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# 1 Introduction

This document aims at achieving progress on SI Broadcast, cell Restrictions/Reservation and Barring, Initial Access, and Connection Setup. It will take as a baseline the proposals and discussions given in the summary document [1].

This email discussion is divided into two/three phases.

The first phase aims at understanding if RAN2 can reach a consensus in the proposals laid in this document by the **25th of February** before the online IAB session.

If consensus is not possible for a proposal, a second phase will be started to collect technical comments and opinions. A third phase may be required for a second set of proposals if needed.

# 2 Phase 1

## 2.1 Cell restrictions, reservations, and barring

The rapporteur considers the ongoing discussions on the RAN2 reflector and understands that proposal 1, even if some comments have been received, could be a possible solution.

Can RAN2 agree on the following proposal?

1. IAB-MTs ignore the IEs cellBarred, cellReservedForOtherUse, and cellReservedForOperatorUse.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No |
| QC | Yes. |
| Ericsson | Yes. |
| Sharp | Yes. |
| Huawei | Generally fine. But we are also OK to allow IAB-MT to follow *cellReservedForOtherUse*, and *cellReservedForOperatorUse*. |
| CATT | Yes. |
| ZTE | Yes |

## 2.2 Unified Access Control

The rapporteur considers the ongoing discussions on the RAN2 reflector and understands that some companies would like to discuss this further. Nevertheless, the rapporteur wants to ask again if:

Can RAN2 agree on the following proposal?

1. IAB-MTs are under UAC.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No |
| QC | No |
| Ericsson | No. |
| Sharp | No. |
| Huawei | Fine to go with majority view. We need to remind companies that if we agree not to support UAC for IAB-MT, it means IAB should ignore the UAC related RRC parameters, and upper layer should not request any Access Category and Access Identities since no response will be sent back to upper layer by IAB-MT RRC. This would cause some RRC standard impacts.  Maybe we need to identify what’s the issue to support UAC, before we exclude this feature, considering the future releases of IAB. |
| CATT | We are OK with P2 if this is majority’s view. |
| ZTE | No |

## 2.3 Other areas

The rapporteur thinks that proposals on 2.3. are not essential and can be addressed in a later meeting. Nevertheless, the rapporteur asks: can RAN2 agree on the following proposal?

1. Topics in “2.3 other areas” are not discussed in RAN2#109-e.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No |
| QC | Not discussed in RAN2#109-e. |
| Ericsson | Not discussed. |
| Sharp | Not discussed. |
| ZTE | Not discussed |

# Phase 2

TBD

# 4 Conclusion

TBD
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