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# 1 Introduction

This document is the report about the second 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

Initial intended outcome: Set of proposals with full consensus agreeable via email, based on the list in Section 4.1 of R2-2002659 (final list to be reflected in R2-2003895)

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): Friday 2020-04-24 10:00 UTC

Proposed agreements in R2-2003896) indicated for email agreement and not challenged until Monday 2020-04-27 12:00 UTC will be declared as agreed by the session chair. For the other ones, the discussion will continue online.

# 2 Discussion

## 2.1 Issue 8: UE behaviour in unlicensed band with non-CAG member cell

**Open issue description:** The UE behaviour in unlicensed band is FFS when the cell belongs to the correct operator but it’s not a CAG member cell.

At RAN2#109 the following was agreed:

For unlicensed spectrum and for a UE with non-empty allowed CAG list, if the highest ranked cell or best cell according to absolute priority reselection rules is a cell which is not suitable due to not broadcasting the selected/registered/equivalent PLMN, the UE with no empty allowed CAG list shall behave according to NR-U agreement. FFS how to handle the case when the cell belongs to the correct operator but it’s not a CAG member cell. (We might come back to this if serious concerns / problems are found with this)

The relevant NR-U agreement is captured in the following way in 38.304:

“For operation with shared spectrum channel access, if the second highest ranked cell on this frequency also does not have a PLMN being equivalent to the registered PLMN, the UE may consider this frequency to be the lowest priority for a maximum of 300 seconds.”

During the online discussion of R2-2002659 it was concluded that a selection from the following options should be made:

* **Option A) Follow the NR-U behaviour:**   
  In unlicensed band when the highest ranked cell or best cell is not suitable due to belonging to the correct operator, but it is not a CAG member cell, the UE shall not consider this cell as candidate for reselection for a maximum of 300 seconds. If the second highest ranked cell on this frequency is not suitable due to belonging to the correct operator, but it is not a CAG member cell, the UE may consider this frequency to be the lowest priority for a maximum of 300 seconds.
* **Option B) Follow the licensed behaviour:**   
  In unlicensed band when the highest ranked cell or best cell is not suitable due to belonging to the correct operator, but it is not a CAG member cell, the UE shall not consider this cell and other cells on the same frequency, as candidates for reselection for a maximum of 300 seconds.
* **Option C)** Introduce a new flag in SIB1 that indicates whether the UE may (or shall not) consider other cells on the same frequency, as candidates for reselection.

**Question 1: Which option(s) do you prefer?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | Option B | In the option the NRU principle is followed if the highest ranked cell or best cell is not suitable due to NOT belonging to the correct operator. So, the UE is allowed to reselect another cell on the same frequency. When the UE finds the second highest ranked cell on this frequency is not suitable due to belonging to the correct operator, but it is not a CAG member cell, the UE may consider this frequency to be the lowest priority for a maximum of 300 seconds.  This option still allows the UE look of cells on this frequency after 300 seconds. During the web session discussion, some operators expressed views of considering CAG deployment on unlicensed frequency with lower priority. Given this operator feedback, we prefer not to optimise the scenario and follow Option B which is simple and less specification impacts |
| Huawei | Option A | I don’t remember having an agreement for licensed regarding “the best cell is not suitable due to belong to the correct operator but it is not a CAG member cell”. Therefore the UE behaviour for licensed spectrum should also be clarified.  In LTE CSG, there is:  *If the highest ranked cell or best cell according to absolute priority reselection rules is a CSG cell which is not suitable due to not being a CSG member cell, the UE shall not consider this cell as candidate for cell reselection but shall continue considering other cells on the same frequency for cell reselection.*   1. For licensed:   We see no motivation of deviating from the CSG behaviour. If the best cell is not suitable due to not being a CAG member, other cells should not be excluded.   1. For unlicensed:   We think the behaviour can be the same with licensed, i.e. other cells should not be excluded.  However, it’s also ok for us to respect the agreements of NR-U, that is, take intra-frequency interference into account, only consider the strongest and second strongest cell on a frequency, other cells are excluded. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary:**

## 2.2 Issue 9: PCI values for CAGs

**Open issue description:** FFS whether PCI values for CAGs are signalled per PLMN per frequency or no new ASN.1 IEs are introduced in Rel-16 for signalling of PCI values for CAGs

During the online discussion of R2-2002659 it was concluded that a selection from the following options should be made:

* **Option A** (used to be option 2 in R2-2002659): Signal PCI range(s) per PLMN per frequency. Number of ranges FFS.
* **Option B** (used to be option 4 in R2-2002659): Signal PCI range(s) per frequency as a list of blacklisted/whitelisted cells (no changes required to ASN.1 and NR-U CRs are the baseline).

**Question 2: Which option(s) do you prefer?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | Option A | This is simple with less signalling overhead |
| Huawei | Option A | As Qualcomm indicated in this email thread, Option B was ruled out by the online discussion:   * Discuss in followup offline [105] the possibility/feasibility to signal PCI range(s) per PLMN per frequency vs just per frequency   And the two options on the table should be “per PLMN per frequency” and “per frequency”.  We think the granularity of PLMN makes sense, because in RAN sharing cases, a physical cell may broadcast multiple PLMNs, some of which contains CAG IDs while others are just for public network. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary:**

## 2.3 Issue 11: Optionality to support reporting about the npn-IdentityInfoList

**Open issue description:** It is FFS if all Rel-16 are required to be able to report the *npn-IdentityInfoList*

At RAN2#109e the following was agreed

4.1: Extend the current measurement reporting procedures to include NPN information to support ANR. (It is FFS if it is mandatory for all Rel-16 UEs to support it.)

4.2: The CAG ID/SNPN NID information shall be added into the CGI-InfoNR. (It is FFS if it is mandatory for all Rel-16 UEs to support it.)

During the email discussion of this issue (see R2-2002659) the following options were discussed

* **Option A:** Reporting about the *npn-IdentityInfoList* is mandatory for all Rel-16 UEs
* **Option B:** Reporting about the *npn-IdentityInfoList* is mandatory for all NPN-capable UEs, but optional for non-NPN capable UEs (separate capability indication about CGI reporting for NPN may be needed)
* **Option C:** Reporting about the *npn-IdentityInfoList* is mandatory for all NPN-capable UEs, and not supported by non-NPN capable UEs (separate capability indication about NPN may be needed)

During the email discussion (see R2-2002659) most of the companies supported option C, but companies that do not support option C had the following technical concerns

* ANR reporting is important
* There is a justification for option A that “the UE reports all the broadcast NCGI(s)/ECGI(s) to the serving cell NG-RAN node reporting about broadcasted IDs” is a requirement in 38.300.
* There is a comment that if reporting about NPN information is not mandatory then an AS level capability indication is needed. (See also issue 18).

**Question 3: Which option do you prefer?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | Option C | It is not desirable that non-NPN capable UEs are forced to report *npn-IdentityInfoList*. Based on the agreement reached for support of emergency calls for non-NPN capable UEs, it is understood that these UEs are not required to read the NPN information. Further, this avoid AS level capability indication i.e. less specification impact. |
| Huawei | C | We agree that ANR reporting is important, but note that the existing CGI related capabilities (without NPN involved) in 38.306 are mandatory with signalling, which is basically equal to optional.  Besides, we don’t think answering “Option C” to this question directly leads to adding an AS capability.  The AMF has a way of knowing UE’s NPN capability by SNPN subscription information and the "CAG Supported" in NAS signalling. The mobility restriction list sent from AMF to NG-RAN node contains the serving NID and allowed CAG list, therefore NG-RAN node can also acquire UE’s NPN capability information. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary**:

## 2.4 Issue 16: UE capabilities

**Open issue description:** Views on UE NPN feature support and necessary capabilities.

NPN support in Rel-16 UEs is optional, but there has not been any discussion whether AS level capability indication is needed that the UE supports NPN.

NAS already has a capability for CAG, 24.501/9.11.3.1 (network provides CAG member list via NAS only if the UE supports this capability). The SNPN mode selection is a UE autonomous procedure.

During the email discussion of this issue (see R2-2002659) most of the companies’ view was that no capability indication is needed, one company proposed separate indication for SNPN and PNI-NPN capability and one company commented that CGI reporting for NPN capability indication is needed if it is not a mandatory feature for all Rel-16 UEs.

**Question 4:** Do you agree that AS level capability indication is needed for NPN support? If yes, then please also provide some proposals on the capabilities to be indicated.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | Disagree |  |
| Huawei | Disagree |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary**:

# 3 Conclusions

## 3.1 The following proposals are proposed to be agreed without further discussion:

## 3.2 The following issues are proposed to be discussed further