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# 1 Introduction

This document captures the following discussion and summary:

**\* [AT115-e][104][RedCap] Identification, access and camping (Ericsson)**

Initial scope: Continue the discussion on p3, p6, p9-p12

Intended outcome: Summary of the offline discussion with e.g.:

§  List of proposals for agreement (if any)

§  List of proposals that require online discussions

§  List of proposals that should not be pursued (if any)

Initial deadline (for companies' feedback): Monday 2021-08-23 10:00 UTC

Initial deadline (for rapporteur's summary in R2-2108892): Monday 2021-08-23 16:00 UTC

Proposals marked "for agreement" in R2-2108892 not challenged until Tuesday 2021-08-24 0800 UTC will be declared as agreed via email by the session chair (for the rest the discussion will further continue online).

Status: Ongoing

This template for discussion is based on the pre-meeting summary in [R2-2109023](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_115-e/Docs/R2-2109023.zip). Original text (excluding “Introduction”) is kept intact and questions and tables for company inputs are inserted for proposals P3, P6, P9-P12. Please note that the existing arguments are summarized above each question.

The parts from the original summary which are most relevant for agreements already made have been greyed out.

New rapporteur comments made after the pre-meeting summary and after the initial online discussion are marked as [Rapporteur].

# 2 Summary of remaining issues

## 2.1 Early identification of RedCap UEs

Early identification and RedCap indication in Msg1/Msg3 and/or MsgA is discussed in [1], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9], [11], [13], [14], [15], [18], [19], [22], [23] and [27] (16 papers).

Early identification in Msg1

RAN1 has informed RAN2 in LS [R1-2106329](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_105-e/Docs/R1-2106329.zip) on RAN1 working assumption that Msg1 indication can be configured to be enabled/disabled. Thus, the rapporteur understanding is that Msg1 indication will be specified in one form or another. RAN2 can confirm the Msg1 indication but the details need to be discussed further, also taking into the discussion in AI 8.18 RACH indication and partitioning.

No company in RAN2 proposes to not support Msg1 indication.

Details of Msg1-based indication are discussed e.g. by HW [4], Spreadtrum [6], Intel [13], ZTE [15], Nokia [22]. There seems to be common understanding that both dedicated ROs for RedCap as well as dedicated PRACH preambles in case of shared ROs can be supported. Couple of companies propose to wait further RAN1 progress e.g. vivo [7], ZTE [15] before discussing further details.

The following are proposed, first based on RAN1 working assumption and second as basis for further discussion:

1. [Easy] Msg1 indication which can be configured to be enabled/disabled can be specified from RAN2 point of view.
2. [To discuss] Both dedicated ROs and dedicated PRACH preambles in case of shared ROs are supported. Details are FFS and discussions in AI 8.18 should be taken into account.

[Rapporteur] P1 and P2 have been treated online.

Early identification in Msg3

One open issue is whether a Msg3 indication is specified. The companies input and views on this open issue are divided like follows (one company per paper mentioned):

* **Do not specify Msg3 indication (assuming Msg1 indication is specified)**: OPPO [1], Spreadtrum [6], Xiaomi [8], Apple [11], Intel [13], LG [14], ZTE [15], NEC [19]

The main arguments for this view are that Msg1 indication covers more scenarios and that there would be limited benefit using Msg3 indication or that it would be redundant. There would be no possibility to affect Msg2/3 scheduling and earliest possible indication is preferred for that reason. Also, more specification effort in RAN2, security issues and that reject based on Msg3 indication should not be preferred as access control mechanism were mentioned.

* **Specify Msg3 indication (i.e. both optional Msg1 and Msg3)**: Huawei [4], Qualcomm [5], Sierra [9], DENSO [18], Nokia [22], Ericsson [23]

The main arguments for supporting Msg3 indication include ability to use early indication in the case Msg1 indication is not configured e.g. when avoiding further PRACH fragmentation. The mentioned benefits include possibility to affect Msg4/5 scheduling in case Msg1 indication is not configured, possibility to configure PUCCH frequency hopping for Msg4 feedback, and the possibility to use RRC reject. It was also mentioned that in most scenarios Msg1 based indication wouldn’t be needed and configured.

* **RAN to confirm that network should identify RedCap UE before Msg4**: CATT [27]

Argument for this option is that the NW should identify RedCap UE at least in Msg1 or Msg3 (not later).

* **Wait for further RAN1 discussion**: vivo [7]

Argument for this option is that the reasons for early indication are mostly RAN1.

Possible solution for Msg3 indication was discussed in few papers e.g. by HW [4], QC [5], Ericsson [23]. All these propose to use an LCID-based solution which would not result in large specification impact or larger Msg3 size. Such solution is also preferred by Nokia [22].

*Rapporteur comment:* There is support for both not specifying and specifying a Msg3-based solution. With the proposed LCID-based solution the specification impact would be low and Msg3 size the same as currently, and the drawback of Msg3-based indication would be that it is later compared to Msg1 indication. There doesn’t seem to be other technical reasons for not supporting, which would be different for Msg3 compared to Msg1 (e.g. RRC reject based on indication, even if not preferred, is also possible with Msg1-based solution). If Msg1 indication is not configured at all, the situation with scheduling Msg2/3 would be the same regardless solution, i.e. no network knowledge, but with no possibility to impact Msg4/5 scheduling either if there is no Msg3 indication.

Therefore, it is proposed to further discuss whether the following proposal is acceptable:

1. [To discuss] A Msg3 early indication based on LCID is supported.

[Rapporteur]: P3 was discussed online with the following captured in chair minutes:

|  |
| --- |
| *Proposal 3 [To discuss] A Msg3 early indication based on LCID is supported.*  - DT thinks this is not essential but ok if some companies think 2 mechanisms are needed  - vivo thinks that RAN1 does not see the need for this and we also did not see the motivation for this.  - Ericsson thinks there is huge support for this and no drawback  - QC/CMCC/ZTE/Mediatek support p3  - Apple thinks that RAN1 discussed that there has to be some handling of msg2 that needs msg1 identification and also thinks that there would be security concerns. Ericsson thinks that if we need to do something for msg2, then of course msg1 identification would be needed.  - VC thinks that a decision should be taken in RAN2 by the end of this meeting.   * Continue in offline 104 |

Based on this, companies are asked whether P3 is agreeable for them, and whether they have any relevant new arguments. Companies are respectfully asked to see above summary where arguments for both sides have been summarized.

**Question 1:** Is P3: “A Msg3 early indication based on LCID is supported”, agreeable?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **P3 agreeable?** | **Comments / new arguments** |
| Qualcomm | Yes | The current WID says that early identification between Msg4 is supported. Therefore, supporting Msg3 early identification gives network an option of not configuring Msg1 early indication. Otherwise, Msg1 early identification has to be always configured. That is against the existing agreement that Msg1 early indication is optional/configurable |
| Ericsson | Yes | Agree with QC comment, it may not be viable to always configure Msg1 indication, as discussed online.  Additionally, we think Msg3 indication may save trouble later if in deployments it is observed Msg4/5 need special handling. If Msg3 indication possibility is not specified, and Msg1 is not configured, it would mean either possible performance degradation for all UEs or performance degradation for such RedCap UEs which would need special treatment. Neither of these options are desirable, and it is easy to provide the means to avoid this now.  Note that it would be too late for enhancement on this in later releases. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

MsgA indication

RAN1 has agreed to support 2-step RACH, and it remains to be discussed how the early indication is provided in that case. Few of the submitted papers, e.g. by HW [4], Intel [13], Nokia [22] and CATT [27] propose to specify a MsgA early indication. However, one company prefers LCID based solution (assuming such is specified for Msg3), one company prefers similar solution as Msg1 (assuming no Msg3 indication), one company prefers to have solution with both MsgA preamble and PUSCH indications and one company prefers to leave details up to RAN1 discussion.

As the solution for Msg1/Msg3 discussion may impact the details of MsgA solution, it is proposed to confirm that a solution will be specified but discuss the details further.

1. [Easy] Solution for early indication in MsgA will be specified.
2. [Postpone] Discuss the details of MsgA based early indication after Msg1/Msg3 discussion has progressed.

[Rapporteur]: P4 was agreed online, P5 outcome may depend on P3 discussion.

## 2.2 Access/camping restrictions

The following papers discuss access restrictions, cell barring or network support for RedCap UEs and relevant indications in MIB/SIB1: [2], [7], [8], [9], [10], [12], [13], [14], [16], [18], [19], [21], [23], [24], [25], [26] and [27] (17 papers).

On cellBarred in MIB

It is stipulated by the WID and agreed in RAN2 already that SIB1 indicates barring for 1 Rx and 2 Rx branches separately for RedCap UEs. However, and open issue is what to do with the relevant *cellBarred* and IFRI indications broadcasted in MIB.

The following have been proposed by companies in the submitted papers:

* **UE ignores the existing *cellBarred* in MIB:** OPPO [2], vivo [7], Apple [10], CATT [27]

The main arguments for this option include no need for UE to check barring indication twice (in MIB and SIB1), thus simpler for implementation, more future proof considering possible RedCap-only cells or SSBs, similar solution as IAB-MT adopted.

* **UE follows the existing *cellBarred* in MIB:** Xiaomi [8], Intel [13], DENSO [18], Ericsson [23], CMCC [25]

The main arguments for this option include that there’s no need to support RedCap-specific cells and for such case other solutions exist already (e.g NPN), cellBarred should apply to all UEs e.g. when the cell is in maintenance, there can be negative impact on power consumption when UE needs to check SIB1 instead of just MIB for barring.

* **Depends on the agreement for IFRI**: NEC [20]

Arguments for this option is that barring should be done based on information in the same message i.e. MIB or SIB1.

*Rapporteur comment:* The views are split, and there seem to be valid technical points on both sides, thus it is difficult to formulate proposal on either direction.

1. [To discuss] Continue discussion on whether UE ignores or applies the existing *cellBarred* in MIB.

[Rapporteur]: P6 has not been discussed online in this meeting.

**Question 2:** Should UE apply or ignore the existing *cellBarred* in MIB?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Q2:Apply / Ignore** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Neutral | We are neutral on this issue but have a slight preference for ignoring cellBarred in MIB, because it is desirable for UE to get all barring related information from a single message (SIB1). |
| Ericsson | Apply | We lean towards using the existing indication, e.g. if cell is in maintenance, it would benefit the UE to apply barring from MIB already. Nevertheless, both options can made to work, thus we do not have strong position and can agree majority view. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

On SI barring indication

The details of the barring indication or cell support indication are discussed in number of papers and the following proposals are made:

* **System information indicates whether 1 Rx / 2 Rx branch RedCap UE is supported**: vivo [7] , Sierra [9]

Arguments for this option are that similar structure was adopted for IAB and that the default should be no Redcap support in the cell (thus no indication in SIB1).

* **Specify cell barring in SIB1 separately for UEs with 1 Rx / 2 Rx branch(es):** Fujitsu (barring or support can be discussed) [12], LG [14], Nokia [21], Ericsson [23], Futurewei [24], CMCC [25], China Telecom [26]

The main argument for this option is that this is the intention of WID.

* **Specify cell barring using one indication in SIB1 for all RedCap UEs, i.e. revise WID objective**: Samsung [16]

Argument for this option is that if UE can receive SIB1, it can also receive DL transmissions, thus there should be no difference in support protocol-wise between 1 Rx or 2 Rx.

* **Wait for RAN1 on how to provide barring indication:** Xiaomi [8]

Arguments for this option is that RAN1 is discussing how to provide barring indication.

*Rapporteur comment:* Details of such indication is in RAN2 domain and the need and differentiation has been discussed in plenary already. Rapporteur thinks it time to make a decision in RAN2. The support for barring indication is larger compared to a “support” indication, therefore the following is proposed:

1. [Easy] Specify separate indications in SIB1 for barring RedCap UEs with 1 Rx chain and 2 Rx chains.

Note that optimizations and slightly different solutions were proposed by different companies, the details can be discussed in stage-3 implementation.

[Rapporteur]: P7 has been agreed online.

On inter-frequency reselection indicator:

The following options have been proposed for IFRI handling for RedCap:

* **Introduce RedCap specific IFRI in SIB1 (ignore legacy IFRI when broadcast) and**
  + **differentiate 1 Rx and 2 Rx**: Qualcomm [5], vivo [7], LG [14], IDT [17], Nokia [21], CATT [27]

The main arguments for this option are that RedCap UEs may impact NW capacity, thus separate indication is preferred flexibility and should follow similar agreement (and WID formulation) for barring. Interference avoidance and differentiation to avoid possible confusion together with barring indications were also mentioned.

* **do not differentiate Rx branches (or not explicitly mentioned):** OPPO [2], Xiaomi [8], Fujitsu [12], DENSO [18], NEC [20], Futurewei [24], China Telecom [26]

Some of the main arguments for this option apply also for the previous option, i.e., independence of IFRI for RedCap and non-RedCap, possibility to control need for coverage enhancement and that RedCap specific IFRI should be supported in any case. Some companies argue that differentiation between Rx branches would not be needed for IFRI, however.

* **Re-use existing IFRI in MIB for RedCap, do not introduce new fields in SIB1**: Intel [13], Samsung [16], Ericsson [23], CMCC [25]

The main arguments for this option include that separate treatment for IFRI is not needed, it is an optimization and all UEs can use the same indication as there should be no difference in IFRI configuration between RedCap and non-RedCap UEs.

* **RAN2 to discuss the need for RedCap specific IFRI**: Huawei [4]

Additionally, at least LG [14] points out that if the cell doesn’t support RedCap, then the existing IFRI indication in MIB should be supported. Rapporteur agrees that this case should also be discussed, i.e. the UE behavior in case the cell doesn’t support RedCap.

*Rapporteur comment*: Althought the view on different options is split, there is larger support for introducing a RedCap specific IFRI. It can be further discussed whether the IFRI should be differentiated on supported Rx branches or not. However, it should be noted that there is no agreement on any coverage enhancement requirement for 1 Rx vs 2 Rx UE.

1. [Easy] Specify a RedCap specific IFRI in SIB1.
2. [To discuss] Specify IFRI separately for RedCap UEs with 1 Rx and 2 Rx branches.
3. [To discuss] If RedCap-specific IFRI is not broadcasted, the existing IFRI in MIB is followed.

[Rapporteur]: P8 has been agreed online and the discussion should continue for 9 and 10. Please see summary of previous arguments above.

**Question 3:** Should RedCap specific IFRI in SIB1 be separate for UEs implemented with 1 Rx and 2 Rx branches?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Q3: common/separate IFRI for 1 Rx/2 Rx** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Separate IFRI for 1 Rx/2 Rx | For the same reason why a separate IFRI for RedCap is agreed |
| Ericsson | Common | As also pointed out by some companies online, we don’t think separate IFRI would be needed at all, and we don’t expect the NW to differentiate IFRI between “normal” and RedCap UEs in deployments.  Now we have agreed separate IFRI, but we don’t see use case for separate indications for 1 Rx and 2 Rx – we see this is an additional optimization for a case which should be rare (if ever used to start with). |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Question 4:** If RedCap specific IFRI is not broadcasted, should the UE follow existing IFRI in MIB (if not, please explain why / alternative action)?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Q4: Yes / No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | See comment | We prefer that if a cell supports RedCap, then it always signals RedCap-specific IFRI (either yes or no). It is simpler for UE implementation. |
| Ericsson | Yes | In such case the UE should follow the MIB bit. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 2.3 Other topics

This section summarizes additional topics which are not explicitly part of the WID but with more than two companies proposing enhancements. Similar proposals have been discussed briefly during earlier meetings, but these topics have not been prioritized.

Number of companies, e.g. THALES [3], QC [5], Apple [10], Fujitsu [12], Intel [13], ZTE [15], Samsung [16], CMCC [25], CATT [27] discuss possible provision of indications on whether neighboring cells support or bar RedCap UEs. The following options are discussed:

* **Provide such information on neighboring cell support/barring:** Fujitsu [12], Samsung [16], CMCC [25], CATT [27]

The main argument is that such indications may reduce the UE power consumption as UE would not need to measure cells which do not support RedCap.

* **Provide such information and also differentiate 1 Rx / 2 Rx**: QC [5], Apple [10], ZTE [15], THALES [3]

The same main argument on power consumption applies for this option. Additionally, it is mentioned cell barring may be more dynamic thus it is not enough to rely on UEs’ previous understanding of cell support.

* **Do not introduce such indications in SI**: Intel [13]

Arguments: Dedicated frequency priority seems sufficient assuming frequencies are upgraded at the same time (Intel)

*Rapporteur comment*: There is some support for introducing neighboring cell information, but based on earlier discussion there is also some opposition. If such enhancement is introduced, the technical details should be discussed further, such as how often such information is expected to change (and e.g. impact on SI updates), higher layer (RAN3) impact, and whether the indication is for cell support or barring in neighboring cells or whether lists of allowed cells are provided as suggested by some companies.

1. [To discuss] Whether information on neighboring cell acceptance of RedCap UE access is provided in system information.

[Rapporteur]: P11 was not discussed online so far.

Question 5: Should system information provide information whether neighboring cells accept RedCap UE access?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Q5: Yes / No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Yes | First, having this information helps UE avoid unnecessary neighbor cell measurements;  Second, this information is readily available to gNBs, as we agreed at the last meeting that gNBs should exchange such information with neighbor cells. So there is no extra implementation complexity to do so. |
| Ericsson | No | General approach is that NW does not advertise which features different nodes support. Also, in practice, it is expected that the network, or at least considerable parts of network (e.g. RAN area), implement support at the same time, thus such info would be redundant. Also, upon cell reselections/HOs, the UE can store information on which cells allow RedCap, which helps when visiting the same cells/area. Thus, we don’t seed need for such information to be broadcast in neighboring cells.  If the barring configuration is expected to be dynamical, it is not acceptable that all neighboring cells need to trigger SI updates based on changing the barring bit(s) in a cell. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Introduction of RedCap-specific cell selection parameters, separate Qrxlevmin and Qualmin and separate cell (re)selection priorities are discussed and proposed in [4], [5], [12], [13], [15], [16], [18], [25] and [27] as follows (Note the following are not necessarily mutually exclusive):

* **Introduce RedCap specific cell (re)selection parameters:** HW [4], Intel [13], CMCC [25], CATT [27]

The main arguments for introducing such is that UE may experience reduced antenna efficiency and bad UL coverage (different performance in general) or that RedCap UEs could be directed towards certain frequencies supporting RedCap.

* **Optionally configure separate Qrxlevmin and Qualmin**: QC [5], Fujitsu [12], Samsung [16], DENSO [18]

The main arguments are that different parameters should be configured in case NW schedules RedCap UEs differently compared to non-RedCap, prioritization of certain cells for RedCap and that 1 Rx UEs may require higher minimum signal strength to access the cell.

* **RedCap UEs can be configured with separate cell (re)selection priorities:** QC [5], Fujitsu [12], ZTE [15], Samsung [16], CMCC [25]

The main arguments are the possible need to direct RedCap UEs e.g. towards lower frequencies for better coverage and to avoid interference.

*Rapporteur comment:* The support for various options seems to be similar as it was during the last meeting and offline discussion ([ATT114-e][106]). The solutions seem to address different problems, as one example need for coverage enhancement and as another example possibility for operator to steer RedCap UEs towards specific frequencies. RAN2 should discuss further if there are particular issues which should be resolved, and if there are, which would be good solutions.

1. [To discuss] Whether to support RedCap specific cell (re)selection parameters and/or priorities (e.g. Qrxlevmin, Qualmin, offsets, cellReselectionPriorities, etc.)

[Rapporteur]: P12 was not discussed online so far.

**Question 6:** Should any of the following be introduced for RedCap in Rel-17 (please include motivation):

1. RedCap specific cell (re)selection parameters?
2. RedCap specific Qrxlevmin, Qualmin? (Or other parameters in detail)
3. Separate cell (re)selection priorities?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Q6: Support for 1/2/3?** | **Comments / motivation** |
| Qualcomm | 2, 3 | Agree with the motivations captured by the rapporteur |
| Ericsson | None | We consider these enhancements to be out of scope of the WID, and such would need strong motivation from the proponents and support to be implemented.  For 1) and 2): There is no agreed coverage loss which would require enhancement for cell reselection. There is no request from RAN1/4 to RAN2 to work on this.  For 3): Is there additional need for something on top of the redirect and dedicated priorities which can be provided in RRCRelease? |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 4 Conclusion

**TBD**
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