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1. Introduction

This document aims to facilitate the discussion on open issues related to MAC CR for XR enhancements, as per the following e-mail discussion:

**[POST123bis][024][XR] 38.321 Running CR (Qualcomm)**

Scope:

- Review running CR

- Identify open issues

- Get inputs for subset of open issues (focus more detailed open issues that would help with CR finalisation.

 Deadline: Nov 1st, 2023

In this discussion, companies may provide their input for (minor) open issues related to stage-3 design details in the MAC running (e.g. MAC CE format design, etc) that have not been officially agreed yet. The intention is to build consensus and prepare for easy agreement at the next RAN2 meeting.

The following are the deadlines for this discussion:

- Company feedback: by 2200 on Oct 30 UTC

- Rapporteur’s summary: by 0900 on Oct 31 UTC

- Final deadline: by 2200 on Nov 1 UTC

2. Contact information

Please provide your contact information in the table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Delegate** | **Email** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

3. Input for the open issues

3.1 Enhanced BSR MAC CE

First, let us discuss the format of the Enhanced BSR MAC CE.

One of the key questions in the format design is how to indicate which BSR table an LCG uses. The rapporteur thinks there can be at least two options (as illustrated in Figure 1):

* Option 1. Introduce a new 8-bit bitmap which indicates which BSR table an LCG uses; or
* Option 2. Add one bit indicator coupled with each Buffer Size field.

There may be other design options too. If you think so, please describe your preferred design in the Comments column.



**Figure 1. Options for the format of the Enhanced BSR MAC CE**

**Question 1: Which format for the Enhanced BSR MAC CE do you prefer?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option 1/2 or other** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary:**

(to be added after the discussion)

In legacy, padding BSR includes a truncated version (i.e. long/short Truncated BSR MAC CE), which is used when there are not enough padding bits to accommodate a regular-sized BSR MAC CE. We may or may not need a truncated version of the Enhanced BSR MAC CE. Please share your preference and comments.

**Question 2: Is it necessary to introduce a truncated version of the Enhanced BSR MAC CE?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary:**

(to be added after the discussion)

There are three types of LCID (legacy 6-bit LCID, one octet eLCID, or two-octet eLCID) that the Enhanced BSR MAC CE may use.

**Question 3: which type of LCID do you think the new Enhanced BSR MAC CE should have?**

* **Option 1: legacy 6-bit LCID;**
* **Option 2: one-octet eLCID;**
* **Option 3: two-octet eLCID.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option 1/2/3** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary:**

(to be added after the discussion)

The Enhanced BSR MAC CE needs to be assigned a logical channel priority. The rapporteur does not see any strong reasons for it to have a priority different from that of the legacy BSR MAC CEs. Please indicate if you would agree.

**Question 4: Do you agree that the Enhanced BSR MAC CE should have the same logical channel priority as the legacy BSR MAC CEs (the ones except the padding BSR)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary:**

(to be added after the discussion)

## 3.2 DSR MAC CE

Based on the agreements so far, the DSR MAC CE should include at least the following fields:

* LCG bitmap, which indicates which LCG has delay information included in the MAC CE;
* remaining time for a reported LCG;
* Amount of data associated with the reported remaining time.

Let us first discuss how to encode the remaining time. Based on proposals submitted so far, there are at least the following two options:

* Option 1: Encode the remaining time field directly through some linear mapping, since the typical delay requirements for UL XR traffic are not stringent (e.g. 50msec). As an example, we may define that the value *r* of the field corresponds to remaining time in the range of 0.5 × (*r*, *r*+1] msec, for r ∈(0, 63]. This mapping covers remaining times from 0 to 64 msec.
* Option 2: One may define a lookup table in the spec, similar to how BSR table is used to encode buffer sizes. This option seems useful only if companies decide to use a non-linear distribution to encode remaining times.

**Question 5: Which option do you prefer to encode the remaining time field in the DSR MAC CE?**

**- Option 1: define in the spec a linear mapping between the values of the field and the values of the remaining time, e.g. the value *r* of the field corresponds to remaining time in the range of 0.5 × (*r*, *r*+1] msec, for r ∈(0, 63];**

**- Option 2: define a lookup table in the spec, similar to how BSR table is used to encode buffer sizes. Distribution and range of this table can be discussed based on companies’ input (please provide details in your comment).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option 1/2** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary:**

(to be added after the discussion)

It also needs to be discussed how to signal which BSR table is used to encode the buffer size field. Similar to the discussion on the Enhanced BSR MAC CE, the rapporteur thinks there can be at least two options: either use a bitmap such as the one used in the Enhanced BSR MAC CE or use one bit between the Remaining Time field and the Buffer Size field for the purpose. The formats of these two options are illustrated in Figure 2. Lastly, there is also the option to use only one particular table, e.g. use either only the legacy table or only the new table (if the range of the new BSR table that companies finally agree on is wide enough).



**Figure 2. Options for the format of the DSR MAC CE.**

**Question 6: which option do you prefer to indicate which BSR table is used to encode the Buffer Size field in the DSR MAC CE?**

* **Option 1: use a one-octet bitmap for the indication;**
* **Option 2: use a one-bit indicator for each reported LCG;**
* **Option 3: use only a specific BSR table (either only the legacy table or only the new table). Hence no indicator for is needed.**
* **Option 4: other (Please describe details of your preferred design in your comment).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option 1/2/3/4** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary:**

(to be added after the discussion)

Next, let us discuss which type of LCID (legacy 6-bit LCID, one octet eLCID, or two-octet eLCID) the DSR MAC CE should have.

**Question 7: which type of LCID do you think the DSR MAC CE should have?**

* **Option 1: legacy 6-bit LCID;**
* **Option 2: one-octet eLCID;**
* **Option 3: two-octet eLCID.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option 1/2/3** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary:**

(to be added after the discussion)

Please indicate which logical channel priority you think the DSR MAC CE should have. For example, if you think its priority should be below LBT Failure MAC CE but above MAC CE for SL-BSR, then please indicate “LBT failure” in the “Below” column and “SL-BSR” in the “Above” column.

**Question 8: which logical channel priority do you think the DSR MAC CE should have?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Below** | **Above** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Summary:**

(to be added after the discussion)

## 3.3 PSI-based PDU discard activation/deactivation MAC CE

First, let us discuss which type of LCID (legacy 6-bit LCID, one octet eLCID, or two-octet eLCID) the PSI-Based PDU Discard Activation/Deactivation MAC CE should have.

**Question 9: which type of LCID do you think the PSI-Based PDU Discard Activation/Deactivation** **MAC CE should have?**

* **Option 1: legacy 6-bit LCID;**
* **Option 2: one-octet eLCID;**
* **Option 3: two-octet eLCID.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option 1/2/3** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary:**

(to be added after the discussion)

When specifying the handling procedures of DL MAC CEs, the MAC spec usually specifies the initial state of a feature upon its configuration and handover. The rapporteur thinks the same needs to be specified for the PSI-Based PDU Discard Activation/Deactivation MAC CE. Moreover, it is reasonable to assume that the PSI-based discard should be initially deactivated upon its configuration and handover.

**Question 10. Do you agree that the PSI-based PDU discard should be initially deactivated upon its configuration and handover?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary:**

(to be added after the discussion)

3.4 Modulus operation on non-integer DRX cycles

RAN2 have agreed to introduce non-integer DRX cycles for XR services and keep the modulus operations in the legacy DRX formula for the new DRX cycles. To minimize the mismatch between the start times of DRX on duration and XR traffic with non-integer DRX cycles, it is important that the modulus operation with non-integer divisor does not produce any rounding errors. At RAN2#123bis, it has been agreed that “We will have normative text to avoid rounding errors.”

Different options have been proposed in contributions. For example,

* We may only need to have a line in the normative text stating that “The MAC entity shall ensure no rounding error is generated when performing the modulus operation with drx-NonIntegerShortCycle or drx-NonIntegerLongCycle as the divisor.” The exact method to ensure no rounding error can be left to UE implementation. For example, some programming languages support fractional number data types or symbolic computations, which can represent and process non-integer values exactly without rounding errors. This option requires minimal changes to the legacy DRX formula and yet can avoid inter-operability issues.
* If one wants to have more details in the spec to ensure UEs do implement the modulus operation properly, a mathematical formula for modulus operation with non-integer divisor must be clearly specified instead of leaving it to UE implementation. For example, it is suggested in [1] that modulus (A, B) can be implemented by A - floor (A/B) × B. It is suggested in [2] that the least common multiples method may also be used, i.e. A modulus (B/C) = (A × C/C) modulus (B/C) = [(A × C) modulus B] / C, where both B and C are integers. For example, if frame rate is 60 fps or DRX cycle is 50/3 msec, then B = 50 and C = 3.

**Question 11. Which one of the following options do you prefer to capture the agreement that “We will have normative text to avoid rounding errors.”?**

* **Option 1. Add a line in the normative text after the DRX formula stating that “The MAC entity shall ensure no rounding error is generated when performing the modulus operation with drx-NonIntegerShortCycle or drx-NonIntegerLongCycle as the divisor.” The exact method to implement the modulus operation without rounding error is left to UE implementation.**
* **Option 2. Specify in the normative text that the modulus operation with non-integer DRX cycles shall be implemented by modulus (A, B) = A - floor (A/B)** × **B.**
* **Option 3. Specify in the normative text that the modulus operation with non-integer (ratio between integers) DRX cycles shall be implemented by modulus (A, B/C) = [(A** × **C) modulus B] / C.**
* **Option 4. Please describe your own preferred method in your comment.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option 1/2/3/4** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary:**

(to be added after the discussion)

## 3.5 Range of the new BSR table

For the maximum buffer size in the new BSR table, a number of options have been proposed in the contributions, which are listed below (the list may not be exclusive):

* It can be determined based on the maximum bit rate and lowest frame rate (e.g. which are specified in the SA4 TR) [3][7];
* It should be based on the maximum PDU size [5];
* It should be the same as the maximum of the legacy BSR table [6].

**Question 12: Please indicate which option you prefer for determining the maximum buffer size for the new BSR table?**

**- Option 1: it can be determined based on the maximum bit rate and lowest frame rate [3][4][7]. (Note: For now, we do not need to emphasize the exact formula for using these two parameters);**

**- Option 2: it can be based on the maximum PDU size [5];**

**- Option 3: it is the same as the maximum buffer size in the legacy BSR table [6];**

**- Option 4: other (please describe your preferred method in your comment).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option 1/2/3/4** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary:**

(to be added after the discussion)

The following is a list of different proposals from the contributions (the list may not be exclusive) for determining the minimum buffer size of the new BSR table:

* Option 1: it can be determined based on the minimum bit rate and highest frame rate (e.g. which are specified in the SA4 TR) [3][4][7];
* Option 2: it should be the code point at which quantization error starts to ramp-up sharply or becomes intolerable [5][6].

**Question 13: Please indicate which option you prefer for determining the minimum buffer size for the new BSR table?**

**- Option 1: it can be determined based on the minimum bit rate and highest frame rate (Note: For now, we do not need to emphasize the exact formula for using these two parameters);**

* **Option 2: it should be the code point at which quantization error starts to ramp-up sharply or becomes intolerable [5][6];**
* **Option 3: other (please describe your preferred method in your comment).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option 1/2/3** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary:**

(to be added after the discussion)
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