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# Introduction

This document is intended to further discuss the barring aspects:

* [POST117-e][102][NTN] 38.304 CR (ZTE)

Scope: Update the 38.304 CR, also trying to resolve the barring aspects and incorporating any available RAN1 feedback

Intended outcome: Agreed 38.304 CR in R2-2203548

Deadline: **Thursday March 10, 1000 UTC**

# Discussion

The following options have been raised during RAN2#117e [1]:

* Option 1: Introduce cellBarredNTN
* Option 2: Use the presence of tracking area list

Firstly, the rapporteur would like to clarify the expected UE behavior in both options.

## 2.1. UE interpretation on the existing bar bit and new NTN bar bit for option 1

R17 NTN capable UE is able to decode the cellBarred-NTN and the existing cellBarred while the legacy UE and R17 non-NTN capable UE is not able to decode the cellBarred-NTN.

The rapporteur understand UE intepretation of the bar bit can be summarized in the following tabe:

**Table 1: UE interpretation on the bar bit**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cell type | Presence and Setting of the cellBarred and cellBarred-NTN | legacy UE and R17 non-NTN capable UE intepretation on the bar bit | R17 NTN capable UE interpretation on the bar bit | Use case for such setting |
| TN cell | cellBarred = “barred”;cellBarred-NTN absent | The cell is barred | The cell is barred | TN cell would like to bar all the UEs |
| cellBarred = “not barred”;cellBarred-NTN absent | The cell is not barred | The cell is not barred | TN cell would like to allow all the UEs to camp |
| NTN cell | cellBarred = “barred”;cellBarred-NTN = “barred” | The cell is barred | The cell is barred | NTN cell would like to bar all the UEs |
| cellBarred = “not barred”;cellBarred-NTN = “barred” | The cell is not barred | Ignore the cellBarred and consider the cell as barred according to cellBarred-NTN | NTN cell would like to bar R17 NTN capable UE but allow legacy UE and R17 non-NTN capable UE=>Corner case since legacy UE and R17 non-NTN capable UE would not be able to get access to NTN cell but having such setting at least allows UE to camp on a NTN cell without losing coverage. |
| cellBarred = “barred”;cellBarred-NTN = “not barred” | The cell is barred | Ignore the cellBarred and consider the cell as not barred according to cellBarred-NTN | NTN cell would like to bar the legacy UE and R17 non-NTN capable UEs but allow NTN capable UEs to camp |
| cellBarred = “not barred”;cellBarred-NTN = “not barred” | The cell is not barred | The cell is not barred | NTN cell would like to allow all kinds of UE to camp.=>Corner case since legacy UE and R17 non-NTN capable UE would not be able to get access to NTN cell but having such setting at least allows UE to camp on a NTN cell without losing coverage. |

The following rules can be summaried based on the above table:

Legacy UE and R17 non-NTN capable UE follow the setting of the existing cellBarred.

R17 NTN capable UE follows the setting of the existing cellBarred, if cellBarredNTN is not present.

R17 NTN capable UE ignores the setting of the existing cellBarred and follows the setting of the cellBarredNTN, if cellBarredNTN is configured.

**Question 1) For option 1, do companies agree with the understanding that:**

**--legacy UE and R17 non-NTN capable UE follow the setting of the existing cellBarred;**

**--R17 NTN capable UE follows the setting of the existing cellBarred, if cellBarredNTN is not present;**

**--R17 NTN capable UE ignores the setting of the existing cellBarred and follows the setting of the cellBarredNTN, if cellBarredNTN is configured?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 2.2. UE interpretation on the existing bar bit and tracking area list for option 2

**Table 2: UE interpretation on the legacy bar bit and tracking area list**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Cell type | legacy UE and R17 non-NTN capable UE intepretation on the bar bit | R17 NTN capable UE interpretation on the bar bit |
| TN cell | No change. Follow existing procedure. Follow cellBarred in MIB and trackingAreaCode in SIB1:--cellBarred = “not barred” + TAC present: not barred--cellBarred = “barred” : barred--TAC not present: barred | Follow cellBarred in MIB and trackingAreaList-17 in SIB1Even if cellBarred = “not barred” in MIB, the cell is still barred as trackingAreaList-r17 = “not present”:--cellBarred = “not barred” + trackingAreaList-17 present: not barred--cellBarred = “barred” : barred-- trackingAreaList-17 not present: barred |
| NTN cell | No change. Follow existing procedure. Follow cellBarred in MIB and trackingAreaCode in SIB1Even if cellBarred = “not barred” in MIB, the cell is still barred as trackingAreaCode = “not present”--cellBarred = “not barred” + TAC present: not barred--cellBarred = “barred” : barred--TAC not present: barred | Follow cellBarred in MIB and trackingAreaList-17 in SIB1--cellBarred = “not barred” + trackingAreaList-17 present: not barred--cellBarred = “barred” : barred-- trackingAreaList-17 not present: barred |

The following rules can be summarized based on the above table:

Legacy UE and R17 non-NTN capable UE follow the setting of the existing cellBarred in MIB and trackingAreaCode in SIB1, i.e. the cell is barred to UE if cellBarred = “not barred” or the trackingAreaCode is not present.

R17 NTN capable UE follows the setting of the existing cellBarred in MIB and the trackingAreaList-r17 in SIB1, i.e. the cell is barred to UE if cellBarred = “not barred” or the trackingAreaList-r17 is not present.

**Question 2) For option 2, do companies agree with the understanding that:**

**--** **Legacy UE and R17 non-NTN capable UE follow the setting of the existing cellBarred in MIB and trackingAreaCode in SIB1, i.e. the cell is barred to UE if cellBarred = “not barred” or the trackingAreaCode is not present;**

**-- R17 NTN capable UE follows the setting of the existing cellBarred in MIB and the trackingAreaList-r17 in SIB1, i.e. the cell is barred to UE if cellBarred = “not barred” or the trackingAreaList-r17 is not present?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 2.3. Down select from option 1, option 2 or any other options

**Question 3) On the barring aspects, which option do companies prefer? Option 1/2/other? If companies want other options, please elaborate the detailed solution in the “comments” row.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option 1/2/other option?** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
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