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# Introduction

This document is the report of the offline email discussion “*[AT116bis-e][301][NBIOT/eMTC R17] Carrier Selection*”, as indicated below:

* *[AT116bis-e][301][NBIOT/eMTC R17] Carrier Selection (ZTE)*

***Status****: Started*

***Scope:*** *Progress the outcome of email discussion [Post116-e][311] to have a set of agreeable proposals and a set of open issues/FFS.*

***Intended outcome:*** *Report in R2-2201786 to treat in wk2 online session (and “easy” agreements by email before the online session, if possible)*

***Deadline:*** *Friday 21 January 1200 UTC.*

# Contact information

Please provide your contact information when feedback:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Contact Name** | **Email** |
| ZTE | Ting Lu | lu.ting@zte.com.cn |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Discussion

In the email discussion “*[Post116-e][311][NBIOT/eMTC R17] NB-IoT carrier selection*”, many aspects have been discussed for the Option 1c and several proposals have been given.

In this email discussion, we firstly have a idscussion on the “easy” proposals from “*[Post116-e][311]“* to see whether all or part of them can be quickly agreed. Then we can discuss those “for discussion” proposals. The new contributions to this meeting would be also taken into account.

## Proposals for “easy agreements”

The following proposals for "easy agreements" have been given in [R2-2200030]. Companies are invited to indicate which one(s) cannot be agreed? Companies can further indicate technical reasons or give wording suggestion in order to make it agreeable.

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposals for "easy agreements":**  **Proposal 2: UE can be enabled/disabled** **coverage-based paging carrier selection via dedicated signalling. Presence or absence of the coverage information can be implicit enable/disable indication.**  **Proposal 3: In SIB, one or more R17 paging carriers can be configured with a same Rmax (npdcch-NumRepetitionPaging) parameter, which means these paging carriers are corresponding to a same coverage level.**  **Proposal 4: In SIB, at most 2 coverage levels can be configured in R17 paging carrier list.**  **Proposal 5: In SIB, the value range for Ramx (npdcch-NumRepetitionPaging) in R17 paging carrier (list) configuration can be ENUMERATED {r1, r2, r4, r8, r16, r32, r64, r128}.**  **Proposal 6: In SIB, coverage specific nB is supported, e.g., a common nB value is configured for the R17 paging carrier(s) with same Rmax (npdcch-NumRepetitionPaging).**  **Proposal 8: In SIB, coverage specific ue-SpecificDRX-CycleMin is supported, e.g., a common ue-SpecificDRX-CycleMin value is configured for the R17 paging carrier(s) with same Rmax (npdcch-NumRepetitionPaging).**  **Proposal 9: Paging weight can still be used in coverage-based paging carrier selection.**  **Proposal 10: In SIB, both non-mixed operation mode and mixed operation mode can be supported in R17 paging carrier list configuration. They can be configured separately (as legacy).**  **Proposal 11: The extension in SIB22-NB can be used for providing R17 paging carrier list configuration.**  **Proposal 13: In SIB, coverage specific NRSRP threshold is supported, e.g., a common NRSRP threshold value is configured for the R17 paging carrier(s) with same Rmax (npdcch-NumRepetitionPaging).**  **Proposal 15: No “offset” (headroom) would be introduced for the configured NRSRP threshold.** |

**Q1: Companies are invited to give comments on whether or not the above proposals for "easy agreements" can be agreed. For the one that cannot be agreed, please indicate the reason or provide wording suggestions:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Which proposal cannot be agreed** | **Additional comments or suggestions** |
| ZTE | None |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Conclusion:**

## Proposals for further discussion

### Issue#1: Information in dedicated signalling

In the email discussion “*[Post116-e][311]*”, 5 companies are fine to provide a Rmax information, e.g., npdcch-*NumRepetitionPaging* to the UE in dedicated signaling (when UE is released to idle). 3 companies are fine with another option, e.g., to provide NRSPR threshold in dedicated signaling. Therefore, the **Proposal 1** in [R2-2200030] still needs to be discussed. In [[R2-2200682](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116bis-e/Docs/R2-2200682.zip)], companies give more comparison between Rmax and other option.

**Q2: Do companies agree Rmax information, e.g., *npdcch-NumRepetitionPaging* is provided to the UE in dedicated signaling (when UE is released to idle)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Additional comments** |
| ZTE | Yes | 1. If a NRSRP threshold is provided to UE in dedicated signaling, it may be possible that several CELs are determined to the UE and the suitability check for several Rmax(s) are fulfilled. This will cause ambiguity when determining the candidate R17 paging list for the UE and furthermore cause potential inconsistence between UE and network.   For example, we may provide the following configuration in SIB:   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Rmax | The corresponding carrier list | The NRSRP threshold for suitability checking for this Rmax | | 4 | f1, f2 | -110dB (can approximately correspond to CEL0) | | 32 | f3, f4 | -120dB (can approximately correspond to CEL1) |   If Rmax = 32 is assigned to the UE in dedicated signaling, via mapping its assigned UE-specific Rmax with the Rmax in SIB, the UE firstly can know that the R17 carrier list (f3, f4) would be the candidate R17 paging carrier list. The UE would further check whether its current serving cell NRSRP (for example, -100dB) is higher (better) than the NRSRP threshold (-120dB) for Rmax = 32, if Yes, that means the suitability checking is fulfilled, UE can use the R17 carrier list (f3, f4) in the following paging carrier selection scheme. Otherwise, e.g, UE’s current serving cell NRSRP is less than the NRSRP threshold (-120dB), that means the suitability checking isn’t fulfilled, the UE would fall back to legacy paging carrier selection.  However, if a NRSRP threshold, e.g., -120dB, is provided to UE in dedicated signaling, the case may be a bit complicated. As it’s a threshold for determining the coverage, if UE’s current serving cell NRSRP (for example, -100dB) is equal to or higher (better) than -120dB, it may be not easy to just say that UE is in CEL1 and the Rmax = 32 would be used. As the UE’s current serving cell NRSRP is also higher (better) than -110dB (the suitability check criteria for Rmax = 4), it may be also correct to say that UE is in CEL0 and the suitability check for Rmax = 4 is fulfilled. This may further cause inconsistence between UE and network. We think this might be avoided with additionally restriction in the field description of the NRSRP threshold in dedicated signaling, but that would introduce more unnecessary complexity.   1. If a NRSRP threshold is provided to UE in dedicated signaling, it may cause more confusion and more specification impacts in RAN3, e.g., new additional IE (which is aligned with the possible NRSRP threshold IE in RRC release message) needs to be introduced into S1/NG signaling that would cause more complicated RAN3 impacts. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Issue#2: Coverage specific DRX cycle

In the email discussion “*[Post116-e][311]*”, 4 companies are fine to introduce coverage specific DRX cycle while 3 companies think no need to specify coverage specific DRX cycle and it’s enough to apply cell specific default DRX cycle. Therefore, the **Proposal 7** in [R2-2200030] still needs to be discussed.

**Q3: Do companies agree to support coverage specific DRX cycle?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Additional comments** |
| ZTE | No strong view | Slightly prefer to introduce coverage specific DRX cycle. But also fine without it. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Issue#3: Procedure for suitability checking of assigned info and carrier selection

In the email discussion “*[Post116-e][311]*”, the proposal 12 give a general procedure for suitability checking of the assigned coverage information and R17 paging carrier selection. As some modifications have been introduced in TS 36.331 running CR and TS 36.304 running CR, rapporteur suggest not to pursue **Proposal 12** in [R2-2200030].

### Issue#4: Time offset for suitability checking of assigned info

In the email discussion “*[Post116-e][311]*”, 4 companies seems fine with that a fixed (e.g., one eDRX cycle) or configurable timer period can be applied when UE compares its serving cell NRSRP with the NRSRP threshold. The other companies think this can be left to UE implementation which can avoid RAN4 impacts. Therefore, the **Proposal 14** in [R2-2200030] still needs to be discussed.

Q4: Do companies agree that a configurable timer period can be applied when UE compares its serving cell NRSRP with the NRSRP threshold**?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Additional comments** |
| ZTE | Yes | We agree it’s beneficial to let the suitability checking based on NRSRP continue for a time period to ensure a stable evaluation result. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Issue#5: “restriction” for that the UE does not switch paging carrier

In the email discussion “*[Post116-e][311]*”, 4 companies agree to introduce a “restriction” that the UE does not switch paging carrier if it has stayed less than [xx] seconds on the carrier or within a PTW. The other 3 companies disagree or think this can be left to UE implementation. Therefore, the **Proposal 16** in [R2-2200030] still needs to be discussed. In [[R2-2201021](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116bis-e/Docs/R2-2201021.zip)], companies further suggest to introduce hysteresis criteria for switching between legacy paging carrier and coverage based paging carrier. But the details need to be clarified.

Q5: Do companies agree to specify that UE does not switch paging carrier if it has stayed less than [xx] seconds on the carrier or within a PTW. The xx seconds can be decided in stage-3. Other suggestion can be indicated in the comments column.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Additional comments** |
| ZTE | Yes | We are fine with that UE should use the same paging carrier during the PTW. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Issue#6: UE report

In the email discussion “*[Post116-e][311]*”, 5 companies indicates some UE report would be helpful to NW, e.g., help NW to provide suitable Rmax value or configure suitable paging carrier selection parameters. 1 company think existing report is not suitable for eNB to decide suitable Rmax. 2 companies oppose that UE indicates a preferred carrier to NW. Therefore, the **Proposal 17** in [R2-2200030] still needs to be discussed. In [[R2-2201021](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116bis-e/Docs/R2-2201021.zip)], companies further suggest that UE indicates to network that the reported measurement has meet the hysteresis criteria. Only if the UE has sent such indication UE can use coverage-based paging carrier in RRC\_IDLE. Per rapporteur’s understanding, this indication similar as the option2 in Q6.

**Q6:For assisting eNB to assigned suitable Rmax information in dedicated signaling, companies are invited to indicate which information below can be reported by the UE to network and how?**

* **Option1: UE measured NRSRP (to make legacy Msg5 report mandatory or via other way?)**
* **Option2: An indication on whether the existing CQI report is suitable for coverage-based paging carrier selection.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred option** | **Additional comments** |
| ZTE | Option 1 | We are fine to make the legacy Msg5 report mandatory. But just note this is no use in EDT and PUR procedure (we assume Msg4 in EDT or PUR procedure can also be used to assign Rmax information to UE).  For option 2, we are not clear the timing for the UE to send such indication. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Other issues

### Issue#7: Signalling for CEL-based paging carrier configuration

In [R2-2201022], Signalling approach 1 and Signalling approach 2 are further compared.

Q7: Companies are invited to indicate which signalling approach is preferred?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred**  **Signalling** | **Additional comments** |
| ZTE | Signalling approach 1 | In Signalling approach 2, a new carrier list *DL-ConfigCommonList* is introduced. But the carriers in this new list cannot be used for DL carrier for RAR. We think this is unnecessary restriction.  During email discussion “*[Post116-e][311]*”, we have given a variant of Signalling approach 1, we suggest to further consider this. For simplicity, here *maxRmaxNumber-NB-r17* can be set to 2 to aligned with **Proposal 4** in [R2-2200030]:  SystemInformationBlockType22-NB-r14 ::= SEQUENCE {  // omit the unchanged part//  ul-ConfigList-r15 UL-ConfigCommonListTDD-NB-r15 OPTIONAL -- Cond TDD  ]],  [[ PCCH-ConfigList-NB-r17 ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE(1..maxRmaxNumber-NB-r17)) OF PCCH-Config-NB-r17 OPTIONAL, -- Need OR  ]]  }  // omit the unchanged part//  DL-ConfigCommon-NB-r14 ::= SEQUENCE {  // omit the unchanged part//  [[ gwus-Config-r16 WUS-ConfigPerCarrier-NB-r15 OPTIONAL -- Cond GWUS  ]],  [[ PCCH-ConfigIndex-r17 INTEGER(1..maxRmaxNumber-NB-r17) OPTIONAL – Cond PCCH-Config-r14  ]]  }  PCCH-Config-NB-r14 ::= SEQUENCE {  // omit the unchanged part//  }  PCCH-Config-NB-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {  npdcch-NumRepetitionPaging-r17 ENUMERATED {  r1, r2, r4, r8, r16, r32, r64, r128, r256, r512, r1024,  r2048, spare4, spare3, spare2, spare1} OPTIONAL, -- Need OP  pagingWeight-r17 PagingWeight-NB-r14 DEFAULT w1,  defaultPagingCycle-r17 ENUMERATED {rf32, rf64, rf128, rf256, rf512, rf1024} OPTIONAL, -- Need OR  ue-SpecificDRX-CycleMin-r17 ENUMERATED {rf32, rf64, rf128, rf256, rf512, rf1024} OPTIONAL, -- Need OR  nB-r17 ENUMERATED {  fourT, twoT, oneT, halfT, quarterT, one8thT,  one16thT, one32ndT, one64thT, one128thT,  one256thT, one512thT, one1024thT,  spare3, spare2, spare1} OPTIONAL, -- Need OR  rsrpThreshold-r17 RSRP-Range,  …  }  // omit the unchanged part// |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Issue#8: Enable CEL-based paging carrier selection

In [[R2-2201076](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116bis-e/Docs/R2-2201076.zip)], company suggest that the paging carrier selection feature can be considered enabled once the network provides the relevant parameters when releasing the UE to idle.

Q8: Do companies agree that coverage based paging carrier selection is enabled implicitly, i.e., when relevant parameters are provided to the UE during release?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Additional comments** |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Issue#9: Rel-17 coverage based paging carrier is used as DL carrier for RAR

In [[R2-2200922](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116bis-e/Docs/R2-2200922.zip)], company think there is no reason why the Rel-17 paging carrier should not be used as the DL carrier for random access.

Q9: Do companies agree that the Rel-17 paging carrier can also be used as the DL carrier for random access?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Additional comments** |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Issue#10: Subgroup of paging carriers for the more easily changed CE level

In [[R2-2200633](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116bis-e/Docs/R2-2200633.zip)], company suggest that one subgroup of paging carriers should be allocated for the more easily changed CE level. And if the measured RSRP variation range exceeds the configured threshold over a period of time, the UE can be considered to have the more easily changed CE level.

Q10: Do companies agree that one subgroup of paging carriers should be allocated for the more easily changed CE level?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Additional comments** |
| ZTE | No | It’s not clear how the eNB to decide the paging carrier for such UE (how to guarantee the consistence between UE and gNB?). |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Conclusion

**TBD**
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