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# 1 Introduction

This is the report of the following discussion, based on offline discussion during RAN2#109bis-e and the summary document submitted prior to the meeting in [R2-2003791](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs//R2-2003791.zip):

* [AT109bis-e][411][eMTC] Idle mode mobility for non-BL UEs - Open issues (Ericsson)

Scope: Remaining open issues on Idle mode mobility for non-BL UEs.

Intended outcome: Report including a list of proposals categorized as agreeable, need further discussion etc.. The outcome can be provided in R2-2003926.

Deadline: Friday, Apr. 24th 10:00 UTC

Questions are added in Appendix for companies to provide input on the topic.

**Text from summary in** [**R2-2003791**](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs//R2-2003791.zip)**:**

This document contains summary of the following tdocs submitted to AI 7.1.6:

[R2-2002879](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs//R2-2002879.zip) Non-BL UE in enhanced coverage mode in “normal” cell Intel Corporation discussion Rel-16 LTE\_eMTC5-Core

[R2-2003344](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs//R2-2003344.zip) Enhancements to idle mode mobility for non-BL UEs Huawei, HiSilicon discussion Rel-16 LTE\_eMTC5-Core

[R2-2003353](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs//R2-2003353.zip) S-Criterion interpretation for non-BL UEs Ericsson discussion LTE\_eMTC5-Core

The discussion in the submitted documents and in number of previous RAN2 meetings has been mostly about the following FFS captured in RAN2#107:

|  |
| --- |
| * FFS if, from Rel-16, it should be possible for a non-BL UE that fullfills S criteria for normal coverage to camp in a “normal” cell, i.e. not standalone, in enhanced coverage. * This discussion will continue as part of the AI 12.1.8 Improvements for non-BL UEs. |

This document summarizes the discussion and proposals in above documents submitted to RAN2#109bis-e.

# 2 Discussion (from summary document)

The following proposals have been presented in the submitted documents:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [R2-2002879](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs//R2-2002879.zip), Intel | **Proposal 1:** As in legacy eMTC operation, a Rel-16 non-BL UE in RRC\_IDLE can camp in a cell in normal coverage either in BR mode (if SIB1-BR is used) or in WB, i.e. non-BR mode (if SIB1 is used).  **Proposal 2**: Network control to limit non-BL UE camping on a cell in normal coverage in BR mode is postponed to future release. |
| [R2-2003344](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs//R2-2003344.zip), Huawei | **Proposal 1:** Non-BL UE is allowed to camp on enhanced coverage mode when S criteria for normal coverage is fulfilled.  **Proposal 2:** The following TP is adopted:   |  | | --- | | If cell selection criteria S in normal coverage is fulfilled for a cell, UE may consider itself to be in enhanced coverage, e.g. if *SystemInformationBlockType1* cannot be acquired but UE is able to acquire *MasterInformationBlock, SystemInformationBlockType1-BR* and *SystemInformationBlockType2*. | |
| [R2-2003353](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs//R2-2003353.zip), Ericsson | [**Proposal 1:** Except for standalone LTE-M cell, non-BL UE shall camp in enhanced coverage only if S-criterion for normal coverage is not fulfilled and S-criterion for enhanced coverage is fulfilled.](#_Toc37401958) |

The arguments in [R2-2002879](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs//R2-2002879.zip) are mostly about whether the current specification allows non-BL UEs to camp in EC without any restriction, where the conclusion is this is possible already in legacy specifications, arriving at conclusion this should be possible in Rel-16 as well and further proposes possible network control to be postponed to be discussed in later releases.

[R2-2003344](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs//R2-2003344.zip) and [R2-2003353](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs//R2-2003353.zip) focus more on impacts on energy and power consumption, paging, complexity and network resources and performance. However, the observations and conclusions are almost completely opposite to each other. The latter document claims there would be potential negative impacts in e.g. paging, complexity, network resources/performance while the former claims none of these would be significantly affected. Therefore, the proposals are opposite. Furthermore, [R2-2003344](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs//R2-2003344.zip) proposes a clarification in 5.2.3.2 in TS 36.304 to account for non-BL UEs camping in EC.

As only three companies submitted contributions, where 2 companies would prefer allowing the functionality mentioned in the FFS and one company wouldn’t, it seems likely further discussion will be needed to conclude the discussion related to the non-BL UE behaviour on camping in enhanced coverage when normal coverage criterion is fulfilled.

However, it would be good to conclude this discussion. Otherwise, if no conclusion is reached, the UE behaviour and interpretation of the specifications will remain unclear in the coming releases. Based on the input to RAN2#109bis-e, but also based on earlier discussions, it seems there are different understandings e.g. on how non-BL UE implementations would (or should) work.

1. There are different interpretations of non-BL UE behaviour related to camping in enhanced coverage when normal coverage criterion is fulfilled. Unless RAN2 finds a conclusion to this discussion, the behaviour will remain unclear.

Therefore, the sourcing company thinks this discussion needs to be concluded in one way or another.

As there doesn't seem to be any "easy agreements", it is proposed to further discuss the companies understanding and concerns related to potential impacts (see e.g. [R2-2003344](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs//R2-2003344.zip) and [R2-2003353](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs//R2-2003353.zip)) and then in general whether the camping behaviour should be allowed or not.

1. If non-BL UEs that fulfil S criteria for normal coverage may camp in enhanced coverage in non-standalone cell, discuss further the potential impacts e.g. on
   1. Network performance (e.g. radio resources, paging)
   2. UE energy/power consumption
   3. UE complexity

Based on further discussion, the following should be concluded:

1. Discuss further on whether it should be possible for a non-BL UE that fulfils S criteria for normal coverage to camp in enhanced coverage in a non-standalone cell.

# 3 Summary

The current summary is based on [R2-2003791](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs//R2-2003791.zip) and can be updated after further discussion

In the previous section we made the following observation:

[Observation 1 There are different interpretations of non-BL UE behaviour related to camping in enhanced coverage when normal coverage criterion is fulfilled. Unless RAN2 finds a conclusion to this discussion, the behaviour will remain unclear.](#_Toc37930955)

The following proposals were made in the previous section, where the intention of the proposals is to continue discussion during RAN2#109bis-e either online or over email:

[Proposal 1 If non-BL UEs that fulfil S criteria for normal coverage may camp in enhanced coverage in non-standalone cell, discuss further the potential impacts e.g. on](#_Toc37931189)

[a. Network performance (e.g. radio resources, paging)](#_Toc37931190)

[b. UE energy/power consumption](#_Toc37931191)

[c. UE complexity](#_Toc37931192)

[Proposal 2 Discuss further on whether it should be possible for a non-BL UE that fulfils S criteria for normal coverage to camp in enhanced coverage in a non-standalone cell.](#_Toc37931193)

# References

1. [R2-2002879](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs//R2-2002879.zip), "Non-BL UE in enhanced coverage mode in “normal” cell", Intel Corporation, RAN2#109bis-e
2. [R2-2003344](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs//R2-2003344.zip), "Enhancements to idle mode mobility for non-BL UEs", Huawei, HiSilicon, RAN2#109bis-e
3. [R2-2003353](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs//R2-2003353.zip) , "S-Criterion interpretation for non-BL UEs", Ericsson, RAN2#109bis-e
4. [R2-2003791](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs//R2-2003791.zip), " Summary of AI 7.1.6 Improvements for non-BL UEs", Ericsson, RAN2#109bis-e

# Appendix for company inputs

Related to Proposal 1, the following potential impacts have been identified and discussed (see e.g. documents [2] and [3] in above summary), assuming it would be possible for non-BL UEs to camp in enhanced coverage in non-standalone when S-criteria for normal coverage is fulfilled:

a) Network performance (e.g. availability of radio resources)

b) UE energy/power consumption

c) UE complexity

d) Impact on paging

e) Other (please elaborate)

Companies are asked to provide their views on whether they think there are impacts on the following aspects. Please consider impacts from both UE and network side, and both possible positive and negative impacts:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View on possible impacts (UE side, NW side, positive and negative impacts)** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Another topic which has been discussed during earlier meetings as well is whether the discussed behaviour is supported by the current (i.e. pre-Rel-16) specifications and subsequently, if behaviour in P2 would be allowed, would there be additional specification impact? References to specifications are encouraged:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **In your view, is the behaviour discussed in P2 supported by (pre-Rel-16) specifications? Please elaborate.** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Especially if you reply "no" above, please consider the following:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **If behaviour in P2 is allowed, would there be specification impact?** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Based on the above discussion and company inputs, companies are asked to provide their view on P2, i.e., whether the behaviour should be allowed or not. Additionally, companies are asked to provide their input whether P2 would be acceptable with network control, e.g. using a SIB bit to indicate whether it is allowed for a non-BL UE that fulfils S criteria for normal coverage to camp in enhanced coverage in a non-standalone cell:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Allow behaviour in P2?** | **Allow behaviour in P2 with NW control?** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | No need | It’s clear from previous discussions that different vendors have different interpretations of the current specification, we can allow both interpretations, and this can be supported simply with the TP given in our TDoc which is anyway needed to support the standalone case. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Any other comments, feedback, issues we should discuss?** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

.