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# **Introduction**

RAN2 has initiated the following long email discussion.

* [Post114-e][251][Slicing] Solution direction details for slice priorities in cell reselection (Lenovo)

      Scope: Discuss technical details for solution directions identified as part of [AT114-e][250] and identify their pros and cons. Can ask questions on how the solutions work, can discuss combined solutions etc.

      Intended outcome: Discussion report (may include also draft CRs if there is enough convergence)

      Deadline:  Long

Following are the agreements from the RAN2#114e:

|  |
| --- |
| * 1: Frequency priority mapping for each slice (slice -> frequency(ies) -> absolute priority of each of the frequency) is provided to a UE.   Note: Signaling optimizations are not excluded.  Note: "slice may also mean "slice group"   * 1b: Frequency priority mapping for each of the slice (slice -> frequency(ies) -> absolute priority of each of the frequency) is part of the “slice info” agreed to be provided to the UE using both broadcast and dedicated signaling. * 2: RAN2 kindly allow one more meeting cycle for understanding the necessity of Slice priority along with the following shortlisted solution directions for Idle mode mobility:   a) Option 4): Slice priority first looping over slice-frequency combination  b) Option 5): Maximize slice support  c) Option 6): Frequency priority of highest priority slice with adjustment based on actually supported slice(s) in best ranked cell, without multiple iterations of cell reselection  d) Option 7): Perform legacy cell reselection mechanism based on slice specific frequency priority   * 3: RAN2 consider a scenario in its work for slice specific cell (re)selection where it is possible that (Suitable) cells on the same frequency belonging to different TAs support different Slice(s). * 4: Working assumption: The Best cell principle according to absolute priority reselection criteria specified in clause 5.2.4.5 of TS38.304 needs to be met also for slice specific cell (re)selection. * 6: In addition to proposal 2, following aspects are FFS:   a) Content of “Slice Info” – to what extent the information needs to be and should be provided to support the Principle in proposal 5  b) If used, who provides the “Slice priority” (NAS/ AS, UE/ Network)  c) Can RAN2 continue to use “intended” slice for initial registration and idle-mode mobility  d) How UE in each of the solutions from proposal 2 uses slice info for cell reselection if both slice info and existing cell reselection priority is signaled (in the SIB and/ or dedicated signaling) |

This email discussion will be carried in 3 phases; currently we are in the second phase:

Phase 1: Development of Solution directions to one well defined solution

Phase 2: Comparison among solutions out of Phase 1 and selecting the most reasonable one

Phase 3: Coming up with an acceptable draft CR for the selected solution if time and situation permits – depending on the outcome of Phase 2.

# **Solution Options**

# **Option 4**

## How does it work?

The UE Idle mode behavior for slice priorities can be described in following sequence of operation:

**Step 1**: List Slices in the priority order starting with highest priority slice.

**Step 2**: Select the first (or next if from Step 7) slice in the list

**Step 3**: Assign the priorities to frequencies according to the priorities provided to the selected slice

**Step 4**: Perform cell search according to the legacy procedure using the priorities assigned in step 3

**Step 5**: If the highest ranked cell is suitable (as defined in 38.304) and supports the selected slice in step 2 then camp on the cell and exit this sequence of operation; FFS: How the UE determines whether the highest ranked cell supports the selected slice.

**Step 6**: If there are remaining cell frequencies then go back to step 3

**Step 7**: **FFS:** If the end of the slice list has not been reached go back to step 2

**Step 8**: Perform legacy cell reselection (using non-slice-based priorities i.e. for frequencies not corresponding to any slice support)

## What is the content of “Slice Info” when provided using Broadcast and dedicated signaling?

In a tabular form the Slice Info looks like:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| SliceInfo-List | | |
| Slice Id-1/ Slice-Group Id-1 | Supported-on-Freq-x | Freq-x-priority |
| Supported-on-Freq-y | Freq-y-priority |
| Slice Id-2/ Slice-Group Id-2 | Supported-on-Freq-x | Freq-x-priority |
|  | Supported-on-Freq-z | Freq-z-priority |
| … | … | … |

## Who provides the “Slice priority” (NAS/ AS, UE/ Network)

AS receives the Slice Priority from NAS and how NAS receives it is left for SA2/ CT1 to solve.

## Can “intended” slice as defined in TR38.832 be used “as is” for in this Solution?

Yes. The content of “intended slice” i.e. which slice is signalled by NAS as part of “intended slice” is left to NAS. For mobility related reselections, the AS uses the “intended slice(s)” last received from NAS.

# **Option 5**

## How does it work?

In general, Option 5 can work for the case when the supported slice info include the supported slice for frequencies but not include the slice specific reselection priority.

When only the supported slice list for frequencies is provided as “slice info” to the UE, the Idle mode UE shall apply the following rules for slice based cell reselection.

**Step (1):** The UE will consider the frequency priority in cell reselection based on the number of supported slices among UE’s intended slices (i.e. allowed S-NSSAIs). That is, the frequency that supports the maximum number of slices among UE’s intended slices has the highest priority in cell reselection. The frequency that supports the second most slices among UE’s intended slices has the second highest priority in cell reselection, and so on.

**Step (2):** If more than one frequency supports the same number of slices among UE’s intended slices, the UE can treat them with equal priority, or further consider the existing absolute cell reselection frequency priority if provided.

**Step (3):** The UE performs the legacy cell reselection (specified in TS 38.304) following the priority assigned based on the above rules.

When additional “slice info” such as slice specific frequency priority or slice priority is provided, how to use them to determine the slice based cell reselection frequency priority is FFS, e.g. use them before step (1), in step (1) or in step (2).

## What is the content of “Slice Info” when provided using Broadcast and dedicated signaling?

For Option 5, the content of “Slice Info” shall include the supported slice list for frequencies.

In a tabular form the Slice Info looks like:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Slice info | |
| For the serving frequency | |
|  | Slice id-1/Slice Group Id-1 |
| Slice id-2/Slice Group Id-2 |
| .... |
| For inter-frequency | |
| Frequency 1 | Slice id-1/Slice Group Id-1 |
| Slice id-2/Slice Group Id-2 |
| ... |
| Frequency 2 | Slice id-1/Slice Group Id-1 |
| Slice id-2/Slice Group Id-2 |
| ... |
| ... | |

Other “Slice Info”, such as slice specific frequency priority (per slice per frequency), or slice priorities of UE’s intended slices are needed or not is FFS.

## Who provides the “Slice priority” (NAS/ AS, UE/ Network)

For Option5, whether Slice priority is used or not may need further discussion.

## Can “intended” slice as defined in TR38.832 be used “as is” for in this Solution?

Yes. For Option 5, UE’s intended slices equal to the allowed S-NSSAIs.

# **Option 6**

## How does it work?

Option 6 can be regarded as one enhanced solution on top of Option 4 if slice availability info on neighbor cells are provided to UE. Compared with Option 4, it has below 2 differences:

1. Adjust frequency priority based on actually supported slice(s) in best ranked cell, to avoid wrongly setting a too high frequency priority corresponding to unsupported slice.
   * In Option 4, if highest ranked cell is suitable but doesn’t support the UE’s intended highest priority slice, the frequency is excluded.
2. There is no need for UE to perform multiple iterations of cell reselection (i.e. remove Option 4’s Step 7 which is labelled as FFS)

Please note that when slice availability info on neighbour cells are absent, Option 6 fallbacks to Option 4 (removing slice iteration in Step 7). The detailed procedure is illustrated in Section 2.3.1.1 and an example can be found in Section 2.3.1.2.

In addition, Option 6 is not exclusive-mutual with other Options. It can work with Option 4 and Option 5 together. Its relationship with Option 4 and Option 5 is provided in Section 2.3.1.3.

*2.3.1.1 Procedure step*

Based on companies’ input, the “slice info” are:

* **From SIB/RRC release**: A list of {Slice group ID, list of [frequency, frequency priority value (Optional), slice availability (Optional)]}
  + “slice availability” is a list of neighbor cell PCI(s) which support the slice group.
  + An example is illustrated in Table 2.3.1

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SliceInfo-List | | | |
| Slice-Group Id-1 | Supported-on-Freq-x | Freq-x-priority (Optional) | PCI 1, PCI2, ... (Optional) |
| Supported-on-Freq-y | Freq-y-priority (Optional) | PCI 3, PCI4, ... (Optional) |
| Slice-Group Id-2 | Supported-on-Freq-x | Freq-x-priority (Optional) | PCI 5, PCI6, ... (Optional) |
|  | Supported-on-Freq-z | Freq-z-priority (Optional) | PCI 7, PCI8, ... (Optional) |
| … | … | … |  |

**Table.2.3.1: An example of “slice info” in SIB/RRC release**

* **From NAS**: Slice priority
  + Whether to introduce NAS signaling is left for SA2/ CT1 to solve. If SA2/CT1 don’t agree to introduce new NAS signaling, it is up to UE implementation.

Option 6 works when both per-slice frequency priority and slice availability are present in SIB/RRCRelease. The procedure step can be described in following sequence of operation **on top of option 4** with different steps highlighted (i.e. add Step 5-a/5-b, remove Step 7):

**Step 1**: List Slices in the priority order starting with highest priority slice.

**Step 2**: Select the first slice in the list

**Step 3**: Assign the priorities to frequencies according to the priorities provided to the selected slice

**Step 4**: Perform cell search according to the legacy procedure using the priorities assigned in step 3

**Step 5**: If the highest ranked cell is suitable (as defined in 38.304) and supports the selected slice in step 2 then camp on the cell and exit this sequence of operation.

**Step 5-a**: Else if the highest ranked cell is suitable (as defined in 38.304) but **doesn’t support** the selected slice in step 2, then the priority value of this frequency is changed to the priority value of the highest priority slice supported by both UE and the highest ranked cell (i.e. intersection slice set). Then, go to Step 5-b

**Step 5-b**: With updated frequency priority, if legacy inter-frequency cell reselection criteria (as illustrated below) is met, camp on the cell and exit this sequence of operation.

* If priority of target frequency is **higher than** serving frequency, Srxlev > ThreshX, HighP during a time interval
* If priority of target frequency is **lower than** serving frequency, Srxlev < ThreshServing, LowP and Srxlev > ThreshX, LowP during a time interval

**Step 6**: If there are remaining cell frequencies then go back to step 3

**~~Step 7~~**~~:~~ **~~FFS:~~** ~~If the end of the slice list has not been reached go back to step 2~~

**Step 8**: Perform legacy cell reselection (using non-slice-based priorities i.e. for frequencies not corresponding to any slice support)

*2.3.1.2 Example*

One example is illustrated in Figure2.3.1.



**Figure.2.3.1 Example scenario**

Then, the UE performs below cell reselection procedure:

UE is provided below “slice info”:

* Cell 3’s SIB provides:
  + List 1: {eMBB, F1, priority 2, (Cell 1, Cell2}}
  + List 2: {eMBB, F2, priority 3, (Cell3)}
  + List 3: {URLLC, F1, priority 8, (Cell 1)}
  + List 4: {URLLC, F2, priority 7, (Cell 3)}
* UE’s slice priority: URLLC > eMBB (from NAS)
* Step 1: List slice in priority order: {URLLC, eMBB}
* Step 2: Select 1st slice (i.e. URLLC)
* Step 3: The UE derives frequency priority value of F1 is 8 and F2 is 7 (i.e. priority of F1 is taken from List 3 and priority of F2 is taken List 4)
* Step 4: Assuming priority of F1 is 8, the UE performs IDLE measurements for cell 1 and cell 2
* Step 5: Both Cell 1 and 2 are suitable. Cell 2 is best ranked cell due to it being close to UE (-82dBm>-92dBm).
* Step 5-a: Because only eMBB is supported in Cell 2, UE decreases priority value of F1 from 8 to 2 (value 2 is from List 1 for eMBB).
* Step 5-b: Because priority value of F1 (value 2) is lower than serving frequency F1 (value 7), the UE checks whether condition of reselection to Cell 2 is fulfilled, i.e. whether cell 3 fulfils Srxlev < ThreshServing, LowP and cell 2 fulfils Srxlev > ThreshX, LowP. The condition is not satisfied because RSRP of serving cell (cell 3) is larger than ThreshServing, LowP. Thus, the UE stay in Cell 3.
  + Please Note if without priority adjustment for F1 in Step 5-a, the UE will regard priority value of F1 is 8 (higher than serving frequency). Then, the UE just need to check whether Srxlev > ThreshX, HighP, the condition of reselection to Cell 2 is fulfilled. So, the UE will reselect to Cell 2 supporting only eMBB, which is not intended behavior.
* Step 6 and 8 are skipped because no remaining frequencies are left

*2.3.1.3 Relationship with Option4 and Option 5*

Option 6 is not exclusive-mutual with other Options:

* It can be regarded as one enhanced solution on top of Option 4 if slice availability info on neighbor cells are provided to UE (besides per-slice frequency priority required by Option 4).
* When slice availability info is absent but per-slice frequency priority is present, it fallbacks to Option 4 (removing slice iteration in Step 7).
* When per-slice frequency priority is absent, the UE performs Option 5 with the assumption that all slices are same priority.

It is illustrated in Table 2.3.2:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Slice availability of neighbor cell  Per-slice frequency priority | Absent | Present |
| Absent | Option 5 | Option 5 |
| Present | Option 4 removing slice iteration Step 7 | Option 6 (i.e. Option 4 + Step 5-a/5-b) |

**Table.2.3.2: Relationship of Option 6 with Option 4/5**

## What is the content of “Slice Info” when provided using Broadcast and dedicated signaling?

In a tabular form the Slice Info looks like:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SliceInfo-List | | | |
| Slice-Group Id-1 | Supported-on-Freq-x | Freq-x-priority (Optional) | PCI 1, PCI2, ... (Optional) |
| Supported-on-Freq-y | Freq-y-priority (Optional) | PCI 3, PCI4, ... (Optional) |
| Slice-Group Id-2 | Supported-on-Freq-x | Freq-x-priority (Optional) | PCI 5, PCI6, ... (Optional) |
|  | Supported-on-Freq-z | Freq-z-priority (Optional) | PCI 7, PCI8, ... (Optional) |
| … | … | … |  |

* Option 6 is applied when both per-slice frequency priority and Slice availability on neighbor cell are present.
* When slice availability info is absent but per-slice frequency priority is present, it fallbacks to Option 4 (removing slice iteration in Step 7).
* When per-slice frequency priority is absent, the UE performs Option 5 with the assumption that all slices are same priority.

## Who provides the “Slice priority” (NAS/ AS, UE/ Network)

UE’s AS receives the Slice Priority from NAS. Whether to introduce NAS signaling is left for SA2/ CT1 to solve. If SA2/CT1 don’t agree to introduce new NAS signaling for slice priority, it is up to UE implementation.

## Can “intended” slice as defined in TR38.832 be used “as is” for in this Solution?

Yes, “intended slice” is signaled by NAS. The signaling details can be discussed further (e.g. left to SA2/CT1 to decide).

# **Option 7**

## How does it work?

### 2.4.1.1 Example deployment scenario for discussion

While homogeneous deployments provide all the allowed slices in all of the cells of a TA, there may be other carriers in another TA in the same geographical region that might offer a slice in the UEs configured list that is not in the allowed slices (i.e. Allowed NSSAI). Take for example, the following Figure 1. Cells 1 offer slice 2 while cells A, B, 2 in the same geographical region does not offer slice 2. Such a deployment can be supported by using different TAs for the cell 1 and cell 2.



Figure 1: Example homogeneous deployments with different slice availability in different carriers of a geographical region

In our view, this example scenario covers all the scenarios (i.e. Geo-1 to 5) described in the Annex. Further, we think this is a valid scenario that corresponds to geographical area 1 and 2 of Figure 5.1.1-1 in TR38.832 when mapped to homogeneous deployments within a TA and should be supported.

### 2.4.1.2 High level description of the solution

Here we provide a high-level summary description of the solution. Details are provided in subsequent sections.

In existing priority based inter-frequency cell reselection, the frequency priority for each frequency is either based on the dedicated priority configuration that the UE receives during RRC release or the cell reselection priority for each frequency in the SIB4.

The key aspect of solution direction option 7 is that the same legacy cell reselection priority mechanism is used. Instead of the broadcast absolute frequency priority, the priority for a frequency is derived from the broadcast slice information and UEs configured slices.

The actual algorithm used for frequency priority determination is dependent on the main objective of slice based cell reselection. For homogeneous deployments, all the cells of a RA support the same slices. Hence prioritisation based on slice availability within an RA is not applicable and operators will have to ensure that all carriers offer the appropriate slices to maximise the available slices to a UE.

We assume that the objective then could be to prioritise a frequency that offers the higher priority slice for a UE among its configured slices. With homogeneous deployments, this frequency is likely to be outside its registration area if the slice was not available previously. Based on this, the algorithm we propose is where the frequency priority for each frequency for cell reselection is the highest frequency priority of the available slices in the frequency among the UE configured slices (i.e. Configured NSSAI).

The reason for doing this is that operator may have some preference on the frequency to use for a particular slice/slice group and hence provides the frequency priority of a frequency for the slice/slice group based on this preference.

A flow chart of procedure steps for Option 7 is shown below (details are provided in subsequent sections):



This option will move the UE to the frequency layer that is the highest priority for slices available among the configured slices in that geographical area based on operator configuration of the highest priority slice. For example, if the operator wants UE to select a carrier where URLCC is available, URLCC will be given higher frequency priority. UE that has URLCC in its configured list will reselect to that carrier whenever it is available in a region. This may involve a change in registration area. If so, UE will perform a TA update and the URLCC slice will be included in the allowed list.

### 2.4.1.3 Detailed description with examples

#### 2.4.1.3.1 Slice info in the SIB/RRC Release

The slice info in the SIB/RRC Release used by Solution direction Option#7 is as follows (same as agreed last meeting):

* 1b: Frequency priority mapping for each of the slice (slice -> frequency(ies) -> absolute priority of each of the frequency) is part of the “slice info” agreed to be provided to the UE using both broadcast and dedicated signaling.

That is, for each frequency where a slice is available, a corresponding frequency priority associated with the available slice is provided. Taking the example above, the SIB/RRC Release can provide the following:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Cell 2 and Cell B** | **Cell 1 and Cell A** |
| Slice 1, F1, frequency priority 3  Slice 1, F2, frequency priority 1  Slice 3, F1, frequency priority 5  Slice 3, F2, frequency priority 2  Slice 4, F1, frequency priority 2  Slice 4, F2, frequency priority 1 | Slice 1, F1, frequency priority 1  Slice 1, F2, frequency priority 3  Slice 2, F1, frequency priority 8  Slice 3, F2, frequency priority 2  Slice 4, F2, frequency priority 1 |

In the above example in the region of Cell 2 and Cell B, operator has preference for UE supporting Slice 3 to be in F1. In the region of Cell 1 and Cell A, operator has preference for UE supporting Slice 2 to be in F1.

The signalling structure for signalling the above can be further discussed in Stage-3. For example, the slices available and the corresponding frequency priority could be provided in SIB4 per inter-frequency neighbour.

#### 2.4.1.3.2 Selecting Frequency priority selection for a carrier frequency based on slice info and UE configured slices

Other than knowing the slice availability and its frequency priority in a carrier frequency, the frequency priority selection also needs to know the slices that UE desires.

In Figure 1, consider a UE that is configured with slice 1 and 2, will request both slices 1 and 2 when registering in cell B in TA1. It is provided with an allowed list of just slice 1 when it registered in TA1 as slice 2 is not available in TA1.

Consider that the UE then moves into cell A, where there is an overlapping cell 1 on frequency F1 in TA2 that offers slice 2. If slice 2 is higher priority than slice 1 (which is reflected in the frequency priority of Slice 2 in F1), UE should then prioritise frequency F1, reselect cell 1 and then perform registration in TA2 to be able to access slice 2. To be able to perform this slice based frequency prioritisation, UE has to consider all the configured slices (slices 1 and 2 in this example) when it does the frequency prioritisation.

In summary, the frequency priority for a carrier is chosen as follows:

For each carrier frequency:

1. identify the available slices in UEs configured slice list (i.e., the slices that are the intersection of the available slices in the slice info and the configured slices)
2. assign a frequency priority equal to the highest frequency priority amongst those identified slices

The above proposal is intended to provide a description of the basic framework. Special cases such as not perfectly overlapping cells can result in non-optimal selection in the cell borders. Whether to introduce additional solutions (e.g. providing cell specific slice info) on top of this basic framework and the additional complexity/benefit can be discussed separately.

#### 2.4.1.3.3 Slice based Cell reselection with solution direction option#7

The slice based cell reselection mechanism for solution direction option#7 reuses the legacy cell reselection mechanism – the main difference is in the determination of the frequency priority for each NR carrier frequency. The frequency priority for a carrier frequency is as provided in bullet 2 in section 2.1.3.2, which is derived first using the configured slice and the slice info in the SIB/RRC Release.

As with the legacy frequency prioritisation, it applies for both RRC IDLE and RRC INACTIVE state and we do not see a difference between RRC IDLE and RRC INACTIVE states. This also works seamlessly with the existing priority based inter-RAT cell reselection (the frequency priority for inter-RAT cells are the same as the legacy broadcast absolute priority).

#### 2.4.1.3.4 UE specific frequency prioritization

As with legacy, UE specific slice info can be provided over dedicated signalling in RRC Release message and will override the broadcast slice info as agreed by RAN2 below:

In the case that slice info is also provided to the UE in the RRC Release message while SIB also provides the slice info, UE follows the dedicated slice info from RRC Release while T320-like timer is running and only if it expires that it follows the slice info in the SIB

This allows the network to provide a UE specific frequency priority for each frequency of an available slice.

For example, a UE can be provided with a slice info that makes slice 1 in F1 as higher frequency priority, while another UE can be provided with a slice info with slice 1 in F2 has the higher frequency priority.

#### 2.4.1.3.5 Summary of specification changes for option #7

1. TS38.331: introduction of the slice info in SIB and RRC Release
2. TS38.304:
   1. Add a new subsection in §5.2.4 the carrier frequency priority determination for each NR frequency based on the slice info and the UE’s desired slices.
   2. The frequency priority determined in a) overrides the legacy broadcast frequency priority (no other changes to the cell reselection procedure)

#### 2.4.1.3.6 Examples based on Figure 1

To understand the option better, we have provided the following examples as illustration with reference to Figure 1:

Example 2\_1:

UE is in Cell A and has configured slices {Slice 1, 2 and 4}. Cell A broadcast the following slice specific cell reselection priority for F1, F2:

Slice 1, F1, cell reselection priority 1

Slice 1, F2, cell reselection priority 3

Slice 2, F1, cell reselection priority 8

Slice 3, F2, cell reselection priority 2

Slice 4, F2, cell reselection priority 1

Based on the configured slices of the UE, F1 = 8 (slice 1 and 2 are part of configured slices and the highest priority for F1 is 8 related to configured slice 2), F2 = 2 (since slice 1 and 4 are in F2 and slice 4 sets higher priority for F2 of 2),

Cell reselection priority for the UE = {F1=8, F2=2}.  This will steer the UE to F1.

The above setting is assuming Slice 2 is of highest slice priority to the network and this is reflected in the use of 8 for F1 where Slice 2 is available, Slice 3 and 4 are preferred in F2, Slice 1 is preferred in F1. This also allows the UE to cross TA boundary to get slice that it previous can’t access in TA1.

Example 2\_2:

Instead of in Cell A, in this example, UE is in Cell 1. Cell 1 can also broadcast the same setting as Cell A. UE moves to Cell A based on the priority based cell reselection parameters (for going from high priority frequency to lower priority frequency).  Logically, the cell reselection parameters will keep UE to higher priority F1 before UE is allowed to go to lower priority frequency

Example 2\_3:

In this example, UE’s configured slice is only Slice 1 and is in Cell A with the same broadcast setting as Example 1

Cell reselection priority for the UE is {F1=3, F2=1}.  This cell reselection will steer the UE to higher priority F1

Example 2\_4:

In this example, UE’s configured slice is Slice 1 and is in Cell 1 with the same broadcast setting as Example 1, it will stay in Cell1 which has highest frequency priority for Slice 1.

## What is the content of “Slice Info” when provided using Broadcast and dedicated signaling?

See Section 2.4.1.3.1

## Who provides the “Slice priority” (NAS/ AS, UE/ Network)

For solution direction Option#7, “slice priority” is not used as such in the frequency priority selection. The slice priority is considered when the network provides a frequency priority for a slice in the slice info. For example, if a slice has higher priority, it will be provided with a higher frequency priority.

If there is a need to provide different slice priority to different UEs, the network can provide UE specific slice info in the RRC Release to in the form of UE specific frequency priority for a slice (See Section 2.1.3.4).

## Can “intended” slice as defined in TR38.832 be used “as is” for in this Solution?

With homogeneous deployments, we think the definition in the TR cannot be directly applied for cell reselection. See Section 2.4.1.3.2 for more details on what is used instead.

# **Behaviours in different scenarios**



Q1: Best Cell (Cell 1) on a high priority frequency (F1) does not support the-most-desired Slice (Slice 2). Where should the UE camp (or reselect)? Only one of TA1 or TA2 is part of UE’s RA.

Option 4: The UE camps on Cell 1, based on the best cell principle.

Option 5: The best cell concept should be adhered to for intra-frequency cell reselection. What is in UE’s RA has no relevance to cell reselection. UE performs RA update if it crosses RA boundary.

Option 6: The UE camps on Cell 1, based on the best cell principle.

Option 7: The best cell concept should be adhered to for intra-frequency cell reselection. What is in UE’s RA has no relevance to cell reselection. UE performs RA update if it crosses RA boundary.



Q2: Best Cell (Cell 4) on a high priority frequency (F1) does not support UE’s only desired Slice (Slice 1). Where should the UE camp (or reselect)? Only TA1 is part of UE’s RA.

Option 4: UE behavior from option 4: On Cell 5 to be able to use Slice 1.

Option 5: It is not clear where the UE is currently in. If it is in Cell 3, the best cell concept should be adhered to for intra-frequency cell reselection. If the best cell is cell 4, then it implies to us that the UE has moved from cell3/5 to cell 4. In this particular figure (which is not entirely clear to us what it is trying to say), UE behaviour depends on the slice info in Cell 4. What is in UE’s RA has no relevance to cell reselection. UE performs RA update if it crosses RA boundary.

Option 6: Because best Cell in F1 (Cell 4) doesn’t support Slice 1, UE will decrease priority of F1 and thereby stay in Cell 5 to use Slice 1 (i.e. not reselection to F1 as inter-frequency cell reselection criteria is not met)

Option 7: It is not clear where the UE is currently in. If it is in Cell 3, the best cell concept should be adhered to for intra-frequency cell reselection. If the best cell is cell 4, then it implies to us that the UE has moved from cell3/5 to cell 4. In this particular figure (which is not entirely clear to us what it is trying to say), UE behaviour depends on the slice info in Cell 4. What is in UE’s RA has no relevance to cell reselection. UE performs RA update if it crosses RA boundary.



Q3: Only TA1 is part of UEs Registration area. All Slices (1, 2, 3 and 4) are part of UEs Slice list. From radio quality Cell 6 is the best cell on F1. Where should the UE camp (or reselect) if

1. Slice 1 is most desired
2. Slice 4 is most desired

Option 4: UE behavior from option 4: In both cases the UE selects cell 6, the best radio cell.

Option 5: In both cases, it is intra-frequency cell reselection, so UE shall camp on Cell 6 if Cell 6 is best cell.

Option 6: In both cases the UE selects cell 6, the best radio cell.

Option 7: From the best cell concept, the UE should be in Cell 6 regardless of the desired slice. What is in UE’s RA has no relevance to cell reselection. UE performs RA update if it crosses RA boundary.



Q4: F1 has the highest absolute frequency priority according to the *cellReselectionPriorities* provided to the UE but none of the UE desired slices prefer F1 (as configured in the Slice-Info) and cell 8 does not broadcast any Slice support indication. Slice 1 is the only desired slice for the UE and UE’s RA consist of:

1. Both TA1 and TA2 (assuming this is not violating “homogeneous principle in the UE’s RA since cell 11 - TA1 does not prohibit use of any particular slice)

Option 4: UE selects cell 9 on F2 since F1 does not explicitly support Slice 1.

Option 5: In all the 3 cases, UE shall camp on Cell 9, if cell 9 is a suitable cell on F2.

Option 6: As no slice availability info, Option 6 fallback to Option 4, i.e. UE selects cell 9 on F2 since F1 does not explicitly support Slice 1.

Option 7: We think it violates the homogeneous deployment principle that requires all the cells of an RA to support the same slices.

1. Only TA1

Option 4: Same behavior as above and UE needs to perform a RAU procedure.

Option 5: In all the 3 cases, UE shall camp on Cell 9, if cell 9 is a suitable cell on F2.

Option 6: As no slice availability info, Option 6 fallback to Option 4, i.e. same behavior as above and UE needs to perform a RAU procedure.

Option 7: No difference for b) and c), cell 8 has no slice info (it is not clear to us why this is so) and hence this feature does not apply. What is in UE’s RA has no relevance to cell reselection. UE performs RA update if it crosses RA boundary.

1. Only TA2

Option 4: UE selects cell 9.

Option 5: In all the 3 cases, UE shall camp on Cell 9, if cell 9 is a suitable cell on F2.

Option 6: As no slice availability info, Option 6 fallback to Option 4, i.e. UE selects cell 9.

Option 7: No difference for b) and c), cell 8 has no slice info (it is not clear to us why this is so) and hence this feature does not apply. What is in UE’s RA has no relevance to cell reselection. UE performs RA update if it crosses RA boundary.



Q5: F1 has the highest absolute frequency priority according to the *cellReselectionPriorities* provided to the UE but none of the UE desired slices prefer F1 (as configured in the Slice-Info). Cell 10 supports only Slice 2 but Slice 1 is the only desired slice for the UE. UE’s RA consist of:

1. Only TA1

Option 4: UE camps on Cell 11 since Slice 1 can be used – UE will need to perform a RAU/ TAU.

Option 5: In both cases, UE will camp on Cell 11, if Cell 11 is a suitable cell on F2.

Option 6: Because best Cell in F1 (Cell 10) doesn’t support Slice 1, UE will decrease priority of F1 and thereby this results in priority of F2 becoming higher than F1. The UE finally camps on Cell 11 to use Slice 1. The UE will also need to perform a RAU/TAU as Cell 11 is in different TA.

Option 7: The question is not very clear to us. Is the *cellReselectionPriorities* referring to the legacy field? If this feature is deployed, the legacy priority is not used by the UE (supporting this feature) anymore. From Option#7, since the only desired slice is Slice 1, UE will stay in Cell 11 or move to Cell 11. What is in UE’s RA has no relevance to cell reselection. UE performs RA update if it crosses RA boundary.

1. Only TA2

Option 4: Same procedure as above but without a RAU/ TAU.

Option 5: In both cases, UE will camp on Cell 11, if Cell 11 is a suitable cell on F2.

Option 6: Because best Cell in F1 (Cell 10) doesn’t support Slice 1, UE will decrease priority of F1 and thereby it results in priority of F2 becoming higher than F1. The UE finally camps on Cell 11 to use Slice 1. But the UE will NOT need to perform a RAU/TAU as Cell 11 is in same TA.

Option 7: The question is not very clear to us. Is the *cellReselectionPriorities* referring to the legacy field? If this feature is deployed, the legacy priority is not used by the UE (supporting this feature) anymore. From Option#7, since the only desired slice is Slice 1, UE will stay in Cell 11 or move to Cell 11. What is in UE’s RA has no relevance to cell reselection. UE performs RA update if it crosses RA boundary.

# **Comparison of options**

**Q1: Is the solution proposed out of Phase 1 clear enough and covering relevant details?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Solution 4** | |
| Company Name | Comments |
| BT | The process can be simplified avoiding extra loops and unnecessary measurements. With current procedure, step 5 says “and supports the selected slice in step 2”. Therefore, with current description, the UE performs cells search (step 4) and after that, it checks if the slice is supported. If slice has priority over frequency, then slice needs to be checked first.  Once the UE is configured (FFS how it is configured) with the set “slice -> frequency(ies) -> absolute priority of each of the frequency”, the UE can create a list of frequencies in priority order where the slice priority is given by their order.  We propose the following sequence:   |  | | --- | | **Step 1**: List Slices in ~~the~~ priority order starting with highest priority slice. If none of the slices are supported by the UE, go to step 8.  **Step 2**: ~~Select~~ Order the UE supported slices based on their priority ~~the first (or next if from Step 7)~~ ~~slice in the list~~.  **Step 3**: Assign the priorities to all frequencies included in the slice set according to the priorities provided to the selected slices (step 2). Lowest duplicated priority slice – frequencies combo will be removed from the list.  **Step 4**: Perform cell search according to the legacy procedure using the priorities assigned in step 3 or step 6 if step 5 has been executed.  **Step 5**: If the highest ranked ~~cell~~ frequency is suitable (as defined in 38.304), ~~and supports the selected slice in step 2~~ then camp on the cell and exit this sequence of operation. FFS: How the UE determines whether the highest ranked cell supports the selected slice.  **Step 6**: If there are remaining ~~cell~~ frequencies, select the following highest ranked cell and ~~then~~ go back to step ~~3~~4. Other case, go to step 7.  **~~Step 7~~**~~:~~ **~~FFS:~~** ~~If the end of the slice list has not been reached go back to step 2~~  **Step ~~8~~**7: Perform legacy cell reselection (using non-slice-based priorities i.e. for frequencies not corresponding to any slice support) |   The following example shows how our proposal works:  Slice information:   * Slice\_URLLC ->[ freq\_A, freq\_B, freq\_C] -> [3, 2, 7] * Slice\_eMBB -> [freq\_A, freq\_B, freq\_C, freq\_D, freq\_E] -> [5, 5, 3, 7, 7]   In this example, it is assumed the order the slice info is transmitted defines the slice priority, thus no extra signalling is required. URLCC is sent before so it has priority over eMBB. The UE supports URLCC and eMBB.  In **step 1,** UE only considers its supported slices. The UE can fallback to legacy procedure if none of them is supported. In **step 2** the UE prioritize only the slices that it supports instead all the slices. **Step 3** creates the frequency list based on slice priority so it its input will be UE eMBB supported frequencies [freq\_A, freq\_B, freq\_C, freq\_D, freq\_E] and the output in the example will be [freq\_C, freq\_A, freq\_B, freq\_D, freq\_E].  In **step 5**, the UE will check first *freq\_C* as it has the highest frequency priority for the slice with highest priority. If it is not suitable, then it will check *freq\_A* and so on. The process will continue until the conditions are meet as defined in 38.304 or until there aren’t remaining frequencies to check in the list. The UE will fallback to legacy procedure if none of them meet the conditions.  If the UE only supports eMBB, after **step 3** it will have to check the frequencies in this specific order [freq\_D, freq\_E, freq\_A, freq\_B, freq\_C].  Len) This modified option-4 seems very similar to the original option 4 but it is not clear why certain slices will not be supported by the UE? With allowed slice list in mind, all the slices included in the allowed list should be supported by the UE since the CN knows the UE subscription and capability. |
| Lenovo, MotM | Yes, the solution is clear and covers the relevant details. The proposed solution was arrived after the result of discussions in Phase 1 with all interested companies. |
| Intel | Rather than discuss a full solution, we think we should discuss the different functionalities of the solution in terms of external visible behaviour to get a better understanding of the differences and benefits of each functionality of the solution.  The followings are some comments and further questions on the solution for our understanding:   * 1. Slice list to be considered by the UE   Our understanding for this solution is that the UE’s Slice list is left to SA2 and CT1 to decide. However, since the overall procedure is to be defined in RAN2, we think RAN2 should discuss and decide/understand which slices are included in the slice list to define the overall solution to achieve the aim of steering the UE to “optimum” frequency.  Our view is that it should be the configured NSSAI in order for the UE to reselect a carrier in a different RA and be able to access slices in a different RA. Just considering the allowed slices are not sufficient. This needs to be conveyed to CT1 and SA2 if the list is to be signalled by NAS. For example, as shown in the Figure 1 in Section 2.4.1.1, while UE is TA1, the allowed slice is only slice 1. In order for the UE to prioritise F1 and reselect cell 1 while UE is in Cell A, UE has to consider the set of configured slices (slice 2 and slice 1).  We think the configured NSSAI which we understood is already available in the UE NAS should be sufficient here. Is this slice list of this option different to the configured NSSAI? If so, what is the benefit to signal another list over NAS signalling? And how is this signalled list different to the configured NSSAI?  PB) Most proponents of option 4 are unanimous in their thinking to use “intended” slice definition as we have already in the TR. What becomes part of “intended” slice can be left to NAS. In that sense AS searches for something that NAS asks it to search (like PLMN IDs). It will be unconventional if AS would need to *understand* slices. If some configured slices are not part of the allowed slice list, some NAS based procedure/ behavior would be better to maintain layer separation of functionalities, possibly leading to change of registration area; AS should not trigger a mobility procedure based on the difference of configured and allowed slice list.   * 1. What slices are available in the UE’s location across the frequencies:   Our understanding of this option is that UE scans through the *m* frequencies available in that area *n* number of times, where *n* is the number of slices in the list (though this is marked FFS in the latest version of the option, we are assuming that the option does the additional *n* loops as we don’t know how it will work without this loops), the sequence of searching also be performed over the order of the slice in the slice list. During this scan, UE also has to read the SIB of the highest rank cell of each frequency to check if the slice is available on that carrier.  We note that this is kind of a modeling, and the end of this scan UE finds the highest priority carrier where the highest priority slice is available. We think this can more easily done without the scan by providing the slices available in the neighbouring frequencies in the SIB of the current cell (as in option 7).  Len) Very good question and it was clarified in the previous occasions that total number of scans will **not** be nr\_of\_slices \* nr\_of\_frequencies\_for\_each\_slice. The field deployment will be for ‘n’ frequencies that are available in a geo and in option 4 as well the UE will not have to measure more than ‘n’ frequencies. To clarify, if the frequency f1 was measured for slice-x, it need not be measured again for another slice-y since the measurement results remain valid for a period. Whether this is something for RAN4 to look at or if we leave it to UE implementation needs to be seen.  In this option, our understanding is that the Slice info only contains the slice specific frequency priority per frequency and does not include the slice supported in neighbouring frequencies. Without providing the slice availability of neighbour frequencies, the UE will have to read the SIB1 of the neighbour cell to get the information on which slices are available. This is not the current UE behaviour and incurs delay, additional UE power and disruption. In Phase 1, the response from the proponent is that this is already done for cell reservation/barring and also TAC, but this is part of the suitability check after the UE selects the cell.  Len) We agreed in the last meeting:   * “*RAN2 consider a scenario in its work for slice specific cell (re)selection where it is possible that (Suitable) cells on the same frequency belonging to different TAs support different Slice(s).*”   This means that unless the serving cell would list about the exact slice support for each of the neighbouring cells, there is no way to find out that EACH cell of frequency f1 indeed supports the slice-x. This is true for all solution options. Whether RAN2 is comfortable to have a huge “Slice-info” or would rather like to contain it to frequency only information will need to be decided at some point.  It is not clear to us why slice availability cannot be made available for neighbour frequencies in each cell (as in option 7) so UE does not have to read the SIB of another cell to obtain this information.  What is the benefit that the proponents see in scanning to read the SIB of cells on inter-frequency carriers instead of providing the inter-frequency slice availability information in the SIBs?  Len) As per our intention, the slice Info provided by the serving cell in the option 4 is comprising of slice(s) supported in neighboring frequencies. So, from the serving cell’s SIB the UE would know which frequencies and slices to expect in the geo.  We have some additional questions:  What (re)triggers this sequence of searching over the frequencies for a highest priority slice availability and how often is this done? For example, is it done when UE needs to reselect another cell in the current frequency or when the S-criteria is met, or something else?  Len) In the current thinking no new cell selection or reselection triggers are seen/ proposed. All legacy criteria for the same remain 100% the same.   * 1. Determining the slices to consider for prioritisation   This option will check through all the slices in the list in priority order until one is found. In our understanding, this option is also then identifying the slices that are available in the region among the list of slices that is provided to the UE (same as option 7). Is this correct?  Len) Yes   * 1. Frequency priority determination   Step 3 mentions “Assign the priorities to frequencies according to the priorities provided to the selected slice”. This information is provided in the slice info table. Is this information broadcast in every cell? Can UE receive this information from the SIBs of the current cell without having to read the SIBs of cells on neighbouring carriers?  Len) Yes  This option also uses an explicit slice priority (rather than implicit in the frequency priority as in Option 7) and frequency priority for each slice. It does not seem essential to have the two step handling – of assigning a priority for a slice and a priority for the frequencies for each of the slices. Having only the priority for the frequencies for each of the slices also seems to achieve this (as in option 7) as we have shown (reference our response to BT).  On the other hand, we understand there is some benefit in having the two step approach – it allows better scalability than what the 8 priority levels that are available today allows.  What motivation/benefit does the proponents see of having a two step (slice specific priority in addition to frequency priority per slice) as in option 4 compared to a single frequency priority per slice as in option 7?  Len) Yes, option 4 has better degree of freedom for the operator compared with option 7 and otherwise both these options try to achieve the same thing. **The “explicitness” about a slice priority might have been one of the driving points for the RAN Slicing study/ work; otherwise, in the past RAN2 avoided RAN slicing by saying that we are implicitly catering to it by assigning UE specific frequency priorities in the RRCRelease**.   * 1. Interaction with legacy Cell reselection procedure   Will this cell reselection mechanism replace the current cell reselection procedures when slice info is broadcast in a cell? That is, how does this procedure and the legacy procedure interact?  And what is the interaction of this procedure with inter-RAT cell reselection?  Len) No, the solution option 4 does not intend to replace the legacy Cell reselection procedure – it just precedes it. As clarified above, the triggers of the legacy Cell reselection procedure remain.  What is the impact of this option on cell suitability? What is the interaction with barring for 300s when a slice is not found?  Len) The solution 4 tries to select a suitable cell that supports an intended slice. It does not change the suitability criteria itself. From a broader picture, if there are more than one suitable cells, this option tells which one of those should be (re)selected. Hopefully, all options do this in their own way – without changing the suitability definition.  Len) On “interaction with barring for 300s when a slice is not found” – legacy Cell reselection procedure is used if no slice support is found. So, nothing new about 300s barring.  How to prevent the continuous search for the highest priority slice?  Assuming the following Scenario, where UE’s only desired slice is Slice 1 with F1 being the highest frequency priority. As the Cell-1 does not offer slice 1, the UE cycles to F2. Since F1 is still the highest frequency priority for Slice 1, the UE will constantly try to move to F1 and continuously loop through F1 and F2?    Len) No, as said earlier, the triggers for legacy Cell reselection procedure remain same, the UE once camped on F2 will not trigger new cell (re)selection unless the legacy trigger comes into picture (for intra or inter frequency reselections).  Another related question is the FFS that was added after one scan of all frequencies with only the highest priority slice. If it is not cycled through the *n* slices (i.e. only take highest priority slice as the second loop is now marked FFS), it seems to take the legacy frequency priorities and perform the cell reselection after checking only for the highest priority slice. The objective of the WI may not be met in this case.  Len) Agree on your observation. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For option 4, for steps listed in section 2.1.1, we are open whether step 7 is kept or removed. During phase 1 discussion, some companies were concerned about extra delay due to this step so that the step was FFS.  For BT’s comments on “and supports the selected slice in step 2” regarding step 5, our comments are as below:  1. this behaviour is to ensure the selected cell can match the selected slice. If not, the UE will try another frequency  2. For the details, we think the UE can either get the slice info from the source cell or the selected cell, and details can be discussed later |
| Xiaomi | Yes, but we have some comments on step 8.  In the step 5, a frequency corresponding to a slice can be excluded as the highest ranked cell not supporting the selected slice in step 2 rather than not suitable cell(as defined in 38.304).  In this case, in step 8, when UE can not find a cell in slice based cell reselection and fallback to legacy cell reselection, the intention is to find a suitable cell (as defined in 38.304) with highest priority frequency and best radio condition, therefore, the excluded frequencies in slice based cell reselection procedure due to not supporting the selected slice should be reconsidered, i.e., all frequencies with priority provided in SIB or RRCRelease should be reconsidered not only the frequencies not corresponding to any slice support.  Thus, we prefer step 8 to be changed as following:  **Step 8**: Perform legacy cell reselection ~~(using non-slice-based priorities i.e. for frequencies not corresponding to any slice support)~~  [Response to BT’s comments]:  We think the intention of BT’s modification is to clarify the slice list in step 1 should be UE supported slice rather than supported slice list provided by gNB. But in our understanding, we think the original version is okay and can reflect this because the process in option 4 is to describe UE behaviour, the slice list in step 1 is the UE supported slices.  Len) Your suggestion is valid AND should be considered when finalizing the details.  [Response to Intel’s comments]:   1. For the “intended” slice list for cell reselection, we have agreed before as following, as slice info is maintain in UE NAS layer, we think the “intended”slice list should be left to SA2 and CT1 to decide and be provided from NAS to AS.   => RAN2 common understanding is that intended slice is based on the information AS receives from NAS for the particular use case.  => In case of cell selection/reselection, the intended slice means the allowed or requested S-NSSAI(s).  For the initial registration, and requesting new S-NSSAI(s): intended slices = Requested S-NSSAI(s)  For idle-mode mobility: intended slices = allowed S-NSSAI(s)  We think configured NSSAI is not suitable as UE may perform extra looping and measurements for cell reselection to find a slice included in configured NSSAI but not included in the UE most desired slice list (i.e. requested NSSAI or allowed NSSAI).   1. For the slice supported in neighbouring frequencies, we think in this option UE doesn’t need to read SIB1 of every cell to get that info, UE can get it from slice specific frequency priority per frequency provided by serving cell. E,g. the slice info{slice1 -> F1( frequency priority2) and F2 ( frequency priority3) and slice2-> F3( frequency priority4) and F2 ( frequency priority1) } is provided to UE, and UE can get aware of the F1 supporting slice1, F2 supporting slice1 and slice2 and F3 supporting slice2.   But we think every cell need to provide its available slices to UE for the final checking for the supporting on slice selected in step2. No need to provide available slices of every neighbouring cell to reduce payload size of SIB.   1. In our understanding, in this option, UE firstly perform cell reselection based on the selected slice specific frequency priority provided by serving cell and final check if the highest ranked cell can support selected slice in step 2 by reading SIB message of highest ranked cell. 2. The slice specific frequency priority is broadcast in the serving cell, and UE can get slice available of neighbouring frequency from this info. 3. For the interaction with legacy Cell reselection procedure, slice based cell reselection mechanism can not replace the current cell reselection procedures. As step 8 shows, if UE can not find a cell based on slice-specific frequency priority, it will fallback to the legacy cell reselection procedure.   For the barring for 300s when a slice is not found, we think legacy mechanism can be reused, a frequency can be barred for 300s if the highest ranked cell is not suitable cell or does not supporting **all** UE “intended” slices. |
| Nokia | There is an FFS in step 5: "FFS: How the UE determines whether the highest ranked cell supports the selected slice."  Our view is that the solution can work (and becomes less complex) without the checking if the cell supports the selected slices. We can only accept the checking if the cell supports the selected slices if it is based on legacy information advertised in SIB1, such as TAC.  Len) Since it is an FFS, we can finalize if TAC or an explicit indication will be used. But if a weak procedure fails to even attempt to secure camping on a higher priority slice, all the RAN2 efforts will go in vain. |
| ZTE | * For ***Step 5****: If the highest ranked cell is suitable (as defined in 38.304) and supports the selected slice in step 2 then camp on the cell and exit this sequence of operation; FFS: How the UE determines whether the highest ranked cell supports the selected slice*, we do not think the highlighted check is needed for option 4.   + As mentioned by Intel, UE has to read the system information to check whether the selected slice is supported or not and this happens usually after the cell is selected.   + And the UE behavior is not clear if the highest ranked cell does not support the selected slice. And we do not think we need to bar such cell or frequency for 300ms as the selected slice does not equal to the slice that UE will initiate access to, it is just a slice that UE may access.   + For a frequency with slice specific priority value provided, we understand that most cells in this frequency support such slice so there seems to be no need for UE to double check this.   Len) The responses for your questions are same as the ones towards Intel’s comments above. Hope those clarify/ help.   * For step 7, as mentioned in the phase 1 discussion, we understand the cell reselection according to the allowed S-NSSAI is a best effort enhancement as UE may initiate MO data on any slices in the allowed list, not exactly the slice associated with slice specific priority it has used during reselection. Thus, we understand it makes not much difference with the loop or without, considering the highest priority slice would be sufficient. This option 4 would be cleaner and simpler without this step 7.   Len) Since companies have different preferences on this (also as expressed in Phase 1), is it fine to resolve this FFS if and once RAN2 selects Option 4?   * On the content of slice info, we prefer the following structure, which is more consistent with the existing structure of the cell reselection information.   Len) The below structure will repeat slices across frequencies e.g. Slice id-1 appears three times in your example. Since length of slice Id (*S-NSSAI*) >> frequency (*maxNARFCN*), it is not signalling efficient.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Slice info | | | | For the serving frequency | | | |  | Slice id-1/Slice Group Id-1 | Slice specific Freq-x-priority (Optional) | | Slice id-2/Slice Group Id-2 | Slice specific Freq-x-priority (Optional) | | .... |  | | For inter-frequency | | | | Frequency 1 | Slice id-1/Slice Group Id-1 | Slice specific Freq-x-priority (Optional) | | Slice id-2/Slice Group Id-2 | Slice specific Freq-x-priority (Optional) | | ... | ... | | Frequency 2 | Slice id-1/Slice Group Id-1 | Slice specific Freq-x-priority (Optional) | | Slice id-2/Slice Group Id-2 | Slice specific Freq-x-priority (Optional) | | ... | ... | | ... | | | |
| Qualcomm | This solution is overall clear as it is. BT suggested changes confuse us. Because the current steps are already compromised outcome with multiple companies’ inputs in phase 1 discussion, we prefer to keep the current way.  We have 3 comments:   * The slice looping in step 7 is unacceptable to us. We have similar view as ZTE that slice specific cell reselection is just a best effort enhancement as UE may not have traffic of the slice associated with slice specific priority it has used during reselection. The looping in Step 7 will cause extra big latency of cell reselection, especially if number of UE intended slice is large. This is conflicted with the intention to introduce “quick” slice specific cell reselection. We believe if step 7 is kept, it will make slice specific cell reselection a paperwork.   Len) Since companies have different preferences on this (also as expressed in Phase 1), is it fine to resolve this FFS if and once RAN2 selects Option 4?   * On the FFS of Step 5, we prefer to keep it. We don’t agree with Intel and ZTE that the checking on slice support of target cell is performed after cell reselection. Our understanding is that UE can read source cell’s SIB to get slice availability info of neighbor cell, same as legacy. We are open to further discuss how it is signaled in SIB (e.g. as Nokia suggested, based on legacy information advertised in SIB1, such as TAC)   Len) Since companies have different preferences on this (also as expressed in Phase 1), is it fine to resolve this FFS if and once RAN2 selects Option 4?     * For Step 5, there is a small issue. We understand the UE can camp on the target cell if the target cell satisfies inter-frequency cell reselection criteria (not just this cell is suitable). The current statement is not 100% correct from technique perspective (although we understand rapporteur tried to simplify the description). Thus, a small suggested change from our side:   **Step 5**: If the highest ranked cell is suitable and satisfies cell reselection criteria (as defined in 38.304) and supports the selected slice in step 2 then camp on the cell and exit this sequence of operation; FFS: How the UE determines whether the highest ranked cell supports the selected slice.  Len) Would your change not exclude slice based cell selection (initial selection or cell selection when leaving RRC Connected, other cell selections e.g., during T311 etc.)? |
| CMCC | Yes, Solution 4 looks clear. But, we are still wondering whether it is properly to only consider the first priority slice. When UE supporting multiple slices, we think not only the first priority slice but also second priority slice or third one should also be considered in the first loop, in order to avoid UE camping on the cell that only support the first priority slice.  Len) Since companies have different preferences on this (also as expressed in Phase 1), is it fine to resolve this FFS if and once RAN2 selects Option 4? |
| OPPO | This solution is logically clear to us, and we are fine to keep it as the baseline. Some comments from our side:   * For the slice looping in step 7, we share the similar view as ZTE and Qualcomm. Slice specific cell reselection is just a best effort enhancement as the slice used in cell reselected may not be the certain one associated with the upcoming MO. The procedure of slice looping will introduce the extra latency for the cell reselection/camping, especially when there are multiple intended slices existing (e.g. 8 intended slices). * For the condition “and supports the selected slice” in step 5, we do not agree to delete it, if we need to cover the case that the selected slice is not supported by the highest ranked cell but supported by other cells of the same frequency as the highest ranked cell. If the highest ranked cell does not support the selected slice, the UE will try another frequency. The slice related info can be obtained by current cell or the selected cell. * For the legacy cell reselection in step 8, we are also fine the following variant   Step 8: Perform legacy cell reselection ~~(using non-slice-based priorities i.e. for frequencies not corresponding to any slice support)~~  Len) All the comments have been captured/ responded to above. Hope the responses are fine with you. |
| CATT | Yes, this solution is overall clear. But in Step 6: If there are remaining cell frequencies then go back to step 3, the “go back to step 3” should be “go back to step 4”.  Len) The intention is to go to the next frequency in the priority order and perform step 4. This will be clarified by rephrasing Step 6.  For the step 7, we have the similar view with QCOM and ZTE. If the first loop is failure, we should perform the legacy reselection to avoid introducing more delay. We think it can be removed for simplicity.  Len) Since companies have different preferences on this (also as expressed in Phase 1), is it fine to resolve this FFS if and once RAN2 selects Option 4?  Regarding FFS in step 5, we share the same with QCOM that UE can get the information via the source cell’s SIB. Using SIB facilitates the whole procedure with less time and power consumption.  Len) Agree, that’s the intention that information about neighborhood/ geo about frequency and slice availability can be broadcasted by the serving cell. |
| LGE | Regarding slice priority, we think we cannot leave it to SA2/CT1. The UE should be able to prioritize frequencies by its own decision when there are multiple intended slices and none of neighbor cells support all of the intended slices, and the UE AS layer can involve in the decision especially when there are multiple intended slices. For example, the frequencies supporting slices associated with suspended services in RRC\_INACTIVE may need to be prioritized if none of neighbor cells supports all intended services.  Len) The example of “the frequencies supporting slices associated with suspended services in RRC\_INACTIVE” seems to be a very specific case. In a general case RAN2 should trust that NAS understands slices better. |
| China Telecom | Yes, Option 4 is clear. But we also have some concerns when UE supports multiple slices, only considering the first priority slice may lead the UE to select a frequency that doesn’t support UE’s other intended slices. If UE initials an MO service other than the first priority slice, HO or redirection might be needed, which causes extra delay.  Len) Since companies have different preferences on this (also as expressed in Phase 1), is it fine to resolve this FFS if and once RAN2 selects Option 4? |
| KDDI | Let me ask some questions below, since some points are still not clear to us.  1. The terminology “Perform cell search” is not so clear to us, since the word are not used commonly in TS38.304. Does it mean intra/inter/inter-RAT frequency measurements which the UE perform during “camped normally” or “Any Cell Selection”?  Len) “Cell search” is used in the sense of cell detection + measurements as you mentioned, no new meaning here.  2. In the case where the serving cell become very worse during step1-7, then does the UE reselect a neighbor cell which doesn’t support the intended slice? If the UE doesn’t re-select the neighbor cell, then the UE may result in entering Any Cell Selection state (≒out of coverage) and the UE may miss a paging indication from the serving cell.  3. If the UE is forced to move from “Cell Reselection evaluation process” to “camped normally” (vis versa) frequently, then we have some concern that the UE implementation will become very complicated. Measurement rules become also complicated. “Cell Reselection Evaluation Process” and  “Camped normally” are the states defined in TS38.304 Figure 5.2.2-1: RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_INACTIVE Cell Selection and Reselection.  For example  In the case where the UE is in Freq z area, if the UE is not allowed to camp on Freq z while the UE is searching Freq x/y supporting slice id 1, then the UE move to “Any Cell Selection” state (out of coverage). This is our concern on option4.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | SliceInfo-List | | | | Slice Id-1/ Slice-Group Id-1 | Supported-on-Freq-x | Freq-x-priority | | Supported-on-Freq-y | Freq-y-priority | | Slice Id-2/ Slice-Group Id-2 | Supported-on-Freq-z | Freq-z-priority |     Len) If the concern is that step 1-7 takes long time and the serving cell radio may really deteriorate during this period, after some close examination it should be clear that the time taken here is no more than the time taken in the legacy inter-frequency reselection. Some steps are just algorithms running in DSP and can be pre-performed before the cell (re)selection trigger takes place. |
| Apple | We also feel this solution is simple and clear.  In addition, we share concerns from companies on the long latency if UE needs to repeat the loop for all slices. This is more critical if UE is moving with high speed. It would be good enough to only consider the highest priority slice.  Len) Since companies have different preferences on this (also as expressed in Phase 1), is it fine to resolve this FFS if and once RAN2 selects Option 4?  Then, we would like to consider a combo of solution 4 and 5. This is mainly to avoid the case if UE has multiple slices during most of the time but has to camp on a cell only supporting the highest priority slice. |
| Ericsson | Solution 4 seems clear on AS level (respecting comments above). Major open issue concerns the “Slice priority” (left for SA2/ CT1 to solve…). Also the FFS in Step 5 is an issue that need a solution ( to avoid ping-pong re-selection). |
| NEC | It is fundamental to clarify FFS bit in step 5 and step 7 in order to compare the solution with others including complexity and effectivity.  We share the same view as Nokia and ZTE that the solution would work and be simple without checking supported slice in step 5. |
| Samsung | The following are few concerns on the sequence of operation:   1. Step 2:    1. In Step 2, the first slice is selected assuming it has the highest priority. However, selecting the first slice is not correct if we agree on using ‘slice group’ concept. 2. Step 5:    1. In Step 5, there is no need for the “FFS: How the UE determines whether the highest ranked cell supports the selected slice”. The reason is that the UE is informed, by the AMF, of the supported/Allowed slices in the UE’s RA, during the registration process, and the slice availability does not change within the UE’s RA. This is mentioned in TS38.300:   **Slice Availability**  [text omitted]. It is assumed that the slice availability does not change within the UE's registration area.   1. Step 6:    1. In Step 6, we need to modify “go back to Step 3” to “go back to Step 4”. The reason is that the assignment of priorities to all frequencies is performed in Step 3 and the UE performs cell search using this information without needing to perform Step 3 again. 2. Step 7:    1. In Phase 1 and again in Phase 2, several companies commented on the need to remove the Step 7. This is in order to avoid unnecessary latency in cell reselection caused by multiple iterations for each slice. Additionally, the multiple iteration based cell reselection may be complex for the UE.    2. In our view it is important to address this issue, before agreeing on the Option 4, and not to keep it as an FFS for further discussion.   We provide our proposed adjustments to this sequence in the answer to Q4. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Solution 5** | |
| Company Name | Comments |
| BT | Yes but in the way step 2 is defined, the network may have an unpredicted behaviour.  [CTC]: For the case that more than one frequency supports the same number of slices among UE’s intended slices, the UE can treat them with equal priority if only the supported slice list for frequencies is provided as “slice info” to the UE, or further consider the existing absolute cell reselection frequency priority if provided. UE’s behaviour is based on the configuration of NW, so we don’t see an unpredicted behaviour. |
| Lenovo, MotM | The use of the main relevant aspect of *slice specific frequency priority* is kept FFS and not clear if this will be used. This is a deviation from an agreement that RAN2 made in the previous meeting:  *“1: Frequency priority mapping for each slice (slice -> frequency(ies) -> absolute priority of each of the frequency) is provided to a UE.”*  [CTC]: We understand that the agreement captures the mapping of frequency priority and slice is provided to UE, which doesn’t mean that it is mandatory. We think slice specific frequency priority shall be optional, same as the existing frequency priority. |
| Intel | Rather than discuss a full solution, we think we should discuss the different functionalities of the solution in terms of external visible behaviour to get a better understanding of the differences and benefits of each functionality of the solution.  The followings are further questions on the solution for our understanding:   * 1. Slice list to be considered by the UE   The solution seems to consider only allowed slices. For homogeneous deployments, all the cells of an RA provide the same slices and all the allowed slices will be supported by all the cells of the RA. So this implies that all of the frequencies of the RA will have equal priority. And since UE only considers allowed slices, it will never reselect another frequency outside of the RA.  As explained, our view (option 7) is that it should be the configured slices in order for the UE to cross the RA boundary. Just considering the allowed slices are not sufficient.  [CTC]: In this case, additional “slice info” ” such as slice specific frequency priority or slice priority might be provided. If no additional slice info is available, the existing frequency priority can be used.   * 1. What slices are available in the UE’s location across the frequencies:   In our understanding the slice availability in neighbouring frequencies is provided in the current cell (same as option 7)  [CTC]: Yes.   * 1. Determining the slices to consider for prioritization   In our understanding, this option considers only the allowed list for prioritization. Is this understanding correct?  [CTC]: Yes.   * 1. Frequency priority determination   The use case of Option 5 seems to be that the slices are of equal priority as its prioritisation is based on maximising the number of slices.  However, if a frequency offers a higher priority slice but one less slice than other frequency, it will not be possible for the UE to prioritise the frequency with the higher priority slice.  Is maximizing the number of slices the only criteria for determining the frequency priority as in Option 5? Or does it considering the highest priority slice that can be supported as proposed by Option 4, 6 and 7 if this is also available? That is, is this option a complete and only solution or is it to be used as an additional solution when network does not provide slice priority?  [CTC]: We think additional “slice info” such as slice specific frequency priority or slice priority are not totally excluded in Option 5. Since companies have different opinions in Phase1 discussion, further discussion might be needed.   * 1. Interaction with legacy Cell reselection procedure   Will this cell reselection mechanism replace the current cell reselection procedures when slice info is broadcast in a cell? That is, how does this procedure and the legacy procedure interact?  And what is the interaction of this procedure with inter-RAT cell reselection?  What is the impact of this option on cell suitability? What is the interaction with barring for 300s when a slice is not found?  [CTC]: No, slice based cell reselection shall be an enhancement of the legacy cell reselection procedure, not to replace it.  Interaction with legacy cells?  Assuming that only the slice specific frequency priorities are provided in Cell B and the neighbour cells (Cell A, Cell 1) do not support Slice info (i.e. only broadcast legacy cell reselection priorities) as shown below, based on the procedure, what is the UE behaviour when a cell on an inter-frequency carrier cell does not broadcast slice information (i.e., legacy cell)? Or is it required that all the cells broadcast slice info?  [CTC]: When UE moves into TA2, the legacy cell reselection criterion shall be used.  [CTC]: In our opinion, NW might optionally choose to provide the supported slice list for certain frequencies. In this way, NW can offload the UEs supporting slice based cell reselection to certain frequencies. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | At RAN2#114-e meeting, RAN2 agreed that “frequency priority mapping for each of the slice is part of the slice info”, and it is our understanding that option 5 has not considered slice priority.  [CTC]: We understand that the agreement captures the mapping of frequency priority and slice is provided to UE, which doesn’t mean that it is mandatory. We think slice specific frequency priority shall be optional, same as the existing frequency priority.  In addition, in Step (2) in section 2.2.1, it mentions the UE can treat them with equal priority if some frequencies support the same number of slices. Follow the design, issue 3 in the TR 38.832 may not be solved.  **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.**  [CTC]: For the case that more than one frequency supports the same number of slices among UE’s intended slices, the UE can treat them with equal priority if only the supported slice list for frequencies is provided as “slice info” to the UE, or further consider the existing absolute cell reselection frequency priority if provided. UE’s behaviour is based on the configuration of NW, and NW can certainly configure different frequency priority for the specific slice in different areas. How to use the slice specific frequency priority can be further discussed. |
| Xiaomi | Share the same view with Lenovo, and we have agreed before as following.  ***The criteria for determining the cell reselection priority for inter-frequency cell reselection should not be left to UE implementation, but should be defined in the specification (just like cell reselection priorities currently).***  As legacy mechanism, in the slice based cell reselection, frequency priority is necessary to be provided by gNB for offloading.  [CTC]: We understand that the agreement captures the mapping of frequency priority and slice is provided to UE, which doesn’t mean it is mandatory. We think slice specific frequency priority shall be optional, same as the existing frequency priority. Besides, NW might optionally choose to provide the supported slice list for certain frequencies. In this way, NW can offload the UEs supporting slice based cell reselection to certain frequencies. |
| Nokia | A major point is missing as it is FFS how to use slice specific frequency priority or slice priority to determine the slice based cell reselection frequency priority.  [CTC]: Yes. Since companies have different opinions in Phase1 discussion, further discussion might be needed. |
| ZTE | * For simplicity, only the frequency supporting the maximum number will be treated as the highest priority and if UE cannot find a suitable cell in this frequency, UE will then use the legacy frequency priority. Then there is no need for UE to decide the second highest priority, third highest priority and so on. The frequency priority is usually configured by the NW and UE will store the value at its own side for use. Creating a priority value list for each frequencies would be a little bit complex at UE side while treating a certain frequency as the highest priority one is something we usually do (e.g. the redirection target frequency will be treated as the highest priority one in LTE). * For the case “*When additional “slice info” such as slice specific frequency priority or slice priority is provided*: * We understand the slice specific frequency priority should be applied and there is no need for UE to decide the frequency priority based on the number of the supported slices in each frequency. * The slice priority is not needed in this option 5 and we do not expect it to impact the procedures in option 5. |
| Qualcomm | Overall, we think current description leaves too many FFSs with big impact. It makes people hard to evaluate Option 5.   * For Step 1, we agree with ZTE that there is no need for UE to decide the second highest priority, third highest priority and so on. SO, we prefer to remove the last sentence:   ~~“The frequency that supports the second most slices among UE’s intended slices has the second highest priority in cell reselection, and so on.”~~     * For the FFS in Step 2 (although not stated clearly):   ***Step (2):*** *If more than one frequency supports the same number of slices among UE’s intended slices, the UE can treat them with equal priority, or further consider the existing absolute cell reselection frequency priority if provided.*  We agree with ZTE that there is no need for UE to decide the second highest priority. We prefer UE may treat them equally to make the procedure simple. It is also aligned with Note 3 of Section 5.2.4.1 of TS 38.304, it is up to UE implementation how to handle these frequencies with same priority:  *NOTE 3: The prioritization among the frequencies which UE considers to be the highest priority frequency is left to UE implementation.*   * For the FFS on “Additional slice info”:   *When additional “slice info” such as slice specific frequency priority or slice priority is provided, how to use them to determine the slice based cell reselection frequency priority is FFS*  We suggest to remove the FFS. If slice specific frequency priority is provided, why not directly use option 4 or option 6? Our understanding is that option 5 is only applied if slice specific frequency priority is not provided to UE. |
| CMCC | Yes, solution 5 is simple and straightforward. Solution 5 is aiming to let UE always camp on the cells that support highest number of intended slices.  I would like to further clarify two points:   1. For step 2, if two frequencies support the same number of intended slices. UE should apply the legacy common frequency priority if it is broadcast in SIB. Or if legacy frequency priority is not provided, UE should take the two frequencies as equal priority. 2. For Solution 5, the UE distribution is generally predictable when network slice is deployed on each frequency. But the UE distribution can still be changed if legacy dedicated priority is provided to UE by *RRCRelease* message. |
| OPPO | In our understanding, Option 5 can only be used when at least slice specific frequency priority is not provided. Otherwise, such “additional slice info” and other option(s) should be used.  Regarding Option5, we have the following comments,   * For Step 1, we share the similar view as ZTE and Qualcomm, there is no need to decide the second highest priority and so on, which follows the similar logic as NR V2X on frequency priority decision. * For Step 2, to avoid the UE complexity, if more than one frequency supports the same number of slices among UE’s intended slices, the UE can treat them with equal priority. |
| CATT | The description of Solution 5 is simple for implementation. But in this solution, UE desired slice priority is not considered. For example the UE support 5 slices and the desired slice is URLLC, the UE should set the frequency support URLLC as highest priority and then consider the slice supported numbers of this frequency.The frequency which supports the maximum number of slice is considered as the highest priority. In this way, it may happen that the frequency which supports the most slices but does not support the most desired slice for UE. |
| LGE | We think slice priority and frequency priority should be considered during cell reselection. Rather than supporting many number of slices, priority would be more important factor to decide better cell. |
| China Telecom | In our opinion, Option 5 is simple and straightforward, especially for the case only the supported slice list for frequencies is provided as “slice info” to the UE. In Option 5, the UE tends to camp on the cell that supports more UE’s intended slices than others, which can help reduce the possibility of HO or redirection caused by camping on the cell not supporting the intended slice.  And we also want to clarify that additional “slice info” such as slice specific frequency priority or slice priority are not totally excluded in Option 5. Since companies have different opinions in Phase1 discussion, further discussion might be needed. |
| KDDI | The number of slices among UE’s intended slices should not be used as a basis for determining cell reselection priority, since the neighbour cell may not provide the slices that the UE is desiring for.  [CTC]: In Option 5, the UE tends to camp on the cell that supports more UE’s intended slices than others, which can help reduce the possibility of HO or redirection caused by camping on the cell not supporting the intended slice. |
| Apple | Overall, we think solution 5 can be used on top of solution 4. And slice priority should be considered first. |
| Ericsson | Solution is fairly clear, but expect also some CT1/SA2 impacts to solve the “intended slice” issue (if more than Allowed NSSAI).  As a further improvement, a weight can be given to a slice to allow the operator to place more or less importance on some of the slices. |
| NEC | Solution 5 is not complete. But we agree the intention that camping on the cell that supports more UE’s intended slices is beneficial.  The solution should be designed to use the slice specific priority if provided, this is our WI target.  [CTC]: Since companies have different opinions in Phase1 discussion. We are open to have further discussion. |
| Samsung | The following are our concerns on this option:   1. The text in 2.2.3: “whether Slice priority is used or not may need further discussion” may contradict with the following RAN2 agreement:  * 1: Frequency priority mapping for each slice (slice -> frequency(ies) -> absolute priority of each of the frequency) is provided to a UE.  1. NW has flexibility how to steer the UE to the target cell based on frequency priority. However, solution 5 deviates from such mechanism, as in:  * **Step (1):** The UE will consider the frequency priority in cell reselection based on the number of supported slices among UE’s intended slices (i.e. Allowed S-NSSAIs). * That is, **Step (1)** indicates a UE-driven cell reselection.  1. The objective of this WI may not intend to take the number of supported slices as the slice specific frequency priority as in the case of solution 5. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Solution 6** | |
| Company Name | Comments |
| BT | Proposal for solution 6 isn’t clear. Steps 5-a and 5-b are confusing.  Is step 5-b executed only if conditions in step 5 are validated?  In the example, why step 5-a is considered? In the way it is described, once the UE meets step 5 conditions, it won’t check step 5-a due to its condition is else if.  If (conditions step 5)  // check cell is suitable (as defined in 38.304)  } else if (conditions step 5-a)  //in the way it is, it looks a confusing behaviour;  }  Step 5-b;  “Step 5: If the highest ranked cell is suitable (as defined in 38.304) and supports the selected slice in step 2 …”  “Step 5-a: **Else if** the highest ranked cell is suitable (as defined in 38.304) but **doesn’t support** the selected slice in step 2, then the priority value of this frequency is changed to the priority value of the highest priority slice …”.  [QC] Step 5b is performed only in “else if” branch. So Step 5-a can add “Then, go to step 5-b” as below to make it clear:  =========  **Step 5-a**: Else if the highest ranked cell is suitable (as defined in 38.304) but **doesn’t support** the selected slice in step 2, then the priority value of this frequency is changed to the priority value of the highest priority slice supported by both UE and the highest ranked cell (i.e. intersection slice set). Then, go to Step 5-b.  **Step 5-b**: With updated frequency priority, if legacy inter-frequency cell reselection criteria (as illustrated below) is met, camp on the cell and exit this sequence of operation.   * If priority of target frequency is **higher than** serving frequency, Srxlev > ThreshX, HighP during a time interval * If priority of target frequency is **lower than** serving frequency, Srxlev < ThreshServing, LowP and Srxlev > ThreshX, LowP during a time interval   ========================== |
| Lenovo, MotM | Agree with BT that this solution is not easy to understand, at least not in the first reading. However, it is possible to understand it and the example provided by the proponent helps. |
| Intel | Rather than discuss a full solution, we think we should discuss the different functionalities of the solution in terms of external visible behaviour to get a better understanding of the differences and benefits of each functionality of the solution.  Our understanding is that the current option 6 includes option 4 when slice availability is not broadcast and option 5 when slice specific frequency priority is not broadcast. For comments/questions on those aspects, please refer to our comment on those options. Here we focus on the option 6 that is applicable when both slice availability and slice specific frequency priority is broadcast.  The followings are further questions on the solution for our understanding:   * 1. Slice list to be considered by the UE   Our understanding of this option on this aspect is the same as option 4 – that is, an additional list is configured by the NAS (in addition to the configured NSSAI). What is the benefit/motivation the proponents see from having this second list (please refer to our question on this in option 4 for more details)?  [QC] Our view is same as Lenovo’s response for Option 4.   * 1. What slices are available in the UE’s location across the frequencies:   In our understanding of this options, the slice availability for other frequencies are broadcast in the current cell (same as option 7). In addition, the option also provides the PCI list. What is the benefit/motivation the proponents see from having the PCI list?  [QC] With the PCI list for each supported slice, the UE can know which slice is supported or not supported in a target cell from its current cell (i.e., avoid UE having to read SIB of target cell to get slice availability info in cell reselection). As you know, ZTE and Nokia raised the concern.   * 1. Determining the slices to consider for prioritization   In our understanding of this option, it considers the list of available slices from the slice list in that region (same as option 7). Is that correct?  [QC] Yes.   * 1. Frequency priority determination   In our understanding of this option, it determines the priority for a frequency from the first loop while looking for the highest priority slice. During that loop, if UE finds a lower priority slice, it will assign the frequency priority of that slice to that frequency (step-5a). And then in step 5-b, UE will exit the sequence. It is not clear to us why the UE exits the sequence in step 5-b as there may be higher priority slice available in another carrier that UE has not scanned yet. What is the intention of exiting the sequence in step 5-b?  [QC] It is intended to not delay cell reselection to search another carrier. As you know, UE access latency is main KPI of cell reselection. We think slice specific cell reselection is just a best effort enhancement. You have to balance between trying all possible frequency and latency of cell reselection. It will be a big burden for UE to decide the second highest priority, third highest priority and so on. And it will cause extra big latency of cell reselection   * 1. Interaction with legacy Cell reselection procedure   Will this cell reselection mechanism replace the current cell reselection procedures when slice info is broadcast in a cell? That is, how does this procedure and the legacy procedure interact?  And what is the interaction of this procedure with inter-RAT cell reselection?  [QC] No, same response as Lenovo to option 4. The solution option 6 does not intend to replace the legacy Cell reselection procedure – it just precedes it. As clarified above, the triggers of the legacy Cell reselection procedure remain.  What is the impact of this option on cell suitability? What is the interaction with barring for 300s when a slice is not found?  [QC] No, option 6 tries to select a suitable cell that supports an intended slice. It does not change the suitability criteria itself. In addition, legacy Cell reselection procedure is still used if no slice support is found. So, we don’t think any impact to cell suitability |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The procedures are clear, but we have one comment regarding step 5-a and 5-b:  In step 5-a, the UE changes the frequency priority value in some cases, and then it performs inter-frequency cell reselection in step 5-b. After that, it may happen that the UE will select the cell mentioned in step 5-a (highest ranked cell is suitable but doesn’t support the selected slice in step 2). We think that the “change of frequency priority” may lead to unpredictable UE distributions.  [QC] First, in LTE eMBMS/V2X and NR V2X, 3GPP has specified that UE may “change frequency priority” if the target frequency can support UE’s eMBMS/V2X service. We don’t see much difference in option 6 from 3GPP already specified service specific cell reselection.  Secondly, UE behavior in Option 6 is actually different from Option 4 only when the UE is boundary of two TAs. In such scenario, we don’t think Network can fully control UE behavior. |
| Xiaomi | Agree with BT that the option is not clearly and we have some concerns on this option.  We wonder that in this option, if the priority value of this frequency is changed to the priority value of the highest priority slice supported by both UE and the highest ranked cell, does UE continue to perform cell reselection based on the frequency priority of the selected slice in step2 or skip to perform cell reselection based on another slice specific frequency priority( e.g eMBB in the example) ? If it is the former one, we think it is the same as option 4 and there is no need to change the priority the frequency can be searched again in the looping as it is also associated with another slice(e.g. eMBB in the example). If it is the latter one, we are confused why UE perform like that as there are still some frequencies associated with higher priority slice.  [QC] if the priority value of this frequency is changed to the priority value of the highest priority slice supported by both UE and the highest ranked cell, UE re-check whether inter-frequency criteria is met after priority value change (e.g, eMBB in the example). For your concern, we think slice specific cell reselection is just a best effort enhancement. You have to balance between trying all possible frequency and latency of cell reselection. It will be a big burden for UE to decide the second highest priority, third highest priority and so on. And it will cause extra big latency of cell reselection (actually, main KPI in cell reselection is the latency of UE access). |
| Nokia | 1) It is not clarified in step 5 how the UE determines whether the highest ranked cell supports the selected slice. (We can only accept the checking if the cell supports the selected slices if it is based on legacy information advertised in SIB1, such as TAC.)  [QC] similar to our comment on option 4, we are open to further discuss how the UE determines whether the highest ranked cell supports the selected slice. Your suggested way (based on legacy information advertised in SIB1, such as TAC) is acceptable to us.  2) It is unclear how this solution leads to solution 5 (bullet 3 of 2.3.1.3).  [QC] We are also interested in solution 5 when Network can’t provide slice specific frequency priority. |
| Qualcomm | Thanks BT for raising the issue. Step 5b is performed only in “else if” branch. So Step 5-a can add “Then, go to step 5-b” as below to make it clear:  =========  **Step 5-a**: Else if the highest ranked cell is suitable (as defined in 38.304) but **doesn’t support** the selected slice in step 2, then the priority value of this frequency is changed to the priority value of the highest priority slice supported by both UE and the highest ranked cell (i.e. intersection slice set). Then, go to Step 5-b.  **Step 5-b**: With updated frequency priority, if legacy inter-frequency cell reselection criteria (as illustrated below) is met, camp on the cell and exit this sequence of operation.   * If priority of target frequency is **higher than** serving frequency, Srxlev > ThreshX, HighP during a time interval * If priority of target frequency is **lower than** serving frequency, Srxlev < ThreshServing, LowP and Srxlev > ThreshX, LowP during a time interval   ==========================  On **Huawei’s comments**, UE behavior in Option 6 is actually different from Option 4 only when the UE is boundary of two TAs. In such scenario, we don’t think Network can fully control UE behavior.  On **Xiaomi’s comments**, if the priority value of this frequency is changed to the priority value of the highest priority slice supported by both UE and the highest ranked cell, UE re-check whether inter-frequency criteria is met after priority value change (e.g, eMBB in the example). For your concern, we think slice specific cell reselection is just a best effort enhancement. You have to balance between trying all possible frequency and latency of cell reselection. It will be a big burden for UE to decide the second highest priority, third highest priority and so on. And it will cause extra big latency of cell reselection (actually, main KPI in cell reselection is the latency of UE access).  For **Nokia’s comments**, similar to our comment on option 4, we are open to further discuss how the UE determines whether the highest ranked cell supports the selected slice. Your suggested way (based on legacy information advertised in SIB1, such as TAC) is acceptable to us. |
| CMCC | Option 6 looks clear to us. Generally, Solution 6 is an enhancement for Solution 4, with the purpose to de-prioritize the selected frequency that doesn’t support the slice in step 2. But we are a bit worry to let UE modify the frequency priority by UE, and wondering if the UE behavior can be predictable by the network side.  [QC] First, in LTE eMBMS/V2X and NR V2X, 3GPP has specified that UE may “change frequency priority” if the target frequency can support UE’s eMBMS/V2X service. We don’t see much difference in option 6 from 3GPP already specified service specific cell reselection.  Secondly, UE behavior in Option 6 is actually different from Option 4 only when the UE is boundary of two TAs. In such scenario, we don’t think Network can fully control UE behavior. |
| OPPO | The solution is logically clear, but we have one comment to Step 5-b,  If the updated priority of the frequency in Step 5-b is lower than the priority of another frequency in step 6, we suggest to choose another frequency directly, to do our best to assure UE prioritize the frequency supporting the most desired slice.  [QC] It is intended to not delay cell reselection to search another carrier. As you know, UE access latency is main KPI of cell reselection. We think slice specific cell reselection is just a best effort enhancement. You have to balance between trying all possible frequency and latency of cell reselection. It will be a big burden for UE to decide the second highest priority, third highest priority and so on. And it will cause extra big latency of cell reselection |
| CATT | This solution is clear. Same comments as for solution 4. In Table.2.3.2: Relationship of Option 6 with Option 4/5, if the two information is absent, state as option5. I have question on it, how option5 work if slice support of neighbour is absent  Option 6 is similar to option 4 except for step 5a/5b where the frequency is resigned. And the priority of the frequency is changed to the priority value of the highest priority slice supported both UE and the highest ranked cell. In this case when the highest ranked cell does not support the slice, the priority of frequency is lowered. However, there may be multiple cells on the frequency and the second ranked cell may support the slice UE supported. So it is not fair to change the priority of the frequency based only on the highest ranked cell.  [QC] It is true that there may be multiple cells on the frequency and the second ranked cell may support the slice UE supported. The current step is intended not to delay cell reselection due to slice consideration, because UE access latency is main KPI of cell reselection. But we are open to consider it if companies think it is necessary  Composed solution is good approach. So we can cover more cases |
| LGE | Regarding the two options of how the UE receives slice priority, NAS signalling or UE implementation, we think we cannot leave it to SA2/CT1. If CN handles all slice priority used for cell reselection in a tracking area, it may not be efficient. Also, the UE should be able to prioritize frequencies by its own decision when there are multiple intended slices and none of neighbor cells support all of the intended slice. The UE AS layer can involve in the decision especially when there are multiple intended slices. For example, the frequencies supporting slices associated with suspended services in RRC\_INACTIVE may need to be prioritized if none of neighbor cells supports all intended services.  [QC] We think LG’s comment is reasonable, and we are fine to leave slice priority to UE implementation. |
| KDDI | The same comment as solution4. |
| Apple | We still have some confusions requesting for clarifications. It looks step 5b should be moved after step 6?  [QC] No, according to current 38.304, as long as UE finds a suitable cell satisfying cell reselection criteria, it camps on the cell, without need to continue search other “better frequency/cell”  The confusion is with current procedure, UE may camp on the first tried frequency (not supporting highest priority slice) while there are other frequencies actually supporting the highest priority slice.  [QC] It is intended to not delay cell reselection to search another carrier. As you know, UE access latency is main KPI of cell reselection. We think slice specific cell reselection is just a best effort enhancement. You have to balance between trying all possible frequency and latency of cell reselection. It will be a big burden for UE to decide the second highest priority, third highest priority and so on. And it will cause extra big latency of cell reselection |
| Ericsson | Option 6 looks also fairly clear to us. We agree Solution 6 is an enhancement of Solution 4 (to solve a problem that also need to be solved for Solution 4) |
| NEC | Solution 6 is basically clear.  In example, it seems assumed that the frequency priority will be changed into a lower priority in step 5-a. is it always the case? What if it is changed into a higher priority? It would be helpful to explain all cases.  [QC] Yes, it is always the case because UE takes the frequency priority value according to its highest priority slice in Step 1. So, the changed priority should be lower. |
| Samsung | The following are our concerns on this solution:   1. It is NOT preferable, that in Step 5-a, in some cases, the UE may update the frequency priority autonomously.   [QC] In LTE eMBMS/V2X and NR V2X, 3GPP has specified that UE may “change frequency priority” if the target frequency can support UE’s eMBMS/V2X service. We don’t see much difference in option 6 from 3GPP already specified service specific cell reselection.   1. It is NOT preferable to deviate from best cell concept.   [QC] It is misunderstanding. The Main intention of option 6 is to keep best cell concept in boundary of two TA.   1. There is no need for modification in Step 5-a/-b, considering RAN2 agreement to support homogeneous slice availability in all cells in UE’s RA.   [QC] It is misunderstanding. The Main intention of option 6 is to keep best cell concept. As agreed in last RAN2 meeting:   * 3: RAN2 consider a scenario in its work for slice specific cell (re)selection where it is possible that (Suitable) cells on the same frequency belonging to different TAs support different Slice(s). |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Solution 7** | |
| Company Name | Comments |
| BT | It is clear but it doesn’t cover all the details (see Q2 option 7). |
| Lenovo, MotM | Yes, solution is clear and covers relevant details. |
| Intel | [Response to BT’s comments]: See our response to Q2 Option 7. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The procedures are clear. However, this option uses configured slice, which is not aligned with the intended slices defined in TR 38.832:  - In case of cell selection and reselection, the intended slice means the allowed or requested S-NSSAI(s).  - For the initial registration, and requesting new S-NSSAI(s): intended slices = Requested S-NSSAI(s)  - For idle-mode mobility: intended slices = allowed S-NSSAI(s)  For idle-mode mobility, from UE point of view, configured slices are quite different from allowed slices. So we are not convinced by using configured slices for determining slice specific reselection.  **[Intel’s response]** By using the Configured NSSAI (i.e., the list of slices that UE can request access to in the PLMN, see Section 5.15.4.1.1 in TS23.501)., it allows the UE to move to a TA where its highest priority configured slice is. With just the Allowed NSSAI, the UE will not find its highest priority configured slice. Isn’t this the intent of this WI is to find the most desired slice of the UE even if it is currently not available? |
| Xiaomi | It is clear but we still have some concerns.  In our understanding to this option, the slice priority is decided by gNB and implicitly provided by configuring higher priority to the frequencies which supports the higher priority slice. However, who decide and provide slice priority is not decided yet, if the slice priority is finally determined to be decided by UE or CN, there may exists a collision on slice priority.  **[Intel’s response]** UE specific slice based frequency priorities can be provided in the RRCRelease and this can provide different UE specific setting. See also our response to CMCC. |
| Nokia | 1) It is unclear how "legacy" (non-slice based) frequency priorities are used.  **[Intel’s response]** It depends on the UE current cell. If UE current cell does not provide slice specific frequency priority, UE will perform "legacy" (non-slice based) frequency priorities. If the current cell provides slice specific frequency priority, UE will perform slice based cell reselection.  2) It is unclear what "UE's configured slice list" is in this solution? Is it coming from NAS?  **[Intel’s response]** Yes. Configured NSSAI of a serving PLMN is already available in the UE NAS (See Section 5.15.4.1.1 in TS23.501). Essentially, it is the list of slices that UE can request access to in the PLMN. |
| CMCC | As for Solution 7, we share similar view with Xiaomi. The slice prioritization for each UE is not considered. Different UE may probably have different preference for the allowed or configured slices.  **[Intel’s response]** UE specific slice based frequency priorities can be provided in the RRCRelease and this can provide different UE specific setting.  Another point is that, we are a bit worry it would be complicated for operator to configure the frequency priority per slice for Solution 7. It seems that the configured priority number for different slices for Freq 1 will finally affect the UE assigned priority for Freq 1. We cannot say it is unpredictable of UE’s distribution, but it would be a bit complicated to predict.  **[Intel’s response]** We think the slice priority can be implicitly included in the frequency priority information for the slices. Complexity depends on how it is perceived. In terms of UE complexity, we think solution 7 is simpler here as UE only has to process one level of priority. In terms of network decision on how to set the priority, two levels may seem simpler concept.  A 2 step approach of providing slice priority and frequency priority could provide better scalability than the 8 priorities available today. If this is considered important, we are open to consider providing a slice priority. |
| OPPO | The solution is logically clear, but we have the following concern   * Agree with Huawei, configured slice is used in this solution, which is not aligned with the intended slices defined in TR 38.832. * Agree with Xiaomi, the concept of slice priority is different from other options and there may be a collision on the related aspect of slice priority.   **[Intel’s response]:** See our response to CMCC and Huawei |
| CATT | Agree with CMCC and xiaomi, different UE have different desired slice. If the slice info is broadcast, all the UE in this serving cell have same priority for this frequency.  **[Intel’s response]** UE specific slice based frequency priorities can be provided in the RRCRelease and this can provide different UE specific setting.  One small question, in example 2-1, how to derive the “F2 = 2 (since slice 1 and 4 are in F2 and slice 4 sets higher priority for F2 of 2”  **[Intel’s response]** Thanks for pointing this out. It is a typo, F2 should be 3 since Slice 1 in F2 has frequency priority of 3. |
| LGE | According to description of this option, “slice priority” is not used as such in the frequency priority selection, but if there is a need to provide different slice priority to different UEs, the network can provide UE specific slice info in the RRC Release.  Then, in our understanding, the slice priority for configured slice will be provided in RRCRelease. Without transition to connected mode, the UE won’t be able to receive the slice priority. Is it correct?  We think the UE should be able to prioritize frequencies by its own decision when there are multiple intended slices and none of neighbor cells support all of the intended slice. The UE AS layer can involve in the decision especially when there are multiple intended slices. For example, the frequencies supporting slices associated with suspended services in RRC\_INACTIVE may need to be prioritized if none of neighbor cells supports all intended services.  **[Intel’s response]** We think the slice priority can be implicitly included in the frequency priority information for the slices.  A 2 step approach of providing slice priority and frequency priority could provide better scalability than the 8 priorities available today. If this is considered important, we are open to consider providing a slice priority.  For UE specific frequency priority, it is correct that it has to be received from RRCRelease. This is no difference to legacy dedicated frequency priority configuration. And the two step approach of providing UE specific slice priority list can also be done only in Connected mode. So in that regard, we don’t see any difference.  The term “intended slice” is very confusing for us - it is not clear what is meant as it means different things based on procedure, deployment etc.. With homogeneous deployment, all the cells of the UE’s RA support all the allowed slices. If a configured NSSAI that is not in the allowed list become available in a neighbouring frequency that is of higher priority, UE will reselect the frequency in our solution. |
| KDDI | Simple and feasible, but we recognize the remaining issue which we may want to discuss a solution for. The remaining issue is different priorities between different areas may cause ping-pong.  For example,  In the case of following the table, if UE is being at the boundary of the tracking area, UE may cause ping-pong between TAC1 and TAC2.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Cell a** | **Cell b** | | Slice 1, Fb, frequency priority 7  Slice 1, Fa, frequency priority 4 | Slice 1, Fa, frequency priority 7  Slice 1, Fb, frequency priority 4 |     **[Intel’s response]:** From the example above, it is unclear why the frequency priority of Fa and Fb with Slice 1 only will flip so drastically. We assume that there must be important Slice in Fa of Cell b (say URLLC slice). In that case, there won’t be ping pong as the UE will keep itself to Cell b as long as it satisfies the priority based threshold and any ping-ponging can be prevented via existing mechanism (i.e., there wont be any more pingpong than the current system). |
| Apple | First, as also pointed by other companies, this solution only supports differentiating priority to frequencies from gNB point of view. However, if the two slices (1 and 2) at UE have different priority, UE cannot prioritize the slice it wants.  **[Intel’s response]** UE specific slice based frequency priorities can be provided in the RRCRelease and this can provide different UE specific setting.  Second, we also don’t feel configured slices should be considered during cell reselection. As we pointed out in our contribution R2-2105109, unnecessary registration update for non-allowed slices lead to extra NAS/AS signaling overhead, which should be avoided.  **[Intel’s response]:** By using the Configured NSSAI (i.e., the list of slices that UE can request access to in the PLMN, see Section 5.15.4.1.1 in TS23.501)., it allows the UE to move to a TA where its highest priority configured slice is. With just the Allowed NSSAI, the UE will not find its highest priority configured slice. Isn’t this the intent of this WI is to find the most desired slice of the UE even if it is currently not available? |
| Ericsson | Yes, solution is fairly clear. Instead of using Configured NSSAI (assuming some of the configured NSSAIs may not be intended to be used by the UE, although they are available available) , the solution could use the combination of “Allowed NSSAI + Requested NSSAI”. |
| NEC | solution 7 is clear. |
| Samsung | The solution is ok.  One comment is on the point of whether a cell on the same frequency needs to provide different frequency priorities per slice. This seems more of an optimization. It is sufficient to assign a single frequency priority per slice. That is, our preference is to assign slice priority via NAS (i.e. step 1 in Option 4). |

**Q2: How well the given solution fulfils relevant Objective set out in the WID [RP:210912] and is in accordance with the intention of the study [TR 38.832]?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Solution 4** | |
| Company Name | Comments |
| BT | Initial proposal may not fulfil the relevant objectives if the UE cannot camp in a cell where the highest ranked slice is supported. |
| Lenovo, MotM | The following objective from the WID will be appropriately fulfilled:   1. *Support slice based cell reselection, specify mechanisms and signalling including [RAN2]* 2. *To assist cell reselection, broadcast the supported slice info of the current cell and neighbour cells, and cell reselection priority per slice in system information message.* 3. *To assist cell reselection, include slice info (with similar information as in SI message) in RRCRelease message.*   Now it seems the “*slice info of the current cell and neighbour cells*” can be provided on a per-frequency basis and a more detailed “per cell” information can be weighed further.  The solution is very much in line with the intention of slice priority based cell (re)selection as established during study i.e. Solution 4 ensures that if the highest priority slice (say URLLC) is available in any of the cell of any of the frequencies provided to the UE as part of Slice-Info, it will camp on that. Some optimizations have been proposed by other supporting companies to save UE battery, wherein the UE camps rather on the highest priority frequency (of the highest priority slice) on a cell supporting a non-highest priority slice. RAN2 should discuss on need for such an optimization once the group decides in favor of Option 4. |
| Intel | As no details of the slice information is available, it is difficult to judge if it meets the WID objectives.  The WID indicates that slice availability for current and neighbour cells are provided as follow:   1. To assist cell reselection, broadcast the supported slice info of the current cell and neighbour cells, and cell reselection priority per slice in system information message. 2. To assist cell reselection, include slice info (with similar information as in SI message) in *RRCRelease* message.   If supported slice info of the neighbour cells are not broadcast for this solution, it would not have fulfilled the WID. Further, as mentioned in our response to Q1, we think that scanning the frequencies degrades the performance and hence we think it doesn’t meet the objectives.  Len) Hope the previous answers (in Q1) clarify. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | During SI phase, four issues were identified in TR 38.832, and they can be summarized as below:   * The UE is unaware of the slices supported on cells/frequencies * Drawbacks of dedicated priorities * Operators may require different frequency priority for specific slices   Generally, the intention is to avoid handover/redirection if the UE accesses to a cell which does not support the UE’s intended slice.  We think Option 4 is in line with the intention of slice specific priority based cell reselection, because the option can let the UE be aware of the slices supported on cells/frequencies, and then the UE will try to find the best cell based on slice specific frequency priority. |
| Xiaomi | The option can meet the objective of WID except ”broadcast the supported slice info of the current cell and neighbour cells”.  In this option “*slice info of the current cell and neighbour cells*” can be implicitly provided if all cells of a frequency supporting the same slices, otherwise the supported slice per cell need to be provided to meet the WID and can be used to check slice supporting in step5. |
| Nokia | Our view that this solution meets the requirement to support slice based cell reselection. |
| ZTE | We understand the objective from the WID will be appropriately fulfilled and the performance will not be impacted if we remove step 7 and the check on the supported slice in step 5:  **Step 1**: List Slices in the priority order starting with highest priority slice.  **Step 2**: Select the first (or next if from Step 7) slice in the list  **Step 3**: Assign the priorities to frequencies according to the priorities provided to the selected slice  **Step 4**: Perform cell search according to the legacy procedure using the priorities assigned in step 3  **Step 5**: If the highest ranked cell is suitable (as defined in 38.304) ~~and supports the selected slice in step 2~~ then camp on the cell and exit this sequence of operation; ~~FFS: How the UE determines whether the highest ranked cell supports the selected slice.~~  **Step 6**: If there are remaining cell frequencies then go back to step 3  **~~Step 7~~**~~:~~ **~~FFS:~~** ~~If the end of the slice list has not been reached go back to step 2~~  **Step 8**: Perform legacy cell reselection (using non-slice-based priorities i.e. for frequencies not corresponding to any slice support)  Len) Hope the previous answers (in Q1) clarify. |
| Qualcomm | We understand the objective from the WID will be appropriately fulfilled and the performance will not be impacted if we remove step 7. |
| CMCC | Generally, we think solution 4 can fulfill the objectives.  But technically, we think the second priority slice or third one should also be considered during the first loop.  And as to step 7, we have no strong view, but wonder is it possible the second loop may come up with the same results as the first loop. |
| OPPO | In our understanding, Option 4 can meet the requirement to support slice-based cell reselection, and the performance will not be impacted even if step 7 is removed. |
| CATT | This solution looks fulfilled the objectives of the WID. In WID, slice info for neighbour cell is not detailed. In this solution slice availability in the neighbour cell is not used. |
| LGE | It is difficult to decide whether the solutions fulfilled the given objectives in WID. We’d like to first decide the details (e.g., which information will be broadcast or transmitted via dedicated signalling.)  Len) As agreed in the last meeting the following will be provided by the serving cell to a UE for the neighboring geo (serving as well as neighboring frequencies):  (slice -> frequency(ies) -> absolute priority of each of the frequency)  In addition, a slice priority will be available in the UE for an intended slice. This slice priority can be received from the UE NAS. |
| China Telecom | Yes, this solution looks fulfilled the objectives of the WID. |
| KDDI | We think that UE behaviour is not as the legacy mechanism.  Len) Hope our answer to Q1 clarifies the doubt. Yes, it is an addition to the legacy mechanism that intends to fulfil the SI/ WID intention. |
| Apple | We think solution 4 without step 7 can fulfill the objectives. Possible enhancement, i.e., combo with solution 5 could be considered. |
| Ericsson | We think solution 4 can fulfill the objectives. |
| NEC | We think solution 4 fulfills the objective |
| Samsung | In our opinion, the solution 4 covers the objectives of this WI. However, the sequence of operation of solution 4 requires adjustment as proposed in our answer to Q4. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Solution 5** | |
| Company Name | Comments |
| BT | It is not our interpretation of the WI “Support slice based cell reselection, specify mechanisms and signalling including [RAN2]”. The UE will select the frequency based on the number of supported slices on that frequency. This solution precludes operators to reserve a frequency for a specific slice and give it the highest priority.  On the contrary to our understanding, in order to provide highest priority to one frequency, it will be required to deploy the highest number of slices on that frequency on that RA resulting in an undesirable congestion not only for data traffic but also for control traffic.  [CTC]: In our opinion, NW might optionally choose to provide the supported slice list for certain frequencies. In this way, NW can offload the UEs supporting slice based cell reselection to certain frequencies. Furthermore, we think additional “slice info” such as slice specific frequency priority or slice priority are not totally excluded in Option 5. Since companies have different opinions in Phase1 discussion, we are open to have further discussion. |
| Lenovo, MotM | Since “Slice Info” is not essentially required in this solution, it is difficult to say that the objectives have been met.  [CTC]: We think the “slice info” used in Option 5 shall at least include the supported slice list for some frequencies. Additional “slice info” such as slice specific frequency priority or slice priority are not totally excluded. Since companies have different opinions in Phase1 discussion we are open to have further discussion. |
| Intel | We don’t think this option meeting the objectives as commented in our response to Q1. This option considers the available slices. We see two issues with this:   1. For homogenous deployments where all the cells of the RA support the same set of slices, this option will prioritise all the frequencies equally. 2. As UE only considers available frequencies, it will not reselect to another carrier (in the same region with different RA) that is offering another slice in the UEs subscribed list.   [CTC]: In our opinion, NW might optionally choose to provide the supported slice list for certain frequencies. In this way, NW can offload the UEs supporting slice based cell reselection to certain frequencies. Furthermore, we think additional “slice info” such as slice specific frequency priority or slice priority are not totally excluded in Option 5. Since companies have different opinions in Phase1 discussion, we are open to have further discussion.  So we don’t think it meets the objective of support slice based cell reselection using:  To assist cell reselection, broadcast the supported slice info of the current cell and neighbour cells, and cell reselection priority per slice in system information message. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For option 4 and option 5, for frequency priority setting, it has different requirements for network side, e.g. for option 4, the network sets priority values for slice+frequency; for option 5, the network sets the slices and uses the number of slices to “implicitly” indicate the priority. Option 5 may meet the intention of the WI, but it would need more efforts for network sides than other options (especially when there are more and more slices deployed). |
| Xiaomi | We don’t think it can meet the WID as it only consider slice availability to decide the reselection priority without consideration of the slice-specific frequency priority.  [CTC]: We understand additional “slice info” such as slice specific frequency priority or slice priority are not totally excluded in Option 5. Since companies have different opinions in Phase1 discussion, we are open to have further discussion. |
| Nokia | Our view that this solution does not fully meet the requirement to support slice based cell reselection (e.g. how frequency priorities are used), as it only enables cell reselection based on the number of supported slices.  [CTC]: We understand additional “slice info” such as slice specific frequency priority or slice priority are not totally excluded in Option 5. Since companies have different opinions in Phase1 discussion, we are open to have further discussion. |
| ZTE | We understand the objective from the WID will be appropriately fulfilled. The slice info used here is the supported slice in the serving and neighbor frequencies.  We understand this option 5 does not contradict with other solutions using slice specific frequency priority since the slice specific frequency priority is not mandatory:   * For the case when the slice specific frequency priority is provided, use such priority in cell reselection and option 4 applied. * For the case when the slice specific frequency priority is not provided, use option 5 to decide a highest priority frequency, i.e. a frequency supporting the maximum number of allowed S-NSSAIs.   If operators would like to reserve a frequency for a specific slice and give it the highest priority, then NW configure the slice specific frequency priority and go for option 4. For the case when all the cells of the RA support the same set of slices, UE can follow the legacy reselection priority. |
| Qualcomm | We are open to further discussion solution 5 as the way when Network doesn’t provide slice specific frequency priority. |
| CMCC | Yes, for Solution 5, the objective from the WID is appropriately fulfilled.  Solution 5 is quite simple, and all the intended slices are considered during the reselection procedure. |
| OPPO | If at least slice specific frequency priority is not available to the UE, we are fine to further discuss Option 5. |
| CATT | From the general perspective, this solution solved the slice based cell reselection. It can be considered as fulfilling the objectives of the WID. But for the detail of slice info may have some difference. The enhancements are needed since only the number of supported slices is considered in option 5. |
| LGE | It is difficult to decide whether the solutions fulfilled the given objectives in WID. This solution seems to fulfill the objectives but we think the enhancements are needed. |
| China Telecom | We think Option 5 can appropriately fulfill the objective of the WID. |
| KDDI | The number of slices among UE’s intended slices should not be used as a basis for determining cell reselection priority, since the neighbour cell may not provide the slices that the UE is desiring for. |
| Apple | We prefer a combined solution with Solution 4 and 5. |
| Ericsson | We think solution 5 can fulfill the objectives |
| NEC | To fulfil the objective of the WID, we think solution 5 need to be updated to use slice specific frequency priority at least for the case where there is only one UE intended slice. |
| Samsung | Similar response to that of Q1 above. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Solution 6** | |
| Company Name | Comments |
| BT | Prioritizes the frequency over the slice. Can the same behaviour be achieved with legacy mechanisms? |
| Lenovo, MotM | The solution is in line with the WID objectives.  The solution however lacks the will to get to the highest priority slice and the solution gives up on finding any cell that supports any of the slices supported by the UE.  One can argue that in the end no one knows which application will trigger RRC establishment (i.e. have data available for transmission) but the entire efforts RAN2 is making is to ensure that the highest priority slice dictates cell camping – if data arrives for a non- highest priority slice, it will have more “tolerance” e.g. in terms of latency and so a slight delay here would be acceptable compared with the case if the highest priority slice would have to wait longer for attaining service. |
| Intel | From our understanding of the solution, the parts of the option where slice availability and slice priority is not provided does not meet the objectives as we commented in option 4 and 5. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As we commented above, for step 5-a and 5-b, we think that the “change of frequency priority” may lead to unpredictable UE distributions, so we are not sure whether option 6 can meet the intention. |
| Xiaomi | This option can meet the objective of WID as supported slices per cell and slice-specific frequency priority need to be provided and considered.  However, there are still some concern for this option as we state in Q1. |
| Nokia | Our view that this solution meets the requirement to support slice based cell reselection. |
| Qualcomm | We understand the objective from the WID is appropriately fulfilled and the performance will not be impacted. |
| CMCC | Yes, the objectives is fulfilled. |
| OPPO | Option 6 can meet the requirement to support slice-based cell reselection. Details can be further discussed if this solution direction is agreed. |
| CATT | This solution more accurately fulfills the objectives |
| LGE | It is difficult to decide whether the solutions fulfilled the given objectives in WID. We’d like to first decide the details (e.g., which information will be broadcast or transmitted via dedicated signalling.) |
| China Telecom | Yes, this solution looks fulfilled the objectives of the WID. |
| KDDI | We think that UE behaviour is not as the legacy mechanism. |
| Apple | At least our question about step 5b should be addressed first. |
| Ericsson | We think solution 6 can fulfill the objectives |
| NEC | We think solution 6 fulfills the objective of the WID |
| Samsung | The solution 6 intends to meet the objectives of this WI but the proposed enhancement “neighbor cell…” may not be needed for this release. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Solution 7** | |
| Company Name | Comments |
| BT | Solution 7 partially supports point 1.  “1. Support slice based cell reselection, specify mechanisms and signalling including [RAN2]”  It is true that in homogenous deployments, a slice will be supported in the whole RA but it doesn’t mean it is mandated the 1-to-1 association slice – frequency or that every cell in the RA supports all slices.  In this solution, prioritization is given per frequency and then, per slice. In case the same slice is supported in more than one frequencies, frequencies will have the same priority level as captured in step 2b. When that happens, nothing precludes that the best cell (step 2a) doesn’t support the highest intended slice. Therefore, the intention to prioritize the slice cannot be fulfilled.  For example, cells with only lower FR1 bands that support slice\_A and Slice\_B. These cells may be used like umbrellas inside the RA. In the same RA, we may have cells with high FR1 bands only with Slice\_B. In this scenario, low and high FR1 bands will result having the same priority. |
|  | The solution is in line with the WID objectives.  From the intention of the RAN2 study, we think this solution deviates:   1. the solution centres around change of registration area (RAU) to ensure attaining configured slice which is not among allowed slice list – to us it seems that the solution tries to solve an issue which is not in RAN2 scope. We assume this is mainly a SA2/ CT1 subject; we think, RAN2 needs to trust/ respect the allowed slice list (or whatever is sent to it by the NAS for the given purpose). A change of Registration area should rather be guided mainly by the radio conditions. Not sure but perhaps this solution may lead to ping-pong between registration areas, leading to un-necessary RAUs – and thereby wasting battery. 2. The solution implicitly uses slice priority, which is realized inherently in the slice specific frequency priority – this is fine but since the total number of slice priority and frequency priority can’t exceed 8 (1..8) this can be too restrictive. One option would be to extend this range to 16 (or more) but then why would one rather not define and use the slice priority? |
| Intel | [Response to BT’s comments]  For Option 7, the slice priority is embedded in the frequency priority set for a frequency. As in response to your comments in Q1 on Option 4, the operator can set different frequency priority for URLLC for freq\_A, freq\_B and freq\_C. Reusing the example that you give:  For Option 7, the slice priority is embedded in the frequency priority setting:   * Slice\_URLCC -> [freq\_A, freq\_B, freq\_C] -> [6,5,7] * Slice\_eMBB -> [freq\_A, freq\_B, freq\_C, freq\_D, freq\_E] -> [3,3,2,4,4]   If the UE supports eMBB and URLLC, the frequency priority determinationin Step 2a and 2b in Option 7 will pick [freq\_C (7), freq\_A (6), freq\_B (5), freq\_D(4), freq\_E(4)]  If the UE supports only eMBB, the frequency priority determinationin Step 2a and 2b in Option 7 will pick [freq\_D (4), freq\_E (4), freq\_A (3), freq\_B(3), freq\_C(2)]  Hence Option 7 is similar to your modified Option 4.  Regarding the comment:  “it doesn’t mean it is mandated the 1-to-1 association slice – frequency or that every cell in the RA supports all slices.”  SA2 agreement is:  *-     all cells of a tracking area support the same S-NSSAI(s); and*  *-     the S-NSSAI(s) of the Allowed NSSAI are supported by all tracking areas in a registration area.*  In our understanding, this is what we have been calling homogeneous deployments. Hence every cell in the RA supports the same set of slices and all the slices in the UEs allowed list.  [Response to Lenovo/MotM]  For a), our solution is to ensure that the UE camps on the cell with the right slice. In homogenous deployments, when a higher priority slice is available in another carrier (which will also be in a different RA in homogenous deployments), UE has to reselect that carrier and hence that will involve a change of RA.  We don’t see a ping-pong issue.  For b), as mentioned in our response, we are open to consider providing slice priority (See our response in Q4). |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As we commented above, this option uses configured slices, which is not aligned with the intended slices defined in TR 38.832. Configured slices are quite different from allowed slices, so we are not sure whether option 7 can meet the intention. |
| Xiaomi | Partly meet the objective of WID. In this option, supported slices of serving cell and neighbour cell are not broadcast. |
| Nokia | Our view that this solution meets the requirement to support slice based cell reselection. |
| CMCC | Yes, this solution fulfills the objectives of WID. |
| OPPO | We are not sure whether Option 7 can meet the requirement due to the concern we mentioned in Q1. |
| CATT | This solution fulfills the objectives |
| LGE | It is difficult to decide whether the solutions fulfilled the given objectives in WID. We’d like to first decide the details (e.g., which information will be broadcast or transmitted via dedicated signalling.) |
| China Telecom | Yes, this solution looks fulfilled the objectives of the WID. |
| KDDI | We think that this solution make it work. |
| Apple | We don’t think “configured slice” should be used. This actually contradicts to SI conclusion with “allowed N-SSAI”. |
| Ericsson | We think solution 7 can fulfill the objectives |
| NEC | We think solution 7 fulfills the objective of the WID |
| Samsung | The solution 7 intends to meet the objectives of this WI but we think that ‘configured slice’ need not be considered in details. |

**Q3: How easy/difficult is to implement/ specify the solution?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Solution 4** | |
| Company Name | Comments |
| BT | We consider the logic can be simplified as we propose in Q1. |
| Lenovo, MotM | The solution is proposed in clear steps and it would be easy to specify these in one small paragraph and implementation, testing should be straightforward since there are no complicated conditions. All cases/ scenarios can be handled with the same logic. |
| Intel | If slice availability checking affect suitability check (i.e. the selected slice is not available), then it will affect quite a few additional sections (4.5, 5.3.1 etc.) other than the cell reselection part (i.e. 5.2.4).  We think the scan procedure is difficult to implement and impacts performance.  The interaction with the legacy procedures and inter-RAT handling is not clear and difficult to evaluate. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Our analysis on potential standard impacts are as below:  Step 1, 2: it should be NAS behaviour  Step 3, 4, 5: mainly impact 38.304 (but few) and 38.331 (how to define slice info)  Step 6, 7, 8: few impacts to 38.304  Generally, we think option 4 has moderate standard impacts. |
| Xiaomi | We think this option is easy to implement as the logic of inner looping is the same as legacy mechanism with outside looping based on slice priority as enhancement. |
| Nokia | We see no major issue except how supported slices can be checked. Removing checking of supported slice from step 5 the solution becomes much less complex. |
| ZTE | We prefer a simplified procedure as follows:  **Step 1**: List Slices in the priority order starting with highest priority slice.  **Step 2**: Select the first (or next if from Step 7) slice in the list  **Step 3**: Assign the priorities to frequencies according to the priorities provided to the selected slice  **Step 4**: Perform cell search according to the legacy procedure using the priorities assigned in step 3  **Step 5**: If the highest ranked cell is suitable (as defined in 38.304) ~~and supports the selected slice in step 2~~ then camp on the cell and exit this sequence of operation; ~~FFS: How the UE determines whether the highest ranked cell supports the selected slice.~~  **Step 6**: If there are remaining cell frequencies then go back to step 3  **~~Step 7~~**~~:~~ **~~FFS:~~** ~~If the end of the slice list has not been reached go back to step 2~~  **Step 8**: Perform legacy cell reselection (using non-slice-based priorities i.e. for frequencies not corresponding to any slice support) |
| Qualcomm | We see no major issue except slice looping in step 7. Removing step 7 will make the solution much less complex. |
| CMCC | Solution 4 looks simple. |
| OPPO | In our understanding, this option is easy to implement, especially when step 7 is removed. |
| CATT | It is not difficult to specify this solution |
| LGE | The implementation complexity would not affect the decision to select one of 4 solutions. |
| China Telecom | Option 4 seems simple to implement. |
| KDDI | We have concerns on its feasibility, since the implementation will be something far different from the current priority behaviour. |
| Apple | Solution 4 is simple if step 7 is removed. |
| Ericsson | Solution 4 seems clear on AS level (respecting comments above). Major open issue concerns the “Slice priority” (left for SA2/ CT1 to solve…). Also the FFS in Step 5 is an issue that need a solution ( to avoid ping-pong re-selection). |
| NEC | We have concern that the frequency priority may be adjusted further after UE find out the best ranked cell on a frequency:   * This would mean that frequency priority order would be different for UEs in different location, this makes the network configuration/UE implementation complicated and result in unpredictable load spread over different frequencies.   Frequency priority is adjusted based on cell level signal and information has never been the case so far. we need to carefully evaluate the cost and gain. |
| Samsung | The solution 4 needs some modifications to avoid multiple iterations operation that seems to be complicated. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Solution 5** | |
| Company Name | Comments |
| BT | Considering our Q2 answer, this question is not relevant. |
| Lenovo, MotM | We do not expect much specification, implementation complexity if implemented exactly as shown by the proponents. |
| Intel | The interaction with the legacy procedures and inter-RAT handling is not clear and difficult to evaluate. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not much impacts to specifications if following section 2.2.1. |
| Xiaomi | The decision of reselection priority seems complexity in different scenarios and we think this option is opposite to our agreements that slice specific frequency priority need to be provided and considered. |
| Nokia | We see major deviation from the legacy procedure, and interaction with non-slice based cell reselection is unclear. |
| ZTE | We understand this solution is quite easy to specify and implement by assigning highest priority to the frequency supporting the maximum number of S-NSSAIs with only 3 steps to take:  **Step (1):** The UE will consider the frequency priority in cell reselection based on the number of supported slices among UE’s intended slices (i.e. allowed S-NSSAIs). That is, the frequency that supports the maximum number of slices among UE’s intended slices has the highest priority in cell reselection. ~~The frequency that supports the second most slices among UE’s intended slices has the second highest priority in cell reselection, and so on.~~  **Step (2):** If more than one frequency supports the same number of slices among UE’s intended slices, the UE can treat them with equal priority, or further consider the existing absolute cell reselection frequency priority if provided.  **Step (3):** The UE performs the legacy cell reselection (specified in TS 38.304) following the priority assigned based on the above rules. |
| Qualcomm | If the step can be modified as below, we can accept Solution 5 as the way when Network doesn’t provide slice specific frequency priority.  **Step (1):** The UE will consider the frequency priority in cell reselection based on the number of supported slices among UE’s intended slices (i.e. allowed S-NSSAIs). That is, the frequency that supports the maximum number of slices among UE’s intended slices has the highest priority in cell reselection. ~~The frequency that supports the second most slices among UE’s intended slices has the second highest priority in cell reselection, and so on.~~  **Step (2):** If more than one frequency supports the same number of slices among UE’s intended slices, the UE can treat them with equal priority~~, or further consider the existing absolute cell reselection frequency priority if provided~~.  **Step (3):** The UE performs the legacy cell reselection (specified in TS 38.304) following the priority assigned based on the above rules. |
| CMCC | Solution 5 is simple and straightforward. |
| OPPO | The solution can only be used when at least slice specific frequency priority is not provided to UE. In our understanding, this solution should be updated with the following change.  **Step (1):** The UE will consider the frequency priority in cell reselection based on the number of supported slices among UE’s intended slices (i.e. allowed S-NSSAIs). That is, the frequency that supports all UE’s intended slices or the maximum number of slices among UE’s intended slices has the highest priority in cell reselection. ~~The frequency that supports the second most slices among UE’s intended slices has the second highest priority in cell reselection, and so on.~~  **Step (2):** If more than one frequency supports the same number of slices among UE’s intended slices, the UE can treat them with equal priority~~, or further consider the existing absolute cell reselection frequency priority if provided~~.  **Step (3):** The UE performs the legacy cell reselection (specified in TS 38.304) following the priority assigned based on the above rules. |
| CATT | It is simple and easy to specify this solution |
| LGE | The implementation complexity would not affect the decision to select one of 4 solutions. |
| China Telecom | Yes, Option 5 is easy to specify and implement. |
| KDDI | This solution is simple, but we think it seems not to search best neighbour cell with consideration of slice information. |
| Apple | It’s simple to specify. |
| Ericsson | Solution looks fairly straightforward on AS, level, but expect also impact on NAS specs (“intended slice”). |
| NEC | Solution 5 is simple to specify, but it needs to be finalized first to utilize slice specific priority. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Solution 6** | |
| Company Name | Comments |
| BT | We consider our proposed text for option 4 captures the intention of option 6. |
| Lenovo, MotM | Lot of things e.g., Freq-x-priority, PCI-list are left optional which of course provides some flexibility to the operator but will be a lot of effort for specification, and especially in implementation and testing since there will be multiple permutation and combinations as a result. Also, the basic algorithm is not simple and would need re-assignment of priorities, re-evaluation etc. It might be one of the hardest option to implement. |
| Intel | If slice availability checking affect suitability check (i.e. the selected slice is not available), then it will affect quite a few additional sections (4.5, 5.3.1 etc.) other than the cell reselection part (i.e. 5.2.4) |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Firslty, we think the option 6 is similar as option 4.  Secondly, regarding the key difference that “UE changes the frequency priority and does inter-frequency cell reselection in step 5-a and 5-b”, we are a bit concerned about the handling, because for legacy priority frequency cell reselection mechanisms (for 4G and 5G), the UE just follows the priority values from the network and the UE is not allowed to dynamically change the priority value. In other words, “dynamic change of frequency priority” may impact UE distribution and it may be different from network policy/expectation. |
| Xiaomi | The changing of frequency priority seems complexity as the best cell changes frequently. |
| Nokia | We see no major issue except how supported slices can be checked. |
| Qualcomm | The complexity of Solution 6 is same as Solution 4. The only difference is when best ranked cell is suitable but not support the selected slice in step 2:   * Solution 4: UE skips this frequency (and go back to step 3 for other frequency) * Solution 6: UE changes the priority value based on actually supported slice and re-check reselection criteria whether to camp in this frequency. |
| CMCC | Solution 6 is enhancement for solution 4, with the frequency priority adjustment. So the standardization complexity is low. But we worry about the deployment complexity if it would be a bit difficult to predict the UE behavior. |
| OPPO | We think the Option 6 is similar as Option 4 except the updating of frequency priority, which seems more complex than Option 4. |
| CATT | It is similar as solution 4. We think Solution 6 is enhancement of solution 4. But we still wondering whether it is reasonable to change frequency priority to the priority value of the highest priority slice supported both UE and the highest ranked cell. |
| LGE | The implementation complexity would not affect the decision to select one of 4 solutions. |
| China Telecom | Option 6 is at least more complex than Option 4. |
| KDDI | We have concerns on its feasibility, since the implementation will be something far different from the current priority behaviour. |
| Apple | We prefer Solution 4 instead. |
| Ericsson | We agree that Solution 6 is an enhancement of Solution 4. Some solution to the problem on supported slice in highest ranked cell is needed. |
| NEC | Same concern as for solution 4. And moreover, providing PCI list would increase signalling overhead. |
| Samsung | Similar comments as that of BT. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Solution 7** | |
| Company Name | Comments |
| BT | Considering our Q2 answer, this question is not relevant. |
| Lenovo, MotM | We do not see major hurdles here. |
| Intel | The impact is minimal and is provided in 2.4.1.3.4 of 2.4 Option 7 as follow:   1. TS38.331: introduction of the slice info in SIB and RRC Release 2. TS38.304:    1. Add a new subsection in §5.2.4 the carrier frequency priority determination for each NR frequency based on the slice info and the UE’s desired slices.   The frequency priority determined in a) overrides the legacy broadcast frequency priority (no other changes to the cell reselection procedure) |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Basically we have some concerns:  1. It uses configured slices, which was not discussed during SI phase  2.in section 2.4.1.2, it mentions “This may involve a change in registration area. If so, UE will perform a TA update and the URLCC slice will be included in the allowed list.", and we are not clear about the motivation of the text. If option 7 is to require the UE to perform RAU in order to add some slices in the allowed list, the option should be carefully reviewed.  Basically we see significant impacts for option 7. |
| Xiaomi | Not too difficult to implement. It seems that the only difficulty for UE is to decide the frequency priority from the slice info provided. Once the frequency priority is decided, the procedure is simple.  But as we state in our response to Q1, the slice priority is not decided yet, thus in option7, there may exists slice priority collision to be resolved if the slice priority is finally decided to be provided by UE or CN. |
| Nokia | We see no major issue, but relation to legacy (non-slice based frequency priorities) should be clarified. Note that this requires careful setting of frequency priorities to enable prioritization of slice groups. |
| CMCC | The standardization complexity is fine. But we are a bit worry it would be complicated for operator to configure the frequency priority per slice for Solution 7. Since the UE will decide the frequency priority based on all the priorities of configured slices for each frequency. |
| OPPO | It is hard to say considering our concern in Q1. |
| CATT | It is not difficult to specify this solution. |
| LGE | The implementation complexity would not affect the decision to select one of 4 solutions. |
| KDDI | Solution 7 is the simplest and most feasible. |
| Apple | It should not be “configured slices”. Also share LGE’s comment the implementation complexity should be not put too much weight on decision making. |
| Ericsson | Solution looks fairly straightforward. |
| NEC | Specification and UE Implementation is not difficult in our understanding.  Network configuration may need to be done carefully: not only the frequency priority setting for one slice is important, also the frequency priority setting for different slices on the same frequency is important |

**Q4: Which Option does your company support?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company Name | Supported Option | Comments |
| BT | Option 4 with changes | We consider our proposed logic simplifies option 4 and captures the intention of option 6. |
| Lenovo, MotM | Option 4 | This option is   * technically most aligned with the intention of the WID, * allows reasonable flexibility to the operator, * is relatively simple to specify and implement and * had maximum support in the previous email discussion [R2-2106501]. |
| Intel | Option 7 (with comments) | We note that some of this discussion is kind of a modeling, and in options 4, 6 and 7 have a common result in that UE finds the highest priority carrier where the highest priority slice is available.  We think we should discuss the functionalities required for the solution rather than just discuss supported option.   * 1. Slice list to be considered by the UE   We think the configured NSSAI, which is already available in the UE NAS, should be used (instead of allowed NSSAI) and should be sufficient here (the benefit of another configured slice list is not clear to us).   * 1. What slices are available in the UE’s location across the frequencies:   Slice availability of the neighbouring frequencies is provided in the current cells so UE does not have to scan and read the SIBs of the cells of the neighbouring frequencies.   * 1. Determining the slices to consider for prioritisation   The slices that are available in the region among the list of slices can be identified by taking the intersection of the configured NSSAIs and available slices on neighbouring carries provided in the SIB of the current cell.   * 1. Frequency priority determination   We think the slice priority can be implicitly included in the frequency priority information for the slices as explained above.  A 2 step approach of providing slice priority and frequency priority could provide better scalability than the 8 priorities available today. If this is considered important, we are open to consider providing a slice priority. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 4 | Option 4 can meet the intention of the WID and has reasonable standard impacts.  Option 5 is to use the number of slices to “implicitly” indicate frequency priority, which may lead to some efforts for network sides.  Option 6 is similar as option 4, but the key difference “change the frequency priority value” may lead to unexpected UE distributions.  Option 7 uses configured slices in procedure steps, and it may lead to significant impacts to NAS layer. |
| Xiaomi | Option 4 with changes | For other options, we have some concerns as we state in our response to Q1. |
| Nokia | Option 4 (see comments)  Option 6 (see comments)  Option 7 (see comments) | **Option 4:** We prefer option 4 if checking of supported slice is omitted or if it is clarified that checking of supported slice does not require advertisement of additional information.  **Option 6:** We are OK with option 6 if it is clarified that checking of supported slice does not require advertisement of additional information.  **Option 7:** We are OK with option 7 after clarifying the open issue |
| ZTE | Option 4 for the case when slice specific frequency priority is provided;  Option 5 for the case when slice specific priority is not provided but the supported slice info is provided |  |
| Qualcomm | When slice specific frequency priority is provided: Option 4 (removing step 7) or Option 6  When slice specific priority is not provided but the supported slice info is provided, Option 5 (with our suggested change) | We think the following 2 ways can be adopted depending on different slice info in UE. It provides operator more flexibility.   * When slice specific frequency priority is provided:   We can accept Option 4 if removing step 7 or Option 6. Option 4 with step 7 is unacceptable to us   * When slice specific priority is not provided but the supported slice info is provided:   We can accept Option 5 with our suggested change, i.e., removing last sentence in Step 1 and also removing last sentence in Step 2 (i.e. UE treat them equally).  For Option 7, we agree with some analysis, but we think it is too late to revert the definition of “intended slice” at this stage (i.e. from already agreed allowed S-NSSAI to configured S-NSSAI). As we mentioned, slice specific cell reselection is just a best-effort enhancement. |
| CMCC | Prefer Option 5.  Fine with Option 4. | We prefer option 5. Considering UEs will support more slices and the diverse deployment in the further, option 5 is the simplest and straightforward solution to taking all the intended slices into consideration and let UE camping on the cell that support the maximum slices. And, no need to configure slice priority can further reduce the complexity for both standardization and deployment configuration.  We see majority companies are supportive for option 4, we are also fine with option 4, which is also aligned with the intention of WID objectives. But as we replied to the former questions, we think option 4 still need some further clarifications. |
| OPPO | Option 4 (see comments)  Option 5 (see comments) | Option 4 and Option 5 can be used for different cases, as we mentioned in the above questions.   * We prefer to further discuss Option 4. * We are ok to Option 5 after resolving our concern in Q3. |
| T-Mobile US | Option 7 (followed by 6 and 4 as least desired.)  [With Option 5 we have concerns it provides least flexibility and may end up loading one particular frequency band which happen to be the one which provides the maximum coverage.] | As stated, “frequency priority for each frequency for cell reselection is the highest frequency priority of the available slices in the frequency among the UE configured slices.” As such, the operator can configure UE to specific spectrums based on operator strategy, which gives the operator more flexibility to configure frequency based on use case requirements, UE type, and geographical location.  Since slices can be configured in any TA geographical location with one or multi-gNBs, we think Option 7 is better suited for our potential use cases. This solution may also enhance the network performance by fast access to the right frequency band with operator proper planning. This will reduce access delays and avoid load-balancing in connected and idle modes. |
| CATT | Option 5(only supported slice info is provided)  Option 6 or Option 4 (slice specific frequency priority is provided) | If the only slice supported information is provide, the option5 is the best and solely option. But we propose to enhance this solution with considering the UE most desired slice.  If slice specific frequency priority is provided, the option 4 and 6 can be used. The option 4 is simpler than option 6. Also the option 5 can be used. |
| LGE | Option 4, 6, 7 | All of 4 options need more discussion.  We’d like to first clarify slice priority (UE/Network, AS/NAS). |
| China Telecom | Option 5 is preferred, and Option 4 is also OK for us. | Agree with CMCC. Option 5 is simple and straightforward. For the case that UE has multiple intended slices, Option 5 can help reduce the possibility of HO or redirection caused by camping on the cell not supporting the intended slice. |
| KDDI | Option7 | We think that opton7 is simplest, with the cell reselection behaviour. However, we may want to discuss about the case of being at the boundary of the tracking area. Since different priorities between different areas may cause ping-pong reselection. |
| Apple | Option 4 without Step 7;  Consider combo of 4 and 5. |  |
| Ericsson | No preference yet | Common to all Options is that they are dependent on the UE AS-NAS model and how the UE reacts when the camped cell indicates slice availability (for the serving cell and neighboring cells). The terms “slice priority”, “intended slice”, “desired slice” (more or less used in all Options) and how they relate to existing Configured/Allowed/Requested NSSAI need to be further discussed in RAN2.  After such discussion, we expect it will be easier to converge on AS solution.  In general, and common to all solutions, we assume the network operator need to ensure slice availability (= access to slices and services) on frequency layers such that this matches the slices/services that UEs may use simultaneously. Otherwise, availability of services to the UE may be interrupted and nw redirect/handover may be needed to move the UE to the appropriate frequency layer. |
| NEC | Mix of solution 4 (simple version) and 5  Solution 4 with change  Solution 7 (see comment) | We are ok with solution 4 but without extra loop in step7 and without supported slice checking on the best ranked cell in step 5.  Combo solution 4 and 5:   * Alt 1: Solution 4 when slice specific priority is provided, Solution 5 when it is not provided. * Alt 2: solution 4 when only one intended slice, solution 5 when multiple intended slices. * Alt 3: solution 5 but apply solution 4 for frequencies supporting same amount of UE’s intended slice.   For solution 6, we have concern to adjust frequencies priority dynamically based on measured best ranked cell and its slice supporting information.  Solution 7 if the slice priority is somehow network decision instead of UE decision. (This may needs to be clarified by CT/SA) |
| Samsung | Option 4 with adjustments | Step 1: List ~~Slices~~ slices in ~~the~~ priority order starting with highest priority slice.  Step 2: Select ~~the~~ slices in priority order starting with the highest priority slice. ~~first (or next if from Step 7) slice in the list~~  Step 3: Assign the priorities to frequencies according to the priority~~ies~~ order ~~provided to~~ of the selected slices.  Step 4: Perform cell search according to the legacy procedure using the priorities assigned in ~~s~~Step 3.  Step 5: If the highest ranked cell is suitable (as defined in 38.304) and supports the selected slices in Step 2 then camp on the cell and exit this sequence of operation~~; FFS: How the UE determines whether the highest ranked cell supports the selected slice~~.  Step 6: If there are remaining cell frequencies then go back to Step ~~3~~4.   1. ~~Step 7: FFS: If the end of the slice list has not been reached go back to step 2.~~   Step ~~78~~: Perform legacy cell reselection (using non-slice-based priorities i.e. for frequencies not corresponding to any slice support). |
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