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# 1 Overall description

RAN2 thanks SA2 for their LS on FS\_5MBS\_Ph2 progress, based on the discussion in RAN2, RAN2 would like to provide the following feedback for SA2’s questions:

**RAN2 Answer to Q1-a) *If there are significant differences in the quality and reliability of the reception of MBS data between UEs in RRC Connected state and UEs in RRC Inactive state*:**

* The quality and reliability of the reception of MBS data between UEs in RRC\_CONNECTED state and UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE state may or may not be different, as HARQ feedback and PTP transmission are not supported and seamless/lossless mobility is not required for multicast reception in RRC\_INACTIVE.

**RAN2 Answer to Q1-b) *If it is possible, as part of the same MBS session, to have some UEs receiving in RRC Connected state, while other UEs receiving in RRC Inactive state*:**

* Yes, it is supported that gNB transmits service of one multicast session to both UEs in RRC\_CONNECTED and UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE in the same cell. It is assumed the gNB can choose which UEs receive in RRC\_CONNECTED and which in RRC\_INACTIVE**.**

**RAN2 Answer to Q1-c) *If the answer to Q1-b) is yes, will a UE incur MBS data loss while transitioning (under NG-RAN control) between RRC Connected state and RRC Inactive state in the middle of MBS data session? If yes, how long can the reception outage be*:**

* There may or may not be interruptions and data loss during state transition, depending on the solution to provide the PTM configuration and also network implementation.

**RAN2 answer to Q1 d) *Whether the existing QoS parameters of MBS QoS Flow(s) are enough or some additional parameter is needed for NG-RAN to differentiate different MBS session and UE, which can be used by NG-RAN to decide how to deliver the MBS data* and Q2 *SA2 would like to receive feedback on the value of such assistance information from RAN perspective*:**

* For the MBS session handling: the existing MBS session QoS parameters (e.g. ARP, 5QI) can be reused to differentiate different MBS sessions to decide whether the corresponding services can be provided to RRC\_INACTIVE UEs.
* For the case of differentiating different UEs: as the MBS session related QoS parameters are the same for different UEs within the same MBS session, the existing QoS parameters of MBS QoS Flow(s) cannot be used by NG-RAN to differentiate the handling for different UEs. FFS whether additional assistance information is needed, if the handling for different UEs needs to be differentiated which is up to SA2.

**RAN2 answer to Q3 *SA2 would like to ask if the UE radio capability provided directly from UE to NG-RAN will contain the information whether the UE supports Rel-18 MBS capability to receive multicast data in RRC\_INACTIVE state*:**

* Yes, the UE radio capability indicating support of multicast reception in RRC\_INACTIVE state can be reported to RAN, which is subject to the discussion of UE radio capability.

**RAN2 answer to Q4 *SA2 would like to clarify with RAN WGs whether the assumption that IDLE UE will need to transition to connected state to start receiving the MBS data and CN initiated group paging (as defined in Rel-17) is thus still required for such UEs*:**

* Yes, the UEs in RRC\_IDLE need to be transitioned to RRC\_CONNECTED state to start receiving the MBS data and thus the CN initiated group paging is still needed to be performed.

**RAN2 answer to Q5 *When MBS Session is activated and MBS data allowed to be received in RRC\_INACTIVE state, is it possible that the RRC\_INACTIVE UE receives MBS data without going back to RRC connected state? If possible, when the MBS session is being activated, how is the RRC\_INACTIVE UE notified. For group paging initiated for IDLE UEs, does RRC\_INACTIVE UE respond to such paging*:**

* It is possible that the RRC\_INACTIVE UE receives MBS data without going back to RRC\_CONNECTED state when the MBS session is being activated provided the UE has already joined the multicast session and the UE has valid MRB configuration. As a baseline, group paging can be used to inform the RRC\_INACTIVE UE(s) about the session activation. The details are still under discussion in RAN2.
* For group paging initiated for UEs in RRC\_IDLE state, per Rel-17 specification, the RRC\_INACTIVE UEs will also respond if they receive the corresponding paging message. However, for Rel-18, if the MBS session can be received in RRC\_INACTIVE state, the RRC\_INACTIVE UE need not go back to RRC\_CONNECTED state if the UE has already joined the multicast session and the UE has valid configuration. It is FFS how to avoid these UEs going back to RRC\_CONNECTED state when the CN group paging is received.

**RAN2 answer to Q6 *SA2 would like to confirm with RAN WGs the above assumption:*** ***Regarding the mobility within the RAN Notification Area (RNA), SA2 assumes the UE in RRC Inactive state should be able to continue receiving DL multicast MBS data within its RNA and the solution will be determined by RAN WGs as RRC\_INACTIVE mobility is under the remit of RAN WGs*:**

* RAN2 has made the following agreements: Multicast service continuity after cell reselection in RRC\_INACTIVE state (i.e. without resuming RRC connection) will be supported (if the configuration for the multicast session in the new cell is available for the UE). Upon cell reselection to neighbour cells during active multicast session, if the configuration of the session is not available for the new cell for UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE, then the UE is required to resume RRC connection to get the Multicast MRB configuration.

**RAN2 answer to Q7 *SA2 would like to know if RAN considers any aspects of the proposed solutions for KI#2 as not feasible or desirable from RAN perspective*:**

* RAN2 would like to leave this question for RAN3 to respond.

# 2 Actions

**To SA2, RAN3 groups:**

**ACTION:** RAN2 kindly asks SA2 and RAN3 to take the above feedback into account.

# 3 Dates of next RAN2 meetings

TSG-RAN WG2#120 November 14th – 18th, 2022 Toulouse, France

TSG-RAN WG2#121 February 27th – March 3rd, 2023 Athens, GR