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# Introduction

The following document includes a list of open issues according to the following email discussion:

* [POST130][027][AIoT] MAC Running CR (Huawei)

Intended outcome: Review CR and open issues

Deadline: Long

Companies are invited to provide feedback on open issue list by: **Aug 1st, 10:00 UTC.**

# Remaining open issues for specification 38.391

## List of the open issues and type of issue

The issue descriptions have been updated according to the RAN2#130 progress with revision marks.

* Some issues have been addressed in RAN2 #130 meeting. The classification of those issues will be marked as “Addressed/closed”.
* For some straightforward/very detailed/not technically complex issues, the Rapp will propose resolution, and invite companies to provide comments in the questionnaire. The summary will be submitted to the next meeting.
* For the specification implementation issues, the Rapp suggests to check/review the MAC running CR directly.
* For the issue newly identified or technically controversial, the classification will be marked as “To be discussed by company contributions”. Further discussion in next meeting would be based on companies’ contribution.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Issue number, brief title | Issue description | Issue classification |
| **Group 1: Paging** | | |
| **Subgroup: Multi-reader scenario** | | |
| Issue 1-1: multi-reader paging | If a device gets a new service request while one procedure is still ongoing, whether/how to specify device behaviour or leave it to implementation, and the end of procedure if needed.   * *Rel-19 devices are not expected to receive parallel service request for overlapping reader scenario based on network implementation. Capture this in stage 2 specification.* * *The Rel-19 device always responds to the new service indicated by the received paging message applicable for that device. Capture this in stage 3 specification.* * *Send LS to RAN3 to notify them of agreements 1 and 2* * *Parallel service request for overlapping reader scenario can be addressed in Rel-20* * *Status in running CR: captured in 5.2.* | Addressed/closed |
| **Subgroup: Transaction ID** | | |
| Issue 1-2: transaction ID | Whether/how to specify how the reader generate Transaction ID, and the size   * *Relevant agreements:* * *The “transaction ID” can be generated by reader based on CN corelation ID. FFS how reader will generate “transaction ID”. FFS the size of transaction ID* * *1 bit solution is excluded. FFS the size. Aim to have a reasonable size* * *Status in running CR: captured as Editor’s Note in 6.2.1.1.* | Companies are invited to input views for Q#2 |
| **Subgroup: Paging message content** | | |
| Issue 1-3:  Paging ID length field | The field to indicate the paging ID length, e.g., value range, how many bits, format design, taking into account of CT4 and SA2 reply LS in C4-252466 and S2-2505793.   * *Relevant agreements:* * *A field indicating Paging ID length information is always included together with the paging ID field in the A-IoT paging message, except the case where no ID is included in the A-IoT paging message.* * *The number of bits required for paging ID length field should be as small as possible. This would require the number of different Paging ID lengths to be small.* * *RAN2 sent LS to CT4 and SA2 in R2-2503197 asking for their feedback on the above agreement, for RAN2 to determine the field for paging ID length. CT4 replied with LS and CR in* *C4-252466 (LS on paging ID)*. SA2 reply LS is in S2-2505793*.* * *Note: SA2 already agreed the filtering information and captured it in clause 5.8 in 23.369, this may enable some extent of RAN2 discussion before their feedback.* * *Status in running CR: the field name is captured in 6.2.1.1 without the detailed format.* | Companies are invited to input views for Q#3 |
| Issue 1-4: AO number field | How to indicate the number of access occasions, e.g. the maximum number, the length of field, format design.   * *Relevant agreements:* * *Issue (1-4) For number of access occasions introduce exponential way, 4 bits, value range FFS* * *Status in running CR: the field name and format is captured in 6.2.1.1 with proposed value range to be reviewed by companies.* | Format is addressed, value range FFS is moved to issue 4-4 |
| Issue 1-5:  Paging content for CFRA | As baseline, the transaction ID is absent in Paging message for CFRA. FFS on the need for the transaction ID for command case.   * *For CFRA, as a baseline the fields related to the transaction ID, indication of paging ID present/absent and number of access occasions are absent. FFS on the need for the transaction ID for command case.* * *Status in running CR: the CR is implemented assuming no transaction ID for CFRA, and no issue is identified.* | Companies are invited to input views for Q#4 |
| (New)Issue 1-7: Security parameter | How to include the security parameters in Paging message.   * *SA3 sent a LS after May meeting in S3-252392, indicating “SA3 is assuming the ability to include an additional parameter, a 128bit random number in the paging request message.” The potential RAN2 impact is to add another field in paging message to contain this security parameter.*   *Status in running CR: not captured yet* | Companies are invited to input views for Q#8 |
| **Subgroup: Others** | | |
| Issue 1-6:  Paging ID visibility | Whether Paging ID is invisible or visible to MAC.   * *Relevant agreements:* * *The current assumption is that the paging identifier is transparent to the A-IoT MAC Layer and carried by upper layer. FFS if there is really a need for visibility in the MAC layer.* * *From the previous discussion, there are some motivations to make paging ID visible to MAC:*   + *1. Reader can operate on the paging ID for further sub-grouping. The Rapp understands this can be considered as an enhancement from reader side for better system efficiency. From device side, since there is an explicit indication for CBRA and CFRA, the device (even in multi-device CFRA) can determine how to perform random access instead of paging ID/group ID. In this case, such visibility is not an essential function. And according to guidance from chairlady, such enhancement can be considered with lower priority.*   + *2. Reader can associate the paging ID/device ID and AS ID for a given device within a service request. The Rapp understands according to RAN3 LS* *R3-252481, reader will allocate NGAP device ID for each device and maintain the per-session per-device context, via which the reader can associate the command receiving from the NG interface with the AS ID assigned for a device, i.e. such device management/association does not rely on the paging ID/device ID.*   + *3. The Temp ID may have impact on this visibility discussion. The Rapp understands SA3 has not concluded on the solution of Temp ID. But majority seems think this Temp ID is maintained/managed between CN and device, since they already concluded there is no AS security in A-IoT. Therefore, no RAN2 discussion is needed before SA3 further inputs.* | Not critical |
| **Group 2: Random access** | | |
| **Subgroup: R2D trigger message and Msg1 related** | | |
| Issue 2-1:  Msg1 resource selection | Whether/how to specify the device detailed behaviour of randomly selecting the Msg1 resource based on the R2D trigger message.   * *Relevant agreements:* * *A new R2D message other than the paging message is introduced for A-IoT device determining MSG1 resources unless RAN1 concludes to use L1 signaling. The R2D message indicates the start of a set of MSG1 resources that were configured in paging message.* * *Assumption: The R2D message does not include slot number/count down number.* * *For Msg1 resource selection procedure capture as guidance the countdown behaviour in the MAC specification (use TP in R2-2503952). Capture a NOTE that other implementation are allowed. X, Y will be signalled by paging message.* * *Status in running CR: captured in 5.3.3.1.* | Addressed/closed |
| Issue 2-2:  Paging&first R2D trigger message | Whether the R2D trigger message is needed in CFRA, and whether the first R2D trigger message will be merged into paging message in CBRA.   * *The start of the first set of MSG1 resources is indicated by Paging message directly instead of the new R2D trigger messages. R2D trigger message is not sent in CFRA procedure. Come back if RAN1/4 sees any issues. Send LS to RAN1/RAN4.* * *Status in running CR: captured.* | Addressed/closed |
| Issue 2-3: R2D trigger message byte alignment | The R2D trigger message should be byte aligned or not.   * *Relevant agreements:* * *The MAC PDU should be byte-aligned, assuming the allocated TBS value is in the unit of byte. The actual TBS value depends on RAN1. FFS for R2D trigger message.* * *FFS R2D byte alignment dependent on TBS size discussion* * *Status in running CR: not captured yet.* | Companies are invited to input views for Q#11 |
| **Subgroup: CBRA procedure related** | |  |
| Issue 2-4: CBRA failure detection | Further down selection between option B and C for msg2 monitor window in CBRA.   * *1 Exclude the option of MSG2 transmission and any retransmission of MSG2 happens within a predefined time window (based on timer)* * *2 A device expecting MSG2 assumes CBRA failure if its MSG2 is not received before a boundary, where the boundary can be further downselected between option B and C below. A device receiving MSG2 within this boundary transmits MSG3. The device does not process MSG2 (re)transmission received after the boundary.* * *Option B – the boundary is the reception of either the next R2D trigger message or the subsequent paging message* * *Option C – the boundary is the reception of either the kth R2D trigger message or the subsequent paging message (K is FFS)* * *Option A (the boundary being the subsequent paging only) is excluded.* * *For option C, further discuss in terms of complexity at the device vs reader flexibility.* * *3 Including frequency index along with RN16 in MSG2 to reduce collisions of MSG1 between different devices is feasible. FFS Discuss further whether to include it.* * *Status in running CR: the common part of option B and C is captured, while the difference part is in [] and highligted.* | To be discussed by company contributions |
| **Subgroup: Msg2 content** | |  |
| Issue 2-5:  random ID differentiation in Msg2 | Whether to include frequency index along with RN16 in MSG2 to reduce collisions of MSG1 between different devices.   * *In previous meetings, RAN2 discussed whether Msg2 need to include more information on top of the random ID to avoid random ID collision, but there was no consensus.* * *RAN2#130 agreement: Including frequency index along with RN16 in MSG2 to reduce collisions of MSG1 between different devices is feasible. FFS Discuss further whether to include it.* * *Status in running CR: not captured yet.* | To be discussed by company contributions |
| Issue 2-6:  number indication of echoed random IDs in Msg2 | Whether to indicate the number of echoed random IDs included in Msg2.   * *RAN2 agreed that A-IoT Msg2 contains one or multiple echoed random ID(s) from A-IoT Msg1 of different A-IoT devices, but there is no discussion on whether/how to indicate the number of echoed random IDs. The Rapp understands this can be considered as signaling design/stage3 issue which should be quite straightforward.* * *Status in running CR: the CR is implemented assuming no explicit number indication, and no issue is identified.* | Companies are invited to input views for Q#5 |
| Issue 2-7: present/absent indication of assigned AS ID in Msg2 | How to indicate the AS ID presence in Msg2.   * *One bit indication is needed for each echoed random ID in Msg2 to indicate whether AS ID is present (i.e., assigned by reader) for this random ID..* * *Status in running CR: captured.* | Addressed/closed |
| **Subgroup: CFRA procedure specific** | | |
| Issue 2-8: no re-access for CFRA | How to achieve “no re-access” for CFRA   * *Relevant agreements:* * *For CFRA, NACK feedback and re-access is not supported. FFS how to achieve.* * *For CFRA, the device always responds to paging regardless of transaction ID (if we put a transaction ID) (i.e. as long as it is addressed to the corresponding device).* * *Status in running CR: captured in 5.2.* | Addressed/closed |
| Issue 2-9: AS ID assignment in multi-device CFRA | Whether to consider multiple device scenario as to the AS ID in CFRA.   * *This scenario is not supported* * *Relevant agreements:* * *ID is the only ID needed for addressing the device in R2D command message assuming for CFRA no multiple devices are performing the procedures with the given reader. FFS if we can assume or need to support multiple device scenario.* * *For CFRA, the device always responds to paging regardless of transaction ID (if we put a transaction ID) (i.e. as long as it is addressed to the corresponding device* * *Status in running CR: not captured.* | Addressed/closed |
| **Subgroup: NACK feedback** | | |
| Issue 2-10: NACK before paging or R2D trigger message | For the re-access due to reception of NACK indication before subsequent R2D message, whether the subsequent R2D message is the R2D trigger message or paging message.   * *Relevant agreements:* * *For msg3, we rely on whether the device receives NACK indication before subsequent R2D message to determine re-access. No need for a timer. FFS whether subsequent R2D message is trigger message or paging* * *After MSG3 transmission, upon receiving NACK with its AS ID before subsequent paging or command addressed to this device from the reader, device determines it will perform re-access. FFS how to specify.* * *Status in running CR: captured in 5.5.* | Addressed.  “*FFS how to specify*” is moved to issue 4-4 |
| Issue 2-11: explicit message for NACK | Whether to use a new/explicit R2D message for NACK feedback.   * *Relevant agreements:* * *NACK based mechanism is supported for D2R messages to determine re-access for at least msg3. FFS details including whether we need a timer or explicit message and when reader sends feedback.* * *NACK feedback is defined as an explicit message (i.e. new message type). AS ID(s) is/are included to indicate the failure for given device(s). Multiplexing of NACK feedback is supported in one message* * *Status in running CR: captured.* | Addressed/closed |
| Issue 2-12: multiplexing for NACK indication | Whether to support multiplexing of information for multiple devices in NACK feedback.   * *Relevant agreements:* * *Support multiplexing of information for multiple devices in R2D message for msg2. FFS others for multicast messages.* * *Multiplexing of NACK feedback is supported in one message* * *Status in running CR: not captured yet.* | Addressed/closed |
| **Group 3: Data transmission** | | |
| **Subgroup: Segmentation** | | |
| Issue 3-1: command for non-first segment | Whether upper layer command is included in the R2D message scheduling for non-first segment.   * *Relevant agreements:* * *FFS whether the reader always includes the command for retransmission of segments.* * *R2D message scheduling non-first segment (re)transmission does not include upper layer command.* * *Status in running CR: captured in 5.4.2.* | Addressed/closed |
| Issue 3-2: offset for first segment | Whether offset is included in the R2D message scheduling for the first segment and unsegmented message   * *Relevant agreements:* * *For the retransmission of the first segment/unsegmented D2R message, the reader sends the R2D message by including the upper layer command again. FFS whether offset zero is always included.* * *For the first segment and unsegmented packet (re)transmission, the “offset” indicator in R2D is not present.* * *Status in running CR: captured in 5.4.3.* | Addressed/closed |
| **Subgroup: AS ID** | | |
| Issue 3-3: AS ID release | Whether a release message is needed for AS ID release   * *Relevant agreements:* * *FFS other cases for release ASID to avoid keeping it indefinitely.* * *- For CBRA, to avoid AS ID being occupied for unnecessary time and to keep alignment between reader and device on AS ID release, device can release AS ID upon receiving paging message with different transaction ID, no matter the paging message is for it or not. FFS for CFRA* * *- FFS for need for release message* * *Status in running CR: captured as Editor’s Note in 5.2.* | Companies are invited to input views for Q#6 |
| **Subgroup: D2R message content for data transmission** | | |
| Issue 3-4: D2R padding indication | How to indicate padding and the Length field for SDU (segmentation or non-segmentation) or padding and its size   * *Relevant agreements:* * *In case where MAC PDU includes both MAC SDU and padding, for D2R a field to indicate how many SDU bits are present is required. FFS how this is provided (i.e. SDU length field or padding length field). The size of length field is FFS.* * *A mandatory length field directly indicates the length of D2R data MAC SDU to support varying lengths of D2R data. The size of length field is 7-bit in bytes.* * *The offset indication for transmission/retransmission of the segments after the first segment of a D2R message is 7-bit length in bytes. Segmented SDUs are also byte aligned.* * *Status in running CR: captured in 6.2.2.2.* | Addressed/closed |
| Issue 3-5: D2R message type | Whether to support D2R message type   * *Relevant agreements:* * *FFS whether we introduce D2R message type. Discuss after looking at the overall MAC header design and space before deciding whether we introduce message type or reserved bits* * *FFS D2R message type. Current running CR will capture no message type, but we can revisit this next meeting and also consider if any other bits are needed for the MAC header* * *Status in running CR: captured as Editor’s Note in 6.1.1.* | Companies are invited to input views for Q#7 |
| Issue 3-6: Write operation response | Whether the write command type may cause a case of ‘no upper layer data is available for a D2R scheduling’ due to long writing time.   * *Relevant agreements:* * *The device is expected to send a MAC response to the reader in the D2R occasion. The MAC response contains the NAS message if available at the D2R occasion. If there is no NAS message available to transmit at the D2R occasion then the response contains MAC with 0 SDU and padding as needed.* * *Send LS to CT1 to inform the agreement 1 to CT1 and explain that we have an issue with delayed NAS write success response. RAN2 would prefer that this is handled by CT1 (and give the example of sending NAS response upon successful reception of write command). Ask if this can be handled by CT1* * *Status in running CR: captured in 5.4.1.* | Addressed/closed |
| (New)Issue 3-7: more data indication handling | How to set “more data indication” value in case of no NAS response available (i.e., zero SDU)   * *During CR implementation, the rapp identified there is no clear conclusion how to set the “more data indication” in case of no data available, i.e., zero SDU.* * *Status in running CR: captured as value FFS.* | Companies are invited to input views for Q#9 |
| **Subgroup: R2D message content for data transmission** | | |
| (New) Issue 3-8: R2D TBS | How to handle the R2D TBS, which may impact R2D padding, byte-alignment design.   * *Relevant agreements:* * *RAN1 LS in R1-2504915* * *The length field inside MAC for SDU is not needed for R2D messages, assuming R2D MAC padding is not needed. FFS can come back if padding is needed depending on granularity of TBS (only if needed)* * *Status in running CR: not captured yet.* | Companies are invited to input views for Q#10.1, Q10.2 |
| **Group 4: Others** | | |
| **Subgroup: RAN1 parameters** | | |
| Issue 4-1:  RAN1 parameters | How to handle RAN1 parameters if any, e.g. scheduling info in paging, Msg2, R2D command messages.   * *Based on RAN1 LS in R1-2504915, the Rapp created a subclause 6.2.1.7 in the MAC running CR to capture all the RAN1 agreement parameter, companies are encouraged to check the details and make comment if any.* * *Status in running CR: a field named as D2R Scheduling Info is included in Paging message, Msg2 and R2D command message as a placeholder, and the details are captured in subclause 6.2.1.6 based on RAN1 inputs.* | To be checked/discussed directly in CR review [POST130][027][AIoT] MAC Running CR |
| Issue 4-6 | Whether/how to reduce the size of Frequency Resource Indication in D2R Scheduling Info field   * *In the current version of CR, Frequency Resource Indication is defined as an 8-bit bitmap based on RAN1 agreement in RAN1 LS in R1-2504915. Some companies propose to reduce the size of the indication. There are two directions raised: 1. If bit duration is set to values other than 266.67μs, shorter bitmap can be used; 2. If the scheduling is for only one resource, the 8-bit bitmap can be replaced with a 3-bit frequency index.* * *Considering the 8-bit bitmap as captured in current running CR work well, this signaling reduction is an optimization, which can be discussed only if time allows.* | Not critical |
| **Subgroup: MAC modelling issue** | | |
| Issue 4-2: transport channel | Whether transport channel concept is used for A-IoT MAC, i.e., between MAC and PHY, and whether logical channel concept or “SAP” is used on the interface between MAC and upper layer.   * *Relevant agreements:* * *Assume two transport channels are introduced between A-IoT MAC and PHY. One is for R2D, and the other is for D2R. Neither logical channel concept nor SAP is defined for the interface between A-IoT MAC and upper layers.* * *Status in running CR: captured as Editor’s Note in 4.2.* | Addressed/closed |
| Issue 4-3 | Terminology, message names, field names, definitions used in MAC running CR   * *Relevant agreements:*   Use as baseline the following message names, field names and definitions are to be used in A-IoT MAC:  − Message name: A-IoT Paging message, Access Trigger message, Random ID message, Random ID Response message, R2D Upper Layer Data Transfer message, D2R Upper Layer Data Transfer message.  − Field name: R2D Message Type, RA Type, Indication of Paging ID Presence, Length of Paging ID, Paging ID, Transaction ID, Number of Access Occasions, D2R Scheduling Info, Random ID, Echoed Random ID, AS ID, Assigned AS ID, More Data Indication, SDU Length, MAC Padding, Received Data Size.  − Definitions:  o Access occasion: A time-frequency resource for device(s) to transmit Msg1 (i.e., the Random ID message) during a CBRA procedure.  o AS ID: The AS layer identifier to address the specific device for R2D reception and D2R scheduling | Addressed/Further update can be conducted during CR review |
| **Subgroup: MAC spec implementation to be checked in CR review** | | |
| Issue 4-4: MAC spec implementation | For some easy FFS (e.g., how to implement agreement in spec), the Rapp took the liberty to propose some implementation resolution, and invite companies to check and review in the running CR.   * *AS ID release: FFS for CFRA* * *Msg2 retransmission: How to capture device behavior is FFS* * *Segmentation: This implies that the R2D message will either have command or offset (but not both).FFS whether we define two message types or one message type with optional fields.* * *NACK: FFS how to specify.* * *Paging message format: FFS if more than one R bit is required.* * *Access occasion number: value range FFS.* | To be checked/discussed directly in CR review [POST130][027][AIoT] MAC Running CR |
| (New)Issue 4-5: Forward compatibility | Whether to consider forward compatibility for R2D messages other than Paging message.   * *In WID RP-250796 , only paging is required to consider forward compatibility as indicated as “RAN2 aims to design a paging message format such that multiple identifiers can be contained in one paging message, for forward compatibility purposes.”* * *But companies may wonder whether this can be extended to other R2D messages.* | Companies are invited to input views for Q#12 |

**Q#1: Companies are invited to provide feedback regarding the above open issue description and classification.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Issue No.** | **Comments** |
| CATT |  | OK with the rapporteur update |
| Lenovo |  | For Open issue 2-9, firstly we agree in R19 we only target for the single device scenario in CFRA. However, we are not so understand the logic in the comment “*The rapp understands there is no such scenario after we agreed that the device always response to new paging.*”  Rappv1: My understanding is that this FFS was added because some companies asked if there is a scenario that multiple devices are selected by several parallel CFRA paging messages, and those devices need to store AS ID, and to perform data transmission even after these several paging message during online discussion. Then after concluding device always respond to CFRA paging message, such scenario is excluded. |
| Ericsson |  | We have the same understanding/feeling as Lenovo. We are fine that RAN2 can conclude multiple device CFRA can be left out from Rel-19. However, this is mainly based on the WID that the paging includes only single identifier. We can just remove the above sentence to avoid confusion.  Rappv2: Sure, I can remove the sentence, anyway it’s just Rapp’s understanding, and it’s clear already from the agreements that neither parallel service requests nor multiple paging IDs is supported. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Collection of company inputs to the open issues

### Issue 1-2: transaction ID

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Issue 1-2: transaction ID | Whether/how to specify how the reader generate Transaction ID, and the size   * *Relevant agreements:* * *The “transaction ID” can be generated by reader based on CN corelation ID. FFS how reader will generate “transaction ID”. FFS the size of transaction ID* * *1 bit solution is excluded. FFS the size. Aim to have a reasonable size* * *Status in running CR: captured as Editor’s Note in 6.2.1.1.* | Companies are invited to input views for Q#2 |

According to previous discussion, the main motivation to consider long transaction ID/specify the generation of transaction ID seems for multi-reader scenario. However, in last meeting, it has been agreed that it should be network implementation to avoid devices receiving parallel service requests. In this case, network implementation can also avoid transaction ID collision, if needed. Therefore, there is no need to further discuss how to specify the transaction ID generation. Then for the length of transaction ID, proposals from companies seem to focus between 2 and 6. So the rapp would like to ask for company’s inputs on the suggested transaction ID length, based on that we can follow majority view.

**Q#2: Companies are invited to provide feedback regarding:**

* **Q2.1: do you agree how to generate transaction ID is also left to implementation?**
* **Q2.2: how many bits between 2 and 6 of transaction ID do you prefer?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Q2.1: Agree or not** | **Q2.2: how many bits** | **Comments if any** |
| CATT | agree | 2 bits |  |
| OPPO | agree | No strong view |  |
| vivo | agree | 4bit | For Q2.1, a Note can be captured to reflect that: at least the NW implementation should guarantee that the transaction ID and correlation ID has a one-to-one mapping relationship. |
| NEC | agree | No strong view |  |
| LGE | agree | 5 or 6bit | Considering that network implementation to avoid transaction ID collision is needed and multiple reader scenarios are considered in Rel-20, 2 or 3 bits do not seem an enough length for transaction ID. 2~3 bit length is enough only for distinguishing a new paging or a subsequent paging sent from the same reader. We prefer 5 or 6 bit transaction ID. |
| Xiaomi | Agree | 2 or 4bits | Short transaction ID is preferred |
| Lenovo | Agree with comments | 3-4bits | Since the transaction ID is generated based the correlation ID, we have no detailed information on the structure and length of the correlation ID yet. From AS layer’s perspective, if the principle can be agreed that the different transaction ID is associated to different service requests, we suggest 3-4 bits which may be a reasonable size to ensure the uniqueness as possible. But anyway, it depends on correlation ID design. |
| ETRI | Agree | At least 4bits | Transaction ID is used to identify a service from the CN. Thus, the length of the transaction ID should consider the maximum number of simultaneous services to a device and the number of readers in a multi-reader scenario. So, we think at least 4 bits are necessary to distinguish a certain service and for future releases. |
| ASUSTeK | Agree | 2 bits | Short transaction ID is preferred. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree | 3-4bits | For Q2.1, agree with vivo. A note can be added here. |
| Apple | Agree | 4-6 bit | To avoid headache in multi-reader scenario, we think a longer transaction ID is better |
| ZTE | Agree | 6 | For 2.1, we don’t see any need to specify how this is generated. In any case, this is out of RAN2 scope. So, we should not discuss this.  For 2.2, Transaction ID needs to indicate the following:   1. Different readers 2. Service ID (i.e. correlation ID from CN) 3. Delta paging (i.e. same service or not)   Considering 2 bits for each, it would be good to have around 6 bit transaction ID |
| InterDigital | Agree | 6 bits | In addition to the cases indicated by ZTE, transaction ID should also be used to differentiate the case when two readers want a device to respond to the same service (for localization purposes) and when this is not needed (device responds to any of them). So we think a larger transaction ID is preferred. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree | Prefer 3bits, but | Maybe 4 bit can be the middle ground. But, this should be one quick decision anyway. |
| Ericsson | agree | comments | We assume there is one to one mapping between CN correlation ID and transaction ID. Instead of making decision by RAN2, RAN2 can send an LS to SA2/RAN3 (cc: CT4) to inform those WGs about the assumptions in RAN2 and ask for the size of transaction ID |
| Qualcomm | Agree | 6 bits | Have sympathy for ZTE’s suggestion. |
| Ofinno | Agree | 2 bits | Short transaction ID is preferred. |
| Sony | Agree | 3 bits | We think 2 bits for different readers and one bit for service ID is sufficient. |
| Docomo | Agree | 6 bits, but | From operation perspective, longer is better.  One point we want to clarify is whether we will introduce separate A-IoT Paging message in Rel-20, or Rel-19 Paging is reused. Since introduction of intermediate UE readers will let the readers more dense, a long bits of Transaction IDs are required. But otherwise, we can deal with even 4 bits in Rel-19 perhaps. |
| Kyocera | Agree | 4 bits |  |
| CMCC | Agree | 4 bits | In Re-19, since only gNB-reader is in scope, the length of transaction ID does not need to be too long. However, with the consideration of the UE-reader in R20, it seems more beneficial to make the transaction ID appropriately longer, because coordination between UE-readers is not supported. Therefore, we think that 4-bit transaction ID makes sense. |
| HONOR | Agree | 4-6 bits | For 2.1, the generation is up to implementation.  For 2.2, based on our understanding, the transaction ID is to differentiate the service request and one-to-one mapping to the correlation ID. Considering the paging may be extended for the Rel-20, a short transaction ID may not enough for the extension. |
| Futurewei | Agree | 6 bits |  |
| Samsung | Agree | 4 bits |  |
| CEWiT | Agree | No strong view |  |

**Summary:**

25 companies provided inputs.

All companies agree how to generate transaction ID is left to implementation, which means RAN2 does not need to further discuss this and no corresponding spec impact.

Regarding the length of transaction ID,

* 2 bits is preferred/accepted by 4 companies (CATT, Xiaomi, ASUSTeK, Ofinno)
* 3 bits is preferred/accepted by 3 companies (Spreadtrum, Huawei, Sony)
* 4 bits is preferred/accepted by 12 companies (vivo, Xiaomi, Lenovo, ETRI, Spreadtrum, Apple, Huawei, Docomo, Kyocera, CMCC, HONOR, Samsung)
* 6 bits is preferred/accepted by 9 companies (LGE, ETRI, Apple, ZTE, InterDigital, Qualcomm, Docomo, HONOR, Futurewei)
* Other 3 companies have no strong view (OPPO, NEC, CEWiT)
* 1 company suggests to ask for other WG to decide (Ericsson)

From the above counting, there are more supporters for 4bits and 6bits. Considering either one works, and it just comes down to whether we prioritize signaling overhead or flexibility. We can make a quick decision in the meeting.

Proposal 1 (Issue 1-2 Transaction ID):

* Generation: RAN2 confirms how to generate transaction ID is left to implementation (no spec impact) (25/25).
* Length: RAN2 to make quick decision on 4 bits (15/25) or 6 bits (12/25).

### Issue 1-3: Paging ID length field

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Issue 1-3:  Paging ID length field | The field to indicate the paging ID length, e.g. value range, how many bits, format design, taking into account of CT4 and SA2 reply LS in C4-252466 and S2-2505793.   * *Relevant agreements:* * *A field indicating Paging ID length information is always included together with the paging ID field in the A-IoT paging message, except the case where no ID is included in the A-IoT paging message.* * *The number of bits required for paging ID length field should be as small as possible. This would require the number of different Paging ID lengths to be small.* * *RAN2 sent LS to CT4 and SA2 in R2-2503197 asking for their feedback on the above agreement, for RAN2 to determine the field for paging ID length. CT4 replied with LS and CR in C4-252466 (LS on paging ID)*. SA2 reply LS is in S2-2505793*.* * *Note: SA2 already agreed the filtering information and captured it in clause 5.8 in 23.369, this may enable some extent of RAN2 discussion before their feedback.* * *Status in running CR: the field name is captured in 6.2.1.1 without the detailed format.* | Companies are invited to input views for Q#3 |

In previous discussion, companies are thinking of paging ID length reduction by indicating the type instead of bit number. However, by reading CT4 and SA2 reply LS in C4-252466 and S2-2505793, it looks like the format of device ID and filter info (in the unit of bit) is very flexible, and there exist uncountable types. The following figures are copied from CT4 agreed CR C4-252464.



Figure aa.3.1: Structure of Filtering Information



Figure aa.3.2: Structure of Identification Information Filter

In this case, 8 bits are needed to indicate 256 bits because filtering Information defined by CT4 is with a maximum length of 256 bits. Companies can check the CT4 and SA2 LS, and feedback whether 8-bit length is acceptable or if there is any better solution.

**Q#3: Do companies agree to use 8 bits to indicate the paging ID length in unit of bit?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree or not** | **Comments if any** |
| CATT | agree |  |
| OPPO | agree |  |
| vivo | See comments | I think the issue should be considered as follows:   * Whether there is a need for length indicator? For example, the device can know the whole size of R2D message by R2D TBS, and it can therefore obtain the paging ID length by a simple subtraction operation together with TBS and fields with fixed size. * However, as we noticed that the current design for D2R TBS is in unit of byte, suggesting R2D TBS may be designed the same as that. Therefore, if paging ID is of viable size which is not byte-aligned, a subtraction operation may not get the absolute length of paging ID because of designing issue. And there is still need for the length indicator of paging ID. In such case, we can consider 8-bit is feasible.   Rappv2: For the first comment, since we agreed that R19 devices may see R20 extensions in paging messages, the length of paging ID can not be derived by the length of whole message.  For the second comment, as per CT4 agreed CR, the filtering info is possible to be not byte-aligned, so the length indication is needed to be in unit of bit. |
| NEC | agree |  |
| LGE | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| Lenovo | Agree |  |
| ETRI | Agree |  |
| ASUSTeK | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree, but… | Is this really necessary to have so many types of IDs!? It seems to us that CT4 basically ignored our message to minimize the number of options! We wonder if such flexibility is really needed and if some reduction in size is possible.  Rappv2: yes, this seems to be the situation, unless SA2/CT4 can have further discussion on the design. |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree | As to the minor concern as to CT4 conclusion from above, maybe we can clarify the proposal as “xxx, under the assumption of current SA2/CT4 conclusion”. |
| Qualcomm | Agree |  |
| Ofinno | Agree |  |
| Sony | Agree |  |
| Docomo | Agree |  |
| Kyocera | Agree |  |
| CMCC | Agree |  |
| HONOR | Agree |  |
| Futurewei | Agree |  |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| CEWiT | Agree |  |

**Summary:**

24 companies provided inputs.

It seems all companies think 8 bits is reasonable based on the CT4 LS, although two companies think the SA2/CT4 design might not be so good which consume more bits than expected. Therefore, at least we can confirm to adopt 8-bit length for the current SA2/CT4 conclusion.

Proposal 2 (Issue 1-3 Paging ID length): 8-bit length field (in unit of bit) is assumed to indicate the paging ID length, based on current SA2/CT4 conclusion. (24/24)

### Issue 1-5: Paging content for CFRA

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Issue 1-5:  Paging content for CFRA | As baseline, the transaction ID is absent in Paging message for CFRA. FFS on the need for the transaction ID for command case.   * *For CFRA, as a baseline the fields related to the transaction ID, indication of paging ID present/absent and number of access occasions are absent. FFS on the need for the transaction ID for command case.* * *Status in running CR: the CR is implemented assuming no transaction ID for CFRA, and no issue is identified.* | Companies are invited to input views for Q#4 |

In last meeting online discussion, some companies raised that transaction ID is needed for command case, but there was no time to elaborate the use case, then an FFS was left. Companies are invited to input views for the following question.

**Q#4: Do companies see a need to include transaction ID in the CFRA paging message for command case?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or no** | **Reason** |
| CATT | No |  |
| OPPO | No strong view | We are open to discuss whether there is any issue for command case. |
| vivo | no | The transaction ID is introduced to let device know the current paging is for the same service or different service from the last received one, when there might be an access failure case due to the contention. However, for the case of CFA, since the device should response to every CFA paging message, the transaction ID is not necessary for the device to determine whether to respond the paging message. Moreover, the case is not relevant to whether the paging is triggered by command or inventory, since the device anyway should firstly perform access according to the received paging message. |
| NEC | No |  |
| LGE | No |  |
| Xiaomi | No, but | The issue raised in the meeting was how to release AS ID for CFRA since the ID is configured in the first command Msg. Can AS ID release solution, e.g., paging with transaction ID be used for the release of AS ID for CFRA case? We do not see the problem considering there is not interleaving between CFRA and CBRA procedure. Therefore the device shall release AS ID assigned during CFRA upon receiving Paging, no matter whether transaction ID is contained or not. |
| Lenovo | No | We do not see the need to include transaction ID in the CFRA paging for command case since device anyways needs to response to new received CFRA paging. Some companies have raised the issue that there may has both CFRA and CBRA procedure for the same transaction id, device may not need to response to the new CBRA procedure with the same transaction ID when CFRA is ongoing. In our understanding, it is not a typical use case. Firstly, we assume that the network will not initiate both CBRA and CFRA for the same service request in parallel; Furthermore, even the case is valid, if the device terminates ongoing CFRA procedure and responses to the new CBRA paging with the transaction ID, based on the principle that device always response to the new paging from the reader with different transaction ID. The procedure still works. Therefore, we suggest the field related to the transaction ID is not needed for CFRA paging. |
| ETRI | No strong view | If there is a case where transaction ID is necessary for a command case, we are open to discuss about it. |
| ASUSTeK | No | We don’t see a strong need to introduce transaction ID in CFRA. |
| Spreadtrum | No |  |
| Apple | No |  |
| ZTE | Yes | Since command could take a long time (e.g. including twice the CN round trip delay), we think keeping the reader to be occupied during CFRA procedure for command is not good. So, some mechanism would be needed to avoid this issue. Transaction ID in paging message would be a simple way to solve this, but we are open to any other mechanism to ensure this.  Rappv2: So I understand the proposal is to have two paging message, both includes the same transaction ID, but one is for CBRA and the other is for CFRA. The goal is to insert the CBRA procedure between the inventory response and command request in the previous CBRA procedure, in order to make use of the radio resource between inventory response and command request. The potential impact is to allow CBRA and CFRA procedure to share the same transaction ID, and then interleave together. This also requires some further discussion on the AS release/transaction ID handling for this particular case, considering RAN2 agreed a device expects to only perform one procedure at a time, and CBRA and CFRA are considered as two separate procedures in the current running CR. |
| InterDigital | No | In CFRA, a device should always respond to a paging message with its transaction ID. So there is no need for transaction ID. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | As to the case from ZTE, we don’t see the practical use case to have parallel services. |
| Ericsson | No | The discussion/FFS was mainly triggered for the scenario where parallel CFRA and CBRA for the same service are on-going. We think that scenario doesn’t make much sense or can be avoided by the reader implementation. Therefore, we don’t think the transaction ID is needed for CFRA paging. |
| Qualcomm | No | The device has to respond to the CFRA anyway. |
| Ofinno | Yes | Considering RFID functionality, it seems desirable to allow parallel services for A-IoT at some point. Therefore, we share ZTE’s view that Transaction ID in paging message would be simple for this. |
| Sony | No |  |
| Docomo | No |  |
| Kyocera | No |  |
| CMCC | No |  |
| HONOR | No |  |
| Futurewei | No |  |
| Samsung | No |  |
| CEWiT | No |  |

**Summary:**

25 companies provided inputs.

23 companies believe there is no need to include transaction ID in the CFRA paging message for command case.

2 companies think adding transaction ID in CFRA paging message is useful, in order to allow CBRA paging and CFRA paging with the same transaction ID can interleave. The motivation is to let CBRA procedure to use the radio resource between inventory message and command request message of CFRA procedure, in case the latency is long. The rapp understands to support this requires further discussion on AS ID and transaction ID handling, which will also impact the running CR.

In this case, the rapp suggests to follow majority view and confirm transaction ID is not to be included in paging message for CFRA.

Proposal 3 (Issue 1-5 Transaction ID in CFRA paging): RAN2 confirms the pervious RAN2 baseline that transaction ID is not included in paging message for CFRA. (23/25)

### Issue 2-6: number indication of echoed random IDs

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Issue 2-6:  number indication of echoed random IDs in Msg2 | Whether to indicate the number of echoed random IDs included in Msg2.   * *RAN2 agreed that A-IoT Msg2 contains one or multiple echoed random ID(s) from A-IoT Msg1 of different A-IoT devices, but there is no discussion on whether/how to indicate the number of echoed random IDs. The Rapp understands this can be considered as signaling design/stage3 issue which should be quite straightforward.* * *Status in running CR: the CR is implemented assuming no explicit number indication, and no issue is identified.* | Companies are invited to input views for Q#5 |

As the running CR implemented, msg2 may include multiple entries, and each entry includes random ID, AS ID indication and AS ID if assigned. So the question is whether the device need to know the number of the entry when decoding msg2. The CR is implemented without an explicit number indication assuming the device just decodes the entry one by one till the end of the message. The same logic can also apply to NACK Feedback message.

**Q#5: Do companies agree that there is no need to indicate the number of random ID entry, the device just decodes the entry one by one till the end of the message?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree or not** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Partially agree with comments | For the NACK msg, we share the same view with the rapporteur. The device can know the end of the NACK based on the R2D TBS indication or postamble (either way is OK from RAN1 perspective). So the device can detect the 16-bit AS ID one by one to detect whether it is addressed. No other fields (except for msg type) exist in the NACK msg.  For the msg2, we prefer to put the echoed RN16 at the top of the msg2 format, for example,    By this way, after the device decoding the whole msg2, the device firstly checks the echoed RN16 to determine whether it finishes the contention resolution. If not, the device does not need to understand the remaining fields. This helps to the device complexity.  Rappv2: thanks for the explanation and discussion. As commented by other companies, PHY layer anyway needs to decode the whole message to perform CRC calculation, there should be no additional complexity assuming MAC can also see the message content of the whole message. In addition, the tag in RFID also decodes the R2D messages bit by bit, which is likely to be the device implementation, so it’s not certain which is more effective: processing in sequence or processing out of order. |
| OPPO | Yes | All bits of TB are verified via CRC checking. It is unclear to us why decoding the whole msg2 increases the device complexity. |
| vivo | Yes | The length of each entry in Msg2, i.e., random ID, AS ID indication and AS ID if assigned, is accurately determined. The number of random ID entry is useless for fast decoding and only increases the overhead. Anyway, device should decode the entry one-by-one till the end of the message or its own entry. Hence, there is no need to indicate the number of random ID entry.  Furthermore, we think Msg1 location indication in Msg2 is useful for RN16 collision case. We propose RAN2 to agree to include the Msg1 location indication in Msg2. |
| NEC | Yes | The simplest approach is to use the same format for multiple entries included in Msg.2; that is, each entry should include a random ID, an AS ID indication, and the AS ID (if assigned). The device can determine the start position of the next RN16 based on the previous AS ID indication. |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes | Same view as OPPO, do not see the additional device complexity. |
| Lenovo | Agree | Agree with Rapp that the device deocdes entry in Msg2 one by one is workable and enough. Do not see a strong need to indicate the number of entries |
| ETRI | Yes | Similar view with OPPO and Xiaomi. |
| ASUSTeK | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | As to the CATT’s point, we may have some doubts on the power saving gain by less decoding few fields in MAC, since anyway the R2D TB is decoded already by PHY. |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Docomo | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Agree |  |
| CMCC | Yes | We share the same view as rapporteur and vivo. |
| HONOR | Yes | This enhancement is not essential for the Msg2 decoding. |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes | To decode the Msg2, the device should carry out CRC checking for the whole message first, which means that the device already decodes each bit in Msg2 before deriving its own random ID. Given the length of each entry can be clearly determined, we didn’t see the need of the field of the number of entries. |
| CEWiT | Agree |  |

**Summary:**

24 companies provided inputs.

23 companies agree not to indicate the entry number for the random ID list in msg2, and the device just decodes the entry one by one till the end of the message. One company suggest to make two lists, one is for random ID and the other is for assigned AS ID. The motivation is to allow device first identify whether its random ID is included or not, which can potentially save decoding assigned AS ID if there is no its random ID at all. However, as replied by other companies, device anyway need to decode the whole message to perform CRC checking, so the benefit may not clear. So the rapp suggests to follow majority view. And the same handling applies to NACK feedback message.

Proposal 4 (Issue 2-6 entry number indication): No entry number is included in either Msg2 or NACK feedback message, and the device decodes the entries one by one till message end. (23/24)

### Issue 3-3: AS ID release

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Issue 3-3: AS ID release | Whether a release message is needed for AS ID release   * *Relevant agreements:* * *FFS other cases for release ASID to avoid keeping it indefinitely.* * *- For CBRA, to avoid AS ID being occupied for unnecessary time and to keep alignment between reader and device on AS ID release, device can release AS ID upon receiving paging message with different transaction ID, no matter the paging message is for it or not. FFS for CFRA* * *- FFS for need for release message* * *Status in running CR: captured as Editor’s Note in 5.2.* | Companies are invited to input views for Q#6 |

According to the current agreements/running CR, devices should release AS ID upon a CFRA paging message or upon a CBRA paging message with new transaction ID/resulting re-access which already address the issue “*avoid keeping it indefinitely*”. In this sense, whether to have a release message to enable early AS ID release is not a critical issue. But the rapp would like to check if there is a majority view on the need of the release message and the detailed solution.

**Q#6: Do companies agree that release message is needed for AS ID release? If so, which option is preferred?**

* **Opt1. Unicast message (only one AS ID)**
* **Opt2. Multiplexing with a list of AS ID (NACK message-like)**
* **Opt3. Broadcast message (without device AS ID)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Needed or not** | **Preferred option** |
| CATT | Option 3 | We share the similar view with the rapporteur there is no critical issue on the AS ID based on the current agreement. If we do some optimization for this early indication, we prefer Option 3, for example, the paging introduces one-bit to indicate this is the end of the current session, and all the devices end the current procedure with AS ID release.  Rappv2: I understand the proposed solution is that adding a bit in paging message, to indicate whether the devices who have successful completed the CBRA in the previous paging rounds with the same transaction ID need to release the AS ID. |
| OPPO | Not | The proponent should probably elaborate more on the use cases of the release message. |
| vivo | Yes | We think release message is useful in some cases, e.g., the interval between two paging messages is relatively long or transaction ID coordination between two readers is not easy. The release message is used to avoid useless AS context keeping and unexpected device's behaviors. And the overhead of the release message may be very small, e.g., via multiplexing and broadcast method. Of cause, unicast message is also necessary when single device is paged/released. Broadcast is also useful to reduce signaling overhead. Details can be left to reader implementation.  Rappv2: I understand the proposed solution is to define a new message type for the release message, which can include one AS ID or multiple AS IDs, and maybe no AS ID means release all device’s AS ID. |
| NEC | Opt1 or Opt2 | Since all access occasions are divided into several groups, each comprising m access occasions (where m equals X\*N\_"SFS" ), the completion of an A-IoT inventory or command in the failure-free case depends heavily on the randomly selected access occasion (or access occasion group). To prevent holding the AS ID indefinitely (here “indefinitely” meaning no further service request is received from the A-IoT CN after the current service is completed), we believe that an explicit AS ID release is necessary. For the scenario described above, either Option 1 or Option 2 is preferable. |
| LGE | Not | Regarding AS ID allocation and release, we see no functional issue which requires the explicit release message. Without the explicit release message, AS ID allocation and release seem to work well. If the intention is to further optimize the solution to avoid keeping AS ID indefinitely, as the moderator mentioned in the issue summary, it does not seem a critical issue. |
| Xiaomi | Not | We do not see the need to add an explicit release Msg. |
| Lenovo | Not needed | We understand the motivation of introducing release message is to release AS ID earlier, in order to reduce AS ID maintenance time and device energy consumption. However, it will also bring extra overhead to introduce release message. Opt1 and Opt2 introduce significant signalling overhead since reader needs to release AS ID for each device. Opt3 introduces extra processing complexity for device and may cause different format of paging messages if we add a release indication in some of the paging messages. For Opt2, if we use NACK message to release the AS ID, seems a little redundant with the existing agreed solution that ‘release AS ID when device triggers new msg1 transmission’, since device will re-access if receives NACK message. In conclusion, introducing release message may bring signalling overhead and device complexity. The benefit of release message is not very clear. |
| ETRI | Not needed | We think current agreements are enough as a release mechanism of AS ID. |
| ASUSTeK | Not | The system could work without an explicit release message for AS ID. |
| Spreadtrum | Not |  |
| Apple | No | Do not see a need for early release. Use paging message to release works. |
| ZTE | Not needed |  |
| InterDigital | Not needed | Current agreements already handle all issues. For instance, the device will anyway release the AS ID when a new CBRA is initiated and when the device runs out of energy. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not needed | Please note AS ID may be needed only for command case, where there will not too many devices under service. Even we specify the new message for the early release, there is no motivation for the BS/reader to release the AS ID earlier, in the cost of some overhead cost. The device is required to be able to maintain this AS ID until the next paging. |
| Ericsson | Perhaps Option 3 | It may be insufficient solely relying on paging message to release AS ID. In one scenario where interval/period between two subsequent paging message is very long or there is no subsequent paging message after a paging message is received, the reader and device(s) would need to keep the AS context for devices for too long time resulting in radio resource wastage. |
| Qualcomm | Not needed | No need to have separate explicit message to release AS ID |
| Ofinno | Preferable | It is preferable to define a safe-guard mechanism for the network to be able to release AS IDs (i.e., to terminate A-IoT procedure for one or more A-IoT devices). The different options address different scenarios, providing more flexibility to the network to better address specific A-IoT deployment requirements. At the minimum, a multicast or broadcast message (opt.2 or opt.3) seems helpful. |
| Sony | Not needed |  |
| Docomo | Option 1 but | Relying on release upon Paging works when the device is static, but cannot cover devices in mobility. For instance, given a device which is allocated an AS ID by Reader A and moving into Reader B’s coverage, it is possible that the device receive R2D data message from Reader B while the device has not reveiced Paging from Device B since the device was out of Reader B’s coverage at the time of Paging. In this case the AS ID can collide in Reader B.  Given the long duration required to execute the AIoT procedure and the fact that devices frequently move between coverage zones in indoor use cases such as logistics, I don't consider this a corner case. However, if companies do not recognize its importance, I’m fine with following along. |
| Kyocera | Not |  |
| CMCC | Not needed | We are open to this. However, if the majority supports the release message, Option 3 listed above is acceptable. |
| HONOR | Yes | Based on the current AS ID allocation mechanism, each device echoed by Msg2 would be allocated a AS ID which is newly assigned or prompted from the RN. More AS ID(s) are occupied and would only be released until the next paging as specified in the current CR. As we aligned in the previous email discussion, there is no need to assign the AS ID in the inventory only case. The device indicated by this release message could stop the current procedure in case of no following command or NACK. With this enhancement, the device could skip the decoding of every NACK message before the paging triggering the Msg1 transmission. |
| Futurewei | Not needed | As to Opt 3, we already have a broadcast mechanism, which is the paging message with new TID. |
| Samsung | Depending on the maximum number of devices in a specific service | This depends on whether the number of devices for one specific service can exceed 2^16 or not. If such service exists, the AS ID reusing among different devices are necessary (i.e., the reader has to recycle the AS ID and assign it to other device), which requires the timely release of the AS ID.  According to the latest RAN3 specification, the maximum number of devices is 2048, i.e.,   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | IE/Group Name | Presence | Range | IE type and reference | Semantics description | | Approximate Number of Target A-IoT Devices | O |  | INTEGER (1..2048, …) |  |   Based on this, a dedicated release message seems to be unnecessary. However, it is better to confirm whether 2048 is the maximum value for the number of devices in one service.  Rappv2: after some internal checking with the RAN3 WI rapp, this value has not been well discussed, so it’s like to be replaced with a larger number. |

**Summary:**

24 companies provided inputs.

16 companies clearly stated opposition. 2 companies are ok to follow majority views.

On the other hand, the arguments from the proponents are generally that releasing it as early as possible would be beneficial, but seems no one mentioned a scenario where release the AS IDs upon reception of paging as now would cause the system to stop working. Among the proponents, the preference of the solution is not fully aligned:

* 2 companies (vivo, NEC) prefer to support both unicast and multicast.
* 1 company (Docomo) prefer unicast message.
* 1 company (Ofino) prefer multicast and broadcast.
* 2 company (Ericsson, CATT) prefer to have a broadcast message or adding an indication in paging message.

One thing worth to mention is that during the CR review, some companies provided comments that device should release AS ID upon reception of NACK feedback message. This does not require new message, so basically comes for free. So the rapp wonders whether companies would like consider this as a method of early AS release. If so, we can discuss and confirm this in the meeting.

Proposal 5 (Issue 3-3 AS ID release): Explicit release message is not needed. (18/24). [If needed: New message can include no AS ID (to release all devices) or AS ID list (to release one or multiple devices).]

### Issue 3-5: D2R message type

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Issue 3-5: D2R message type | Whether to support D2R message type   * *Relevant agreements:* * *FFS whether we introduce D2R message type. Discuss after looking at the overall MAC header design and space before deciding whether we introduce message type or reserved bits* * *FFS D2R message type. Current running CR will capture no message type, but we can revisit this next meeting and also consider if any other bits are needed for the MAC header* * *Status in running CR: captured as Editor’s Note in 6.1.1.* | Companies are invited to input views for Q#7 |

According to the previous discussion, some companies propose to have D2R message type for further proof. But it’s not crystal clear what’s the future scenario they are thinking of. Considering the R20 scope/objectives are relatively stable now, companies are invited to double check if the D2R message type is necessary and provide detailed reason and use cases if any.

**Q#7: Whether D2R message type is necessary and what’s the use case if any?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Necessary or not** | **Use cases** |
| CATT | Not |  |
| OPPO | Not |  |
| vivo | See comments | It seems not critical to introduce D2R message type. But we are open to understand the motivation. |
| NEC | No for Rel-19 |  |
| LGE | See comments | Based on the rapporteur’s summary, we are open to discussing future scenarios for which D2R message type is beneficial, including a scenario using DO-A D2R transmissions which is not scheduled by R2D message. |
| Xiaomi | Not |  |
| Lenovo | Not Needed | Although DO-A is an import traffic type in R20, in Rel-20 WIDs, there was a note saying “Coexistence between Device 1 and Device 2b/C is not considered in the same deployment in the same band”. From our side, it implies DO-A transmission by device 2b/C will not co-exist with legacy Rel-19 device 1. It may be not needed to differentiate DO-A transmission and DT transmission especially for Rel-19 device(s).  While for Rel-20 target for device 2b/C, except the frequently energy status report during the procedure, the device may send the senssor data or emergency data to reader. In such case the device may actively send these message with pre-configured resource, hence, D2R message type may not be needed to enable reader know which type of data received from device. |
| ETRI | Not needed for Rel-19 |  |
| ASUSTeK | See comments | For future cases, we share the same view with LGE that it could be beneficial for DO-A D2R transmission. |
| Spreadtrum | No for R19 |  |
| Apple | Yes | The absent of D2R message type in R19 means for Rel-20 active device in DO-DTT procedure, a different message format has to be supported for Msg1/3…this is not a good design and adds unnecessary work for Rel-20. We prefer to add D2R message type in R19 design and prevent this issue.  On the other hand, companies may use the lack of D2R message type in R19 to further constrain the R20 DO-A design (as Lenovo suggested to use pre-configured DO-A transmission resource) to further exclude D2R message type in R20. That seems a very negative side effect of not have a procedure-independent means to differentiate any A-IoT MAC messages from the signaling formats perspective.  In general, unable to discern different signaling messages from signaling format design, (but relying on when and where the signalling message is transmitted) is an exception and risky practice in L2/L3 protocol design for a communication system. Hence, we prefer to have a D2R message type in D2R messages. |
| ZTE | Preferred | In general, having no D2R message type would need the reader to exactly know which message is to be expected in D2R direction at all times. In general, protocol design should not require such state maintenance at the reader and hence we prefer to have a D2R message type included both for reader simplification and future proofing of the standard. |
| InterDigital | Not needed for R19, but preferred | While not needed for R19, it’s preferrable to have the message type as it improves future extendibility. If we decide to not include message type now, then every new D2R message we add to the protocol later would need to be introduced in a fashion in which it is not fully backward compatible. For example, it would force new information to always be included at the end of the message. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not necessary | The point is that this D2R message type for future does not come free for now.  Please note that device 1 and active devices will not co-exist in the same reader, as in R20 WID.  The argument is mainly for R20 further proof.  See no critical technical issue for R19. |
| Ericsson |  | Agree with Lenovo and other companies’ comment, the message type is not needed. For DO-A traffic, devices need to have (pre)configured resources which are different from the resources for passive accesses. Based on which, the reader can distinguish the Msg types of devices in different releases if they coexist in the same deployment in the same band. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | W/o D2R message type will require the reader to fully track the R2D message and D2R response w/o any error. Standard not studying the coexistence of device 1 and active devise does not mean there is no possibility to have different types of devices in the same area. |
| Ofinno | Yes | We also share the views from Apple, ZTE and Qualcomm. |
| Sony | No | We see no need for rel19. |
| Docomo | Not needed | Based on the conditions in the Release 20 WID, a gNB that supports Rel-20 AIoT will not receive D2R messages from Rel-19 devices. In other words, within the context of future Rel-20 discussions, we can consider introducing new messages dedicated for Rel-20 which are based on Rel-19 messages. Then introducing a message type field in Rel-20 would be sufficient. |
| Kyocera | Not | Regarding DO-A in Rel-20, we have similar view as Lenovo and Ericsson, and we assume some resource control by the reader even for DO-A, i.e., the device doesn’t have the complete freedom when/where it initiates the DO-A D2R transmission. In this case, the reader can allocate different resources for different traffic types as pointed out by Ericsson. |
| CMCC | Not |  |
| HONOR | Not needed for R19, but preferred |  |
| Futurewei | Not needed for Rel-19 | Agree with Lenovo, Ericsson, and Kyocera. DO-A traffic needs to be separated from non-DO-A traffic, in time, frequency, or both, even if the devices may be in the same proximity; otherwise, the CW required for device 1 will become interference for DO-A devices. |
| Samsung | No |  |
| CEWiT | No for Rel-19 |  |

**Summary:**

25 companies provided inputs.

17 companies (CATT, OPPO, vivo, NEC, Xiaomi, Lenovo, ETRI, Spreadtrum, Huawei, Ericsson, Sony, Docomo, Kyocera, CMCC, Futurewei, Samsung, CEWiT) clearly confirm that D2R message type is not needed. 3 companies (ZTE, InterDigital, HONOR) also confirmed there is no clear case requiring D2R message type in R19, but it’s nice to have it to keep the possibility of further extension.

5 companies (LGE, ASUSTek, Apple, Qualcomm, Ofinno) think D2R message type is necessary to accommodate the DO-A case in R20.

The rapp would like summarize the companies views on the two concerns and make sure there is no problem to confirm no D2R message type:

* For this further extension, the rapp agrees that we mustn’t completely block this direction and then think of some fallback methods. The thinking is that at lease the spare value of SDU length (in this release only 1-125 are used, 126 and 127 can be considered as reserved value) can indicate the future message, if needed. But adding D2R message type introduce one byte to the inventory response and command response in this release, when there is no clear possibility that future expansion will be needed.
* For the DO-A case, as many companies explained, in R20 SID and WID, it clearly states that Coexistence between Device 1 and Device 2b/C is not considered in the same deployment in the same band. This implies that the two types of devices will operate either in different band, or in different area. This is because the interference issue in a coexistence scenario can not be easily addressed, especially not by a D2R message type in MAC message.

Based on above discuss, the rapp would suggest to follow majority view and confirm D2R message type is not introduced in this release.

Proposal 6 (Issue 3-5 D2R message type): RAN2 confirms D2R message type is not introduced in this release (Rationale: no valid requirement, as DOA coexist with R19 device is excluded in R20 WID). (17+3/25)

### Issue 1-7: Security parameter in Paging message

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| (New)Issue 1-7: Security parameter | How to include the security parameters in Paging message.   * *SA3 sent a LS after May meeting in S3-252392, indicating “SA3 is assuming the ability to include an additional parameter, a 128bit random number in the paging request message.” The potential RAN2 impact is to add another field in paging message to contain this security parameter.* * *Status in running CR: not captured yet* | Companies are invited to input views for Q#8 |

This parameter is already agreed by SA3 and reflected in their TS 33.369 as follows. It’s RAN2 usual business to capture the security parameters in AS HL message if required by SA3. For this 128bit random number, it’s should be feasible to be included in Paging message, which can be done in the August meeting. If SA3/CT1 conclude anything other by August meeting, we can implement in MAC spec in post CR update as usual. And if they make further conclusions after August, we can adapt in the MAC spec in Oct and Nov meetings.

|  |
| --- |
| **Copied from SA3 TS TS 33.369 V0.2.0**   1. ADM shall generate RANDAIOT\_n.   Editor’s Note: Whether ADM or AIOTF generates RANDAIOT\_n is FFS.  2. AIOTF shall send inventory request message including RANDAIOT\_n to NG-RAN.  Editor’s Note: The inclusion of RANDAIOT\_n in Paging Request and the size of RANDAIOT\_n needs RAN confirmation.  3. NG-RAN shall send the paging request message including RANDAIOT\_n to the AIoT device.  Editor’s Note: Whether replay attack is possible is FFS.  … |

**Q#8: Do companies agree to add a 128-bit field in Paging message to contain the security parameter in Aug meeting?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Yes | This is needed based on SA3 agreement. |
| ASUSTeK | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes | A single random number (even for group paging) can be included in paging message. We need to check the final size of the paging message to ensure that it doesn’t require segmentation once the paging message format is finalized. |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | For authentication procedure, we agree to add a 128 bit security parameters in paging message. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | This is to implement SA3 conclusion. |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Ofinno | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Docomo | Yes |  |
| LGE2 | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| HONOR | Yes |  |
| ETRI | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | - | OK with the size of 128 bit security parameter but not sure if it should be carried in the AioT paging message in the R2D direction. For the D2R direction, the device also needs to send its RANDAIOT\_d in its Inventory Response to the AIOTF. Inventory Response is sent as an AioT NAS PDU. It is a little bit odd that RANDAIOT\_d issent in AioT NAS PDU while theRANDAIOT\_n is sent in AioT MAC PDU. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |

**Summary:**

23 companies provided inputs.

22 companies agree to add a 128-bit field in Paging message to contain the security parameter.

1 company think this should be put in the same AS container together with paging ID.

The rapp observes there is a clear majority view, and no technical concern from the comments, then suggest we go with the proposal.

Proposal 7 (Issue 1-7 security parameter): add 128-bit field in paging message to contain the security parameter. (22/23)

### Issue 3-7: more data indication

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| (New)Issue 3-7: more data indication handling | How to set “more data indication” value in case of no NAS response available (i.e., zero SDU)   * *During CR implementation, the rapp identified there is no clear conclusion how to set the “more data indication” in case of no data available, i.e., zero SDU.* * *Status in running CR: captured as value FFS.* | Companies are invited to input views for Q#9 |

Given that the “more data indication” is a 1-bit field, and value 0 means there is no more data, while value 1 means there is more data, in this “no NAS response available” case, this indication should be set to “1”, as there will be more data once the NAS response is available.

**Q#9: Do companies agree to set “more data indication” value to “1” in case of no NAS response available (i.e., zero SDU)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| Apple | No | If I understand correctly, “more data” is a MAC-layer indication of subsequent segments, not to indicate the “NAS layer” more data. We think the “0 SDU” means what it is as the name suggests, what the reader will do next is completely up to reader. The device does not need to suggest “1” in more data indicator. |
| ASUSTeK | No | Since the NAS response is unavailable at the time when the device transmits the D2R message, the more data indication should be set as zero. Otherwise, the reader may schedule another D2R transmission which still includes zero SDU. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | We assume “more data indication” field is mandatory, and therefore we need to decide which value 0 or 1 shall be set for the case zero SDU. With value 1+zero SDU, the reader can know that it is for the case that NAS response is not available. |
| ZTE | No | Isn’t the agreement that we transmit an SDU of zero length in this case? i.e. all padding? If more data is included, the reader may schedule another D2R transmission and it is unclear when this will stop. No need for further optimization. As agreed, this is up to NAS layer to solve. |
| InterDigital | Yes | In our view, it is necessary, otherwise there is no way to avoid that the reader sends an empty SDU to the NAS layer. The more data indication set to ‘1’ combined with a zero SDU ensures the reader knows it is for the case of device not ready. |
| Spreadtrum | See comments | We are not sure whether more data indication field is mandatory. If we assume it is mandatory, it doesn’t matter whether the value set to 1 or 0. Because the reader can determine that the NAS response is not available based on 0 SDU and all MAC padding. The reader can schedule the davice again later. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Now, this “more data indication” is not limited to segmentation purpose anymore.  Apple’s comment seems indicating the “1” more data indication is redundant with “0 SDU”. However, as long as the field is mandatory, “1” is better than “0” to indicate “more data is to be available, since the data is not available now”  The point is to first conclude the value, if we assumes the field is mandatory. |
| Ericsson | No | Since the reader doesn’t know in how long time the delayed NAS response will be available at the device, it is not helpful for the device to indicate “1”, i.e., more data coming. So that the reader cannot schedule subsequent D2R transmission occasions in good time. We can revisit if we get input (LS response) from SA2 and/or CT1 later. |
| Lenovo | Yes | We also think “1” is better than “0”, at least the reader could know there will be followed data although not know when it will be coming. |
| Qualcomm | No | ‘0 SDU’ is already clear to indicate that the NAS response is not ready. The ‘more data indication’ is used for segmentation case. If ‘more data indication’ is set to 1, reader may immediately send the D2R resource, but NAS response may still not be ready. |
| vivo | Yes | As far as our understanding, both More Data Indication bit and SDU Length are necessary fields for a D2R MAC PDU. In case the D2R response is not available, the device sets More Data Indication to 1 and SDU Length to 0 in the MAC PDU for response. Upon reception of such D2R MAC PDU, the reader can figure out that the device has received the cmd and needs more time to prepare the D2R response. This is one simple and feasible solution for this issue. |
| Ofinno | See comment | In our understanding, this approach would mean that the value gets multiple meanings:  Based on current running CR:   * Case 1.a) When there is still the last data/segment to transmit 🡪 value = 1 * Case 1.b) When it is the last data/segment to transmit 🡪 value = 0   Depending on whether upper layer operation is visible or not to MAC, the following cases are also to be considered:   * Case 2.a) When the MAC knows there is no data available due to the delay (e.g., NAS layer) but there will be (e.g. in the near future) 🡪 value = 1 * Case 2.b) When the MAC does not know whether there is any response/data (e.g., in the near future) 🡪 value = 0   It can work with the understanding that the device’s feedback might be more open (i.e., not as concrete). |
| Sony | See comment | We think RAN2 should wait for LS response |
| Docomo | No | When the More Data Indication field is set to 1, the Reader understands that it should wait for the next segment at the MAC layer. In this case, if the field is set to 1, it means the Reader MAC—not the CN—will be waiting for data from the device, which seems to contradict the fact that we sent LS to CT1 to solve the issue.  Rather, to ensure the behavior where the Reader forwards data to the CN when the More Data Indication field is 0, which is consistent to segmentation function, the field should be set to 0 in this case. |
| LGE2 | No | Firstly, more data indication is intended to indicate whether there is a remaining segment or not. It is not for the delayed or unavailable NSA response. Secondly, as Apple, ASUSTeK and ZTE mentioned, NAS layer is responsible for handling the situation. Also, as mentioned by Docomo, RAN2 already includes the following text in the LS to CT1.  “RAN2 have not agreed on a mechanism for the device to transmit the delayed NAS response to the reader. RAN2 would prefer that this situation be avoided or handled by CT1.”  Based on that, we think that the case of no NAS response available is handled in the upper layers. |
| Kyocera | No | We wonder how the device AS layer determines “no NAS response available” as “more data available”. |
| CMCC | Yes | Setting the “more data indication” to 1 and, length of SDU to 0 simultaneously can inform the reader about the no NAS response available. We understand it is a feasible solution. The reader can schedule the NAS response with subsequent D2R resource. |
| HONOR | No | Firstly, the MDI is used to indicator whether there is more data left after segmentation and the reader schedules resource for the following data. However, in this case, there no higher layer data for now. Secondly, the reader could know there is no Data SDU according to SDU length field and could determine the response to AIoTF accordingly. Last but not least, if CT1 provides the NAS based solution for the identified solution mentioned in the LS, there is no need to set “more data indication” value to “1”. Thus, we prefer waiting for the response from the CT and discussing the RAN-based solution only if needed. |
| ETRI | No | We have same view with Ericsson. |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| Samsung | No for now | “more data indication” is introduced for segmentation. While, here, delayed NAS response does not mean segmentation. Let’s wait for response from SA2 and/or CT1 first. |
| OPPO | No | Agree with other companies that “more data indication” is introduced for segmentation. |
| CATT | No | We share the similar view with Apple. According to the current MAC running CR, the “More data indication” is set by the MAC layer. That is to say, this indication represents the segment the MAC PDU due to not a large enough D2R TBS, but not to indicate it follows upper layer data. As ZTE pointed out, even we set this indication with value 1, the reader may schedule a new D2R but the device still doesn’t complete the write operation. So we prefer value 0. |

**Summary:**

23 companies provided inputs.

7 companies (Xiaomi, InterDigital, Huawei, Lenovo,vivo, CMCC, Futurewei) believe in this case more data indication should be set to 1, to indicate that there will be data arriving later.

13 companies (Apple, ASUSTek, ZTE, Ericsson,Qualcomm, Docomo, LGE, Kyocera, HONOR, ETRI, Samsung, OPPO, CATT ) disagree to set the value to 1. And the main reason seems to be “more data indication” can only be used for segmentation.

* The rapp would like to clarify there is no direct relationship between segmentation and this indication now, because for the non-segmentation case, this indication is also present and the value is set to 0, otherwise RAN2 needs to agree to introduce different messages for non-segmentation and segmentation case, just to skip this indication which is not worth it. Then, setting the value to 0 meaning no more date looks not self-consistent with the situation: *the data is not available now, but will available later*.

2 companies (Spreadtrum, Ofinno) think it does not matter much which value is used as anyway the reader can learn the situation from 0 SDU already.

* The rapp agrees with the above analyze, but prefer to specify the value setting in a self-consistent way in the spec, if possible.

1 company (Sony) wants to wait for CT1.

* The rapp understands RAN2 already agreed to capture the no data available case, then how to set the message content is a pure RAN2 issue, not relying on CT1’s solution.

Proposal 8 (Issue 3-7 More data indication): For no data available case, RAN2 to quick decide either to set more data indication to "1" (7 companies) or "0" (13 companies). (Note: reader behavior is expected to be same either way).

### Issue 3-8: R2D TBS

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Subgroup: R2D message content for data transmission** | | |
| (New) Issue 3-8: R2D TBS | How to handle the R2D TBS, which may impact R2D padding, byte-alignment design.   * *Relevant agreements:* * *RAN1 LS in R1-2504915* * *The length field inside MAC for SDU is not needed for R2D messages, assuming R2D MAC padding is not needed. FFS can come back if padding is needed depending on granularity of TBS (only if needed)* * *Status in running CR: not captured yet.* | Companies are invited to input views for Q#10 |

The related RAN1 agreements For R2D reception are copied as below. So in RAN2, we need to decide: 1. which messages need to include such information; 2. what’s the format (e.g., length, value range).

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**  R2D postamble is specified with 4 ON chips corresponding to M value of the PRDCH   * R2D postamble is added immediately after the PRDCH * R2D postamble has always 4 ON chips   + Note: For M=24, 2 ON chips at the end of OFDM symbol for CP handling are in addition to R2D postamble, and are not part of the R2D postamble * R2D padding duration is determined after R2D postamble insertion   TBS information for R2D is supported via higher layer R2D control signalling.   * Send LS to RAN2 asking to include R2D TBS information (excluding CRC length) in higher layer signaling, at least for messages with variable size.   Note: Exact method for determining the end of PRDCH at the device is not specified. |

According to RAN1 agreement, there is no technical requirement to use this info for the fixed size R2D message, and among the current R2D messages (i.e., Paging message, Access Trigger message, Random ID Response message, R2D Upper Layer Data Transfer message, NACK Feedback message), Access Trigger message is the only one with fixed message, which does not need to have this TBS information.

**Q#10.1: Do companies agree that the R2D TBS information is not included in the message with fixed length (e.g., Access Trigger message)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| Apple | NO | We think it is better to always included this field at the beginning of all R2D message to reduce device complexity. Otherwise, device need to decode message type first to determine whether it has TBS field or not.  [Apple 2]: we do not agree with the “Performance degradation” argument in ASUS. The trigger message has to be used in combination with the paging message. If the device can receive a much longer paging message, why it cannot decode the much shorter trigger message?  Rappv2: I think the comment is not about the decoding but the signaling overhead. For instance, the R2D TBS may be 7-bit long according to the discussion below, then adding a unnecessary 7 bits to a 3-bit long frequently occurring message would impact the system efficiency. |
| ASUSTeK | Yes | Based on Q#10.2, the TBS is at least 6 bits. If the Access Trigger message includes the TBS information, this message would become above 9 bits or even align to 16 bits. Such a large overhead of TBS information could be redundant and could cause performance degradation. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | Access trigger message is only used as sync message, and should be transmitted frequently, the small size is preferred in order to reduce the total overhead, In addition, the size is fixed, therefore TBS is not needed for it.  Then it means, the TBS shall be put after the Message type. We do not see the difficulty from device side to support it. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| InterDigital | No | Agree with Apple |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | For the fixed length message, there is no need to indicate TBS information |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | As clarified in RAN1 LS.  Device needs to decodes the message type anyway. |
| Ericsson | Yes | Agree that TBS information is not needed for Access Trigger message. The TBS information is only needed if R2D message size is not fixed. |
| Lenovo | Yes | TBS is not needed for fixed size message. |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Ofinno | See comment | Suggest narrowing down the question to Access Trigger message. If this, we share Xiaomi’s view that it is preferable to define it with a fixed length as it would be transmitted very frequently. For other R2D messages, it is preferable to always include the TBS information.  Rappv2: right, Access Trigger message is the only one with fixed message size. |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Docomo | Yes |  |
| LGE2 | Yes | If the Access trigger message is also byte-aligned and TBS field is included, reception of the message can be processed in the same manner as other R2D messages. However, the overhead induced from byte-alignment and explicit TBS field seems considerable, particularly compared to the essential information of the message. So, we can accept Access trigger message format without TBS field. |
| Kyocera | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes | The TBS information is not necessary for fixed size. |
| HONOR | See comment | We share similar view with Ofinno, this issue is only about the access trigger message. Although we think the aligned design reduces the complexity of the device, we can compromise that the TBS is not included in the Access trigger message. |
| ETRI | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes | Access trigger message has a fixed size and uniqueness among all R2D messages. When receiving it, the device can determine the length based on the preamble and postamble, which can determine whether it is trigger message. |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| CEWiT | Yes | No need to indicate in case of fixed size. |
| CATT | Yes |  |

**Summary:**

24 companies provided inputs.

22 companies (ASUSTek, Xiaomi, ZTE, Spreadtrum, Huawei, Ericsson, Lenovo, Qualcomm, vivo, Ofinno, Sony, Docomo, LGE, Kyocera, CMCC, HONOR, ETRI, Futurewei, Samsung, OPPO, CEWiT, CATT) agree that access trigger message is the only R2D message with fixed value, and R2D TBS info is not needed for it.

2 companies (Apple, InterDigital) think it is better to always included this field at the beginning of all R2D message to reduce device complexity.

* The rapp would like to clarify the R2D TBS can be added right after R2D message type indication, in this case the device first decodes R2D message type, then know the format of the message including whether there is a R2D TBS.

Based on above situation, the rapp would suggest to go with majority view.

Proposal 9-1 (Issue 3-8 R2D TBS): R2D TBS information is not included in the Access Trigger message.(22/24)

Then for other R2D messages with variable length, the TBS information is required, but it’s not crystal clear whether it should be a 7-bit indication with value range from 1 byte to 125 bytes, like what defined for D2R TBS, or this could be a shorter indication with less candidate values in order to save some signaling overhead. Since this has not been thoroughly discussed in RAN2, it would be good to hear company’ views first.

**Q#10.2: Do companies agree to add a R2D TBS field in the beginning of the R2D messages with variable length (i.e., Paging message, Random ID Response message, R2D Upper Layer Data Transfer message, NACK Feedback message)? and if so, how many bits it requires and what’s the according value range?**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree or not** | **How many bits** | **Value range** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Agree | 8-bit | 0-255 (or up to RAN1 range) | Not sure about the significance of overhead reduction by using shorter field. For us, always one-octet at the beginning of all R2D message is desirable. |
| ASUSTeK | Comment | At least 6 bits |  | The R2D TBS field should be added after the message type field, if Q#10.1 is agreed.  Currently the length of Random ID Response message could exceed 32 bytes, so the TBS should be at least 6 bits. On the other hand, the R2D TBS also depends on the amount of R2D upper layer data for command. |
| Xiaomi | Agree | 7 or 8 bit | 0-127 or 0-255 | Not strong opinion on 7 or 8 bits considering the max size of message should be 1000bits, therefore 7 bits is sufficient. |
| ZTE | Agree | TBD | TBD | Reducing the overhead if possible, considering the candidate values may be useful as suggested by rapporteur, but this needs further analysis. We also need to ensure byte alignment in the end. |
| InterDigital | Agree | 7 or 8 bits | 0-127 or 0-255 |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree | 7 bits | 0-127 | There is no need to reduce the accuracy of TBS indication in order to save a few bits. |
| Ericsson | agree | 8 bits? |  | It is perhaps better to support 8 bits, considering the paging message size will be increased due to inclusion of “security parameters” . |
| Lenovo | Agree | 8 bits |  |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree | 7 bits |  |  |
| vivo | Agree | 7 bits |  | No strong view but better to be aligned with SDU Length. |
| Ofinno | Agree | 7 or 8 bits |  |  |
| Docomo | Agree | 7 or 8 bits | 0-127 or 0-255 | We share the similar view to Xiaomi. |
| LGE2 | Comment | 7 or 8 bits |  | Firstly, considering that RAN1 operation uses the R2D TBS field, it seems proper that the field is located in the beginning of the R2D message. However, if R2D TBS field is omitted in the case of Access trigger message, we have a concern about how an A-IoT device distinguishes the Access trigger message from the other message formats. As mentioned by ASUSTeK, it may be considered that R2D TBS field is added after the message type field.  Secondly, if the maximum message size is considered as 1000 bits, TBS field length should be at least 7 bits and the unit of values is byte. |
| Kyocera | Partially agree | TBD | TBD | We wonder if the R2D TBS field is needed only for Random ID Response message and NACK Feedback message. Furthermore, we assume the fields for number of Echoed Random IDs and number of AS IDs are sufficient in the two messages, instead of R2D TBS field, since all the fields in these messages are fixed length. In this case, a smaller number of bits can work to determine the R2D TBS. |
| CMCC | Agree | 7 bits | 0-127 | Considering the maximum data size is 1000bits, 7 bits TBS is enough. |
| HONOR | Agree | 7 | 0-127 |  |
| ETRI | Agree | 7 or 8 bits |  |  |
| Samsung | Agree | 7 for now | TBD |  |
| OPPO | Agree | 7 for now |  | In Rel-20, the paging message size could be large when paging message includes the security parameters, device ID and Rel-20 DO-A parameters. |
| CATT | Comment | TBD | TBD | We are wondering how the device decodes the whole message correctly without TB size info?  Because before reading the msg content of a R2D msg, the device should firstly check the CRC to determine the potential error. That is to say, the device needs to know the TB firstly so that it can perform the CRC checking. It seems meaningless to put the TBS field in the content of R2D msg.  Rappv2: my understanding is that CRC check is to ensure the whole message is decoded correctly, so the device implementation still could be able to decode the part before CRC and derive the content defined in MAC.Then if later CRC checking does not pass, the device needs to stop/withdrawn this message. |

**Summary:**

20 companies provided inputs.

Almost all companies agree to add R2D TBS info in the R2D messages with variable length (i.e., Paging message, Random ID Response message, R2D Upper Layer Data Transfer message, NACK Feedback message). One company questioned how this TBS info is to be used considering CRC has not been calculated yet.

For the length, most companies think 7 bits (in unit of byte) should be sufficient for 1000-byte long message. 2 companies (ZTE, Kyocera) suggest to further analyze how to reduce the length.

Based on above situation, the rapp would suggest to go with majority view.

Proposal 9-2 (Issue 3-8 R2D TBS): Add a 7-bit R2D TBS field (in unit of byte) after R2D message type indication in variable-length R2D messages (i.e., Paging message, Random ID Response message, R2D Upper Layer Data Transfer message, NACK Feedback message). (17/20)

### Issue 2-3: R2D trigger message byte alignment

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Issue 2-3: R2D trigger message byte alignment | The R2D trigger message should be byte aligned or not.   * *Relevant agreements:* * *The MAC PDU should be byte-aligned, assuming the allocated TBS value is in the unit of byte. The actual TBS value depends on RAN1. FFS for R2D trigger message.* * *FFS R2D byte alignment dependent on TBS size discussion* * *Status in running CR: not captured yet.* | Companies are invited to input views for Q#11 |

According to previous RAN2 discussion, majority of companies were inclined to R2D byte-alignment for simplicity. However, for Access Trigger message which appears extremely frequently, in order to make it byte-aligned, a large proportion of padding is required, which will waste a lot of transmission resources and have a significant impact on system performance. That is why there is still FFS for the R2D trigger message byte alignment. But it’s time to make a final decision.

**Q#11: Do companies agree to make the Access Trigger message bit-aligned instead of byte-aligned, as it’s with fixed length which is less than one byte?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| Apple | See comment | What is the concern of “a large proportion of padding is required”? how large is this?  Rappv2: 5 bits of padding would be needed for a 3-bit long message. |
| ASUSTeK | No strong view |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes | From MAC perspective, so far only 3 bits message type is contained for Access Trigger message. 5 additional bits are needed if we want to support byte align for it. |
| ZTE | Yes | This message is very frequent and impacts system performance as rapporteur pointed out correctly. So, we support minimizing the size. |
| InterDigital | No | It would seem simpler for the design to always assume byte alignment. |
| Spreadtrum | No | From the perspective of air interface transmission, the physical layer needs to perform operations such as CRC, and bit alignment does not seem to save overhead. And byte aligned seem more simpler for the design. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Agree with ZTE.  3-bit message type is the only useful information. The rest 5 bits (62.5%) are redundant. |
| Ericsson | No strong view |  |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| vivo | No | From MAC perspective, the payload of MAC PDU should be in number of bytes. |
| Ofinno | No strong view |  |
| LGE2 | Yes | Although it seems to make an exception, if there is no information except the message type information of 3 or 4 bits, we can accept it. |
| Kyocera | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes | Agree with ZTE. |
| HONOR | Yes | If there is no more mandatory field in the message, bit-aligned is enough. |
| ETRI | No strong view | Tradeoff between resource usage and simplicity. |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| Samsung | No |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |

**Summary:**

21 companies provided inputs.

12 companies (Xiaomi, ZTE, Huawei, Lenovo, Qualcomm, LGE, Kyocera, CMCC, HONOR, Futurewei, OPPO) prefer to make access trigger message as bit-aligned, i.e. 3-bit short.

5 companies (Apple, Interdigital, Spreadtrum, vivo, Samsung) prefer byte-alignment to align with other R2D message.

4 companies (ASUSTeK, Ericsson, Ofinno, ETRI) have no strong view.

The rapp does not see technical issue to allow bit-alignment for access trigger message. On the other hand, there is a slightly majority is ok go with bit-alignment, which is also beneficial for signaling efficiency. In this case, the rapp would suggest to follow majority view.

Proposal 10 (Issue 2-3 trigger message alignment): Access Trigger message is bit-aligned (no padding bits). (16/21)

### Issue 4-5: Forward compatibility

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| (New)Issue 4-5: Forward compatibility | Whether to consider forward compatibility for R2D messages other than Paging message.   * *In WID RP-250796 , only paging is required to consider forward compatibility as indicated in “RAN2 aims to design a paging message format such that multiple identifiers can be contained in one paging message, for forward compatibility purposes.”* * *But companies may wonder whether this can be extended to other R2D messages.* | Companies are invited to input views for Q#12 |

For Paging message design, in last RAN2 meeting, there are two methods agreed: 1. To ensure forward compatibility for paging with multiple identifiers, introduce at least one R field. FFS if more than one R bit is required. 2. Rel-19 devices would ignore the content of future release instead of ignoring the whole paging message. If other messages are identified with the need of forward compatibility, the similar methods can be applied to those messages. In addition, since most messages are non-integer bytes, so the left spare bits can be taken as reserved bits for future use anyway.

In previous RAN2 discussion, companies may think future extension is necessary when R20 is coming. However, according to R20 SID RP-251884 and WID RP-251885, it’s clear “Coexistence between Device 1 and Device 2b/C is not considered in the same deployment in the same band.”. Therefore, we need to first understand whether there is a use case to consider forward compatibility and which messages would be impact to.

**Q#12: Which R2D message(s) other than paging message need to consider forward compatibility using similar handling as paging, with the corresponding the use case clearly clarified.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Which message(s)** | **Use case, expected device behavior, other comments** |
| Apple |  | Not sure about the purpose of discussion. As there are enough “R” or spare bits in the R2D header, we have no problem for forward-compatibility. Is it intended to revert the earlier agreement?  Rappv2: no impact to the conclusion made for paging message. |
| ASUSTeK | D2R Upper Layer Data Transfer message | In section 3, what we mentioned is considering forward compatibility for **D2R message**.  The D2R message type could be added in Rel-20. Moreover, as agreed in study phase, the device could provide energy status report/indication, which could be considered for active device in Rel-20. The device could also report its device type, if needed in Rel-20. |
| Xiaomi |  | We do not see issue for 2b/2c and DO-A considering coexistence with device 1 is not considered in R20. The only thing we may need to consider is, whether to support multiple reader scenario in R20 for device 1. If yes, paging may be impacted. But R bit should be sufficient. |
| ZTE |  | As long as the messages are future extendable (e.g. using R bit) there is no issue for these messages other than paging. |
| InterDigital |  | Agree with ZTE |
| Spreadtrum |  | In R20, the parallel service from the same reader and multiple reader scenario may be supported. If yes, paging and access trigger message may be impacted. We are not sure whether R bit should be added in access trigger message or add new message type in R20. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | Agree with ZTE |
| vivo |  | There is no strong motivation. |
| Ofinno |  | Agree with ZTE |
| Sony |  | Agree with ZTE |
| LGE2 |  | We don’t think that R20 design is separated from R19 design even though co-existence is not considered in R20 SID/WID. Expecting that future releases including R20 will be designed on top of R19 design, some reserved bits need to be considered in R19 message formats. However, we don’t think that detailed discussion on forward compatibility with R20 is the scope of this release. |
| Kyocera |  | Agree with ZTE. |
| CMCC |  | We share same understanding with ZTE and Apple. |
| HONOR |  | Agree with ZTE. Thus, we need to further check “R” bit is available in every Msg for the forward compatibility. |
| ETRI |  | Agree with ZTE |
| Samsung |  | So far, one R bit in Paging is enough for future extension. |
| CEWiT |  | We also share the same view as ZTE. |
| CATT |  | Agree with ZTE |

**Summary:**

18 companies provided inputs.

Based on the reading of comments, the rapp understands there is no strong view on the detailed solution to do forward compatibility of the R2D messages other than paging message, and most companies think it’s better to keep the possibility of further extension.

In addition, some companies explicitly mention paging and access trigger message may be impacted for further enhancement.

And some companies mention there are spare bits in the R2D upper layer data transfer message, which can be taken as R bit.

The rapp tries to summarize and make the following proposal.

Proposal 11 (Issue 4-5 forward compatibility):

* Add a R bit in Msg2, NACK feedback message, R2D upper layer data transfer message, and Rel-19 devices drop the whole message when R bit is set to 1.
* Similar to paging message, Access Trigger message can be extended to add more fields in further release, and Rel-19 devices ignore the content of future release instead of dropping the whole message.

# Other identified open issues

**Companies are invited to describe any other identified open issues not currently included within this document**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Other identified open issues? (please describe)** |
| CATT | In the current MAC running CR, it captured that upon receiving the paging msg (CBRA), the device will store the transaction ID no matter whether it is addressed or not. From our view, we should re-structure this part and follow the similar principle in NR paging, i.e., the device firstly check whether it is paged or not, and then do the corresponding behavior.  Rappv1: Yes, I see your same comments in running CR, and please see my reply below.  *This question has been raised and answered in last meeting post CR review. It is intentionally to make device update the transition ID even when this paging is not selecting the device, in order to sync up with the reader. Otherwise, the transition ID wrap-around has more chance to happen. For instance, if the device successfully responded ID#1, and the later ID#2, ID#3 … are not selecting it, but the new ID#1 is selecting it which however would be considered as a paging retransmission by this device. This situation can be avoided by keeping transaction ID sync with reader.* |
| NEC | 1. We would like to echo the above CATT comment. Regarding the sequence of device behavior—specifically, checking whether it is paged and checking the transaction ID—we also believe that it would be better to first check whether the device is paged.  2. In the current MAC running CR, there is no description of device behavior when the Random ID Response fails to be received successfully within the defined boundary. In our understanding, the simplest way is to release the stored transaction ID for such a case.  Rappv1: For 1, please see the reply to CATT as above for transaction ID update. Regarding paging ID checking first or transaction ID checking first, I do not see much difference, because in running CR, device will check both of paging ID and transaction ID. For 2, in clause 5.5, it is captured that “CBRA not successful” is considered failure and will trigger reaccess. |
| ASUSTeK | 1. In the current running CR, the description for Random ID Response reception and CBRA completion is not clear. For example, the device shall not continue monitoring Random ID Response message after the CBRA procedure is successful. And the device could consider the CBRA is failed after [FFS one or k] Access Trigger message. 2. Similar to paging message, some reserved bits could be added in D2R Upper Layer Data Transfer message for future extendibility.   Rappv1: For 1, instead of specifying CBRA completion, we described CBRA is not successful, which will trigger reaccess. In addition, even if device received msg2 and resolved collision, it needs to continue reception of msg2 retransmission.  For 2, good point, please see the new added Q12. |
| NEC2 | While Rapp, has captured the signaling for "Bit Duration and Frequency Resource Indication" in the current running CR, there remains interests in exploring ways to reduce the total size of this indication e.g., for CBRA or CFA case. Given this, we think this matter should be listed as an open issue for continued discussion.  Rappv2: please see the new issue 4-6. |
| Qualcomm | The # of bits for ‘Bit Duration’ and ‘Frequency Resource Indication’ in D2R Scheduling Info field (and in different cases.)  Rappv2: please see the new issue 4-6. |
| vivo | According to “Frequency Resource Indication” in D2R scheduling info field, there will be 1-8 possible value for access attempt in frequency domain. However, the current design of the number of access occasions is the power of 2, which causes some combinations of odd number of frequency access attempt cannot be indicated via the number of access occasion field. The agreement about to include the number of access occasion in the paging message, with 4-bit exponential encoding can be revisited.  Rappv2: right, during the CR discussion, companies mention this may result waste of some AO triggered by the last trigger message, which is not perfect but acceptable. |
| Futurewei | TS 33.369 specifies the following: 5.3.3 Input parameters to integrity algorithm The input parameters to the integrity algorithm as described in Annex D.3 in TS 33.501[5] shall be set as follows.  The KEY input is equal to the KAIOTF key.  Editor’s Note: whether the KAIOTF key is fresh for each round of inventory-command procedure is FFS.  The DIRECTION bit is set to 0 for uplink and 1 for downlink.  The BEARER is set to all zeros.  The COUNT is set to all zeros.  Without a varying and unique COUNT value for each command request, each round of inventory-command procedure can only convey one command request/response exchange. A round with multiple command exchanges would result in the reuse of the same key-nonce pair on different contents and hence violating an important security principle of one-time pad ciphering. In addition, re-keying for each round incurs heavy signaling overhead and energy consumption at the device. RAN2 should discuss and confirm: 1) the need for potentially supporting multiple command request/response exchanges within one AIoT service round; 2) desire of not to perform re-keying for each round of inventory-command procedure; 3) availability of non-volatile memory (NVM) for storing AIoT NAS COUNT value along with security keys at the device. RAN2 can send LS to SA3, with these reasons, to request a changing AIoT NAS COUNT be supported for cyphering and integrity protection.  Rappv2: the detailed solution of security is in SA3 scope, we should leave them to discuss and decide. |

# Conclusions

The following proposals have been provided based on feedback to the above document:

[Proposals for easy agreement]

Proposal 1-1 (Issue 1-2 Transaction ID): RAN2 confirms how to generate transaction ID is left to implementation (no spec impact) (25/25).

Proposal 1-2 (Issue 1-2 Transaction ID): RAN2 to make quick decision on 4 bits (15/25) or 6 bits (12/25) of Transaction ID length.

Proposal 2 (Issue 1-3 Paging ID length): 8-bit length field (in unit of bit) is assumed to indicate the paging ID length, based on current SA2/CT4 conclusion. (24/24)

Proposal 3 (Issue 1-5 Transaction ID in CFRA paging): RAN2 confirms the pervious RAN2 baseline that transaction ID is not included in paging message for CFRA. (23/25)

Proposal 4 (Issue 2-6 entry number indication): No entry number is included in either Msg2 or NACK feedback message, and the device decodes the entries one by one till message end. (23/24)

Proposal 5 (Issue 3-3 AS ID release): Explicit release message is not needed. (18/24). [If needed: New message can include no AS ID (to release all devices) or AS ID list (to release one or multiple devices).]

Proposal 6 (Issue 3-5 D2R message type): RAN2 confirms D2R message type is not introduced in this release (Rationale: no valid requirement, as DOA coexist with R19 device is excluded in R20 WID). (17+3/25)

Proposal 7 (Issue 1-7 security parameter): add 128-bit field in paging message to contain the security parameter. (22/23)

Proposal 8 (Issue 3-7 More data indication): For no data available case, RAN2 to quick decide either to set more data indication to "1" (7 companies) or "0" (13 companies). (Note: reader behavior is expected to be same either way).

Proposal 9-1 (Issue 3-8 R2D TBS): R2D TBS information is not included in the Access Trigger message.(22/24)

Proposal 9-2 (Issue 3-8 R2D TBS): Add a 7-bit R2D TBS field (in unit of byte) after R2D message type indication in variable-length R2D messages (i.e., Paging message, Random ID Response message, R2D Upper Layer Data Transfer message, NACK Feedback message). (17/20)

Proposal 10 (Issue 2-3 trigger message alignment): Access Trigger message is bit-aligned (no padding bits). (16/21)

Proposal 11 (Issue 4-5 forward compatibility):

* Add a R bit in Msg2, NACK feedback message, R2D upper layer data transfer message, and Rel-19 devices drop the whole message when R bit is set to 1.
* Similar to paging message, Access Trigger message can be extended to add more fields in further release, and Rel-19 devices ignore the content of future release instead of dropping the whole message.

# Appendix (Optional)

Agreements in RAN2#129 meeting and RAN2#129bis meeting:

 RAN2 understands that the service type of A-IoT (e.g. inventory, command) and whether the service is targeted for a single or multiple devices can always be provided. The approximate number of target devices can be provided if available.

8.2.2 A-IoT Paging

 Parallel service requests by the same reader is not supported.

 The device is expected to only perform one procedure at a time. FFS device behaviour if multiple requests are received in parallel (if needed).

 The “transaction ID” can be generated by reader based on CN corelation ID. FFS how reader will generate “transaction ID”. FFS the size of transaction ID

 1 bit solution is excluded. FFS the size. Aim to have a reasonable size.

 RAN2 acknowledges that multi-reader scenario may exist but we will not specify something specific for this purpose. We can rely on transaction ID and implementation to handle it.

 The “one identifier” in the paging message includes both the case of “one single device identifier” and “one group identifier”/”filtering criteria”, while the exact format of latter is supposed to be designed by SA2.

 The current assumption is that the paging identifier is transparent to the A-IoT MAC Layer and carried by upper layer. FFS if there is really a need for visibility in the MAC layer

 the A-IoT paging message can include a number of msg1 resources

 From RAN2 perspective, after initial paging message, the R2D transmission which determines the Msg1 resource(s), can be achieved by one of the below two ways, unless RAN1 concludes to use L1 signaling later:

 Way-1: introducing new R2D message other than the paging message, e.g., QueryRep-like; or

 Way-2: reusing the same paging message, using field(s) to indicate it is only to determine the Msg1 resource(s) and omitting the paging identifier (device ID/group ID) field

 The service type of A-IoT (e.g., inventory only, inventory + command) is not included in paging message.

 FFS which solution if any for device behavior if it gets a new service request while one procedure is still ongoing or leave it to implementation.

 RAN2 aims to design Rel-19 AIoT R2D messages extensible to accommodate devices and features of future release.

 Introduce an explicit 1 bit indication to indicate whether it is CFRA or CBRA per paging message

 A field indicating Paging ID length information is always included together with the paging ID field in the A-IoT paging message, except the case where no ID is included in the A-IoT paging message.

 The number of bits required for paging ID length field should be as small as possible. This would require the number of different Paging ID lengths to be small.

 Send an LS to SA2 to tak this into account for their design.

8.2.3 A-IoT Random Access

 For Rel-19, only 3-step CBRA is supported for A-IoT

 We will specify both CBRA and CFRA.

 Re-use the subsequent paging message to trigger re-access. There is no need to differentiate msg1 resource for initial access vs re-access.

 NACK based mechanism is supported for D2R messages to determine re-access for at least msg3. FFS details including whether we need a timer or explicit message and when reader sends feedback

 RAN2 assumes that device randomly selects among FDMA occasions as the baseline.

 In case of CBRA, only 16 bits random ID is included in Msg1. FFS can be revisited if message type will be needed for other D2R messages purposes

 RN16 is not included in the first D2R message in the CFRA procedure. AS ID is the only ID needed for addressing the device in R2D command message assuming for CFRA no multiple devices are performing the procedures with the given reader. FFS if we can assume or need to support multiple device scenario.

 A new R2D message other than the paging message is introduced for A-IoT device determining MSG1 resources unless RAN1 concludes to use L1 signaling. The R2D message indicates the start of a set of MSG1 resources that were configured in paging message.

 Assumption: The R2D message does not include slot number/count down number.

 A-IoT Msg2 contains one or multiple echoed random ID(s) from A-IoT Msg1 of different A-IoT devices.

 Same Msg2 format is used for initial transmission and retransmission of Msg2.

 For CBRA, as a baseline, NACK based mechanism is applied only to the Msg3. May come back for D2R data, if the NACK feedback indication is needed for the purpose to stop/terminate the “on-going procedure” and release the AS ID accordingly (depending on other later discussion).

 For msg3, we rely on whether the device receives NACK indication before subsequent R2D message to determine re-access. No need for a timer. FFS whether subsequent R2D message is trigger message or paging

 For CFRA, NACK feedback and re-access is not supported. FFS how to achieve

 FFS on end of procedure

8.2.4 A-IoT Data Transmission and Other general aspects

For CBRA, it is up to Reader to decide whether to reuse the random ID as the AS ID or to assign a new AS ID. FFS how this is signalled, which message is used and size of AS ID.

From device perspective, it is only required to use one AS ID.

CFRA is not supported for group ID

RAN2 assumes, AS ID is needed for CFRA at least for inventory + command procedure

For CFRA, if a valid AS ID is not already assigned, continue the discussion on AS-ID assignment based on the following options:

Option 2: the device includes a random ID in “Msg 1”. And same as CBRA, it is up to Reader to decide whether to reuse the random ID as the AS ID or to assign a new AS ID.

Option 3: New “Msg 2” for AS ID assignment, complementary option or independent from option 2

Option 4: “Msg 2” (including the “Command”) for AS ID assignment, complementary option or independent from option 2

To support segmentation, a 1 bit indication is introduced to indicate whether there is more data or not, if SA2 indicates that CN can provide an estimated expected D2R message size. If not possible, FFS if the 1 bit is sufficient.

Segment retransmission is supported.

For segment retransmission, reader explicitly indicates an offset in the MAC layer– e.g. number of bits successfully received so far (from the start). FFS This implies that unsegmented packet can also be retransmitted. FFS if this applies to msg3

R2D segmentation is not supported for R19 A-IoT.

From RAN2 perspective only the following types of procedures will be considered in the normative phase: “Inventory only” and “Inventory and command”.

AS ID is applied for Inventory + command case;

AS ID is not included in D2R message except Msg 1 (RN16 in Msg 1 has been agreed.

For both CFRA and CBRA, the AS ID size is same as RN 16, i.e. 16 bits.

Do not specify the reader behaviour on how exactly the ASID is generated.

The device releases the AS ID upon power off (no stage 3 specification impact);

The device only keeps one AS ID at a time.

For CFRA, command message is used for AS ID assignment

For CBRA, Msg 2 is used for AS ID assignment

The device releases the AS ID at least:

- upon receiving Paging with new transaction id for that device, i.e. different session/service

- when it triggers new msg1 transmission as a result of receiving Paging message (i.e. it has to generate a random ID for CBRA)

- FFS other cases for release ASID to avoid keeping it indefinitely.

For the retransmission of the first segment/unsegmented D2R message, the reader sends the R2D message by including the upper layer command again. FFS whether offset zero is always included.

FFS whether the reader always includes the command for retransmission of segments.

1-bit indication is sufficient to indicate whether more D2R data will be sent

For inventory response, RAN2 assumes that segmentation is not applied. RAN2 assumes that the reader can avoid segmentation by reader being aware of inventory response size. Notify SA2 about this assumption.

Agreements on MAC PDU format design

Aim to design simple MAC PDU format design

Support multiplexing of information for multiple devices in R2D message for msg2. FFS others for multicast messages

At least the following field are required for at least for R2D in the MAC header– message type, length for SDU and variable part(s).

FFS whether for D2R we need message type field, any length and need for padding

Specify message types and contents. As starting point consider the following MAC message types.

 R2D MAC PDU (Paging/R2D trigger (depending on agreement on WF))

 D2R MAC PDU (MSG1) (FFS if this requires a MAC header or not)

 R2D MAC PDU (MSG2)

 D2R MAC PDU (MSG3 and data)

 R2D MAC PDU (R2D data)

 Other message types are FFS. The message types may evolve based on functionality agreements.

The MAC PDU should be byte-aligned, assuming the allocated TBS value is in the unit of byte. The actual TBS value depends on RAN1. FFS for R2D trigger message

RAN2 assumes that the upper layer data SDU is byte-aligned, and an LS can be sent to CT1.

The D2R MAC PDU size will correspond to the TBS size indicated in the R2D message

The MAC padding is supported at least for D2R from RAN2 perspective. The device includes padding bits if there is no more data and there is still space available in the TBS.

In case where MAC PDU includes both MAC SDU and padding, for D2R a field to indicate how many SDU bits are present is required. FFS how this is provided (i.e. SDU length field or padding length field). The size of length field is FFS.

Agreements in RAN2#130 meeting

1 Use as baseline the following message names, field names and definitions are to be used in A-IoT MAC:

− Message name: A-IoT Paging message, Access Trigger message, Random ID message, Random ID Response message, R2D Upper Layer Data Transfer message, D2R Upper Layer Data Transfer message.

− Field name: R2D Message Type, RA Type, Indication of Paging ID Presence, Length of Paging ID, Paging ID, Transaction ID, Number of Access Occasions, D2R Scheduling Info, Random ID, Echoed Random ID, AS ID, Assigned AS ID, More Data Indication, SDU Length, MAC Padding, Received Data Size.

− Definitions:

o Access occasion: A time-frequency resource for device(s) to transmit Msg1 (i.e., the Random ID message) during a CBRA procedure.

o AS ID: The AS layer identifier to address the specific device for R2D reception and D2R scheduling

2 One bit indication is needed for each echoed random ID in Msg2 to indicate whether AS ID is present (i.e., assigned by reader) for this random ID.

3 NACK feedback is defined as an explicit message (i.e. new message type). AS ID(s) is/are included to indicate the failure for given device(s). Multiplexing of NACK feedback is supported in one message

4 Assume two transport channels are introduced between A-IoT MAC and PHY. One is for R2D, and the other is for D2R. Neither logical channel concept nor SAP is defined for the interface between A-IoT MAC and upper layers.

**Agreements on parallel service request**

1. Rel-19 devices are not expected to receive parallel service request for overlapping reader scenario based on network implementation. Capture this in stage 2 specification.
2. The Rel-19 device always responds to the new service indicated by the received paging message applicable for that device. Capture this in stage 3 specification.
3. Send LS to RAN3 to notify them of agreements 1 and 2
4. Parallel service request for overlapping reader scenario can be addressed in Rel-20

**Agreements on paging**

1. For CFRA, as a baseline the fields related to the transaction ID, indication of paging ID present/absent and number of access occasions are absent. FFS on the need for the transaction ID for command case.
2. For CFRA, the device always responds to paging regardless of transaction ID (if we put a transaction ID) (i.e. as long as it is addressed to the corresponding device).
3. To ensure forward compatibility for paging with multiple identifiers, introduce at least one R field. FFS if more than one R bit is required.
4. Rel-19 devices would ignore the content of future release instead of ignoring the whole paging message.
5. Issue (1-4) For number of access occasions introduce exponential way, 4 bits, value range FFS

**Agreements**

1. For Msg1 resource selection procedure capture as guidance the countdown behaviour in the MAC specification (use TP in [R2-2503952](file:///C:\Users\panidx\OneDrive%20-%20InterDigital%20Communications,%20Inc\Documents\3GPP%20RAN\TSGR2_130\Docs\R2-2503952.zip)). Capture a NOTE that other implementation are allowed. X, Y will be signalled by paging message
2. The start of the first set of MSG1 resources is indicated by Paging message directly instead of the new R2D trigger messages. R2D trigger message is not sent in CFRA procedure. Come back if RAN1/4 sees any issues. Send LS to RAN1/RAN4
3. FFS R2D byte alignment dependent on TBS size discussion

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements on RA  1 Exclude the option of MSG2 transmission and any retransmission of MSG2 happens within a predefined time window (based on timer)  2 A device expecting MSG2 assumes CBRA failure if its MSG2 is not received before a boundary, where the boundary can be further downselected between option B and C below. A device receiving MSG2 within this boundary transmits MSG3. The device does not process MSG2 (re)transmission received after the boundary.   * Option B – the boundary is the reception of either the next R2D trigger message or the subsequent paging message * Option C – the boundary is the reception of either the kth R2D trigger message or the subsequent paging message (K is FFS) * Option A (the boundary being the subsequent paging only) is excluded.   For option C, further discuss in terms of complexity at the device vs reader flexibility.  3 Including frequency index along with RN16 in MSG2 to reduce collisions of MSG1 between different devices is feasible. FFS Discuss further whether to include it.  **Agreements on NACK reception:**   1. After MSG3 transmission, upon receiving NACK with its AS ID before subsequent paging or command addressed to this device from the reader, device determines it will perform re-access. FFS how to specify.   **Agreements on RN16/AS ID maintainance:**   1. Confirm a device is not expected to maintain both AS ID and RN16. After msg2 reception, RN16 becomes AS ID, if new AS ID was not assigned by reader.   This implies that the reader cannot change AS ID and RN16 pair across message 2 retransmission. How to capture device behavior is FFS |

**Agreements**

1. R2D message scheduling non-first segment (re)transmission does not include upper layer command.
2. For the first segment and unsegmented packet (re)transmission, the “offset” indicator in R2D is not present.
3. This implies that the R2D message will either have command or offset (but not both). FFS whether we define two message types or one message type with optional fields.

**Agreements**

1. The device is expected to send a MAC response to the reader in the D2R occasion. The MAC response contains the NAS message if available at the D2R occasion. If there is no NAS message available to transmit at the D2R occasion then the response contains MAC with 0 SDU and padding as needed.
2. Send LS to CT1 to inform the agreement 1 to CT1 and explain that we have an issue with delayed NAS write success response. RAN2 would prefer that this is handled by CT1 (and give the example of sending NAS response upon successful reception of write command). Ask if this can be handled by CT1

**Agreement on MAC PDU format**

1. A mandatory length field directly indicates the length of D2R data MAC SDU to support varying lengths of D2R data. The size of length field is 7-bit in bytes.
2. The offset indication for transmission/retransmission of the segments after the first segment of a D2R message is 7-bit length in bytes. Segmented SDUs are also byte aligned.
3. FFS D2R message type. Current running CR will capture no message type, but we can revisit this next meeting and also consider if any other bits are needed for the MAC header
4. The length field inside MAC for SDU is not needed for R2D messages, assuming R2D MAC padding is not needed. FFS can come back if padding is needed depending on granularity of TBS (only if needed)

**Agreements**

- For CBRA, to avoid AS ID being occupied for unnecessary time and to keep alignment between reader and device on AS ID release, device can release AS ID upon receiving paging message with different transaction ID, no matter the paging message is for it or not. FFS for CFRA

- FFS for need for release message