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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 |
| LG | Yes but cellBarred. We think that CellBarrd should be commonly applicable for IAB MT as well, given that cellBarred was intended to completely bar “any” access in abnormal cases. Differentiated access control to UEs and IAB MTs can be realized by other means, e.g., cell reservation IEs and IAB-support IE.  |
| Nokia | Yes, IAB-MT should be allowed to ignore those fields. |
| Apple | Yes.  |
| Sony | Yes but Cell Barred IE. Agree with LGE that Cell Barred is intended for handling the abnormal scenarios and in this case, ignoring this IE is needed to bar operator UEs with AC11-15 and for such UEs should camp elsewhere. These UEs are not expected to be many in the network. However, allowing IAB-MT to ignore it requires a new behavior compared to a UE so we should be careful in introducing it. |
| vivo | Yes but cellReservedForOtherUse. We think that cellReservedForOtherUse shall not be ignored since it may be defined for other use such as CSG IAB node access with iab-support = true. |
|  |  |

NECYES

## 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 |
| LG | OK to follow majority view |
| Nokia | No. The intention of UAC is to limit the traffic from Access UEs, not to prevent from potentially extending the capacity of the network. Following UAC for IAB nodes would have the effect opposite to the intended one. |
| Apple | No. Agree with Nokia. |
| Sony | We are OK to follow the majority. A question for clarification is that if this proposal apply to IAB initiated DRB setup as well (i.e. OAM DRB)?  |
| vivo | No |
| NEC | 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 |
| LG | Not discussed |
| Nokia | Not discussed |
| Apple | Agree. Not to be discussed.  |
| Sony | We have noticed only one proposal in this section regarding the handling of PWS information and whether to select the information received either via SIB or F1 interface. The proposed change is for stage-2 only and we are ok to wait till the next meeting, if this is the majority view.  |
| vivo | Not discussed. |
| NEC | Not discussed |

# Phase 2

TBD

# 4 Conclusion

TBD
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