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# 1 Introduction

This document is the report about the 3rd round of the following email discussion

**[AT109bis-e][105][PRN] Open issues (Nokia)**

Initial scope: Continue the discussion on PRN open issues, based on [R2-2002659](file:///C%3A%5CData%5C3GPP%5CExtracts%5CR2-2002659-Post109e-18-PRN-OpenIssues.docx)

Initial intended outcome: Set of proposals with full consensus agreeable via email, based on

the list in Section 4.1 of [R2-2002659](file:///C%3A%5CData%5C3GPP%5CExtracts%5CR2-2002659-Post109e-18-PRN-OpenIssues.docx) (final list to be reflected in [R2-2003895](file:///C%3A%5CData%5C3GPP%5CRAN2%5CInbox%5CR2-2003895.zip))

Initial intermediate deadline (for companies' feedback): Tuesday 2020-04-21 09:00 UTC

Updated scope:

  for open issue 8: discuss the possibility to introduce an indication in SIB1 to allow UEs to search other cells on the same frequency

  for open issue 9: discuss the possibility to signal PCI range(s) per PLMN per frequency vs just per frequency

  continue the discussion on open issues 11 and 16

Updated intended outcome: summary of the offline discussion with e.g.:

  Set of proposals with full consensus, if any (agreeable over email)

  Set of proposals to discuss in the follow up conference call

Second intermediate deadline (for companies' feedback): Friday 2020-04-24 06:00 UTC

Second intermediate deadline (for rapporteur's summary in [R2-2003896](file:///C%3A%5CData%5C3GPP%5CRAN2%5CInbox%5CR2-2003896.zip)):  Friday 2020-04-24 10:00 UTC

Final scope: discuss whether PCI ranges can be optionally broadcast by all cells (both public cells and private cells) and the PCI range validity time

Final intended outcome: summary of the offline discussion with e.g.:

  Set of proposals with full consensus, if any (agreeable over email)

  Set of proposals to postpone to after the meeting

Final deadline (for companies' feedback): Wednesday 2020-04-29 10:00 UTC

Final deadline (for rapporteur's summary in R2-2003907):  Wednesday 2020-04-29 16:00 UTC

Proposed agreements in R2-2003907 indicated for email agreement and not challenged until Thursday 2020-04-30 06:00 UTC will be declared as agreed by the session chair. For the other ones, the discussion will continue after the meeting.

# 2 Discussion

## 2.1 Broadcasting PCI ranges for CAGs by all cells

**Open issue description:** It is FFS whether any cells including PLMN cells that do not support CAG IDs can optionally broadcast the PCI ranges for CAG cells.

**Background:** During the RAN2#109bis online session the following was agreed

The PCI range(s) can be optionally signalled per PLMN and per frequency when the CAG cell is shared among different PLMNs

**Question 1a:** Do you agree that a PLMN cell that is not a shared cell and supports CAGs can optionally broadcast PCI ranges for CAGs per frequency as agreed for CAG cells that are shared among different PLMNs?

**Question 1b:** Do you agree that a PLMN cell that does not support CAGs can optionally broadcast PCI ranges for CAG cells per PLMN and per frequency as agreed for CAG cells that are shared among different PLMNs?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Q1a** | **Q1b** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | Y | N?(Does not seem needed) | We assume the PCI range will contain the PCIs used by CAG cells and the PCIs outside the range will be used by the public cells. The PCI range will then be used like this:* A CAG UE w/ CAG only indication only need to consider cells inside the PCI range when it searches for cells.
* A CAG UE w/o CAG only indication considers all cells since it camp on both public and CAG cells.
* A non-CAG UE considers all cells since some of the cells within the PCI range may be “hybrid” cells (hybrid cells are not supported in Rel-16 but we may want to support it in the future)

If no PCI range information is configured the UE does not make any assumption whether a cell is a public or CAG cell based on PCI, i.e. all cells need to be considered during the cell search regardless of whether the UE is a CAG or non-CAG UE or whether the CAG only indication is set or not.Based on the above analysis it seems the PCI range information only provide a benefit for the CAG UEs w/ CAG only indication. But these UEs would never camp on a public cell (except for emergency) so it doesn’t seem necessary to broadcast PCI range information in such cells.  |
| Intel | Yes | Yes | We do not see why there is a need of restriction to provide such information by a cell. It is basically just providing a neighbour cell list to assist the CAG capable UE with non-empty allowed CAG list to find CAG cells. UE should still follow best and highest rank cell concept in cell reselection. |
| Nokia | Yes | No? | We also think that PCI range for CAG cells are only beneficial for CAG UEs with CAG only indication, but this type of UEs will never camp on a PLMN cell that does not support CAGs. Therefore, advertising PCI ranges for CAG cells do not seem necessary. |
| Sony | Yes | Yes | Agree with Intel.We also wonder how would the CAG PCI range be used by non-CAG UEs. We don’t see a need for a hybrid cell’s PCI, if and when introduced in the later release, to be included in the CAG PCI range as normal cell selection/reselection rules should apply for a hybrid cell for both member and non member UEs. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Yes | It is okay for the CAG PCI range to be broadcasted by both CAG and non-CAG cells.Regarding how the UEs use it, it is used by CAG-capable UEs to optimize the implementation dependent function for CAG cell search.The non-CAG UEs (non-capable or empty Allowed list) don’t need to use the CAG PCI list, because they are required to rank every cell (as opposed to LTE, where the strongest cell could be omitted from ranking if it was a CSG cell). |
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**Summary:**

## 2.2 Validity time of PCI ranges for CAGs

**Open issue description:** The validity time for PCI ranges for CAGs are FFS.

**Background:**

During the RAN2#109bis online session the following was agreed

The PCI range(s) can be optionally signalled per PLMN and per frequency when the CAG cell is shared among different PLMNs

There was no conclusion on the validity time of the PCI ranges for CAGs. Proposal 2 of R2-2002745 is the following: “The PCI range is valid among the whole frequency within the same PLMN for 24 hours”. During the discussion some companies’ view was that the generally used 3-hour validity is enough.

**Question 2:** Which option do you prefer for the validity time for PCI ranges advertised for CAGs?

* **Option A:** 24 hours (as for CSG)
* **Option B:** 3 hours (as for other SIB parameters)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preference** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | B | The UE will use the PCI range information broadcasted by its serving cell when it searches for other cells. It should therefore be possible to use the same time limit for the PCI range information as we use for other SIB parameters. |
| Intel | Option A | We have a slight preference for Option A as it does not seem logical for cell that does not support CAG to always provide the PCI range, considering that the SIBs of a cell is cell scope and the PCI range is supposed to be used for a frequency by the UE with applicability of the PCI range wider than a cell (in view that CAG concept can be applied to both enterprise and residential deployment). It would be good to keep the PCI range for longer than 3hrs. |
| Nokia | B | We see no use-case when longer storage is needed. If the UE can use PCI ranges for CAGs longer than other information, then the network cannot know which information the UEs will use during cell reselection.  |
| Sony | B |  |
| Qualcomm | B | 3 hours seems enough, and reduces chance of error as the UE moves to different areas of the network. |
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**Summary:**

# 3 Conclusions