**3GPP TSG-RAN WG2 Meeting #127-bis R2-2407985**

**Hefei, China, 14th – 18th October, 2024**

**Agenda Item: 8.2.4**

**Source: Huawei, HiSilicon**

**Title: Report of [POST127][033][AIoT] Random Access**

**Document for: Discussion and Decision**

# 1 Introduction

This contribution gives the discussion summary of following post email discussion.

* **[POST127][033][AIoT] Random Access (Huawei)**

Intended outcome: Discuss Failure/success indication aspects and FFS for CBRA and on FFS on AS ID for scheduling purposes

Deadline: long

## Scope and structure

|  |
| --- |
| Some FFSs about the random access in RAN2 agreements:   * *Handling of contention resolution failure and access failure at the device will be studied in RAN2, including failure detection and re-access. FFS details* * *Failure/success indication of D2R will be studied. FFS if it would be implicit or explicit and for which use case it is needed. FFS whether it is applied only to some cases.* * *for 2step CBRA, RAN2 design will support msg2. Whether it is needed it is up to the reader. FFS when it is needed. For 2-step CBRA (when mgs2 is needed), the random ID (fixed 16bits) is also included in A-IoT Msg1, and is echoed in A-IoT Msg2. FFS if there will be devices support only 2-step RA and any other optimizations will be needed for such devices.* * *wait for further RAN1 progress on indication of the start of access occasion.*   Some FFS points about random access in the current TR:  “*- If the random access is contention-based random access:*  *- Performs access occasion/resource determination/selection: [FFS];*” |

Rapporteur clarifications on the scope and discussion structure of this email discussion:

* To have a clear/comprehensive discussion on “Failure/success indication aspects”, it is better that companies share their understanding on:
  + First, who/how to detect the D2R failure (See [2.1.1](#_2.1.1_Failure_detection));
  + Second, the consequence/device behavior after the D2R failure (See [2.1.2](#_2.1.2_Consequence_of));
  + Third, the need/when/how to provide the failure/success indication (See [2.1.3](#_2.1.3_Need/when/how_to)),
  + Then, the follow-up discussion to handle the failure by re-access will continue in [2.2.4](#_2.2.4_Re-access);
* As to some FFSs for CBRA, several aspects are discussed:
  + When the Msg2 is needed in 2step RA (See [2.2.1](#_2.2.1_When_Msg2));
    - The related optimization is also good to collect companies’ views (See [2.2.2](#_2.2.2_2-step_RA));
  + One critical step is missing between the “reader triggers RA procedure” to “device sends Msg1”, i.e. how the device selects/determines the access occasion.
    - It is time to have some very high-level discussion and common views on the essence of the slotted ALOHA procedure (See [2.2.3](#_2.2.3_Access_occasion)) and have some basic terminologies/concepts for the re-access discussion;
  + Re-access is also one critical FFS point while RAN2 does not have chance to touch it yet. It is also the follow-up discussion after 2.1.2 (See [2.2.4](#_2.2.4_Re-access));
* FFS on AS ID for scheduling purposes (See [2.3](#_2.3_AS_ID_1)). The intention is to consider all cases, e.g. contention-free access and CBRA.

## Contact information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Name (Email)** |
| CATT | Jianxiang Li (lijianxiang@catt.cn) |
| Apple | Zhibin Wu zhibin\_wu@apple.com |
| LG | San (geumsan.jo@lge.com) |
| CMCC | Ningyu Chen (chenningyu@chinamobile.com) |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yiru Kuang (kuangyiru@huawei.com) |
| Vivo | Boubacar Kimba (kimba@vivo.com) |
| Nokia | [stepan.kucera@nokia.com](mailto:stepan.kucera@nokia.com) |
| Vodafone | Alexey Kulakov1@vodafone.com |
| Ericsson | [Min.w.wang@ericsson.com](mailto:Min.w.wang@ericsson.com) |
| Nordic Semiconductor | Jouni.korhonen@nordicsemi.no |
| NEC | [xie\_zonghui@nec.cn](mailto:xie_zonghui@nec.cn) |
| ZTE | [eswar.vutukuri@zte.com.cn](mailto:eswar.vutukuri@zte.com.cn) |
| Sharp | Chongming.zhang@cn.sharp-world.com |
| Spreadtrum Communications | [Huifang.fan@unisoc.com](mailto:Huifang.fan@unisoc.com) |
| Xiaomi | [Wangshukun3@xiaomi.com](mailto:Wangshukun3@xiaomi.com) |
| OPPO | [liuyangbj@oppo.com](mailto:liuyangbj@oppo.com) |
| NTT Docomo | Riki Okawa (riki.ookawa.rp@nttdocomo.com) |
| Qualcomm | Ruiming Zheng (rzheng@qti.qualcomm.com) |
| Transsion Holdings | Wen wu(wen.wu5@transsion.com) |
| Lenovo | Jing HAN (hanjing8@lenovo.com) |
| Futurewei | Yunsong Yang (yyang1@futurewei.com) |
| China Telecom | Jialin Zhu (zhujl6@chinatelecom.cn) |
| HOHOR | Xiaoxuan Tang ([tangxiaoxuan@honor.com](mailto:tangxiaoxuan@honor.com)) |
| InterDigital | Martino Freda ([martino.freda@interdigital.com](mailto:martino.freda@interdigital.com)) |
| MediaTek | Nathan Tenny ([nathan.tenny@mediatek.com](mailto:nathan.tenny@mediatek.com)) |
| Kyocera | Masato Fujishiro (masato.fujishiro.fj@kyocera.jp) |
| Fujitsu | Sue Yi (yisu@fujitsu.com) |
| Continental Automotive | [rikin.shah@continental-corporation.com](mailto:rikin.shah@continental-corporation.com) |
| Robert Bosch GmbH | Mehdi Harounabadi (mehdi.harounabadi@de.bosch.com) |
| Wiliot | Penny.efraim.sagi@wiliot.com |
| ASUSTeK | Willie1\_Lai@asus.com |
| Panasonic | Harshith Dhananjaya (harshith.dhananjaya@eu.panasonic.com)  Quan Kuang ([quan.kuang@eu.panasonic.com](mailto:quan.kuang@eu.panasonic.com)) |
| Samsung | Sangyeob Jung (sy0123.jung@samsung.com) |
| ETRI | Seungkwon Baek (skback@etri.re.kr) |

# 2 Discussion

## 2.1 Failure/success indication related

This discussion initially focuses on the D2R transmission for Msg3 and any following D2R transmission for data as examples. It will be nice if the discussion can somehow extend to Msg1 transmission and Msg2 reception failure cases (if possible).

### 2.1.1 Failure detection for D2R data transmission

RAN1 studied the timing relationship options:

|  |
| --- |
| A-IoT processing time aspects are studied in terms of the following timing relationships:  *T*R2D\_min: Minimum time between a R2D transmission and the corresponding D2R transmission following it.  *T*D2R\_min: Minimum time between a D2R transmission and the corresponding R2D transmission following it.  *T*D2R\_max: Maximum time between the D2R transmission and the corresponding R2D transmission following it, so that the R2D transmission timing is expected to be within [*T*D2R\_min, *T*D2R\_max], when a R2D transmission in response to a D2R transmission is expected for A-IoT Msg2 response to A-IoT Msg1 for the A-IoT device.  *T*R2D\_R2D\_min: Minimum time between two different consecutive R2D transmissions to the same A-IoT device.  *T*D2R\_D2R\_min: Minimum time between two different consecutive D2R transmissions from the same A-IoT device.  For the time interval between a R2D transmission and the corresponding D2R transmission following it, there are two options studied:  Option 1: Define a maximum time *T*R2D\_max between a R2D transmission and the corresponding D2R transmission following it, so that the device transmits D2R transmission within [*T*R2D\_min, *T*R2D\_max].  Option 2: The corresponding D2R transmission timing *T*R2D following a R2D transmission is determined based on the control information in the R2D transmission, where *T*R2D ≥ *T*R2D\_min. |

Based on the service type (inventory and/or command), the reader understands whether the device is supposed to feedback to one R2D transmission. **Reader** can detect the D2R transmission (Msg3) failure, based on the above timing relationship, i.e. no corresponding D2R (Msg3) received after reader sends R2D transmission (Msg2). But, the reader may have no idea whether it is caused by Msg2 failure or Msg3 failure.

The above understanding also applies to the following data transmission, e.g. “Msg4” and “Msg5” and indeed for any subsequent message (i.e. the failure to receive a message at the reader may be due to the loss of the D2R transmission or due to loss of the preceding R2D transmission which schedules the D2R transmission).

**Device** can determine/consider the D2R (e.g. Msg3) success, if there are subsequent R2D data received (e.g. in inventory plus command use case). In case there is no subsequent R2D data to transmit, reader may schedule the next/another device.

Note one example of the reader implementation: After reader sends “Msg4 carrying the command” to the device, if there is no “Msg5 carrying the feedback” received, reader may re-send the same “Msg4 carrying the command” to re-trigger the same “Msg5 carrying the feedback”. This example may happen in some reader implementation once or multiple times.

However, the **device** cannot determine whether its last D2R data transmission (Msg3 or following D2R transmission pending on the use case) is successfully received by the reader or not, since there may be no more subsequent R2D transmission to this device after that (e.g. if the D2R transmission was the last transmission of this service).

Question 1: Do you agree the following understandings on failure detection by reader and device?

* Part 1: The reader is able to detect the failure when D2R data transmission fails (but no differentiation is possible at the reader side between the failure due to the preceding R2D part that schedules the D2R transmission or failure of the following D2R transmission itself);
* Part 2: The device may not be able to detect/determine its D2R data transmission failure (of its last D2R data) without indication from reader.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Apple | See comments | For Part 1, we think it would be more accurate to say the reader can detect a failure, but it may be not sure whether is result of a R2D failure or D2R failure.  [Rapp]: Yes, that’s the intention.  For Part 2, we think RAN1 has agreed that for Msg1/2, “define a maximum time TD2R\_max between the D2R transmission and the corresponding R2D transmission following it, so that the R2D transmission timing is expected to be within [TD2R\_min, TD2R\_max].” So, the device may be able to detect a failure for Msg1/Msg2 exchange if it receives Msg2 in time. The answer would be yes if we assume the part 2 above is only about Msg3 failure case.  [Rapp]: See the highlight part above for the clarification of the Part2. |
| LG | Yes | Part 1 – RAN2 already assume that there will be feedback to reader for an R2D msg. Therefore, a reader is able to detect a transmission failure (e.g. no feedback)  Part 2 – We agree to part 2 of the understanding. Either of following assumptions is required. One is that the reader sends ACK if it receives successfully. The other is that the reader sends NACK if it does not receive successfully. We prefer the latter one. |
| CMCC | Yes | For Part 1, energy detection or CRC may help reader detect D2R data transmission fail, but it can hardly know it’s caused by device or reader itself. For Part 2, even UE doesn’t have the ability to detect uplink transmission failure without implicit or explicit indication from gNB. |
| Vivo | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes with comments | Part 1: Timer-based as well as CRC-based failures are detectable at the RX, however the differentiation of interference from low-SINR reception may be difficult.  Part 2: The RX cannot know what happened at TX unless there is TX-to-RX feedback. |
| Vodafone |  | Part 1: I think the easiest implementation of the reader in case of 3 step RACH is just timer based (e.g. if the reader sent msg 2, but no message 3 was received, there is failure).  Part 2: The device is listening all the time in my understanding, so if it sent e.g. msg 1, it would expect to get msg 2 in case of 3 step RACH within a particular time and so it can understand that something went wrong. I think it is also given in case of contention resolution as msg 2 should have 16Bit Random ID as we agreed during last meeting.  [Rapp]: Msg2 itself is somehow the “indication” in your example. See case 1 in 2.1.3. |
| Ericsson | Part 1 yes, but Yes and No for Part 2 | We have two general comments regarding how **this email discussion is organized**.   1. Generally, for each of issues/questions, it would be preferred that all possible options are to be discussed/evaluated rather to exclude certain option artificially, so that we can capture the study outcome for all options in the TR, and may recommend specific options over other options based on pros and cons. Even some options can be considered as the baseline when the study item is concluded. 2. Regarding the terms and the model, i.e., clause 2.2.3   the terms and definitions on the procedure seems to directly mimic RF-Id including defining terms and steps while we in RAN2 have not discussed and agreed on the details of those, and where there are other variants to be considered (not only in discussions but also in the TR for later down selection). The follow up questions are therefore also limited into that assumption.  [Rapp]: Thanks for the general comments.  For part 1, we agree with the understanding.  For part 2, In AS, it is true that the device may not be able to determine a D2R transmission failure if there is no AS feedback from the reader and no subsequent (upper layer) R2D transmissions. In addition, it is also feasible for a device to determine its D2R transmission was successful or failed based on upper layer message (explicitly or implicitly). |
| Nordic | Yes |  |
| NEC | Depends | Generally, we think the discussion should distinguish contention based random access transmission and dedicated transmission.  For CBRA msg1 transmission, reader only respond the device whose transmission is received successfully, msg2 is success indication, not failure indication. It should be device itself to detect the failure of msg1 transmission and resend msg1 in another access occasion.  For dedicated transmission ( e.g., CFRA msg1, msg3, or other following up data transmission), reader is able to and should be responsible for failure detection and send indication explicitly or implicitly  [Rapp]: As clarified in the beginning in 2.1, the discussion first focus on Msg3 and any following D2R transmission for data. But, it is good if companies mention whether something different or same can apply to Msg1/Msg2 case. |
| ZTE | Yes | We think that a common approach to failure recovery for any message in D2R direction is preferable and the reader should be able to detect the failure. Since the data in D2R direction is always scheduled, we think the reader should be aware of the exact resources used for transmissions and hence it should be able to decode and determine whether the reception is successful or not (i.e. it should either receive and decode and check CRC or it should detect DTX – i.e. the scheduling message in R2D direction is lost – there is no need to distinguish between these failure events as hinted by the rapporteur).  The device on the other hand doesn’t know whether reception was successful unless and explicit indication is included in a subsequent R2D message. |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | For part 1and part 2, we agree with the understanding. |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Agree with part 1 | PART 1: as we already agreed there is no HARQ ACK mechanism in the A-IOT system, then the reader cannot differentiate the failure due to the preceding R2D part or the failure of the following D2R transmission.  Part 2: we could judge if the reader has successfully received the preceding D2R message by investigating the relationship between the time moment of reception of the subsequent R2D message and *T*D2R\_max. Firstly, if the A-IOT device could receive the subsequent R2D message (regardless of if or not towards the device) in time (<*T*D2R\_max +processing time), then the A-IOT device could interpret as reader receiving the previous D2R message successfully, otherwise no.  [Rapp]: As mentioned above, “*In case there is no subsequent R2D data to transmit, reader may schedule the next/another device.* ”, which may make the device difficult to judge.  [OPPO]: the device could know that the reader does not receive the D2R message successfully by observing if, after *T*D2R\_max +processing time, there emerges a QueryRep-like message. Our assumption is that the reader could indicate a QueryRep-like message in time (before *T*D2R\_max +processing time) if it receives the D2R message successfully, in case there is no subsequent R2D message towards this device.  [Rapp] Follow up question, the reader may still send the QueryRep-like message even if the reader received nothing, right? |
| Docomo | Yes | We agree with Rapporteur’s description for both Part1 and Part2.  For part 1, how the reader detects the lost of D2R messages (e.g. timer-based and/or CRC check) and what to do for each case could be discussed later.  For part 2, the device cannot be aware of Msg1 lost unless noticing Msg2 is timed-out, and cannot be aware of Msg3 lost unless consequent R2D message (could be Msg4) notifies the message lost, where both (missing of) Msg2 and Msg4 could be regarded as so called *indication from reader*. We are therefore fine with Rapporteur’s understanding. |
| Qualcomm | See comments | For part 1, not clear on how reader can ‘detect the failure when D2R data transmission fails’. The point is that if the reader does not receive the expected D2R response, the reader has no idea on whether the D2R transmission is failed or the pervious R2D transmission is not successful.  For part 2, w/o feedback or implicit method (subsequent R2D message), not clear on how device can detect the D2R transmission failure. |
| Transsion Holdings | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | For part 1: reader is able to detect the failure but does not know the exact cause.  For part 2: device is not able to detect the failure if there is no more subsequent R2D for this device. Otherwise, the device seems able to detect the failure.  As to the comments from OPPO, OPPO seems assuming the device just “consider” the success by default if the device is not sure about whether it is successfully received by the reader e.g. for its last D2R data. |
| Lenovo | Yes | For Part 1, in the last RAN2 meeting, we have reached agreements on the “Failure/success indication of D2R will be studied”. Hence, the reader may be able to detect the D2R transmission failure.  For Part 2, we agree that the device may not be able to detect/determine its D2R data transmission failure without implicit or explicit indication from reader. For the inventory-only use case, the reader may send ACK if receives successfully or send NACK if does not receive successfully. For the inventory+command use case, the subsequent transmission may implicitly indicate the D2R data transmission are successful transmission. After receiving the implicit or explicit indication from reader, the device may know whether the D2R data transmission is successful or not. |
| Futurewei | Yes | As to what OPPO has suggested for part 2, it works only if the device is the last one or the only one that has transmitted right before the subsequent R2D message; otherwise, it may not work for several reasons: 1) the device does not know when the last device’s transmission ends; 2) if the device uses the end of its own D2R transmission + TD2R\_max to determine, it will make a wrong determination; 3) the further the device’s D2R transmission is away from the last device’s D2R transmission, the worse its clock may have drifted, and as a result, a wrong timing may be used by the device (comparing to the timing used by the reader) and hence a wrong determination may be made by the device. |
| China Telecom | Yes |  |
| HONOR | Yes with comments | General agree with Part 1 that reader could detect the failure when D2R data transmission fails. But for the Msg3, the reader is aware of the device who occupied this specific resource. We would like to mention one case that if the reader receives one message in this specific resource occasion but could not decode it, the reader may further know the R2D message is well received but the following D2R message is failed.  For Part 2, device is not able to detect the failure for the Msg3, since the device is even not aware of whether there is subsequent R2D transmission if the reader has not indicated following scheduling (e.g., the inventory+command use case) in advance. If we extend to Msg1 transmission and Msg2 reception failure cases, the TD2R\_max could be the maximum time between the device receives the Msg2 and the transmission of Msg1, which requires the reader send back the Msg2 before the TD2R\_max after receiving the Msg1. If there is no Msg2 within the min [TD2R\_max , the time of next occasion], the device could determine its Msg1 will not be responded. |
| InterDigital | Yes, with comments | In MSG3 case, and for command case:   * + For part 1, the reader is scheduling the transmission, and is therefore aware of the failure either based on CRC or the absence of any reception. We would like to clarify, however, that the causes may be either **failure of the device to receive the R2D message** or failure of the D2R message.   + For part 2, if this is the last D2R message, we agree that there is no way for the device to know if it is successful or not.   For MSG1/2, we prefer to discuss this separately, because it depends on whether this is contention based or contention free. For example, in contention-based, the reader may not be able to detect all failures of MSG1 transmission. |
| MediaTek | Yes | We agree with part 1 as stated. Other companies have noted that there could be heuristics for determining if a D2R message was “probably” sent, e.g., detection of energy without successful decoding on the assigned radio resources, but there could be cases where such heuristics fail (like another nearby reader assigning a different device to the same radio resources—a situation that the system should try to guard against but probably cannot completely exclude).  For part 2, the device cannot determine if a D2R transmission was received without feedback in the general case. |
| Kyocera | Yes | As some companies pointed out, we also assume not only the “timer-based” but also the “CRC-based” failure detection are feasible for Part 1. |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |
| Continental Automotive | Yes |  |
| Bosch | Yes | We agree with the part 1 and for part 2, the device may wait for an indication if the message is not received correctly at reader. |
| Wiliot | Yes, please See comments | For Part 1 – We believe the Reader can detect a failure, but it may not be able to identify the source of the error, whether it’s a D2R transmission failure or an R2D reception failure.  For Part 2 – We think the issue with messages 1 and 2 can be addressed using RAN1 timers [TD2R\_min, TD2R\_max]. However, for message 3, we believe an explicit indication is required. In the case of a NACK, there could be a D2R failure where the Reader sends a NACK, but the Device fails to detect it. As a result, the data won’t be retransmitted. We think using an explicit ACK is a better option to avoid ambiguity. |
| ASUSTeK | Yes | For Part 1, we agree that the reader will realize there is a failure with unsuccessful D2R reception.  For Part 2, we agree with the understanding since subsequent R2D transmission may not be mandatory. |
| Panasonic | Yes | Part-1: The reader can detect D2R transmission failures either while checking CRC for the D2R message or when the scheduled D2R occasion does not detect/receive any data.  Part-2: The device cannot detect transmission failures, especially when subsequent R2D messages are not scheduled/intended for this device. |
| Samsung | Yes | For part 2, we understand that indication from reader could be explicit and/or implicit in accodance with use case. |
| ETRI | Yes | Similar view with Panasonic. |

**Rapporteur Summary:**

* **Technical points from companies:** Most companies agree with the general understanding, and we have following points from companies:
  + Timing based failure detection is mentioned both reader and device side;
    - CRC-based is also mentioned
  + The reader may not be sure about the failure cause (either R2D failure or D2R failure);
    - It is also mentioned that if the reader is able to detect the resource occupation but fail to decode, the reader seems able to detect this as D2R failure rather than R2D scheduling failure. While, some companies indicate this is not so reliable.
  + Some companies clarify the difference between Msg1/2 and Msg3
    - For Msg1 transmission, the device is able to detect the Msg1 failure based on the RAN1 agreed max timing from Msg2 reception;
  + Similar to NR, UE has no ability to know the UL transmission failure. Device does not know whether the D2R was successful, unless indication is included in a subsequent R2D message
    - Some companies mentioned this can be achieved also by upper layer message.
    - It is mentioned the indication/feedback can be either implicit or explicit.
    - Some companies consider “QueryRep-like message” is sufficient while is not count as the “indication” (or maybe it is kind of implicit indication).
* **Suggested proposals/observations from rapp:**

In order to avoid any confusion, the following observations and proposal will limit the discussion to Msg3 and following D2R data. But, we don’t have to forbid the possibility of extension to Msg1 if applicable.

Observation 1a: The reader is able to detect the failure when D2R data transmission fails, but the reader may not be able to know whether the failure is due to the preceding R2D part that schedules the D2R transmission or due to failure of the D2R data transmission itself.

Observation 1b: The device may not be able to detect/determine its D2R data transmission failure of its last D2R data (Msg3 or following D2R transmission), without implicit/explicit feedback/indication from reader.

### 2.1.2 Consequence of D2R data transmission failure

In order to have some common understanding on the need of failure detection, we may need to first discuss the usage of this failure detection (or, the motivation for the device to be aware of the failure), i.e. the **device** **behavior** after/as the consequence of failure detection:

* **Option 1**: Re-transmit the D2R data
  + In case the R2D provides the D2R scheduling for this device (within the timing relationship);
  + Note the RLC/HARQ like re-transmission is not supported. If the device just feedbacks according to the received upper layer data resent by reader, it seems not relying on any AS layer failure indication;
* **Option 2**: Re-access in another opportunity (i.e. retry the random access)
  + In case there is no R2D providing the D2R scheduling for this device (within the timing relationship);
  + Use the re-access procedure to send the D2R data, while the contention resolution may be needed again in the re-access;
  + The details of re-access will be further discussed in [2.2.4](#_2.3_AS_ID).
* **Option 3**: No particular action
  + It means no solution for AS layer reliability for D2R data, and it relies on CN to re-initiate the new service;
* **Option 4: Follow Reader’s paging/triggering message**

Question 2: Which option(s) do you support as to the device behavior in case of D2R data transmission failure?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Option(s)** | **Comments** (companies can also indicate their understandings on the **reader** behaviors in case of D2R data transmission failure) |
| CATT | Option 3 | For the data transmission, even multiple devices are successfully decoded in A-IoT Msg1, the subsequent PDRCH data transmission should be allocated with orthogonal resource to avoid interference. That is to say, the failure of Msg3 may occur only when the channel quality of PDRCH is bad enough, instead of conflicted resource. Note that this issue can also be mitigated by the PDRCH repetition discussed by RAN1.  If we go with option 1 or option 2, the channel quality may be still under bad situation, so re-transmitting data or re-access may also suffer failure at this moment.  Suggest CN implementation to re-initiate the new service. By this way, the device does not need to be aware of the data transmission failure. |
| Apple | Option 4 | We assume this question is still only focus on Msg3 failure case. In general, we think this is up to reader, and the device cannot decide itself. Whether another triggering/paging message is triggered by CN or AS layer of reader itself can be further discussed.  [Rapp]: Seems option 4 is similar to option 3, i.e. wait for the next paging message from reader, if any (either initiated by CN via a new service or by reader for the same service) |
| LG | Option 2 | At least, for MSG2 of 3-step CBRA, re-access in another access opportunity is reasonable because the contention resolution is not confirmed.  For other subsequent messages, we prefer handling them in the same manner |
| CMCC | Prefer Option 2, see comment | Option 2 can be the baseline. Option 3 is not in RAN2’s scope.  From our perspective, the importance of Msg3 containing device ID is higher than other R2D data (e.g., upper layer data), as a result, the device's behavior in response to D2R data transmission failure can vary before and after contention resolution, Therefore, if a D2R transmission failure occurs during the RA process, Option 1 and/or 2 could be considered. However, if the failure happens after RA, it could be handled by the CN, or the CN could indicate whether retransmission-like procedure is needed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2 | Considering the re-access due to contention resolution failure is anyway needed, Option 2 can be reused to improve the reliability in AS layer.  For Option 3, in case of group devices inventory using the group ID/mask, CN may not able to detect the missing of one specific device ID, since CN has no knowledge of correct full list of device ID. Therefore, Option 3 is not sufficient (but option 3 is allowed by implementation).  For option 4, we believe option 2 covers the option 4 case, in which the device perform the re-access triggered by the subsequent paging. Note that RAN2 agrees we should avoid the redundant response to the subsequent paging, i.e. the failed device should access rather than the successful device. |
| vivo | Option 2 | As the part 1 in Q1, the reader is able to detect the D2R transmission failure and indicate to the device this failure. Upon the failure indication, the baseline behavior of device is to re-access in another access round. In this way, the success probability of inventory can be improved and the channel quality of PDRCH may be recovered in that time. Hence, option 2 can be baseline.  In option 1, if the reader can indicate the device to re-transmit the D2R data immediately, it seems that already successful Msg1 and Msg2 can avoid repeated attempts and start recovery directly from Msg3. However, this re-transmission of Msg3 data may be redundant with RAN1 repetition mechanism.  In option 3, it will have a long latency and extra signaling overhead to re-initiate the new service by CN. Furthermore, option 3 does harm for QoS satisfaction of inventory, e.g. success rate and latency. |
| Nokia | Option 2 with commens | The reader shall trigger re-transmission opportunities, eg by using “delta” paging (ie Option 2 but with explicit reader control) as devices cannot detect reader-side failures and unilateral device-triggered re-transmission may still fail again if the underlying problem such as interference persists. Otherwise, any notion of e2e reliability is assumed to be managed by upper layers (eg AF). |
| Vodafone | Option 3 | On data retransmissions, I think that the delay on the air is much higher compared to the delay between the readers and CN and therefore, I do not see how the retransmission mechanisms between Device and Reader would be helpful and speed up the communication. |
| Ericsson | comment | We are fine to study/evaluate all options. It is sufficient to capture pros and cons, and dependency on AS feedback for all options. At this point, it is too early to perform down-selection. Down-selection can be performed later after RAN2 has done sufficient evaluation.  In our view, option 1 and 2 would rely on AS feedback, while option 3 and 4 may not rely on AS feedback. |
| Nordic | See comments | In a failed transmission Msg1 (or not received Msg2) case Option 2 could be a baseline. However, the control should be on the reader so that the device never initiates a re-access on its own i.e. more like Apple’s Option 4. |
| NEC | see comment | Option 1: applicable for dedicated D2R transmission. For simplifying device behavior, in case the R2D provides the D2R scheduling for this device (within the timing relationship), device shall follow the received R2D to transmit the D2R regardless it is initial transmission or re-transmission.  Option 2: for CBRA msg 1. |
| ZTE | Option 2  For all D2R messages | We think option 2 can be the baseline. However, it would be good to clarify if we are talking about just MSG3 or any D2R transmission in general.  We think option 2 would need feedback and if we assume that some feedback is needed (at least for MSG3) then we don’t see any reason why we can adopt the same mechanism for any message including MSG3 and afterwards. This enables a general and unified framework for all messages which is our preferred option.  [Rapp]: Yes, it should cover Msg3 and afterwards. |
| Sharp | Option 2 | The motivation for the device to be aware of the failure is to decide if the re-access is necessary or not. |
| Spreadtrum | Option 2 | As understood in part 1 of Question 1, reader is not able to distinguish between the failure due to the preceding R2D part that schedules the D2R transmission or failure of the following D2R transmission itself.  If it is the former, then it means that contention resolution has not been completed, and the access has failed, so re-access is a natural course of action. If it is the latter, it seems more reasonable that the device re-transmits Msg 3 directly. However, since reader cannot distinguish which reason fails, it is more reasonable to re-access for the sake of insurance, although for the latter, there is a certain amount of redundant access and waste of resources. |
| Xiaomi | Option 1/2/4 | We think the 3 options are possible and it is also up to reader. We can discuss it further online. |
| OPPO | 1&2 | Option 1&2 is not mutually exclusive. The A-IOT device behavior should just follow the reader’s instruction. If the reader thinks that the current radio condition towards the A-IOT device is not good, then it can leave it to re-access in another opportunity. Otherwise, option 1. Anyway, both 1&2 could be possible |
| Docomo | Option 2 | Thanks to ZTE for clarifying the discussion. We are fine with studying option 2 for all D2R messages.  To us option 3 looks like a last resort that the application layer can always conduct whichever option we select. At this phase we could study how beneficial RAN-side optimization like option 2 is, on top of option 3.  To our feeling at this time, re-paging upon Msg1 or Msg3 failure could be beneficial in terms of compensation for temporary degradation of channel quality (e.g. when the device hides behind an obstacle), but for consequent D2R messages it may be too often if the whole procedure restarts from scrach every time any D2R message is lost. But we can discuss more. |
| Qualcomm | Option 2/4 | Both Option 2 and 4 are possible. First, assume this D2R data transmission failure is in so-called msg3. Then the reason of D2R data transmission failure is various. It could be the contention resolution is not really successful in some cases, and re-access can increase the success possibility of D2R data transmission. |
| Transsion Holdings | Option1/2 | We think if the D2R message is dedidated for the device(e.g. in CFRA or after msg3 in CBRA), then option 1 is applicable.  For Option2, it applicale for all cases. |
| Lenovo | Option 1 and Option 2 | For the case that device have completed the contention resolution, and there occurs the D2R data transmission failure, Option 1 may be preferred for the reason that this option has benefits on reducing signalling overhead on contention resolution. That is to say reader R2D message from reader provides the D2R scheduling for this device re-transmitting D2R data. But how does reader knows the R2D message transmission is failed and then provide scheduling needs clarified.  For the case that D2R data transmission failure occurs before contention resolution (e.g., 2-step CBRA), Option 2 may be reasonable that the reader triggers the device to re-access in another access occasion/round. |
| Futurewei | Options 1 and 2 | Options 1 and 2 don’t contradict to each other as they are used in different scenarios.  Option 1 is used when there is a subsequent R2D transmission (within the timing limit) that schedules another D2R transmission from the device and the same command is repeated in the subsequent R2D transmission, which may serve as an implicit indication that the previous D2R transmission has failed. The device simply follows the command and hence (re)transmits the same response that had failed before. If the command had been a different one, the device would follow the new command (and might take it as an implicit indication that the previous D2R transmission is successful). In either case, the device simply follows the R2D/command. That is why we consider Option 1 same as “follow the trigger” part of Option 4.  Option 2 is used when there is no subsequent R2D transmission received (within the timing limit) after the device sent the D2R transmission, which failed. In this case, the device retries the random access when receiving another AIoT paging message, attempting to receive another R2D transmission intended for it, which would schedule another D2R transmission for the device. Option 2 is also consistent with the device’s behavior when the device fails in receiving a Msg2 with a matching RN ID within the timing limit after sending Msg1.  In our view, Option 4 is basically Option 1 (i.e., following the trigger) + Option 2 (i.e., following the paging). |
| China Telecom | comment | From our perspective, options 1/2/4 are efficient in handling the D2R data transmission failure. Then option 2 has a wider range of applications and can be discussed as a baseline. |
| HONOR | Option1 and 2 | Option 1 and 2 could be applied in different failure handling cases.  For the Msg1/Msg2 failure, the failure may be caused by contention resolution. That is, several devices could pick the same occasion and the reader could not identify the devices in this occasion. Option 2 could be utilized to let the device re-access and complete the service request.  For the failure of Msg3, since the contention resolution is already solved and there is only one device in this occasion. This device could re-transmit the Msg3 if indicated by the subsequent R2D message. Option 1 is more preferred in this case to improve the efficiency. |
| InterDigital | Option 1, 2, and 4 | Similar to our comment on the previous question, we should differentiate between random access transmissions (i.e., MSG1) and MSG3/command response since they will lead to different answers.  For MSG3/command response, since the reader is aware of the failure, it can schedule a new transmission or a retransmission.  For MSG1, the device may be able to re-access in another occasion, or it may wait for a new paging message. We prefer option 2 but think we should leave option 4 open for purposes of the study. |
| MediaTek | Options 2 and 1/4 for different cases (see comment) | We generally agree with Futurewei’s comment above. In all circumstances, when there is an R2D transmission that schedules a subsequent D2R transmission, the device should comply with it; this could be interpreted as either option 1 or option 4, depending on how one interprets the description. The important point is that the device will (re)transmit the lost data **because the reader requested it again**, not autonomously.  But there will never be such an R2D transmission for a Msg3 failure unless the reader repeats Msg2, which seems logically inconsistent (repeated contention resolution). Thus, we see Msg3 failure as a failure of the access procedure, and for simplicity, the device should have a single response for all such failures: Try the access procedure again (if there is another access occasion that is available to the device—this depends on the design of the procedure).  In summary, we think option 2 is appropriate for Msg3 failure, and other D2R transmissions should simply not be repeated until the reader asks for them again (not necessarily involving the CN as suggested in option 3), which could be interpreted as option 1 or 4. |
| Kyocera | Option 2 | We assume the “re-access” is triggered by the subsequent A-IoT paging, so the device needs to monitor the subsequent A-IoT paging when the D2R transmission failed. |
| Fujitsu | Option 2 /1 | Option 2 can be considered as baseline. Option 1 can be considered in some specific scenario, e.g., when an explicit indication is received by the device indicating the D2R failure. |
| Continental Automotive | Option 2 | Given that re-access is necessary because of contention resolution failures, Option 2 can serve to enhance the reliability. |
| Bosch | Option 1 and 2 | The devices may be configured to take option 1 or 2 depending on the device type, status or etc. |
| Wiliot | Option 2 | Re-Access will be utilized in the event of a contention resolution failure. A failure after msg3 transmission may leave the Ambient device with insufficient energy for another immediate transmission. By permitting re-access at a later time, the device can recharge to the desired energy level, enabling a new transmission flow. |
| ASUSTeK | Option 2/4 | If the failure happens after contention resolution, we think Option 2 can be served as the baseline for the feasibility. We believe re-access should be performed for Msg 1 failure. Thus, to have unified concept to handle both cases, Option2 is preferred.  For Option 4, we believe it is also feasible, but RAN2 may deprioritize the discussion. |
| Panasonic | Comment | For Msg3 transmission, if the retransmission is carried out by AS layer, it is option 2. If retransmission is carried out by NAS layer, it is option 3 (by interpreting that "no action from AS layer"). Option 4 looks to cover both option 2 and option 3. Which layer to have the response needs further discussion and in general case the AS layer based retransmission can be more efficient but there can be the cases where AS layer may not be able to detect the failure.  For generic D2R transmission case, in addition to Msg3 transmission cases, option 1 should not be excluded as to re-transmit the data, here this can be more efficient than to transmit from the beginning especially if some segmentation is required to be supported. The layer to have such retransmission is AS or NAS needs further discussion. |
| Samsung | Option 1, 2, and 4 | Details on each option are to be discussed further but our understanding is that the device behavior should be under reader control. So all reader-related options are possible i.e. even for option 2 whether the device retries the random access is decided/controlled by reader. |
| ETRI | Option 1, 2, and 4 |  |

**Rapporteur Summary:**

* **Technical points from companies:**
  + **Option 1 (re-transmission)**: Xiaomi, OPPO, Transsion, Lenovo, Futurewei, HONOR, InterDigital, MediaTek, Fujitsu, China Telecom, Bosch, Samsung, ETRI
    - Companies mention this option 1 can be used/supported together with option 2 (i.e. not mutually exclusive).
    - Some proponents mention the device just follow the reader scheduling (e.g. upper layer re-transmission, or same command is sent in R2D).
    - Some opponents have some doubt on the usage of re-transmission, considering the RAN1 repetition.
    - Some companies mention this is suitable/only for dedicated transmission case, i.e., after contention resolution or contention-free case.
    - Rapporteur understands the NACK-based D2R data re-transmission may not work well, if failure is due to that the previous R2D message (e.g. Msg2 or command) is not received.
  + **Option 2 (re-access)**: LG, CMCC, Huawei, vivo, Nokia, Nordic, ZTE, Sharp, Spreadtrum, Xiaomi, OPPO, Docomo, Qualcomm, Transsion, Lenovo, Futurewei, China Telecom, HONOR, InterDigital, MediaTek, Kyocera, Fujitsu, Continental, Wiliot, Bosch, ASUSTeK, Samsung, ETRI
    - Almost all companies are fine with option 2. Some companies consider this as baseline.
      * Some companies also think this option 2 is needed anyway in case of contention resolution failure. And, it is unified solution with Msg1 contention resolution failure
    - Some companies prefer option 2 seems also open to additionally consider option 1 (for different use case).
    - Some companies mention re-access via “delta” paging, which seems aligned with option 4.
  + **Option 3 (CN re-initiates new service)**: CATT, Vodafone
    - Rapporteur tends to consider it as waiting for “CN to re-initiate the new service”.
    - Companies indicating this option consider option3-only will be sufficient.
    - One argument is that the radio condition may not change if the device immediately re-transmit/re-access, while RAN1 also support repetition.
    - The opponent mention this is up to CN/SA, while not in RAN2 scope, and also show the concern to the latency.
      * Rapporteur understand that we will not exclude option 3.
  + **Option 4 (follow paging/trigger)**: Apple, Xiaomi, Qualcomm, InterDigital, MediaTek, China Telecom, ASUSTeK, Samsung, ETRI
    - Rapporteur tends to consider it as waiting for “reader to re-send the paging”. It is similar to the option in 2.2.4 for “re-access in the next paging round”.
    - Some companies mention the similarity/relationship with option 2.
* **Suggested proposals/observations from rapp:**

Proposal 1: In case of D2R data transmission failure (Msg3 or following D2R data), device follows the reader instruction:

* it is supported to re-access in another opportunity controlled/provided by the reader (i.e. retry the random access); and
* reader can repeat the R2D “command” to trigger the device to re-send the same D2R “response” (i.e. device just follows the received R2D to transmit D2R). FFS on whether/how to handle the “device ID” re-transmission for inventory case.

NOTE 1: whether the re-access is in the reader’s subsequent paging is discussed in 2.2.4 (Option 4 is not excluded by this proposal).

NOTE 2: we don’t give inclusive or exclusive proposal to CN/upper layer implementation way (Option 3).

### 2.1.3 Need/when/how to feedback the failure/success indication

Some online discussion minutes are cited here:

|  |
| --- |
| Subesequent R2D message  Discussions on subsequent transmission after msg3.  - Docomo asks if the reader can determine whether there was a failure. Intel thinks that there is a case where the reader knows that it hasn’t received but doesn’t know it happens.  - Intel thinks that even the device sends a failure indication the device doesn’t know what to do.  - Xiaomi thinks that there is a case where it can be useful to configure the random value again.  - LG thinks that this would be useful to resolve the collision between device.  - Huawei thinks that the reader can indicate the failure to the device and the device can re-attempt access.  - Ericsson thinks that in some cases it is needed and in some cases it is not needed, so we should study cases it may be needed.  - MEdiatek thinks that if there was data in msg3 we should acknowledge it, but not necessarily a failure indication for msg3.  - Lenovo thinks it is necessary.  - Vodafone is not sure that msg3 contains data, just device ID.  - Interdigital thinks that the device has already completion contention so it would be beneficial for the reader to indicate so it doesn’t have to trigger another message. ZTE agrees.  - Qualcomm thinks that there are different use cases and in some cases it is needed. R2D should indicate whether subsequent acknowledgement should be expected by device. |

As to the discussion points *“FFS if it would be implicit or explicit and for which use case it is needed. FFS whether it is applied only to some cases”*, based on the online comments and companies contributions in section [4.1](#_4.1_Failure/success_indication), rapporteur provides following understandings:

When the indication can be absent (i.e. implicit indication on the success):

* **Case 1**: The reader has the subsequent R2D data to transmit for this device (e.g. command after inventory), i.e.
* After D2R data transmission, if device receives its R2D data transmission, it considers the success of previous D2R data transmission by default.

When the indication is needed:

* **Case 2**: The reader has no more subsequent R2D data to transmit for this device (e.g. after the device sends feedback to the command), where we have several options:
* Option 1: 1-bit indication with two code-points as “success” and “failure”;
* Option 2: 1-bit indication for success indication (while its absence means failure);
* Option 3: 1-bit indication for failure indication (while its absence means success);
* Option 4: no AS feedback (success or failure) indication
* Option x: ?

NOTE: in this discussion, we only discuss the “failure/success indication” rather than the “message”, while which R2D message to use/piggyback can be discussed later.

Question 3a: (with the above discussion on the failure detection and device behavior as the consequence of failure detection) Do you agree the R2D explicit failure/success indication for the D2R data transmission is not needed in case 1?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Apple | See comment | Yes for “command after inventory” case  No for “command after command” case. In this case, the reception of a new command does not mean the device’s prior response has been received correctly. |
| LG | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes | Agree with rapporteur, the existence of subsequent R2D data can be regarded as an implicit indication. But if absence, timing accuracy for device should be considered. |
| Vivo | Yes | The subsequent R2D data is implicit success indication in case 1 |
| Nokia | Yes | There is no such need. |
| Vodafone | Yes(see comments) | Confused by question: “if device receives its R2D data transmission”. If the reader receives R2D data transmission within time X, it can assume that previous D2R transmission was successful |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| NEC | Yes | It is reasonable to consider the success of previous D2R data transmission by default if device receives subsequent R2D data transmission (i.e., “command”) after D2R data transmission (i.e., device ID). |
| ZTE | See comment | As Apple has rightly highlgithed, in case 1, there should also be a sub-case where there could be a subsequent R2D transmission (during command), but the previous D2R transmission fails. In this case the device cannot assume the previous D2R transmission has been successfully received.  In general, it would be good to avoid the MAC layer to know the details of whether the device is in command phase or in inventory phase and if in command phase, whether it is first command PDU or subsequent command PDU etc. We think an unified approach should be applied for all these messages. |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes | But we have to emphases that we need to differentiate the case of the device receiving a R2D transmission for scheduling the re-transmission of the D2R message with the case 1 mentioned here |
| Docomo | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Maybe | It is up to Reader to send subsequent R2D message or explicit success/failure indication. |
| Transsion Holdings | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | See comments | Agree with that the subsequent R2D transmission may implicitly indicate the D2R data transmission are successful transmission. But explicit failure indication with e.g. NACK is still needed since the device dose not know whether there has subsequent R2D messages and cannot determine failure transmission via no subsequent R2D transmission. |
| Futurewei | Yes with comments | Agree that there is no need for explicit success/failure indication for case 1.  For the “command after inventory” case, receiving the subsequent R2D transmission including the command can serve as an implicit indication of the success of the previous D2R transmission.  For the “command after command” case, receiving the subsequent R2D transmission including the same command with the same parameter(s) as before can serve as an implicit indication of the failure of the previous D2R transmission, while receiving the subsequent R2D transmission including a different command or the same command with different parameter(s) can serve as an implicit indication of the success of the previous D2R transmission. In either case, the device follows what is in the command.  On the other hand, we also agree with ZTE that a unified design may be desirable so that a device doesn’t need to determine the absence or presence of certain field(s) in the R2D transmission based on what state it is in or based on an explicit bit for presence indication. |
| China Telecom | Yes |  |
| HONOR | Yes |  |
| InterDigital | Yes, with comments | In general, we agree. For the case mentioned by Apple and ZTE, we think there may be a need for the reader to send a failure indication (either before the subsequent command message, or along with it). |
| MediaTek | Mostly yes (but see comment) | We need to be a little careful about the definition of “subsequent”. There are at least three different cases subsumed under “case 1”:   * 1. R2D transmission A (success) => D2R transmission (failure) => repeat of R2D transmission A (success) – same as Futurewei’s description of the “command after command” case, e.g., if A is a read command, the “subsequent” R2D transmission might be a second attempt to read the data that were missed due to the lost D2R transmission. This is not an indication of “success”, but it doesn’t require the device to do anything special—the device can forget the earlier transmission and just respond to the retry. So this case fits in the spirit of the rapporteur’s case 1 but doesn’t literally match the description.   2. R2D transmission A (success) => D2R transmission (success) => immediate R2D transmission B (success). We understand this is the case described by the rapporteur and here we agree that the arrival of B can implicitly confirm that the D2R transmission was successful. The problem is distinguishing it on the device side from the following case.   3. R2D transmission A (success) => D2R transmission (failure) => no retry => separate request from CN => unrelated R2D transmission B (success). We need to determine if this case is real: If R2D transmission A expects a response (e.g., a read command that expects data) but does not receive one, will the reader ever give up? If no, then this case turns into case a above, but if yes, then the device should not interpret B as an ack.   So we need to interpret “subsequent R2D data” to mean “conditioned on the delivery of the earlier data”, e.g., from the same upper-layer transaction or something of that nature. If case c above can occur, then not every R2D transmission should be interpreted as an ack of the preceding D2R transmission. It’s not clear to us how the device can distinguish cases b and c.  [Rapp]: in case c, if a new request is received, the device will response the new service/paging and forget all previous transmissions related to old service, right? It should be up to the reader whether/when to give up. |
| Kyocera | Yes |  |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |
| Continental Automotive | Yes |  |
| Bosch | Yes |  |
| Wiliot | Yes |  |
| ASUSTeK | Yes | We agree that subsequent R2D data is implicit success indication in case 1, if the R2D transmission does not refer to retransmission. |
| Panasonic | Yes with command. | For "command after inventory", we agree other companies as "yes".  For "command after command", it can be designed with " the reception of a new command does not mean the device’s prior response has been received correctly" (like Apple and ZTE has mentioned). It also can be designed with "the reception of a new command means the device’s prior response has been received correctly". In case of former design, the buffer in the device is increased as the device needs to buffer "prior response" and "new response to the command". In case of latter design, the buffer may be simplified as the buffer of prior response can be flushed at the time of the reception of new command. Therefore, we support "yes". |
| Samsung | Yes | Have some sympathy with MediaTek i.e. the intention of case 1 covers b. |
| ETRI | Yes |  |

**Rapporteur Summary:**

* **Technical points from companies:**
  + For case 1, it is clear the subsequent R2D message is the implicit way to indicate the D2R transmission failure/success.
    - Some companies mention that, in “command after command” case, the reception of a new command does not mean the device’s prior response has been received correctly.
      * Rapporteur understands that the device is not aware of the failure in this case. But the device has no other choice, it has to follow the reader instruction, i.e. response to the 2nd “command”, regardless whether the command is a new or old command. The point is in this case, there is no need of explicit success/failure indication.
      * One company think maybe a failure indication is still needed in this case.
    - MediaTek raises some technical points that companies may need to check.
      * Rapp understands, for now, we don’t target to let the device known the success/failure of D2R transmission 100% clearly. The important thing is to clarify/specify the device behavior after D2R transmission. If the device just follows the reader scheduling, even if with some ambiguity on the success or failure at the device side, maybe it still works.
    - Unified design is suggested.
* **Suggested proposals/observations from rapp:**

Observation 2: R2D explicit failure/success indication for the D2R data transmission is not needed, if the reader has the subsequent R2D data to send for this device.

Question 3b: (with the above discussion on the failure detection and device behavior as the consequence of failure detection) Do you support the explicit R2D failure/success indication for the D2R data transmission in case 2? (Please clarify your preferred option, if yes for case 2)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| CATT | No | Similar view as our comments in Q2, i.e., the device does not need to be aware of the data transmission failure. It can be left to CN implementation to re-initiate new service. |
| Apple | No | To simplify the device implementation. AIoT device would rather be agnostic to the consequence of its UL transmission. We are OK to not introduce any indication |
| LG | No | For success case, from the underlying principle of 3-step CBRA, success of msg3 transmission is implicitly indicated. In other words, no msg4 transmission indicate success of msg3.  For failure case, there is no agreement on the failure indication for D2R data transmission. We think that there is a case where explicit failure indication is needed. For example, the reader does not successfully receive the D2R transmission, the reader transmits the failure indication to the device in order to perform the re-access procedure. |
| CMCC | Yes | Support Option 3 in case 2. Device should be aware of whether its RA is success or not to decide whether to re-access. Msg3 failure is not very common hence NACK is preferred. For other D2R data, i.e., upper layer data, it is up to CN. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Slightly prefer option 1 or 2. In any option, we may need to clarify the missing of this indication should be interpreted as “failure” by device, considering the possibility of missing of the R2D message carrying this indication.  Based on the companies’ input, there seems **two directions**:   * Direction 1: device needs to know the D2R failure or success, so that the device can decide **whether to response** the subsequent paging/access occasion (to avoid redundant response). * Direction 2: when the device is not sure about the D2R failure or success, the device consider the success and **will not** response the subsequent paging/access occasion (even the D2R data fails). |
| vivo | Yes | As our above answers, it cannot be left to CN to recover failure which does harm for QoS satisfaction and efficiency.  We prefer a simple indication mechanism, i.e. failure only indication. Since the probability of success is usually much greater than that of failure, the absence of explicit failure indication means success. This failure only indication mechanism can also cover the subsequent R2D data in case 1 and new access occasion for another device, which can be implicit success.  Hence, we prefer Option 3 with removal “1-bit indication” since it can be left to stage 3 design. We propose to re-word Option 3 to failure only indication |
| Nokia | No | E2e reliability is assumed to be provisioned by upper layers (Option X – no indication). |
| Vodafone | No | Agree with CATT |
| Ericsson | comment | Case 2 is not complete; we would like to add one more option  **Option 4: no AS feedback (success or failure) indication.**  It is too early/premature for RAN2 to discuss detailed signaling options for AS feedback. RAN2 should focus on discussion of the need of AS feedback, which is also dependent on RAN1 discussions. Since there are other L1/L2 tools feasible to improve transmission reliability, e.g., repetition, segmentation etc. The issue may be also dependent on whether Msg1 transmission and Msg3 transmission are coherent, if there is coherence between Msg1 and Msg3, it may be less likely that the device succeeds to transmit Msg1, while fails to transmit Msg3. |
| Nordic | Yes | And agree with Apple as well. |
| NEC | Yes with Option 1 | For inventory use case, the reader has no more subsequent R2D data (i.e., “command”) to transmit after receiving device ID in Msg.3. Therefore, the only motivation for supporting explicit R2D failure/success indication for the D2R data transmission is for re-access case. Assuming a second trigger message which used to re-trigger devices whose status is “failure” for the previous access attempt responding to the initial trigger message (i.e., A-IOT paging message) is supported, then the device needs to acknowledge its status, i.e., either “success” or “failure”, which is assumed to be explicitly indicated by R2D failure/success indication. Therefore, we think Option 1 matches the above scenario. |
| ZTE | Yes | We don’t have a strong view on sub option for case 2. But in general, we think explicit indication is nice because this enables unified handling of the MAC procedure and MAC can then be agnostic to exact upper layer payload being exchanged in the MAC layer. |
| Sharp | Yes | It makes thing clear to have an explicit indication and we also find the consequence of missing reception of the indication may result the device to make an incorrect decision, but we think it is acceptable. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | Option 1-3 can work，but we slightly prefer option 1 with clear “success” and “failure” indication. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | Option 2 is enough, the failure detection can be based on timer, e.g., Tmax. |
| OPPO | No | As addressed in the Q2, an implicit failure/success indication for the D2R data transmission could be applied, repeated as follows:  “we could judge if the reader has successfully received the preceding D2R message by investigating the relationship between the time moment of reception of the subsequent R2D message and *T*D2R\_max. Firstly, if the A-IOT device could receive the subsequent R2D message (regardless of if or not towards the device) in time (<*T*D2R\_max), then the A-IOT device could interpret as reader receiving the previous D2R message successfully, otherwise no.”  If we really need to go for the explicit indication way, then Option 3 is preferred due to the saving of the energy of decoding the R2D message, considering the A-IOT device, in majority time, should be able to transmit the D2R message successfully to the network  [Rapp]: The usage of this question is on case 2, where there is no subsequent R2D for this device.  [OPPO]: Please see my answer in Q1. The case that there is no subsequent R2D for this device could also be solved by implicit way. |
| Docomo | No | Similar view to Nokia. Only the CN can know whether the upper layer message is successfully decoded, i.e., the success indication from the reader may not be correct. A failure indication from the reader is at least valid, but we cannot find how the device uses it.  [Rapp]: The usage of failure indication is discussed in Question2. |
| Qualcomm | See comments | It could be success or failure indication or even no indication. It really depends on the use cases. For example, if the AIoT function only would like to collect the AIoT data from the AIoT device regardless which AIoT device sends the data, no success/failure indication is needed. |
| Transsion Holdings | Yes | Opiton1/Option 2 can work.  we need to consider the failure receving of the indication at the device, so the opiton 3 can’t work.  The UE should has the D2R reception status at the reader to avold duplicated response if the reader/CN re-triggerd the procedure, so the option4 can’t work. |
| Lenovo | Yes | For the case that the reader has no more subsequent R2D data to transmit for this device, reader may provide explicitly R2D failure/success indication for the D2R data transmission. After the device receives the indication, it may be aware whether there occurs failure for the D2R data transmission, and further decide whether to re-transmit the D2R data or perform re-access. For the candidate options, we prefer Option 3, e.g., 1-bit indication for failure indication and the absence means success. |
| Futurewei | Yes | We slightly prefer option 1. To address Ericsson’s concern on the R2D transmission solely for the purpose of AS feedback, we are open to considering this 1-bit indication to be piggy-backed on the subsequent trigger message for other device(s), as long as the mapping relationship is clear.  As to the timing based failure detection suggested by Xiaomi and OPPO, we have expressed our view in response to Q1 that it works only if the device is the last one or the only one that has transmitted right before the subsequent R2D message. |
| China Telecom | Yes | We are fine with the explicit indication. Similar view to Huawei. |
| HONOR | Yes | Option1~3 could work. However, considering the failure rate, we slightly prefer the option 3 failure indication. To reduce the signalling overhead, the reader could skip the indication when there is no following scheduling to indicate the success with the absence. |
| InterDigital | Yes, with comments. | Again, we think we need to differentiate random access from data transmission phase.  For MSG3, we think it may be beneficial to support the indication so that it is clear at the device whether the inventory procedure was successful and whether a subsequent access to paging message is needed or not. We have a preference for option 3, although 1-3 all work.  For random access, explicit indication is not needed, since MSG2 response implicitly indicates success of MSG1. |
| MediaTek | Yes | Considering the Msg3 case, we think option 1 is the most robust approach.  In general, if the D2R transmission (Msg3 or otherwise) includes any application data, we think it needs to be acked so the device knows when it can discard data/advance a “next data” pointer/etc. For this data handling, what the device needs to do is conditioned on **successful transmission**, so it makes sense if the reader sends an instruction that says “you can do your postprocessing now”, i.e., an explicit indication of successful reception.  However, for the specific case of Msg3, as discussed above it seems reasonable to retry the access procedure if a subsequent access occasion is available. Thus there is something for the device to do also in the case of reception failure, which argues for an explicit indication of failure. Hence, option 1. |
| Kyocera | Yes | We slightly prefer Option 1 since it’s clearer, although Options 2 and 3 also work. We assume this indication makes the device to determine whether to monitor the subsequent A-IoT paging. |
| Fujitsu | Yes | Slightly prefer Option 3 to save signaling overhead. Option 1/2 is also fine. |
| Continental Automotive | Yes | we are fine with option 1/option 2. |
| Bosch | Yes | Option 3 is more efficient for simplicity of device implementation. |
| Wiliot | Yes | With preference for option 1 or 2 |
| ASUSTeK | Yes | We slightly prefer Option 2 for simplicity. |
| Panasonic | Option-2 | For contention based random access, the subsequent request of D2R for a new transmission after Msg3 reception means the R2D success. On the other hand, if no subsequent R2D is received for some time (regulated by a timer), the device can assume Msg3 has failed. Therefore, option-2 is useful for the random access in contention based procedure.  For the generic D2R transmission, option-2 can be the baseline while the other options can be discussed further. |
| Samsung | Yes | We think it is sufficient to agree the support of explicit R2D failure/success indication for the D2R data transmission (though we slightly prefer option 2). |
| ETRI | Yes | Option 1, 2 and 3 can be feasible. |

**Rapporteur Summary:**

* **Technical points from companies:**
  + **Camp 1: Yes**: CMCC, Huawei, vivo, Nordic, NEC, ZTE, Sharp, Spreadtrum, Xiaomi, Transsion, Lenovo, Futurewei, China Telecom, HONOR, InterDigital, MediaTek, Kyocera, Fujitsu, LG?, OPPO (fine with option 3?), QC (indication in some case?), Continental, Bosch, Wiliot, ASUSTeK, Samsung, Panasonic, ETRI
    - More support to option 3 for companies replying yes, while some claim the robustness from option 1.
  + **Camp 2: No**: CATT, Apple, LG, Nokia, Vodafone, OPPO, Docomo, Ericsson?
    - Device simplification intention is mentioned.
    - Assume the upper layer-based reliability.
* **Suggested proposals/observations from rapp:**

Rapporteur understands option 3-like indicator has some support among the “Yes” camp, while it allows the reader to not/never use this indicator. So, not sending the indicator will be the same design as the device behavior from “No” camp. While this option also addresses some concern from the “no” camp, who want to make it up to reader implementation. Then, this option3-like will also be unified/aligned design with the case 1 implicit way (i.e. subsequent R2D means success by default).

Hope this is the compromised way forward, considering any camp/any option works, which is just about the tradeoff between AS layer reliability and complexity.

Proposal 2a: Support explicit R2D failure/success indication for the D2R data transmission.

Proposal 2b: RAN2 to discuss: It is up to the reader whether/when to include this indication. The absence of this indication will not trigger device re-transmission/re-access (i.e. absence means “likely success”).

## 2.2 Some FFS for CBRA

### 2.2.1 When Msg2 is needed in 2step RA

Some online discussion minutes and contribution proposals are cited here:

|  |
| --- |
| R2-2406682 Discussion on Random Access for Ambient IoT Apple  Proposal 3 Regardless of Solution 1/Solution 2, A-IoT Msg2 (or equivalent) is always transmitted for the sake of contention resolution and to acknowledge the success of device’s RA attempt.  R2-2406752 Discussion on random access of Ambient IoT Spreadtrum  Proposal 5: Msg2 is not needed if reader has subsequent transmission with device. |
| - Qualcomm thinks that msg2 is similar to msg4 (i.e. subsequent transmission). We should have a unified solution with the 3 step RA. Vodafone thinks that we should resolve contention based on random number.  - Huawei thinks that for 2-step RA msg2 is needed. Mediatek thinks that it is important for the AS to have an AS device to address the device. ZTE thinks it is important to simplify the devices and including random number will be good.  - Intel explains that there are cases where msg2 is not needed. Inventory only cases – device ID sent to reader and if you don’t receive it you can trigger the device to send the ID again. For command – it may be needed  - Apple doesn’t see the complexity of supporting different design as the UE would only support either 2-step or 4-step. Vodafone thinks that logistically this is difficult to differentiate between devices. Williot agrees that there can devices that only support 2 step RA.  - ZTE thinks that the difference between 2 and 3 step is just the reader indicating to the UE simply send random ID or send data as well. |

*For 2step CBRA, RAN2 design will support msg2. Whether it is needed it is up to the reader. FFS when it is needed. For 2-step CBRA (when mgs2 is needed), the random ID (fixed 16bits) is also included in A-IoT Msg1, and is echoed in A-IoT Msg2.*

As to the above RAN2 agreement FFS parts, rapporteur has following understandings on the need of Msg2 in 2step CBRA:

* Purpose-1: Msg2 is always needed to carry the received random ID, due to the contention resolution purpose;
  + Some online comments claim that, for inventory-only case, there is no need to address the contention in Msg1. It means the device ID reporting will be probably missed when there is the contention (without AS layer reliability mechanism).
* Purpose-2: Whether Msg2 is needed to carry the “failure/success indication” follows the same principle as Question 3 in [2.1.3](#_2.1.3_Need/when/how_to).
* Purpose-3: Msg2 is needs to provide the scheduling information for the following D2R data transmission if any.
* Purpose-x: ?

Question 4: Do you agree the Msg2 is always needed for 2step CBRA, considering the above purposes?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** (please clarify the exact case when Msg2 can be absent, if answer is no) |
| CATT | Yes | Prefer unified solution for 2-step CBRA |
| Apple | Yes with comments | We agree with Purpose-1 and Purspoe-3, but not purpose-2. |
| LG | Yes | We think that the Msg2 of 2step CBRA corresponds the Msg2 and Msg4 of 3step CBRA because CBRA needs the contention resolution.  In 3step CBRA, the Msg2 is used for the completion of the contention resolution. After the completion of the contention resolution, the device considers that the random access procedure is successfully completed.  Since 2step CBRA is also contention based random access, it should apply the same principle as 3step CBRA. |
| CMCC | Yes | Msg2 is necessary as an indication for D2R data transmission success or failure. |
| Vivo | Yes | Msg2 is always needed for contention resolution, success indication and following scheduling in different cases. |
| Nokia | Yes with comments | No strong views except that Msg2 should always have the same format to promote unified design. Strictly speaking, unified design would also require Msg2 to be always sent (tradeoff between resource efficiency and implementation complexity). In case Msg2 is the last message used in an ACKing-only function (Inventory), it may be omitted, ideally based on (CN) config. |
| Vodafone | Yes(comments) | For 2-step CBRA, where msg 1 contains the device ID and only if this procedure is adapted by 3GPP (we are not sure, this should be the case as sending device full ID in msg 1 will make this message much bigger and also require sending it more often in case of failure), msg 2 should be sent for propose 1. |
| Ericsson | Yes | First, we want to highlight that rapporteur has artificially ruled out the option that Msg2 is not needed from the discussion. It is good to also include that option to allow companies express their views.  We think Msg2 is always needed for 2-step CBRA for contention resolution purpose i.e., purpose 1. Whether purpose-2 and purpose-3 are also valid can be further discussed. Especially for Purpose-2, our comments for Question-3 are also applicable here. |
| Nordic | Yes with comments | As discussed during the meeting there might be use cases where Msg2 is not really needed. Especially, if the device does not know whether its D2R transmission failed and re-access would always be reader initiated (see Q2), it is simple to support Msg2-less use case. |
| NEC | Yes | Since it is about CBRA, then contention resolution (msg2) seems needed always. |
| ZTE | Yes with comments | We think in any case, the protocol design should support MSG2 to be sent. Then, to us, it can be left up to the reader whether MSG2 is really sent or not. If MSG2 is not sent then the procedure would have to end anyway (since the device cannot transmit anything autonomously in UL). |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes with comments | We support Msg2 is needed at least for the contention resolution purpose (Purpose-1), Purpose-3 depends on RAN1. Not support purpose-2, if Msg1 fails due to collision, the reader cannot successfully decode the Msg1 and send a NACK to the colliding devices. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | Purpose 1/2. |
| OPPO | Yes | For the 2-step CBRA, the A-IOT needs to know if it has already successfully transmitted the ID towards the network, we are afraid that the msg2 is the only way to let the A-IOT device be aware of this. |
| Docomo | Yes with comments | To aim to unified procedure, we are fine to always transmit Msg2. But as some compnies already mentioned, if consequent D2R message is not required (e.g. inventory-only use case) the Msg2 is not technically needed, thus if we capture purpose-1 in proposed conclusion, we prefer to delete the word “always” in the first sentence. |
| Qualcomm | No | As our comments in the Question 3b, it depends on the use case. If the AIoT function only cares about to collect enough AIoT data (in 2-step CBRA) regardless which AIoT device reports data, the msg2 is not needed.  [Rapp]: R19 use cases are just inventory and command. |
| Transsion Holdings | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes | We think Msg2 for 2-step CBRA is always needed to resolve the contention. Some comments thinks the collision happens and device id transmission failure can be resolved by upper layer solution e.g. re-send the inventory request. We think this is inefficient way to always rely on upper layer to re-trigger the service. |
| Futurewei | Yes | For contention resolution purpose and also serving as an implicit success/failure indication (i.e., there is no need to include an explicit success/failure indication in Msg2). |
| China Telecom | Yes | For contention resolution, Msg2 is needed to indicate successful transmission for Msg1. |
| HONOR | Yes |  |
| InterDigital | Yes | We prefer a unified approach for 2-step and 3-step. |
| MediaTek | Yes | We think purposes 1 and 2 are valid, and as indicated in our comments online at RAN2#127, we also see that Msg2 is needed to assign an AS identity that can be used for subsequent data transmission (this is related to but not the same as purpose 3 above). |
| Kyocera | Yes |  |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |
| Continental Automotive | Yes |  |
| Bosch | Yes | Msg2 is needed for random access contention resolution and also can be utilized for indication of success or failure. |
| Wiliot | Yes | We agree with proposal 1 and 3 |
| ASUSTeK | Yes | We think Msg2 for contention resolution is necessary. |
| Panasonic | Yes | For contention based 2-step RA, Msg2 is needed at least for contention resolution (i.e. purpose-1). Whether Msg2 serves other purposes is subject to the discussion related to other questions. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| ETRI | Yes | We prefer a unified solution for CBRA. |

**Rapporteur Summary:**

* **Technical points from companies:**
  + It is clearly majority to support the rapporteur understanding.
  + Some companies mention the purpose is not for failure indication.
  + Some companies mention 2-step CBRA is not needed at all.
  + Some companies mention Msg2 is not needed in some use case that the network does not care whether the data is from some specific devices.
* **Suggested proposals/observations from rapp:**

Proposal 3: Msg2 is always needed for 2step CBRA.

### 2.2.2 2step RA optimization

|  |
| --- |
| - Huawei thinks that for 2-step RA msg2 is needed. Mediatek thinks that it is important for the AS to have an AS device to address the device. ZTE thinks it is important to simplify the devices and including random number will be good.  - Intel explains that there are cases where msg2 is not needed. Inventory only cases – device ID sent to reader and if you don’t receive it you can trigger the device to send the ID again. For command – it may be needed  - Apple doesn’t see the complexity of supporting different design as the UE would only support either 2-step or 4-step. Vodafone thinks that logistically this is difficult to differentiate between devices. Williot agrees that there can devices that only support 2 step RA.  - ZTE thinks that the difference between 2 and 3 step is just the reader indicating to the UE simply send random ID or send data as well. |
| **Agreements**  - for 2step CBRA, RAN2 design will support msg2. Whether it is needed it is up to the reader. FFS when it is needed. For 2-step CBRA (when mgs2 is needed), the random ID (fixed 16bits) is also included in A-IoT Msg1, and is echoed in A-IoT Msg2. FFS if there will be devices support only 2-step RA and any other optimizations will be needed for such devices. |

Question 5: For the proponents of optimization for 2step RA, please clarify the optimizations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** (you can also suggest WF before we actually make agreement on the support of “only 2-step RA” right now) |
| Apple | The optimization could be: not including 16-bit random ID in Msg 1, assume the A-IoT reader will echo a partial device ID back in Msg 2 for contention resolution purpose. How to generate partial device ID can be further discussed in normative phase. |
| CMCC | We think that the random ID is not necessary in 2-step RA. If there is further data transmission between reader and device, reader can use partial device ID to address the device or as reader can request an AS address for data transmission after RA.  Always sending random ID in 2-step RA can waste device energy. |
| Vodafone | In our view, we should be careful creating environment, where different devices support different kinds of RACH procedure. In our view, 3 step RACH is sufficient to be supported. We are not sure about the need for 2Step CBRA, but if the design should be common to 3step RACH, meaning msg 2 includes random ID |
| Ericsson | This question is mainly concerning Stage 3 discussion and can be discussed later (e.g., after RAN2 has made recommendation based on outcome of the study phase). For each device (type), we think both 3/4 step RA and 2 step RA can be studied and supported at least in the study phase. They are applicable to different load situations. E.g., 3/4 step RA may be applicable if there is high load/congestion, while 2 step RA may be applicable if there is low load and low congestion. |
| ZTE | We think unified procedure for 2-step and 3-step RA is important. Otherwise, the device behaviour and procedures would branch-out and is not preferable. Although optimisations as mentioned above (e.g. excluding random ID etc) are possible, we don’t think these should be pursued in the initial implementations.  So, we think random ID should be included. All devices should support both 3-step and 2-step RA and it is up to the reader to choose which option to use (simply by indicating in the initial trigger message). The device simply follows the reader indication. |
| Spreadtrum | In order to save device energy, Msg 1 does not contain a random ID. If reader has the subsequent R2D data to transmit for this device (e.g. command after inventory), reader can generate a random ID for the device based on the device ID. The random ID generation rules are also known to the device side. Then, the random ID is sent to the device in Msg2. |
| OPPO | In the last RAN2 meeting, we hear that the only reason to include the random ID in the msg1 is for the convenience of the reader to make further scheduling. But actually, whether or not there is further scheduling needs should depend on the reader/CN’s intention, i.e., if a ‘read’ command is needed. Bearing this in mind, rather than the A-IOT device to generate a random ID and transmit in the msg1 for the 2-step RA, it should be OK to leave the job to the reader.  Also, we think the case for the CFRA is similar as the 2step CBRA in such perspective, and a related FFS is left in the last RAN2 meeting as follows: “In contention-free access, the A-IoT device directly sends the upper layer data (e.g. device ID) in its very first D2R message after being triggered (i.e. skip contention resolution Msg1/2). FFS if a short AS ID is also included in the message and what type of ID for scheduling purposes.  - FFS if reader assigns the AS ID for scheduling purposes”  So we hope to discuss the need of the transmission of the random ID for 2-step CBRA and CFRA together in the next RAN2 meeting, since the logics behind are the same. |
| HONOR | Firstly, we don’t think that the type of device impacts the supported types of RA. As in NR, the RA type could be determined by the UE based on configured RSRP. Secondly, the random ID could be included only if there is Msg2 with the same RN to have a unified solution with 3-step RA. If there is no Msg2, then we don’t see the need of including RN in the Msg1 which results in more signalling overhead without many benefits. |
| InterDigital | We think as a baseline, we should assume the random ID is included in MSG1 for 2-step, and any optimizations can be studied in the work item phase.  We think support of both 2-step and 3-step procedures would be important for the reader to handle different load situations, and that the reader can decide which procedure to use and the device follows it (e.g., based on indication in the paging message). Based on this and unification of the procedures, we don’t see a very large impact on all devices supporting both procedures. |
| Kyocera | We still wonder why RN16 needs to be included in Msg1 in 2-step RA, if Msg1 can contain the Device ID. The echo information in Msg2 can be optimized (e.g., CRC16 of Device ID, instead of RN16), which is useful for Inventory use case and/or is used as AS temporary ID for the following data transfer for Command use case. |
| Bosch | The initial access ID (msg1) should contain random and deterministic parts. The deterministic portion identifies the device and extended information regarding energy level, etc. can be encoded in the msg 1, which can be interpreted by the reader in a proper way. |
| Wiliot | Optimization can be using msg 1 CRC and avoid the 16 bits random ID |
| Panasonic | We support the view from Ericsson on to be discussed later. The purpose of 2-step RA should be concluded. Power/energy saving by reduced transmission length is sufficiently obtained by 2-step RA or commonality with 3 step RACH is sufficient is more important for the reduced complexity, such aspects need to be discussed later. |

**Rapporteur Summary:**

* **Technical points from companies:**
  + The proposed optimization is still that: Msg1 does not include random ID in 2step CBRA.
  + Some companies prefer to revert the agreement to not even include the random ID at all.
  + Some companies claim this can be checked if needed in the normative phase.
  + The opponent of the optimization insist the unified/common design.
* **Suggested proposals/observations from rapp:**

Since there seems no way to make further progress, it OK to go with the Apple, Ericsson, InterDigital suggestion: We can discuss this after RAN2 concludes the down-selection/support of 2step vs. 3step, or even in WI phase.

**No proposal/observation.**

### 2.2.3 Access occasion in slotted ALOHA

#### 2.2.3.1 Terminology and modelling

In order to have some reference for discussion, following terminologies and demonstration figures are given:



Figure 2.2.3-1 The overall framework example of slotted ALOHA random access

**Access occasion**: An opportunity of time/frequency resource for A-IoT device to perform access (e.g. transmitting the A-IoT Msg1).

**Access round**: One access round consists a certain amount of access occasions for difference devices, which are assigned via one R2D message (e.g. [R2D Round Trigger message]) by the reader.

**Paging round**: One paging round consists one or multiple access rounds, which is initiated by the A-IoT paging message. One service request may associate with multiple paging rounds.

NOTE 1: The need of (multiple) access round(s) and the difference/combination with paging round will be discussed later in section [2.2.4](#_2.3_AS_ID), not here.

#### 2.2.3.2 What is slotted ALOHA? Definition of access occasion

It is understood as RAN1 discussion/issue/responsibility on the detail of following **block** in the above figure, i.e. the definition or determination of the exact time/frequency domain resources of Msg1.



Figure 2.2.3-2 The RAN1 responsibility in the random access (the resource for Msg1)

Please see below RAN1 progress on the above Msg1 resource related issues:

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal in R1-2407532 for TDMA**  FL4 High priority Proposal 6.1.1-1b: A **R2D transmission triggering** random access determines X time domain resource(s) available for D2R transmission(s) **for Msg1**, where each D2R transmission occurs in one time domain resource.   * FFS X=1 or X>=1 considering the necessity, pros and cons.   **RAN1 Agreement**  Study FDMA of D2R transmissions **for** **Msg.1** from multiple devices in response to a **R2D transmission** **triggering** random access, including following   * How the frequency domain resources are allocated for the FDMA of D2R transmissions for Msg.1 * How a device determines the frequency domain resource for the D2R transmissions for Msg.1   Note: this does not preclude discussion on TDMA for D2R transmissions for Msg.1 |

Observation 1: In the RAN1 design, there is one “R2D transmission triggering” which determines/initiates [X-time domain and] Y-frequency domain resources for Msg1 transmission.

Rapporteur would like to clarify the RAN1 and RAN2 work split:

|  |
| --- |
| **RAN1 Chair clarification in RAN1 reflector**:  *“I have been coordinating with the RAN2 Chair and would like to provide the following guidance for companies’ submissions on random access for agenda 9.4.2.2:  It is not in the scope of RAN1 to define the number of steps and the function of the message for each step in random access procedure. RAN1 can study contention resolution aspects at physical layer (in case of contention-based access) and how to use physical resources (in case of contention-free access), i.e. to study physical resources and physical channel(s)/signal(s) for contention-based and contention-free random access procedures that are agreed to be studied by RAN2 (please refer to RAN2 agreements).  David”*  **RAN2 agreements**:   * *RAN2 confirms slotted-ALOHA is the baseline for Ambient IoT random access* * *RAN2 to discuss the contention-based and contention-free access procedures and detailed solutions.* * *Handling of contention resolution failure and access failure at the device will be studied in RAN2, including failure detection and re-access. FFS details* |

Observation 2: To decouple the RAN1 resource design and RAN2 message/procedure design for random access, it can be up to RAN2 discussion on using which R2D message to support this “R2D transmission triggering”.

#### 2.2.3.3 What is slotted ALOHA? To distribute devices into slots

Some related proposals from contributions are cited in section [4.2](#_4.2_Access_occasion).

RAN2 confirms slotted-ALOHA is the baseline for Ambient IoT random access.

Based on the TR 38.848 target device density, there could be up to thousands of devices to respond the paging trying to perform the random access.

From RAN2 perspective, as to the slotted-ALOHA procedure, reader first selects many devices and then distribute those devices into many “slots”.

Observation 3: From RAN2 perspective, slotted-ALOHA needs to support the distribution of many devices (value *N*), selected by the one A-IoT paging, into similar/close number of access occasions (or “slots”) (value *Q*).

Observation 4: One A-IoT paging message may select up to several hundred of devices (or possibly even more).

Question 6a: Do you agree that: As the basic assumption, from RAN2 perspective, slotted-ALOHA needs to support the distribution of many devices (could be up to several hundred of devices), selected by the one A-IoT paging, into similar/closed number of access occasions.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Yes with comments | Generally, we agree with the rapporteur’s view. But it can be left to reader implementation to determine the number of access occasions within an access round, due to the fact that the number of devices which do not successfully access to the reader will be decreased at the subsequent access round. So no need to have “into similar/closed number of access occasions”. |
| Apple | NO | We think we do not need make any assumption on how reader allocates CBRA resource because this is up to reader implementation. The reader may not even have an idea of the number “N”, so it is hard to say it can dimension the access occasion accordingly. Even if CN provides an N, this is just an upper bound and the actual devices which can be discovered could be much less. So, we do not agree with “similar/close” part of the proposal. |
| LG | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes | To our understanding, between two paging messages, there can be multiple access occasion with explicit boundary indication (similar to *QueryRep* command in RFID) to partition tag.  Slotted-ALOHA is most efficient when only one device transmits in one access occasion. |
| vivo | See comment | Left to reader implementation. |
| Nokia | See comments | Agree with the concept of multiple access occasions. Their usage is to be flexible to which end for example “delta” paging shall be used to correct suboptimal resource allocation (eg Q adaptation). |
| Vodafone | Yes | According to 38848:  According to the consolidated potential KPIs in TR 22.840, the maximum connection density target is:  - 150 devices per 100 m2 for indoor scenarios.  - 20 devices per 100 m2 for outdoor scenarios.  Also a reader may cover more than 100m2 as per simulation assumptions of 38.769. |
| Ericsson | No | As other companies commented, how a reader allocates a number of occasions/resources, is fully up to reader implementation. It is unnecessary for RAN2 to make the above assumption. The characteristics of A-LOHA are mainly up to RAN1 discussion. |
| Nordic | No | Left for reader implementation |
| NEC | Yes | But suggest to delete “similar/closed” before “number of access occasions” , which may not be mathematically right here considering random access channel capability |
| ZTE | Yes | We think the protocol should support this and how it is used can be up to the reader implementation. |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | Same view with CMCC. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | Slotted-ALOHA is baseline and the triggered device amount is huge in one paging.  So “slot” concept as RFID is good solution for grouping device to reduce the collision possibility. |
| OPPO | Yes | Different access occasions are distributed in the manner of the TDM |
| Docomo | Yes, but | Definition of “accesss occasion” is up to RAN1. |
| Qualcomm | No | Why the assumption that similar /closed number of access occasions is required for the distributed devices? It is up to Reader to assign the resources.  [Rapp]: As clarified, the intention is not to mandate reader behavior (i.e. not requirement). It is to support the possibility that reader can allocate similar /closed number. |
| Transsion Holdings | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Based on the comments above, we suggest to update the question like:  **As the basic assumption, from RAN2 perspective to slotted-ALOHA, the reader should be allowed to distribute many devices (could be up to several hundred of devices), selected by the one A-IoT paging, into similar/closed number of access occasions. It is up to the reader implementation on the actual assigned number of access occasions.** |
| Lenovo | Yes | We support the basic assumption, just one comment on the description related to ‘similar/closed number of access occasions’, it may be further clarified on the meaning of ‘similar/closed number of access occasions.’ |
| Futurewei | Yes | Agree with ZTE that we need to design the protocol to support this, but how it is used can be up to the reader implementation. The following changes to the Rapporteur’s text proposal can be considered as a WF:  “… the distribution of M number of anticipated ~~many~~ devices (could be up to several hundred of devices), selected by the one A-IoT paging, into N ~~similar/closed~~ number of access occasions, where N ≥ M.” |
| China Telecom | Yes | Depend on reader implementation. |
| HONOR | Yes |  |
| InterDigital | Yes, with comments. | Agree with the intention. For the last part, it is sufficient to say – “into a number of access occasions”. The definition of access occasion is being discussed in RAN1. |
| MediaTek | See comment | The “similar/close number of access occasions” part is a bit unclear, and as others have suggested we think the number of access occasions can be up to reader implementation. We need to design a protocol that allows some maximum number of access occasions, and we agree that responses from “many” (e.g., hundreds of) devices need to be supportable.  OK with Huawei’s suggested reformulation, except that the “similar/close” language should be clarified: similar/close to what? |
| Kyocera | Yes | We share the rapporteur’s view that the slotted-ALOHA needs to support a method to distribute multiple devices to multiple time/frequency resources, even though it’s up to Reader implementation how to do it properly. |
| Fujitsu | Yes, with comments | Agree with the updated basic assumption.  We think that it is up to the reader implementation on the number of access occasions. One aspect needs to be considered is the number of devices. |
| Continental Automotive | Yes |  |
| Bosch | Yes |  |
| Wiliot | See comment | We think it is reader implementation. We do agree that the upper bound should be specify. |
| ASUSTeK | Yes | We can support it, and whether it is about “similar/closed number of access occasions” is mainly a reader implementation. |
| Panasonic | Yes and no | For the part of "slotted-ALOHA needs to support the distribution of many devices (could be up to several hundred of devices), selected by the one A-IoT paging", we support it.  For the part of "similar/closed number of access occasions", it is not always required to be so. It is up to reader implementation. |
| Samsung | See comments | We are fine with the intention but as commented by some companies, we do not see a need of mentioning 'similar/close' which could be a bit confusing. |
| ETRI | Yes |  |

**Rapporteur Summary:**

* **Technical points from companies:**
  + There is the clear majority to confirm the rapporteur’s understanding, but:
  + This should be reader’s implementation rather than some requirement/must.
  + Some companies clarify that Slotted-ALOHA is most efficient when only one device transmits in one access occasion, i.e. equal number of slot compared to number of device.
  + Some companies prefer to remove “similar/closed”. Some other wording suggestions are also provided.
* **Suggested proposals/observations from rapp:**

Rapporteur clarifies that the proposal is to just confirm one reader implementation possibility, i.e. we use “can/support”.

Proposal 4a: From RAN2 perspective on slotted-ALOHA, it should be possible/supported that the number of access occasions can be as large as the number of devices that may attempt to access. (It is up to the reader implementation on the actual assigned number of access occasions.)

As to the RAN1 discussion on the access occasions in response to/assigned by one “R2D transmission triggering”, it can be X\*Y access occasions, which is a limited number (e.g. 2\*4 in some cases). This is because that the large SFO of A-IoT device limits the value of X, and the frequency-shit capability of A-IoT device limits the value of Y.

Observation 5: When reader intends to allocate many access occasions (e.g. *Q*=several hundred), it needs to allocate multiple (value *R*) blocks of X\*Y access occasions, due to the limited number of X\*Y (e.g. less than or about 10).

for example requires

Therefore, it is necessary to support multiple “R2D transmission triggering” after one A-IoT paging.

Question 6b: Do you agree that: After one A-IoT paging message (which selects/indicates the devices to perform RA procedure), there can be multiple “R2D transmission triggering” to schedule the Msg1 resources?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Yes | Agree with rapporteur it should have multiple rounds where each round is triggered by reader for the intention of re-timing by the device, due to the large SFO of A-IoT device. |
| Apple | No. (Wait for RAN1) | This needs to discussed in RAN1 first. Whether there are any further triggers/sync signals to indicates the start of AO is up to RAN1 to decide. The Msg 1 resource scheduling part is also need RAN1 input. |
| LG | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes | Ambient IoT device has very limited capability, this design is better in reliability and efficiency. |
| vivo | See comments | What is the meaning of “R2D transmission triggering”? Refers to R2D Round Trigger or R2D Trigger in Figure 2.2.3-1?  Rapp: Refer to the R2D Trigger in Figure 2.2.3-1 |
| Nokia | No | RAN1 is discussing AIoT synchronization mechanisms and so RAN2 shall wait for their progress before discussing own paging / trigger / synchronization messages |
| Vodafone | See comments | Not sure it is really needed, but we also not sure we understand the question fully.  Is this for TDMA or FDMA? In RAN1 this was not discussed, it was only based on a single R2D transmission triggering.  The latest proposal by RAN1 considers only one R2D transmission triggering for multiple X time domain resources for TDMA:  **FL4 High priority Proposal 6.1.1-1b: A R2D transmission triggering random access determines X time domain resource(s) available for D2R transmission(s) for Msg1, where each D2R transmission occurs in one time domain resource.**   * **FFS X=1 or X>=1 considering the necessity, pros and cons.**   Also for FDMA it is only considered 1 R2D transmission triggering  Agreement  Study FDMA of D2R transmissions for Msg.1 from multiple devices in response to a R2D transmission triggering random access, including following   * How the frequency domain resources are allocated for the FDMA of D2R transmissions for Msg.1 * How a device determines the frequency domain resource for the D2R transmissions for Msg.1   Note: this does not preclude discussion on TDMA for D2R transmissions for Msg.1 |
| Ericsson | No (wait for RAN1) | Agree with Apple, Nokia that this should be left for RAN1 decision. |
| Nordic | No |  |
| NEC | Yes | “R2D transmission triggering” is used to indicate devices the starting of one access occasion. When the reader allocates multiple access occasions to devices (i.e., devices need perform RA procedure), there should be multiple “R2D transmission triggering” to indicate devices the starting of multiple access occasions.  Moreover, similar to RFID, devices can randomly pick up its access occasion, and determine whether the current access occasion is its own’s by counting the number of received “R2D transmission triggering” . |
| ZTE | May be yes, but | We think the first R2D message (i.e. the A-IoT paging message) can be used for indicating the targeted AIoT devices and also the TDM/FDM/CDM RA resources and can also indicate the initial Q value. The exact format TDM/FDM/CDM RA resources can be defined by RAN1.  We think it is important to have a clear separation between RAN1 and RAN2 discussions in this regard and we would like to clarify first which group would decide which aspect so that there is no overlap and we can make quick progress. |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | Agree with rapporteur. Due to limited device capability, multiple “R2D transmission triggering” message are required to re-timing of device. |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| OPPO |  | If the quoted ‘R2D transmission triggering’ here is equivalent to the QueryRep message for the RFID system, we are ok. FFS the upper bound of the X and Y value. |
| Docomo | No | Wait for RAN1.  At least I’m confused of what we are discussing, TDMA or FDMA? To my understanding RAN1 did not conclude the definition of resource for Msg1 transmission for TDMA. Duplicating RAN1 discussion in RAN2 may lead to deadlock that we cannot resolve in 1Q until the end of study phase...  [Rapp]: The key point of this question is “multiple”, rather than discuss the detailed scheduling or resource definition in RAN1. |
| Qualcomm | No | The whole term captured in RAN1 agreement is ‘R2D transmission triggering random access’. We are not sure whether it is the same concept of the question in question 6b, multiple “R2D transmission triggering”. At least we fail to observe the understanding in question 6b ‘After one A-IoT paging message, there can be multiple “R2D transmission triggering”…’ from RAN1 agreement/intention. Thus, we prefer to keep RAN2 agreement, to wait for RAN1 conclusion on the access occasion.  [Rapp]: The “multiple” block of the access occasions is from RAN2 procedure perspective, while we leave the design of radio resource inside that block of access occasions to RAN1. |
| Transsion Holdings | See comments | We think the “R2D round triggering” defines the access around, and the “R2D trigger” defines the access occasion. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes | Based on the slotted-ALOHA solutions, the reader may handle one device at each access occasion (when only TDMA is considered and only for single time-domain resource in one access occasion), the boundary for each access occasion is needed for next device to perform the access, there can be explicit signaling e.g., access trigger message for each access occasion as the boundary. The devices select specific access occasion can perform the random access within the occasion when receive corresponding R2D transmission trigger message. |
| Futurewei | Yes | When designing the protocol/procedures, RAN2 can at least make it a working assumption that multiple “R2D transmission triggering” may be needed per AIoT paging message for the worst case scenario. Then, we can check whether the design is still valid or not as RAN1 make progress in their corresponding design. |
| China Telecom | Yes |  |
| HONOR | Yes |  |
| InterDigital | Yes, with comments. | We think whether RAN1 or RAN2 discusses this, the need of a signal to delimit the start of one or more access occasion (e.g., FDM and/or TDM) is assumed by most companies given the asynchronous nature of the devices.  We think that for now, we can assume these messages exist and use a more generic wording: “there are multiple R2D transmissions which **define the resources for MSG1 transmission**.” Whether these messages are designed in RAN1 and RAN2 will depend on further discussion in those groups, and, for example, whether these messages require L2 signaling (e.g., for resource allocation) or not. |
| MediaTek | Wait for RAN1 | It seems clear that one AIoT paging event needs to be able to allocate resources for many responses, and as written, RAN1’s definition of “R2D transmission triggering” is limited in the number of devices it can serve, so it seems plausible that one AIoT paging event needs to be able to give rise to multiple “R2D transmission triggering” events. But we should get more information from RAN1 before committing to any particular way of structuring this relationship.  We understand that there is some confusion on this issue in RAN1 as well, with uncertainty as to whether the AIoT paging message is the same as an instance of “R2D transmission triggering”. The underlying question that needs to be answered is whether we have QueryRep-like signalling in AIoT, vs. just sending a single paging message that assigns D2R resources over a very long time window. The biggest technical issue here may be timing drift, which is best evaluated by RAN1. |
| Kyocera | No | We think the limitation of X\*Y access occasion depends on how to achieve the synchronization, which is up to RAN1 discussion. |
| Fujitsu | See comments | It seems that this should be discussed in RAN1 for Msg1 resource scheduling, or for re-timing.  Let’s wait for RAN1 decision. |
| Continental Automotive | Wait for RAN1 |  |
| Bosch | Yes |  |
| Wiliot | See comment | We agree with rapporteur view but we should wait for RAN1 decisions |
| ASUSTeK | See comments | We need to clarify the purpose of “R2D round trigger” and “R2D trigger” before making decisions. Scheduling Msg1 resources with signals other than A-IoT paging message can be considered. |
| Panasonic | Comments | We interpreted the question as whether one "R2D transmission triggering" can cover all possible distribution of devices to access occasions. Then we agree such design is not possible or not sufficient. Therefore, we agree there needs to be multiple "R2D transmission triggering". |
| Samsung | Yes, but | We think that the final decision about the necessity of multiple R2D transmission triggering after AIoT paging message should be made in RAN1. |
| ETRI | Yes | We agree with rapporteur view. |

**Rapporteur Summary:**

* **Technical points from companies:**
  + See quite some support on the understanding, but
  + Some companies want to wait for RAN1. (Apple, Nokia, Ericsson, Docomo, MediaTek, Fujitsu, Continental, Wiliot), e.g. following aspects
    - Whether there are any further triggers/sync signals to indicate the start of AO is up to RAN1 to decide.
    - The Msg 1 resource scheduling part is also need RAN1 input.
  + ZTE point out that we should have a clear split on this between RAN1 and RAN2.
* **Suggested proposals/observations from rapp:**

Rapporteur intends to clarify the RAN1/RAN2 work split and propose following which could impact our RAN2 slotted-ALOHA procedure. It means RAN2 will address the FFS with the order/work split by the sub-bullets.

Proposal 4b: FFS: After reader selects the devices to perform RA procedure (via A-IoT paging), there can be multiple R2D transmissions which define/schedule the resources for Msg1 transmission.

* It is up to RAN1 on how to define/schedule the time-frequency resources for Msg1 transmission. *(another part was already captured in RAN2 agreement “=> wait for further RAN1 progress on indication of the start of access occasion”*)
* RAN2 to discuss the R2D message corresponding to the “R2D transmission triggering” in RAN1 agreement (i.e. A-IoT paging message and/or other separate “QueryRep-like” R2D message), after more progress in RAN1.

Then, RAN2 can discuss the **message design** options to support the above “R2D transmission triggering”:

* Option 1: Separate R2D message (e.g. Occasions Trigger message); *(somehow like the QueryRep message in RFID)*
* Option 2: Reuse the naming of “A-IoT paging message”, but with different content (i.e. not including the paging identifier/device ID/group ID for selecting devices);
* Option x: ?

Question 6c: Do you agree to use a new separate R2D message (e.g. Occasions Trigger message) to support the RAN1 agreed “R2D transmission triggering” for Msg.1 resource(s)?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** (you can also indicate other preferred terms or your thinking on the message design) |
| CATT | Yes | A separate R2D msg to trigger new round is more flexible, as there may be the situation where the initial trigger msg indicates the devices that need to response, but the access occasion is delayed until some time duration after the initial trigger msg. In this situation, separate round trigger msg helps the acquisition of timing info. |
| Apple | NO (Wait for RAN1) | First, in RAN1 agreement, “R2D transmission” and “triggering” are two different part of the sentence, it does not imply there is a separate “Occasion triggering message” other than the existing “paging message” which is “triggering” the whole CBRA procedure. |
| LG | Yes | We prefer a term that means clearly “start of access occasion”. |
| CMCC | Yes | We would like a dedicated message as the trigger message of access occasion for CBRA. It can be much shorter than paging message (e.g., just a header, no other content as the *QueryRep* command) and thus more efficient.  Paging message can also act as a trigger message, but only in CFRA. |
| vivo | See comments | It is important to first discuss and agree the function and role clearly. Msg design can be left to stage 3. |
| Nokia | No | RAN1 is discussing AIoT synchronization mechanisms and so RAN2 shall wait for their progress before discussing own paging / trigger / synchronization messages |
| Ericsson | No | The discussion should be up to RAN1 decision. Agree with Apple and Nokia, that RAN1 is discussing this issue. |
| Nordic | See comments | Wait for RAN1 |
| NEC | Option 1 | The purpose of such a R2D message is to indicate the starting of one access occasion. Option 1 is simple in our understanding. |
| ZTE | See above |  |
| Sharp | Yes | A separate trigger message is preferred. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | Support separate R2D message (e.g. Occasions Trigger message, somehow like the QueryRep message in RFID) |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| OPPO | No. Option 2 | We think that the paging message combines the functionalities of selection and query message. So with sophisticated design, the paging message could also only fulfill functionality of query message. |
| Docomo | No | Wait for RAN1. |
| Qualcomm | No | RAN1 agreement is ‘Study FDMA of D2R transmissions **for** **Msg.1** from multiple devices in response to a **R2D transmission** **triggering** **random access’**. It is unclear how this would be interpreted as a ‘separate R2D message’. |
| Transsion Holdings | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes | We support to define the separate R2D message, which is similar as the *QueryRep* message in RFID, this message is used to indicate the start of one access occasion. And the naming can be e.g., access trigger message, or access occasion trigger message, etc. Option2 to Reuse the naming of “A-IoT paging message” is not suggested to avoid the confusion with actual A-IoT paging message which contains service request related information. |
| Futurewei | Yes | We prefer Option 1. But if Option 2 is selected, we think some kind of paging session ID is needed to prevent devices that have already responded from responding again. |
| China Telecom | Yes | A separate trigger message may be more efficient and flexible for CBRA. |
| HONOR | See comments | We prefer to confirm the content and function of this message instead of the naming. And this trigger message (with the name of Separate R2D message or AIoT paging message) is to divide the resource into occasions while each occasion could be utilized by one device. We think that this kind of trigger message could be agreed for the signalling-based solution. |
| InterDigital | Yes, with comments | We think this question is not so critical now, as what are the contents of this message (relative to the paging message) is more important.  That being said, we have a slight preference towards going with a separate message to keep specifications clearer and have clear separation of functionality. |
| MediaTek | Wait for RAN1 | As per the agreement quoted by Qualcomm, it seems that RAN1 are considering the possibility that one triggering transmission maps to the multiple responses. Probably RAN2 could agree that one or more R2D messages (i.e., AIoT paging + additional messages FFS) contain the allocation of D2R resources for multiple devices to respond, but as others have noted, the RAN1 discussion is still in progress.  The naming of messages is not critical at this point. |
| Kyocera | No | As in Question 6b above, we think it still depends on RAN1’s synchronization procedure. So far, we prefer to stick with a single message (i.e., A-IoT paging). |
| Fujitsu | See comments | We wonder if the difference is the A-IoT paging message can be the occasion trigger or not. In Option 1, an occasion trigger message is required in addition to A-IoT paging message, even for the first slot/access occasion? |
| Continental Automotive | Wait for RAN1 |  |
| Bosch | Yes |  |
| Wiliot | Yes | Different messages will allow shorter messages |
| ASUSTeK | See comments | The definition of “Occasion Trigger Message” needs to be clarified first. |
| Panasonic | No | Wait for RAN1. |
| Samsung | Wait for RAN1 | We do not see any urgency for this issue for now and it is more like next step. |
| ETRI | No | Wait for RAN1. |

**Rapporteur Summary:**

* **Technical points from companies:**
* **Suggested proposals/observations from rapp:**

It seems better to wait before we agree anything now. Also please see the above proposal on the future RAN2 discussion points.

#### 2.2.3.4 What is slotted ALOHA? Selection among access occasions

The next RAN2 issue is **how the device selects a certain access occasion** after the reader assigns/distributes the access occasions.

Following proposals are referred from RAN2#127 contributions:

|  |
| --- |
| R2-2406341 Random Access for Ambient IoT device NEC   * Proposal-4: in addition to the RA slot selection, the device may need to randomly selects one frequency location among the available frequency locations for that “RA slot” to send MSG-1 to the reader.   R2-2406460 Unified random-access procedure for A-IoT ZTE   * Proposal 9: If the DL trigger message indicates more than one UL resource for transmission of the MSG1 for a given device (CBRA), the device shall randomly select one of the resources for UL message transmission   R2-2406716 A-IoT random access procedure Huawei   * Proposal 2c: A-IoT device randomly selects one access occasion among the multiple time-domain access occasions in the access round.   R2-2406899 Random access procedure for Ambient IoT China Telecom   * Proposal 2: The device can randomly select one occasion in one access round.   R2-2407317 Views on Random Access Aspects of Ambient IoT Qualcomm   * Proposal 1: The AIoT devices selects the AIoT access occasion among the resources provided by Reader. The resource selection in the time domain of the AIoT access occasion is supported. Other schemes of the resource selection of the AIoT occasions can be further studied by RAN1/RAN2.   R2-2407458 Further discussion on Ambient IoT random access Samsung   * Proposal 1: For contention-based access procedure, the reader provides the total number of access occasions to the devices, from which each device randomly selects one access occasion for A-IoT Msg1 transmission. FFS on detailed configuration. |

Based on the common spirit from above proposals, rapporteur propose to first agree the high-level device selection behaviours.

Question 7: Do you agree: From RAN2 perspective for random access procedure, the device randomly selects one access occasion for A-IoT Msg1 (corresponding to a time and/or frequency resource) from *Q* access occasions provided/assigned by the reader, as the baseline for CBRA?

**“Access occasion**: An opportunity of time/frequency resource for A-IoT device to perform access (e.g. transmitting the A-IoT Msg1).”

NOTE: This question does not intend to discuss the exact message to assign the *Q* access occasions.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Apple | Wait for RAN1 | The “randomly selects one” part in this question is to be determined by RAN1. We tend to think the device can support it, but some other options may also be considered such as based on device ID, device energy status...etc. So, whether this is the only viable solution for A-IoT device is to be decided by RAN1. |
| LG | Yes | We think that the remaining energy should be considered as well. For example, a device with low energy level may randomly select the first part of access occasions to save its energy (not to wait long time for access attempt). In other way, a device with low energy level may randomly select the last part of access occasions to have more time for energy harvesting. |
| CMCC | Yes | IoT-NTN discusses CRDSA, where device selects two occasions in an access round and sends Msg1 with pointer twice. It can be more time efficient but it is also consuming twice device energy. So just one occasions is fine for Ambient IoT. |
| vivo | See comments | One-step random selection: randomly selects one access occasion from total number of access occasions in one access round;  Two-step random selection: randomly selects one “R2D trigger/QueryRep” and then randomly selects one access occasion in the range of the selected “R2D trigger/QueryRep”;  It can be FFS to choose one-step random selection or two-step random selection. We slightly prefer two-step random selection since small random numbers are easier operation for device. Besides, scheduling freedom of each “R2D trigger/QueryRep” can be retained and left for RAN1 design. |
| Nokia | See comments | Similar view to Apple. FFS whether Q could / should be updatable during subsequent occasions. |
| Vodafone | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | No | Eventually, how to select access occasions should be up to RAN1 decision.  Do access occasions cover only occasions in time or cover both occasions in time and frequency? For the latter, the answer may be different since devices may have different frequency shifting capabilities. In other words, in frequency domain, devices may be not able to do random selection.  For pure TDM based multiple access, the above assumption is fine  [Rapp] The original intention of the question is mainly about time domain or TMDA. We can somehow follow RAN1 further discussion for FMDA case details. |
| Nordic | Yes with comments | We should wait for RAN1. |
| NEC | Yes | RFID-like solution would be sufficient. |
| ZTE | May be yes, but | We need first to clarify the split between RAN1 and RAN2. |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes | Similar RFID-like random selection scheme could be applied |
| Docomo | Yes, but | Definition of “accesss occasion” is up to RAN1. |
| Qualcomm | Maybe | It could be one option from RAN2 p.o.v. But we are OK to wait for RAN1 further decision. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes, also | The detailed selection of frequency resource can also subject to RAN1 further progress. Similar to vivo’s comments |
| Lenovo | Yes with comments | We agree that random selection for access occasion determination can be used as baseline for CBRA procedure. It is suggested to add the note that other solutions may also be considered based on the needs. For example, the access occasion determination may also consider the device energy status. |
| Futurewei | Yes | We support random selection as a baseline (or at least a working assumption in RAN2) for both TDM and FDM based CBRA. |
| China Telecom | Yes | Randomly selecting one access occasion is a more appropriate approach for Ambient IoT devices in our understanding. |
| HONOR | Yes | The random selection could be agreed as the baseline. But for the resource related part (e.g., TDMA and/or FDMA), we still need to wait for RAN1 first. |
| InterDigital | See comments | This could be a baseline assumption, however, RAN1 may discuss whether this is completely random or may be device dependent, and how to handle FDM/TDM. |
| MediaTek | Wait for RAN1 | Random selection seems like a reasonable general mechanism, but other approaches are conceivable (like LG’s suggestion about devices with low energy). We should get a clear picture from RAN1 before taking decisions in this direction. |
| Kyocera | Maybe yes with comments | We think it’s up to RAN1, although we’re fine that the device selects an access occasion randomly in general. We also wonder if the device can select one from all the access occasions or one from a limited part of access occasions. |
| Fujitsu | See comments | Agree with Ericsson. Random selection of TDM resources/slots can be the baseline for CBRA. |
| Continental Automotive | Yes | We are fine to wait for RAN1 decision |
| Bosch | Yes | Random selection will reduce the chance of msg1 collisions but other options like considering device status, etc. can be studied. |
| Wiliot | Yes | Randomly select one access from Q occasions |
| ASUSTeK | See comments | We agree with other companies that other options such as device ID, device type, energy status, etc. need to be considered as well. |
| Panasonic | Yes | Selecting one access occasion ‘randomly’ helps to reduce contention among A-IoT devices in a CBRA scenario, and hence the decision to randomly select one occasion (in time domain) by the device can be a baseline. On the other hand, access occasion may have more meaning than just TDM as pointed out by some companies, and randomly selecting frequency location may be subject to device capability and discussion in RAN1, therefore any optimizations for such selection can be discussed/ studied further in RAN1/RAN2. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| ETRI | Yes |  |

**Rapporteur Summary:**

* **Technical points from companies:**
  + Clear majority is fine with the rapporteur intention, but
  + Some further enhancements are mentioned for further discussion (e.g. based on device ID, device energy status), on top of the “randomly selecting one”.
  + Some companies mention there could be two steps to do the selection: 1st step to select the set of access occasion and 2nd step to select inside this access occasion set.
  + Some companies prefer to reconsider this based on/after some RAN1 progress.
* **Suggested proposals/observations from rapp:**

Proposal 5: From RAN2 perspective, the device randomly selects one access occasion for A-IoT Msg1 from the total access occasions provided/assigned by the reader, as the baseline for CBRA (further enhancement can be considered after more RAN1 progress on TDMA/FDMA).

### 2.2.4 Re-access

Some related proposals from companies contributions are cited in section [4.3](#_4.3_Re-access).

One potential failure case to trigger the re-access is already discussed in the [2.1.2](#_2.1.2_Consequence_of). Another failure case is the contention resolution failure (i.e. not received the correct random ID in Msg2 timing relationship).

In general, we may need to first confirm the support the re-access in case of failure.

Question 8: Do you support the A-IoT device to perform re-access in another opportunity (i.e. retry the random access), at least in case of contention resolution failure?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** (you can also indicate other failure cases to trigger re-access, if any) |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Apple | Wait for RAN1 | We think for Msg1/Msg 2 failure, although RAN1 defines a timing restriction/bound for the reader to send subsequent Msg 2, whether the device need re-access is to be further discussed in RAN1. From RAN2 perspective, we think we have agreed to have a subsequent paging round to provide random access opportunities for failed devices. So, it is not clear why we need to have another mechanism for “re-access” especially for Msg 1 failure.  [Rapp]: Somehow the subsequent paging round is also for the re-access of the device which fails in the first paging round. This is because only the failed device will respond the subsequent paging round. |
| LG | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes | From our perspective, reader can always trigger a re-access round for access failure handle. Whether to preform CN-initiated re-access is up to CN, but RAN has to at least support re-access or access failure handling when it is indicated. |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Nokia | See comments | A re-transmission should possible only after an explicit permission by the reader (eg, via “delta” paging).In general, a device should be restricted to a single transmission attempt for each paging instance. |
| Vodafone | See comments | Is this question related to autonomous device retry?  [Rapp]: Not exactly. It means the device can retry in the opportunities controlled/ provided by the reader. |
| Ericsson | Yes | We think this is a valid issue. All options should be evaluated. RAN2 can focus on reader initiated re-access, which may be beneficial to reduce latency compared to CN initiated (re)access. |
| Nordic | Yes with comments | Re-access should only be triggered by a reader. |
| NEC | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes, but | Same view as CMCC and Nordic that the re-access should still be explicitly triggered by the reader. i.e. there is no autonomous re-access from the device side. |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes | RFID-like principle, the failed A-IOT device setting its access occasion to the maximum number, could be applied. Only when the reader issues a QueryAdjust-like message, the A-IOT device could re-roll its access occasion index. |
| Docomo | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | It is generally fine. |
| Transsion Holdings | Yes | The re-access in another opportunity can be triggerd by device itself if the opportunity is provided in advance. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes | We think re-access is an efficient way to fulfill the inventory completion rate. |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| China Telecom | Yes | We think that at least one of the methods reader-initiated or CN-initiated should be supported for re-access in the SI stage. |
| HONOR | Yes | Generally agreed with the re-access. But we could further discuss what the meaning of next opportunity and if this opportunity is initiated by device or Reader or CN. |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes, conditionally | We agree with others that the reader should be in control of the device responses; the device should not autonomously re-trigger access unless the reader has granted the opportunity. Maybe this mechanism can be controlled by the reader in the paging message as part of the access resource description. |
| Kyocera | Yes | We assume the Reader handles the re-access. |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |
| Continental Automotive | Yes |  |
| Bosch | Yes |  |
| Wiliot | Yes | To support re-access failure handling |
| ASUSTeK | Yes | We think re-access should be supported. |
| Panasonic | Yes as far as not autonomous device retry | We think it is better to clarify whether this means autonomous device retry or not. |
| Samsung | Yes | Share same view about no autonomous re-acess from the device. |
| ETRI | Yes |  |

**Rapporteur Summary:**

* **Technical points from companies:**
  + It is almost consensus that we need to support the A-IoT device to perform re-access in another opportunity.
  + But, companies want to address this is still under reader control, rather than autonomously re-triggering access.
  + One company indicates the need to wait for RAN1, but also agrees the re-access via subsequent paging.
* **Suggested proposals/observations from rapp:**

Note: this is a supplementary proposal to P1a to address the contention resolution failure case.

Proposal 6: The A-IoT device performs re-access in another opportunity controlled/provided by the reader (i.e. retry the random access) in case of contention resolution failure.






**Access round**: One access round consists a certain amount of access occasions for difference devices, which are assigned via one R2D message (e.g. [R2D Round Trigger message]) by the reader.


**Paging round**: One paging round consists one or multiple access rounds, which is initiated by the A-IoT paging message. One service request may associate with multiple paging rounds.

In the definitions, both [Round Trigger message] and A-IoT paging message may assign the total number of access occasion in the following round. And, A-IoT paging message additionally includes the paging identifier for selecting the devices. Following discussion for below options can decide the need of each later.

As to **where/when to perform the re-access**, there are several options:

* **Option 1**: In the same access occasion
  + Proponent companies may need to clarify whether the reader will extend additional sub-access occasions in this access occasion *(something like “adding more sub-access occasions specific for re-access purpose”)*.
* **Option 2**: In the following access occasion of the same access round
  + Proponent companies may need to clarify:
    - Option 2a: whether the reader will extend additional access occasions in this access round. (something like “*adding more access occasions specific for re-access purpose*”, i.e. adaptive length/number of access occasions of this access round), or
      * 
    - Option 2b: whether the device just re-accesses in the later already allocated access occasions, which were originally intended for the initial access of other devices.
* **Option 3**: In the next access round
  + **Access round**: One access round consists a certain amount of access occasions for difference devices, which are assigned via one R2D message (e.g. [R2D Round Trigger message]) by the reader.
  + This implies the need of multiple access rounds (one for initial access and others for re-access) and the need of R2D Round Trigger message to assign the *Q* value of access occasions in the beginning of the access round.
  + 
* **Option 4**: In the next paging round
  + **Paging round**: One paging round consists one or multiple access rounds, which is initiated by the A-IoT paging message. One service request may associate with multiple paging rounds.
  + Device re-accesses for the subsequent paging associated with the same service.
  + 
* **Option 5**: the round length is adaptive. The round can be adjusted by increasing its length or terminating earlier upon detection of too high collision. More time occasions are added in current round or in the new round (if current one terminated)
* Option x:?

Rapporteur attempts to give more figures to demonstrate the key points and difference among options after reading some companies input.

* It seems there are 3 types of access occasions (somehow the types are controlled by the reader):
  + initial access only,
  + re-access only,
  + both initial access and re-access are allowed.
* Option 2a shares some similarity to Option 3, if we ignore the concept of “access round”.
  + The key point seems on: whether to allow the re-access between two paging message.
* Option 2a/3 seems not exclusive with Option 4.
  + The key point seems on: whether to also allow the re-access between after the subsequent paging (i.e. both initial access and re-access are allowed).
  + 

Question 9: Which option(s) do you prefer about when to perform the re-access? It will be better if you can first clarify your understanding on the need/definition of access round/paging round (in the comment box)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Option(s)** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Option 2a/2b | Generally speaking, we prefer Option 2a/2b.  For Option 1, the access occasion needs to be variable in time-domain to allow multiple access attempts, which may further check with RAN1.  For Option 3/4, no motivation was found to delay the random access for a device to next round or next paging round, as the current round has multiple access occasions for the device to use.  We understand that Option 2b may aggravate the burden for contention resolution in the subsequent access occasions. So Option 2a is also acceptable to us, for example, define specific access occasions for re-access. |
| Apple | Option 4 or Wait for RAN1 | First, we do not agree with the assumption of “access round within paging round” modeling. This is neither agreed in RAN1 nor RAN2, and we cannot make selections based on a model which has not been discussed.  So far, RAN2 has only agreed that subsequent paging message will be supported to handle paging failures .That leaves only Option 4 as the only legitimate choice from RAN2 perspective as new Msg 1 will be transmitted by the decice after receiving subsequent paging message.  But we are fine to wait for RAN1 to decide the exact device-side behavior of Msg 1 failure first, if needed. |
| LG | See comments | RAN2 did not discuss the concept of the access round and paging round and the need of the access round and paging round. Thus, before discussing above options, RAN2 need to discuss that the concept of the access round and paging round is needed.  In our view, the paging can be used for two purposes. One is that the initial paging is associated with a service request to perform the first access procedure. The other is that the subsequent paging is associated with the same service request to perform the re-access procedure. Thus, we think that the access round is not needed, and only paging round is needed. |
| CMCC | No Option 2b | Option 1/2a/3/4 is acceptable for us.  Option 2b is not preferred given that the re-access device may collide with initial access device that also select the same occasion. Which is harmful for efficiency.  Option 3 and 4 are similar, but Option 4 is more like a CN-based solution.  [Rapp]: Option 4 can be used via the subsequent paging associated with the same service. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 3 and 4 | The problem of option 1 is: it is not fair for the devices which select the access occasion in the back of this round, if the devices selecting the access occasion in the beginning cause much delay due to re-access.  The problem of option 2b: It causes more collision for the later access occasions.  One point on option 2a: If the signaling to “add more access occasions” can indicate the number of occasion assigned for re-access, there is no significant difference with option 4, which also uses the R2D message to assign the number of access occasion in the beginning of the next access round for re-access.  Option 4 is always there, i.e. device is allowed to perform re-access upon received the subsequent paging message for the same service. |
| Vivo | Option 3 | No matter whether this re-access is caused by a collision or a failure, the next access round is baseline option. In the next access round, all rest devices randomly select access occasion again and with the change of time, the bad link may be recovered for failure device(s). Option 3 is simpler.  Both Option 1 and Option 2 are optimization. In these two options, it seems that the specific device can reduce the access latency. However, there is no benefit for the overall performance from the perspective of all paged devices.  Option 4 is for missing paging case or new device(s) arrival. |
| Nokia | Option 3/X – see comments: | A device may use the next access round but only upon explicit command from the reader. In other words, no unilateral device-originated re-access/re-transmissions should be possible. |
| Ericsson | Not option 1 | First, we agree with Apple and LG that, RAN1/2 need to first discuss and agree on the concept of access round and paging round, before discussing detailed options.  Second, for the options, we suggest adding one more option  Option 5: the round length is adaptive. The round can be adjusted by increasing its length or terminating earlier upon detection of too high collision. More time occasions are added in current round or in the new round (if current one terminated).  Note: this option 5 may be considered to be merged with option 2a, if feasible.  For option 1, some retransmission resources/sub-occasions may be required to be allocated/reserved in advance, which may cause resource waste if those resources turn out to be not used at the end.  With option 2, devices which have failed to transmit don’t need to wait for the next round. Devices which have failed and other devices which have not transmitted would access the rest time occasions at the same time. The queue would pile up during the rest time occasions in this round.  Option 3/4 may be simpler from gNB/intermediate UE design perspective as devices are assumed to retry in a next round upon unsuccessful access attempt. gNB/intermediate UE is not required to reserve occasions and resources for re-accesses ahead. However, in a different round, devices performing re-accesses may suffer from longer access delay.  With option x, the length for each round (i.e., number of time occasions) is set by gNB/intermediate UE depending on collision rate.  So, after RAN1 and RAN2 has agreed on the concept/model of the access round and the paging round, RAN2 can further discuss pros and cons focusing on option 2, 3, 4 and 5. |
| Nordic | See comments | Options that include explicit trigger from the reader i.e., Options 2a, 4 and maybe 3. The device shall not initiate re-access on its own. |
| NEC | Option 2 or Option 3 | Option3 is baseline, same as RFID.  Option2 maybe works too, for example, device shall still randomly select a access occasion out of multiple following up random access occasions, and reader need to extend access occasion more than as configured via Q value. |
| ZTE | See comments | It would be first good to agree definitions for the terms used in each option (such as a) access occasion,  b) sub-access occasions,  c) re-access,  d) access round,  e) paging round etc.  Then, we think any option is okay as long as the re-access is controlled by the reader. |
| Sharp | Option 2b Option 3 | We assume there could be a time gap for device to decide if contention resolution fails. So Option 1 may not be enough for the time gap.  And regarding to option 4 , we think it could be used for re-access as a new one.  For Option 2 and 3 are ok for us and we think there is no need to specify dedicate RA resources for the devices suffering contention. They could go with other devices. |
| Spreadtrum | Option 3 | Option 3 is the baseline, option 1/2/4 are all optimization. |
| Xiaomi | option 2/3/4 | In my understanding, option 2/3/4 works for different cases and it is up to reader to choose which solution to use.  The latency of service should be considered when we decide re-access mechanism. |
| OPPO | 3 | We think that the option 3 is the most similar one with the RFID scheme. We assume that consecutive access rounds triggered by one piece of paging message are for the same group of A-IOT devices. A-IOT devices fail to access to the network in the previous access round could try to access to the system again in the next access round. |
| Docomo | Comment | This discussion seems to be going too far…  We have not concluded whether to introduce the concept of “access round” and that depends on RAN1. If we go this way the deadlock may be occur between RAN1 and RAN2, that will impact the completion of study phase.  In our understanding the only thing we can decide now is whether Option 4 or not. |
| Qualcomm | See comments | We have similar view with LG. It seems all options are based on the assumption that there are already concept of access round and paging round, which we don’t think RAN2 has such discussion or conclusion. Before discussing the options, we think RAN2 should first discuss whether having access round and paging round is necessary. Particularly, we do not share the understanding depicted in the figure with multiple type of R2D messages to indicate different concepts such as paging vs triggers. |
| Transsion Holdings | Option 2a/3 | We think the access round or access occasions specific for re-access can be allocated, then all the failed devices can re-access using the re-access resources without the reader re-trigger. |
| Lenovo | All options | We think all options can be studied. Since there are multiple causes for the access failure e.g. Msg1 collision, Msg3 transmission failure, out-of-energy etc., device may select suitable opportunities for re-access. For example, if a device is out of energy and complete the charging, if let the device waiting too much time e.g. wait until the next paging round, the energy may be outage again. So it is important to let device to select suitable opportunity to perform re-access.  On the other hand, the definition/concept of “Access round” and “Paging round” needs further clarification, there are following two possible understandings  1. Understanding#1: One service contains multiple paging rounds; one paging round contains multiple access rounds; and one access round contains multiple access occasions  2. Understanding#2: One service contains multiple paging rounds; one paging round contains one access round; and one access round contains multiple access occasions |
| Futurewei | Options 3 and 4 | Certainly not option 1. Even for option 2, it may increase the collision probability beyond what the reader has planned for. More collisions lead to more failures, and hence more retries, and hence a vicious cycle. For Option 3 or 4, if the reader is able to detect the failures, it will have a chance to adjust parameter(s) in the new access round to mitigate the potential impact on collision probability. |
| China Telecom | Options 2/3/4 | We are ok for Options 2/3/4 and Option 3 has the highest priority among them. But we should determine the concept of access round and paging round first. |
| HONOR | See comments | All options could work and are suitable to copy with different failure cases. And each option has its limitation and benefits. For example, for Option2, if access occasions specific for re-access purpose could be pre-reserved only when the reader could estimate the number of collision/failure which requires good implement to avoid resource waste. Weprefer to discuss the solutions case by case. |
| InterDigital | Options 2/3/4 | Option 1 may be difficult as it requires allocation of dedicated resources for re-access. Regarding option 5, it may have some difficulties if the device misses some of the reader triggering messages.  The other options can all be further studied. For example, it may be upto the reader to decide which option the device uses. Alternatively, not all devices should be allowed to use all options. There may be cases where it is acceptable for the device to wait for the next paging round, and other cases where the device should access in the same paging round.  Finally, for our understanding of option 2a vs option 3 is as follows:   * + Option 2a: the trigger message may define a different number of access occasions in the same access round, where some of the occasions are for re-access.   + Option 3: An access round itself may be entirely dedicated to re-access.   If our understanding is correct, we are not sure of the need for the R2D message between the initial access occasions and the re-access occasions for the figure 2a. |
| MediaTek | See comment | Agree with Apple and others that this question presupposes a model that we have not agreed yet. Options 1-3 all seem at least theoretically valid if we have such a model, though we need a design of the access occasion/access round concepts before going into the details.  Option 4 seems unnecessary to specify as part of the access behaviour; a new paging message will result in a new set of responses, and we agreed to look at a mechanism for suppressing duplicate responses, so this seems not so much “re-access” as “access in response to a new paging event”.  Option 5 looks like it burdens the device with the complexity of deciding when to perform access in a changing set of access occasions. We don’t see a benefit that would justify the device impact. |
| Kyocera | Option 4 | We prefer Option 4 since it’s the simplest. We assume the “Access round” is equal to the “Paging round”. In the subsequent A-IoT paging, the duplicate responses from the devices that already responded in a previous round as RAN2 agreed to study, so it would be assumed the collision rate in the latest “round” should be improved without complicated definition/mechanism. |
| Fujitsu | Option 2a | There is no strong need to introduce an “access round”. |
| Bosch | Option 1,2 |  |
| Wiliot | Option 3 or 4 | Separation of initial access and re-access allow the AIoT device to recharge between the round access |
| ASUSTeK | Option 2a/3 | We think that an indication from the reader is required for re-access. |
| Panasonic | Option 4 | Agree with Apple and Docomo that option 4 is the only option that can be decided right now. Depending on future progress on “access round” probably in RAN1, we can revisit other options. |
| Samsung | See comments | Agree with previous comments that we need to first discuss and agree on the concept of access round and paging round, before discussing detailed options. We don't think it is not a right time to discuss these since there are so many uncertainties. |
| ETRI | Option 2,3, or 4. | Agree with above options provided by Rapporteur. But we think further discussion in needed in detail. |

**Rapporteur Summary:**

* **Technical points from companies:**
  + Companies have quite divergence.
  + There is really minority to consider **option 1 or 2b**.
    - companies in favor of option 1/2b seem also fine with other options
    - Some companies show strong preference to NOT consider 1 or 2b.
  + **Option 2a: same access round:** CATT, CMCC, Ericsson, Nordic, NEC, ZTE, Transsion, Lenovo, China Telecom, InterDigital, Fujitsu, Bosch, ASUSTeK, ETRI
    - Proponents prefer to handle the failure via re-access immediately rather than delaying to the next round. While the opponents challenge the latency for other devices and the overall latency.
    - One of the argument from opponent: separation of initial access and re-access allows the AIoT device to recharge between the round accesses.
  + **Option 3: next access round:** CMCC, Huawei, Vivo, Nokia, Nordic, NEC, Sharp, Spreadtrum, Xiaomi, OPPO, Transsion, Lenovo, Futurewei, China Telecom, InterDigital, Wiliot, ASUSTeK, ETRI
    - Companies indicate the simplicity by separating the initial access and re-access rounds (e.g. to avoid potential collision).
    - Some proponents mention this is baseline since it is similar to RFID.
  + **Option 4: next paging round:** Apple, Huawei, Xiaomi, Docomo, Lenovo, Futurewei, China Telecom, InterDigital, Kyocera, Wiliot, Panasonic, ETRI
    - One of the key point is that it is unnecessary to introduce additional level of “access round” between paging round.
    - It is mentioned that the subsequent paging can serve both initial access and re-access. Opponents would prefer to separate the initial access and re-access.
  + **Option 5:** **adjust round length**: Ericsson
    - Even though only one company support option 5, but rapporteur understands the key spirit of option 5 seems the common part among all other options (also mentioned by some companies for the need of reader explicit trigger/control of re-access).
      * Option 2a is to use option 5:“adding more occasions” message allows re-access purpose occasions in the same “access round”
      * Option 3 is to use option5: “round trigger message” additionally assigns re-access purpose occasions by starting a new “access round”;
      * Option 4 is to use option5: “subsequent paging message” allows and assigns re-access purpose occasions, by starting a new “paging round”.
    - Some companies mention the need of reader control regardless the options.
* **Suggested proposals/observations from rapp:**

Companies seems not ready to use the “access round” and “paging round” terms yet. So, let’s try to discuss the issue by not mentioning those two different terms.

It seems there are 3 types of access occasions from companies’ view: initial access only, re-access only, both initial access and re-access are allowed. However, somehow the types are still controlled by the reader.

Observation 3: Device should perform re-access in the access occasion, which is allowed by the reader for re-access purpose.

Then, let’s first find some common part among Option 2a, Option 3, and Option 4 (considering the key spirit of option 5). In those options, reader needs to assign or add some access occasions by one R2D message, to somehow control those access occasions can be used for re-access purpose.

Proposal 7a: Reader can send the R2D information which assigns or adjusts the number of following access occasions (e.g. can be used for re-access purpose).

So, if this proposal is agreed, the so-call “access round” will be the round between any two R2D message providing this information in the proposal (e.g. paging message or other R2D message providing this information).

With the common part, we can then check the key difference among options. Option 4 will only use subsequent paging message to do this proposal. Option 3/2a will use another R2D message(s) (in between two paging messages) to do this proposal (*the difference between 2a and 3 seems minor, if we allow more than one “adding occasion” message in option 2a. Otherwise, those are exclusive*).

So, it comes to the first FFS-1 point: whether we allow re-access in between two paging message, and other FFS-2 point: whether the first set of access occasion right after A-IoT paging message is only for initial access or also for re-access.

With below proposal: if only Alt.2 is agreed, option 2a/3 is used; if only Alt.1 is agreed, option 4 is used; If both Alt.1 and Alt.2 are agreed, it is up to reader to use either option 2a/3 and/or option 4 (i.e. combination is possible). With those alternatives, it means all the option 2a/3/4 are possible, and is up to the reader to use or all those are for further down-selection.

Proposal 7b: RAN2 to discuss following alternative(s) for re-access:

* Alternative 1: The access occasions following the subsequent A-IoT paging can be also used for re-access; and/or
* Alternative 2: Reader can assign some access occasions for re-access purpose between two A-IoT paging.

## 2.3 AS ID for scheduling purposes

RAN1 concludes the general usage of AS ID for scheduling purpose:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement  For D2R scheduling, the following information potentially can be explicitly/implicitly indicated to the device via corresponding PRDCH:   * Time domain resources * Frequency domain resources * MCS-like information * Chip duration * ID associated with device(s) * Repetitions   FFS: other information  FFS: For each information, whether higher-layer signaling and/or L1 R2D control signaling is used  Agreement  For R2D reception, the following information potentially can be explicitly/implicitly indicated to the device via PRDCH:   * ID associated with device(s) intended for the reception of R2D, potentially including all devices (if supported)FFS: other information   FFS: For each information, whether higher-layer signaling and/or L1 R2D control signaling is used |

RAN2 initiates the discussion with following status:

|  |
| --- |
| - In contention-free access, the A-IoT device directly sends the upper layer data (e.g. device ID) in its very first D2R message after being triggered (i.e. skip contention resolution Msg1/2). FFS if a short AS ID is also included in the message and what type of ID for scheduling purposes.  - FFS if reader assigns the AS ID for scheduling purposes |

Terminology: In this discussion, we call it “**AS scheduling ID**”, corresponding to the “AS ID for scheduling purposes” in RAN2 agreements and “ID associated with device(s)” for “D2R scheduling” and “R2D reception” in RAN1 agreements. **But, please note the “AS ID” in RAN2 agreement/discussion may not be exactly same as the “ID associated with device(s)” in RAN1 agreement/discussion.**

Based on the RAN1 discussion, there two potential purposes of this “AS scheduling ID”:

* 1) D2R scheduling: the ID associated with specific device for this D2R scheduling;
* 2) R2D reception: the ID which indicates the targeted device supposed to receive/decode its unicast R2D.

NOTE: It should be the RAN1 final decision on whether this AS scheduling ID is really needed in D2R scheduling and R2D reception, while RAN2 only attempts to studies some assumptions.

The Msg1 scheduling part may be different with the other D2R/R2D message:

* For CBRA Msg1 “scheduling”, there may be no need of such AS scheduling ID, since the reader actually provides the “schedule” information for contention based resources, rather than a specific device scheduling/resource.
* For CFRA Msg1 “scheduling”, it seems the reader can directly use the paging identifier/device ID to do the resource mapping from dedicate resource to specific device.

Then, the discussion of this AS scheduling ID is actually for the scheduling/reception after Msg1 transmission.

In the beginning, it could be straight forward to discuss the following assumption:

Question 10: Do you assume this AS scheduling ID is a short AS layer ID, rather than the upper layer device ID (FFS for resource allocation of the first D2R transmission in contention-free access)?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Yes | Since the device ID is contained in the inventory/command signaling, which is transparent to the reader according to the key issue in SA3, it is straightforward that this is a short AS scheduling ID. |
| Apple | No | First, we think “FFS if a short AS ID is also included in the message” means there is no agreement to support to have this short AS ID in CFRA messages yet.  In our view, for A-IOT air interface scheduling, think there is no need of a AS ID like C-RNTI. Given that the reader may only have one or two transactions towards a A-IOT device per hour or even longer, the device may not want to maintain any additional “short AS ID”, especially because it may even forget those ID when it goes through energy on-off cycles . |
| LG | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes | An upper layer device ID can be very long, and a shorter AS layer ID (e.g., no more than 16 bit) can be more time and energy efficient. |
| Vivo | Yes | Like C-RNTI in Uu. |
| Nokia | Yes | We can assume this but need to be aware of update frequency as RAN1 thinks frequent or recurring writing to non-volatile memory should be avoided. |
| Vodafone | No | Not sure, it is needed, but  This discussion does not seem productive if RAN2 would just make assumptions on what RAN1 has agreed regarding the ID. We should discuss if we assume this ID is needed and what for and if this clash at the end with RAN1 assumptions we can clarify it with RAN1 via LS |
| Ericsson | No (comment) | Agree with Vodafone, whether AS scheduling ID is needed, should be decided first. Therefore, we prefer to have a deeper discussion for the need and format of AS ID, e.g., as described in clause 2.8 of our paper [R2-2406818](file:///C:\Users\panidx\OneDrive%20-%20InterDigital%20Communications,%20Inc\Documents\3GPP%20RAN\TSGR2_127\Docs\R2-2406818.zip) submitted in RAN2#127. In addition, we may also need to consider the potential impact to the device’s complexity, if AS scheduling ID needs to be stored in the device’s non-volatile memory.  If AS scheduling ID is needed, there may be several options to generate it: random ID, part of the CN ID. |
| Nordic | Yes | Whether AS ID/Short ID is needed for CFRA case is to be seen. |
| NEC | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes | It is important to have a unified design for all RA options. The system should allow multiplexing of devices regardless of which RA option is used for initial access. So, we think it is important to have same ID regardless of the access mechanism. As a minimum, the length of this ID should be same for all options and in our view the short AS ID (same as random ID) should be the baseline. |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes | We are wonder the difference between random value in CB access and a short AS layer ID? |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Docomo | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | No | RAN2 has not agreed a short AS ID for scheduling purpose yet, and it is still in FFS. Then at this stage we can not decide that AS scheduling ID is a short AS layer ID. And whether it is related to upper layer device ID need further study. Besides that, how can device maintain any additional ‘ID’ is another open issue. |
| Transsion Holdings | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes, but | Up to RAN1 final decision on whether we really need the AS ID. |
| Lenovo | Yes | The AS scheduling ID should be a short AS layer ID. If upper layer device ID is exposed to the AS layer, security and privacy issues may be introduced. On the other hand, upper layer device ID usually has large size, e.g., 96 bits. Hence, using upper layer device ID as AS scheduling ID may bring large signalling overhead. To sum up, it’s not suitable to use upper layer device ID as AS scheduling ID due to its large size and potential security issues. The AS scheduling ID should be a short AS layer ID. |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| China Telecom | Yes |  |
| HONOR | Yes | We assume the AS ID is beneficial if the upper layer ID has large size. |
| InterDigital | Yes | We see an advantage of the AS ID not only in reducing the message size overhead (compared to including an upper layer device ID), but also for security purposes. We think the AS ID can be maintained by the reader and the device for a short period of time, which should be feasible from a device perspective. |
| MediaTek | Yes | We don’t see it as reasonable to address the device by upper-layer ID, for size and security reasons (remembering also that size relates to reception time and thus to energy consumption). Of course the final decision should be aligned between RAN1 and RAN2, but we think there are compelling reasons to have a short AS ID from RAN2 perspective, and we could indicate from RAN2 side “we need this”. |
| Kyocera | No at this point | We assume the necessity of a short AS ID depends on how many scheduling for D2R transmission is assumed and wonder if it’s really needed after the device is allocated the dedicated resource (i.e., we’re wondering if the resource needs to be dynamically changed in each D2R transmission.) So, we think more discussion is needed. |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |
| Continental Automotive | Yes |  |
| Bosch | Yes |  |
| Wiliot | No, see comment | Up to RAN1 final decision on whether we really need the AS ID. |
| ASUSTeK | No | We agree with Apple and Qualcomm that RAN2 has not agreed on short AS ID yet. |
| Panasonic | Yes | We see benefit of using short AS ID for scheduling from perspective of saving signaling overhead and avoid security issues. |
| Samsung | Yes but | If needed, it should be AS layer ID. |
| ETRI | Yes |  |

**Rapporteur Summary:**

* **Technical points from companies:**
  + It is the clear majority view that AS scheduling ID is a short AS layer ID, rather than the upper layer device ID, but…
  + Some companies don’t believe we need such AS ID at all, considering the very few messages in the short period of one service and memory loss of such AS ID due to energy.
  + Some companies claim all those discussion should be just some assumptions and should be coordinated with RAN1.
* **Suggested proposals/observations from rapp:**

Proposal 8 (part 1): It is RAN1 final decision on whether the “AS ID” is needed for the purpose of D2R scheduling and R2D reception, while RAN2 just attempts to study some assumptions:

* RAN2 assumes this “AS ID” can be a short AS layer ID, rather than the upper layer device ID.

As to the assignment/allocation of this AS scheduling ID, companies may also discuss their understanding on whether this AS scheduling ID should be the device-unique ID among the devices in the current service under a reader.

For **CBRA case**, since there is the random ID in Msg1 for contention resolution, this ID can be somehow unique after the reader address the contention via Msg2. If it can be reused later as the AS scheduling ID, some signalling can be saved.

Question 11a: Do you agree: From RAN2 perspective, the random ID in Msg1 can be reused as the AS scheduling ID, after the reader addresses the contention by Msg2 in CBRA?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Yes but with comments | The random ID in Msg1 can be reused as the AS scheduling ID, after the reader addresses the contention by Msg2 in CBRA.  But there is an observed corner case: when both device 1 and device 2 sent the same 16-bit number to reader in msg1 but unfortunately, the reader only decoded the ID from device1, and failed to decode the ID from device2. So when the reader sent back the received 16-bit ID which may be decoded by both device 1 and 2, device 2 will be miss lead and will fail in the subsequent procedure.  So we need further check with RAN1 whether it is allowed for this corner case. |
| Apple | No | The size of 16-bit Random ID is designed for “contention-resolution” purpose and is only good for contention resolution period. Any longer-term usage of this ID will result further collisions with “random ID”s generated by new devices triggered by additional paging messages. |
| LG | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes | It is feasible at least within a paging/access round. Beyond that, the random ID in Msg1 may collide. |
| Vivo | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| Vodafone | No | I think the question is how long would the device store such an ID. The example from CATT, we would see as a corner case, but in general, if the scheduling ID is needed, it would be better to define an independent ID |
| Ericsson | No (comment) | See comments for Q10, we think RAN2 should first discuss the need of the AS ID then discuss how to generate unique AS ID. |
| Nordic | No | As a general principle the Short ID should be very short lived i.e., using it after Msg2 is questionable. Also the overall need for AS scheduling ID or Short ID after Msg is not clear. |
| NEC | See comment | Even after contention resolution, device access in different occasions may still use the same random id. We should take that into consideration. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes with comments | We agree the random value can be used as RFID, but this random value is changed in the following one to one communication.  But network can allocate the short id for one device to avoid collision as C-RNTI in NR. |
| OPPO | Yes | Otherwise follow the new random ID allocated by the reader in the msg2 or the subsequent R2D/D2R message. Note that the reader could let the A-IOT device change to a new random ID autonomously and report it in a subsequent D2R message. |
| Docomo | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Transsion Holdings | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Straight forward option if RAN1 confirms the need of the AS ID. |
| Lenovo | No | We think the AS scheduling ID should be device-unique ID among the devices to avoid the potential ID collision from the reader point of view. And we don’t think the random ID in Msg1 is unique after contention resolution, because the random ID may be same with other existing AS ID in the reader coverage. Hence, from our side, using random ID as AS scheduling ID is conditional. For example, if reader detects that the random ID does not collide with other existing AS ID, reader can indicate device to treat the random ID as AS scheduling ID. Otherwise, it’s suggested that reader assigns new AS scheduling ID to the device. |
| Futurewei | No | If we decide on having an AS short ID, we prefer that it is assigned by the reader to ensure the uniqueness. |
| China Telecom | Yes |  |
| HONOR | No with comments | Based on our observation, we should first discuss whether the AS ID is long-term one or a one-shot ID for the current procedure. In this case, in addition to the corner case mentioned by CATT, a more general situation would be that one device would randomly generate the same RN which is already belonged to the device in the previous time.  Thus, although we support the AS ID, further discussion for the use case and detailed solution is required rather than jumping into a “simple” solution. |
| InterDigital | Not entirely | The random ID selected by the device can serve as the AS ID. However, there is a case where two devices select the same random ID and both succeed the random access (e.g., they select different occasions). So there is a need for the reader to also be able to assign the AS ID (e.g., in MSG2, or a subsequent message after MSG3). |
| MediaTek | No | The longer a random ID remains in use, the higher the chances of collision, of course. The length of active communication between a device and a reader may not be very predictable, and having the ID assigned by the reader avoids the risk of collision without asking the device to remember any extra information (it does need the ability to repopulate the 16-bit random ID with an assigned ID, but it never needs to use both IDs at once). |
| Kyocera | No at this point | We have the same concern as in Question 10 above. In addition, we wonder if it’s really sufficient that such an AS ID is unique only in a reader, in case a device is located within multiple reader’s coverages. |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |
| Continental Automotive | No | If an A-IoT device uses a random ID for scheduling, the device may not be able to perform contention-free RACH. This is because multiple devices could potentially use the same random ID. For example, if both A-IoT device 1 and A-IoT device 2 use the same random ID 'X at different time,' when the reader sends a paging message to one device (e.g., A-IoT device 1), A-IoT device 2 may also respond along with A-IoT device 1, leading to a collision between the two devices. |
| Bosch | No | This can increase the probability of random ID collisions. |
| Wiliot | Yes |  |
| ASUSTeK | No | Whether AS scheduling ID is needed should be discussed first. |
| Panasonic | See comment | As mentioned by many companies above, extend the usage of random ID beyond contention resolution as an AS scheduling ID cannot guarantee the uniqueness of the AS scheduling ID in the coverage of a reader. Therefore, we think a better solution is to let reader (or gNB in case of topology 2) to decide whether to use the random ID as AS scheduling ID or assign a new AS scheduling ID to device. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| ETRI | Yes |  |

**Rapporteur Summary:**

* **Technical points from companies:**
  + **Yes:** CATT, LG, CMCC, Vivo, Nokia, ZTE, Sharp, Spreadtrum, Xiaomi, OPPO, Docomo, Qualcomm, Transsion, Huawei, China Telecom, Fujitsu, Wiliot, Samsung, ETRI
    - Companies also mention on corner case on Msg1 decoding in case of collision.
  + **No:** Apple, Vodafone, Ericsson, Nordic, Lenovo, Futurewei, InterDigital, MediaTek, Kyocera, Continental, Bosch, ASUSTeK, Panasonic?
    - Some companies prefer a reader allocated ID, since random ID by device 1 may be randomly generated by device 2 later in another access occasion.
    - The decision depends on the assumption on whether it is a long-term ID or short term ID.
    - Companies mention this AS ID should be device-unique.
* **Suggested proposals/observations from rapp:**

Rapporteur understands both directions have their points while it is not clear how long we need avoid AD ID collision for now. Note this proposal subjects to the previous proposal on whether RAN2 consider AS short ID or device ID.

Proposal 8 (part 2): From RAN2 perspective, there are two candidate options for this “AS ID”, after the reader addresses the contention by Msg2 in CBRA case:

* Option 1: the random ID in Msg1 can be reused;
* Option 2: reader assigns this “AS ID”, which is unique among the devices under service.

[Rapp]: Some clarification for below terms: In CFRA for this question, let’s call the first D2R message from device as “Msg1”, then the next R2D message from reader as “Msg2”, and so on.

For **contention-free access,** this AS scheduling ID can be initially assigned/allocated by several options:

* Option 1: reader assigns a device specific AS scheduling ID before Msg1 (e.g. via A-IoT paging);
* Option 2: a random ID in Msg1 can be reused
* Option 3: an ID calculated based on the dedicated Msg1 time/frequency resource (e.g. RA-RNTI-like);
* Option 4: an ID assigned by the reader after Msg 3, if AS ID to be supported by an A-IOT device
* Option 5: an ID assigned by the reader in the Msg2

Question 11b: Which option do you prefer for the AS scheduling ID allocation in contention-free access case?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Option** | **Comments** (you may also need to consider how the Msg2 reception and Msg3 transmission work) |
| CATT | With comments | An AS scheduling ID is required to associate with device(s) intended for the reception of R2D. Option 1/2/3 are feasible according to the analysis as below:  -For Option 1, the reader needs to know the device ID info contained in the initial trigger msg so that it can assigns a device specific AS scheduling ID.  -For Option 2, similar view as our comment in Q11a.  -For Option 3, the dedicated resource should be associated with the device ID contained in the initial trigger msg. So similar with Option 1, the reader also needs to know the device ID info so that it can make such association.  Generally we have no strong view on this, but if we go with Option 2, suggest further check with RAN1. |
| Apple | Option 4 | Option 1 is infeasible. Option 2/3 is not good as they will cause collisions issues, as we explained in Q11a.  If we want to support short AS ID, the only viable option is to have reader assign this in Msg 4 or later…But we think this may be only supported by certain device which can afford to write this ID in its non-volatile memory. |
| LG | Option 2 |  |
| CMCC | Option 1 and 3 | Option 1 is simpler and more effective compared to Option 2, where device doesn’t generate the random ID and send it. Reader can assign a unique ID to device within its coverage area.  Option 3 bring benefits under certain circumstances where device doesn’t need to send its scheduling ID to reader, nor reader need to assign an ID and sent it to device |
| vivo | Option 4 or Option 2 | Option 1 may waste ID resources and paging overhead since specific device paging may be also broadcast in several readers. Only one reader is useful and others are wasted.  Option 2 may achieve a unified content for Msg1 in 2-step CBRA and CFRA.  Option 3 is not preferable since timing reference in A-IoT is not similar with Uu.  In our option4, Msg2 for CFRA may be via dedicated resource to one device. Even the content of Msg2 can be reused. Multiplexing of Msg2 with multiple devices can be FFS now. |
| Nokia | See comments | We don’t think there is any need for a new ID to be stored and maintained by the reader(s) and devices. At least RAN2 should first understand what would happen in case the device gets within range of another reader.  We think the A-IoT paging should be harmonized and keep this as upper layer ID. |
| Vodafone |  | no strong view, but slightly we prefer not to go to option 2 |
| Ericsson | No for single device contention free access;  FFS for multiple devices contention free case. | At least for single device contention free case, we don’t see the need of AS scheduling ID. In this case, there is only one target device for the assigned resources, there is no ambiguity between the reader and the device regarding resource allocation.  Whether contention free is supported for multiple devices, can be further discussed. |
| Nordic | See commands | Option 1 would work for CFRA case. Option 2 would be preferred for CBRA case with an assumption the ID is short lived. Don’t want to add/invent yet another ID so option 4 should not be considered. |
| NEC | See comment | Since RA steps are common for CFRA and CBRA, at least a unified solution is needed for CFRA and CBRA. |
| ZTE | Option 2 |  |
| Sharp | Option 2 | A unified solution is preferred. |
| Spreadtrum | See comments | In order to save device energy, Msg 1 does not contain a random ID. If reader has the subsequent R2D data to transmit for this device (e.g. command after inventory), reader can generate a random ID for the device based on the device ID. The random ID generation rules are also known to the device side. Then, the random ID is sent to the device in Msg2. |
| OPPO | Option 5 | Regarding option 2, a further online meeting discussion on the need of the random ID in the msg1 is required.  An AS scheduling ID could be allocated to the A-IOT device after the msg 1 transmission, e.g., in the msg2, if there is a really need for scheduling of the subsequent D2R transmission. |
| Docomo | Maybe Option 4 | We think that consuming the size of Msg1 for unnecessary random ID transmission may not be a good idea. Option 4 seems feasible, but not completely sure. |
| Qualcomm | See comments | At least in the latest running TR, it seems no msg1 or so-called msg3 in a contention-free access case  ===  If the random access is contention-free access:  - Selects the indicated D2R occasion/resource;  - Skips the contention resolution in Step 2 and performs the data transmission in according to clause 6.3.5.  [Rapp]: in CFRA, the first D2R message from device is “Msg1”, then the following R2D message is “Msg2”. |
| Transsion Holdings | Option2 |  |
| Lenovo | Option 1 | Option 1 is the most simple and efficient way. Option 2 cannot guarantee the uniqueness of the random ID in the reader coverage. Option 3 may introduce complexity to the device, and may have abundant specification work to specify the ID calculation process at the device side. |
| Futurewei | Option ¼ | We consider Options 1 and 4 are the same, because they both are about the AS ID being assigned to the device during a transaction between the reader and the device prior to the current contention-free access. |
| China Telecom | Option 2 |  |
| HONOR | See comments | Option 1 and 2 is acceptable to us. We prefer to have a unified solution for both CBRA and CFRA. For the pros and cons about the two options are as following:  Option 1 could work but may bring higher payload and is not applicable to all/group based CBRA. That is, this solution is only applicable to limited cases, e.g., when specific devices are identified by the reader.  Option 2 could be also used in the 3-step RA which to have a unified solution in the whole system. But as mentioned in the previous question, more discussion is required considering the contention issue. |
| InterDigital | Option 2, 4. | Option 2 can work except in the case where two devices select the same ID in different occasions. Then the reader should assign a different ID to at least one of them. For that, either option 4 or option 5 would work, but we have a preference for option 4. |
| MediaTek | Option 4/5 | We see the appeal of option 1, but we don’t immediately see how to do it without allowing association of the temporary ID with the permanent ID sent in the clear, which looks like a security problem. If someone has a design for option 1 that does not do this, we could discuss.  Options 4 and 5 both allow the reader to assign an AS ID after the initial handshake with the device and seem valid. Option 4 is appealing because of not requiring an additional R2D signalling message beyond Msg2 |
| Kyocera | No | We agree with Ericsson’s view on the single device contention-free access. |
| Fujitsu | Option 2 |  |
| Continental Automotive | Option 4 4/Option 5 | Option 4/Option 5: If only random ID is used for scheduling purpose, to prevent collisions among devices, new ID should assign by reader in Msg2 or after Msg3 |
| Bosch | Option 1 |  |
| ASUSTeK | See comments | We think a unified solution would be preferred according to the result of Q11a. |
| Panasonic | Options 4 and 5 | As we commented on previous question, it is preferable to let reader to control assignment of AS ID. Along with this direction, options 1, 4 and 5 can be considered. Further, option 1 might waste the ID space and message size because the device might not be able to respond to the paging. |
| Samsung | Option 2 |  |
| ETRI | Option 2 and 4 |  |

**Rapporteur Summary:**

* **Technical points from companies:**
  + Some companies claim for single device CFRA case, there is no need such AS ID.
  + Some companies indicate the need of unified design between CBRA and CFRA cases.
  + We don’t see quite support for option 3 (or companies in favor of option 3 seem also fine with other options).
  + **Option 2**: LG, vivo, ZTE, Sharp, Transsion, China Telecom, InterDigital, Fujitsu, HONOR, Samsung, ETRI
    - Some companies see the complexity to let device generate the random ID, while the proponents prefer to have the unified Msg1 format by including random ID.
    - Some companies see the additional overhead caused by adding random ID in Msg1.
    - The uniqueness is also challenged.
  + **Option 1/4/5**: Apple, CMCC, vivo, Vodafone, OPPO, Docomo, Lenovo, Futurewei, InterDigital, MediaTek, Continental, Bosch, Panasonic, ETRI
    - It is mentioned the feasibility of option 1 for reader to know the device ID info.
* **Suggested proposals/observations from rapp:**

Note this proposal subjects to the previous proposal on whether RAN2 consider AS short ID or device ID.

Proposal 8 (part 3): From RAN2 perspective, there are two candidate options for this “AS ID” in contention-free access case:

* Option 1: a random ID in Msg1 can be reused as;
* Option 2: reader assigns this “AS ID”. FFS via which R2D message.

3 Conclusion

This contribution makes the following proposals:

*Failure/success indication related*

Observation 1a: The reader is able to detect the failure when D2R data transmission fails, but the reader may not be able to know whether the failure is due to the preceding R2D part that schedules the D2R transmission or due to failure of the D2R data transmission itself.

Observation 1b: The device may not be able to detect/determine its D2R data transmission failure of its last D2R data (Msg3 or following D2R transmission), without implicit/explicit feedback/indication from reader.

Proposal 1: In case of D2R data transmission failure (Msg3 or following D2R data), device follows the reader instruction:

* it is supported to re-access in another opportunity controlled/provided by the reader (i.e. retry the random access); and
* reader can repeat the R2D “command” to trigger the device to re-send the same D2R “response” (i.e. device just follows the received R2D to transmit D2R). FFS on whether/how to handle the “device ID” re-transmission for inventory case.

Observation 2: R2D explicit failure/success indication for the D2R data transmission is not needed, if the reader has the subsequent R2D data to send for this device.

Proposal 2a: Support explicit R2D failure/success indication for the D2R data transmission.

Proposal 2b: RAN2 to discuss: It is up to the reader whether/when to include this indication. The absence of this indication will not trigger device re-transmission/re-access (i.e. absence means “likely success”).

*Msg2 in 2step RA*

Proposal 3: Msg2 is always needed for 2step CBRA.

*Re-access*

Proposal 6: The A-IoT device performs re-access in another opportunity controlled/provided by the reader (i.e. retry the random access) in case of contention resolution failure.

Observation 3: Device should perform re-access in the access occasion, which is allowed by the reader for re-access purpose.

Proposal 7a: Reader can send the R2D information which assigns or adjusts the number of following access occasions (e.g. can be used for re-access purpose).

Proposal 7b: RAN2 to discuss following alternative(s) for re-access:

* Alternative 1: The access occasions following the subsequent A-IoT paging can be also used for re-access; and/or
* Alternative 2: Reader can assign some access occasions for re-access purpose between two A-IoT paging.

*slotted ALOHA*

Proposal 5: From RAN2 perspective, the device randomly selects one access occasion for A-IoT Msg1 from the total access occasions provided/assigned by the reader, as the baseline for CBRA (further enhancement can be considered after more RAN1 progress on TDMA/FDMA).

Proposal 4a: From RAN2 perspective on slotted-ALOHA, it should be possible/supported that the number of access occasions can be as large as the number of devices that may attempt to access. (It is up to the reader implementation on the actual assigned number of access occasions.)

Proposal 4b: FFS: After reader selects the devices to perform RA procedure (via A-IoT paging), there can be multiple R2D transmissions which define/schedule the resources for Msg1 transmission.

* It is up to RAN1 on how to define/schedule the time-frequency resources for Msg1 transmission. *(another part was already captured in RAN2 agreement “=> wait for further RAN1 progress on indication of the start of access occasion”*)
* RAN2 to discuss the R2D message corresponding to the “R2D transmission triggering” in RAN1 agreement (i.e. A-IoT paging message and/or other separate “QueryRep-like” R2D message), after some progress in RAN1.

*AS ID for scheduling purposes*

Proposal 8: It is RAN1 final decision on whether the “AS ID” is needed for the purpose of D2R scheduling and R2D reception, while RAN2 just attempts to study some assumptions:

* RAN2 assumes this “AS ID” can be a short AS layer ID, rather than the upper layer device ID.
* From RAN2 perspective, there are two candidate options for this “AS ID”, after the reader addresses the contention by Msg2 in CBRA case:
  + Option 1: the random ID in Msg1 can be reused;
  + Option 2: reader assigns this “AS ID”, which is unique among the devices under service.
* From RAN2 perspective, there are two candidate options for this “AS ID” in contention-free access case:
  + Option 1: a random ID in Msg1 can be reused;
  + Option 2: reader assigns this “AS ID”. FFS via which R2D message.

# 4 References: Companies proposals in RAN2#127

## 4.1 Failure/success indication

**R2-2406341 Random Access for Ambient IoT device NEC**

Proposal-13: Support subsequent R2D transmission of “ACK/NACK” indication after D2R transmission of Msg.3 when the second trigger message is supported.

**R2-2406392 Random Access Procedure for A-IoT Device vivo**

Proposal 5. A device can determine contention resolution failure immediately if next Msg2/MsgB with other random ID than itself or next Msg0 is received (without further TDM or FDM solution).

Proposal 6. For 4-step RACH, after the device sends the Msg3, it can consider the access success and no re-access is needed any more.

**R2-2406542 Discussions on AIoT Random Access Fujitsu**

Proposal 1: In 3-step random access, a NACK may be used to handle the Msg3 transmission failure.

Proposal 6: The acknowledgement to one AIoT device in one R2D transmission is supported as baseline.

**R2-2406711 Random Access Procedure for Ambient IOT InterDigital**

Proposal 6: In contention-based random access, the reader may optionally transmit a subsequent R2D (after access procedure) to the device. RAN2 studies at least the following cases for subsequent R2D message transmission and the corresponding message contents: 1) Indication of a failure to receive MSG3, 2) Providing command to the device; 3) Providing resources required by the device for further/subsequent device unicast (re)transmission, 4) Providing a temporary device ID.

Proposal 7: Absence of the subsequent R2D message (after access procedure) can be interpreted by the device to mean at least successful data transmission and no additional command reception.

**R2-2406716 A-IoT random access procedure Huawei**

Proposal 14: After the device transmits the A-IoT Msg1, it considers A-IoT random access as failed, if the A-IoT Msg2 is not successfully received and it has received the R2D message indicating start of the next access occasion for another device.

Proposal 15a: Reader can send an R2D message to the device, which indicates whether its A-IoT procedure (data transmission for inventory and/or command) is successfully done or not.

Proposal 15b: After the device transmits the A-IoT Msg3 or the following upper layer data, the failure/success of D2R transmission is determined based on the following R2D message (e.g. according to above Proposal 15a).

**R2-2406752 Discussion on random access of Ambient IoT Spreadtrum**

Proposal 3: Msg4 is needed only if the reader has not received Msg3 successfully.

**R2-2406786 Discussion on UL multiple access Ericsson**

Proposal 11 For 4-step contention-based random access, study if Msg4 is needed to acknowledge Msg3 transmission considering the reliability requirements of the use case and energy usage cost at the devices.

**R2-2406880 Discussion on random access for Ambient IoT Lenovo**

Proposal 7: Device detects access failure if NACK for Msg3 is received from the reader.

Proposal 11:“Msg4” presence/absence has following three cases:

Case 1: “Msg4” is presence to provide NACK to device when Msg3 failure.

Case 2: “Msg4” is presence to provide ACK for confirming the correctly reception of Msg3 for the case that there is no subsequent access trigger message.

Case 3: “Msg4” is not presence if Msg3 is correctly received and there is the subsequent trigger message.

**R2-2406899 Random access procedure for Ambient IoT China Telecom**

Proposal 6: The reader should send a failure indication message to the device if it can't receive the A-IoT Msg3 after sending A-IoT Msg2.

**R2-2406987 Further consideration on Ambient IoT random access CMCC**

Proposal 14: Introduce a R2D A-IoT message (NAK) to indicate reader’s failure reception of A-IoT Msg3, whose absence indicates otherwise.

**R2-2407344 Discussion on A-IoT random access HONOR**

Proposal 1: For 3-step CBRA, the subsequent R2D transmission after Msg3 could be used for the following one or both potential cases:

Confirm the failure/success reception of Msg3.

Scheduling/transmission for the following higher layer data.

Proposal 2: RAN2 confirms that the subsequent R2D transmission after Msg3 is not always present in 3 Step CBRA (e.g., present to confirm the failure reception of the Msg3 while the absent of it indicates the success reception of Msg3).

**R2-2407458 Further discussion on Ambient IoT random access Samsung**

Proposal 6: The device considers A-IoT Msg3 transmission as successful if the subsequent R2D transmission to this device is received. Subsequent R2D transmission is either for sending the command or for indicating the successful transmission of A-IoT Msg3.

**R2-2407542 Discussion on Failure Handling Rakuten Mobile**

Proposal 4: Detection of failure and triggering retries. The reader should have mechanisms to detect when MSG3 is not received or decoded correctly and trigger retries. This can be determined by the absence of an expected response within a predefined timeframe.

Proposal 5: Use of MSG4: If MSG3 is not received, the reader can send an MSG4 to request a retransmission or provide new instructions to the device.

## 4.2 Access occasion determination

R2-2406341 Random Access for Ambient IoT device NEC

Proposal-3: RAN2/RAN1 needs to study if we adopt the similar approach (as “QUERYREP” command for RFID) for AIoT device for the purpose of RA slot count down, and synchronization or clock tracking.

Proposal-4: in addition to the RA slot selection, the device may need to randomly selects one frequency location among the available frequency locations for that “RA slot” to send MSG-1 to the reader.

R2-2406392 Random Access Procedure for A-IoT Device vivo

Proposal 10. There should be a Secondary Msg0 to indicate next RACH occasion starting point in the same RACH round, which may omit the initial paging message and RACH configuration.

Proposal 11. There should be a Master Msg0 to indicate next RACH round starting point, which may carry the initial paging message and/or new RACH configuration.

R2-2406484 Discussion on the Random Access for Ambient IoT CATT

Proposal 8a: Introduce frame start-like command to initiate the access procedure based on slot-ALOHA.

Proposal 8b: Introduce occasion start-like command to indicate the start of a new access occasion within the current frame.

R2-2406716 A-IoT random access procedure Huawei

Proposal 1: RAN2 agrees that the reader transmits one explicit R2D message to define/indicate the start/boundary of the access occasion (instead of defining the NR RACH occasion by absolute timing).

Proposal 2b: The total number of time-domain access occasions within one access round is indicated by the reader.

R2-2406899 Random access procedure for Ambient IoT China Telecom

Proposal 1: Introduce a D2R A-IoT Msg0 to indicate the start of access occasion and provide synchronization for A-IoT device. Can discuss what other indication should be captured, e.g., RA type.

R2-2407265 Discussion on random access aspects for Ambient IoT LG Electronics

Proposal 7. In order to indicate the start of the access occasion, the reader should send a start indication for the access occasion to the A-IOT device(s). Then, the A-IOT device(s) performs the contention-based or contention-free access procedure.

R2-2407458 Further discussion on Ambient IoT random access Samsung

Proposal 2: For contention-based access procedure, the reader explicitly indicates the starting point of each access occasion to the devices by R2D signalling for A-IoT Msg1 transmission.

R2-2407536 Discussion on Random Access procedure for Ambient IoT Philips

Proposal 2: Reader may transmit access occasion announcement message.

R2-2406361 Discussion on access procedure for ambient IOT Xiaomi

Proposal 1: R2D command-based slot definition in Slotted-ALOHA access is supported, i.e., the tag considers the beginning of a new slot based on R2D command reception.

## 4.3 Re-access

R2-2406341 Random Access for Ambient IoT device NEC

Proposal-11: RAN2 should study the possibility for the device to try to access via another access occasion within the current access round or after the current access round after initial access contention failure.

Proposal-12: Introduce second trigger message following the initial trigger message within the same access round.

R2-2406379 Consideration on A-IoT Random access Intel

Proposal 5: AIoT device shall wait for the reader to trigger the next round of operation when it does not have enough energy to complete the requested operation.

Proposal 7: AIoT device shall wait for the reader to trigger the next round of operation upon detection of an AIoT RACH failure.

R2-2406392 Random Access Procedure for A-IoT Device vivo

Proposal 7. A device which detects contention-failure or access failure, re-accesses in the next RACH round.

Proposal 8. The RACH round length is adaptive. One round can be terminated earlier by the reader, e.g. upon detection of too high collision/blank. A new round, e.g. with more/less RACH occasions, is initiated.

R2-2406484 Discussion on the Random Access for Ambient IoT CATT

Proposal 12: RAN2 to discuss the following options as the baseline of re-access,

Option 1 – Perform re-access in the subsequent access occasions, including the ones within the current frame or in the subsequent frames;

Option 2 – Complete the access procedure within one access occasion, i.e. perform re-access in the same access occasion as the one used for initial access.

R2-2406542 Discussions on AIoT Random Access Fujitsu

Proposal 3: The device considers access failure when no valid ACK is received after sending the first access message, or a NACK is received from the reader after the uplink data transmission.

Proposal 4: RAN2 to study the following options for handling device access failure:

Option 1: support re-access in the same access round.

Option 2: support delta access in next access round.

Proposal 5: Support re-access in the same access round (Option 1). Dedicate transmission occasions for re-access in the end of the same access round may be used for re-access by the devices which experienced access failure in the previous transmission occasions.

R2-2406711 Random Access Procedure for Ambient IOT InterDigital

Proposal 2: When access failure is detected, MSG1 retransmissions with additional access occasions in the same round can be performed by either: 1) selecting multiple access occasions for MSG1 transmission, 2) use of additional occasions configured by reader for failed MSG1

R2-2406716 A-IoT random access procedure Huawei

Proposal 16: After the D2R transmission, the device should perform re-access in case of the “A-IoT procedure failure”, including the contention resolution failure and D2R data transmission failure.

Proposal 17: The device performs the re-access in the next access round, rather than in the same access round after detecting a failure, so that the reader is able to adjust the number of access occasions in the next round.

R2-2406752 Discussion on random access of Ambient IoT Spreadtrum

Proposal 6: If contention resolution fails due to collision, A-IoT device will perform the access again in the next access round upon receiving the new trigger message from reader.

R2-2406764 Further discussions on A-IoT random access ETRI

Proposal 11: The device needs the following configuration information for re-access

waiting time (or waiting access occasions) for Msg2 reception after Msg1 transmission;

window size for re-selecting access occasions;

maximum number of retransmission attempts;

transmission power ramping configuration, if needed

R2-2406786 Discussion on UL multiple access Ericsson

Proposal 12 For handling contention resolution failure and access failure, RAN2 to study the three options:

a. Option 1: a device which experiences contention-failure or access failure, re-accesses in the same round.

b. Option 2: a device which experiences contention-failure or access failure, re-accesses in the next round.

c. Option 3: the round length is adaptive. The round can be adjusted by increasing its length or terminating earlier upon detection of too high collision. More time occasions are added in current round or in the new round (if current one terminated).

Proposal 13 For devices with unsuccessful random access, RAN2 to study the response message (Msg2) indicating additional information related to back-off and re-access.

R2-2406880 Discussion on random access for Ambient IoT Lenovo

Proposal 8: Device can perform re-access in the same occasion, or re-access in the same round, or re-access in the next round, or re-access when a pre-defined back-off timer expires.

R2-2406899 Random access procedure for Ambient IoT China Telecom

Proposal 7: RAN2 to support that A-IoT devices can re-access in the next access round if access failure occurs.

R2-2406987 Further consideration on Ambient IoT random access CMCC

Proposal 13: RAN2 to study at least the following options for both 2-step and 3-step CBRA Msg1 failure handling,

Device attempts to re-access in the next access round.

Device attempts to re-access in the next access occasion.

R2-2407022 Discussion on Random Access for A-IoT Transsion Holdings

Proposal 3: The retry access configuration can be provided in the trigger message for the failed access device to retry access without the reader re-initiated trigger.

R2-2407265 Discussion on random access aspects for Ambient IoT LG Electronics

Proposal 7. In order to indicate the start of the access occasion, the reader should send a start indication for the access occasion to the A-IOT device(s). Then, the A-IOT device(s) performs the contention-based or contention-free access procedure.

Proposal 12. If contention resolution or access procedure is failed, the A-IOT device perform the re-access procedure within the next round.

R2-2407317 Views on Random Access Aspects of Ambient IoT Qualcomm

Proposal 7: If the AIoT devices contention resolution is unsuccessful or the AIoT data transmission is failed, the AIoT devices should be able to perform AIoT re-access. FFS details of AIoT re-access.

Proposal 8: RAN2 to study the following options for AIoT devices to perform AIoT re-access.

Option 1: AIoT devices perform re-access only upon reception of next trigger message from Reader.

Option 2: AIoT devices autonomously perform re-access without waiting for next trigger message from Reader.

Proposal 9: During AIoT re-access, AIoT devices can transmit the AIoT Msg1 again in a newly selected access occasion or in an indicated access occasion.

R2-2406770 Discussion on random access for A-IoT OPPO

Proposal 7 If the device detects RA failure, the device may re-access in the next RA round.

R2-2406361 Discussion on access procedure for ambient IOT Xiaomi

Proposal 18: The network can trigger devices in one slot to perform re-access more than one times.