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# General

This document contains the list of comments made during the review of the MAC CR for SDT

## Contacts

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Company | Email address |
| SeungJune Yi | LG Electronics | seungjune.yi@lge.com |
| Anil Agiwal | Samsung | anilag@samsung.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Comments

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Companies | Brief description of the issue | Suggested resolution/company comments | Proposed way forward by rapporteur  |
| LG01 | 5.23> when the Contention Resolution is considered successful for Random Access procedure when the CG-SDT procedure is ongoing:Double “when” is misleading | Change the second “when” to “while”.3> when the Contention Resolution is considered successful for Random Access procedure while the CG-SDT procedure is ongoing: |  |
| LG02 | 5.21> when instruction from the upper layer has been received for indicating the expiry of the *cg-SDT-TimeAlignmentTimer*:The text is not aligned with RRC text.instruct the MAC entity to stop the *cg-SDT-TimeAlignmentTimer*, if it is running; | Align the text between RRC and MAC. Either using “expiring” or “stopping”.If we choose to keep the RRC text, the MAC spec should keep the original text, i.e. “stopping”. |  |
| LG03 | 5.8.21> if, after initial transmission for CG-SDT with CCCH message has been performed according to clause 5.4.1, PDCCH addressed to the MAC entity's C-RNTI has not been received, and the SSB corresponding to the configured UL grant has the same SSB index as the SSB selected for initial transmission for CG-SDT with CCCH message (i.e., retransmission of initial transmission of CG-SDT); 3> if this is the initial transmission of CG-SDT with CCCH message after the CG-SDT procedure is initiated as in clause 5.27: (i.e., SSB selection for initial transmission for CG-SDT)3> else if PDCCH addressed to C-RNTI has been received after the initial transmission of CG-SDT with CCCH message: (i.e., SSB for subsequent new transmission for CG-SDT)Three highlighted texts are not aligned. | Remove “SSB selection for” from the second text and remove “SSB for” from the third text. |  |
| LG04 | 5.27.2The MAC entity shall:1> store the RSRP of the downlink pathloss reference derived based on the *measObject* configured for the Serving Cell as in TS 38.331 [5].It is not clear when the MAC entity stores the RSRP. | Add the timing when the MAC entity stores the RSRP.The MAC entity shall, upon reception of configuration for CG-SDT:1> store the RSRP of the downlink pathloss reference derived based on the *measObject* configured for the Serving Cell as specified in TS 38.331 [5]. |  |
| Samsung001 | 5.27.1 General2> if CG-SDT is configured on the selected UL carrier, and TA of the configured grant Type 1 resource is valid according to clause 5.27.2; and2> if, for at least one RB configured for SDT having data available for transmission, *configuredGrantType1Allowed* is configured with value *true* for the corresponding logical channel(s); and2> if at least one SSB configured for CG-SDT with SS-RSRP above *cg-SDT-RSRP-ThresholdSSB* is available:3> indicate to the upper layers that the conditions for initiating SDT procedure are fulfilled;3> perform CG-SDT procedure on the selected UL carrier according to clause 5.8.2.We do not agree with this change. In our understanding, the intention of the agreement was to use LCH restriction (i.e. configuredGrantType1Allowed or allowedCG-List) for CG-SDT during the LCP procedure. It was not intended for CG-SDT vs RA-SDT selection. | Remove the changeLenovo: We agree with Samsung |  |
| Lenovo001 | As already discussed by email last week, we think that the following RAN2#118e agreement would require some clarifications/changes in TS38.321.UE doesn’t need to update Bj once being released to RRC\_INACTIVE.  FFS whether a change is needed for SDT and Lenovo can give a TP. According to the current specifications, UE needs to update Bj also while being in RRC\_INACTIVE and during a SDT procedure. There is a requirement that UE needs to have a up to date value for Bj when LCP is performed. Just to mention, that we actually don’t think that the interpretation/implementation option mentioned by NEC – “T” should be considered as zero at the time of the first update of Bj, e.g. first LCP procedure after initializing Bj to zero – was the intended behaviour at the time when LCP procedure was specified for NR Rel-15. In particular given that the exact moment when UE updates Bj is up to UE implementation (UE doesn’t need to be update Bj at the time when performing LCP) as specified in TS38.321, this would lead to different implementations having a different *Bj* value at the time when a grant is processed by LCP. This seems to be also the understanding of other companies (e.g. R2-2203391, R2-2203186) when the issue was discussed for the SCG activation and deactivation feature. Even though we don’t consider the issue as critical, we think that RAN2 should be at least clear on what the intended UE behaviour is for SDT. Taking the agreement reached during RAN2#118e it seems that UE also doesn’t need to update Bj during a SDT procedure, e.g. for subsequent SDT initial transmissions. As commented already by email, we think that a NOTE would be the simplest to clarify the intended UE behaviour, but we don’t have a strong opinion.  |  |  |