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# Introduction

This contribution provides a summary of the following email discussion:

* [Post115-e][089][ePowSav] Paging Subgrouping (Xiaomi)

Scope: Objective to continue work based on existing agreements. Further progress the roles of AMF gNB UE and potential impact to stage-2. Take RAN1 agreements into account. Progress how CN subgrouping and UE ID subgrouping relates to L1 and the control of this.

Intended outcome: Report to pave the way for progress

Deadline: Long

Deadline for companies’ inputs:

1st round deadline: initial comments collection, October 14th, 0900 UTC

2nd round deadline: one week for proposal checking and companies can further comment by October 21th, 0900 UTC

# Contact information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Name and email address |
| Xiaomi | Li Yanhua; liyanhua1@xiaomi.com |
| Ericsson | Martin van der Zee: martin.van.der.zee@ericsson.com |
| Samsung | Anil Agiwal; anilag@samsung.com |
| OPPO | Haitao Li lihaitao@oppo.com |
| CATT | Pierre Bertrand ; pierrebertrand@catt.cn |
| MediaTek | Li-Chuan TSENG ; li-chuan.tseng@mediatek.com |
| Intel | Seau Sian Lim ; seau.s.lim@intel.com |
| Nokia | Chunli Wu ; chunli.wu@nokia-sbell.com |
| vivo | Chenli, chenli5g@vivo.com |
| Sony | [Anders.Berggren@sony](mailto:Anders.Berggren@sony). com |
| Sharp | LIU Lei; lei.liu@cn.sharp-world.com |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yiru Kuang ; kuangyiru@huawei.com |
| Futurewei | Yunsong Yang ; [yyang1@futurewei.com](mailto:yyang1@futurewei.com) |
| Sequans | noam.cayron ; [noam.cayron@sequans.com](mailto:noam.cayron@sequans.com) |
| CMCC | Xiaoxuan Tang; tangxiaoxuan@chinamobile.com |
| DENSO | Tatsuki Nagano ; [tatsuki.nagano.j7f@jp.denso.com](mailto:tatsuki.nagano.j7f@jp.denso.com) |
| Apple | Sethuraman Gurumoorthy ; [sethu@apple.com](mailto:sethu@apple.com) |
| Qualcomm | Linhai He ; linhaihe@qti.qualcomm.com |

# Discussion

## 3.1 General

The motivation of UE paging subgrouping is to reduce power consumption in the UE due to false paging alarms (i.e. when the UE receives a paging message on PDSCH on its paging occasion, which is not intended for that UE). This is done by further dividing the UEs within a paging occasion into multiple subgroups. A UE will decode the Paging message in its Paging occasion only if it is received an indication that its subgroup is being paged.

In the previous RAN2 #115e meeting, the following agreements were made [1] and a LS [2] was sent to other TWG.

|  |
| --- |
| * When AMF has assigned a UE with a Paging subgroup, some NAS signaling should be supported between AMF and UE to convey the related information to the UE. Exact information is FFS. The design and procedure are up to SA2/CT1. * When AMF has assigned a UE with a Paging subgroup, some signaling should be supported between AMF and gNB(s) to inform gNB(s) about the related subgroup information for paging a UE in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE. Exact information is FFS. The message(s) and associated design are up to RAN3. * It is FFS when a UE in RRC\_INACTIVE has been assigned by CN a Paging subgroup, whether some signaling should be introduced between gNBs to inform each other about the UE’s subgroup for RAN paging. * If RAN2 agrees to support UE assistance information to CN in support of Paging subgroup assignment, RAN2 will focus on the paging probability and power profile attributes. * UEID-based subgroup method requires, in addition to the already available information for legacy UEID-based grouping in PO, the total number of supported UEID-based subgroups by the network. * At least for UEID-based subgroup method the total number, Nsg, of supported subgroups by the network is decided by RAN and broadcasted in System Information. * At least for UEID-based subgroup method the total number, Nsg, of supported subgroups is controlled on a cell basis and can be different in different cells. * We go with Option 1 (CN assigns subgroup ID) * R2 assumes that All the cells within the registration area supports the same number of CN assigned subgroups, i.e. no remapping of CN assigned group ID to RAN subgroup ID (will revisit only if serious issues are found). * For the purpose of continued discussions, R2 assumes that UE has separate UE caps for CN assigned and UEID based subgrouping, the actual decision to be taken later. * RAN capability is known based on broadcast information. FFS with explicit indication or implicitly based configuration. |

RAN1 is discussing the design of Lay1 subgrouping indication and the following agreements were made in the previous RAN1 #105e-106e meetings [3]:

|  |
| --- |
| RAN1 #105e meeting  Agreement :  For UE subgroups indication in physical layer, maximum of 8 subgroups per PO is supported.  **Conclusion:**  To down-select one solution for PEI physical-layer channel/signal in RAN1 #106-e, using below as a starting point:   * PDCCH-based PEI * SSS-based PEI * TRS/CSI-RS-based PEI   Note: Additional details for each of the above 3 solutions are encouraged for more informed down-selection  Note: further refinement of the above list is possible, e.g., by merging/further splitting, depending on significance of the commonality and/or differences  RAN1 #106e meeting  Conclusion:  To down-select one solution for PEI physical-layer channel/signal in RAN1 #106-e,   * PDCCH-based PEI * SSS-based PEI   Proposed Working Assumption   * PDCCH-based PEI   Supported by 20 companies, but can not be accepted by 3 companies, i.e., Intel, CATT, Sony. |

RAN plenary discussed the design of Lay1 subgrouping indication and RAN3 is now included in the WID [23]:

|  |
| --- |
| conclusion:  Issue 1 (How to proceed PEI in Rel-17):  Support PDCCH-based PEI as the only option  - Only essential function for PEI is support  • New DCI format  • Higher layer configuration, including SS  • Details of the procedures of PEI monitoring, and identification of MOs before PO  • Only Behv-A (per RAN1#104e agreement) is supported  • If TRS availability indication is agreed to be supported in both paging DCI and the DCI format for PEI, same mechanism/principle for TRS availability indication is adopted for the two DCI formats  • Supporting TRS availability indication in DCI format for PEI shall not delay the completion of essential functionality of PEI    Issue 2 (Whether or how to involve RAN3 for supporting paging sub-grouping):  revised WID RP-212619 was at first approved and later revised in RP-212630    Issue 3 (Whether or what to modify the Status report RP-212307):  SR is updated to RP-212612 to reflect  - RAN decision on PEI (see Issue 1 above)  - Core part completion level of 65%  - To capture RAN2 request to RAN3 from R2-2108917 as open issues for RAN3 |

## 3.2 On the roles of AMF/gNB/UE

For CN-assigned subgrouping, we have agreed the option1 last meeting as illustrated in the following figure [5] which has the following characteristics:

* CN assigns subgroup ID to UE and indicates to gNB when the UE is paged
* gNB and the UE apply the assigned subgroup ID
* gNB broadcast subgroup configuration (e.g. number of total subgroups)
* If specific subgrouping information is not provided from CN, UE ID based subgrouping may be used
* possible with or without remapping to RAN subgroup ID depends on the sub-options



Figure 1: message sequence chart for option 1

To help people have a clear view and to help the discussion step by step, the rapporteur divides it into 3 parts.

3.2.1 is mainly focusing on RAN capability for CN-assigned subgrouping. It is possible that RAN can only support CN-assigned subgrouping.

3.2.2 is mainly focus on RAN capability for UE-ID based subgrouping. It is possible that RAN can only support UE-ID based subgrouping.

3.2.3 is discussing about co-existing of both.

### 3.2.1 CN-assigned subgrouping

The first question is how gNB informs the UE that it supports CN-assigned subgrouping. According to [5], all the companies agree RAN capability could be known based on broadcast information. And we need to further discuss whether explicit indication or implicitly based configuration will be used. In LTE, presence of additional information related to group based WUS configuration is used as the indication for NW capability. I.e., whether NW supports paging probability based grouping is based on the presence of relevant resource mapping for this paging probability information and WUS group on Uu interface. If we take the same principle as in LTE, a candidate solution would be network capability to support CN assigned subgrouping can be implicitly indicated by presence of CN assigned subgrouping configuration with the details discussed later.

Hence, we have 2 options:

* Option 1: network capability to support CN assigned subgrouping can be implicitly indicated by presence of CN assigned subgrouping configuration (e.g., X number of CN based subgroups by the network);
* Option 2: via an indication in SIB [9][12][15] (e.g., if the X number of CN based subgroups by the network by fixed and specified in Q10, then an indication in SIB is used for RAN supporting )

Q1: Which option do companies prefer out of option 1-2 on RAN capability indication about supporting CN assigned subgrouping?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option1/2 | Comments |
| Ericsson | Option 3: via PEI configuration. | The gNB has to provide the PEI configuration in system information, and the DCI information will indicate if CN grouping is supported or not. The details depend on progress/agreements in RAN1 about the DCI format and the number of bits available to indicate the CN group, and potentially other information carried in the PEI.  PS: we do not see the need to indicate the number of CN subgroups to the UE, but the UE only needs to know which DCI bits of the PEI to monitor to acquire the CN subgroup ID. |
| Samsung | Option 2 | We do not see any need to indicate total number of CN assigned subgroups to UE. In our understanding, PEI will include a bitmap where each bit maps to a paging subgroup identity. UE checks for the bit corresponding to its paging subgroup identity. |
| OPPO | Option 2 | Since we have agreed that RAN2 assumes all the cells within the registration area supports the same number of CN assigned subgroups, the maximum CN assigned subgroup number can be fixed in the spec. So we see no need to indicate the total CN assigned subgroup number. |
| CATT | Option 1 but | We prefer option 1 for the “implicit” approach but we disagree that RAN capability distinguishes CN assigned and UEID-based subgrouping. The RAN2 agreement is: “*RAN capability is known based on broadcast information. FFS with explicit indication or implicitly based configuration*”. In our understanding, this RAN2 agreement leaves it open at the moment whether the RAN capability is common to both CN-assigned and UEID-based or whether RAN can have separate capabilities for CN-assigned and UEID-based. And this question is actually addressed in Q9, but all questions up to Q9 assume all 4 cases discussed in Q9 should be supported. Our view is that a common RAN capability for subgrouping is sufficient, simpler, and can be indicated by the total number of supported subgroups in the cell. |
| MediaTek | Option 3 | We believe that paging indication for UE subgroups will be carried by PEI, and thus there will be “UE-group PEI” configurations, which indicates CN support of UE subgrouping, similar to the *GWUS-Config* in LTE. We also do not see the need to indicate the number of CN subgroups to the UE. |
| ZTE | Option 3 | We also tend to agree with that there is no need for NW to broadcast the information about the number of CN assigned groups to UE as an indication about whether the RAN support CN assigned grouping method. It seems simpler to indicate the RAN capability via PEI configuration. Anyway, it mainly depends on the RAN1 progress in OCT meeting. |
| Intel | Option 1 with comments (maybe this is now Option 3?) | We do not see the need to indicate the number of CN based subgroups.  As long as the SIB indicates the support of the CN subgroup in the DCI configuration of the PEI (e.g. indicating the bits for the CN subgroup), the UE will know that the RAN supports CN assigned subgrouping for the cell and also which bit corresponds to its CN assigned subgrouping ID . |
| Nokia | Option 1 | Could be as part of PEI configuration. |
| Vivo | Option 2 with comments? Or Option 3? | In our understanding, there is no need to indicate the number of CN based subgroups, as we have agreed that RAN2 assumes that all the cells within the registration area supports the same number of CN assigned subgroups. Or would the proponent provide more intention for this information?  Regarding using PEI configuration to indicate the RAN capability of CN subgrouping, this option cannot distinguish the case of PEI+CN subgroup and the case of PEI+RAN subgroup. Anyway, some indication is needed to indicate whether CN subgroup is supported. For the capability of RAN subgroup, we think it could be implicitly indicated by the number of subgroups broadcasted in SI.  In summary, the answer for this issue related to: how to indicate CN assigned subgroup either in PEI/Paging PDCCH, whether RAN have separate capability for CN subgrouping and RAN subgrouping, what configuration is needed for CN subgrouping, etc. |
| Sony | Option 3? | Agree that there is no need to broadcast number of CN based subgrouping. The UE needs to know in each cell via system information, which physical PEI group to monitor. |
| Sharp | Option 1 with comments | We also don’t think the number of CN based subgroups needs to be broadcast. And an implicit method can be PEI configuration. |
| LGE |  | We also assume some RAN1 configuration will be provided to support CN-assigned subgrouping, e.g. PEI/DCI configuration, and UE can know whether the serving cell supports the CN-assigned subgroup based on the configuration. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2/3 with comments | If common RAN capability is not supported by the RAN, RAN needs to indicate whether CN-assigned subgrouping is supported or not. For the number of CN based subgroups, we think that it can be derived from PEI configuration, e.g. based on the available bits for subgroups in PEI. But if the total number of CN subgroups is fixed and the available bits for subgroups in PEI is fixed, then there is no need of broadcast configuration. This stage 3 signalling design should depend on the selected scheme. |
| Futurewei | Option 1/3 | We are open to implicitly indicating RAN capability of supporting CN assigned subgrouping if we can identify other configuration information that can unambiguously imply such capability. |
| Sequans | Option 1/3 | We prefer an implicit indication. The specific details will the depend on the exact solution |
| CMCC | Option 1/3 | We prefer not to add one explicit indication in the SIB. It is sufficient to implicitly indicate this RAN capability of CN assigned subgrouping by presence of the corresponding configuration (e.g. PEI configuration). |
| DENSO | Option 2 | Considering RAN2 agreements, it is not necessary to indicate the number of CN-based subgroups. |
| Xiaomi | Depends on Q10 | If the total number of CN subgroups is fixed, option2 is OK. A flag will enable UE to know whether there will be subgroups used for CN assigned subgrouping. If not, Option1 is OK. We agree that the implicit way can be used. |
| Apple | Option 1/3 | Prefer to indicate it via the PEI configuration |
| Qualcomm | Option 2 | Option 1 is not preferred because RAN should not have the flexibility in choosing number of CN-assigned subgroups to support.  Option 3 works only if RAN1 agree that only PEI can carry subgroup indication . In other words, if enhanced paging indication can include subgroup indication, then Option 2 should be used. |

**Summary:**

20 companies provided inputs to this question. According to people’s inputs, they can be categorized in 2 ways (implicit/explicit):

* Network capability to support CN assigned subgrouping can be implicitly indicated in PEI configurations (option1/3, 15 companies). FFS on the signaling details.

Some examples:

e.g., X number of bits are indicated by the network for CN assigned;

e.g., the total number of supported subgroups are indicated by the network for CN assigned and UE-ID based way (CATT)

* Network capability to support CN assigned subgrouping can be explicitly indicated by a flag (5 companies chose option2). The argument is that if the maximum CN assigned subgroup number is fixed, a flag is sufficient for the UE to know gNB’s capability.

The Rapporteur agrees that this issue will need some input with RAN1 and can wait for RAN1 progress on PEI design till Wednesday.

**Proposal 1 ():**

As described above, in LTE eNB configures via broadcast the relation between this paging probability information and WUS group on Uu interface. The UE will first choose a “WUS group set” based on paging probability and corresponding thresholds, and then selects its WUS group from the WUS group set based on UE ID as captured in TS 36.304.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The UE determines the WUS group set corresponding to its probability PNAS, if configured, as defined in Table 7.5.2-1 If PNAS is not configured, UE selects the WUS group set with highest index.  Table 7.5.2-1: WUS group set definition when *probThreshList* is configured   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | WUS group set | probThreshList | WUS group index in WUS groups list | | | Lower bound | Upper bound | | 1 | PNAS ≤ Thresh1 | 0 | Nth1 -1 | | 2 | Thresh1 < PNAS ≤ Thresh2 (Note) | Nth1 | Nth1 + Nth2 -1 | | 3 | Thresh2 < PNAS ≤ Thresh3 (Note) | Nth1 + Nth2 | Nth1 +Nth2 + Nth3 -1 | | 4 | PNAS > Thresh3 | Nth1 +Nth2 + Nth3 | maxWG-1 | | where  Threshi is the value signalled in the ith entry of *probThreshList*  Nthi is the value signalled in the ith entry of *groupsForServiceList*  Note: When the total number of WUS group sets is less than 4, the upper bound for the WUS group set with highest index is maxWG-1. | | | | |

In the following, we needs to consider how to relate the CN assigned subgrouping information to Lay1 subgrouping indication(s) [9][13]. The concept is similar to LTE. Note that the design of Lay1 subgrouping indication itself is not in the scope of the email as RAN1 is still discussing it. A Lay1 subgrouping indication can be a bit or a code point from DCI bit in PEI resource(s) which depends on RAN1 input. And PEI configurations giving Lay1 subgrouping indications will be discussed on more RAN1 inputs.

Option1 is gNB mapping a subgrouping to a Lay1 subgrouping indication while option2 is gNB mapping a subgrouping to multiple Lay1 subgrouping indications while for the later the UEs will still uniformly been distributed into different Lay1 radio resources based on UE\_ID as in LTE. The benefits of it is that if the number of UE in the same paging group is very large, the second level group as UE-ID based is applied. The drawback is that UE has to perform extra step of hashing to determine its subgroup assignment.

Table 1: Mapping subgroup(s) to a Lay1 subgrouping indication (Option1)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CN-assigned subgroup | Lay1 subgrouping indication |
| Subgroup0 | PEI subgrouping indication 0 |
| Subgroup1 | PEI subgrouping indication 1 |
| Subgroup2 | PEI subgrouping indication 2 |
| … | … |

Table 2: Mapping subgroup(s) to multiple Lay1 subgrouping indications (Option2)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CN-assigned subgroup | Lay1 subgrouping indications |
| Subgroup0 | PEI subgrouping indication 0  PEI subgrouping indication 1 |
| Subgroup1 | PEI subgrouping indication 2  PEI subgrouping indication 3  PEI subgrouping indication 4 |
| … | … |

People did not like UE to perform extra step of hashing so the 2-step way in LTE is excluded in last meeting. Rapporteur think it is good to confirm that we will not pursue this when considering how gNB configures the mapping between subgrouping information to Lay1 subgrouping indication(s) on Uu interface.

Q2: Companies are invited to confirm that a subgroup can only be mapped to a Lay1 subgrouping indication rather than multiple Lay1 subgrouping indications on Uu interface?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Ericsson | Not option 2, and wait for RAN1 progress | What is a "Lay1 subgrouping indication"? Bit or codepoint, or…? If there is no hashing, it is not clear how the UE determines which "PEI subgrouping indication" to use? We think this is unclear and therefore it is also difficult to really answer this question.  We cannot discuss and agree how the CN subgroup ID (integer 0..7) should be encoded into the PEI DCI bits for the CN grouping, because we do not know how many bits are available, and whether bits/codepoints are used, and whether 1-to-N mapping of PEI to Pos is included/excluded, and whether the encoding depends on configuration in system information. We think RAN2 should wait for RAN1 progress.  Rapp:  I understand your concern is whether we will have a mapping between subgroup and PEI subgrouping indication even if we agreed that a subgroup ID will only mapped to one PEI subgrouping indication?  I agree with you that more input from RAN1 is needed. But that does not impact our intention is to confirm there will not be a 2 step distribution for a UE.  Option 2: in case many UEs are assigned to a certain CN subgroup, the CN can allocate those type/category of UEs to another CN subgroup, i.e. distribute the UEs over two CN subgroups. We do not think the RAN is needed for this and this can be left to CN implementation.  Rapp:  Yes. It is CN’s implementation. |
| Samsung | Yes | However, we do not see any need to explicit signal mapping between subgroup and PEI subgrouping indication by gNB.  Paging subgroup IDs can be sequentially mapped to PEI subgrouping indications in DCI. |
| OPPO | Yes | From RAN2 point of view, 2-step grouping method has been excluded, so we don’t need to discuss option 2.  Option 1 is a straightforward way for mapping, we can take it as baseline. The details should be up to RAN1 design, e.g., the number of available bits for subgrouping indication in PEI, whether to use bitmap or codepoint, etc. |
| CATT | Yes | We already agreed not to go the LTE way. |
| MediaTek | Yes | Although we prefer the two-step grouping approach, it has been excluded, as other companies pointed out and thus we need not to discuss Option 2. The details of Option 1 should be in RAN1 scope (e.g. bitmap or codepoint) |
| ZTE | - | We prefer the two-step grouping approach since the reason have be shown as rapporteur point out, if there are super majorties UE with a certain paging probability, the two-step grouping approach can derive more power saving gain than option 1, we are open to discuss this issue, and if majorities prefer option 1, we can also accept. |
| Intel | Yes Option 1 | As mentioned by others, we have an explicit working assumption below:   * **R2 assumes that All the cells within the registration area supports the same number of CN assigned subgroups, i.e. no remapping of CN assigned group ID to RAN subgroup ID (will revisit only if serious issues are found).** |
| Nokia | Yes | Fine without option 2 |
| Vivo | Option 1 with comments | As RAN2 has agreed that no remapping of CN assigned group ID to RAN subgroup ID, we think option 2 has been excluded.  Regarding Option 1, we think further inputs from RAN1 is needed. Whether need to configure or define the mapping to bitmap or codepoint depends on the decision in RAN1, e.g. whether bitmap or codepoint, how many bits/codepoints could be used for subgroup indication.  Rapp:  See comments above. |
| Sony | Yes, option 1 | For option 1 there is a CN to RAN subgrouping re-mapping, and it is the PEI subgrouping that the UE needs to know. |
| Sharp | Yes | Option 1 is fine. |
| LGE | Yes | RAN2 agreed to assume that all the cells within the registration area supports the same number of CN assigned subgroups, so the re-mapping between the CN-assigned subgroup and RAN-level subgroup is not needed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes for now | This is related to the agreement “R2 assumes that All the cells within the registration area supports the same number of CN assigned subgroups, i.e. no remapping of CN assigned group ID to RAN subgroup ID (will revisit only if serious issues are found)”. It depends on the RAN1 detailed design of PEI, e.g. available bits for subgrouping indication in PEI, hence we need to wait for RAN1. |
| Futurewei | Yes | Option 1 is fine. |
| Sequans | Yes | As previously agreed, option 2 is not considered. Further details depend on RAN1. |
| CMCC | Yes | According to the previous agreements, we agree that Option 2 is excluded. |
| DENSO | Yes | Option 1 is fine. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | Ok to go with 1 to 1 mapping. |
| Apple | Yes | Option 1 is fine and it is simpler as well. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | We have the same comment as Samsung. No option 2, as that has been ruled out at the last RAN2 meeting. |

**Summary:**

20 companies provided inputs to this question and 18 companies agree to confirm that a subgroup can only be mapped to a Lay1 subgrouping indication rather than multiple Lay1 subgrouping indications on Uu interface considering that mapping to multiple Lay1 subgrouping indications will involve 2-step grouping method which was not liked by people in last online meeting.

However, 2 companies (Ericsson, Vivo) raised some comments on whether we will still have a mapping between subgroup and PEI subgrouping indication (e.g., mapping to code points)even if we agreed that a subgroup ID will only mapped to one PEI subgrouping indication. The Rapporteur agreed this issue will need some input with RAN1. But currently, that does not impact our intention is to confirm there will not be a 2 step distribution for a UE (No mapping from a subgrouping to multiple bits or multiple codepionts as in LTE).

**Proposal 2 (18/20): RAN2 confirms that one subgroup will not be mapped to multiple Lay1 subgrouping indications, i.e., the 2-step way of distributing UE is excluded.**

It was agreed that the number of CN assigned subgroups should be the same across the registration area, with a possible interpretation that there will not be any remapping of CN assigned subgroup ID to RAN subgroup ID or Lay1 subgrouping indication, interpretation which can be revisited “if serious issues are found”. On the other hand, it was also agreed that “**at least** for UEID-based subgroup method the total number, Nsg, of supported subgroups is controlled on a cell basis and can be different in different cells”. Considering some gNB can only support limited subgroups for a PO (e.g., the DCI bit in PEI will be used for other futures or the DCI bits in a PEI would be potentially shared by multiple POs. More RAN1 input is needed), it is seems reasonable gNB can map several CN assigned subgroups to the same Lay1 subgrouping indication where the network can allow subgroupings of similar paging probability range to share WUS resources for efficiency. In other words, the above “at least” could be extended to both UEID-based and CN-assigned subgroups. The rapporteur wants to ask companies whether it is feasible for RAN to support the same number of CN assigned subgroups across gNBs with different Lay1 resources in each cell, without remapping. An example of N to 1 mapping based on option1 in Q2 is illustrated in the following table.

Table 3: Mapping subgroups to a Lay1 subgrouping indication (N to 1 mapping)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CN-assigned subgroup | Lay1 subgrouping indication |
| Subgroup0  Subgroup1 | PEI subgrouping indication 0 |
| … | … |

Hence we have 2 options

* Option1: Yes
* Option2: Not needed.
* Option3: whether N to 1 mapping is needed depends on RAN1 outcome?

Q3: Which option do companies prefer out of option 1-3 regarding to whether different subgroups can be mapped to the same Lay1 subgrouping indication(s) on Uu interface?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option1/2/3 | Comments |
| Ericsson | Option 3 | Wait for RAN1 progress.  In our view we should not re-discuss the remapping of the CN assigned subgroup ID to RAN subgroup IE (option 3). This was discussed several times in different proposals, and there was a SoH in last meeting where it was agreed that RAN2 assumes that the RAN nodes in the registration area support the number of CN groups. This assumptions will only be revisited if serious issues are found.  RAN plenary agreed that only DCI based PEI will be used, which compared to sequency based PEI can support more groups. RAN1 agreed to need 8 subgroups and we do not expect any serious issues that would require remapping in RAN.  Anyways, we think that RAN2 should wait for RAN1 progress on the number of bits for CN groups in PEI. After that RAN2 can discuss if there is a problem to support 8 groups. But we think it is currently a waste of time to discuss if companies prefer remapping one more time. |
| Samsung | Option 2 | Support, one to one mapping between paging subgrouping and paging early indication. Why to create more paging groups than the number of paging early indications? |
| OPPO |  | This question is similar as Question 2, we don’t need to re-discuss it. |
| CATT | Option 1 | We agree with the Rapporteur that there currently is some contradiction, or at least room for interpretation, regarding both agreements that “*there will not be any remapping of CN assigned subgroup ID to RAN subgroup ID*”, and at the same time, “*at least for UEID-based subgroup method the total number, Nsg, of supported subgroups is controlled on a cell basis and can be different in different cells*”. For the case (still open and discussed in Q8) where CN assigned and UEID-based share the same subgroup set, the latter agreement could require that some remapping is done anyways. |
| MediaTek | Option 3 |  |
| ZTE | Option 2 | First of all, we do think that the remapping rule (i.e remap the CN assigned subgroup ID to the UE based subgroup ID) may increase the false alarm ratio for a UE with a certain paging probability but in the same group there are some other UEs are not able to estimate the their paging probability but only using the UE ID based subgrouping. |
| Intel | Option 2 | Again, we do not understand the need to rediscuss this with the following working assumption:  **R2 assumes that All the cells within the registration area supports the same number of CN assigned subgroups, i.e. no remapping of CN assigned group ID to RAN subgroup ID (will revisit only if serious issues are found).**  Our understanding is that there is no remapping and the CN assigned subgrouping map one to one to the L1 subgrouping indication. Unless serious issues are found, RAN2 should not rediscuss remapping. |
| Nokia | Option 1 or 3 | RAN2 could also discuss and decide if single PEI to multiple PO is needed since it is more system requirement level of discussions. |
| Vivo | Option 3 | **I am not sure whether companies are aligned with the intention for this question.**  Our understanding on the intention for this question is whether we need to have some bit/codepoint to indicate the wake up for more than one subgroup. Our answer is this should depend on the progress in RAN1 on whether bitmap or codepoint is used for subgroup indication.   * If bitmap is used, then, it could be naturally supported to wake up more than one subgroup by more than one bits. * If codepoint is used, we need further discussion on whether any codepoint should be defined to indicate more than one subgroup. |
| Sony | Option 1 | CN to L1 subgrouping is needed, even if the number of CN based groups and physical layer groups may be the same. |
| Sharp | Option 2 |  |
| LGE | Option 2 |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 3 |  |
| Futurewei | Option 2 | If option 1, the benefit of CN-assigned subgrouping (optimizing for false paging alarms) may be compromised. |
| Sequans | Option 3 | Agree with Ericsson |
| CMCC | Option 2 |  |
| DENSO | Option 2 |  |
| Xiaomi | Option3 | Ok to wait for RAN1 progress. |
| Apple | Option 3 | Wait for RAN1 progress to conclude on this. |
| Qualcomm | Option 2 | This proposal (mapping multiple CN-assigned subgroups to a single bit or codepoint in PEI or paging indication) is an optimization and hence not needed. |

**Summary:**

20 companies provided inputs to this question.

* 3/19 companies support (option 1) that allowing multiple subgroup mapped to the same Lay1 subgroup indication, with key argument that it is beneficial if we support CN assigned and UEID-based sharing the same subgroup set (the overlapped case raised by CATT).
* 9/19 companies support (option 2) that multiple subgroup mapped to the same Lay1 subgroup indication is not needed, with key argument is that RAN2 has agreed that there is no remapping and the CN assigned subgrouping map one to one to the L1 subgrouping indication.
* 8/19 companies thinks that whether N to 1 mapping is needed depends on RAN1 outcome.

Rapporteur suggests to wait for RAN1 progress on PEI design till Wednesday.

**Proposal 3: Whether multiple subgroups can be mapped to the same Lay1 subgroup indication needs to wait for RAN1 (**till Wednesday)**.**

### 3.2.2 UE-ID based subgrouping

Same as for CN-assigned subgrouping, we first check how gNB informs the UE that it supports UEID-based subgrouping. As we have agreed “UEID-based subgroup method requires, in addition to the already available information for legacy UEID-based grouping in PO, the total number of supported UEID-based subgroups by the network”, the candidate solution could be the implicit way.

Hence, we have 2 options:

* Option 1: network capability to support UEID-based subgrouping can be implicitly indicated by presence of the total number of supported UEID-based subgroups by the network;
* Option 2: via an indication in SIB [15]

Q4: Which option do companies prefer out of option 1-2 on network capability indication about supporting UE-ID based subgrouping?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option1/2 | Comments |
| Ericsson | Option 1 |  |
| Samsung | Option 1 |  |
| OPPO | Option 1 |  |
| CATT | Option 1 | With same comment as for Q1: a common RAN capability for subgrouping is sufficient and can be indicated by the total number of supported subgroups in the cell. |
| MediaTek | Option 1 |  |
| ZTE | Option 1 |  |
| Intel | Option 1 |  |
| Nokia | Option 1 |  |
| vivo | Option 1 |  |
| Sony | ?? | Not sure how option 1 and 2 are alternatives? The first option is a network capability is needed. The second option is how to inform the UE.  Rapp:  My intention for Q4 is which way (implicit way or explicit way) will used for RAN’s capability. I will confirm with you offline. |
| Sharp | Option 1 |  |
| LGE | Option 1 |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 1 |  |
| Futurewei | Option 1 |  |
| Sequans | Option 1 |  |
| CMCC | Option 1 |  |
| DENSO | Option 1 |  |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 |  |
| Apple | Option 1 |  |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 |  |

**Summary:**

20 companies provided inputs to this question.

* 19/20 companies support (option1) that network capability to support UEID-based subgrouping can be implicitly indicated by presence of the total number of supported UEID-based subgroups by the network. And one company claimed that a common RAN capability for subgrouping is sufficient and can be indicated by the total number of supported subgroups in the cell.

Considering the majority view:

**Proposal 4 (19/20): Network capability to support UEID-based subgrouping can be implicitly indicated by presence of the total number of supported UEID-based subgroups by the network**

In LTE, if the relation between the paging probability information and Lay1 WUS group(s) on UU interface is not broadcasted but the Lay1 WUS groups, UE will assumes that all the Lay1 WUS groups are available and select its Lay1 WUS group from all the Lay1 WUS groups based on UE ID as captured in TS 36.304:

|  |
| --- |
| If *probThreshList* is not present in *gwus-Config*, there is only one WUS group set containing all the WUS groups configured in *numGroupsList*. The total number of WUS groups is maxWG.  After selection of the WUS group set as specified in clause 7.5.2, the UE selects the WUS group to monitor as below.  For BL UE or UE in enhanced coverage, the UE determines wg with following equation:  For NB-IoT, the UE determines wg with following equation:  where:  UE\_ID, N, Ns, Nn and Ware definedin clause7.1.  Nw is the number of WUS groups in the selected WUS group set.  wg is the index of the WUS group in the selected WUS group set, determined as defined in clause 7.5.2, 0 .. Nw-1. |

Hence rapporteur think it is also possible for RAN to implement UE-ID only by configuring all the subgroup for UE-ID based subgrouping, i.e., no subgroup used for CN assigned subgrouping means all the RAN configured subgroups will be used by UE-ID assigned subgrouping.

Q5: Do companies agree that RAN may configure all subgroups for UE-ID based subgrouping?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Ericsson | Yes, RAN may configure the UE to use UE-ID based subgrouping, also when the UE has a CN group ID assigned. | We are not sure if we fully understood the question, i.e. not sure why there is a reference to the LTE solution? Furthermore, what are "Lay1 WUS groups"? RAN2 agreed to exclude option 2 "CN assigns a set of subgroup IDs".  But if we read Q5 literally we understand that only UE-ID based subgroups are used, i.e. the gNB can configure the UE to use UE-ID based grouping (even when a CN group ID is assigned).  Rapp:  Yes, the purpose is to confirm whether RAN can configure only to support UE-ID based subgrouping. LTE’s case is to illustrate that all the L1 resource can be for UE’s modular operation if no configuration for CN. |
| Samsung | - | In our understanding if total number of paging subgroups for UE ID based subgrouping is P, paging subgroup identities of paging subgroups are 0 to P-1. |
| OPPO | Yes | It is up to RAN implementation. |
| CATT | No | We think this situation is possible but does not depend on RAN configuration. The only case where this could result from RAN configuration is if RAN supports UEID-based subgrouping but does not support CN-assigned subgrouping. As discussed in Q1, we do not support separate RAN capabilities for CN-assigned and UEID-based. With a common capability, RAN broadcasts whether it supports subgrouping or not, and the case where all subgroups in a cell are used for UE-ID based subgrouping only corresponds to no UE was assigned a subgroup by AMF. And this is not due to RAN configuration. Note this is also aligned with the RAN2#103bis agreement: *If we go for network controlled subgrouping, If the network chooses to not provide specific subgrouping information, there will be configuration option where subgrouping can be supported by randomization (by UE-ID)* |
| MediaTek | Yes | Our understanding is that the R2#103bis agreement mentioned by CATT does not mean CN-assigned and UE-ID based subgrouping cannot co-exist. |
| ZTE | Yes | We think RAN can have its liberty to determine whether to support CN assigned subgrouping on top of the UE ID based subgrouping. |
| Intel | Yes, the RAN can configure a cell to just support UE-ID based subgrouping | We are not sure why there is a need to use LTE as example in this context. Of course, the RAN should be able to configure a cell to just support UE-ID based subgrouping or to support CN assigned subgrouping or to support both.  Rapp:  LTE’s case is to illustrate that all the L1 resource can be for UE’s modular operation if no configuration for CN. |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| vivo | - | I am not sure whether companies are aligned with the intention for this question.  Our understanding is that, of course, RAN may configure only UE-ID based subgrouping.  If the purpose of this question is to confirm whether RAN can configure only to support UE\_ID based subgrouping. Then, we support it.  Rapp:  Yes, the purpose is to confirm whether RAN can configure only to support UE-ID based subgrouping.  In last meeting, we have agreed that:  *At least for UEID-based subgroup method the total number, Nsg, of supported subgroups by the network is decided by RAN and broadcasted in System Information.*  We think the agreement is that the RAN will decide the subgroups for UE-ID based subgroups, not for CN assigned subgroups. That is to say, RAN may configure all subgroups for UE-ID based subgrouping.  Besides, we think the pre-condition for RAN to configure all subgroups for UE-ID based subgrouping is that, CN does not assign subgroup ID, according to the below agreements in RAN2#113bis:  *If we go for network controlled subgrouping, If the network chooses to not provide specific subgrouping information, there will be configuration option where subgrouping can be supported by randomization (by UE-ID).*  Rapp:  Do you mean the RAN’s configuration depends on CN’s capability? |
| Sony | - | Not sure about the intention of this question.  Rapp:  I will confirm with you offline. |
| Sharp | Yes with comments | It is possible to configure UE to use UE-ID based subgrouping only if RAN2 agree the gNB can support CN based subgrouping and UE-ID based subgrouping separately. Else UE-ID based subgrouping is a fallback of CN based subgrouping. |
| LGE |  | We also think we should discuss based on the discussion and decisions that have been made in R17, not based on LTE solution.  Though we are also not sure if our understanding is right, the question seems to be based on the assumption that the subgroup used by CN-assigned subgroup cannot be used in UE-ID based subgroup. However, we think the same subgroup can be used in both subgroupings.  Rapp:  The purpose is to confirm whether RAN can configure only to support UE-ID based subgrouping, i.e., the subgroups RAN has can be used for UE-ID based subgroup if it is not used by CN-assigned subgroup. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | Yes | Such RAN implementation should be possible. |
| Sequans | Yes | We are not quite sure what is the intention, but based on the wording, when UE-ID is used, the NW can configure as many groups as it wants, up to all available subgroups. |
| CMCC | Yes | We agree with Vivo. Based on previous agreements, RAN can decide the total number of supported subgroups for the UE-ID based subgrouping method. When RAN can support the UE-ID based and CN assigned subgrouping simultaneously, RAN can configure all subgroups for UE-ID based subgrouping by implementation. |
| DENSO | Yes | Not sure the intention of this question, but the UE\_ID based solution is to be defined to use all the sub-groups, i.e. 0 to Nsg-1, where Nsg is the total number of the sub-groups indicated via SIB. |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes | We do see a possibility that RAN could simply implement only UE-ID based subgrouping, but in that case will RAN consider the subgrouping assignment done by CN and assigned to the UE earlier and ensure that UE is mapped to the same subgroup as part of the UE-ID based subgroup ? |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |

**Summary:**

20 companies provided inputs to this question. Rapporteur confirms that the purpose of Q5 is to confirm whether RAN can configure only to support UE-ID based subgrouping as in LTE’s case that all the L1 resource can be for UE’s modular operation if no configuration for CN.

* 15/20 companies support (option 1) that RAN may configure all subgroups for UE-ID based subgrouping and it is gNB implementations.
* 1/19 companies do not support with the arguments that RAN supports UEID-based subgrouping but does not support CN-assigned subgrouping should not be supported (CATT).

**Proposal 5 (15/20): RAN may configure all subgroups for UE-ID based subgroups, i.e., no subgroup used for CN assigned subgrouping.**

### 3.2.3 Co-exist of CN-assigned subgrouping and UE-ID subgrouping

#### 3.2.3.1 UE’s behavior

To make things simple, Q6 is based on UE has capability for subgrouping and UE’s capability in detail will be discussed in Q7.

The network can broadcast it support CN assigned subgrouping and/or UE-ID based subgrouping. UE needs to determine which scheme it will use based on UE identity or paging subgroup assigned by CN. [6][9][11]gives views on UE’s behaviour under various configurations and [6] gives nice tables to clarify this and rapporteur would like to quote here by categoried in 2 cases.

Case1: If UE has a CN-assigned subgroup ID

If UE has a CN-assigned subgroup ID and the camped cell supports CN-assigned subgroup, UE will performs paging indication monitoring based on CN-assigned subgrouping. However, if the camped cell only supports UE ID based subgrouping, UE will use UE ID based subgrouping. If the camped cell does not, UE needs to fallback to legacy paging.

Table 4: UE has a CN-assigned subgroup ID (case1)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Paging subgroup assigned to UE by CN | RAN supports CN assigned paging subgroups | RAN supports UE ID based subgrouping | Paging indication monitoring based on paging subgroup assigned by CN or based on UE ID |
| Yes | Yes | Yes | CN assigned |
| Yes | No | Yes | UE ID based |
| Yes | Yes | No\* | CN assigned |
| Yes | No | No | No sub grouping |

\*: The validity of the configuration will be further discussed in 3.2.3.

Case2: If UE has not a CN-assigned subgroup ID

UE definitely cannot use CN-assigned subgrouping no matter the network supports it or not. If the camped cell supports UE-ID based subgrouping, UE will performs paging indication monitoring based on UE-Id based subgrouping. If the camped cell does not, UE needs to fallback to legacy paging.

Table 5: UE has not a CN-assigned subgroup ID (case2)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Paging subgroup assigned to UE by CN | RAN supports CN assigned paging subgroups | RAN supports UE ID based subgrouping | Paging indication monitoring based on paging subgroup assigned by CN or based on UE ID |
| No | Yes | Yes | UE ID based |
| No | No | Yes | UE ID based |
| No | Yes | No\* | No sub grouping |
| No | No | No | No sub grouping |

\*: The validity of the configuration will be further discussed in 3.2.3.

Hence, we propose:

**Proposal: If UE has paging subgroup ID assigned by CN and camped cell supports CN-assigned subgroup:**

* + - **UE will performs paging indication monitoring based on CN-assigned subgrouping**

**Else if camped cell supports UE-ID based subgrouping:**

* + - **UE performs paging indication monitoring based on UE-ID based subgrouping.**

Q6: Do companies agree UE’s behaviour in the above proposal? If not, a modification is most welcomed.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Ericsson | Modification | We think the use case that the CN supports subgrouping, but does not assign an ID to the UE does not exist. Why would the CN do like that? The CN can always assign the UE to a "default" group when it does not have UE specific information for grouping.  Rapp: Need to confirm with CT1.  Furthermore the simultaneous use of both CN and UE-ID based grouping creates problems to "share" or "divide" PEI bits, which has its disadvantages.  We think it is beneficial to have these two possible deployment scenarios:   1. Enhanced but more complex/costly: CN assigns a subgroup based on UE characteristics (and UE-ID based grouping is not used). 2. Simple but it might do the trick: Random RAN assignment based on UE-ID (no impact on CN/NAS).   We would like to ask for the support of option 2, i.e. UE-ID based grouping over-writes the CN group, if assigned.  Rapp: The “else if” bullet says that if RAN only support UE-ID based subgrouping then UE will use UE-ID based grouping even it has a CN assigned subgrouping ID. Is it cover your “over-writes” case? |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| CATT | No | With a common subgrouping RAN capability there is no need to distinguish cases where the camped cell supports CN-assigned and UEID-based subgrouping. The behaviour is simpler:  **If UE has paging subgroup ID assigned by CN and camped cell supports ~~CN-assigned~~ subgrouping:**   * **UE performs paging indication monitoring based on CN-assigned subgrouping**   **Else if camped cell supports ~~UE-ID based~~ subgrouping:**   * **UE performs paging indication monitoring based on UE-ID based subgrouping**   **Else:**  **UE performs paging indication monitoring as in legacy.** |
| MediaTek | Yes | We do see the possibility that CN does not assign subgroup ID to some UEs and let these UEs do hashing to find their subgroup. For example, if RAN supports 8 subgroups (0 to 7), CN may assign subgroup IDs (0 to 3) for a small number of UEs that need to be “protected” (e.g. power sensitive or rarely paged), and let all other UEs share remaining subgroups (4 to 7). Of course the network can assign other UEs to a default subgroup ID (say, 4), but if RAN does support more subgroups, such randomization helps save UE power. |
| Vodafone | comments | 1. Because of “network slicing” it is quite likely that a gNB is connected to AMFs with different capabilities (e.g. an AMF for high value eMBB consumers that supports PEI, and a Public-Safety AMF that a cash-strapped government cannot afford to upgrade to support PEI). The solution must work for such a scenario of mixed AMFs…and this proposal in Q6 probably is OK. 2. I assume that this proposal relates to only the US’s “last used cell” and not all cells in the network. Otherwise non-stationary UEs are likely to destroy all the potential benefits of PEI.   Rapp: The “last used cell” issue will be discussed in 3.3.2. |
| ZTE | Yes if UE support both subgrouping methods |  |
| Intel | Yes | As like ZTE, we assume the proposed behaviour is for UE supporting both subgrouping methods |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| vivo | Modification | **We think any discussion in this email should be based on the previous agreements!**  Considering the agreement in RAN2#113bis-e:  “*If the network chooses to not provide specific subgrouping information, there will be configuration option where subgrouping can be supported by randomization (by UE-ID)*”,  Our understanding is that if the network chooses to provide specific subgrouping information, then, CN assigned subgrouping should be supported and used. Only if the network chooses to not provide specific subgrouping information, UE\_ID based subgrouping should be used. In this way, the proposal should be modified into:  Rapp: Seems in your understanding, RAN’s capability is implicitly enabled by the CN assigned subgrouping information?  **Proposal: If UE has paging subgroup ID assigned by CN ~~and camped cell supports CN-assigned subgroup~~:**   * + - **UE will perform~~s~~ paging indication monitoring based on CN-assigned subgrouping**   **Else if the number of subgroups is provided from camped cell ~~supports UE-ID based subgrouping~~:**   * + - **UE performs paging indication monitoring based on UE-ID based subgrouping.** |
| Sony | Comment | Basically if the CN assigned subgrouping is converted into physical layer subgrouping, do we need to differentiate whether that subgrouping is based on CN Paging probability or UE-ID based subgrouping?  Rapp: In my understanding, physical layer will not care about the L1 resources are used for which higher layer solution. |
| Sharp | Yes with comments | Yes, if RAN2 agree the gNB can support CN based subgrouping and UE-ID based subgrouping separately. Else, vivo’s modification seems fine. |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | We think it is possible that the UE does not have a CN-assigned subgroup ID, e.g. for the case where UE or CN does not support CN-assigned subgroup ID. However, the assumption of above Proposal is that UE is capable for supporting two subgrouping methods, we suggest that it would better to make this point in the proposal clearer.  Rapp: Accepted.  We do understand that the main point here is that the CN-assigned subgrouping is prioritized over UE ID based subgrouping if both methods can be supported by UE and NW. We also favour this prioritisations since the CN-assigned subgrouping provides better performance.  Rapp: In my memory, CN-assigned subgrouping is prioritized over UE ID based subgrouping is confirmed by majority in last meeting’s email. |
| Futurewei | Yes with comments | Yes if UEs supporting subgrouping are required to support both subgrouping methods; otherwise, the following:  **If UE has paging subgroup ID assigned by CN and camped cell supports CN-assigned subgroup:**   * + - **UE performs paging indication monitoring based on CN-assigned subgrouping**   **Else if both UE and camped cell supports UE-ID based subgrouping:**   * + - **UE performs paging indication monitoring based on UE-ID based subgrouping.**   **Else:**   * + - **UE performs paging indication monitoring without using subgrouping.** |
| Sequans | Yes, but | Agree with FW |
| DENSO | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes | OK with FW’s modification if considering UE’s capability. |
| Apple | Modification | If UE is assigned a CN based subgroup, then it should be possible for the RAN to assign the UE to the same subgroup as assigned by CN (in both cases where the RAN supports CN based subgrouping or not)  Rapp: What if RAN supports less number of subgroups for UE-ID based subgrouping? Then the remapping would be used.  **Proposal: If UE has paging subgroup ID assigned by CN ~~and camped cell supports CN-assigned subgroup~~:**   * + - **UE will perform~~s~~ paging indication monitoring based on CN-assigned subgrouping**   **Else if the number of subgroups is provided from camped cell ~~supports UE-ID based subgrouping~~:**   * + - **UE performs paging indication monitoring based on UE-ID based subgrouping.**   **Else:**  **UE performs paging indication monitoring as in legacy.** |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |

**Summary:**

20 companies provide inputs for this question on UE’s behaviours and 15/20 accepted this as the right behavior. One company suggests the common subgrouping RAN capability (CATT), the Rapporteur think this does not impact UE’s behavior because we only put it as “cell supports CN-assigned/ UE-ID based subgrouping” which can be indicated by a common capability or a separate capability.

Therefore, rapporteur suggest as following:

**Proposal 6: If UE has paging subgroup ID assigned by CN and camped cell supports CN-assigned subgrouping:**

**- UE performs paging indication monitoring based on CN-assigned subgrouping**

**Else if both UE and camped cell supports UE-ID based subgrouping:**

**- UE performs paging indication monitoring based on UE-ID based subgrouping**

**Else:**

**- UE performs paging indication monitoring as in legacy.**

In [5], people have different views on whether we should pursue common capability for subgroup or separate capability for CN assigned and UE-ID based subgrouping among CN, UE and gNB. Opponents of separate capabilities think this will lead more complicated cases for subgrouping while proponents think separate capabilities facilities implementation in different layers (NAS vs AS) and RAN2 should not mandate UE to signal only one capability for features in two different functional units.

So rapporteur suggest companies to re-consider this question. If UE gets the CN assigned subgroup ID, it implies that UE can support the CN-assigned subgrouping. gNB only needs to know UE’s capability for UE-ID based subgrouping if it only supports it. For the case UE has not got the CN assigned subgroup ID, gNB only needs to know whether UE support for UE-ID subgrouping or not. If not, the UE would be paged in the legacy way. As analysed above, the rapporteur thinks that a candidate solution is that RAN only needs to care about UE’s capability of supporting the UE ID based subgrouping. RAN can get this capability for UE-ID by paging message from CN while CN can get this capability by NAS reporting from UE or via UE capability transfer procedure from gNB. In the meanwhile, UE’s capability of supporting the CN-assigned subgrouping is reported to CN by NAS signalling.

However if both are combined together as a single UE capability (I.e., only one UE capability reported to CN), which means that if the UE gets CN paging subgrouping ID, gNB will know UE supports both and the benefits of paging subgrouping can be maximum since paging subgrouping can always be used no matter which method is supported in a cell [22]. It seems leads less capability judgment in gNB. However, if the UE has not got a CN paging subgrouping ID, the gNB anyway needs to know UE’s capability for subgrouping.

The rapporteur thinks both way can work. Hence, we have 2 options:

* Option 1: introduce common UE capability for UE ID based subgrouping and network-assigned subgrouping in CN and RAN (i.e., only one UE capability reported to RAN or CN by NAS);
* Option 2: introduce separate UE capabilities for UE ID based subgrouping and network-assigned subgrouping;
* Option 2a: RAN only needs to care about UE’s capability of supporting the UE ID based subgrouping (UE’s capability of supporting the UE ID based subgrouping is reported to RAN by AS UE capability signalling) while UE’s capability of supporting the CN-assigned subgrouping is handled in NAS (UE’s capability of supporting the CN-assigned subgrouping is reported to CN by NAS signalling).
* Option2b: both capabilities are reported to CN by NAS signalling and CN forwards both to RAN in paging message( indicates UE’s subgroup or whether UE supports UE-ID based subgrouping);
* Option2c: one of the 2 capabilities is supported by default. E.g., UE supports only UE ID based subgrouping, or supports both, or supports neither [22];

Q7: Which option do companies prefer out of option 1-2 described above for UE capability?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option1/2 | Comments |
| Ericsson | Option 2 when RAN UE-ID can over-write CN group ID, otherwise option 1. | Q7 is a mixture of optionality discussion and the need for capability signalling for an optional feature. In our understanding:   * Subgrouping grouping should be optional for the UE * Explicit NAS capability signalling is required for CN grouping:   + CN grouping capability is implicitly indicated in PAGING message from CN to RAN when CN group ID is included. * In case it is agreed that the RAN UE-ID can over-write the CN group ID, i.e. the NW can deploy grouping using either CN assigned group ID or RAN assigned UE-ID, it makes sense to have two separate UE capabilities for this as well. But if the UE-ID method is used as a fallback when the CN does not assign a group ID, then there should be a common/single capability.   In case of option 2, it is beneficial for the RAN to know if the UE that is paged supports UE-ID based subgrouping. If the UE does not support UE based subgrouping the subgroup can be omitted from the PEI. The same of course applies to the CN group ID. |
| Samsung | Option 1 | Option 1 seems simpler. |
| OPPO | Option 2a | We think UE ID based subgrouping should be an AS capability while network-assigned subgrouping should be a NAS capability, we prefer to introduce separate UE capabilities, which would be more flexible for UE implementation. |
| CATT | Option 1 | A common UE capability is simpler because in our understanding it makes not much difference from UE perspective whether it supports CN-assigned or UE-based, in the end, it is a subgroup that it needs to monitor in PEI. |
| MediaTek | Option 1 | From UE implementation perspective, it would be more reasonable to support both methods, or none. |
| Vodafone | None of the above. We only need an implicit NAS capability. | Why is any [AS] capability signalling needed for a UE ID based grouping? A non-supporting UE will ignore the PEI and wake up for the PO. A supporting UE will wake up for the PEI and use that to decide whether to wake up for the PO.  Rapp: gNB needs to know UE’s AS capability if we call UE supporting UE-ID based subgrouping is an AS capability.  For CN based grouping, the presence/absence of PEI assistance information in the registration request is an implicit indication that CN based grouping is supported.  Rapp: Yes. But sometimes CN may not assign the subgrouping ID (to be confirmed by CT1). In such case, gNB do not know what the situation is. The CN does not assign (UE supporting) or UE is not supporting. See the comments by Futurerwei. |
| ZTE | Option 1 | Option 1 seems simpler |
| Intel | Option 2a | We think option 1 is sufficient from UE implementation point of view but from indicating inter-operability testing bit perspective, we may need option 2. Option 2a seems to be the most straightforward and also aligns to RAN2 agreement from last meeting as follow:   * **For the purpose of continued discussions, R2 assumes that UE has separate UE caps for CN assigned and UEID based subgrouping, the actual decision to be taken later.** |
| Nokia | Option 1 or 2b |  |
| vivo | Option 1 | I am not sure whether I understand this question correctly. Our understanding is that option 2 has been agreed in last RAN2 meeting, is that correct?  Rapp: need to be confirmed this meeting.  If not, we think option 1 is much simpler. From UE point of view, there is no difference between subgrouping methods. Besides, assuming UE has separate capabilities of CN-assigned and UE\_ID based subgrouping, it may cause a mix of UEs in a cell using NW-assigned subgroup and UE\_ID based subgroup. Once the mix of UE\_ID based and CN-Controlled subgroups in the same cell exists, we wonder whether the subgroup IDs from CN assigned and the subgroup IDs based on UE-ID should be overlapped. Our understanding is that the UEs having no CN assigned subgroup ID should not impact the paging for UEs with CN assigned subgroup ID. Therefore, from UE point of view, a common UE capability of supporting subgrouping should be defined covering both CN-Controlled and UE-ID based subgrouping.  If option 1 can’t be agreeable, then, we think option 2b is more suitable.  In option 2a, RAN may need store the UE’s capability, and option 2b follows LTE. As in option 2b, the paging will include whether the UE supports WUS in LTE, and in NR RAN can get UE’s capability that UE supports UE\_ID based subgroup when it receives CN paging for RRC\_IDLE UE; and for RRC\_INACTIVE UE, it can get the UE’s capability in RRC Inactive Assistance Information from CN. Hence, we think option 2b is feasible.  Rapp: In LTE, there is no WUS used for UE in RRC-inactive. See comments to Futurerwei. |
| Sony | Option 1 |  |
| Sharp | Option 1 | Option 1 is simpler. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2a | Agree with OPPO. |
| Futurewei | Option 2b | First, we are OK with having separate UE capabilities.  Under that assumption, during paging escalation, a non-anchor gNB also needs to know whether a UE to be paged is capable of UE-ID based subgrouping or not when the UE’s subgroup ID is not provided. For escalating RAN-initiated paging, option 2a is sufficient. But for escalating CN-initiated paging, the UE’s capability regarding UE-ID based subgrouping needs to come from the CN. Option 2b supports the escalating of both RAN-initiated paging and CN-initiated paging.  Rapp: Do we need to transfer UE’s AS capability when escalating CN-initiated paging? That’s a good question. We can discuss about it. |
| Sequans | Option 1 | For simplicity |
| CMCC | Option 1 | Option 1 is sufficient. But if we stick to the previous agreement, we prefer Opt. 2b. |
| DENSO | Option 1 |  |
| Xiaomi | Option2a | Having separate UE capabilities is clearer. UE do not need to report the UE-subgrouping capability to CN but it needs to seed this to RAN.  But can accept option1 if it is the majority view. |
| Apple | Option 2a | Agree with Oppo |
| Qualcomm | Option 2b |  |

**Summary:**

20 companies provide inputs for this question.

* 12/19 companies support (option 1) that introduce common UE capability for UE-ID based subgrouping and network-assigned subgrouping in CN and RAN. With key argument is that option 1 is a simple scheme and from UE perspective there is no too much difference.
* 8/19 companies support option 2:
  + 5 companies support (option 2a) that RAN only needs to care about UE’s capability of supporting the UE ID based subgrouping while UE’s capability of supporting the CN-assigned subgrouping is handled in NAS.
  + 3 companies support (option 2b) that both capabilities are reported to CN by NAS signalling and CN forwards both to RAN in paging message.

**Proposal 7: No consensus on whether subgrouping capability is common or separate.**

#### 3.2.3.2 gNB’s behavior

The network can broadcast its support for CN assigned subgrouping and/or UE-ID based subgrouping. The rapporteur would like to invite people to anlysis whether the following cases are all valid and how to achieve them.

* Case1: RAN support UE-ID based subgrouping only;
* Case2: RAN support CN assigned subgrouping only;
* Case3: Both CN assigned subgrouping and UE-ID based subgrouping are supported in RAN (Both subgrouping methods can co-exist in a cell)
* Case4: Neither CN assigned subgrouping nor UE-ID based subgrouping is supported in RAN;

As we have agreed UE-ID based subgrouping is the baseline for UE not having a CN-assigned subgroup, to begin with, the rapporteur would like to quote TR23.501 below for people to understand better why CN will not assign a subgroup,:

|  |
| --- |
| To support the Wake Up Signal (WUS), the WUS Assistance Information is used by the ng-eNB to help determine the WUS group used when paging the UE (see TS 36.300 [30]).  The content of the WUS Assistance Information consists of the paging probability information. The paging probability information provides a metric on the probability of a UE receiving a paging message based on, e.g. statistical information.  The UE may in the Registration Request message provide its capability to support receiving WUS Assistance Information. If WUS Assistance Information is supported by the UE, then the UE in the Registration Request message may provide the additional UE paging probability information. The AMF may use the UE provided paging probability, local configuration and/or previous statistical information for the UE, when determining the WUS Assistance Information. If the UE supports WUS Assistance Information, the AMF may assign WUS Assistance Information to the UE, even when the UE has not provided the additional UE paging probability information.  If the AMF has determined WUS Assistance Information for the UE, the AMF provides it to the UE in every Registration Accept message. The AMF stores the WUS Assistance Information parameter in the MM context and provides it to the ng-eNB when paging the UE.  UE and AMF shall not signal WUS Assistance Information in Registration Request, Registration Accept messages when the UE has an active emergency PDU session. |

As captured in TR23.501, if the UE does not supports WUS Assistance Information, the AMF may not assign WUS assistance Information to the UE and UE and AMF shall not signal WUS assistance Information in Registration Request, Registration Accept messages when the UE has an active emergency PDU session. For such cases, UE will be assigned to the WUS group set corresponding to the highest probability in LTE which is very reasonable, i.e., CN assignment and UE-ID based can share the same subgroups. In this way, CN assigned subgrouping configuration can be used by both types. In [5], the proponent think in NR we can reuse this as a simplest approach and hard split would lead to inefficient use of the bits with less subgroups while the opponents think hard split is required to mitigate false alarm among the two grouping schemes.

Hence, we have some options for subgroups splitting in RAN for UEs in the cell with CN assignment and UE-ID based:

* Option 1: The subgrouping configuration used by CN assigned subgrouping is also used for UE ID based subgrouping; (overlap case)

e.g., if multiple Lay1 subgrouping indications mapped to a subgroup, UE-ID based grouping is anyway needed for deriving the exact Lay1 subgrouping indications (as described in 3.2.1);

e.g., the last RAN configured subgroup for CN assigned subgrouping is used by UE for UE-ID based subgrouping as in LTE show below (For such case, RAN broadcasting only one total number of subgroup for CN assigned subgrouping means RAN supports both);



Figure 2: an example of overlapped case (the last subgroup is overlapped)

e.g., some subgroups for CN assigned subgrouping can be used by UE for UE-ID based subgrouping [19];



Figure 3: an example of overlapped case (some subgroups are overlapped)

* Option 2: The subgrouping configuration used by CN assigned subgrouping cannot be used for UE ID based subgrouping; (non-overlap case)

e.g., there should be two separate sets of subgroups at the same time, e.g., X (>=0) number of CN based subgroups and Y (>=0) number of UE-ID based subgroups (with only one Lay1 subgrouping indication would be allocated to a subgroup where there will be no need for UE-ID based grouping.) [7]



Figure 4: an example of non-overlapped case

e.g., there should be only one set of subgroup at the same time, e.g., all bits/subgroups are either used for CN assigned subgrouping or for UE-ID based subgrouping;

* Option 3: Left to gNB implementation whether to allow overlapping or not [8][19];

Q8: Which option do companies prefer out of option 1-3 described above for subgroups splitting in RAN?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option1/2/3 | Comments |
| Ericsson | None | We think that CN and UE-ID grouping should not be used simultaneous in the cell, because this leads to the question whether the precious DCI grouping bits should be shared or divided. Both sharing and dividing the bits have disadvantages and these disadvantages are avoided when either CN or UE-ID grouping is used in the cell.  When bits are shared this implies that multiple groups are triggered at the same time, when perhaps only one of the groups is paged. When bits are divided, this leads to an in-efficient use of the bits, and the PEI size is increased and the power saving gains of the PEI are decreased.  Rapp:  I think your concern has been captured in the second example of option2. |
| Samsung | None | Agree with Ericsson  Rapp:  I think your concern has been captured in the second example of option2. |
| OPPO | Option 2 | The subgroups for CN assigned subgrouping and UE id based subgrouping should not be overlapped to avoid false alarm among the two grouping schemes. |
| CATT | Option 1 | The simplest approach. Key argument from opponents is that sharing a subgroup between UEID and CN-assigned will mix two different subgrouping techniques and thus decrease their performance. For example, a subgroup expected to be used by UEs with same paging probability profile will also host randomly other UEs with possibly different paging probability, thus jeopardizing the principle of distributing UEs based on their paging probability. But:  1) UEID distribution randomizes the remaining UEs across paging probability groups, so the overall impact should be uniform across groups  2) RAN1 simulations showed how little power saving subgrouping provides on top of PEI alone. Therefore optimizing further the subgrouping design should only be allowed if significant power saving gains are shown. |
| MediaTek | Option 2 | If we allow co-exist of CN assigned and UE-ID based subgrouping, having non-overlapping subgroups is a more reasonable way. For rarely-paged and power-sensitive UEs, CN “protects” them by assigning specific subgroup IDs. If other UEs are allowed to select these subgroups (Option 1), the paging “false alarm” rate will increase significantly, and the CN subgroup assignment becomes meaningless. |
| Vodafone | Option 2 | The argument from Mediatek (“*For rarely-paged and power-sensitive UEs, CN “protects” them by assigning specific subgroup IDs.”)* is the important one. |
| ZTE | Option 2/3, it depends on the outcome of Q7 | For option 1, it is obvious that the false alarm for a UE with a certain paging probability in one subgroup is increasing if some UE only have a subgroup ID derived by UE-ID.  Assuming that UE support separate capabilities, it means diverse types UE may locate in the same RAN, it is reasonable to divide different UE types into different subgroups for reducing the false alarm, thus option 2 can be taken into account  Assuming that UE support both capabilities or none, for the UE support both capabilities, the most simple solution is that CN allocate all registered UE those support both capabilities to several subgroups , thus the concern can be avoided, the option 3 can be taken into account.  Rapp:  But sometimes CN may not assign the subgrouping ID (to be confirmed by CT1). |
| Intel | Prefer Option 3 | All 3 options are acceptable to us. Option 3 provides the most flexibility in that it can be used to implement Option 1 or 2.  There is a possibility of false alarm with Option 1.  Option 2 is the simplest but hard partition may not lead to uniform distribution depending on the number of UEs that are assigned CN and RAN. |
| Nokia | Option 2 | Randomly allocating UE-ID based UEs to CN assignment subgroups might increase the false alarm rate of CN assignment UEs which defeat the purpose of CN assignment. |
| vivo | None | In our understanding, the UEs having no CN assigned subgroup ID should not impact the paging for UEs with CN assigned subgroup ID. In this way, CN assigned and UE\_ID based subgrouping cannot be used simultaneously.  Rapp:  I think your concern has been captured in the second example of option2.  Regarding separated subgroups splitting, we agree with Ericsson, if the number of subgroups is reduced, the power saving gains of the PEI are decreased. We would like to check with the rapporteur or proponent why CN doesn’t use all available subgroups, which could obtain most power saving gain. Is there any practical use case?  We are not sure why we need to discuss such issue. We think the current UE behaviour is clear enough:  *If a subgroup is assigned from CN, then, CN controlled subgrouping could be used.*  *Else if totally number of subgroups is broadcasted from gNB, then, UE\_ID based subgrouping should be used.*  *Else, legacy paging without subgrouping could be used.* |
| Sony | Option 1 | But agree with Vivo, that not clear why we at all need any splitting, why would the UE care anyway, since what it needs is the subgroup to monitor from the base station. |
| Sharp | Option 3 |  |
| LGE | Option 1 |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2 | If we allow co-existence of CN assigned and UE-ID based subgrouping, we should support non-overlapping subgroups to ensure the performance of CN-assigned subgrouping is not degraded. Otherwise, it is meaningless to use CN-assigned subgrouping, as the “false alarm” will increases due to the randomization of UE ID based subgrouping. |
| Futurewei | Option 2 | If both subgrouping methods are supported in the same cell, the simplest way for splitting subgroups is the non-overlapping way. Meanwhile, we are also open to partial overlapping case in Option 1. |
| Sequans | None | Agree with Ericsson.  If RAN2 wanted to support case 3, option 3 (GWUS architecture) should have been selected, which would have supported it out of the gate with the remapping.  Case 3 is also unnecessary, as the CN can itself randomly divide UEs between groups that are not assigend with specific considerations in mind.  Option 2 has already been discussed when “R2 assumes that All the cells within the registration area supports the same number of CN assigned subgroups, i.e. no remapping of CN assigned group ID to RAN subgroup ID (will revisit only if serious issues are found)” was agreed – having more RAN groups was on the table and was rejected.  Option 1 is very damaging and would wreak havoc on the groupings. This would hurt most the most sensitive groups, impacting how useful this feature actually is. |
| DENSO | None | Agree with Ericsson and vivo. Overlapped case should be avoided in order not to increase false alarm for UEs with CN assigned subgrouping ID (e.g., rarely-paged UEs). For option2, it seems to be complicated. We wonder how the number of subgroup(s) in each set is determined. For example, if most UEs have CN-assigned subgroup ID but there are more subgroups for UE\_ID based than necessary, subgroup mechanism may not be used efficiently. |
| Xiaomi | Option1 | Partial overlapping case in Option 1 is already on the table in LTE and can ease people’s concern of false alarm caused by mixing two different subgroup together. |
| Apple | Option 2/3 | Option 2 provides a clean split, we are in for an approach that avoids false paging. So we are open for Option 3 as well. |
| Qualcomm | Option 3 | This can be left to gNB implementation |

**Summary:**

20 companies provide inputs for this question.

* 4/19 companies support (option 1) that the subgrouping configuration used by CN assigned subgrouping is also used for UE ID based subgrouping (overlap case). With key argument is that overlap is not a big issue according to RAN1 simulation result that power saving gain is mostly from PEI not subgrouping and overlap case can be alleviated if reusing LTE way.
* 8+5/19 companies support (option 2) that the subgrouping configuration used by CN assigned subgrouping cannot be used for UE ID based subgrouping (non-overlap case). With key argument is that the subgroups for CN assigned subgrouping and UE id based subgrouping should not be overlapped to avoid false alarm among the two grouping schemes. As 5 companies does not provide option that they think CN and UE-ID grouping should not be used simultaneous in the cell, they are put into the none-overlap case.
* 3/19 companies support (option 3) that left to gNB implementation whether to allow overlapping or not.

**Proposal 8: There is no consensus on subgroups splitting in RAN for CN assigned subgrouping and UE-ID based subgrouping.**

For option1, since the subgroups configured can be used for both CN assigned subgrouping and UE ID based subgrouping, it also implies both types are supported in RAN (UE-ID based is anyway supported thus case3 below is invalid). For option2, since separate subgroups configured can be used for CN assigned subgrouping and UE ID based subgrouping individually, it also implies either type is supported by the presence the associated subgrouping configuration. The rapporteur summarize in a table and gives some examples on how to achieve.

Table 5: gNB broadcast its support for CN assigned subgrouping and/or UE-ID based subgrouping

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| cases | supports CN assigned subgrouping | supports UE-ID based subgrouping | How to achieve that?  (Based on the previous discussion) |
| case1 | Yes | Yes | Both CN-assigned subgrouping and UE-ID based subgrouping configuration is present (whether the configuration is the number of group or a flag is discussed in 3.2.1 and 3.2.2)  e.g., overlap case as option1 in Q8 described;  e.g., Network broadcast each type of configurations as option2 in Q8 described; |
| case2 | No | Yes | Only UE-ID based subgrouping configuration is present  e.g., no subgroup used for CN assigned subgrouping as described in Q5 |
| case3 | Yes | No | Only CN-assigned subgrouping configuration is present.  However, if option1 is agreed, case3 is invalid. |
| case4 | No | No | Neither CN-assigned subgrouping nor UE-ID based subgrouping configuration is present  e.g., No PEI configurations are broadcasted. |

Q9: Companies are asked to give comments on which cases the RAN should support (companies can select multiple and companies are welcomed to gives comments on how it is achieved)?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Comments |
| Ericsson | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | We think that simultaneous use of CN and UE-ID based grouping has disadvantageous, and we think that the following two deployment options should be supported:   1. Enhanced but more complex/costly: CN assigns a subgroup based on UE characteristics. 2. Simple but it might do the trick: Random RAN assignment based on UE-ID (no impact on CN/NAS).   Perhaps the whether the UE-ID configuration in RAN over-writes or is only used as fallback can be made configurable, if both options need to be supported. |
| Samsung | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes | No | No | Yes | Only a common capability should be supported in RAN: subgrouping capability. |
| MediaTek | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | If RAN supports UE-ID based subgrouping, it can send UE group PEI, and it should accept CN assignment of UE subgroups |
| Vodafone | yes | yes | yes | yes | Need to be able to support networks that have a mix of PEI supporting/non-supporting AMFs. |
| ZTE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | To our understanding, there is no need for us to limit the RAN capability in any cases. |
| Intel | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| vivo | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | In case both CN assigned subgrouping and UE ID based subgrouping are provided, CN assigned subgrouping should be applied. |
| Sony | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | For case 1, if common UE capability is supported, then we don't see the necessity of case 1, since UE supporting subgrouping will always use CN-assigned subgrouping (based on Q6), and RAN only needs to indicate support of CN-assigned subgrouping instead of both.  But if separate UE capability is supported and if only one subgrouping method is supported in a cell, the “method mismatched” can happen and the UE cannot use subgrouping, e.g. RAN only supports CN-assigned subgrouping but UE only supports UE ID based subgrouping. So in this case, case 1 is beneficial. |
| Futurewei | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| Sequans | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| DENSO | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |

**Summary:**

19 companies provide inputs for this question.

* 5/18 companies do not support simultaneous use of CN and UE-ID based grouping.
* 1/18 companies only support a common capability that means either supporting both subgrouping scheme or supporting none.
* 13/18 companies support all cases that network can support for CN assigned subgrouping and/or UE-ID based subgrouping.

**Proposed 9.1 (18/19): Network can support for either CN assigned subgrouping or UE-ID based subgrouping;**

**Proposed 9.2 : FFS Network can simultaneously support for both CN assigned subgrouping and UE-ID based subgrouping;**

## 3.3 issues related to other WG

This session relates to issues related to other WG. The rapporteur believes it is worthy to discuss this as the chairman has made the guideline that we can outline what information we expect need to be exchanged while the details are up to other WG. LS can be considered if necessary.

### 3.3.1 Assistant information to between CN/gNB/UE

We have agreed that all the cells within the registration area should support the same number of CN-assigned subgroups in order not to have mapping rules from CN subgroup ID to RAN subgroup ID if the ID from CN is larger than RAN. We discuss whether this “no-remapping” interpretation should be revisited in Section 3.2.1, Q3. Assuming no remapping, the rapporteur think we need to discuss how to ensure that all the cells within the registration area do configure the same number of CN-assigned subgroups:

* Option 1: The total number of CN-assigned subgroups is fixed and specified [13]
* Option 2: The total number of CN-assigned subgroups is decided by CN and informed to RAN [13]
* Option 3: gNB(s) to provide assistance to CN for CN paging subgroup configuration within the RA [10];
  + Vodafone comment: there seems to be a fundamental misunderstanding of what a Registration Area is. The RA is a set of Tracking Areas allocated to a UE. Different UEs can have RAs with overlapping sets of TAIs (e.g. UE1 is allocated an RA of Tracking Areas A and B while UE2 is allocated an RA of tracking Areas A and C.) Having the gNB provide information to the CN on a TA basis does not seem to help – unless the registration accept is modified to carry multiple bits of PEI assistance information (one per TA in the TAI list)
* Option 4: No need to specify, e.g., by OAM
* Option 5: leave it to SA2/CT1

Q10: Which option do companies prefer out of option 1-5 described above to ensure all the cells within the registration area to support the same number of subgroups for CN assigned subgrouping?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option1-5 | Comments |
| Ericsson | Option 1: for the maximum number of 8 subgroups that can be signalled.  Option 2: for the number of groups that is used for CN grouping, which enables the gNB to configure the appropriate number of bits in PEI.  Option 3 or 4: RAN can provide assistance info to CN for the UE's paging probability in Inactive mode. | RAN1 agreed that the number of subgroups is 8, i.e. the maximum number of subgroups that can be used is 8 in our understanding. This is also sufficient from a power saving gain perspective, i.e. 16 does not add much.  Option 5: RAN2 should discuss and agree on the overall solution, including UE assistance/capability via NAS or RAN assistance info to CN via NGAP, and only leave the implementation of the signalling details to CT1/RAN3. This was also clarified in the updated SR ([RP-212612](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/TSG_RAN/TSGR_93e/Docs/RP-212612.zip)). Otherwise there will be parallel discussions on the overall solution in different WGs, leading to possible conflicts. |
| Samsung | - See comments | Maximum number of paging subgroups is fixed in specification.  The number of CN assigned paging subgroups can be decided by CN and informed to RAN, so RAN can configure appropriate number of PEI bits.  Rapp:  Is this option2? |
| OPPO | Option 1 | Option 1 is simple, and we don’t need to introduce signaling for the total number of CN-assigned subgroup. |
| CATT | Option 2 | Option 4 could also be envisaged if the total number of CN-assigned subgroups is static. This needs inputs from SA2/CT1. |
| MediaTek | Option 2 | We may need input from SA2/CT1 |
| Vodafone | Option 1 | Option 1 is probably sufficient.  Option 2 does not work if one AMF wants to use 4 groups and another AMF wants to use 8 subgroups.  Option 3 seems to be based on a large misunderstanding.  Option 4 does not work with multi-vendor RAN and CN.  Option 5 -> probably best to use RAN 2’s established knowledge |
| ZTE | Option 2 | Option 2 can be a baseline. |
| Intel | Option 4 or 5 | As in our response to Q8, it can be left to network implementation to decide how it want to partition the subgrouping configuration between UEID based subgrouping and CN assigned subgrouping provided that all the cells within the registration area do configure the same number of CN-assigned subgroups. Option 4 is the simplest without further specification impact or we can leave it to SA2/RAN3 to decide how to ensure consistency between CN and RAN on the number of CN subgroups in an RA. |
| Nokia | Option 2, 4 or Option 5 | RAN3 to be added as well. After the previous questions on the architecture are clear, it should be clear how the system work and the details can be left to other working groups. |
| vivo | Option 1 | We would like to check why CN doesn’t use all available subgroups, which could obtain most power saving gain.  In addition, we think the number in option 1 should be fixed to 8, as we agreed before. |
| Sony | Option 2 | Option 2 seems reasonable to start with. SA2/RAN3 to decide on signaling. |
| Sharp | Option 1 | Option 1 is simpler. |
| LGE | Option 4/5 | Prefer option 4 but SA2/CT1 should decide it. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not Option 3, prefer Option 5 | Regarding Option 3 we are not sure how to realize option 3. In a typical deployment there will be many gNBs within a RA and it is unrealistic to provide assistance information from all the gNBs to CN for coordination as this will cause excessive signaling. Hence we would not prefer this option. |
| Futurewei | Option 2, 4, or 5 | Option 1 may be too restrictive. |
| Sequans | Option 1 or 2 | Genrally agree with Vodafone, but:  Option 2 has no issue if last used cell or similar restriction is used, and it would allow to vary the number of bits in the DCI, which may be necessary  Option 3 is not a sultion, but an enhancement (ignoring the scope issue). We are fine with considering support information from gNB. |
| CMCC | Option 1 |  |
| DENSO | Option 1 or 2 |  |
| Xiaomi | Option 2, 4, or 5 | For option1, CN may not need to use all available subgroups (e.g. 8 subgroups) if CN do not want to differentiate so many paging probability levels (e.g., 3 levels for high, medium, low). Option2 can work well.  If people do not want specify anything, option4 by OAM is OK for us. |
| Apple | Option 1 or 2 | Both need SA2/CT1 Input |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 | Option 1 is sufficient and the simplest |

**Summary:**

20 companies provide inputs for this question.

* 9/20 companies support (option 1) that the total number of CN-assigned subgroups is fixed and specified. With key argument is that this is a simple solution and 8 subgroups may be sufficient.
* 9/20 companies support (option 2) that the total number of CN-assigned subgroups is decided by CN and informed to RAN. With key argument is that option 2 may not restrict subgroups for CN assigned subgrouping and can be baseline to start.
* 2/20 companies support (option 4/5) that no need to specify, e.g. by OAM or leave it to SA2/CT1.

**Proposal 10: No consensus that how to decide the total number of CN-assigned subgroups.**

**FFS:**

* Option 1: The total number of CN-assigned subgroups is fixed and specified [13]
* Option 2: The total number of CN-assigned subgroups is decided by CN and informed to RAN [13]
* Option 4: No need to specify, e.g., by OAM
* Option 5: leave it to SA2/CT1

For assistant information, apart from total number of subgroups from CN to gNB (if option2 of Q10 is accepted), the rapporteur would like to invite people to discuss whether there should be some assistant information from CN to gNB in support of paging subgroup configuration. [21] points out that in LTE, RAN might want to have more WUS group for the higher paging probability range to reduce paging false alarm. Or the network can configure several adjacent CN assigned subgroups to the same Lay1 subgrouping indication as described in Q3. However unlike in LTE, the gNB does not know the exact meaning of a certain subgroup. A question is whether the CN need to provide some assistance information for gNB to know the subgroup index it assigns will be ranked by a matrix, e.g., paging probability?

Companies are welcomed to bring other some assistance information to gNB(s) in support of paging subgroup configuration to discuss.

Q11: Do you support CN providing some assistance information to gNB(s) in support of paging subgroup configuration besides of Q10? If “Yes”, please indicated which information would be needed from RAN2 perspective?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Ericsson | No | RAN2 agreed that CN assigns a subgroup ID to the UE (and not RAN), i.e. there is no need for CN assistance information to RAN to enable RAN to assign more WUS groups. Let's stop re-discussing RAN2 agreements. |
| Samsung | No |  |
| OPPO | No | We share the same view as Ericsson. |
| CATT | Yes | UE reports its subgrouping capability to AMF. If AMF does not assign the UE with a subgroup ID (e.g. AMF does not support the feature), AMF still needs to inform gNBs that the UE supports subgrouping to allow UEID-based subgrouping in cells supporting subgrouping. This prevents the UE to report its subgrouping capability to both AMF and gNB. |
| MediaTek | No | (agree with Ericsson) |
| ZTE | No |  |
| Intel | No | RAN2 already agree that it is the subgroup ID that is provided to the UE. Hence it is unclear to us what other assistance information is needed to be provided by AMF to gNB |
| Nokia | Yes | CN knows better the portion of UEs supporting CN assignment and UE-ID based if they are separate capabilities and can help the judge of bits split for them in RAN. Could be done via OAM as well. |
| vivo | No | For CN-controlled subgrouping, CN assigns the subgroup ID for UEs.  For UE-ID based subgrouping, the subgrouping should be random in RAN.  Therefore, there is no need for CN to provide assistance information to gNB(s) in support of paging subgroup configuration. |
| Sony | Yes | Exact what type of information that is needed, SA2/RAN3 still needs to confirm. |
| Sharp | No |  |
| LGE | No |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No |  |
| Futurewei | No |  |
| Sequans | No | Agree with Ericsson |
| CMCC | No |  |
| DENSO | No |  |
| Xiaomi | NO | Ok to follow the majority view. |
| Apple | No | Agree with Vivo |
| Qualcomm | No |  |

**Summary:**

20 companies provide inputs for this question.

* 17/20 companies do not support CN providing some assistance information to gNB(s) in support of paging subgroup configuration. With key argument is that RAN2 agreed that CN assign a subgroup ID to UE by implementation.
* 3/20 companies support CN roviding some assistance information to gNB(s) in support of paging subgroup configuration.
  + CATT: If AMF does not assign the UE with a subgroup ID (e.g. AMF does not support the feature), AMF still needs to inform gNBs that the UE supports subgrouping to allow UEID-based subgrouping in cells supporting subgrouping.
  + Nokia: CN knows better the portion of UEs supporting CN assignment and UE-ID based if they are separate capabilities and can help the judge of bits split for them in RAN
  + Sony: Exact what type of information that is needed, SA2/RAN3 still needs to confirm.

Since majority agree not to provide assistance information by CN to gNB(s), rapporteur think we can conclude the proposal as below:

**Proposal 11 (17/20): CN will not provide assistance information to gNB(s) in support of paging subgrouping configuration.**

In [4], the need for gNB(s) assistance information to CN in support of paging subgroup assignment was discussed. At that time, the framework of subgrouping is not decided, so the issue was not discussed. However, we saw people’s interest in pursuing this in contributions [11][17][18][20]. The motivation of this is that UE may have different paging probabilities in RRC Idle and RRC Inactive, hence gNB may want to update the UE’s subgroup when releasing it into RRC\_INACTIVE while the opponents says subgroup determination should be up to CN implementation.

Note this does not break our previous agreement of using the same subgrouping for CN paging and RAN paging as the CN may assign a new subgroup ID when UE goes to Inactive. Hence it is proposed to re-assess this.

Q12: Do you support gNB(s) providing some assistance information to CN in support of paging subgroup assignment when IDLE UE moves to RRC\_INACTIVE? If “Yes”, please indicated which information would be needed from RAN2 perspective?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Ericsson | Yes, for inactive paging probability only. | See also our reply to Q10. Perhaps this can also be solved via OAM.  Q12 seems to indicate that the assistance info is provided when IDLE UE moves to RRC\_INACTIVE. In our understanding this assistance information could be provided when the UE leaves CM-CONNECTED mode (e.g. the time UE spend in CM-CONNECTED and the number of times RAN PAGING is used for that UE). |
| Samsung | No | We have agreed to have same paging subgroup in idle and inactive. |
| OPPO | No | Same understanding as Samsung. |
| CATT | No | We see no reason for optimizing this and unlike Rapporteur, we think this would break our earlier agreement on using the same subgrouping for CN paging and RAN paging.  Furthermore, if the assistance info is provided to CN when RRC\_IDLE UE moves to RRC\_INACTIVE, when will AMF send the updated CN-assigned subgrouping to the UE? The UE has already been moved to RRC\_INACTIVE. |
| MediaTek | No | (Agree with Samsung) |
| Vodafone | Yes | I assume that the question should be:  *“Do you support gNB(s) providing some assistance information to CN in support of paging subgroup assignment for when the UE is inRRC\_INACTIVE”*  Then (accepting the Samsung and Oppo comments) the RAN needs to provide the CN with information on RAN paging events/duration of connected times/UE mobility to aid the CN’s assignment of the CN group (and the CN group is then used in both Idle and Inactive). |
| ZTE | No |  |
| Intel | No | Since the purpose of Inactive mode is mainly to reduce the signalling overhead during call establishment, even though the paging probability may be different to Idle mode while UE is in Inactive mode, we do not think this isessential and can be left out from Rel-17. |
| Nokia | No |  |
| vivo | No | Agree with Samsung, we have agreed the same paging subgroup in idle and inactive.  The question is how gNBs trigger the sending of assistance information to CN for the UEs which may be released into RRC\_INACTIVE. If this procedure is nested during release, CN needs to re-assign subgroup ID before release. It will delay and complex the RRC release procedure.  Furthermore, if UE state transits from RRC\_INACTIVE to RRC\_IDLE state, is it necessary to assign subgroup ID again? If Yes, Frequent assignment of subgroup ID will have harm to power consumption. If No, unsuitable paging subgrouping may lead to high paging false alarm.  In CN-assigned subgrouping, subgroup determination should be decided at CN, and up to CN implementation. |
| Sony | No |  |
| Sharp | No |  |
| LGE |  | No strong view, but if there is a big difference between the CN paging probability and RAN paging probability, it would be better that the RAN paging probability is provided to CN by RAN, rather than by UE. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | Same paging subgroup should be used in idle and inactive. |
| Futurewei | No |  |
| Sequans | No | This was already agreed. Agree with vivo on the details. |
| CMCC | No |  |
| DENSO | No | We have agreed the same paging subgroup in idle and inactive. |
| Xiaomi | No strong view | No strong view even though we do think there is a big difference between the CN paging probability and RAN paging probability.  But if people do not want to consider this in R17, we are OK not to consider it. |
| Apple | No | The subgrouping does not change between IDLE and INACTIVE. So no special handling needed for INACTIVE over IDLE. |
| Qualcomm | See comment | We see values in having such an assistance information from RAN to CN. But we should leave this issue to SA2/CT1 to study/decide, as it does not involve RAN2. |

Summary:

20 companies provide inputs for this question.

* 16/20 companies do not support gNB(s) providing some assistance information to CN in support of paging subgroup assignment when IDLE UE moves to RRC\_INACTIVE. With key argument is that same paging subgroup should be used in idle and inactive.
* 2/20 companies support gNB(s) providing some assistance information to CN in support of paging subgroup assignment when IDLE UE moves to RRC\_INACTIVE:
  + Ericsson: This assistance information could be provided when the UE leaves CM-CONNECTED mode (e.g. the time UE spend in CM-CONNECTED and the number of times RAN PAGING is used for that UE).
  + Vodafone: think this should be “support gNB(s) providing some assistance information to CN in support of paging subgroup assignment for when the UE is inRRC\_INACTIVE”. Then the RAN needs to provide the CN with information on RAN paging events/duration of connected times/UE mobility to aid the CN’s assignment of the CN group.

Since majority think there is no need for gNB to provide some assistance information to CN in support of paging subgroup assignment when IDLE UE moves to RRC\_INACTIVE, rapporteur suggest that we can conclude proposal as below:

Proposal 12 (16/20): gNB(s) will not provide some assistance information to CN in support of paging subgroup assignment when IDLE UE moves to RRC\_INACTIVE.

As we have made the working assumption that RAN will focus on the paging probability and power profile attributes if RAN2 agrees to support UE assistance information to CN in support of Paging subgroup. Therefore, it is helpful for UEs to report these attributes to assist network in subgroup assignment. Here comes the question whether the assistance information sent to CN by NAS or UE reports them to gNB by RRC signaling?

* Option 1: The assistance information sent to CN by NAS; LS sent to CT1;
* Option 2: The assistance information sent to RAN by UAI?
* Option 3: leave it to SA2/CT1

Q13: Which option do companies prefer out of option 1-3 described above on UE assistance information to the network?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option1-3 | Comments |
| Ericsson | Not option 2 | Any UE assistance information should be sent to CN, because CN assigns the subgroup ID, i.e. option 2 is excluded. |
| OPPO | None | How to allocate UEs into subgroup is totally up to CN implementation, we see no need for such UE assistance information. |
| CATT | None | Agree with OPPO. We don’t think any UE assistance information is needed. |
| MediaTek | Option 1 | We may not need UE assistance information.  [MTK2] If some assistance information (e.g. power consumption profile, mobility, etc.) helps CN assign subgroups more properly, we can support Option 1. Then RAN2 needs to inform CT1 what assistance information is expected. |
| Vodafone | See Q14 | The CN needs to know the UE mobility pattern and the data communication pattern in order to allocate a CN group accurately – otherwise PEI has to be restricted to the last used cell. |
| ZTE | Option 3 | The CN is responsible for assigning the subgroup ID, we think SA2/CT1 can decide whether or what assistance information is needed for CN to allocate the subgroup ID. |
| Intel | None | No new UE assistance is provided by UE in this release to help in the allocation of the UEs in the different UE paging subgroups. |
| Nokia | Option 1 |  |
| vivo | None with Comment | According to RAN2 agreement on RAN2#115-e meeting: “*If RAN2 agrees to support UE assistance information to CN in support of Paging subgroup assignment, RAN2 will focus on the paging probability and power profile attributes.”*  In our understanding, RAN2 does not agree to support UE assistance information to CN yet. We could discuss the details after RAN2 agreed support UE assistance information to CN. |
| Sony | Option 1 |  |
| Sharp | None |  |
| LGE | None |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 1 or none | Accurate UE assistance information is better than nothing as it can provide a finer information, e.g. paging probability. The concern may be that there is no consistent evaluation method which make the assistance information unreliable. So if option 1 is supported, it is useful to define an evaluation principle for deriving the assistance information. Otherwise, if the effectiveness cannot be ensured by assistance information, nothing is needed and it is up to CN implementation. |
| Futurewei | Option 1 |  |
| Sequans | None,  otherwise option 1 | None, as the need hasn’t been agreed and we don’t think it is likely to be beneficial.  If it is eventually agreed, option 1 is preferrable. |
| CMCC | Option 1 | Firstly, UE assistance information could help the CN assign finer and more efficient subgrouping. Secondly, for Opt.1 and Opt.2, we prefer that UE report its attributes directly to the CN by NAS. |
| DENSO | None | UE assistance information may not be needed. |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 |  |
| Apple | Option 1 |  |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 |  |

Summary:

20 companies provide inputs for this question.

* 10/20 companies think there is no need to introduce UE assistance information.
* 8/20 companies think the assistance information need to be sent to CN by NAS. With key argument is that assistance information could help the CN assign finer and more efficient subgrouping.
* 1 company (ZTE) think that SA2/CT1 can decide whether or what assistance information is needed for CN to allocate the subgroup ID.

Proposal 13: No consensus on whether there is a need for UE assistance information to the network.

### 3.3.2 RAN paging

In [4] most companies suggest that for a UE in RRC\_INACTIVE, anchor gNB should provide UE’s subgroup ID to serving gNB when it sends paging notification. If this is the common view, this requires, at least from RAN2 perspective, the need for some signaling between gNBs to inform about the UE’s subgroup while [24] has a different view. The reason is that the UE only monitors the PEI in the last used cell, and a gNB that receives a PAGING message over the Xn-interface during paging escalation does not use PEI. The rapporteur wants to ask whether the last used cell can be a non-anchor cell.

Also, one company also brings an issue of gNB interoperability [16], i.e., when the anchor gNB is a non-supporting gNB whether the UE’s paging subgrouping related information is forwarded or not. The rapporteur thinks we can discuss this later after we are clearer.

So the first question is:

Q14: Do companies agree that restricting the PEI monitoring by UE to the last used cell?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Ericsson | Yes | In LTE WUS is only used in last used cell, see 36.300:  When (G)WUS is used in RRC\_IDLE, the following are applicable:  - The UE monitors (G)WUS only in the last used cell as defined in TS 36.304 [11];  The reason why WUS is only used in the last used cell in LTE, and why PEI should also only be used in last used cell in NR, is that when the CN cannot find the UE in the first paging attempt (e.g. because the UE has moved), the CN may page the UE in the complete registration area [24, [R2-2105736](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_114-e/Docs/R2-2105736.zip)]. This paging escalation phase may thus cause a lot of paging, because the registration area may consist of many cells. Thus using PEI during paging escalation causes a lot of PEI transmissions, which increases the NW power consumption. Furthermore these PEI transmissions are rather useless, because the "missing" UE will only be found in a single cell of the registration area.  Typically the UE is reached in the first paging attempt, i.e. there is little impact on the UE power saving gains, when PEI is only used in the last use cell. |
| Samsung | No | UE may not be always in the last use cell due to mobility. From UE's power saving perspective, we prefer not have this restriction. |
| OPPO | No | We see no need to introduce such restriction as UEs will not always camp on the last used cell. |
| CATT | -- | We are not sure whether the LTE design, applicable to NB-IoT UEs, is also applicable to NR UEs, e.g. Ericsson’s comment: “Typically the UE is reached in the first paging attempt”. This design choice trades-off UE power consumption vs NW power consumption. In principle, this WI is for UE power saving but we are OK to follow majority view. |
| MediaTek | No | We understand that sending PEI in the registration area causes signaling overhead, but so does paging message itself. This is unavoidable cost of a mobile communication system where UEs can move. |
| Vodafone | Yes (unless better group allocation methods are used) | The Ericsson comment is very valid…. And (with regard to CATT comment) **even more valid** when we are designing PEI to work on smartphones rather than low end IoT devices (this is because many – but not all – IoT devices are stationary while most smartphones move frequently between cells, and, because VoNR paging needs to be low delay and hence may always be sent to all cells in the TAI list without paging escalation).  With UE\_ID or paging probability based grouping it will be essential to restrict PEI to the last used cell in order to avoid UEs being woken up by the PEI for paging for UEs in other cells within the TAI list.  Alternative (non-paging probability) CN grouping techniques based on VoNR support and mobility patterns might enable the “last used cell” restriction to be removed. |
| ZTE | No |  |
| Intel | Maybe No | We think the scenario is a bit different with eMTC/NBIoT where the UEs are mainly stationary. In this case where UE power saving also applies to eMBB, mobility may need to be considered for PEI. We understand that restricting the PEI monitoring by UE to the last used cell may reduce the false alarm for other UEs when the paging is reattempted over the whole paging area. However, this is done at the expense of the paged UE as it will act as legacy UE in other cells other than the last used cell. Without further evaluation and knowledge of the paging probabilities of the UEs in the last used cell and outside, it is difficult to judge which way is more efficient from UE power saving point. |
| Nokia | - | Escalating the paging would wake up the subgroup the UE is in in the whole TA which might increase power consumption of those UEs. But if limit to the last used cell, there is no power consumption gain for the UE when the UE has moved. Can be left to RAN3 to judge if any extra complexity to support moving case. |
| Vivo | Maybe no | If the subgrouping-based paging is only applied in the last used cell, the UE cannot use it after moving out of the last use cell, which will limit the power saving gain from paging subgrouping, especially when there are many UEs with high mobility.  In our understanding, the CN can determine the area of using paging subgrouping, e.g. with taking account of UE characteristics, such as a list of cells according to UE movement area, or RNA in the registration area, etc. |
| Sony | No | See no reason to restrict mobility as we did in LTE for NB-IoT. |
| Sharp | No strong view | It is ok to go with the majority’s view. |
| LGE | No | We also prefer not to have this restriction in NR. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | The use case here is different to LTE NB-IoT, as eMBB UE (smart phone) is one of the important device type considered for power saving enhancements and mobility of such devices is a general and important attribute that needs to be taken into account. Otherwise the designed solution will be too restrictive and the power saving gain will be very limited. |
| Futurewei | No | We also prefer not to have this restriction in NR. |
| Sequans | Yes | Agree this is not a similar use case as NB-IoT/Cat-M, but while the higher mobility makes not applying the last used cell principle more compelling when considering a specific UE, it also means that a lot more PEI-based paging will occur, thus negating its power saving value.  Again, we need to remember that PEI is most useful for the more sensitive UEs, which are those who will be impacted the worst by allowing escalation.  Additionally, this will also prevent having a variable number of PEI DCI bits, as mentioned in Q10 |
| CMCC | No |  |
| DENSO | No | If PEI monitoring is limited to the last used cell, power saving gain may be marginal especially for UEs with high mobility. |
| Xiaomi | No strong view | Considering the time left, we are OK to accept the LTE way.  But if people want to deviate from LTE, we need to consider the gNB interoperability issues. |
| Apple | No | We should not restrict this simply because of PEI overhead, wherein actually there is also going to be paging overhead otherwise. |
| Qualcomm | No | LTE has that restriction because WUS was designed for IoT (stationary) devices. If we restrict PEI to last served call, then it basically means PEI can’t be used by smartphones, which by far are the most UEs in 5G network now and probably will so for a while. |

**Summary:**

20 companies provide inputs for this question.

* 13/20 companies disagree that restricting the PEI monitoring by UE to the last used cell. With key argument is that the UE cannot use it after moving out of the last use cell, which will limit the power saving gain from paging subgrouping.
* 3/20 companies agree that restricting the PEI monitoring by UE to the last used cell. With key argument is that using PEI during paging escalation causes a lot of PEI transmissions, which increases the NW power consumption.
* 4/20 companies does not provide the option:
  + CATT: are not sure whether the LTE design, applicable to NB-IoT UEs and can follow the majority view.
  + Nokia: Escalating the paging would wake up the subgroup the UE is in in the whole TA which might increase power consumption of those UEs. But if limit to the last used cell, there is no power consumption gain for the UE when the UE has moved.
  + Sharp: follow majority view.
  + Xiaomi: Considering the time left, we are OK to accept the LTE way. But if people want to deviate from LTE, we need to consider the gNB interoperability issues.

Rapporteur observe that majority do not want to restrict the PEI monitoring by UE to the last used cell, and other companies who do not provide option also can follow majority view. Therefore rapporteur suggest as below:

**Proposal 14 (13/20): No restricting the PEI monitoring by UE to the last used cell.**

Based on this, we can discuss whether UE’s paging subgrouping related information should be in a forwarded RAN paging message. Hence, we have some options:

* Option 1: When a UE in RRC\_INACTIVE, UE’s paging subgrouping related information should be in a forwarded RAN paging message; the message and associated design are up to RAN3;
* Option 2: When a UE in RRC\_INACTIVE, UE’s paging subgrouping related information should not be in a forwarded RAN paging message; No impact on RAN3.
* Option 3: Left to RAN3

Q15: Which option do companies prefer out of option 1-3 described above on whether UE’s paging subgrouping related information should be in a forwarded RAN paging message?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option1-3 | Comments |
| Ericsson | Option 2 | PEI should not be used during RAN paging escalation. The RNA area can be large, and the unnecessary PEI overhead should be avoided, i.e. similar motivation as for CM-IDLE mode paging. |
| Samsung | Option 1/3 |  |
| OPPO | Option 1 | We think PEI and paging subgrouping can be used in any cell, so when network releases a UE into RRC INACTIVE, UE’s paging subgrouping related information should be forwarded from anchor gNB to non-anchor gNB. |
| CATT | 1 or 2, depending on Q14 |  |
| MediaTek | Option 1/3 |  |
| Vodafone | Depends upon the RAN providing mobility and connection pattern to the CN. | If the CN is provided with information that enables proper grouping to be done, then option 1, otherwise PEI needs to be restricted to the last used cell. |
| ZTE | Option 1/3 |  |
| Intel | Option 1 |  |
| Nokia | Option 3 |  |
| vivo | Option 1 | It makes sense to apply PEI in RNA area, especially in case of many UEs with high mobility. |
| Sony | Option 1/3 |  |
| Sharp | Option 1/3 |  |
| LGE | Option 1/3 |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 1/3 |  |
| Futurewei | Option 1/3 |  |
| Sequans | Option 1/2 | Depending on Q14 |
| CMCC | Option 1/3 |  |
| DENSO | Option 1/3 |  |
| Xiaomi | - | Depending on Q14 |
| Apple | Option 1/3 |  |
| Qualcomm | Option 1/3 |  |

**Summary:**

20 companies provide inputs for this question. And rapporteur think this issue is related to Q14 (i.e. whether restrict PEI monitoring by UE to last used cell) and based on companies feedback, we can conclude after Q14.

## 3.4 Other

Q16: Any other relevant issue to discuss (Only limits to paging subgrouping)?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Issue description |
| Ericsson | **Subgrouping without PEI**  Paging subgrouping should also be supported with normal Paging PDCCH and cross-slot scheduling (without PEI). The PEI power saving gains may depend on UE implementation and only apply to UEs is in bad coverage while the UE typically is in good coverage. The power saving gains with subgrouping is perhaps lower compared to PEI, but they are beneficial for all UEs and do not require additional NW transmissions. Furthermore subgrouping might be more simple to implement (e.g. UE-ID random grouping in RAN only).  Rapp:  Should it be discussed in RAN1?  **SIB provides DCI subgroup configuration**  In SIB it can be indicated how many bits in the DCI are used for subgrouping and how the bits are used (e.g. each bit indicates one CN subgroup (and subgroups can be signalled independently), or a CN subgroup is indicated by a codepoint (and there is an "all" subgroup when more then one subgroup needs to be paged in the same PO)). This strategy offers a semi-static flexibility in the DCI configuration, and can adapt to the number of subgroups used by the CN, and given the expected paging load whether bit or codepoints should be used. |
| MediaTek | **Subgrouping without PEI**  We do not see the benefit of this, but this can be discussed in RAN1. |
| vivo | **Subgrouping without PEI**  We need to discuss this after Oct. RAN1 meeting, if it is still an open issue. |

Summary:

2 Companies bring out the Subgrouping without PEI with normal Paging PDCCH or cross-slot scheduling. Rapporteur thinks this should be discussed in RAN1 first. Nothing much to be discussed here.

# Conclusions

Based on companies’ inputs to this email discussion, the following proposals are listed for agreement:

On the roles of AMF/gNB/UE

* **CN-assigned subgrouping**

**Proposal 1: (**till Wednesday)

**Proposal 2 (18/20, for agreement): RAN2 confirms that one subgroup will not be mapped to multiple Lay1 subgrouping indications, i.e., the 2-step way of distributing UE is excluded.**

**Proposal 3: Whether multiple subgroups can be mapped to the same Lay1 subgroup indication needs to wait for RAN1 (**till Wednesday)**.**

* **UE-ID based subgrouping**

**Proposal 4 (19/20, for agreement): Network capability to support UEID-based subgrouping can be implicitly indicated by presence of the total number of supported UEID-based subgroups by the network**

**Proposal 5 (15/20, for agreement): RAN may configure all subgroups for UE-ID based subgroups, i.e., no subgroup used for CN assigned subgrouping.**

* **Co-exist issues**

**Proposal 6 (for agreement): If UE has paging subgroup ID assigned by CN and camped cell supports CN-assigned subgrouping:**

**- UE performs paging indication monitoring based on CN-assigned subgrouping**

**Else if both UE and camped cell supports UE-ID based subgrouping:**

**- UE performs paging indication monitoring based on UE-ID based subgrouping**

**Else:**

**- UE performs paging indication monitoring as in legacy.**

**Proposal 7 (12 v.s. 8, for discussion): No consensus on whether subgrouping capability is common or separate. FFS:**

* Option 1: introduce common UE capability (i.e., only one UE capability reported to RAN or CN by NAS);
* Option 2: introduce separate UE capabilities;
* Option 2a: UE’s capability of supporting the UE ID based subgrouping is reported to RAN by AS UE capability signalling while UE’s capability of supporting the CN-assigned subgrouping is reported to CN by NAS signalling).
* Option2b: both capabilities are reported to CN by NAS signalling and CN forwards both to RAN in paging message

**Proposal 8 (for discussion): There is no consensus on subgroups splitting in RAN for CN assigned subgrouping and UE-ID based subgrouping.**

* Option 1: Overlapping is allowed;
* Option 2: Overlapping is not allowed;
* Option 3 :Left to gNB implementation whether to allow overlapping or not

**Proposed 9.1 (18/19, for agreement): Network can support for either CN assigned subgrouping or UE-ID based subgrouping;**

**Proposed 9.2 (for discussion): FFS Network can simultaneously support for both CN assigned subgrouping and UE-ID based subgrouping;**

ON issues related to other WG

**Proposal 10 (for discussion): No consensus that how to decide the total number of CN-assigned subgroups.**

**FFS:**

* Option 1: The total number of CN-assigned subgroups is fixed and specified [13]
* Option 2: The total number of CN-assigned subgroups is decided by CN and informed to RAN [13]
* Option 4: No need to specify, e.g., by OAM
* Option 5: leave it to SA2/CT1

**Proposal 11 (17/20, for agreement): CN will not provide assistance information to gNB(s) in support of paging subgrouping configuration.**

Proposal 12 (16/20, for agreement): gNB(s) will not provide assistance information to CN in support of paging subgroup assignment when IDLE UE moves to RRC\_INACTIVE.

Proposal 13(for discussion): No consensus on whether there is a need for UE assistance information to the network.

* Option 1: No need to introduce UE assistance information
* Option 2: The assistance information sent to CN by NAS; LS sent to CT1;

**Proposal 14 (13/20, for agreement): No restricting the PEI monitoring by UE to the last used cell.**
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