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# 1 Introduction

This document is to kick off the following email discussion:

* [AT121][012][IAB] IAB SIB1 Cell Barring (Ericsson)

 Scope: agreeable CRs if possible.

 Intended outcome: Report to CB session

 Deadline: Friday 2022-03-02 1600 UTC

# 2 Contact Information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Contact: Name (E-mail) |
| SONY | Vivek.sharma@sony.com |
| LGE | Sunghoon.jung@lge.com |
| ZTE | huang.ying11@zte.com.cn |
| CATT | luyang@catt.cn |
| Intel | Sudeep.k.palat@intel.com |
| Samsung | m.tesanovic@samsung.com |
| Sharp |  |
| Nokia | andrew.lappalainen@nokia.com |
| Apple | pcheng24@apple.com |
| Qualcomm | ghampel@qti.qualcomm.com |
| Lenovo | zhuoyb1@lenovo.com |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 3 Discussions

## 3.1 Motivation of CR

Since 38.331 refers to TS 38.304 for cell barring idle mode MT-IAB behaviour, the clause is missing in TS 38.304 spec. As such the idle mode MT-IAB behaviour should be captured in TS 38.304. Hence, for completeness of specification, the proponent has provided the CR.

Do company agree to the CRs (provided in same folder)?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| SONy | Yes | We think this was missed during rel-16 and its ok to capture now. |
| LGE | No | In 331, UE behaviors are already specified clearly as follows:3> else if UE is IAB-MT and if *iab-Support* is not provided for the selected PLMN nor the registered PLMN nor PLMN of the equivalent PLMN list nor the selected SNPN nor the registered SNPN:4> consider the cell as barred for IAB-MT in accordance with TS 38.304 [20];In our view, the green part is only to refer to the exact definition of “barring” as specified in 38304 and to follow barring-relevant behaviors as specified in 304. Since the yellow part is already in 331, it does not have to be repeated in 304.  Normally it is strongly desirable to avoid unnecessary duplication across specifications unless really necessary. Duplicated specifications only increases potential mismatch but no real gain. Unfortunately, our specs already have many duplicated text across 304 and 331. We would like to stop repeating the same thing across specifications unless something is really broken or indeed misleading without the duplication. We do not see anything broken or misleading in the current spec.  |
| ZTE | Perhaps no  | Agree with LGE. It’s true that the current text in 38.304 doesn’t list all the cases when the UE shall treat the cell as if cell status is “barred”. However there is no technical issue in current 38.304. |
| CATT | Yes | Not all the barring conditions are constrainedly described in 38.331’s text part at present, instead, the barring configurations are all clarified in the field of IE part in 38.331. However, each barring parameter is normally captured in 38.304. So, we think the same principle should be applied to “iab-support”. |
| Intel | No; see comments | The confusion seems to come from what is captured in 304. Some companies believe that “cell as barred for IAB-MT” is captured, while others believe that “cell as barred” is captured in 304. As the behaviour for IAB-MT is not different compared to normal barring, we prefer not to add something specific for this for IAB-MT in 304. Would the following change in 331 help avoid the confusion:consider the cell as barred in accordance with TS 38.304 [20] for IAB-MT; |
| Samsung | No strong view | We feel the cross reference is clearer with this change, but we also empathise with LGE’s view.We also see Intel’s point, but do not think their proposal fixes this (the rewording could also be interpreted in the wrong way). |
| Sharp | Yes | As many of the other cell restriction/reservation parameters are captured in both 304 and 331, we think it is natural to follow the current style. It looks odd if only “iab-support” is treated differently. |
| Nokia | See comments | We wonder if the green text highlighted by LG from 38.331 has some ambiguity that appears to be resulting in different interpretations of the text.The text should be interpreted in reference to the following from 38.304 5.3.1: “When cell status "barred" is indicated or to be treated as if the cell status is "barred",…”However, as currently structured, prior to this text, 38.304 already notes IAB-specific behaviour in addition to UE behaviour when some other feature-specific barring indications are present/not present. We are wondering if this is leading some individuals to instead interpret that those behaviours are what are being referenced to by the statement in green.The text proposal from Intel would have the same issue, whereas the CR seems to at least resolve this ambiguity (even if it is somehow a little excessive by restating things across specs). |
| Apple | Perhaps no | We think the CR is correct, but have sympathy with LGE on avoiding the duplicated description in different spec. Since it is Rel-17 CR, we think the bar for CR is high, and maybe the CR is not needed.  |
| Qualcomm | No | Intel made a good point. The intention of the RRC statement is:consider the cell as barred in accordance with TS 38.304 [20] for IAB-MT;However, the RRC presently states:consider the cell as barred for IAB-MT in accordance with TS 38.304 [20];We should not add anything to 38.304. We could consider a rewording in RRC. However, this clarification may not be necessary. The RRC spec’s intention becomes clear by the very fact that there is no corresponding statement on IAB-MT in TS 38.304.  |
| Lenovo | Yes | Current descriptions in 38331 and 38304 are not clear enough on cell barred for IAB-MT. It’s meaningful to make such correction as in CRs. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |