**3GPP TSG-RAN WG2 Meeting #119bis Electronic R2-22xxx**

**Online Meeting, 10th – 19th Oct 2022**

Agenda Item: 8.12.2

Source: Huawei, HiSilicon

**Title:** Report of [AT119bis-e][021][eIAB] Enhancements for Idle Inactive UE

Document for: Discussion and Decision

# Introduction

This paper aims at capturing the summary of offline discussion.

**[AT119bis-e][021][eIAB] Enhancements for Idle Inactive UE (Huawei)**

Scope: Idle Inactive UEs. Make some assumptions on typical configuration and cell reselection behaviour for legacy UEs, and potential performance issues, reasonable configurations / scenarios with issues etc. List the potential enhancements proposals on the table for enhanced UEs and for such proposals clarify what is the target performance characteristic to enhance and target scenario (if any). Proponents assumed to be initially active. In a second round, Collect evaluation comments (e.g. importance, feasibility, complexity, pros-cons) for the different proposals, and whether some proposal seems unacceptable.

Intended outcome: Report, for online CB, for discussion on exclusion / keep on the table / agreement (if possible) for either issues or solution proposals or both.

Deadline: CB W2 Wed

[R2-2209522](file:///C:\Users\mtk65284\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2_RL2\TSGR2_119bis-e\Docs\R2-2209522.zip) Mobile IAB mobility enhancement Huawei, HiSilicon discussion Rel-18 NR\_mobile\_IAB-Core

DISCUSSION 3 & 4 (mobile-IAB-Node to UE indications and UE mobility enhancements).

- Nokia think legacy users need to be able to access, so this contradicts WI statement. HW indicate that this is for UE to prioritize, not access control.

- AT&T think it is useful that UE can know more quickly whether it is on-board.

- IDT think it is useful to optimize measurements, ping-pong, etc.

- NEC think that speed and location may change dynamically and think such info may be out of date when transmitted and think such solution should not be considered. Support proposal 3b.

- ZTE think a bcast indication is needed, to reduce measurement etc, think subscription info etc is needed as onboard indication.

- Apple also think this indication is useful, e.g. for cell reselection.

- QC think that 4c can determine that it is on-board only if there is an indication.

- Chair: a number of comments on Torhu on “on-board”.

- Terminology: Chair think that we can use the “on-board” notation for the sake of discussion, with the loose meaning that a UE is “on-board” when it is suitable for the UE to use a mobile IAB cell. Likely we will not define a state etc with this name, maybe it doesn’t exactly mean on-board.

- TMO don’t want to support any enhancements, as the most important case is for existing UEs, and those UEs shall be IAB-capable. AT&T think there are cases when this is useful and think that at some point in time there will be a majority of UEs Rel-18 and later, and it would also useful for public safety UEs. TMO think only public safety UEs then would IAB capable.

- Chair: The TMO objection to impact UEs and the related assumption that legacy UEs is the most important case is noted and can be taken into account when we decide. There is significant support to make enhancements for better performance for new UEs. On the details there seems to be a number of diverging opinions. In order to make decisions, we need to explore the proposals, to see it there are any enhancements that could be agreeable.

**RAN2 confirms that Mobile IAB need to work with legacy UEs.**

**RAN2 observes that a UE could potentially consider itself on-board of a mobile-IAB cell, if the UE camps on/connects to a mobile IAB cell during a long period (i.e. the UE then need to know that this is such a cell). FFS the time. FFS if this is needed.**

Offline: Outline what would/could be a typical configuration and cell reselection behaviour for legacy UEs. Clarify the potential enhancements on the table for enhanced UEs.

**Contact**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Contact (Email)** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yulong (shiyulong5@huawei.com) |
| Apple | Peng (pcheng24@apple.com) |
| Qualcomm | Georg (ghampel@qti.qualcomm.com) |
| Kyocera | Masato Fujishiro (masato.fujishiro.fj@kyocera.jp) |
| Ericsson | Antonino Orsino (antonino.orsino@ericsson.com) |
| ZTE | Lin Chen(chen.lin23@zte.com.cn) |
| Samsung | June Hwang (june77.hwang@samsung.com) |
| Lenovo | Yibin Zhuo ([zhuoyb1@lenovo.com](mailto:zhuoyb1@lenovo.com)) |
| vivo | Boubacar Kimba D.A. (kimba@vivo.com) |
| Fujitsu | Sue (yisu@fujitsu.com) |
| Intel | Ziyi (ziyi.li@intel.com) |
| Xiaomi | Gordon ([gordonpetery@xiaomi.com](mailto:gordonpetery@xiaomi.com)) |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Andrew Lappalainen (andrew.lappalainen@nokia.com) |
| LGE | SungHoon Jung ([sunghoon.jung@lge.com](mailto:sunghoon.jung@lge.com)) |
| Interdigital | Oumer Teyeb (oumer.teyeb@interdigital.com) |
| Sharp | Art Ishii (ishiia@sharplabs.com) |

# Phase 1 discussion

* 1. **Company proposals on this issue**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc** | **Company** | **Proposals** |
| R2-2209522 | Huawei | Proposal 3a: It is up to UE implementation to use the “mobile-IAB cell” indication during cell (re-)selection, if RAN2 agree to introduce this indication in SI.  Proposal 3b: Not to introduce any broadcasting mobility state/location/speed information by mobile IAB cell, considering the security issue and frequent SI update.  Proposal 4a: No special standard effort is needed to prevent the surrounding UE from accessing the mobile IAB-node.  Proposal 4b: RAN2 to discuss whether to support the identification of on-board UE in following cases:  - Case 1: UE in RRC\_IDLE state (e.g. for cell (re-)selection prioritization)  - Case 2: UE in RRC\_CONNECTED state (e.g. for NW to determine whether it is suitable to configure CHO and RACH-less, in addition to the RSRP measurement reporting) |
| R2-2209616 | ZTE | Proposal 1: UE may prioritize to select the cell with which UE has similar mobility state via stationary or low relative mobility evaluation.  Proposal 2: If the mobile IAB node only allows the restricted access of certain group of on-board Ues, the design of PNI-NPN and CAG (Close Access Group) may be leveraged.  Proposal 3: To avoid unnecessary inter-frequency measurement with high priority, UE camped on mobile IAB cell may regard the frequency which provide mobile IAB cell to be the highest priority. In addition, the relaxed RRM measurement may be enabled for Ues camped on the mobile IAB cells. |
| R2-2209640 | Intel | Proposal 1: Mobility enhancement of mobile IAB-node’s served RRC\_CONNECTED, RRC\_INACTIVE and RRC\_IDLE Ues for handover/cell (re-)selection should be considered for following four scenarios:  Scenario 1: The UE is moving inside the vehicle equipped with a mobile IAB-node  Scenario 2: The UE is moving out of the vehicle equipped with a mobile IAB-node  Scenario 3: The onboard UE is moving together with the vehicle equipped with a mobile IAB-node  Scenario 4: The onboard UE is moving inside the vehicle equipped with multiple mobile IAB-nodes  Proposal 2: For cell (re-)selection, to differentiate from stationary network nodes, mobile IAB-node broadcasts “miab-cell” indication in its system information.  Proposal 3: Mobile IAB-node broadcasts its velocity (details FFS) in its system information to enhance handover, cell (re-)selection decision.  Proposal 4: For Rel-18 Ues, consider new information/measurement event based on mIAB node’s velocity, TA, UE’s relative speed estimated by doppler shift, etc, as mobility enhancement for served Ues during their cell (re)selection, handover and conditional handover. |
| R2-2209699 | AT&T | Proposal 1: RAN2 should discuss what mechanisms, including the use of physical layer measurements such as timing advance, RRM measurements, and other L1 measurements can be used for identification of a set of serving Ues for group mobility procedures associated with a given mobile IAB node. RAN1 may additionally be consulted for input on the feasibility if necessary.  Proposal 2: RAN2 should consider mechanisms to avoid connection (re)establishment of onboard Ues to a virtual DU of a mobile IAB node during a full migration procedure. |
| R2-2209703 | Qualcomm | Proposal 1: The mobile IAB-node cell to broadcast a “mobile-IAB” status indicator. |
| R2-2209763 | Apple | Proposal 1: RAN2 agree the following UE behaviors in cell reselection enhancement of mobile IAB, similar to Rel-17 HSDN:  The UE considers the IAB nodes which are moving together as highest priority  The UE considers the IAB nodes which are not moving together as lowest priority  The UE which is moving together IAB node should consider static cells as lowest priority  Proposal 2: RAN2 reuse the similar solution of NR HSDN to determine whether the UE moves together with a mobile IAB node, i.e. Mobile IAB node can broadcast mobility indication(s) similar to hsdn-Cell-r17 in SIB and it is up to UE implementation to decide whether moving together. FFS signaling and format of the mobility indication(s).  Proposal 3: Following principle captured in clause 5.2.3.1 of TS 38.304, cell selection doesn’t need to be enhanced in mobile IAB. |
| R2- 2209953 | Lenovo | Proposal 3: Mobile IAB-node broadcasts its mobile attribute to Ues, e.g., via SIB1.  Proposal 4: To differentiate onboard Ues and surrounding Ues of mobile IAB-node for IAB-donor. |
| R2-2209997 | CANON | Proposal 4: A mobile IAB-node may broadcast some mobile capability signalling towards the Ues in its vicinity using SIB signalling. This Mobile capability signalling may include a mobility profile similar to the one shared with the IAB-donor-CU.  Proposal 5: In case the mobile IAB node is static, the mobile IAB node may inform the Ues in its vicinity about its static status, as well as the duration for which it will remain static. |
| R2-2210778 | Nokia | Proposal 2. Optimizations for cell (re-)selection behaviour can be de-prioritized in Rel.18 |
| R2-2210327 | Ericsson | Proposal 1:RAN2 to discuss the need of provide mobile IAB specific information to the UE, such as mobile IAB’s position, velocity, access class/category and any other parameters to help the UE in performing (or avoiding) certain RRC procedures. |
| R2-2210387 | vivo | Proposal 1 Legacy UE uses the information broadcast by mobile IAB to decide to reselect to the mobile IAB cell  Proposal 2 Release 17 slice aware cell reselection mechanism is reused as baseline for UE reselection to/from a mobile IAB cell. |
| R2-2210429 | Kyocera | Observation 1 The Ues moving together with the IAB-node can stay on the IAB-node, based on the existing radio condition-based cell reselection and the proper frequency priority.  Observation 2 If the UE and the mobile IAB-node stop, the UE cannot decide whether it should reselect the mobile IAB-node or not, unless the UE knows the user’s intention.  Proposal 1 RAN2 should agree that no enhancement is needed for Ues to perform cell reselection to/from the mobile IAB-node. |
| R2-2210447 | Xiaomi | Proposal 2. Through establishing on-board state and reselecting to the mIAB of the vehicle the UE has on-boarded the UE can use this status when stationary or in motion as depicted in scenarios 1, 2 and 3 to maintain connectivity to the mIAB node.  Proposal 3. RAN2 should use the observations (1-4) captured for the scenarios described in this paper as a basis to develop requirements to guide good selection and reselection behaviour for UE vehicle on-boarding, continued connectivity whilst on-board and for leaving a vehicle to efficiently and accurately manage the connectivity to the mIAB.  Scenario 1. Stationary UE connected to external gNB on-boards to UE with mIAB node  Scenario 2. UE connected to mIAB leaves vehicle and connects to external gNB  Scenario 3. Ues on-board vehicle in transit. During the journey mIAB performs full migration to new IAB-CU.  Scenario 4. Lines of similarly moving (or not) vehicles e.g. queuing to exit |
| R2-2210522 | Samsung | Proposal 4. RAN2 discuss whether in idle/inactive mode of access UE, whether access UE’s cell reselection to neighbour cell (out of the IAB node) and again back to the cell of the IAB node could be a problem, and if so, to find the solution for this. |
| R2-2210548 | InterDigital | Proposal 1: A mobile IAB cell broadcasts the current mobility state of the IAB node.  Proposal 2: The granulity of the mobility state information is FFS (e.g., detailed information like speed/direction/trajectory vs less granular information such as static, low mobility, high mobility, etc.,).  Proposal 3: A UE that is connected to a mobile IAB node or camping on a cell of the IAB node in IDLE/INACTIVE can stop or deprioritize neighbor cell measurements depending on the mobility state of the IAB node. Exact details are FFS.  Proposal 4: A UE can stop or deprioritze measurements on nerighbour cells belonging to a mobile IAB node, depending on the mobility state of the IAB node. Exact details are FFS. |
| R2-2210562 | LG Electronics | Proposal 6: If UE determines that it is on-board in a mobile cell, the UE is allowed to consider cell reselection frequency priority of (the frequency of) the mobile cell to be the highest one. FFS how to determine that UE is indeed on-board in a mobile cell or whether it is left to UE implementation. |

**2.2 Legacy UE clarifications**

We first try to clarify the behaviors/impacts of legacy Ues under the mobile IAB cell, i.e. the scope “*Make some assumptions on typical configuration and cell reselection behaviour for legacy Ues*” of this email discussion.

Rapporteur understands there should be no impact to legacy UE working on mobile IAB cell, regardless the enhancement/impact we introduced in R18 for mobile IAB cell. “*RAN2 confirms that Mobile IAB need to work with legacy Ues.*”

Therefore, following assumption should be the common understanding of the Ues working in the mobile IAB cell and the typical configuration of mobile IAB cell for cell (re)selection.

**Assumption 1: From the NW perspective of mobile-IAB cell, the principle of setting the legacy parameters (including cell (re)selection, cell reservations and access restrictions) does not change, compared to the legacy IAB cell.**

**Assumption 2: No spec impact to legacy Ues behaviors.**

**Assumption 3: Any R18 newly broadcasted info of mobile-IAB cell (if agreed) does not forbid/control the access of legacy Ues.**

**Assumption 4: Non-enhanced Ues (including legacy Ues and R18 Ues not supporting the enhancement) just ignore the R18 newly broadcasted info of mobile-IAB cell (if agreed).**

**Q1: Do you agree the above assumptions on legacy UE and typical configuration of mobile IAB cell?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** (indicate which assumption you have comment, or you can add more assumptions if needed) |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Yes | We agree the assumptions, but we wonder if RAN2 should first identify the scenarios and issues for the legacy UE’s cell reselection under the mobile IAB cell with a typical configuration.  [Rapp]: That will be contribution driven, after we have the common assumptions. Then, we can see if there is any scenario/issue requiring something more. |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes | But have the same opinion with Kyocera |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes | But we think Assumption 1 is unnecessary since it would be specific to network implementation anyway.  [Rapp]: This assumption does not give any NW implementation restriction either. That’s the point to avoid any new NW implementation restriction. |

**Summary:**

Clear majority are fine with the above assumptions.

**Proposal 1 [14/14]: RAN2 assume below for the UEs working in the mobile IAB cell:**

* **Assumption 1: From the NW perspective of mobile-IAB cell, the principle of setting the legacy parameters (including cell (re)selection, cell reservations and access restrictions) does not change, compared to the legacy IAB cell.**
* **Assumption 2: No spec impact to legacy UEs behaviors.**
* **Assumption 3: Any R18 newly broadcasted info of mobile-IAB cell (if agreed) does not forbid/control the access of legacy UEs.**
* **Assumption 4: Non-enhanced UEs (including legacy UEs and R18 UEs not supporting the enhancement) just ignore the R18 newly broadcasted info of mobile-IAB cell (if agreed).**

**2.3 Mobile IAB cell broadcasting info and UE behaviors**

### **2.3.1 Mobile IAB cell broadcasting info**

We see following proposals on the mobile IAB cell broadcasting info to assist the R18 UE’s cell (re)selection.

* **Alt.1**: Mobile-IAB cell indication (1bit, i.e. the cell is a R18 mobile-IAB cell or not)
  + HW P1, Intel P2, Lenovo P1, LG P6, QC P1
* **Alt. 2**: Mobile-IAB cell status indication (1bit, i.e. the mobile IAB cell is moving currently or not)
  + Apple P2, CANON P4/5, InterDigital P1
* **Alt. 3**: Mobility state info (e.g. speed, location, direction, trajectory)
  + Yes: Intel P3, Ericsson P1, InterDigital P2.
  + No: HW P3b (*Not to introduce any broadcasting mobility state/location/speed information by mobile IAB cell, considering the security issue and frequent SI update.*)

**Q2: Do you agree the motivation of above alternatives on “Mobile IAB cell broadcasting info” is to help UE to determine “it is on-board of mobile IAB cell”, and then to assist the UE’s cell (re)selection?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Y/N** | **Comments** (please clarify your motivation of mobile IAB cell broadcasting info) |
| Apple | Y with comments | We agree the broadcast indication is used to assist Rel-18 mobile IAB capable UE’s cell (re)selection. But its motivations can include below 2 aspects:  1) Help UE to determine “it is on-board of mobile IAB cell” (as Rapporteur mentioned).  2) Help UE to differentiate the type/status of candidate target cells (at least stationary cell or mobile node) during cell reselection  [Rapp]: “on-board” and “mobile IAB cell” are the two folds. |
| Qualcomm | Yes only for “assist cell (re)selection)” | The broadcast indication aims to assist the UE to perform cell reselection in presence of a mix of mIAB-cells and non-mIAB-cells.  The UE may be able to better determine its relative speed with respect to mIAB-cells vs. non-mIAB-cells.  The UE will not be able to determine if it is “onboard of a vehicle” based on such indication. |
| Kyocera | No | We’re not sure why the UE needs to identify whether it’s “on-board” and still assume the legacy cell reselection can work well. So, we would like to know what the issue is. |
| Ericsson | Yes – See comments | We are not sure what is the target of this question, but we would like to point out that the indication of ”mobile-IAB cell” and the ”mobility state of the mobile-IAB” are not mutually exclusive.  Both they may be used for different scopes. The indication of mobile-IAB cell can be used by the UE to improve the cell (re)selection process while the mobility state of the mobile-IAB can be used to improve other aspects such as for example mobility. |
| ZTE | Yes with comments | We think the mobile IAB cell broadcasting indication may be helpful for the UE cell (re-)selection. However, it is hard to determine it is on-board UE only based on the mobile IAB cell indication or mobility state info. |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Samsung | No | We don’t know how much the legacy reselection mechanism makes the problem without any enhancement. In most cases, UE once camped on the mIAB cell, then the signal strength of that cell measured at UE will be remained, and the camped cell would remain as the 1st ranked cell, and UE will keep to camp on that cell. The only possible problematic cases is when mIAB transport is penetrating the near center of the other static / or other mIAB cells. Even in this case, the received signal strength from camping cell would be greater than neighbor cells because the distance between access UE and the mIAB cell would be shorter than the access UE and other cell’s center, and the transport carrying mIAB and Ues would be likely to block the signal from other cells. This situation will be augmented further if considering FR2. |
| Lenovo | Yes, with comments | Agree with“Mobile IAB cell broadcasting info” is to assist the UE’s cell (re)selection. But the “Mobile IAB cell broadcasting info” is not necessary for UE to determine “it is on-board of mobile IAB cell”. |
| Sharp | Yes, with comments | The broadcast indication will help optimize cell reselection for moving cell, but it is not clear if and how it helps UE determine “on-board”. |
| Vivo | Yes, with comments | Agree just to consider assist info to allow UE cell (re)selection. |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes, only to assist cell (re)selection | We agree that the mobile IAB cell broadcasting information can help UE’s cell (re)selection. However, it is unrelated to the onboard status of a UE.  UE cannot know whether it is onboard or not based on this broadcast information alone. The UE can only identify that it is connected to a mobile IAB-node, but not whether it is an on-board UE or a surrounding UE. The key benefit of having this broadcast information is to help the UE in following scenarios:  1) an onboard IDLE UE moving together with a mobile IAB-node  2) a surrounding IDLE UE getting on a mobile IAB-node  3) an onboard UE getting off a mobile IAB-node  As listed above, it is unrelated to the onboard status of a UE, while it is related to how UE is moving relative to the mobile IAB-node. This broadcasting information is used for the UE to be able to differentiate a mobile IAB node from stationary IAB-node (legacy gNB). This can not only help UE in scenario 1) and 2) listed above to prioritize/select a mobile IAB-node during cell (re)selection, but also can help UE in scenario 3) to prioritize cell (re)selection to a stationary network.  Moreover, we think Alt.2 and velocity in Alt.3 are almost the same, i.e. broadcasting mIAB’s mobility information. The main difference between two alternatives is the granularity of mobility information, i.e. whether it is an accurate value or a rough state (e.g. high mobility state, low mobility state, etc). We think for that part, it can be left to FFS for future discussion. **We propose to update above Alt.2 and Alt. 3 as below:**   * **Alt.2: mIAB mobilty state (the mobile IAB cell’s moving status, FFS on the granularity, e.g. velocity or mobility status)** * **Alt.3: Other Mobility state info (e.g. location, direction, trajectory)** |
| Xiaomi | Yes with comments | It is about the on-board status, which provides optimised performance for REL18 UEs. It is expected that there will be no impact or support towards legacy UEs.  We actually indicate in our proposal [13] that there may be some limited benefit to supporting alt.1 a mobile-IAB cell indication in some limited scenarios, but conclude that this could be made redundant by a UE determination of on-board status. We could support Alt 1 as partially useful, but potentially redundant solution in some circumstances.  We see Alt.2 and alt.3 are applicable in only certain scenarios and even then these have limited applicability. If RAN2 sees these limited scenarios as worth pursuing and no other viable options are available, RAN2 then needs to determine applicability of these scenarios to this work item and confirm with SA1/SA2 regarding any potential limitations in scope of this work, before proceeding with these limited functional proposals. |
| Nokia | No | We have a similar view as Qualcomm that the UE cannot reliably determine whether it is on-board or off-board; however, the usage of such an indication might be used for prioritizing (re)selection in some Rel-18 UEs (although not legacy UEs). |

**Summary:**

Clear majority agree the motivation to use mobile IAB cell broadcasting info is to assist the UE’s cell (re)selection, but not sure on the motivation of considering itself as on-board of mobile IAB cell.

**Proposal 2 [11/14]: The mobile IAB cell broadcasting info is to assist the UE’s cell (re)selection, by considering the cell is a mobile IAB cell. FFS if this info is used to assist UE to determine whether it is on-board of mobile IAB cell.**

Rapporteur’s understanding: The basic option will be letting UE know whether the cell is a “mobile-IAB cell type” (the atl.1). In addition, some mobile IAB cell may not always be in the mobility status (like in the train station temporarily). Alt.2 gives more information to UE on whether this mobile IAB cell is currently moving or not. Further, finer granularity information is provided in alt.3 to let UE knows the speed/location/direction/trajectory.

**Q3: Which alternative do you prefer?**

Please clarify how should UE uses this info;

Please clarify why alt.1 is not sufficient if you prefer alt.2, and why alt.1/2 is not sufficient if you prefer alt.3;

Please clarify the security concern by allowing NW broadcasting its speed/location/direction/trajectory and SA3 involvement, if you prefer alt.3;

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Alt.** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Alt-2 with comments | For Alt-1, we think it is not sufficient to differentiate below two cases:  1) The vehicle just temporarily stops (e.g. a bus temporarily stops in station but will starts very shortly).  2) The vehicle stops for a long time (e.g. a motor home stops for sleep)  In our understanding, Alt-1 can only set "true" for both above cases while Alt-2 will set "true" for case 1) but "false" for case 2). From cell reselection perspective, we don't case 1) and case 2) should be treated equally.  Meanwhile, we think the granularity of Alt-2 can be further discussed (e.g. low/medium/high). For Alt-3, we disagree to introduce location/direction/trajectory because of security concern raised by Rapporteur. In addition we think absolute speed value is impossible to include in SIB because SIB update is slow, so the quantization of speed is the only option, which is a general form of Alt-2. We can further discuss its granularity. |
| Qualcomm | Alt 1 | We do not support broadcast of dynamically changing information as proposed by Alt 2 and Alt 3. This would imply that SIB will have to frequently change (e.g., at every stoplight), and UEs need to perform frequent SIB updates. This had significant power consumption impact on idle/inactive UEs. |
| Kyocera | No | We think RAN2 should first identify the issue, before discussing the solutions. |
| Ericsson | Alt1 OK  Alt2+Alt3 FFS | For Alt1, our understanding is that we need to have it anyway.  Question is whether we need Alt2 or Alt3, even if we see Alt3 has the Alt2 with a more fine granularity.  However, it would be good to check the use cases first and that is why we propose to have Alt2 and Alt3 as FFSs. |
| ZTE | Alt1 | For the UE which has already camped on mobile IAB cells, in order to avoid unnecessary inter-frequency measurement with high priority, UE may regard the frequency which provide mobile IAB cell indication to be the highest priority. |
| Sony | Alt 1 | We think Alt 1 is the base line and Alt 2 and 3 are further optimisations which we may need some justifications on why we need them. |
| Samsung | No | RAN2 should first justify the problem, and determine whether the problem is significant. |
| Lenovo | Alt 1 | Alt 1 is the baseline. Whether we need Alt 2 or Alt 3 is FFS and can be discussed scenario triggered. |
| Sharp | Alt 1  FFS (Alt 2/3) | It is desired to avoid UE’s unnecessary cell reselection when camping on a mobile IAB cell, regardless of its speed. Alt 2 or 3 may be a further optimization whose benefits are to be discussed. |
| vivo | Alt1 | We would be better to avoid frequent SIB information changing that may occur with Alt2. |
| Fujitsu | Alt2 | We think the essential motivation of all the alternatives is to help UE determine “it is on-board”.  For Alt.1, the network can send the mobility cell type indication no matter the cell is in what speed, and the UE may have difficulty in determining to be “on-board” or not if the mobile IAB stops moving.  For Alt.3, UE determines “on-board” or not by itself according to the mobility status info broadcasted by the network. In some scenarios, such as a mobile IAB node on a slow-moving bus, the moving state may change frequently. Broadcasting its state in real-time will lead to frequent SI modification in this case. We think there is no need for the network to broadcast the mobility status all the time.  For Alt.2, the network can give the indication on whether the UE can be determined as “on-board” or not directly, considering the status of the cell. It is simpler than Alt.3 and it can support the case that the UE does not determine itself as “on-board” when the mobile IAB cell stops moving. Thus Alt.2 is the best choice. |
| Intel | Alt.2 and velocity in Alt.3 | The mobile IAB-node indication may benefit for the UE to differentiate the mIAB-cell vs. stationary cell. However, if we only have alt 1, in our understanding of alt 1, the UE behaviour will need to be left to UE implementation. We think we should have a specified and testable UE behaviour.  Further, it is possible that there are multiple mobile IAB-nodes can be detected by the UE, some mobile IAB-nodes are moving, some other mobile IAB-nodes are temporarily stopped. As discussed in our paper R2-22xxxxxx, if a UE attempts to get on a vehicle, it can only choose a mIAB-cell which is temporarily stopped. By only knowing the cell is a mobile IAB-cell or not is not sufficient, as a UE get on a vehicle should not select a moving mobile IAB-cell.  Additionally, when the UE is moving together with the vehicle, since mIAB-cell’s is moving, by knowing such information, the UE does not need to perform any measurement for cell (re)selection.  As mentioned in above question, the granularity of mobility state can be further discussed, i.e. whether it’s an accurate value or a binary mobility state (stationary/moving) or anything in between.  Regarding to the SIB update, the mobile IAB-node does not need to always broadcast the real-time velocity if the speed doesn’t change a lot. The mobile IAB-node may only consider to update its mobility information in SIB if there’s a significant change or depending on the granularity of speed (e.g., with a binary indication, it doesn’t change often). The SIB update frequency can then be reduced. |
| Xiaomi | Alt 1 with comments | Detailed analysis of scenarios shows weaknesses in relying on m-IAB indications. We can support alt 1 as an assistance to UE implementation, but mandating behaviour based on its use at a UE is unreliable.  Alt2 and lat3 provide for even more ambiguity requiring further detailed analysis and scenario scope reductions, which would result in limited optimisations for each alt. These could be a focus for REL19 optimisations. |
| Nokia | No | In our view, introducing new indications to optimize (re)selection should be avoided if possible because legacy UEs would not benefit from them (plus, as we mentioned above, we do not think UEs can reliably determine their on-board status this way). Hence, prior to selecting Alt-1, it should first be looked into whether existing indications, e.g. CAG, could serve this purpose. |

**Summary:**

* **Alt.1**: Mobile-IAB cell indication (1bit, i.e. the cell is a R18 mobile-IAB cell or not)
  + [Qualcomm, Ericsson, ZTE, Sony, Lenovo, Sharp, vivo, HW, Apple]
* **Alt. 2**: Mobile-IAB cell status indication (1bit, i.e. the mobile IAB cell is moving currently or not)
  + [Apple, Fujitsu, Intel, Interdigital]
* **Alt. 3a**: Mobility speed info
  + **[**Intel]
* **Alt. 3b:** Mobility other info, e.g. location, direction, trajectory.
  + [Ericsson, Sharp consider it a FFS]
* **None: [**Kyocera, Samsung, Nokia]

Rapporteur observe the some comments:

* Frequent/dynamic change information should not be broadcasted.
* Open to discuss the Alt.2/3 as FFS.
* Not support on the very detailed mobility other info, e.g. location, direction, trajectory.

**Proposal 3: For the mobile IAB cell broadcasting info:**

* **[8/15] 1 bit mobile-IAB cell type indication is introduced;**
* **[5/15] FFS on mobile-IAB cell moving status indication is also needed (assuming the information should not be frequently changed, if any).**

**Other solutions are proposed to control the on-board UE access.**

On mobile IAB cell access control, whether to support only allowing on-board UEs to access?

* Yes, e.g. slicing based solution (vivo P1), PNI-NPN and CAG based solution (ZTE P2);
* No. HW P4a (No special standard effort is needed to prevent the surrounding UE from accessing the mobile IAB-node.)

Rapporteur’s understanding:

* The slicing/CAG based solution to control the access is already optionally supported by IAB cell. So, it is up to the NW to determine whether/how to use this feature. The discussion is about whether we should mandate the mobile IAB cell to use slicing/CAG based solution to control the access of on-board/surrounding Ues (otherwise, there is no standard effort).
* Note that it does not work for legacy Ues not supporting slicing/NPN feature. There will be legacy surrounding Ues access to the mobile IAB cell anyway.

**Q4: Which understanding do you agree?**

**Understanding 1: mandate the mobile IAB cell to use slicing/CAG based solution to control the access of on-board/surrounding Ues.**

**Understanding 2: No special standard effort/impact is needed to prevent the surrounding UE from accessing the mobile IAB-node.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Understanding** | **Comments** |
| Apple | 2 | 1. WID objective has clearly stated that optimization of surrounding Ues is not in scope.  2. We tend to think the below use case mentioned by Proponent is a rare case:  “ Ues on other vehicles may have similar speed with the mobile IAB node. These Ues are actually surrounding Ues instead of on-board UE for this vehicle. After a while, these surrounding Ues may be far away from the mobile IAB node since the trajectory of these vehicles are not exactly the same.” |
| QC | 2 | Option 1 is not effective in stopping surrounding Ues from accessing the mIAB-node. It only stops access for Ues that use this slice/CAG. Ues that do support the designated slice/CAG may still be outside the vehicle.  The WID explicitly supports connecting surrounding Ues.  The mIAB-DU certainly supports slicing/CAG in the same manner as every legacy gNB-DU. |
| Kyocera | 2 | We agree with the rapporteur’s understanding. |
| Ericsson | See comments | Regarding Option 1, this is currently discussed by SA2 and they may agree on it during their WI. Therefore, we should not rule this out at the moment, but we should rather wait the SA2 progresses on this.  For the handling of the surrounding Ues, in principle we think that something is needed as the QoS of this UE may be deeply disrupted in case they connect to the mobile IAB for a short time (because the mobile IAB in that moment is the best cell) and then they require to be handed over short after to another (because the mobile IAB has moved far away).  Probably for surrounding Ues in RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_INACTIVE this is not a big issue, but for surrounding Ues in RRC\_CONNECTED this may imply a lot of subsequent handover (at least 3) and a very long connectivity interruption.  Therefore, we may need some simple solution to prevent surrounding Ues to connect the mobile IAB. |
| ZTE | See comments | The usage of slicing/CAG solution is just recommendation. Of course it is not mandatory. However, we may change the understanding 1 as **“Mobile IAB cell may use slicing/CAG based solution to control the access of on-board/surrounding Ues without new specification impact**”.  With regard to QC’s comment, we think Ues not entitled to access a mobile IAB node mounted on a vehicle can not select mobile IAB cells that broadcast a CAG ID which is not allowed for the UE’s access. In this way, it can stop the access of surrounding Ues.  With regard to Apple’s comment, we think it is not rare case that Ues on other vehicles may have similar speed and trajectory with the mobile IAB node. Especially for the rush hour, the two vehicles may share the same speed on the congested road for quite a long time.  For understanding 2, does it mean that we are allowed to consider solutions to assist the on-board UE to access mobile IAB node while the surrounding UE decide whether to access the mobile IAB node based on legacy specification? However, it is not clear yet how a UE determine it is on-board UE or surrounding UE? Do we need to consider the potential specification impact for the UE’s determination of surrounding UE? |
| Sony | 2 |  |
| Samsung | 2 | As other companies said, WID already request no optimization of surrounding Ues. |
| Lenovo | 2 | Agree with the rapporteur. And it’s out of scope of WID. |
| Sharp | 2 | Agree on the rapporteur’s understanding. |
| vivo | See comments | Agree with Ericsson that Alt1 is currently discussed by SA2 and they may agree on it during their WI. Additionally, we also agree with ZTE that we may change the understanding 1 as **“Mobile IAB cell may use slicing/CAG based solution to control the access of on-board/surrounding Ues without new specification impact**” |
| Fujitsu | 2 |  |
| Intel | 2 | Optimization for surrounding UEs (including preventing surrounding UEs join mIAB-cell) is not in Rel-18 scope, which is clearly stated in WID. |
| Xiaomi | 2 with the understanding in comments | It is clear to us that U.1 is not in scope, in as much there is no mandate to optimise the handling of surrounding UEs.  For U.2 this may be considered in two views.  View 1 is that a surrounding UE is a legacy UE, in as much there is no impact to legacy UEs accessing a m-IAB node then clearly there is no special effort.  View 2 where the surrounding UE is a REL18 UE and as discussed in the preceding questions (Q2 & Q3) there may be ways for a REL18 to identify that a particular cell belongs to a m-IAB, then we think normal (re)selection mechanisms will enable some special standards behaviour preventing a surrounding REL18 UE supporting m-IAB from accessing this cell. |
| Nokia | 2 | Agree with rapporteur understanding. |

**Summary:**

Clear majority agree rapporteur’s view.

Some reply to Ericsson’s comment: SA2 is discussing about the enhancement to the optional CAG feature, rather than considering to mandate this CAG for mobile IAB cell.

Some reply to ZTE/vivo’s comment: This is already supported currently. No need of further clarify. See the updated proposal.

**Proposal 4 [12/14]: RAN2 agree below:**

* **a): No special standard effort/impact is needed to prevent the surrounding UE from accessing the mobile IAB-node.**
* **b): RAN2 will not mandate the mobile IAB cell to use slicing/CAG based solution to control the access of on-board/surrounding UEs (i.e. a legacy optional feature for IAB cell).**

### **2.3.2 R18 enhanced UE behaviors**

As to the enhanced UE behaviors, “*List the potential enhancements proposals on the table for enhanced UEs and for such proposals clarify what is the target performance characteristic to enhance and target scenario (if any)”*, we have following proposals.

* On-board UE considers cell (re)selection prioritization to mobile IAB cell
  + ZTE P1/P3, Apple P1, Xiaomi P2, HW 3a, LG P6
* Nothing to enhance
  + Nokia P2, Kyocera P1

Rapporteur try to collect the company’s views on the enhanced UE behaviors for cell selection by below candidate proposals. Note this proposal does not touch the solution/spec impact of UE “on-board” determination yet. This proposal is only to clarify the UE behaviors if UE determines itself on-board of mobile IAB cell.

**Q5a: Do you agree that “R18 UE may/can prioritize the cell (re)selection to a mobile IAB cell, if the UE determines itself on-board of this mobile IAB cell”?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Yes | The intention is to avoid R18 Mobile IAB capable UE to camp in a stationary node, which will result in the consequence that this UE has to reselect to another cell shortly.  Meanwhile, please note that NR has introduced similar cell reselection enhancement to HSDN, V2X and Embms. And in LTE, similar solution was also specified in Embms/V2X. We never heard complaint about its interoperation issues. So, we don’t see any technique issue, including legacy UE impact. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | This is possible by implementation. If the UE observes that it does not move with respect to an Miab-cell but it moves with respect to non-Miab-cells, it may conclude that it is “onboard” and select the Miab-cell |
| Kyocera | No | If the expected UE behaviour is “*R18 UE may/can prioritize the cell (re)selection to a mobile IAB cell*”, we think legacy mechanisms can do the job, e.g., cell reselection priority, HSDN, etc. |
| Ericsson | Yes with comments | In principle we are fine with the proposal, but before to agree on this RAN2 needs to discuss how a UE understands that is an onboard UE. Not sure this is an easy task but at least RAN2 needs to make some assumption. One option would be that RAN2 leave this to the UE implementation. |
| ZTE | Yes | We think UE may prioritize to select the mobile IAB cells if it moves together with the mobile IAB node. This may be achieved based on the relative mobility detection between mobile IAB node and UE. The mechanisms for the stationary evaluation and low mobility evaluation between UE and serving cell have been specified in TS 38.304. The fundamental idea is for UE to check if the variation between current RSRP measurement result and the maximum RSRP for the time period for which the variation is evaluated is lower than a given threshold. If the variation is lower than a given threshold for stationary/low mobility, the UE regards it fulfills the stationary/low mobility criteria for relaxed measurement. In our opinion, this mechanism can be leveraged by the UE to detect the relative mobility of cells and then prioritize to select the cell with low or stationary relative mobility. |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Samsung | No | We think there would be no significant problem even using legacy cell reselection mechanism. |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes | Agree on Qualcomm’s comment. |
| vivo | Yes, but | It can be left to UE implementation. |
| Fujitsu | Yes | It is the main reason that mobile IAB cell broadcasting info is to be supported, if Q2 is agreed. |
| Intel | Yes with comment | We agree Rel-18 UEs can consider to prioritize cell (re)selection to a mobile IAB-cell. However, we think the 2nd half of the sentence is not accurate.  As stated earlier, the UEs which are going to onboard or already onboard when mIAB-cell is moving needs to prioritize cell (re)selection towards a mIAB-cell. For the UE which is onboard but going to get off when mIAB-cell is temporarily stopped, it should prioritize cell (re)selection towards a stationary gNB.  Therefore, the prioritization should not only towards mIAB-cell, but also towards stationary cells when UEs get off the vehicle.  We suggest with following rewording:  **R18 UEs may/can prioritize the cell (re)selection to a mobile IAB cell, if the UE determines itself is going to be on-board of a mobile IAB-cell or moving together with a mobile IAB-cell. Otherwise, the R18 UEs may prioritize stationary cells during cell (re)selection or perform legacy cell reselection.** |
| Xiaomi | Yes | We note that on-boarding occurs generally when the m-IAB is (temporarily) stationary, and maybe we can confirm this scenario limitation as an assumption for now.  The decision to get on-board in initial scenarios involves user decision, however this again may not be restricted to a user’s free decision, or even the user being of a human/life form factor. We also note that a UE surrounding the m-IAB may precede on-board so clarification between these two conditions is needed to clarify discussion.  We agree on-board determination can be mostly managed by UE implementation, although some REL18 assistance may be useful if scenarios can be confirmed as reliable and predictable. |
| Nokia | No | Agree with Kyocera’s comment. |

**Summary:**

Clear majority (11 vs. 3) agree with the intention. Some companies want this as UE implementation.

**Proposal 5 [11/14]: R18 UE may/can prioritize the cell (re)selection to a mobile IAB cell, if the UE determines itself on-board of this mobile IAB cell. FFS if any spec impact or purely UE implementation.**

Then, the solution of “on-board UE identification” is related/bounded with the above cell (re)selection enhancement. We see very few detailed solution proposal from contributions.

|  |
| --- |
| **RAN2 observes that a UE could potentially consider itself on-board of a mobile-IAB cell, if the UE camps on/connects to a mobile IAB cell during a long period (i.e. the UE then need to know that this is such a cell). FFS the time. FFS if this is needed.** |

Based on the above agreement and rapporteur understanding, the mobile IAB cell broadcasting info, discussed in Q3, is supposed to help UE to identify it is on-board. For instant, if the alt.1 in Q3 (mobile-IAB cell) is known by UE, UE could potentially/is able to determine itself on-board of a mobile-IAB cell.

In this stage, it is not clear on whether we should have spec impact or leave it to UE implementation. But, there is no harm to share the views on this.

**Q5b: Do you agree with below understanding/proposal?**

**Based on the mobile IAB cell broadcasting info, agreed in Q3, R18 UE is able to determine whether it is on-board of mobile IAB cell. FFS if any spec impact or purely UE implementation.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** (you can also provide your views on the spec impact vs. UE implementation)(also it is good for proponents to clarify how exactly UE determines it is on-board) |
| Apple | Yes | It is clear that some current smart phone can already identify whether it is on-board in a vehicle via its implementation. So, we don't see technique issue for this proposal. Note that the mobile status indication in SIB is still needed for the UE to differentiate the candidate target cells in cell reselection.  On whether any spec impact, we think at least UE implementation can work but we are open to discuss specified solution. However, from history of 3GPP similar discussions, it will be hard to converge to a specified speed estimation solution because 3GPP can only specify air interface related solution but UE can rely on other techniques (e.g. its sensor info). |
| Qualcomm | Yes | A Rel-18 UE, that observes low/no mobility to an mIAB cell and high mobility with respect to non-mIAB cells, would understand that it is moving together with the mIAB cell (i.e., be “onboard”). The legacy UE would not be able to interpret the conflicting mobility measurements, and therefore not know which mobility state it is in.  A Rel-18 UE, that observes high mobility to an mIAB cells and low/no mobility with respect to non-mIAB cells, would understand that it is stationary and not moving with the mIAB cell (i.e., non “onboard”). The legacy UE would not be able to interpret the conflicting mobility measurements, and therefore not know which mobility state it is in. |
| Kyocera | Yes | As RAN2 observed, we think the understanding in Q5b is correct. But it does not mean the additional information in Q3 is needed, since RAN2 also reached the consensus with “*FFS if this is needed*”. |
| Ericsson | No | This of course may sound like an easy solution, but we tend to see that this solution may disrupt the connectivity of a lot of surrounding UEs. You can think for example at a situation in which a mobile IAB stops at a crowded area or at a bus station.  We should not make this work for on-board UE (that are few) at the cost of the other UEs (that are many). Probably the easiest solution would be to leave this to the UE implementation. |
| ZTE | Yes | Once again, we think the accurate on-board UE determination can reuse the PNI-NPN and CAG design.  For the rough determination of on-board UE, it can be based on the relative mobility detection as already specified in Ts 38.304, i.e., if the variation between current RSRP measurement result and the maximum RSRP for the time period for which the variation is evaluated is lower than a given threshold for stationary/low mobility, the UE regards it fulfills the stationary/low mobility criteria. In our opinion, if the UE detect the stationary or low mobility with mobile IAB cells, it may regard it as on-board. |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Samsung | See comment | We think the question is bit confusing due to saying “understanding/proposal” simultaneously.  If the question wants to know the understanding, we can say Yes, i.e., if some indication is introduced in broadcasting, UE can/might use that for the estimate of its location. But this can be UE’s implementation. Specifying UE’s operation on this determination would be tricky since hard to find the exact values of speed threshold, etc..  If the question want to know on the proposal, we don’t agree this proposal. |
| Lenovo | Yes | Based on the indication in Q3, UE may determine whether it’s on-board using the approach observed in online session. But it’s not accuracy enough in this way in case of motionless vehicle or in crowed downtown area. Maybe UE can determine whether onboard by implementation. |
| Sharp | Yes | With additional broadcast information the UE may be able to determine “on-board”. |
| vivo | Yes | Based slicing/CAG on which UE is camping, UE is able to determine whether it is on-board of mobile IAB cell. No additional specification effort is necessary. |
| Fujitsu | Yes | We think it is very hard to have a standardized solution to determine whether a UE is on-board or not. May leave it to UE implementation. |
| Intel | Yes with comment | As we stated earlier, the UE can only know it is connected to a mobile IAB-cell, while it can either be on-board or in the neighbourhood of a vehicle.  On the other hand, we don’t see a need to differentiate whether the UE is onboard or surrounding.  We suggest to change into:  **Based on the mobile IAB cell broadcasting info, agreed in Q3, R18 UE is able to determine whether it is connected to a mobile IAB cell. FFS if any spec impact or purely UE implementation.** |
| Xiaomi | see comments | The question is confusing and considering other responses above we are not alone on this.  Whether the rapporteur asks for confirming any agreement (or not) as to whether to broadcast something based on proposals in Q3, or whether the agreed observation as quote in the minutes actually amounts to any concrete proposal is not the case. We do not agree.  However if the intent is to confirm whether companies see a need for spec impact to support determination of on-boarding or it can be left to purely UE implementation.  As discussed in [13] we support UE implementation to determine on-board status.  But we are willing to consider a small spec impact to assist with this UE implementation, assuming there is no detrimental impact to these UEs’ behaviours in normal mobility scenarios. We think in general without lengthy and detailed evaluations it will be difficult to provide for reliable and standardised solutions. |
| Nokia | No | First, it is not clear what is agreed in Q3. We believe it makes sense to have a look at existing indications (e.g. CAG) so that legacy users can be equally served by mobile-IAB nodes. Based on Apple’s comment, it seems that there already exist proprietary solutions that facilitate on-board status determination, without extra specification effort. This questions the reliability of any new broadcast indicator. Considering this, the agreed “FFS if this is needed” is critical and should not be ignored at this point. |

**Summary:**

Cleary majority agree with the proposal (10 vs. 4). Considering the limited online time this meeting, rapporteur consider to just change this proposal as FFS for next meeting.

**Observation 1: FFS: Based on the mobile IAB cell broadcasting info, R18 UE is able to determine whether it is on-board of mobile IAB cell. FFS if any spec impact or purely UE implementation.**

# Phase 2 discussion

Based on the phase 1 summary, following proposals are listed for companies to check if this is agreeable.

**Proposal 1 [14/14]: RAN2 assume below for the UEs working in the mobile IAB cell:**

* **Assumption 1: From the NW perspective of mobile-IAB cell, the principle of setting the legacy parameters (including cell (re)selection, cell reservations and access restrictions) does not change, compared to the legacy IAB cell.**
* **Assumption 2: No spec impact to legacy UEs behaviors.**
* **Assumption 3: Any R18 newly broadcasted info of mobile-IAB cell (if agreed) does not forbid/control the access of legacy UEs.**
* **Assumption 4: Non-enhanced UEs (including legacy UEs and R18 UEs not supporting the enhancement) just ignore the R18 newly broadcasted info of mobile-IAB cell (if agreed).**

**Proposal 2 [11/14]: The mobile IAB cell broadcasting info is to assist the UE’s cell (re)selection, by considering the cell is a mobile IAB cell. FFS if this info is used to assist UE to determine whether it is on-board of mobile IAB cell.**

**Proposal 3: For the mobile IAB cell broadcasting info:**

* **[8/15] 1 bit mobile-IAB cell type indication is introduced;**
* **[5/15] FFS on mobile-IAB cell moving status indication is also needed (assuming the information should not be frequently changed, if any).**

**Proposal 4 [12/14]: RAN2 agree below:**

* **a): No special standard effort/impact is needed to prevent the surrounding UE from accessing the mobile IAB-node.**
* **b): RAN2 will not mandate the mobile IAB cell to use slicing/CAG based solution to control the access of on-board/surrounding UEs (i.e. a legacy optional feature for IAB cell).**

**Proposal 5 [11/14]: R18 UE may/can prioritize the cell (re)selection to a mobile IAB cell, if the UE determines itself on-board of this mobile IAB cell. FFS if any spec impact or purely UE implementation.**

**Question in phase-2: Do you agree with the above proposals?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Y/N** | | | | | **Comments**  (Good to provide some wording updates, if possible, rather than just saying no ☺) |
| **P1** | **P2** | **P3** | **P4** | **P5** |
| Intel | Y | Y and see comment | Y | Y | Y and see comment | In general, we agree with above proposals. But we also think these enhancements can be used for other scenarios, **e.g. UEs going to be onboard of a vehicle or UEs getting off the vehicle**. We think those scenarios should also be considered together during this discussion.  [Rapp]: I have sympathy. But it is not commented/proposed by others. I would suggest we discuss this in next meeting. |
| LGE | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | For P3/P4, we believe RAN2 should avoid over-specification attempts related to reselection enhancements, such as optimization for the temporal moments of get-off/get-in.  For P5, we think P5 handles the most important objective for reselection enhancement and hence P5 should be focused. |
| Kyocera | Y | N | N | Y | Y | As we commented in Phase 1 discussion, we prefer to identify the issue of current mechanisms first, i.e., before discussing and agreeing solutions.  [Rapp]: Clearly, the motivation/issue is that majority want to enhance the R18 UE’s cell reselection. This may be not some critical issue. But we normally go for the enhancement if majority see the needed (see the motivation in P2), which is corresponding to the WID “- *Solutions providing optimization for Mobile IAB may entail Rel-18 UE enhancements , provided that such enhancements are backwards compatible*”.  Although the rapporteur is correct that the majority of companies supported P2, we prefer the following changes, if possible:  *Proposal 2 [11/14]: The mobile IAB cell broadcasting info ~~is to~~ may assist the UE’s cell (re)selection, by considering the cell is a mobile IAB cell. FFS if this info is used to assist UE to determine whether it is on-board of mobile IAB cell. FFS in what scenario this info improves the performance, comparing to the existing cell reselection mechanisms.*  [Rapp]: the proposed FFS part is NW implementation, right?  On the other hand, we wonder if P3 is really supported by the majority. We assume if the moving status indication is introduced, the 1-bit indication will not be necessary:  *Proposal 3: For the mobile IAB cell broadcasting info:*  *- [8/15] As working assumption, 1 bit mobile-IAB cell type indication is introduced;*  *- [5/15] FFS on mobile-IAB cell moving status indication is also needed (assuming the information should not be frequently changed, if any).* |
| Ericsson | Y | Y | Y | N | N | About P4, SA2 captured already in their TR 23.700-05 that existing CAG can be used to manage the UAC of the UEs to the mobile IAB. Therefore, we don’t agree with the Rapporteur’s understanding.  From 23.700-05:  This solution relates to KI#7 "Control of UE's access to 5GS via a mobile base station relay". The solution proposes to use the existing CAG, Closed Access Group, concept as a base to manage the UE access control via MBSR.  There are certain simplifications on the existing CAG logic to fit into the IAB architecture.  Editor's note: Whether this is a CAG or whether this will have to be an independent identifier supported from rel-18 or both the CAG and a new identifier could be considered is FFS.  [Rapp] Note P4 does not preclude existing CAG and any enahcnement. P4 is just to clarfiy CAG is not mandaory for R18 mobile IAB cell.  About P5, this is very similar to P2. Even if the cell-reselection procedure can be enhanced, indeed, we need first to clarify how a UE consider itself an on-board UE before discriminating UEs behaviour based on this condition (i.e., UE is on-board). According to this, P2 would be enough for the time being.  [Rapp]: P2 is to calirfy the motivatoin. P5 is to calrify the UE behavior.  We anyway have some UE implementation manner of on-borad determination. See agreement ” RAN2 observes that a UE could potentially consider itself on-board of a mobile-IAB cell, if the UE camps on/connects to a mobile IAB cell during a long period (i.e. the UE then need to know that this is such a cell).” |
| Apple | Y | Y | Y with comments | Y with comments | Y with comments | For P3, we can also support 1-bit type. Rapporteur can update ratio to (9/15).  [Rapp] Thanks  For P4, we are fine with current formulation. For the concern raised on CAG, maybe we can remove either remove the CAG part (i.e. b) or state "RAN2 leave whether to use CAG/slicing based solution to SA2".  [Rapp]: We’d better not to leave something to SA2, if it causes some mandatory behavior/restriction to the mobile IAB cell.  For P5, during phase-1 discussion, we found it seems no company to disagree some UE implementation can determine whether it is on-board. As some companies had concern on this part is not clear, maybe we can change to below:  **Proposal 5 [11/14]: R18 UE may/can prioritize the cell (re)selection to a mobile IAB cell, if the UE determines itself on-board of this mobile IAB cell via its implementation. FFS if any spec impact ~~or purely UE implementation.~~**  [Rapp] Is there any really difference? Thanks for the suggestion anyway. |
| Interdigital | Y | Y | Y with comments | Y with comments | Y with comments | Regarding proposal 3, we would like to be added to the camp supporting the moving status (i.e., 6/15 FFS on moving status indication, …)  [Rapp]: Thanks  Regarding proposal 5, we think we can agree at a high level at the moment, without considering “on-board” or “off-board” UEs.  **Proposal 5: R18 UE may/can prioritize the cell (re)selection to a mobile IAB cell. Details are FFS.**  [Rapp]: The issue is that “R18 UE xxx” is not sufficient. You get to define which UE should prioritize the mobile IAB cell.  Also, if we agree with proposal 5, then proposal 4a seems a bit contradictory (e.g., if a UE can prioritize cell reselection to a mobile IAB node cell if it can find out that it is on-board, then why can’t it down prioritize cell reselection to a mobile IAB cell if it finds out that it is not on board?)  [Rapp]: P5 is about periodization. P4-a is about the “prevention/forbidden”  As such, one possibility is to remove proposal 4a, and to rewrite proposal 5 as:  **Proposal 5: R18 UE may/can prioritize or down-prioritize the cell (re)selection to a mobile IAB cell. Details are FFS.**  [Rapp]: The point is we are not sure UE is able to determine “I am off board”. But we know UE has some ways to determine “I am on board”. See agreement ”RAN2 observes that a UE could potentially consider itself on-board of a mobile-IAB cell, if the UE camps on/connects to a mobile IAB cell during a long period (i.e. the UE then need to know that this is such a cell).” |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |  |
| ZTE | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | For proposal 4, we still prefer to change it to “**Mobile IAB cell may use slicing/CAG based solution to control the access of on-board/surrounding UEs without new specification impact**.” or  “**Mobile IAB cell useing slicing/CAG based solution to control the access of on-board/surrounding UEs is not precluded**.” |
| vivo | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Fine with ZTE rewording proposal. |
| Sharp | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y and see comment | P5: Prioritization of a mobile IAB cell may apply when UE is considered to be “on-board” or moving along with the mobile IAB node. |

# Conclusion and proposals

Based on the above summary, following proposals are given

**Observation 1: FFS: Based on the mobile IAB cell broadcasting info, R18 UE is able to determine whether it is on-board of mobile IAB cell. FFS if any spec impact or purely UE implementation.**

**TBD**
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