to the MN in a container called *ULInformationTransferMRDC* as specified in TS 38.331 [4].

2. The MN initiates the RRC Transfer procedure, in which it transfers the received SN measurement report, failure information, SN UE assistance information or CPC execution completion as an octet string.

**MCG failure information and RRC Reconfiguration / RRC Release / inter-RAT handover command over SRB3:**



Figure 10.10.2-4: RRC Transfer procedure for MCG failure information

Figure 10.10.2-4 shows an example signaling flow for RRC Transfer in case of the forwarding of the MCG failure information from the UE:

1. When the UE sends *MCGFailureInformation* over SRB3, it sends it to the SN in a container called *ULInformationTransferMRDC* as specified in TS 38.331 [4].

2. The SN initiates the RRC Transfer procedure, in which it transfers the received *MCGFailureInformation* as an octet string.

3. The MN initiates the RRC Transfer procedure, in which it transfers the *RRCConnectionReconfiguration*, or *RRCReconfiguration*, or *RRCConnectionRelease*, or *RRCRelease*, or *MobilityFromNRCommand*, or *MobilityFromEUTRACommand* as an octet string.

4. The SN sends the received RRC message to the UE in a container called *DLInformationTransferMRDC*, as specified in TS 38.331 [4].

**F1-C traffic transfer:**

Figure 10.10.2-X: Scenario 2: F1-C is transported between IAB-MT and MN (F1-termination node) in NR-DC

1. The IAB-MT sends a F1-AP message encapsulated in SCTP/IP or F1-C related (SCTP/)IP packet to the SN (non-F1-termination node) via split SRB2 in a container within *ULInformationTransfer* encapsulated in a PDCP PDU as specified in TS 38.331 [4].

2. The SN initiates the RRC Transfer procedure, in which it transfers the received PDCP PDU (*ULInformationTransfer* message) including F1-AP message.

3. When the MN (F1-termination node) sends a F1-AP message encapsulated in SCTP/IP or F1-C related (SCTP/)IP packet, it starts the procedure by initiating the RRC Transfer procedure, if split SRB2 is determined to be used and usage of SCG path is determined. The MN sends the F1-AP message to the SN in a container within *DLInformationTransfer* encapsulated in a PDCP PDU specified in TS 38.331 [4].

4. The SN forwards the encapsulated *DLInformationTransfer* in a PDCP PDU as specified in TS 38.331 [4] to IAB-MT.

*Next Modification*

## 10.15 F1-C Traffic Transfer

In EN-DC/NR-DC, the F1-C Traffic Transfer message is sent by the MN to the SN or by the SN to MN to transfer the F1-C traffic to and from an IAB-node.

Figure 10.15-1: F1-C Traffic Transfer procedure in EN-DC

1. When the IAB-MT sends a F1-AP message encapsulated in SCTP/IP or F1-C related (SCTP/)IP packet, it sends it to the MN in a container within *ULInformationTransfer* as specified in TS 36.331 [10].

2. The MN initiates the F1-C Traffic Transfer procedure, in which it transfers the received F1-AP message encapsulated in (SCTP/)IP or F1-C related (SCTP/)IP packet as an octet string.

3. When the SN sends a F1-AP message encapsulated in SCTP/IP or F1-C related (SCTP/)IP packet, it sends it to the MN as an octet string through the F1-C Traffic Transfer procedure.

4. The MN sends the received F1-AP message encapsulated in SCTP/IP or F1-C related (SCTP/)IP packet to the IAB-MT in a container within *DLInformationTransfer* as specified in TS 36.331 [10].

Figure 10.15-XX: Scenario 1: F1-C is transported between IAB-MT and SN (F1-termination node) in NR-DC

1. The IAB-MT sends a F1-AP message encapsulated in SCTP/IP or F1-C related (SCTP/)IP packet to the MN (non-F1-termination node) via SRB2 in a container within *ULInformationTransfer* as specified in TS 38.331 [4].

2. The MN initiates the F1-C Traffic Transfer procedure, in which it transfers the received F1-AP message encapsulated in (SCTP/)IP or F1-C related (SCTP/)IP packet as an octet string.

3. The SN (F1-termination node) sends a F1-AP message encapsulated in SCTP/IP or F1-C related (SCTP/)IP packet to the MN as an octet string through the F1-C Traffic Transfer procedure.

4. The MN sends the received F1-AP message encapsulated in SCTP/IP or F1-C related (SCTP/)IP packet to the IAB-MT via SRB2 in a container within *DLInformationTransfer* as specified in TS 38.331 [4].

*End of Changes*

# Annex (not part of the specification) - collection of RAN2 agreements on NR IAB enhancements WI

Cyan highlight – agreement captured in this running CR

No highlight – agreement with no direct impact on specifications

## RAN2#116-e agreements

**MAC - LCG extension and BSR**

* Support of Extended BSR by an IAB-MT is an optional capability.
* The same format is adopted for Extended Long and Extended Long Truncated BSR.
* Reserved values from the one-octet eLCID space are used to identify new Extended BSR formats.
* Extended LCG space (max 256 LCGs) shall also apply to pre-emptive BSR.
* Extended pre-emptive BSR format shall be identical to the Extended Long BSR format.
* When the Extended BSR is configured, the selection between Extended BSR and legacy BSR is not left to IAB-MT implementation.
* When the Extended BSR is configured, if the maximum LCGID among the configured LCGs is 7 or lower, legacy format is always sent; otherwise the Extended format is sent.
* The following format is adopted for Extended Long and Extended Long Truncated BSR: Fixed size of 256 LCGi followed by variable number of (fixed size) Buffer Size fields; related buffer size field is added only when the corresponding LCG bit is set to 1 in the bitmap.
* RAN2 will not attempt standardizing buffer size calculation for Rel-17 pre-emptive BSR, nor make any further effort to standardizing triggering of Rel-17 pre-emptive BSR.

**RLF indications**

* Type 2 indication by dual-connected node is triggered when the node initiates RRC re-establishment resulting from BH RLF on both CGs or BH RLF on MCG with no fast MCG recovery.
* A node can transmit type-3 indication if re-establishment is successful. FFS whether to specify a detailed condition for success of re-establishment, e.g., successful transmission of RRC reestablishment complete. FFS whether to also include additional triggering condition such as successful transmission of ReconfigurationComplete, which is for the case the node initiates re-establishment and selects a CHO candidate cell and hence performs CHO successfully.
* A node can transmit type-3 indication only if it previously sent type-2 indication, i.e., type-3 indication cannot be triggered without triggering type-2 indication previously.
* Upon reception of type-2 indication, the node should perform local re-routing if possible.
* Upon reception of type-3 indication, the actions (e.g. local re-routing) triggered upon reception of a previous type-2 indication should be reversed, if possible.
* FFS if Type 2 indication by dual-connected node can be triggered when the node detects BH RLF on any BH and it cannot perform re-routing for affected traffic (if agreed see R2-2111539 for more details)

**CP-UP separation**

* The configuration of F1-C traffic on the indication of the the leg(s) used for transferring the F1-C traffic is configured to IAB-MT by a new field , e.g., *f1c-TransferPath-r17* ENUMERATED {MCG, SCG, both}.
* As long as the BH RLC CH for F1-C on the indicated Cell Group is configured (the CG is indicated by the field *f1c-TransferPath-r17*), IAB node can be aware of whether to use F1-C transferring over BH or F1-C transferring over RRC, i.e. F1-C-over-BAP is selected as long as BH RLC CH for F1-C on the indicated CG is configured.
* It is not necessary for IAB-node to be aware whether the gNB allows “F1 over BAP” or only allows “F1-C over RRC” during cell (re)selection, in case the gNB broadcasts *iab-Support*.
* ONLY SRB2 is used for F1-C transport in CP/UP-separation scenario 1.
* ONLY split SRB2 is used for F1-C transport in CP/UP-separation scenario 2
* FFS if For IAB-MT’s RRC message that carries F1-C/F1-C related traffic, the IAB-MT use split SRB2 via SCG in scenario 2 if *f1c-TransferPath-r17* indicates ‘*SCG’* or ‘*both’* regardless of the *primaryPath* configuration. FFS on how to capture this in specs.
* FFS if In case the split SRB2 RRC message contains both F1-C traffic and other information unrelated to IAB, the IAB-MT follows the configuration of F1-C transfer path (if configured) to transmit this RRC message.

**Routing and re-routing**

**Inter Topology Routing**

* Go with B, including the following:

- If BAP address matches, deliver to upper layer;

Else:

- If routing ID matches rewriting table, perform the header rewriting;

- perform routing and mapping to BH RLC CH.

* For downstream, the boundary node is able to identify/differentiate the traffic routed from inter-topology vs. the traffic routed from intra-topology, based on the ingress link.
* For downstream at the boundary node, for any received data from inter-topology identified by the ingress link:

The data is delivered to upper layer, if the BAP address in the header is same as the boundary node BAP address configured in the topology of the ingress link (of this packet); otherwise, the data is determined as to be header rewritten (assumes support only of topology where decedent nodes belong to same topology).

(This requires that traffic not terminated at the boundary node should not use the BAP address in header same as the boundary node BAP address configured in the topology of the ingress link.)

Perform the header rewriting based on the configured rewriting table, and then perform routing and mapping to BH RLC CH.

* For upstream at the boundary node, for any received data from lower layer:

We may keep the ingress BAP text of R16 (that is intended for donor DU but general in Stage-3), i.e. if the BAP address in header match the boundary node BAP address configured in the topology of the ingress link, deliver to upper layer.

The data is determined as to be header rewritten and perform the header rewriting accordingly, if routing ID in header matches any “previous routing ID” in the rewriting table; and then perform routing and mapping to BH RLC CH.

* Will have rewriting mapping configuration(s) Old routing ID to New routing ID that limits the possible rewriting (for all cases of re-writing), details FFS

## RAN2#115-e agreements

**Organizational**

* R2 assumes that the UE need to be able to treat the separate resources as different cells on L1.
* LS is agreeable with the addition of the above assumption. Can consider one more round of details checking.

**On Enhancements to improve topology-wide fairness multi-hop latency and congestion mitigation**

* The length of LCG to be extended to 8 bits (i.e., at most 256 LCGs).
* New Short (Truncated) BSR format to specified that has a fixed size and consists of an 8-bit LCG ID field and an 8-bit Buffer Size field.
* Exclude P1

**On Topology adaptation enhancements**

* A configured threshold of available buffer size based on flow control feedback is used to determine the congestion, for the purpose of local re-routing.
* For intra-CU cases, Support inter-donor-DU re-routing at least in the scenarios of NR-DC among donor-DUs, inter-donor-DU recovery and inter-donor-DU migration.
* Support inter-CU re-routing, i.e. IAB-node re-routes the data to its original donor-CU via the alternative BAP path over the topology in target CU.
* For inter-donor-DU re-routing, support the “previous routing ID to new routing ID” BAP header rewriting.
* RAN2 to further discuss the open issues for inter-CU routing:
* What’s the BAP address added in BAP header in the first topology (i.e. the BAP address of ingress data at the boundary node);
* How to differentiate the concatenated traffic and non-concatenated traffic;
* How to determine whether a data should be delivered to upper layer (for downstream);
* How to determine whether the BAP header of a data should be rewritten (i.e. whether being routed to another topology or its own topology).
* As baseline, support the 1:1 and N:1 mapping from “previous routing ID” to “new routing ID” for BAP header rewriting at the boundary node, in inter-CU routing.
* As baseline, support the 1:1 and N:1 mapping from “ingress BH link + ingress BH RLC ID” to “egress BH link + egress BH RLC ID” for bearer mapping at the boundary node, in inter-CU routing.

## RAN2#114-e agreements

**On Topology adaptation enhancements**

* RAN2 preference is to support inter-topology routing via BAP header rewriting based on BAP routing ID option 4
* Assume that the IAB-donor will configure (alternative) egress links that can be used at local re-routing (at least with same destination, FFS same routing ID)
* Local re-routing based on flow control feedback is allowed based on certain value of available buffer size. FFS further details. (Current hbh fc is for DL traffic.
* NR DLInformationTransfer and ULInformationTransfer messages can be enhanced to transfer F1-C related packets in CP/UP separation.
* A new IE named DedicatedInfoF1c can be defined to transfer F1-C related packets via NR RRC message
* F1-C over RRC and F1-C over BAP should not be supported simultaneously on the same parent link.
* The trigger to generate a type 2 RLF indication is at RLF detection. FFS whether for both: single and dual connection cases.
* The trigger for type 3 RLF indication transmission is successful recovery after BH RLF. FFS whether for both: single and dual connection cases.
* Type 2 and Type 3 BH RLF Indications are transmitted via BAP Control PDU.
* Upon reception of the type-2 indication, the IAB node does not initiate RRC re-establishment.
* If an IAB node with dual parents (via DC) receives type-2 BH RLF indication from one parent, IAB-node may trigger a local re-routing to the other parent. The detail of local re-routing and whether/how the action on type-2 indication is configurable is FFS.

## RAN2#113bis-e agreements

**On Enhancements to improve topology-wide fairness multi-hop latency and congestion mitigation**

* LCG range to be extended for IAB-MT. Size of LCG and enhancements to BSR are FFS

**On Topology adaptation enhancements**

* The use cases for IAB-MT CHO should be migration and RLF recovery.
* RAN2 should have a common solution for intra-CU/intra-DU CHO and intra-CU/inter-DU CHO.
* condEventA3 and condEventA5 are applicable to IAB-MT
* FFS if other CHO execution condition is needed (e.g. whether type 2 RLF indication can be used as trigger)
* SRB2 can be used for F1-C transport in CP/UP-separation scenario 1 (FFS other cases)
* Split SRB2 can be used for F1-C transport in CP/UP-separation scenario 2 (FFS other cases)

## RAN2#113-e agreements

**On Enhancements to improve topology-wide fairness multi-hop latency and congestion mitigation**

* RAN2 will not further discuss ways of evaluating success of any fairness mechanisms that may be introduced, beyond the already agreed definition of topology-wide fairness and its variants.
* Chair: On the agreed issues below, the agreement doesn’t mean that we have agreed that there need to be a solution for it in R17. Furthermore, liberal interpretation of the text is ok.
* ISSUES: eIAB work on topology-wide fairness will focus on the following issues
* IF-1: The scheduler of an IAB node does not have all the information needed (e.g. link quality across multiple hops) to make appropriate upstream or downstream scheduling decisions which take into account the overall route link quality (such as e.g. using downstream link quality measurements to adjust the scheduling weights so as to achieve proportional fairness for different bearers/RLC channels across multiple child-IAB nodes)
* IF-2: Congestion conditions on BH RLC channels carrying UE bearers with same or similar QoS requirements can be unbalanced and some channels may even be congested, thereby leading to some users experiencing longer latency and violating fairness requirement.
* IF-4: IAB node cannot give more resource to those BH RLC CHs that aggregate more bearers and/or carry bearers with higher load per bearer (i.e. IAB node cannot give more resource to those BH RLC CHs with higher aggregate load)
* ISSUES: In the first instance, eIAB work on multi-hop latency will focus on the following issues:
* IL-1: IAB node cannot help ensure that overall or remaining PDB is met for a packet (e.g. by prioritizing bearers with higher number of hops), as it does not have a latency reference for the packets being scheduled, resulting in packets with the same QoS requirement ending up with different latency
* IL-2: IAB node may need to report joint buffer status for LCHs which have rather differing QoS requirements, due to the current (Rel-16) limit on the number of LCGs
* IL-3: Buffer size calculation for pre-emptive BSR may differ for nodes of different vendors as it is left to implementation in Rel-16
* IL-5: The CU is unable to put bearers with lower PDB on routes with less congestion risk (higher resource efficiency) or which are RLF-free
* IL-6: The CU is unable to configure routing based on actual (real-time) latency per BH RLC channel

**On Topology adaptation enhancements**

* RAN2 to discuss CHO and start with intra-donor CHO until RAN3 has made progress on inter-donor IAB-node migration.
* R2 confirm the intention Rel-16 CHO is / can be used for IAB-MT (FFS whether any modification is needed).
* R2 assumes that Rel-16 specification is the baseline for the configuration of default route, IP address(es) and target path for intra-donor CHO.
* RAN2 to support type-2/3 RLF indication (FFS specified behavior(s) TS impact, FFS details).
* Type-2 RLF indication may be used to trigger local rerouting
* Type-2 RLF indication may be used to trigger deactivation of IAB-supported in SIB
* Type-2 RLF indication may be used to trigger deactivation or reduction of SR and/or BSR transmissions
* 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.
* RAN2 considers inter-donor-DU local rerouting to be in scope

## RAN2#112-e agreements

**On Enhancements to improve topology-wide fairness multi-hop latency and congestion mitigation:**

* R2 assumes Rel-17 IAB work will not define any new end-user QoS metrics on top of the existing 5G QoS framework.
* Rel-17 IAB work will comprise agreeing on a definition of topology-wide fairness.
* Topology-wide fairness provides mechanisms for the management of QoS so that the required QoS is met across the topology, regardless of where a UE attaches to the IAB network. Variants of this definition is not precluded. FFS how the success of such mechanisms is evaluated.
* RAN2 will not discuss enhancements to DL E2E flow control without input from RAN3
* FFS if RAN2 will deprioritize splitting data of a radio bearer into two or more paths (RAN3 agreements to deprioritize Multi-Route Support with data split in IAB)

**On Topology adaptation enhancements:**

* 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.