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# Introduction

This document is to summarize the following offline discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| * [AT116bis-e][054][ePowSav] Subgrouping and PEI (MediaTek)         Scope: Based on online agreements, 1) Address the FFS from discussion on R2-2201675 on the interpretation PEI bits map to paging subgroups, and confirm value ranges of SubgroupNumPerPO and Nsg-UEID. 2) Discuss whether LS should be sent with specific questions to RAN1, e.g. on PEI applicability to eDRX, if so then draft agreeable LS. 3) For “PEI used in last cell” (only), attempt to find an agreeable compromise, e.g. a simple way of configurability that can let different operators choose if to use it or not. Chair: Simplicity is important.        Intended outcome: Report, LS out if applicable.        Deadline: Tue W2 |

**Contact information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Name <email> |
| MediaTek | Li-Chuan TSENG <li-chuan.tseng@mediatek.com> |
| BT | Salva Diaz <salva.diazsendra@bt.com> |
| Qualcomm | Linhai He (linhaihe@qti.qualcomm.com) |
| Sony | Anders.Berggren@sony.com |
| OPPO | Haitao Li (lihaitao@oppo.com) |
| Intel Corporation | Seau Sian Lim <seau.s.lim@intel.com> |
| CATT | Pierre Bertrand ; pierrebertrand@catt.cn |
| Ericsson | Mattias Bergström <Mattias.a.bergstrom@ericsson.com> |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Jagdeep Singh jagdeep.singh6@huawei.com |
| InterDigital | Brian Martin (brian.martin@interdigital.com) |
| Samsung | Anil Agiwal (anilag@samsung.com) |
| vivo | Chenli (Chenli5g@vivo.com) |
| ZTE | Fei Dong (dong.fei@zte.com.cn) |
| LGE | SangWon Kim (sangwon7.kim@lge.com) |
| CMCC | Xiaoxuan Tang (tangxiaoxuan@chinamobile.com) |
| Nokia | Chunli Wu (Chunli.wu@nokia-sbell.com) |
| Xiaomi | Li Yanhua ([liyanhua1@xiaomi.com](mailto:liyanhua1@xiaomi.com)) |
| Sequans | Noam Cayron ([noam.cayron@sequans.com](mailto:noam.cayron@sequans.com)) |
| Nordic Semiconductor | Jouni Korhonen (Jouni.korhonen@nordicsemi.no) |
| Futurewei | Yunsong Yang (yyang1@futurewei.com) |
| DENSO | Tatsuki Nagano ([tatsuki.nagano.j7f@jp.denso.com](mailto:tatsuki.nagano.j7f@jp.denso.com)) |
| Apple | Sethuraman Gurumoorthy (sethu@apple.com) |

# Discussion

## PEI and paging subgrouping

### Interpretation of PEI bits map to paging subgroups

RAN2 has agreed that both CN-assigned and UEID-based paging subgrouping are supported. According to current RAN2 agreements and running CRs, we have

For CN-assigned paging subgrouping, UE belongs to the n-th (CN-assigned) paging subgroup, where n is assigned by CN;

For UEID-based paging subgrouping, UE belongs to the k-th (UEID-based) paging subgroup, where

* k = floor (UE Identity/(N\*Ns)) mod Nsg-UEID
* N is the number of Paging frames,
* Ns is the number of POs per paging frame,
* Nsg-UEID is the number of UEID-based paging subgroups

In a PDCCH-based PEI, there is a bitmap, where each bit is used to indicate paging for a subgroup of UEs. When both CN-assigned and UEID-based subgrouping methods and supported, they share the bits in the (bitmap-based) PEI. According to RAN1 design of DCI format 2\_7, the bitmap in a PEI may indicate paging for multiple subgroups in multiple POs in at most 2 paging frames, and UE checks -th bit for paging, where

* : Subgroup index by network
* *K* = , if configured
* is the relative PO index in PEI

A simple example is given below:



Now we need to discuss how (subgroup index) is allocated to the two subgrouping methods.

* Option 1 – Subgroup index is allocated to CN-assigned subgroups first
* Option 2 – Subgroup index is allocated to UEID-based subgroups first

Rapporteur’s understanding is that both options work well. Some details may require proper stage-3 description, but that does not violate RAN2 agreements. We’d like to know companies view on each option. Do you accept, or really object to each option? In the comment field, please also indicate your preference, and share your views on how to describe subgroup index allocation in the spec.

**Q1: What are your views on the subgroup index allocation?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Accept Opt1? | Accept Opt2? | Comments |
| Qualcomm | Accept Opt1 |  | We prefer Option 1, because of the agreements that no remapping of CN assigned subgroup ID and CN assigned subgroups have higher priority than UE-ID based subgroups |
| Samsung | Accept Opt 1 | Accept Opt 2 | In the RAN1 formula to map the bits in PEI to paging subgroups, refers to paging subgroup index. This formula will be defined in RAN1 spec and upper layer needs to provide paging subgroup index to PHY.  In case of CN assigned paging subgroups, paging subgroup index is provided by CN to UE. If the number of CN assigned groups are N, paging subgroup index assigned by CN to UE is one of 0 to N-1.  In case of UE ID based subgrouping paging subgroup index is calculated by UE based on formula (k = floor (UE Identity/(N\*Ns)) mod Nsg-UEID). As per this formula, If the number of UE ID based groups are X, paging subgroup index is one of 0 to X-1.  If paging subgroup index is not unique for CN assigned and UE ID based paging subgroups, there will be overlapping (i.e. both CN and UE ID based subgroup will map to same bit in PEI). This is against our previous agreement.  For option 2 to work,  UE indicates to PHY Paging subgroup index isg  For CN based paging subgroup: Paging subgroup index isg = Paging subgroup index received from CN + number of UE ID based subgroups  For UE ID based paging subgroup: Paging subgroup index isg = Paging subgroup index derived from formula  For option 1 to work  UE indicates to PHY Paging subgroup index isg  For CN based paging subgroup: Paging subgroup index isg = Paging subgroup index received from CN  For UE ID based paging subgroup: Paging subgroup index isg = Paging subgroup index derived from formula + number of CN based subgroups  Both options are similar in the sense that offset is either added to Paging subgroup index received from CN or offset is added to formula to determine UE ID based paging subgroup index. Since UE ID based paging subgroup index is determined by UE based on formula, it is simple to add offset to formula. So we slightly prefer option 1. |
| OPPO | Accept Opt 1 |  | Both options can work.  For Option 1:   * For CN-assigned subgrouping, isg = CN-assigned subgroup index. * For UE-ID based subgrouping, Subgroup index = floor (UE Identity/(N\*Ns)) mod Nsg-UEID+ offset 1, where the offset 1 value is the total subgrouping number for CN-assigned subgrouping   For option 2:   * For CN-assigned subgrouping, isg = CN-assigned subgroup index + offset 2, where the offset value is the total subgrouping number for UE-ID based subgrouping * For UE-ID based subgrouping, Subgroup index = floor (UE Identity/(N\*Ns)) mod Nsg-UEID   For Option 1, the CN-assigned subgroup index can be used without remapping, which would make the spec simpler. So we prefer option 1. |
| Intel | Accept Opt 1 |  | Both options could work in our view. We have opted for Option 1 because the number of subgroups for UEID based subgrouping can vary from cell to cell. If so, if the start of the CN subgroups always starts from the last subgroup for the UEID based subgrouping, the CN subgroup index may have to be shifted by the max number of UEID based subgroups, which is not aligned to RAN2 agreement that there is no remapping. We are fine to go with the majority |
| CATT |  | Accept Opt 2 | We agree both options work and we would not object any. However, we have a preference for option 2 because:  - No offset needs to be added in the above UEID-based subgroup formula  - No parameter needs to be defined for Nsg-CN  - When a UE is assigned a subgroup nsg-CN by AMF, both gNB and UE apply *iSG* = nsg-CN + Nsg-UEID  This is by far the simplest stage 3 implementation.  Considering the above capturing in spec, the argument that the number of subgroups for UEID based subgrouping can vary from cell to cell does not seem relevant. |
| Ericsson | Accept Opt 1 | Accept Opt 2 | Both work, should just go with majority. It doesn’t seem to matter much which option we take. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Accept Opt1 |  | We support Option 1 with the UE ID subgroup ID to be k = floor (UE Identity/(N\*Ns)) mod Nsg-UEID + Nsg-CN (or subgroupsNumPerPO - Nsg-UEID) because of the following reasons.   1. RAN2 has already agreed that we will not do remapping on CN subgroups and 2. CN assigned subgroups has higher priority than UE-ID based subgroups. 3. Number of CN subgroups is not likely to change frequently.   Furthermore, if we adopt option 1, for both CN subgrouping and UE ID subgrouping, the UE can directly use the assigned or calculated subgroup index to determine the bit in PEI to be checked for paging. No additional rules or descriptions are needed.  Conversely, if we adopt option 2, we need to specify how the UE determines or interprets the subgroup indication in PEI, which makes the bitmap determination more complex and may have further RAN1 impact or issues.  Considering these subgroup index should be allocated to CN-assigned subgroups first and the UE ID subgroup ID to be k = floor (UE Identity/(N\*Ns)) mod Nsg-UEID + Nsg-CN (or subgroupsNumPerPO - Nsg-UEID). |
| InterDigital | yes | yes | We have a slight preference for option 2 because it simplifies the formula slightly by removing the unnecessary offset and agree with CATT and Ericsson comments.  The options are actually functionally identical. It makes no difference whether the CN allocates (e.g. in case of 4 bits each) from the range 1-4 or 5-8.  Some of the arguments above in support of option 1 are artificial – there is no remapping needed, no reconfiguration needed, no impact from priority and no difference in complexity. CN would simply allocate the subgroups from the lower or upper range (or in other words from the left or right of the range), that’s all. |
| vivo | Yes |  | R2 assumes that all the cells within the registration area supports the same number of CN assigned subgroups, i.e. no remapping of CN assigned group ID to RAN subgroup ID is need for option 1.  But for UEID-based subgroup method, the number of supported subgroups Nsg-UEID is controlled per-cell basis and can be different between cells. For example, cell1 supports 4 subgroups, while cell2 supports 5 subgroups. Then, CN could only assign 3 subgroups in all cells including cell1 and cell2. In this way, in cell 1, CN subgroup is remapped to subgroup 5 6 7, while in cell 2, CN subgroup is remapped to subgroup 6 7 8. For a UE moving from cell1 to cell2, it will change their subgroup ID. It is very strange. But I agree there is no technique issue, and I am not sure whether this is conflict with our previous agreement, there is no remapping for CN assigned subgroup.  Therefore, we accept option1. |
| ZTE | Yes | Yes | Both options can work, we can not see any significant implementation gap between these two options. |
| LGE | Yes | Yes | But slightly prefer option 1, because it doesn’t requires UE having a subgroup ID assigned by CN to update the assigned subgroup ID based on the different offset (=Nsg UEID) per cell. |
| CMCC | Yes |  | We agree that both options could work but slightly prefer Option1. RAN2 has agreed that no mapping for CN assigned subgrouping. Instead of calculating based on Nsg-UEID, simply applying the number assigned by CN is more straightforward and aligned with the previous agreement. As for the subgroup index for the UE-ID based solution, it can be further derived from the formula and the total number of CN-assigned subgroups. |
| Nokia | Yes | Yes | No strong view. Slightly prefer option 2 with UE-ID based first. |
| Xiaomi |  | Yes | We slightly prefer option2. The reason is that No parameter needs to be defined for Nsg-CN or no more additional calculation for the UE to get the offset.  @vivo, it does not mean UE changed their subgroup ID when UE moves across cells. The CN assigned subgroup id keeps the same. What changes is Isg. So there is no problem for option2. |
| Sequans | Accept Opt 1  (preferable) | Accept Opt 2 | Both work fine. Agree with OPPO’s description. Prefer option 1 for simplicity and clearness as the offset is constant between cells. |
| Nordic | Accept Opt 1 | Accept Opt 2 | No strong preference since both works just fine. Probably Option 2 would be slightly easier to implement due no need to calculate the Nsg-CN as it would implicitly be the Nsg-UEID. However, these are meaningless optimization in any case. |
| Futurewei | Accept Opt 1 |  | Same view as Qualcomm, Samsung, Intel, and CMCC. |
| DENSO | Accept Opt1 | Accept Opt2 | There is no significant difference between the two options, but we prefer option 1 considering the previous agreement “no remapping of CN assigned group ID to RAN subgroup ID”. |
| MediaTek | Accept Opt 1 | Accept Opt 2 |  |
| Apple | Accept Opt 1  (preferred) |  | Both options would work. In option 2, we might have to do the remapping of CN assigned ID, and hence might violate our previous agreement. If not for that, even option 2 would work. |

Summary

Totally 20 companies provided their answers to Q1.

* 18 companies can accept Option1: Subgroup index is allocated to CN-assigned subgroups first
* 12 companies can accept Option2: Subgroup index is allocated to UEID-based subgroups first

Rapporteur suggests that we follow majority, i.e., PEI subgroup index is allocated to CN-assigned subgroups first.

**Proposal 1: PEI subgroup index is allocated to CN-assigned subgroups first.**

### Value ranges of SubgroupNumPerPO and Nsg-UEID

It seems a common understanding that

* *SubgroupNumPerPO* ranges from 2 to 8
  + If network configures subgrouping, there is at least 2 subgroups
  + If network does not configure subgrouping, there is no subgrouping related information
* Nsg-UEID ranges from 1 to 8
  + Nsg-UEID means that one bit in PEI is for UEID-based subgroups, while other bits are for CN-assigned subgroups

We would like to confirm companies’ views on the value ranges.

**Q2: Do you agree that *SubgroupNumPerPO* ranges from 2 to 8 and *Nsg-UEID* ranges from 1 to 8?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Y/N | Comments |
| Qualcomm | See comments | Value ‘1’ may seem degenerate for SubgroupNumPerPO, but it may still be needed. For example, in the case where network supports PEI but no subgrouping is configured, each PO still requires one bit in PEI. Then according to the diagram and formula in Q1, SubgroupNumPerPO should be 1. At least it would simplify spec text. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| OPPO | See comments | We think the minimum value of SubgroupNumPerPO should be 1, which could at least separate UEs supporting subgrouping from others not supporting subgrouping. |
| Intel | Partially, see comments | For subgroupNumPerPO, RAN1 already provided the following:  **Agreement**  Confirm the following working assumption:  **Working Assumption**   * The paging indication field of PEI DCI format comprises of *POnumPerPEI* segment(s) of *K* bit   + *K* = 1, if  is absent or set to 0 or 1,   + *K* = , if  is configured.   + UE identifies its paging indication bit as follows:     - Let  denote the relative PO index, with starting value of 0, among the POs associated with the PEI       * , where  are as defined in clause 7 of TS 38.304     - when *K* = 1 ~~and UE is not provided a subgroup index~~     - when UE is provided a subgroup index     - UE checks the corresponding paging indication from -th bit of the paging indication field where the starting bit index is 0 * If the corresponding paging indication value is set to ‘1’, it indicates the UE to monitor the PO * If the corresponding paging indication value is set to ‘0’, it indicates the UE is not required to monitor the PO   From the above, 1 subgroup is always defined since K needs to be at least 1. As suggested in RAN1 agreement, it can be signal by  is absent or set to 0 or 1’  So the bullet should be (based on RAN1 input):   * If network signals *SubgroupNumPerPO*, and its value is > 1, there is at least 2 subgroups * If network does not signal *SubgroupNumPerPO* or set it to 0 or 1, there is 1 subgroup (though the actual ASN.1 signalling and code points should be discussed in RAN2 during stage 3 – we don’t see a need to have three ways to signal one value)   Absence of Nsg-UEID means that UEID based subgrouping is not configured. While we agree that it can take a value of 1 to 8, the value 1 is not useful as all UEs belong to the same subgroup (it is equivalent to not using UE ID based subgrouping). Therefore, we think the useful range is from 2 to 8. |
| CATT | Y | The simplest stage 3 implementation.  @Intel, yes indeed, in their agreement, RAN1 assume *subgroupsNumPerPO* is either absent or set to 0 or 1 when subgrouping is not supported in PEI. However, the latest endorsed running 38.331 CR includes all subgroup parameters in the IE *subgroupConfig-r17*, which is optional, see below. Therefore, the support/no-support of subgrouping is already captured in RRC spec via the configuration or absence of *subgroupConfig-r17*, not by the parameter *subgroupsNumPerPO*, which is mandatory present if *subgroupConfig-r17* is configured, and equals at least 2 because if subgrouping is supported it means you have at least 2 subgroups. RAN1 will have to capture their agreements in specifications taking into account the stage 3 finalization of RRC.  PEI-Config-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {  pei-SearchSpace-r17 FFS,  subgroupConfig-r17 SubgroupConfig-r17 OPTIONAL, -- Need R  ...  }  SubgroupConfig-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {  subgroupsNumPerPO-r17 INTEGER (FFS.. maxNrofPagingSubgroups-r17),  subgroupsNumforUEID-r17 INTEGER (FFS.. maxNrofPagingSubgroups-r17)  ...  } |
| Ericsson |  | Agree with QC. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | This would avoid any possibility of having misinterpretations and have a simple stage 3 implementation. |
| InterDigital |  | Agree with QC. |
| vivo | **Partially** | We would like to check the range of two parameters case by case:   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Case** | **SubgroupNumPerPO range** | **Nsg-UEID range** | | only CN-assigned subgrouping is use | subgroupsNumPerPO is present, the value then equals to the number of CN-assigned subgroups.  i.e. ranges from 2 to 8 | Nsg-UEID is absent | | only UEID-based subgrouping is used | subgroupsNumPerPO has the same value as Nsg-UEID, i.e. ranges from 1 to 8 | Nsg-UEID ranges from 1 to 8 | | both subgrouping methods are used | 0 < Nsg-UEID < subgroupsNumPerPO.  i.e. ranges from 2 to 8 | Nsg-UEID ranges from 1 to 8 | | Only PEI is used without subgrouping | *SubgroupNumPerPO*=1 | Nsg-UEID =1 | | Summary | subgroupsNumPerPO ranges from 1 to 8 | Nsg-UEID ranges from 1 to 8 |   Therefore, Both SubgroupNumPerPO and Nsg-UEID ranges from 1 to 8. |
| ZTE | Yes | Proponent |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| CMCC |  | Agree with QC. |
| Nokia |  | Value 1 should be supported for SubgroupNumPerPO. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | RAN1 has made it very clear that “if  is absent or set to 0 or 1”, it means there is only one subgroup (k=1) to wake all the UE(UE-id base capable or/and CN-assigned capable or even PEI only if we think there is a PEI separate FG). There is one case of network does not configure PEI subgrouping.  If  is configured, it means gNB configures PEI for subgrouping.  @CATT: The whole PEI-Config-r17 should be optional. If no PEI configure, it means not to support PEI thus no PEI subgrouping.  And I understand that you want to use the absence of the whole IE *subgroupConfig-r17* to express for PEI of no subgrouping, what does that mean if this IE is absent but PEI ss is present?  Can we make *subgroupConfig-r17 mandatory as PEI ss but keep the* subgroupsNumPerPO-r17 and subgroupsNumforUEID-r17 absent? |
| Sequans | partially | Agree with comments above that both values should be between 1 and 8 |
| Nordic | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | Yes | Also OK with SubgroupNumPerPO = 1 when Nsg-UEID is absent. This is not equivalent to no subgrouping (which should be indicated by the absence of SubgroupNumPerPO), because at least UEs having a CN-assigned subgroup ID (which = 0) are not subject to false paging alarms caused by UEs sharing the same PO but without a CN-assigned subgroup ID. This scenario can occur when the CN’s policy is to protect only one type of UEs and the rest UEs are a don’t-care (hence without a CN-assigned subgroup ID), while the gNB doesn’t support UEID-based subgrouping. |
| DENSO | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Partially | The RAN1 agreement of “K = 1, if *subgroupNumPerPO* is absent or set to 0 or 1” may be confusing. From RAN1 perspective, anyway, “K = 1” means that there is one bit in the PEI allocated for this PO. However, from RAN2 perspective we need to know: Should all three cases (absent, ‘0’, ‘1’) be supported? If more than one cases are supported, do they have different meaning? Our understanding is:   * As CATT commented, *subgroupConfig* being **absent** means that there is no subgrouping in a cell. PEI may still be sent, and it is set TRUE (the bit = ’1’) is any UE monitoring this PO is paged. * It is possible that CN uses one subgroup and assigns “subgroupID=0” to *some* UEs. In this case, the minimum number of PEI subgroups to be supported in a cell is one. A cell may support only CN-assigned subgrouping, and let Nsg-UEID be absent, meaning that it does not support UEID-based subgrouping. In this case, PEI-capable UEs without CN-assigned subgroup ID do not monitor PEI in this cell. In this case, *subgroupNumPerPO* = 1. |
| Apple | Yes | Agree with Qualcomm view. Also better to explicitly clarify the range values for sake of clarity. |

Summary

Totally 20 companies provided their answers to Q2.

* 10 companies think the value ranges in original proposal are OK
* 10 companies raise their concern about value range for *subgroupNumPerPO*, and think it should start from 1

Rapporteur thinks that we need to support the use case of *subgroupNumPerPO* = 1, which is different from the case where *subgroupNumPerPO* is absent. Therefore, we propose to have both *subgroupNumPerPO* and Nsg-UEID range from 1 to 8.

**Proposal 2: Both *subgroupNumPerPO* and Nsg-UEID range from 1 to 8.**

However, there seems to be different understanding about how *subgroupNumPerPO* should be configured when network supports PEI but not subgrouping. Rapporteur suggests that we follow CATT’s explanation that if network supports PEI but not subgrouping, the whole *SubgroupConfig-r17* is absent, and the parameter *subgroupsNumPerPO* is mandatory present if *subgroupConfig-r17* is configured.

**Proposal 3: If network supports PEI but not subgrouping, the whole *SubgroupConfig-r17* is absent. The parameter *subgroupsNumPerPO* is mandatory present if *subgroupConfig-r17* is configured.**

## LS to RAN1

RAN2 intend to support eDRX with PEI and subgrouping. We may need consult RAN1 for the applicability.

**Q3: Should we send LS to RAN1 on the applicability of PEI and subgrouping to eDRX? Are there any related questions to ask RAN1?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Y/N | Comments |
| Qualcomm | No | We don’t see any impact of this agreement on RAN1 spec. |
| Samsung | No |  |
| OPPO | Yes | If PEI is applied to eDRX, the time required for DL synchronization before PO may be longer than that for DRX case since UE wakes up from deep sleep for a long time. This may have an impact on the offset required between PEI and PO, which is RAN1 scope. As we know, RAN1 has not discussed supporting PEI for eDRX so far, so we think we need to check with RAN1. |
| Intel | No |  |
| CATT | Y | OK to send an LS to check if any RAN1 concern, indicating RAN2’s preference per this week’s agreement. |
| Ericsson | No | Agree with QC. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | It seems there are no impact on RAN1 spec. |
| InterDigital | No | Agree with QC and others. |
| vivo | **Y** | Inform RAN1 that RAN2 aims to Support PEI and subgrouping with eDRX. Suggest RAN1 to discuss PEI for e-DRX, if any feedback or concern. |
| ZTE | No | We think it still can work to eDRX UE without any involvement of RAN1, regarding above comments, we do not think there is no any room for RAN1 to discuss this. |
| ZTE | No | No impact on RAN1. |
| CMCC | No |  |
| Nokia | No |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes | Agree with OPPO. |
| Sequans | No | See no impact on RAN1, concerned companies can bring this directly there. However, OK to go with majority. |
| Nordic | No | Does not harm, though, letting RAN1 know about this. |
| Futurewei | No |  |
| DENSO | No |  |
| MediaTek | No | We believe that the PEI-to-PO offset should not be longer even when applied to eDRX. The problem is delayed paging: There’s a risk that PEI says “no paging” but Paging comes during the offset. If UE needs more time for synchronization due to eDRX, it can always wake up earlier t process more SSBs. |
| Apple | Yes | Same comment as Vivo. If RAN1 comes back and says no concerns, we are good. |

Summary

Totally 20 companies provided their answers to Q3.

* 15 companies do not see the need to send the LS to RAN1 about eDRX support with PEI and subgrouping
* 5 companies see the need

Rapporteur thinks that we follow majority and save the effort of LS drafting. Companies with concerns may contribute to RAN1 directly.

**Proposal 4: We do not send LS to RAN1 about eDRX support with PEI and subgrouping.**

We may have other issues to discuss with RAN1.

**Q4: Are there any other information or questions to be included in a LS to RAN1?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
|  |  |

Summary

There is no input for this question, so no proposal.

## PEI monitoring only in last used cell

In LTE WUS, UE monitors WUS only in its last used cell, and companies proposed to have the same rule for PEI monitoring. While this ensures power saving for stationary UEs, mobile UEs may not benefit from PEI/WUS. There are also proposals to make this configurable, i.e., operator can choose the behavior. To help reach consensus, we’d like to know if companies can accept, or really object to, each method.

If you think PEI monitoring area can be configurable, please also suggest how the configurations are provided to UEs.

**Q5: Do you accept to have PEI monitoring only in the last used cell?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Y/N | Comments |
| BT | **N** | Last visited cell helps to reduce the paging load in the TAI/RNA but it removes completely all PEI benefits to mobile UEs. Therefore, it is BT preference to have a configurable solution rather than a solution that was designed for static UEs. |
| Qualcomm | No |  |
| Samsung | No |  |
| Sony | **N** | Our view is that only supporting static UE´s is clearly a limitiating when it comes to supporting mobile UE´s, e.g. for tracking use cases.  But also the fact the UE´s that are stationary but at cell edge, may under some circumstances may have to do cell reselection and hence fall outside last cell paging.  The drawback with doing paging over large area is the increase of false wake-up, but this can be mitigated by placing stationary UE´s together in same subgroup.  When it comes to network complexity, there is no additional complexity. The same signalling toward the gNB and UE would be the same for doing paging in one cell or multiple cells. So there should in principle be no additional impact on specifications.  Further, most UE´s are mainly stationary, so the extra paging load should be able to be regarded as fairly small, or mobility can be foreseen in limited area covering a few number of cells. |
| OPPO | No | We see no need to introduce such restriction as UEs will not always camp on the last used cell. |
| Intel | Y | With the limited time left to complete the WI, we can accept to go with just supporting PEI monitoring in the last used cell. |
| CATT | N | We prefer to let it configurable. Note that it is our understanding that it is already configurable in legacy LTE, via the parameter *noLastCellUpdate* (TS36.304):   |  | | --- | | 7.4        Paging with Wake Up Signal Paging with Wake Up Signal is only used in the cell in which the UE most recently entered RRC\_IDLE triggered by:  -     reception of *RRCEarlyDataComplete*; or  -     reception of *RRCConnectionRelease* not including *noLastCellUpdate*; or  -     reception of *RRCConnectionRelease* including *noLastCellUpdate* and the UE was using (G)WUS in this cell prior to this RRC connection attempt. | |
| Ericsson | Y | We are surprised to see that some companies object to the behaviour which we already have in LTE! It is difficult to understand how to interpret this.  We note that PEI in only last used cell is simpler since it does not require any RAN3 work for this. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | We think that mobile UE (smart phone) is one of the important device type considered for power saving enhancements and mobility of such devices is a general and important attribute that needs to be taken into account.  If we introduce such restriction, we believe the designed solution will be too restrictive and the power saving gain will be very limited for the mobile UEs.  If there are concerns about the waking up stationary UEs due to false paging alarms caused by mobility, we think this can be easily avoided by including stationary UEs in a separate CN subgroup. |
| InterDigital | Y | There is limited, if any, gain to support the mobility case – note that this would not only impact “stationary” UEs but any UE which happens to be in the same TA as a UE being paged after cell reselection (assuming the NW would escalate paging to be throughout the TA) - any gains to the mobile UE come at a cost to all of the other UEs in the TA and therefore may cause the performance in the system overall to be worse. Furthermore this limitation would simplify things somewhat which at this stage in the release would be welcome. |
| vivo | N | As we all know, the LTE WUS is only used for NB-IoT and eMTC UEs which are less mobile. However, things are different in R17, the UE types are various and some UEs may move around.  If PEI monitoring is only applied in the last used cell, the UE cannot use it after moving out of the last used cell, which will limit the power saving gain from paging PEI/subgrouping. |
| ZTE | No strong view | Can follow majorities. |
| LGE | No | Such a restriction seems not suitable for NR UE supporting mobility. |
| CMCC | No |  |
| Nokia | No |  |
| Xiaomi | - | Can accept to make it configurable as a compromise. |
| Sequans | Yes | This is detrimental to static UEs, which form a large part of the most power sensitive UEs, at a questionable benefit to mobile UEs. Temporarily static UEs, which many mobile UEs often-times are, can still enjoy the feature even with this limitation. And the simpler specification is a real boon at this stage.  However, since this is also dependent on the NW paging strategy, we are fine to make it configurable as a compromise.  If this is still deadlocked even with that compromise, we suggest sending an LS to SA2, their input helped the discussions during the LTE sessions. |
| Nordic | - | Prefer to follow what was specified for LTE (G)WUS. |
| Futurewei | No | Agree with Sony and Huawei that the false alarm issue can be addressed by the CN assigning stationary UEs and mobile UEs into different subgroups. |
| DENSO | No | The UE power saving is a serious problem for mobile UEs (not just for stationary UEs). Unlike WUS in LTE, PEI needs to cover the mobility case. |
| MediaTek | Yes | To protect stationary UEs, which may have limited power supply, network can assign stationary UEs to specific subgroups. Then Paging and PEI for stationary UEs are only sent in the last used cell, and false alarm rate can be kept low.  The power-saving benefit of PEI/WUS is, unfortunately, limited for mobile UEs:   * If PEI is sent in many cells (e.g., the whole TA), the effective number of UEs in a subgroup becomes large, group paging rate becomes high, and PEI is likely to be positive. That is, UE usually needs to decode paging message. * If PEI is sent only in the last used cell, UE does not benefit from PEI once it reselects to another cell.   Therefore, we can accept “PEI only in last used cell”, as this is the simplest solution. But we can also accept PEI with configurability, if a simple solution can be found. |
| Apple | No | In our view, this would be detrimental for mobile UEs. Mobility would result in null power saving benefits in this case. |

Summary

Totally 22 companies provided their answers to Q5.

* 14 companies do not accept that PEI is only monitored in the last used cell
* 5 companies think that PEI can only be monitored in the last used cell
* 3 companies do not have strong view

Since many companies do not accept that PEI is only monitored in the last used cell Rapporteur suggest that we allow UE monitor PEI after cell reselection and look for a simple solution that allows network to configure this (see Q6).

**Proposal 5: It is possible for UE to monitor PEI after cell reselection.**

**Q6: Do you accept to have configurable PEI monitoring area? If yes, how should the configurations be provided to UEs?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Y/N | Comments |
| BT | **Y** | A compromise could be reached for paging escalation introducing a new PEI subgroup TAI/RNA list area that works similar to Paging optimization for UEs in CM\_IDLE and for Paging optimization for UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE.  Each PEI subgroup can contain a list of RAN nodes, *<1 .. max number of nodes>*, where PEI is sent. Then, operators can choose to engineer the network to have a last used cell approach if the list contains a single node or specific patterns to match mobility if more than one node is included. |
| Qualcomm | Y | We can accept configurable PEI monitoring area as a compromise, for the sake of moving forward. A simple option can be {no restriction, or the last TA used}. |
| Samsung | - | Our preference is not to have any configuration. However, if there is significant majority supporting configuration as an compromise, we will accept. |
| Sony | **Y** | Yes, for paging escalation any variant of TAI/RNA list area could be supported, e.g. similar as for paging optimization for UE´s in RRC-Inactive, using RNA (RAN Notification Area) for limiting the number of cells supported for paging escalation.  So, all mechanisms are in place to support also non-stationary UE´s to benefit from the usage of PEI monitoring in order to save power. |
| OPPO | - | Share the same view as Samsung. |
| Intel | - | Even though we could accept it if there is significant support, we prefer not to have it in view of the limited time left for the work item as it will lead to further discussion on the details. |
| CATT | Y | We can either follow the LTE way, UE-specific through dedicated signaling in the *RRCConnectionRelease* message (see Q5), or make it cell-specific and broadcast it along with PEI configuration as follows:  PEI-Config-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {  pei-SearchSpace-r17 SearchSpaceId,  po-NumPerPEI-r17 ENUMERATED {1, 2, 4, 8},  payloadSizeDCI-2-7-r17 INTEGER (1..maxDCI-2-7-Size-r17),  pei-FrameOffset-r17 FFS,  firstPDCCH-MonitoringOccasionOfPEI-O-r17 FFS,  subgroupConfig-r17 SubgroupConfig-r17 OPTIONAL, -- Need R  lastUsedCellOnly ENUMERATED {true} OPTIONAL,  ...  } |
| Ericsson | Y | As a compromise, we could have it configurable whether PEI applies only in last used cell or in any cell. Its one bit in system info. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **-** | We prefer not to have such configuration for the reasons stated in Q5. |
| InterDigital | Y | Agree with Ericsson, it could be 1 bit to indicate whether the last cell limitation is applied or not, but we do question whether the added complexity is worth the gain (if any) |
| vivo | - | We agree with Samsung.  If companies really want to achieve some compromise by configuring PEI monitoring area, we think a suitable area of using paging PEI/subgrouping should be defined. In this way, network can balance the PEI gain for a mobile UE and its impact to the stationary UEs  In our understanding, the CN can determine the area of using paging PEI/subgrouping, e.g. with taking account of UE characteristics, such as a list of cells according to UE movement area, or RNA in the registration area, etc. it’s flexible to configure the applied area of PEI, e.g. RNA area. |
| LGE | **-** | Share the same view as Samsung |
| CMCC | Y | A configurable area could be provided by CN to balance the power consumption for both NW and UE side. We are fine to go with the majority if 1-bit indication is widely supported. |
| Nokia | - | If to have any configuration, enough to have last cell or not last cell. No need to have list of cells. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | Can accept to make it configurable as a compromise.  But if UE gets the configuration from gNB, then when the UE reselect to another cell, it need to get the updated indication from the new cell?  We think we need to discuss who will be the node for configure this? CN or the gNB?  The CN can be the node since it knows UE’s paging probability and stationary state. If a group is consist of UEs of high paging probability and high mobility, then CN can indicate to UE belonging to this group not to use the PEI during moving across the cells of a TA.  And we also want it simple that we do not want to differentiate CN paging and RAN paging. |
| Sequans | Yes | Would prefer a simple solution (e.g., 1 bit) but not e.g. a list of cells |
| Nordic | - | Prefer not to have any additional configurations. |
| Futurewei | - | Prefer not, but can accept if configuration is the only way to move forward. |
| DENSO | Y | We prefer to have configurable PEI monitoring area. And it should be configured UE-specific based on UE characteristics, not cell-specific. PEI mechanism can be optimized by allowing the monitoring area narrower for Stationary UEs and wider for mobile UEs. The simplest way is to introduce one bit in *RRCRelease* message that indicates whether PEI is delivered only in the last cell or not. If the bit is absent, PEI is transmitted in the TAI list or RNA, as for the legacy paging scheme in NR today. |
| MediaTek | Yes | As a simple solution, we can have one bit in SI indicating whether a UE reselecting to this cell should monitor PEI, as the example provided by CATT. |
| Apple | Yes | As a compromise solution, a simple solution is preferred. |

Summary

Totally 20 companies provided their answers to Q6.

* 8 companies do not want PEI monitoring area to be configurable
* 13 companies think that PEI monitoring area can be configurable, among them 2 companies think the configuration is provide as a cell list (e.g., TAI/RNA for PEI), 1 company does not specify a preferred solution, and 10 companies think that we only need one bit to indicate whether UE monitors PEI only in the last used cell (the indication can be provided in SI).

Rapporteur suggests that we follow majority view to have PEI monitoring area configurable. Then as a simple solution, we have one bit in SI indicating whether UEs monitor PEI only in the last used cell.

**Proposal 6: In system information, indicate whether UEs monitor PEI only in the last used cell.**

# Conclusion

The following proposals can be considered for agreement:

**Proposal 1: PEI subgroup index is allocated to CN-assigned subgroups first.**

**Proposal 2: Both *subgroupNumPerPO* and Nsg-UEID range from 1 to 8.**

**Proposal 3: If network supports PEI but not subgrouping, the whole *SubgroupConfig-r17* is absent. The parameter *subgroupsNumPerPO* is mandatory present if *subgroupConfig-r17* is configured.**

**Proposal 4: We do not send LS to RAN1 about eDRX support with PEI and subgrouping.**

**Proposal 5: It is possible for UE to monitor PEI after cell reselection.**

**Proposal 6: In system information, indicate whether UEs monitor PEI only in the last used cell.**
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