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# Introduction

The paper is to capture the outcome for open issues in below email discussion

* [Post116bis-e][078][eIAB] 38340 (Huawei)

Scope: Updated running CR taking into account agreements of R2-116bis-e. Best effort review. Endorsement if possible. Capture TS related Open Issues, not captured elsewhere and suggest how to treat.

Intended outcome: Updated Running CR, reviewed, baseline for next meeting. TS related Open issue with suggestion how to treat.

Deadline: Short.

# Open issue list

### Open issue list for BAP

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Issue number** | **Issue description** | **Suggestion how to treat** |
| **BAP#01** | Considering below options for the scenario of inter-to-intra-topology re-routing:  Option 1: No header rewriting is applied, and the upstream packet’s BAP routing ID in the ingress topology contains the BAP address of the IAB-donor-DU in the same topology.  Option 2: Header rewriting is applied based on a header-rewriting entry, which contains the packet’s ingress BAP routing ID and the BAP routing ID of the packet’s egress topology after inter-to-intra re-routing.  Option 3: Header rewriting is applied based on a header-rewriting entry, which contains the BAP routing ID of the packet’s intended egress topology after inter-topology routing and the BAP routing ID of the packet’s egress topology after inter-to-intra re-routing.  Option 4: The boundary node is configured with a default BAP routing ID for each topology via RRC, and such default BAP routing ID can be used as the egress routing ID when applying inter-topology rerouting. | Down-selection among those options, based on the discussion/contribution in next meeting.  Companies’ paper are welcome, taking into account the offline summary R2-2201879. [TP are also welcome] |
| **BAP#02** | The RAN3 signalling on how to include/configure the “information” in below:  The BH RLC CH mapping configuration of the boundary node includes information for the boundary node to differentiate mappings based on ingress topology and egress topology.  The UL mapping configuration to include information for the boundary node to determine the egress topology of each UL mapping entry.  The routing configuration to include information that allows the boundary node to determine the topology each routing entry applies to. RAN3 to decide on St3-related aspects. | Wait for the RAN3 detailed signalling design. |
| **BAP#03** | For inter-topology routing, the header rewriting configuration to include information that allows the boundary node to determine either the egress topology, or the ingress topology, or the traffic direction of a header-rewriting entry (selection of one of these expected) | Down-selection among 3 options in RAN2 and then wait for the RAN3 detailed signalling design. |
| **BAP#04** | FFS on granularity of per BH RLC channel level for local re-routing triggered by flow control feedback. | Quick decision next meeting online.  No need of companies’ contribution on this. |
| **BAP#05** | FFS for type4 indication on whether to use “BH RLF recovery failure indication” or existing name “BH RLF indication”. | Quick decision next meeting online.  No need of companies’ contribution on this. |
| **BAP#06** | FFS Type-2 indication triggered by a dual-connected node does not include any routing information | Quick decision next meeting online.  No need of companies’ contribution on this. |
| **BAP#07** | FFS whether Type-2 is propagated further:[below is copied from minutes]   * 1: FFS whether Type-2 is propagated further for single connection scenarios (single connection from UP point of view). * 2: FFS whether Type-2 is propagated further for dual connection scenarios (dual connection from UP point of view), whether routing info need to be included for the indication to be useful in such scenarios, whether the indication need to be regenerated for the indication to be useful in such scenarios. FFS what should be the meaning/semantics to the receiver of a propagated Type-2 indication in such scenario. | Quick decision next meeting online.  Proponent’s contribution to clarify the details FFS is welcome. |
| **BAP#08** | FFS for type-3 indication, if genetic condition “upon recovery” from BH RLF is sufficient. | Quick decision next meeting online.  No need of companies’ contribution on this. |

### Companies’ views collection

**Please provide your comment to the above open issue list, add more open issue if needed.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Issue No.**  **or new Issue** | **Comments** | **Rapporteur reply** |
| Kyocera | New | Regarding the editor’s note in 5.2.x (for BAP header rewriting operation), “*The need/place/details of this section are to be confirmed/revised after RAN2 make clear agreements for all the cases for header rewriting.*”, RAN2 agreed “*[049] Determination/execution of header rewriting is handled by the BAP TX entity.*”, so we wonder if the section should be moved under 5.2.1 (for Transmitting operation), i.e., “5.2.1.x”. This is just an editorial issue, so we assume quick decision can be made in Pre117-e-offline. |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

# Conclusion

In this contribution,
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