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## 1 Introduction

After RAN2#112-e meeting, based on the chair notes [1][2], the following email discussion was agreed:

* **[Post112-e][253][RAN slicing] Prioritized solutions for RAN slicing (CMCC)**

Scope: Discuss the potential solutions for slice-based cell reselection and slice-based RACH configuration based on agreements on candidate solutions. Collect company views on schemes that should be prioritized with analysis on benefits and complexity for each solution.

 Intended outcome: Discussion report including TP to the TR 38.832

 Deadline: Dec 16

This email discussion is to progress on solutions for RAN slicing.

Since upload announcement is not mandatory required, indicating contact person is helpful in case companies would like to offline.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Name** | **Email** |
| Qualcomm | Peng Cheng | chengp@qti.qualcomm.com |
| Huawei | Jun Chen | jun.chen@huawei.com |
| OPPO | Zhe Fu | fuzhe@oppo.com |
| Vodafone  | Manook Soghomonian  | Manook.soghomonian@vodafone.com  |
| Intel | Seau Sian Lim | seau.s.lim@intel.com |
| Nokia | Gyorgy Wolfner | gyorgy.wolfner@nokia.com |
| CMCC | Ningyu Chen | chenningyu@chinamobile.com |
| Xiaomi | Xiaofei Liu | liuxiaofei@xiaomi.com |
| Fujitsu | Ohta, Yoshiaki | ohta.yoshiaki@fujitsu.com |
| Apple | Yuqin Chen | yuqin\_chen@apple.com |
| ZTE | Yuan Gao | gao.yuan66@zte.com.cn |
| SoftBank | Katsunari Uemura | katsunari.uemura@g.softbank.co.jp |
| KDDI | Hiroki Suezaki | hi-suezaki@kddi.com |
| Samsung | Hyunjeong Kang | hyunjeong.kang@samsung.com |
| Ericsson | Håkan Palm | Hakan.l.palm@ericsson.com |
| LGE | HyunJung Choe | stella.choe@leg.com |
| Futurewei | Hao Bi | Hao.bi@futurewei.com |
| Sharp | Art Ishii | ishiia@sharplabs.com |
| Spreadtrum | Xiaoyu Chen | xiaoyu.chen@unisoc.com |
| Turkcell | İzzet Sağlam | Izzet.saglam@turkcell.com.tr  |
| CATT | Chunlin Ni | nichunlin@catt.cn  |

## 2 Slice based cell reselection under network control

### 2.1 RAN2#112-e agreements

Here are the relevant agreements made at RAN2#112-e meeting [2]:

Agreements

* 5.1: These issues will be studied in this SI:
Issue 1: The UE is unaware of the slices supported on different cells or frequencies, which prevents UE from (re)select to the cell or frequency supporting the intended slice.
Issue 2: Dedicated priorities would not be available to the UE prior to first RRC connection establishment and only remain valid before T320 expires upon entering IDLE mode. In addition, dedicated priorities are discarded each time when UE entering CONNECTED mode and need to be configured again before UE leaving CONNECTED mode.
Issue 3: Operator may require different frequency priority configurations for the specific slice in different areas, however the dedicated priority always overwrites the broadcast priorities if configured.
Issue 4: If the serving cell is unable to support the requested slices for the subsequent access of the UE, the serving cell may bring on handover or rejection of access request. That may increase control plane signalling overhead as well as long control plane latency for the UE to access the network.
* 7: The following solution approaches are captured in the TR and will be studied in this SI:
Solution 1: Legacy dedicated priority via RRCRelease message.
Solution 2: Rel-15 mechanisms such as HO, CA, DC and redirection can be used to access the intended slice in different cell
Solution 3: Slice related cell selection info, the slice info of serving cell and neighboring cells is provided in the system information or RRCRelease message. FFS: what information is broadcast.
Solution 4: Slice related cell reselection info (e.g. Cell reselection priority per slice), the slice info of neighboring cells is provided in the system information or RRCRelease message. FFS: what information is broadcast.

Please note that the solution number is changed to align with the solution number in draft TR 38.832.

### 2.2 Discussions on solutions

Based on the scope of this email discussion, the following tables are provided for collecting companies’ comments. The suggestions are as below:

* For benefit, it is suggested to focus on the agreed issues that each solution can solve. For complexity, it is suggested to focus on general impacts on specifications
* Companies can refer to submitted Tdocs for analysis, e.g. submitted at RAN2#112-e meeting, and it may save the size of this email discussion
* For solution details, if needed, it is suggested to only figure out key aspects of a solution but not all details

The above suggestions are also applied to section 3.2.

#### Comments for solution 1

**Solution 1: Legacy dedicated priority via *RRCRelease* message.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred (Yes/No)** | **Benefits** **(Please list the issue(s) that this solution can address)** | **Complexity** |
| **Qualcomm** | **N/A** | **No need for benefit analysis.** **In our understanding, this legacy solution is captured in RAN2 TR as a reference (e.g. show the intention why enhancement is needed in Rel-17 RAN slicing SI)** | **No need for complexity analysis** |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **N/A** | **Solution 1 is available, but it cannot solve Issue 1, 2, 3, and 4.****For initial access, and subsequent access where its Intended Slice has changed, the UE may still select the wrong cell. In this way, the legacy dedicated priority is only a passive solution to guide UE to the correct cell.** | **No RAN2 impact observed.** |
| **OPPO** | **N/A** | **We share the same view as Qualcomm.** | **No need** |
| **Vodafone** | **yes** | **Works with R15 UEs with existing R15 system design for slicing (i.e. based on a common set of slices being available in all cells in a TA).****The correct use of “TA not allowed” style cause values avoids the UE camping on cells in the incorrect slice.****Note that for URLLC service the UE needs to be in connected state – so idle mode reselection is not really an issue for URLLC slices.**  | **Existing functionality, copied from, and debugged in,4G.** |
| **Intel** | **Yes** | **Since this solution is already supported by UEs, it has to be considered. This solution will be part of the overall solution space by default, to solve the issue to steer the UE to the preferred frequency of a slice in a TA.** **If the 2 areas in the TR (Area 1 and 2 in Figure 5.1.1-1) are in different TAs, this solution will provide the up-to-date dedicated priority to move the UE to the right frequency layer and provide fast access.** | **No additional UE complexity as it is an existing mechanism.** |
| **Nokia** | **Yes** | **Issue 1, 4 for cell reselection** **Note that this solution does not solve the case when the cells on the same band support different slices (e.g. at the border of different geographical areas). Assigning CAG IDs to slices or group of slices could solve this issue as well [see details on CAG ID assignment in R2-2009067]** | **No impact, as it is legacy mechanism** |
| CMCC | No | Agree with Qualcomm and Huawei.Solution 1 cannot address issue 1~4. That’s why we need to study solutions in Rel-17. | Not needed. |
| **Xiaomi** | **N/A** | **It should be analyzed based on the different answers of SA2 LS.****A)different cells support same set of slices in the same RA/TA (i.e. if answer is “Yes” for SA2 LS R2-2008759) and different slices have no different preferred frequency(s) in the RA/TA****For A), the issue 1/4 is no exist as solution1 has considered allowed NSSAI and allowed NSSAI is supported within RA. If UE requests slices outside of allowed slices or moves out of RA, registration procedure is performed to update allowed NSSAI and dedicated priority can be updated accordingly.****B)different cells support same set of slices in the same RA/TA (i.e. if answer is “Yes” for SA2 LS R2-2008759) but different slices have different preferred frequency(s) in the RA/TA****C)different cells support different slices in the same RA/TA (i.e. if answer is “No” for SA2 LS R2-2008759)** **For B) and C), legacy dedicated priority can not solve all 4 issues because UE can not be aware of the relationship of (preferred) frequencies/cells and slices.** | **No impact on current spec as legacy mechanism.** |
| **Fujitsu** | **Yes** | **Same view with Nokia for Issues 1 and 4.** | **No complexity since it is legacy function.** |
| **Apple** | **No** | **We also feel this cannot address issues 1-4. Especially if to allow flexible network deployment where not all the cells in the same RA support the same set of slices (though still FFS), dedicated priority configuration is not applicable.** |  |
| ZTE | N/A | We understand the dedicated priority via RRCRelease has already been supported but cannot address issue 1-4 and that is why further enhancement is needed. | No need for complexity analysis. |
| SoftBank | No | It can be available as a legacy solution, but it cannot be solved issues 1-4. | No need |
| **KDDI** | **N/A** | **No need to capture the benefit of this solution in TR. Although issue1 can be addressed with this solution for a while, but after T320 being expired, the UE cannot select the frequency supporting the intended slice. This can be addressed only by introducing the slice info on SIB.** | **No need to capture the impact, as it is legacy mechanism** |
| **Samsung** | **Yes** | **This solution should be supported for dedicated priority based slicing.** | **No additional AS impact.** |
| Ericsson | Yes | As we discussed earlier, with proper allocation of slices to cells and TAs, the Rel-15/16 mechanisms (together with e.g. redirection in RRCRelease) can solve all issues 1, 2, 3. If Issue 4 (additional CP signalling/delay) is an essential problem to solve need further discussion.Unfortunately, RAN2 did not yet reach consensus on that Rel-15/16 mechanisms for slice support in RAN assumes all cells of a TA (RA) support access to the same set of slices. This is an obstacle in RAN2 discussion on what new mechanisms are essentially needed. | For the case the UE attempts to register to a slice that is not supported by the camped cell/freq/TA but is supported by another cell/freq/TA, SA2 solution #17 proposes modifications to CN-RAN signalling (RAN3) such that gNb can redirect UE to the cell/freq that supports the slice. We discussed this in R2-2009986 (section 6.2.Z, on a Solution 6). |
| LGE | Yes if SA2 solution #17 is applied in the network side  | This solution can address the issue 1 and 4 if SA2 solution #17 is applied in the network side. Without this modification, the dedicated priority cannot solve the issues. | No RAN2 impact is foreseen. |
| Futurewei | No | As a legacy feature, solution 1 can’t address issues 1, 2, 3, and 4 effectively. As UE is not informed of the mapping between supported slice and cell/frequency, UE is not able to perform cell reselection based on the intended slice. | N/A |
| Sharp | No | This is a legacy solution already available, but it will not solve issue 1-4. | N/A |
| **Spreadtrum** | **N/A**  | **Solution 1 may address issue 1 and issue 4.****Solution1 has been supported in specs. The network can configure the dedicated priority based on the slice deployment in RAN. However, as the frequency of specific slice may be different in different area, UE may still select an unsuitable cell according to the dedicated priority.** | **No need for existing method** |
| **Turkcell** | **Yes** | **This solution already supported by UEs.** | **No complexity since it is legacy function.** |
| **CATT** | **N/A** | **Not need to have benefit analysis****The solution cannot address issue1~4 if no any other enhancement introduced (e.g SA2 solutions)** | **N/A** |

#### Summary for solution 1

21 companies replied for solution 1. If the view is supported by more than 10 companies, we can consider it as majority view and capture into the TR.

Which issue can the solution address?

6 companies thought solution 1 can address issue 1.

1 companies thought solution 1 can address issue 2.

1 company thought solution 1 can address issue 3.

5 company thought solution 1 can address issue 4.

9 companies thought solution 1 can address none of the 4 issues, and 4 companies show N/A.

In general, we can conclude that solution 1 cannot address issue 2&3.

Complexity

9 companies thought there is no impact.

11 companies replied N/A.

1 company thought there is RAN3 impact.

**Proposal 1: Solution 1 (i.e. Legacy dedicated priority via RRCRelease message) cannot address issue 2&3, and has no specification impact.**

#### Comments for solution 2

**Solution 2: Rel-15 mechanisms such as HO, CA, DC and redirection can be used to access the intended slice in different cell.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred (Yes/No)** | **Benefits** **(Please list the issue(s) that this solution can address)** | **Complexity** |
| **Qualcomm** | **See comments** | **Similar to solution 1, it is legacy solution. However, there may be one new issue for HO/redirection if different cells support different slices in the same RA/TA (i.e. if answer is “No” for SA2 LS** [R2-2008759](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cterhentt%5CDocuments%5CTdocs%5CRAN2%5CRAN2_112-e%5CR2-2008759.zip))**:** * **Issue scenario: the UE with active PDU session of slice 2 is HO/redirected to another cell not supporting slice 2 in the same RA/TA. In this case, it is not clear how the UE can handle the active PDU session of Slice 2**.
* **One possible solution is to release PDU session of Slice 2 while another alternative is to suspend the PDU session of Slice 2 so that it is still available when Slice 2 is available later, e.g. UE returning to original cell. But all these solutions need SA2 impacts**
 | **From RAN2 perspective, there is no further RAN2 impact even if the new issues need to be studied.** |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **N/A** | **Solution 2 is available, however, solutions as HO, CA, and DC are only for connected mode UEs. The whole Section 2 here is about cell (re)selection, so Solution 2 can not address it. And legacy redirection solution has the same problem as the dedicated priority of Solution 1.****In the pre-meeting discussions (see summary in R2-2010366), there were lots of discussions regarding Solution 2, and generally the solution will lead to extra delay and signaling overhead if applied in cell (re)selection scenarios.** | **No RAN2 impact observed.** |
| **OPPO** | **N/A** | **It is legacy solution, and can only applied in limited cases. For CA/DC solution, the related UE capability is required. For HO/redirection, the network may redirect/handover UE to the cell not supporting the most intended slice, since the gNB does not know whether the subsequent required slice is the most intended one or not.** | **No need unless some RAN2 impact is foreseen.** |
| **Vodafone** | **yes** | **This is the existing Rel 15 solution that has been debugged and shown to work in 4G.****We believe that RAN 3 have answered “yes” to the question in SA2 LS** [R2-2008759](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cterhentt%5CDocuments%5CTdocs%5CRAN2%5CRAN2_112-e%5CR2-2008759.zip), and hence the (good) Qualcomm comments are not needed. |  |
| **Intel** | **Yes** | **This solution solves the issues for some scenarios where different slices are supported in different frequency layer within a TA as in the scenario below in the TR:****With CA/DC, the UE may still be able to access the intended slice even if it is not in the same freq depending on UE capability and network deployment.****Using redirection/handover to another frequency without CA/DC may not be a viable solution for some scenarios. As mentioned by Qualcomm, if UE is in F2 and has active slice 2, handover or redirection to F1 for Slice 1, may result Slice 2 becoming not available depending on UE capability and Issue 5 as in the previous email discussion may occur. Issue 5 also occurs for the case UE moves from Area 1 to Area 2 in the TR (Figure 5.1.1-1) with active Slice 2 and this also need to be resolved.** | **No additional UE complexity as it is an existing mechanism.** |
| **Nokia** | **Yes** | **Issue 1** | **No impact, as it is legacy mechanism** |
| CMCC | No | HO, CA, DC and redirection are the legacy mechanisms to make UE accessible to the intended slices on the non-serving cell. But as stated in issue 4, these mechanisms increase the control plane signalling overhead and latency.  | No impact |
| **Xiaomi** | **N/A** | **For IDLE/inactive UE, this solution requires UE to enter connected state first, which can consume additional signaling and access delay, and depends on network deployment and UE capability, e.g. DC/CA.****For connected UE, there is no problem with this solution.** | **No impact on current spec as legacy mechanism.** |
| **Fujitsu** | **No/Yes** | **NO: The HO, CA, DC are for connected mode and cannot be applicable for idle mode.****Yes: For redirection, it can be applicable for Issue 1.** | **No complexity since it is legacy function.** |
| **Apple** | **No** | **These are legacy mechanisms which can be used in certain cases. But some basic issues (like delay, UE capability limitation) concerned cannot be addressed.** |  |
| ZTE | N/A | As mentioned in issue 1, the UE is unaware of the slices supported in different cell or frequencies and the HO, CA, DC and redirection can be used to compensate for such loss with increased signaling overhead and latency. For the issue raised by QC, we understand it is not new and the existing procedure can address it. For Xn-based or NG-based HO, it is possible that some PDU sessions cannot continue in the target side and a cause will be provided for each PDU session ID. The cause “Slice(s) not supported by NG-RAN” can be used when the slice is not supported at the target side. These PDU sessions will be released after HO to the target side and re-establishment procedure will be triggered if UE or network still needs to set up these PDU sessions. | No impact |
| SoftBank | No | Not applicable for Idle mode cases. |  |
| **KDDI** | **Yes** | **The solution has some benefits. In case where the UE cannot initiate the RRC conection with the frequency not supporting the intended slice, the network can move the UE to the frequency supporting the intended slice.** | **From the standard point of view, no impact. But in terms of network implementation and operation, coordinating two nodes for DC/CA is somewhat complicated.** |
| **Samsung** | **Yes** | **This mechanism can be used for issue #1 and #4.** | **No additional AS impact.** |
| Ericsson | Yes | Existing mechanism. See our comments on Solution 1..We also agree with Intel that CA/DC is needed in order to serve UE’s using multiple slices served at different frequency bands. | No impact. |
| LGE | Yes | Issue 1Network should have the control on the operating frequency (or frequencies in CA/DC) of the UE by taking the intended slice and active PDU session into account. Then, the existing network controlled mobility mechanisms and CA/DC are clearly those to enable such control.  | No impactHowever, we may need to think whether the RAN node has sufficient knowledge, e.g. intended slice/frequency, required for optimal (mobility) configurations. |
| Futurewei | No | These mechanisms can be used only after UE enters connected mode through non-preferred cell/frequency, which incurs extra delay and signaling overhead.  | N/A |
| Sharp | N/A | This legacy mechanism is always available with no specification impact, only for connected mode UE. | No impact |
| **Spreadtrum** | **N/A** | **Solution2 could be a supplementary method for solution 3/4.** **If the highest priority slice for UE changes, HO, CA/DC or redirection could move part or all slices of UE to a new cell.** **NW may need to know UE intended slice, so that it can take appropriate actions. The concerned issues are delay and signaling overhead.****The slice re-mapping discussed in RAN3 could be considered in solution2.** | **No impact** |
| **Turkcel** | **Yes** | **Solution is already available.**  | **No need** |
| **CATT** | **Yes** | **The existing solution can solve some issues.** | **NO impact** |

#### Summary for solution 2

21 companies shared comments for solution 2. If the view is supported by more than 10 companies, we can consider it as majority view and capture into the TR.

Which issue can the solution address?

6 companies thought solution 2 can address issue 1.

1 company thought solution 2 can address issue 2.

1 company thought solution 2 can address issue 3.

1 company thought solution 2 can address issue 4.

6 companies don’t think solution 2 can address any of the issue 1-4, and 6 companies show N/A.

**Proposal 2.1: Capture into the TP “Solution 2 is legacy solution. With solution 2, the UE is still unaware of the slices supported in different cell or frequencies and the HO, CA, DC and redirection can be used to compensate for such loss with increased signalling overhead and latency. HO, CA, DC, redirection are applicable only for connected mode UE.”**

All companies agree that there is no complexity to support solution 2.

**Proposal 2.2: There is no complexity to support solution 2.**

#### Comments for solution 3

**Solution 3: Slice related cell selection info, the slice info of serving cell and neighboring cells is provided in the system information or *RRCRelease* message. FFS: what information is broadcast.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred (Yes/No)** | **Benefits** **(Please list the issue(s) that this solution can address)** | **Complexity** |
| **Qualcomm** | **Yes for SIB****No for RRC release** | **Providing supported slices info in SIB can resolve all the 4 identified issues:** * **For issue 1/2/4, the UE can avoid selecting a cell not supporting its intended slice from beginning (and thereby avoid signaling/latency caused by PDU session rejection);**
* **For issue 3, the UE will see different slice availability in Area 1 and Area 2, and thereby the UE can take area-different frequency priority, which is similar to existing Rel-13 LTE SC-PTM and Rel-16 NR V2X cell (re)selection.**

**We think the existing frequency priority mechanism in *RRCRelease* based RFSP is sufficient and can’t address any 4 identified issues. So, we see no need to enhance.**  | **The main 2 issues to provide supported slice info in SIB:*** **Payload size: we think it can be resolved (e.g. providing only SST, or on-demand SIB, or SIB segmentation)**
* **Security: we don’t see any security issue to broadcast supported slice info in SIB, but open to send LS to SA3**
 |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **Yes** | **SIB solution should be the priority. It can resolve issue 1 and 4 efficiently.****SIB solution can enable UE fast access as the UE will know the suitable cell by identifying the supported slices.** **Slice related info in *RRCRelease* is not suitable for the initial access scenario.** | **The impacts are moderate because solution 3 is similar to priority-based cell reselection.****For signaling overhead due to slice related information, we have the following suggestions:*** **Slice info depends on slice deployment, for example, the number of slices deployed in an area**
* **Some solutions can be considered, such as slice group and on-demand SI**
 |
| **OPPO** | **Yes** | **If slice related information is provided in system information, issue 1/2/4 can be resolved.****If slice related information is provided in RRCRelease, issue 1/4 can be resolved in the scenarios expect initial access/RLF.** **But, the solution of RRCRelease can provide a UE-specific information and can be a supplementary to the solution of system information.**  | **Regarding the concern on provision of supported slice info in SIB, we share similar view as Qualcomm. In details:****Payload size: Simplified identity for slice id, e.g. SST, slice group, or on-demand SIB can be used.****Security: Slice info is already carried in msg5 which is unprotected. But, no serious issue on security is raised. If security issue does exist in some cases, gNB can control it and stop broadcasting slice related information.** |
| **Vodafone** | **Slice type OK to add to broadcast SIB** | **Benefits seem limited as R15/16 UEs are likely to need to be supported.****Existing RRC release messages seem able to address all 4 scenarios (so no updates needed) – although the RAN needs to know how to convert UE context information into the priority information sent in the RRC Release.****Dedicated priorities timer T320 can be set up to 3 hours – and most devices are likely to contact the network more frequently (e.g. for smartphone heartbeat traffic, or, periodic registration updates), so R15 techniques can work in most cases.****Broadcasting “slice type” to make cells preferred may be OK, but, using Slice Information to indicate prohibited cells (within the registered TAI list) will lead to wasted paging messages.**  |  |
| **Intel** | **Yes or No, depends on whether the 2 Areas need to be in the same TA** | **See our contribution R2-2009198 for detailed explanation. In brief:****If Area 1 and Area 2 are in different registration areas, current Rel-15 mechanisms addresses the dedicated frequency priority update issue and also update of the allowed NSSAI to provide fast access. Additional benefit of Slice related cell selection info in the SIB or in the RRC Release needs more discussion.** **On the other hand, if Area 1 and Area 2 in TR Figure 5.1.1-1 are in the same UE registration area, there are many issues (1, 3, 4, 5) on the system aspects. For example, how data of the active slice are handled etc. and how fast access can be achieved as mentioned in R2-2009198 needs further discussion as there is no common understanding on this during the discussion on SA2 LS response.**  | **If separate TA is used for both Area 1 and 2 as in the Figure 5.1.1-1, there is no further complexity as the existing mechanism may address all the issues.** **If same TA is used for both Area 1 and 2 as in the Figure 5.1.1-1, further discussion is needed on how it works end to end considering overall system aspects. And further discussion is also needed on the details of reduction in access delay that can be achieved with such broadcast to understand the solution and associated complexity.** |
| **Nokia** | **Yes for RRCRelease****No for broadcasting** | **Issue 1, 4 for cell selection** | **RRCRelease: Low**, as the details on cell selection could remain implementation specific.**Broadcasting: High:** SIB sizes are very limited, especially SIB1 case, and thus very high level of optimization is required. Note also that SIBs using a significant amount of radio resources |
| CMCC | Yes for SIBNo for RRCRelease | Solution 3 can address issue 1,2,3,4.The broadcasting slice info for serving cell and neighbour cell enable the UE to select to the cell supported the intended slices, which address all the issues in 1~4.Using RRCRelease message is not preferred, since it causes the same problem as issue 2. | Agree with Qualcomm. |
| **Xiaomi** | **Yes, both for SIB and RRCRelease, and can also be provided by NAS.** | **Providing supported slices in SIB can solve all issues but it is configured per cell rather than per UE.** **Providing supported slices in RRCRelease can solve issue1/4 but it has benefits that can be configured per UE considering network conditions and UE requests.** **For issue 2, we think it is not a big issue for UE without dedicated priorities prior to first RRC connection establishment. And the maximum value of T320 is min180 which is long enough to avoid frequent reconfiguration of dedicated priorities.****For issue 3, we think it can be solved by configuring valid area in RRCRelease message.****Besides, SA2 is considering to configure slice-specific frequency info to assist cell (re)selection, e.g. TR23.700-40 solution#29/30, thus, the slice related cell (re)selection info can also be provided by NAS.****For slice related cell （re）selection info, we think it should include available slices info and whether it includes slice priority depends on slice priority is decided by UE or by network which should be further discussed. If slice priority is decided by UE, slice related cell （re）selection info need not include slice priority. Otherwise, slice priority need to be included in slice related cell (re) selection info and indicated by network to UE.** | **same views as Qualcomm.** |
| **Fujitsu** | **Yes for SIB and RRC.** | **Solution 3 can address issues 1, 2, 3 and 4. However, T320 handling may need to be re-considered.** | **No complexity since it is legacy function. T320 handling may need to be re-considered.** |
| **Apple** | **Yes for both SIB and RRCRelease** | **Provision of slice info in SIB can address all the issues.** **Provision in RRCRelease can be considered especially on how to address the root issue that the dedicated configuration is only valid for a geographical location (but not the whole RA).** | **If SIB size is the concern, OnDemand SI is feasible.** |
| ZTE | Yes | We understand solution 3 can address issue 1,2,4 to assist cell selection and reselection. | **RRCRelease:** * When the dedicated reselection priority or redirection information is provided, the supported slice for the corresponding frequency can also be provided to assist cell reselection.
* No security concerns as the dedicated reselection priority and redirection information will be sent under protection.

**Broadcasting:** Although broadcasting NSSAI/S-NSSAI (or parts of it) is acceptable to some slices without security concern, the NSSAI/S-NSSAI (or parts of it) shall not be exposed in system information for some security/privacy sensitive slices as emphasized by SA3 (R2-1703762\_S3-170902 Reply LS on privacy of registration and slice selection information). => We understand that a common solution of broadcasting supported slice information is needed for slice with/without security concern on exposing of NSSAI/S-NSSAI (or parts of it)* For the camped cell, since there has been association between the slice and the access category, UE can be aware of the supported slice via the broadcast UAC information in SIB1 to avoid any security concerns, which is also beneficial in reducing the signaling overhead for such enhancement.
* For the neighbor cell, the same solution can be applied by broadcasting the access categories associated with slices.
 |
| SoftBank | Yes for SIBNo for RRCRelease | RRCRelease is complimentary solution as it is not applicable for initial access cases. So providing slice information in SIB should be considered as a baseline. | Agree with Qualcomm |
| **KDDI** | **Yes for SIB****No for RRC Release** | **SIB: UEs can select the appropriate frequency supporting intended slice automatically using the slice info provided by the network, without indicating its dedicated priority explicitly.****RRC Release: As we commented above, issue1 cannot be addressed, after being T320 expired, the UE cannot select the frequency supporting the intended slice.** | * **X2/Xn interface (RAN3); for the slice information of the neighboring cells, X2/Xn interface (inter node RRC interface) need to be enhanced.**
* **Payload size: If the slice info of the neighboring cells is too large then we may want to explore some solutions.**
 |
| **Samsung** | **See comment** | **For cell selection case, SIB or RRCRelease can be used to provide slice information of cells/frequencies for issue 1/issue 2/issue 3.** | * **Additional cell selection criteria is necessary to use the slice info in SIB/RRC Release during cell selection.**
 |
| Ericsson | No (not needed) | Can address Issues 1 and 4, but agree with the concerns raised by Intel and Vodaphone.SIB solution can provide cell selection info to UE that reflects the local frequency coverage situation, while info in RRCRelease message is expected to be valid for the UE until next network contact (e.g. NAS registration).  | RRCRelease: Low, agree that details on how to use the info is up to UE impl.SIB: Share concern on SIB size. Solution need to be optimized |
| LGE | Yes for SIB | Issue 1 and 4 | Payload size and security should be considered. SA2/SA3 should be involved for security concerns. |
| Futurewei | Yes for SIB | Broadcasting slice information can address all 4 issues, and allow UE to perform cell selection according to its intended slice. | What is broadcasting in SIB is the capability of a cell/frequency, not a particular UE’s capability or service. Hence, we don’t see security or privacy issue. |
| Sharp | Yes | Our preference is the SIB solution, It would address Issues 1/2/4 | SIB: agree on Qualcomm’s viewRRCRelease: agree on ZTE’s view |
| **Spreadtrum** | **Yes for SIB****No for RRC release** | **Solution3 can address issues 1-4 and could enable the UE to select the cell supported the intended slices.****Slice related cell selection info needs to be contained in SIB because the UE should obtain this information beforehand when the RRC connection re-establishment is triggered. Then there is no need to contain this info in the RRC release.** | **Agree with QC** |
| **Turkcell** | **Yes** | **We prefer SIB solution** |  |
| **CATT** | **Yes** | **We also prefer the SIB solution** |  |

#### Summary for solution 3

21 companies commented for solution 3. If the view is supported by more than 10 companies, we can consider it as majority view and capture into the TR.

Which issue can the solution address?

18 companies thought solution 3 can address issue 1.

13 companies thought solution 3 can address issue 2.

10 company thought solution 3 can address issue 3.

16 company thought solution 3 can address issue 4.

3 companies didn’t comment on which issue can solution 4 address.

There is clear majority supporting that solution 3 can address issue 1/2/4.

**Proposal 3.1: Capture into the TR “****Solution 3 can address issue 1/2/4”**

Broadcast vs. RRCRelease:

18 companies support to broadcast slice related cell selection info in SIB. 2 companies don’t support that.

6 companies support to use RRCRelease message to transmit slice related cell selection info. 8 companies don’t support that.

Therefore, majority companies support the broadcast way.

**Proposal 3.2:** **There is benefit to broadcast slice related cell selection info in SIB and it is recommended for normative work.**

For complexity discussion, comments main focused are SIB payload size and security.

SIB Payload size:

3 companies raised concerns on SIB size. And correspondingly, 10 companies replied that SST, on-demand SIB, SIB segmentation or slice grouping can address the SIB size concerns. And 1 company commented that broadcasting the UAC information which is associated with slice can address both SIB size and security concerns.

Security:

2 company commented that security is a concern for broadcasting slice related cell selection info. 9 companies don’t think there is any security issue.

**Proposal 3.3:** **The concerns on SIB payload size for broadcasting slice related cell selection info can be resolved (e.g. providing only SST, on-demand SIB, SIB segmentation, slice grouping or slice associated UAC information).**

#### Comments for solution 4

**Solution 4: Slice related cell reselection info (e.g. Cell reselection priority per slice), the slice info of neighboring cells is provided in the system information or *RRCRelease* message. FFS: what information is broadcast.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred (Yes/No)** | **Benefits** **(Please list the issue(s) that this solution can address)** | **Complexity** |
| **Qualcomm** | **Yes for SIB****No for RRC release** | **Same comments to Solution 3.** **We assume supported slices info can be included in one SIB type for both cell selection and reselection.** | **Same comments to Solution 3** |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **Yes** | **SIB solution should be the priority. It can solve issue 3 and 4 efficiently.****Slice specific cell reselection priority in SIB could help UE to camp on suitable frequency/cell according to the Intended Slice and the network policy.** | **Same comments to Solution 3.** |
| **OPPO** | **Yes** | **Similar as the comments to Solution 3.** **In addition, for issue 3, if other information, e.g. area-specific frequency priority per specific slice, is provided in RRCRelease, it can be avoided that the dedicated priority wrongly overwrites the broadcast priorities.** | **See comments to Solution 3.** |
| Vodafone | No | Benefits seem limited. Co-frequency adjacent cells are likely to need to support the same services, so limited gain from adding this information is expected. | Complexity outweighs gains. |
| **Intel** | **Yes or No as per Solution 3** | **Same comments as Solution 3** | **Same comments as Solution 3** |
| **Nokia** | **Yes** | **RRC Release:** Issue 1, 4 and may provide partial solution for issue 2, 3 **Broadcasting:** Issue 1, 2, 3, 4 | **RRC Release: Medium****Broadcasting: High,** as SIB sizes are very limited, and thus optimization is required |
| CMCC | Yes for SIB,No for RRCRelease | Solution 4 can address issue 1,2,3,4.The broadcasting slice info for serving cell and neighbour cell enable the UE to reselect to the cell supported the intended slices, which address all the issues in 1~4.RRCRelease message is not preferred, since it causes the similar problem as issue 2&3. | Same comments to Solution 3. |
| **Xiaomi** | **Yes, both for SIB and RRCRelease, and can also be provided by NAS.** | **Same comments as solution 3** | **Same comments as solution 3** |
| **Fujitsu** | **Yes for SIB and RRC** | **Same comments to Solution 3.**  | **Same comments to Solution 3.**  |
| **Apple** | **Yes for both** |  |  |
| ZTE | Yes  | **Broadcasting:** Issue 1, 2, 3, 4**RRCRelease:** Issue 1,3,4. Dedicated reselection priority per slice would also be helpful since operator may require different frequency priority configurations for the specific slice in different areas. | **RRCRelease:** No security concerns as the dedicated reselection priority per slice will be sent under protection.**Broadcasting:** As analyzed under solution 3, we understand that a common solution of broadcasting slice specific reselection priority is needed for slice with/without security concern on exposing of NSSAI/S-NSSAI (or parts of it). Thus it is suggested to associate the reselection priority to certain slices implicitly via access categories. |
| SoftBank | Yes for SIBNor for RRCrelease | Same comment as Solution 3 | Same comment as Solution 3 |
| **KDDI** | **Yes for SIB****No for RRC Release** | **Same comments to Solution 3.** | **Same comments to Solution 3** |
| **Samsung** | **Yes for RRCRelease** | **For cell reselection, RRCRelease message can be used to provide slice information including priority for issue 1/issue 2/issue 3/issue 4.** |  |
| Ericsson | No (not needed) | Solution 4 can address issue 1,2,3,4.See comments on Solution 4. | RRCRelease: Medium. UE cell re-selection and measurement rules need to take slice-specific cell re-selection priorities into account.SIB: Share concern on SIB size. Solution need to be optimised. Since SIB solution, all UEs use the same info. Further, UE cell re-selection and measurement rules need to take slice-specific cell re-selection priorities into account. |
| LGE | Yes for SIB | Same comment as Solution 3 |  |
| Futurewei | Yes for SIB | Broadcasting slice information can address all 4 issues, and allow UE to perform cell selection according to its intended slice.RRCRelease is an optimization over SIB approach, which can support UE specific fine-tuning of slice information, at the cost of extra delay and signaling overhead. It can be considered as low priority after SIB solution is defined. | What is broadcasting in SIB is the capability of a cell/frequency, not a particular UE’s capability or service. Hence, we don’t see security or privacy issue. |
| Sharp | Yes (SIB preferred) | Same comment as Solution3 |  |
| **Spreadtrum** | **Yes for SIB****No for RRC release** | **Solution4 can address issues 1-4 and could enable the UE to reselect the cell supported the intended slices.****Slice related cell reselection info needs to be contained in SIB because it is necessary for the idle/inactive UE which come from other cells via cell reselection to perform slice based cell reselection in current cell. Then there is no need to contain this info in the RRC release.** | **Same comments to Solution 3.**  |
| **Turkcell** | **Yes** | **The benefit can be limited**  |  |
| **CATT** | **Yes** | **Same comment as Solution3** |  |

#### Summary for solution 4

21 companies commented for solution 4. If the view is supported by more than 10 companies, we can consider it as majority view and capture into the TR.

Which issue can the solution address?

15 companies thought solution 4 can address issue 1.

14 companies thought solution 4 can address issue 2.

14 company thought solution 4 can address issue 3.

16 company thought solution 4 can address issue 4.

4 companies didn’t comment on which issue can solution 4 address.

Therefore, majority companies thought that solution 4 can address the issue 1/2/3/4.

**Proposal 4.1: Capture in the TR that “****solution 4 can address the issue 1/2/3/4”.**

Broadcast in SIB vs. RRCRelease

17 companies support to broadcast slice related cell reselection info in SIB. 1 companies don’t support that.

7 companies support to use RRCRelease message to transmit slice related cell reselection info. 7 companies don’t support that. 1 company commented RRCRelease message should be lower priority than broadcast in SIB.

Therefore, majority companies support the broadcast way.

**Proposal 4.2:** **There is benefit to broadcast slice related cell reselection info in SIB and it is recommended for normative work. FFS whether to contain slice related cell reselection info in RRCRelease message.**

And companies’ comments for complexity are quite similar as solution 3.

**Proposal 4.3:** **The concerns on SIB payload size for broadcasting slice related cell reselection info can be resolved (e.g. providing only SST, on-demand SIB, SIB segmentation, slice grouping or slice associated UAC information).**

## 3 Slice based RACH configuration

### 3.1 RAN2#112-e agreements

Here are the relevant agreements made at RAN2#112-e meeting [2]:

Agreements

* 10: The intentions and use cases for slice-based RACH configuration are as follows:
Intention 1: RA resource isolation. From marketing point of view, some of the industrial customers have the requirement for access resource isolation, in order to provide guaranteed RA resources for their sensitive slices.
Intention 2: Slice access prioritization. In R15/16, all slices are sharing the same RA resources and cannot be differentiated by network side. But some slices may need to be prioritized during the RA procedure.
* 11: The following solutions will be studied and captured in the TR 38.832:
Solution 1: Slice-specific separate RACH resources pool can be configured per slice or per slice group, in addition to the existing common RACH resources.
Solution 2: Slice-specific RACH parameters prioritization can be configured per slice or per slice group.
Neither solution may not be applicable to all possible slices.

### 3.2 Discussions on solutions

Same suggestions as section 2.2. Please companies provide the comments into the following tables if any.

#### Comments for solution 1

**Solution 1: Slice-specific separate RACH resources pool can be configured per slice or per slice group, in addition to the existing common RACH resources.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred (Yes/No)** | **Benefits** | **Complexity** |
| **Qualcomm** | **Lower priority than Solution 2** | **It can provide benefit to reduce RACH collision/delay for some slices with urgent requirement** | * **It may cause RACH resource fragment**
* **It may require spec change on basic RACH procedure, which should be avoided.**

**In all, we think it can be considered for the target of urgent slices, but its study priority should be lower than solution 2.**  |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **Yes** | **Solution 1 can meet Intention 1 and 2.**  | **The impacts are moderate.****The UE gets Intended Slice info at its AS layer, and the UE also gets slice-specific RACH configurations, and then the UE will select suitable resources for the RACH procedure.** |
| **OPPO** | **Yes** | **It is suitable to the case of some slices with urgent requirement.** | * **To solve the collision of RA-RNTI if slice-based RACH resources are added in addition to the existing common RACH resources.**
 |
| **Vodafone**  |  | **Separating RACH resources into smaller groups reduces statistical multiplexing gains and may lead to increased congestion.****However, it is a tool that can be used to provide enhanced access to a subset of users.**  | **Configuring this in the UE may be complex unless related to simple broadcast (e.g. Slice Type) information.** |
| **Intel** | **Yes** | **Same comment as QC** | **Agree with QC. But could be used for urgent slices and hence beneficial to specify it.****Some mechanism will be needed to avoid broadcasting the slice info itself to reduce the size of SIB.** |
| **Nokia** | **Yes** | It makes total slice isolation is feasible at RAN level, but only very limited number of slice or slice group specific resources is feasible to minimize overhead and RACH resource fragmentation. | **Medium** in general**Low,** if existing Access Stratum knowledge on slices (Access Categories) is reused |
| CMCC | Yes | It addresses both intention 1 and 2, which are quite essential for operators to explore the vertical markets. | The complexity is low.We don’t think fragmentation is a problem, network can balance the trade-off between RACH resource fragmentation and the requirement of slice resource isolation which come from vertical customers. |
| **Xiaomi** | **Yes** | **Pros：** * **meet intention1 and 2**
* **provide totally resource isolation between slices, especially is beneficial for critical service while solution2 can not.**

**Cons: may lead to RACH resource fragmentation but we think it can be managed via network.** | **It may requires neccessary spec changes to provide guaranteed RACH resources for slices.** |
| **Fujitsu** | **Yes** | **RA resource separation is totally up to NW configuration.** | **Low complexity.** |
| **Apple** | **Yes** | **It provides isolation on RACH resources for different slices, which is promising for some services requiring extreme low latency.** | **Low complexity** |
| ZTE | Yes | Both intention 1 and 2.Solution 1 is quite useful to reflect the resource isolation among slices in Uu interface. | The spec impact would be low if the RACH resources are associated with slices implicitly via the access categories, which is helpful in reducing the payload size as well as addressing the security concern of exposing the NSSAI/S-NSSAI (or parts of it) for some security/privacy sensitive slices. |
| SoftBank | Yes | Solution 1 can meet Intention 1 and 2. | Low complexity |
| **KDDI** | **Yes** | **Agree with QC comment** | **We have to discuss maximum numbers of isolated RACH resources, since having too much isolated resources would cause some drawbacks, less efficiency, need to use more resources for RACH rather than other uplink channels.**  |
| **Samsung** | **See comments** | **Differentiation of RACH handling is available since designated RACH resource can be used only for certain slice(s).** | **Resource wastage if there is no access for designated slice in cell(s)** |
| Ericsson | Yes/No | Addresses both intention 1 and 2. | Not complex to introduce, but usefulness and need can be questioned (concern on fragmentation).How to link the slice(s) to Slice-specific RACH resources need discussion, might need SIB solution. |
| LGE | No | RACH resource fragmentation wouldn’t be preferred because it RACH isolation, e.g., in time domain, may have negative impact on latency. There is also a risk to increase collision within the slice. | From UE perspective, the complexity is not expected to be high. From network perspective, it may not be easy to configure a proper RACH resource unless the population within the slice is estimated/predicted accurately. |
| Futurewei | Yes | It can address both intentions. It can be a tool at the disposal of network, which would balance the slice access need and the RACH resource efficiency.  | Low. |
| **Spreadtrum** | **Yes** | **It could reduce the RACH collision impact from other slice, and enables some urgent/special/customized slice service could be fast established.** | **Too many “customized slices” could result in RACH resource fragment.****UE needs to know the slice related RACH resources configured by NW, some spec changes is needed.** |
| **Turkcell** | **No** | **RACH resource can be fragmented** | **RACH resource can be fragmented** |
| **CATT** | **Yes** | **It address the intention 1 and 2** |  |

#### Summary for solution 1

19 companies commented on solution 1. If the view is supported by more than 10 companies, we can consider it as majority view and capture into the TR.

Preferred or not?

Yes: 15 companies (including 8 companies thought solution 1 meet both Intention 1&2)

No: 2 companies

N/A: 3 companies

3 companies commented solution 1 should be lower priority than solution 2.

Therefore, majority companies supported solution 1.

Complexity

7 companies thought the complexity is low.

4 companies concern about the RACH resource fragment.

**Proposal 5: For Solution 1 (i.e. Slice-specific separate RACH resources pool can be configured per slice or per slice group)**

* **solution 1 can meet both intention 1 and intention 2**
* **the complexity is low.**
* **recommended for normative work.**

#### Comments for solution 2

**Solution 2: Slice-specific RACH parameters prioritization can be configured per slice or per slice group.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred (Yes/No)** | **Benefits** | **Complexity** |
| **Qualcomm** | **Yes** | **It can provide benefit to reduce RACH collision/delay for some slices with higher latency requirement** | * **It is simple and has minor impact on UE behavior and spec,**
* **RAN2 has specified RACH prioritization for MPS and MCS in NR Rel-16 TEI, which can be easily extended to slice (group) based RACH parameter prioritization**
 |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **Yes** | **Solution 2 can meet Intention 2.**  | **The impacts are minor.****The UE gets Intended Slice info at its AS layer, and the UE also gets slice-specific RACH parameters prioritization, and then the UE will select relevant parameters for the RACH procedure.** |
| **OPPO** | **Yes** | **It is suitable to the case of different slices with different priority/latency requirements.** | **To solve the collision between RA parameters prioritization for access identity and RA parameters prioritization for specific slice(s).** |
| Vodafone |  | This does not seem to relate to user plane latency, but to Idle/inactive mode to connected mode transition time. | Configuring this in the UE may be complex unless related to simple broadcast (e.g. Slice Type) information. |
| **Intel** | **Yes** | **Agree with QC comments** | **Complexity is minimal as such mechanism is already possible for HO and beam recovery in Rel-15 and is extended to MPS and MCS in Rel-16.** **Some mechanism will be needed to avoid broadcasting the slice info itself to reduce the size of SIB.** |
| **Nokia** | **Yes** | It enables prioritization of access to slices, but only very limited number of slice or slice group specific parameters is feasible to limit the overhead | Medium (general)Low, if existing Access Stratum knowledge on slices (Access Categories) is reused |
| CMCC | Yes | It addresses the intention 2. | The complexity is low. |
| **Xiaomi** | **Yes** | **This solution only meets the intention 2 and can not provide resource isolation because all slices still share the common RACH resource. Once congestion happened, all slices can be affected and UE can not access network.** **Considering limited RACH resource, slice-specific RACH resource may be assigned to a group of slices. In this case, solution2 can be applied for different slices sharing the same resource per UE to prioritize the slice.** | **It can be easier extended based on current spec to prioritize slices and has minor impacts on spec.** |
| **Fujitsu** | **Yes** | **RA resource prioritization is totally up to NW configuration.** | **Low complexity** |
| **Apple** | **Yes** | **It provides an approach to guarantee lower latency to some prioritized services.** | **Low complexity. 3GPP already supports this for MCS/MPS services.** |
| ZTE | Yes | It addresses the intention 2. | The spec impact would be low if the RACH prioritization are associated with slices implicitly via the access categories, which is helpful in reducing the payload size as well as addressing the security concern of exposing the NSSAI/S-NSSAI (or parts of it) for some security/privacy sensitive slices. |
| SoftBank | Yes | This solution can meet Intention 2.  | Low complexity |
| **KDDI** | **Yes** | **Agree with QC comment** | **The solution works for the emergency purpose like MPS and MCS. We are wondering whether we can use this solution for consumer services. For the consumer services, solution 1 seems to be enough. We may want to identify the use case for this solution first.** |
| **Samsung** | **Yes** | **Differentiation of RACH handling for certain slice(s)** | **Simply available with existing RACH resource (RACH-ConfigCommon)** |
| Ericsson | Yes/No | Addresses the intention 2. | Not complex to introduce, but usefulness and need can be questioned. |
| LGE | Yes | Intention 2 can be addressed by slice-specific RACH parameters prioritization. | RACH prioritization by RA event is already supported in NR, which can be used as a baseline. |
| Futurewei | Yes | It can address the intention 2 to prioritize the access of network slice of high priority and/or low latency  | Low. |
| **Spreadtrum** | **Yes** | **It could meet Intention 2.** | **Low complexity** |
| **Turkcell** | **Yes** | **It addresses Intention 2** | **Low complexity** |
| **CATT** | **Yes** | **It addresses Intention 2** | **low** |

#### Summary for solution 2

19 companies shared comments for solution 2. If the view is supported by more than 10 companies, we can consider it as majority view and capture into the TR.

Preferred or not?

Yes: 18 companies (including 11 companies thought that solution 2 can meet Intention 2)

N/A: 2 companies

Complexity

Low complexity: 16 companies

**Proposal 6: For Solution 2 (Slice-specific RACH parameters prioritization can be configured per slice or per slice group)**

* **solution 2 can meet intention 2.**
* **the complexity is low.**
* **recommended for normative work.**

## 4 Conclusion

Here are the summarized proposals for this email discussion.

**Proposal 1: Solution 1 (i.e. Legacy dedicated priority via RRCRelease message) cannot address issue 2&3, and has no specification impact.**

**Proposal 2.1: Capture into the TP “Solution 2 is legacy solution. With solution 2, the UE is still unaware of the slices supported in different cell or frequencies and the HO, CA, DC and redirection can be used to compensate for such loss with increased signalling overhead and latency. HO, CA, DC, redirection are applicable only for connected mode UE.”**

**Proposal 2.2: There is no complexity to support solution 2.**

**Proposal 3.1: Capture into the TR “Solution 3 can address issue 1/2/4”**

**Proposal 3.2: There is benefit to broadcast slice related cell selection info in SIB and it is recommended for normative work.**

**Proposal 3.3: The concerns on SIB payload size for broadcasting slice related cell selection info can be resolved (e.g. providing only SST, on-demand SIB, SIB segmentation, slice grouping or slice associated UAC information).**

**Proposal 4.1: Capture in the TR that “solution 4 can address the issue 1/2/3/4”.**

**Proposal 4.2: There is benefit to broadcast slice related cell reselection info in SIB and it is recommended for normative work. FFS whether to contain slice related cell reselection info in RRCRelease message.**

**Proposal 4.3: The concerns on SIB payload size for broadcasting slice related cell reselection info can be resolved (e.g. providing only SST, on-demand SIB, SIB segmentation, slice grouping or slice associated UAC information).**

**Proposal 5: For Solution 1 (i.e. Slice-specific separate RACH resources pool can be configured per slice or per slice group)**

* **solution 1 can meet both intention 1 and intention 2**
* **the complexity is low.**
* **recommended for normative work.**

**Proposal 6: For Solution 2 (Slice-specific RACH parameters prioritization can be configured per slice or per slice group)**

* **solution 2 can meet intention 2.**
* **the complexity is low.**
* **recommended for normative work.**
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