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**1. Overall Description:**

RAN2 thanks CT1 for the LS in [R2-2204510](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs//R2-2204510.zip)/[C1-223219](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_135e/Docs//C1-223219.zip).

RAN2 discussed the following definition of the single bit approach described in the attached CR in C1-223001:

|  |
| --- |
| The disaster related indication indicates that the available PLMN broadcasting this indication is the only PLMN accessible for disaster inbound roamers, that this PLMN accepts disaster inbound roamers from any other PLMN, that a disaster condition applies to all other PLMNs in the location of the broadcast, and that the disaster inbound roamers attempt to determine the MS determined PLMN with disaster condition as per bullet q2) |

RAN2 identified some issues with this usage for example in a RAN sharing scenario. Consider a scenario where PLMN A and PLMN B share a cell and are both unaffected by a disaster condition while there are other PLMNs in the area which are affected by a disaster condition, it would not be possible for these two PLMNs to **both** use the single bit approach if defined as above. This because if indeed the single bit "*indicates that the available PLMN broadcasting this indication is the only PLMN accessible for disaster inbound roamers*" if PLMN A indicates the single bit, it would imply that disaster conditions apply for PLMN B, and vice versa.

RAN2 understands that, for the non-sharing case, the single bit according to the above definition from CT1 should only be interpreted as if a PLMN indicates this single bit it accepts disaster inbound roaming from any other PLMN in the location of the broadcast.

But from RAN2 understanding the single bit seems also feasible to be applied to the RAN-sharing case where this single-bit approach can be used by each the PLMNs broadcasted in SIB1, in which case it would be indicating that the PLMN indicating this bit accepts disaster inbound roamers from any PLMN other than the PLMNs sharing the cell.

Further, based on current RAN2 understanding the field description of the single bit indicates (only) that "*this network(s) accepts disaster inbound roamers from any other PLMN (except those indicated in SIB1).*". Means that "*indication indicates that the available PLMN broadcasting this indication is the only PLMN accessible for disaster inbound roamers*" and "*that a disaster condition applies to all other PLMNs in the location of the broadcast*" are currently **not** captured in RAN2 specs.

RAN2 asks CT1 to indicate if CT1 sees any problems with any of the above.

**2. Actions:**

**To CT1**

**ACTION:** RAN2 asks CT1 to indicate if CT1 sees any problems with any of the above.

**3. Date of Next RAN2 Meetings:**

RAN2#119-e 2022-08-15 - 2022-08-26 electronic meeting

RAN2#119-bis-e 2022-10-10 - 2022-10-19 electronic meeting