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1 Overall description

RAN2 thanks SA2 and RAN3 for their LSs on 5MBS progress and issues to address. Regarding the exact questions that SA2 and RAN3 asked RAN2 to feedback on, RAN2 would like to provide the following answers:

In S2-2102077, SA2 asks:

|  |
| --- |
| *SA2 requests RAN2 for confirmation whether NG-RAN node can notify session activation to UEs based on MBS session ID. SA2 normative work on this aspect will be pending RAN2 conclusion.* |

And in R3-211296, RAN3 asks:

|  |
| --- |
| RAN3 would like to ask RAN2 and SA2 to consider how to page the UEs which are not in RRC\_CONNECTED state, whether a group notification towards NG-RAN supporting MBS and, if applicable, to NG-RAN nodes not supporting MBS is needed/feasible/beneficial comparing to the legacy paging methods. |

**RAN2 response:**

RAN2 agreed to support group notification for multicast for MBS supporting nodes and that using MBS session ID for this purpose is feasible. RAN2 also agreed that the same group notification identity will be used for UEs in both RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_INACTIVE states.

In S2-2102077, SA2 asks:

|  |
| --- |
| *SA2 asks RAN2/RAN3 for feedback on whether UEs camping on non-supporting NG-RAN nodes can be notified using MBS session ID or the 5GC is required to fallback to regular paging for UEs that have not connected during MBS session activation.* |

**RAN2 response:**

RAN2 concluded that for gNBs not supporting MBS, group notification using MBS session ID is not feasible as it would have an impact on such nodes. Notification using regular unicast paging is feasible in this scenario. Some companies are concerned about scalability issue when using legacy unicast paging if a large number of MBS users are served by non-supporting NG-RAN node (e.g. comparable to the number of users receiving an MBS service under MBS supporting node). However, majority of companies believes such scenario should be prevented by configuring/deploying the nodes to be MBS supporting node whenever there is sufficient demand. If a node covering large number of MBS UEs is configured/deployed as MBS non-supporting node, then radio resources capacity can be exceeded not only for paging channel, but also for data channels.

RAN2 would also like to inform RAN3 and SA2 that RAN2 decided to prioritize multicast support in RRC\_CONNECTED mode in Rel-17. If time permits, multicast support for RRC\_INACTIVE can be considered later, once connected mode multicast solution and broadcast solution become more mature. RAN2 will not discuss multicast reception in RRC\_IDLE in Rel-17.

2 Actions

**To SA2, RAN3 group:**

**ACTION:**

RAN2 respectfully asks SA2 and RAN3 to take the above feedback into account.

3 Dates of next RAN2 meetings

TSG-RAN2 Meeting #114-e May 19 – May 27, 2021 E-Meeting