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# 1 Introduction

This is the report from the offline discussion below:

* [AT119-e][116][RedCap] Idle mode CR (Ericsson)

Scope: Draft 38.304 CR, taking into account the relevant agreement from offline 115

Intended outcome: Agreeable 38.304 CR

Deadline (for companies' feedback): Thursday 2022-08-25 1000 UTC

Deadline (for 38.304 CR in R2-2208773): Friday 2022-08-25 1000 UTC

Companies should consider the following Tdocs and the discussions therein in mind when providing feedback to the offline discussion:

[R2-2207007](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_119-e/Docs/R2-2207007.zip) Correction to description of first-PDCCH-MonitoringOccasionOfPO Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd draftCR Rel-17 38.304 17.1.0 NR\_redcap-Core

[R2-2207207](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_119-e/Docs/R2-2207207.zip) 38.304 Correction on the e-DRX for Redcap Xiaomi Communications draftCR Rel-17 38.304 17.1.0 NR\_redcap-Core

[R2-2207622](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_119-e/Docs/R2-2207622.zip) Corrections on the intra-FreqReselection and eDRX supporting for RedCap Huawei, HiSilicon CR Rel-17 38.304 17.1.0 0265 - F NR\_redcap-Core

[R2-2207750](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_119-e/Docs/R2-2207750.zip) Discussion on cellBar for RedCap vivo, Guangdong Genius discussion Rel-17 NR\_redcap-Core

[R2-2208112](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_119-e/Docs/R2-2208112.zip) Miscellaneous correction on eDRX ZTE Corporation, Sanechips CR Rel-17 38.304 17.1.0 0271 - F NR\_redcap-Core

[R2-2208221](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_119-e/Docs/R2-2208221.zip) Correction on eDRX-Allowed indication Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell CR Rel-17 38.304 17.1.0 0274 - F NR\_redcap-Core

In this document, we discuss the remaining idle mode corrections based on the Tdocs provided above with the intention to formulate a list of proposals that are agreeable and a list of proposals that require further discussion during the next online session.

# Contact Information

Please fill in the following table for contact information:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Contact person - email@address.com |
| Ericsson | Emre A. Yavuz – emre.yavuz@ericsson.com |
| Futurewei | Yunsong Yang – yyang1@futurewei.com |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 2 Discussion on idle mode corrections

**Q 2.1** Do you agree with the intention of changes in R2-2207007? Please elaborate your reply, especially if you do not and comment below if you have any suggestions for the wording if you do.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Yes | We are OK with the intention. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.1**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

**Q 2.2** Do you agree with the intention of changes in R2-2207207? Please elaborate your reply, especially if you do not and comment below if you have any suggestions for the wording if you do.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | No | The “if” here describes among which UE specific DRX value(s) should the shortest be determined. One should follow 38.331 regarding whether any of them is mandatory or optional for RRC\_INACTIVE. Besides, the “if” applies to “RRC and/or upper layers”. So, technically the current text is still OK. We don’t see a problem here.  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.2**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

**Q 2.3** Do you agree with the intention of changes in R2-2207622? Please elaborate your reply, especially if you do not and comment below if you have any suggestions for the wording if you do.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | See comments | For the first change, in 38.331, 5.2.2.5, we have:2> else if the UE is unable to acquire the *SIB1*:3> consider the cell as barred in accordance with TS 38.304 [20];3> if the UE is a RedCap UE:4> peform barring as if *intraFreqReselectionRedCap* is set to allowed;Therefore, the RedCap UE will pass the following three ifs in 38.304 and end up executing the two mays:When cell status "barred" is indicated or to be treated as if the cell status is "barred",…- If the UE is not a RedCap UE, or if the UE is a RedCap UE and *intraFreqReselectionRedCap* in SIB1 is available:- If the field *intraFreqReselection* in *MIB* message is set to "allowed":- the UE may select another cell on the same frequency if re-selection criteria are fulfilled;- If the cell is to be treated as if the cell status is "barred" due to being unable to acquire the *SIB1*:- the UE may exclude the barred cell as a candidate for cell selection/reselection for up to 300 seconds;We sympathize with Huawei in that one has to look at both 38.331 and 38.304 to figure the UE’s behavior. We don’t mind adding some text in 38.304, such as for the same “if” proposed by Huawei, the UE considers the cell as “barred” and *intraFreqReselectionRedCap* as if set to allowed. Then, the current text takes care of the rest. And we think it is reasonable to use “may”, instead of “shall”, for “exclude … for up to 300 seconds” because the UE may try to acquire the next SIB1 and actually succeed. No strong view for the second change. Can go with the majority.On the third change, we may need to wait for (or jointly consider with) P1 and P2 of e-mail discussion [115], i.e., changing the description of *eDRX-AllowedIdle* and *eDRX-AllowedInactive*. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.3**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

**Q 2.4** Do you agree with the intention of changes in R2-2207750? Please elaborate your reply, especially if you do not and comment below if you have any suggestions for the wording if you do.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | See comments | Agree with the intention. There may be more redundancy that can be removed, as follows:First, within Part 2, case 2-1 and case 3-1 are already covered by the first two ifs within case 2-3 and case 3-3 in Part 1, based on the same 38.331 text and reasoning that we have provided in Q2.3. (We consider “as if *intraFreqReselectionRedCap* is set to allowed;” in 38.331 means “as if *intraFreqReselectionRedCap* is available and set to allowed”.) Secondly, within Part 2, <When cell status "barred" is indicated for RedCap UEs with 1Rx/2Rx> is already covered by Part 1, because <When cell status "barred" is indicated> in Part 1 includes both cases of indicated by MIB barring indicator and indicated by 1Rx/2RX barring indicator. And since the 1Rx/2RX barring indicator is present, the IFRI-RedCap must be present as well.So, what remains in Part 2 is only case 2-2 and case 3-2, as follows:When the UE is a RedCap UE and the cell is to be treated as if the cell status is "barred" due to not supporting RedCap UEs,- The UE shall select another cell according to the following rule:- the UE shall exclude the barred cell as a candidate for cell selection/reselection for 300 seconds.- the UE may select another cell on the same frequency if re-selection criteria are fulfilled.…With that, we think it is better to remove Part 2 (i.e., the second “When …” paragraph) completely and add case 2-2 and case 3-2 into Part 1 as follows:….When cell status "barred" is indicated or to be treated as if the cell status is "barred",- The UE is not permitted to select/reselect this cell, not even for emergency calls.- The UE shall select another cell according to the following rule:- If the UE is a RedCap UE and the cell is to be treated as if the cell status is "barred" due to not supporting RedCap UEs:- the UE shall exclude the barred cell as a candidate for cell selection/reselection for 300 seconds.- the UE may select another cell on the same frequency if re-selection criteria are fulfilled.- elseif the cell is to be treated as if the cell status is "barred" due to being unable to acquire the *MIB*:- the UE may exclude the barred cell as a candidate for cell selection/reselection for up to 300 seconds.- the UE may select another cell on the same frequency if the selection criteria are fulfilled.- else:… |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.4**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

**Q 2.5** Do you agree with the intention of changes in R2-2208112? Please elaborate your reply, especially if you do not and comment below if you have any suggestions for the wording if you do.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Postpone? | We may need to wait for (or jointly consider with) P1 and P2 of e-mail discussion [115], i.e., changing the description of *eDRX-AllowedIdle* and *eDRX-AllowedInactive*. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.5**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

**Q 2.6** Do you agree with the intention of changes in R2-2208221? Please elaborate your reply, especially if you do not and comment below if you have any suggestions for the wording if you do.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Postpone? | We may need to wait for (or jointly consider with) P1 and P2 of e-mail discussion [115], i.e., changing the description of *eDRX-AllowedIdle* and *eDRX-AllowedInactive*. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.6**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

# 3 Conclusion

Based on the discussion above rapporteur suggests the following proposals:

[Proposal 1 ???](#_Toc112239661)

[Proposal 2 ???](#_Toc112239662)

[Proposal 3 ???](#_Toc112239663)

[Proposal 4 ???](#_Toc112239664)

[Proposal 5 ???](#_Toc112239665)

[Proposal 6 ???](#_Toc112239666)
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