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# Introduction

This contribution provides a summary of the following email discussion:

* [Post114-e][076][ePowSav] Paging SubGrouping (CATT)

Scope: Based on the agreements in R2-114-e, make further progress on CN based subgrouping: Identify the impacted signalling incl the new information that need to be exchanged. Identify which different configurations that could/should be supported. Can also take into account non-treated parts of [AT114-e][024] that are applicable to CN based sub-grouping. Identify Open issues, Find agreeable proposals.

Intended outcome: Report,

Deadline: Long

Deadline for companies’ inputs: 08-04-2021 12:00 UTC

# Contact information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Name and email address |
| CATT | Pierre Bertrand; pierrebertrand@catt.cn |
| Samsung | Anil Agiwal, anilag@samsung.com |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Discussion

## RAN2 made the following agreements on Paging subgrouping in RAN2#113bis-e [1]:

|  |
| --- |
| * We adopt Network controlled subgrouping (based on individual UE characteristics, not specified or limited to paging prob as EUTRA, possibly with additional randomization) * 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). |

And as a follow-up of the offline #024 [3], the following additional agreements were achieved in RAN2#114-e [2]:

|  |
| --- |
| The following is supported:   * CN is responsible for allocating UEs to UE paging subgroups based on UE characteristics * Use same UE subgroups when in RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_INACTIVE |

## And RAN2 informed RAN3, SA2 and CT1 about above decisions in an LS [4].

## Signaling needs in support of CN-assigned Paging subgroup

As a minimum, CN needs to inform the UE and gNBs about the assigned UE subgroup. The possible signaling steps are illustrated in Figure 1.

****

**Figure 1: Possible signalling steps in support of CN-assigned UE Paging subgroup**

We discuss each of these steps in the following sub-sections.

### Signaling from CN to UE

In the question Q2.1 of offline #024 [3], several companies considered that CN should inform the UE about its assigned subgroup during the NAS registration procedure. After the agreement that CN decides the UE subgroup, there seems no other node option but AMF to signal it to the UE. On the other hand, an LS was sent to SA2/CT1 about RAN2 decisions and so the NAS procedure and signaling design should be discussed in SA2/CT1. Therefore, from RAN2 perspective, we can stick to expressing our need as follows:

**Proposal: When AMF assigns a UE with a Paging subgroup, some NAS signaling should be introduced between AMF and UE to inform the UE about its Paging subgroup. The design and procedure are up to SA2/CT1.**

**Q1: Do you agree with the above proposal and if not, please provide your suggested change(s)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | Yes | NAS signaling is used to inform UE about its Paging subgroup |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary:**

### Signaling between network nodes for RRC\_IDLE UEs

In the question Q2.4 of offline #024 [3], several companies proposed that, for Idle UEs, the assigned subgroup is included in the PAGING message to the gNB. On the other hand, which message is used, and the associated design is in RAN3 scope. Therefore, similar to Q1, we suggest limiting RAN2’s discussion to express RAN2 needs as follows:

**Proposal: When AMF assigns a UE with a Paging subgroup, some signaling should be introduced between AMF and gNB(s) to inform gNB(s) about the subgroup where to page a UE in RRC\_IDLE. The message and associated design are up to RAN3.**

**Q2: Do you agree with the above proposal and if not, please provide your suggested change(s)?**

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

**Summary:**

### Signaling between network nodes for RRC\_INACTIVE UEs

In the question Q2.4 of offline #024 [3] most companies suggest that for a UE in RRC\_INACTIVE, the assigned subgrouping is stored in the anchor gNB as part of the UE context (e.g. it is provided in CN assistance information for RRC\_INACTIVE IE). This may require another signaling between AMF and gNB(s) specifically for UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE. But, same as above, which message is used, and the associated design is in RAN3 scope. Therefore, similar to Q1/Q2, we suggest limiting RAN2’s discussion to express RAN2 needs as follows:

**Proposal: When AMF assigns a UE with a Paging subgroup, some signaling should be introduced between AMF and gNB(s) to inform gNB(s) about the subgroup where to page a UE in RRC\_INACTIVE. The message and associated design are up to RAN3.**

**Q3: Do you agree with the above proposal and if not, please provide your suggested change(s)?**

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

**Summary:**

In the question Q2.4 of offline #024 [3] most companies support that 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. Same as above, since the selected message and associated design are in RAN3 scope, we suggest limiting RAN2’s discussion to express RAN2 needs as follows:

**Proposal: When a UE in RRC\_INACTIVE has been assigned by CN a Paging subgroup, some signaling should be introduced between gNBs to inform each other about the UE’s subgroup for RAN paging. The message and associated design are up to RAN3.**

**Q4: Do you agree with the above proposal and if not, please provide your suggested change(s)?**

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

**Summary:**

## Assistance information for CN in support of Paging subgroup assignment

### Assistance information from UE

The need for UE providing some assistance information to CN was discussed in Q2.3 of offline #024 [3], resulting in split views among companies. A group of companies believe that CN can decide the subgrouping based on subscription information only, while supporting companies mention attributes may include UE’s paging probability (similar to those in NB-IoT), mobility profile (e.g. stationary vs mobile) and power profile (e.g. plugged in or on battery). After the agreement that CN decides the subgroup, we can give another try, proceeding step by step:

**Q4: Do you support UE providing some assistance information to CN in support of Paging subgroup assignment?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | - | In our view, assistance information is not essential. Paging probability can be estimated by network itself. Power profile (plugged in or on battery), is not a fixed characteristic for a UE and can dynamically change while the UE is not in RRC\_CONNECTED. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Considering the most popular attributes mentioned so far, we suggest discussing further the following options:

1. Paging probability

2. Mobility profile

3. Power Profile

4. Other

**Q5: If some assistance information from UE to CN in support of Paging subgroup assignment would be supported, which attribute would be the most relevant (companies can select multiple)?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Summary:**

### Assistance information from gNB

The need for RAN providing some assistance information to CN was partly addressed in Q2.4 of offline #024 [3], where most companies think there is no such need. However some companies think it is FFS, could depend on the attributes used for the subgrouping decision, and could be needed at least for letting CN know about the UE capability. We therefore try to progress the issue in the below question.

**Q6: Do you support gNB(s) providing some assistance information to CN in support of Paging subgroup assignment? If “Yes”, please indicated which information would be needed from RAN2 perspective.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
|  |  | If UE type (redcap) is considered for UE sub grouping, capability indication may be needed. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary:**

## UE-ID subgrouping

### Co-existence of UE-ID based and CN-assigned subgroups in the same cell

This issue (discussed in [7]) was raised in the offline #024 [3] as part of the “other issues” to be further discussed in RAN2. Considering the RAN2#113bis-e [1]agreement that “*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)*”, the point made is that it should be clarified that there can be a mix of UEs in a cell using NW-assigned subgroup and UEID-based subgroup. That is, it should not be mandated to the NW that if it assigns *some* UEs with NW-assigned subgroups, it shall assign *all* UEs with NW-assigned subgroup.

Note this question does necessarily assume the UE subgroup is *either* assigned directly by network *or* calculated based on UE-ID and, for example, does not rule out solutions considering a mix of both as e.g. in LTE GWUS [5][6].

**Q6: Do you agree there can be a mix of UEs in a cell using NW-assigned subgroup and UEID-based subgroup?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
|  | No | In our view, Cell may support either NW assigned subgroup or UE ID based sub group  If cell supports NW assigned subgroup:   * If UE is assigned paging subgroup by NW, it monitors paging based on the paging subgroup. Otherwise, not.   Else if cell supports UE ID based subgroup:   * it monitors paging based on the UE ID based paging subgroup. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary:**

### Subgroup determination

In the context of the discussion about “RAN-assigned UE subgroup” in the offline #024 [3], several companies discussed the UEID-based subgroup method where the only information UE needs, in addition to the already available information for legacy UEID-based grouping in Paging Opportunities (POs), is the total number Nsg of supported subgroups by the network [7]-[9]. We suggest clarifying this assumption.

**Q7: Do you agree that UEID-based subgroup method only requires, in addition to the already available information for legacy UEID-based grouping in PO, the total number Nsg of supported subgroups by the network?**

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

**Summary:**

### Who decides the number of subgroups Nsg?

In the context of the discussion about “RAN-assigned UE subgroup” in the offline #024 [3], several companies discussed the UEID-based subgroup method suggesting the total number Nsg of supported subgroups is decided by RAN and broadcasted in System Information, similar to the legacy UEID-based grouping in Paging Opportunities. This is also proposed in [7]-[10].

**Q8: Do you agree that the total number, Nsg, of supported subgroups by the network is decided by RAN and broadcasted in System Information?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | Yes | For UE ID based subgroups |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary:**

### Homogeneous/heterogeneous number of subgroups Nsg across cells?

Considering the main trend is that UEID-based subgrouping inherits from the principles of legacy UEID-based grouping, it seems logical that, similarly, the number Nsg of subgroups is controlled on a cell basis and can be different in different cells [7]-[10].

**Q9: Do you agree that the total number, Nsg, of supported subgroups is controlled on a cell basis and can be different in different cells?**

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

**Summary:**

## False paging alarm due to mobility and PEI

This issue (discussed in [11]) was raised in the offline #024 [3] as part of the “other issues” to be further discussed in RAN2.

In LTE the UE only monitors the WUS in the last used cell, i.e. the cell where the UE was released from connected mode the last time. This means that the NW only transmits the WUS when the UE is paged on the last used cell e.g. during the first paging attempt from the CN. It is proposed to extend this to the NR PEI, to avoid similar useless PEI transmission during paging escalation, e.g. when the NW cannot find the UE and pages the UE in all the cells of the Tracking Area List (TAI List), while the UE only replies in a single cell.

From Rapporteur’s perspective, this issue is out of the scope of this email discussion as it is unrelated to Paging subgrouping. Therefore Rapporteur suggests discussing this issue separately from this email discussion.

## Other issues

Companies are invited to spot other issues within the scope of this email discussion that we would have missed.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
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