**3GPP TSG-RAN WG2 Meeting #116e R2-21xxxxx**

Online, 1st – 12th November 2021

**Agenda item: 8.3.4**

**Source: Huawei/HiSilicon**

**Title: Summary of [Post115-e][236][MUSIM] Paging with service indication**

**WID: LTE\_NR\_MUSIM-Core**

**Document for: Discussion and Decision**

# Introduction

This document aims to collect views from companies for the following email discussion agreed during RAN2#115e:

* [Post115-e][236][MUSIM] Paging with service indication (Huawei)

 Scope: Discuss remaining open issues for paging with service indication and try to have draft CRs to illustrate the necessary modifications to specifications. Can discuss which specifications are affected. Can also discuss AS/NAS interactions with paging cause.

 Intended outcome: report + draft CRs

 Deadline: Long

Rapporteur would like to organize the email discussion in two phases:

**Phase 1:** Companies are invited to provide comments to the questions by Sep 30th

**Phase 2:** Rapporteur provides the summary report + draft CRs by Oct 11th and companies can further comment by Oct 19th, 0900 UTC; Rapporteur will finalize the summary + the draft CRs to submit on 22nd Oct

Please provide your contact information when responding.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Contact: Name (E-mail) |
| vivo | Boubacar(kimba@vivo.com) |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Rama Kumar Mopidevi (rama.kumar@huawei.com) |
| OPPO | Jiangsheng Fan(fanjiangsheng@oppo.com) |
| Qualcomm | oozturk@qti.qualcomm.com |
| NEC | Wangda(wangda@labs.nec.cn/wang\_da@nec.cn) |
| MediaTek | Felix Tsai(chun-fan.tsai@mediatek.com) |
| Sharp | Fangying.xiao@cn.sharp-world.com |
| Samsung | Sangyeob Jung (sy0123.jung@samsung.com) |
| Ericsson | lian.araujo@ericsson.com |
| Nokia | Srinivasan.selvaganapathy@nokia.com |
| Xiaomi | hongwei@xiaomi.com |
| Intel | Sudeep.k.palat@intel.com |

# Discussion

SA2 raised the following issue in the LS [17]:

**Issue:** UE shall be able to discriminate the case where it is being paged for non-voice from the case where it is being paged (for any service) by a RAN node not supporting the Paging Cause, either because the RAN node does not support the Paging Cause feature, or because in case of RAN sharing it is configured to operate without the Paging Case feature for some of the connected CNs.

In RAN2#113bis-e, the following agreements were made:

* 1: RAN2 works to support the MUSIM paging cause feature that SA2 is working on and also addresses the paging cause issue raised by SA2 LS.
* 2: RAN2 attempts to reply LS to SA2 once we progress on solution and agree on CR(s) that support/address the above feature/issue.
* 5: If RAN2 agrees to add a paging cause value (or any other information that could lead to a specific paging cause) in Uu paging message, RAN2 specifies the relevant UE behavior (i.e. inform or passing to the upper layer) upon its reception in both LTE and NR specifications.
* RAN2 does not intend to introduce alternative paging IDs for MUSIM paging (unless requested by SA2).

There were several contributions in RAN2#115-e with proposals to introduce paging cause feature and address the issue raised in the SA2 LS. The email discussion attempts to collect views from companies on the issues for adding paging cause with service indication.

## Solution Direction

Based on the contributions in RAN2-115e, the proposals to add paging cause can be classified into two groups:

* Group A: Add paging cause to the legacy paging record [11][14]
* Group B: Extend ”nonCriticalExtension” and create a parallel list or separate list [1][2][3][4][5][7][8][9][10][12][13][15]

We would like to collect views from companies on which group they prefer to decide on the solution direction.

#### Q1. Of group A and B, which one do you prefer to add paging cause?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Preferred Solution Group | Comments |
| Vivo | Group B | The parallel list approach was adopted in LTE Rel-16 extension (*accessType, mt-EDT*) as it introduces lower overhead. Group A (using extension marker “…”) has higher signalling overhead a the bits for versions determination and the version’s length determination are required per each paging record.  |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Group B |  |
| OPPO | Group B |  |
| Qualcomm | A or B | Either can be made to work. |
| NEC | Group B |  |
| MediaTek | Group B |  |
| Sharp | Group B |  |
| Samsung | Group B | Use of the extension marker "…" would incur 2 ~ 3 byte for each MUSIM UE paged from RAN suporting paging cause feature. Hence, we think Group B is more efficient/straightforward approach to go. |
| Ericsson | Group B |  |
| Nokia | Group B |  |
| Xiaomi | Group A | Group A is more efficient as discussed in our paper [11]. What’s more important, group B violates SA2’s agreement as we analyse in Table 3 below.  |
| Intel | Group B |  |

**Summary:**

**12 companies responded:**

* **10 companies prefer Group B**
* **1 company prefers Group A**
* **1 company commented that either Group can be made to work.**

**Considering the majority view, Group B is the preferred method to add paging cause.**

**Proposal 1: Introduce paging cause by using the ”nonCriticalExtension” in the Paging record.**

## Down selection of Solution Proposals

We discuss different proposals in each group and collect companies’ views on which solution they prefer. Different solution proposals in Group A are listed below along with the necessity of additional signalling to discriminate legacy paging from non-voice paging.

Table 1: Group A solutions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Group A Solution | Details including ASN.1 code snippet and additional signalling requirements to address the issue described in SA2 LS [17] |
| A.1 | Define a new pagingCause IE with {voice, other} in the legacy Paging Record IE [11]; no additional signalling required to address the issue raised in SA2 LS [17]PagingRecord ::= SEQUENCE { ue-Identity PagingUE-Identity, accessType ENUMERATED {non3GPP} OPTIONAL, -- Need N...,[[pagingCause-r17 ENUMERATED {voice, other} OPTIONAL, --Need N]]} |
| A.2 | Define a new pagingCause IE with {nonVoice} in the legacy PagingRecord IE; Broadcast in system information if RAN supports paging cause or not [14] to address the issue raised in SA2 LS [17]PagingRecord ::= SEQUENCE { ue-Identity PagingUE-Identity, accessType ENUMERATED {non3GPP} OPTIONAL, -- Need NpagingCause-r17 ENUMERATED {nonVoice } OPTIONAL, --Need N...} |

As mentioned in Section 2.1, Group B solutions are based on extending “nonCriticalExtension”:

Paging ::= SEQUENCE {

 pagingRecordList PagingRecordList OPTIONAL, -- Need N

 lateNonCriticalExtension OCTET STRING OPTIONAL,

 nonCriticalExtension Paging-v17xy-IEs OPTIONAL

}

Different solution proposals to add paging cause are listed below along with required additional signalling to discriminate legacy paging from non-voice paging.

Table 2: Group B solutions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Group B Solutions | Details including ASN.1 code snippet and additional signalling requirement to address the issue described in SA2 LS [17] |
| B.1 | Parallel list with only one cause value; UE capability/CN support exchange between UE and CN on paging cause which was already agreed by SA2 [2][7][12][18][19] to address the issue raised in SA2 LS [17]Paging-v17xy-IEs ::= SEQUENCE { pagingRecordList-v17xy PagingRecordList-v17xy OPTIONAL, -- Need NnonCriticalExtension SEQUENCE {} OPTIONAL}PagingRecordList ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE(1..maxNrofPageRec)) OF PagingRecordPagingRecordList-v17xy ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE(1..maxNrofPageRec)) OF PagingRecord-v17xyPagingRecord ::= SEQUENCE { ue-Identity PagingUE-Identity, accessType ENUMERATED {non3GPP} OPTIONAL, -- Need N ...}PagingRecord-v17xy ::= SEQUENCE { pagingCause-r17 ENUMERATED {voice} OPTIONAL -- Need N} |
| B.2 | Parallel list with 2 cause values [2][3][5][9]; no additional signalling required to address the issue raised in SA2 LS [17]Paging-v17xy-IEs ::= SEQUENCE { pagingRecordList-v17xy PagingRecordList-v17xy OPTIONAL, -- Need NnonCriticalExtension SEQUENCE {} OPTIONAL}PagingRecordList ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE(1..maxNrofPageRec)) OF PagingRecordPagingRecordList-v17xy ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE(1..maxNrofPageRec)) OF PagingRecord-v17xyPagingRecord ::= SEQUENCE { ue-Identity PagingUE-Identity, accessType ENUMERATED {non3GPP} OPTIONAL, -- Need N ...}PagingRecord-v17xy ::= SEQUENCE { pagingCause-r17 ENUMERATED {voice, other} OPTIONAL -- Need N} |
| B.3 | Separate list of pagingrecords for MUSIM UEs paged for voice in paging message [13]. The contribution does not explain how to address the issue raised in SA2 LS [17]Paging-v17xy-IEs ::=                SEQUENCE {    voicePagingRecordList-r17          VoicePagingRecordList-r17     OPTIONAL, -- Need N    nonCriticalExtension               SEQUENCE{}                OPTIONAL} PagingRecordList ::=                SEQUENCE (SIZE(1..maxNrofPageRec)) OF PagingRecord VoicePagingRecordList-r17  ::=      SEQUENCE (SIZE(1..maxNrofPageRec)) OF PagingRecord PagingRecord ::=                    SEQUENCE {    ue-Identity                         PagingUE-Identity,    accessType                          ENUMERATED {non3GPP}    OPTIONAL,   -- Need N...} |
| B.4 | Separate list of pagingrecords for MUSIM UEs in paging message [8]. The contribution does not explain how to address the issue raised in SA2 LS [17]Paging-v17xy-IEs ::=                SEQUENCE {    pagingRecordList2-r17             PagingRecordList2-r17     OPTIONAL, -- Need N    nonCriticalExtension               SEQUENCE{}                OPTIONAL} PagingRecordList ::=                SEQUENCE (SIZE(1..maxNrofPageRec)) OF PagingRecord PagingRecordList2-r17  ::=         SEQUENCE (SIZE(1..maxNrofPageRec)) OF PagingRecord-r17 PagingRecord ::=                    SEQUENCE {    ue-Identity                         PagingUE-Identity,    accessType                          ENUMERATED {non3GPP}    OPTIONAL,   -- Need N    ...} PagingRecord-r17 ::=                SEQUENCE {    ue-Identity                         PagingUE-Identity,    accessType                          ENUMERATED {non3GPP}    OPTIONAL,   -- Need N paginingCause-r17                   ENUMERATED  {voice}     OPTIONAL -- Need S} |
| B.5 | Including the number of UEs paged for voice in paging message and place the paging records with voice paging cause at the beginning or at the end of the paging message. An indication from RAN node if it supports paging cause or not [4] to address the issue raised in SA2 LS [17] Paging-v17xy-IEs ::= SEQUENCE {numOfPagingCause INTEGER {1..maxNrofPageRec} nonCriticalExtension SEQUENCE {} OPTIONAL} |

The table below lists the issues raised/expressed by companies in their contributions.

Table 3: Issues Raised for Group B Solutions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Solution | Issues Raised by companies or not clear from the proponent’s contribution for the solution |
| B.1 | 1. Requires uniform support of the paging cause in the registration area [5][10][15]

**[vivo]**: In the registration area, RAN can, per cell, indicate whether the paging cause feature is supported via the precense of the parallel list. So, there is no such restriction on the deployment and upgrade of the network.**[HW]**: Agree with Vivo. If ”pagingrecordlist-v17” is NOT included, it means that gNB does not support paging cause. If ”pagingrecordlist-v17” is included and paging cause present, it means that gNB supports paging cause and paged for voice. ”pagingrecordlist-v17” is included and paging cause absent, it means that gNB supports paging cause and paged for other.**[OPPO]** We don’t think B.1 has this issue and share the similar understanding with vivo.1. Service type should be identified by only Uu paging message to identify service type, that is, not combine Uu paging message and NAS indication to identify service type [3][15]

**[vivo]**: As SA2 has alreadly introduced the NAS indication and the combination seems not complicated, it is reasonable for RAN2 to consider this indication to avoid useless signalling overhead in Uu paging message. **[HW]**: there is no separate NAS indication, here UE uses the MUSIM capability exchange etween the UE and the CN to address the issues mentioned in the SA2 LS.**[OPPO]** why this cannot be solved by UE implementation? No big issue from our side.1. Causes much signalling overhead compared to A.1[11]

**[vivo]:** see our comments in Q1.**[HW]:** Signalling overhead is not an issue as analysed in our contribution [12]**[OPPO]** we see no much difference from signalling overhead perspective, tend to have a easy ASN design.1. Violates SA2’s agreement that paging cause indication should not be applied indiscriminately [11]

**[vivo]**: In case of incoming service is voice, the RAN will include the *pagingCause* IE for for MUSIM UE, while not include the *pagingCause* IE for non MUSIM UE. So, paging cause indication is not applied indiscriminately by the RAN.**[HW]:** paging cause indication is applied only to Ues that support it so it does not violate SA2’s agreement.**[OPPO]** we don’t think B.1 goes aganist any SA2 decision.**[Xiaomi]** Clearly this solution violates SA2’s decision since the length of the new added *PagingRecordList-v17xy* has to be the same with the old *PagingRecordList*. Otherwise this solution can’t work. This means the base station has to set up the corresponding *PagingRecord-v17xy* field for UEs which are not working in MUSIM mode, not only for UEs which are working in MUSIM mode. |
| B.2 | 1. Introducing 2 values is not consistent with SA2’s conclusion [12][21]

**[Ericsson]** The cause “Other” is needed to address the issue raised in SA2 LS [17]1. Causes much signalling overhead compared to A.1[11]

**[Ericsson]** If we go for group B solutions, the parallel list is needed in any case. However the signalling overhead seems not to be a big issue.1. Violates SA2’s agreement that paging cause indication should not be applied indiscriminately [11]

**[Ericsson]** The paging cause is only sent to the Multi-USIM UEs, so it does not violate the SA2 agreement**[Xiaomi]** Clearly this solution violates SA2’s decision since the length of the new added *PagingRecordList-v17xy* has to be the same with the old *PagingRecordList*. Otherwise this solution can’t work. This means the base station has to set up the corresponding *PagingRecord-v17xy* field for UEs which are not working in MUSIM mode, not only for UEs which are working in MUSIM mode. |
| B.3 | 1. It is not clear from [13] how to address the issue raised in SA2 LS [17]
 |
| B.4 | 1. RAN node needs additional information from CN/RAN if the paging is for MUSIM or not so that RAN can page the UE via legacy or new paging record [12]
2. It is not clear from [8] how to address the issue raised in SA2 LS [17]
 |
| B.5 | 1. Restricts way of extension in future [7]
 |

#### Q2: If Group A is your preferred direction, which solution do you prefer?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Preferred Solution in Group A | Comments |
| Qualcomm | A.1 |  |
| Xiaomi | A.1 |  |

**Summary:**

**2 companies responded and both prefer A.1 solution. Since Group A did not get the majority, we suggest not to proceed with Group A solutions.**

**Proposal 2: No need to study solution proposals based on extending legacy Paging record.**

#### Q3: If Group B is your preferred direction, which solution do you prefer? Proponents are encouraged to address the issues mentioned in Table 3.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Preferred Solutions in Group B | Comments |
| vivo | B.1 (proponents) | We provide our reply for the comments of the solution B.1 in Table 3.Basically, we prefer B.1 due to its advantages of simplicity and readability, as it follows the extension method that was adopted in LTE. For solutions B.3~B.5: Solutions B.3 and B.4 have the same drawback as B.5. For example, if a new feature is introduced in the later release, the sorted-based or group-based solutions may introduce more complexity, because it is difficult to put one UE supporting both paging cause feature and the new feature in one proper position. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | B.1 | Please see our answers for the comments of the solution B.1 in Table 3.Of group B solutions, B.1 is the simplest solution, and with the SA2 agreement on MUSIM UE capabilities information exchange between UE and CN, the issue raised in SA2 LS [17] will be addressed. There is no need for 2 paging cause values as proposed in B.2 |
| OPPO | B.1 | Among solutions, B.1 is straightforward, we prefer to have a easy solution. |
| Qualcomm | B.2 or B.4 | It is not true that B.1 solves the problem of UE differentiating between legacy NW and Rel-17 supporting this indication. If the paging is due to non-voice, this new IE in B.1 (PagingRecord-v17xy) will not be included and thus the UE will only see the legacy paging record. In that case, the UE does not know whether this is a Rel-17 NW sending non-voice paging or legacy NW not supporting the paging indication. We need a way for the UE to differentiate these two cases so that the UE can, for example, decide to send busy indication for non-voice. Thus, we either add “other” as in B.2 or create a parallel list as in B.4 which is used instead of the legacy list for Rel-17 NW. |
| NEC | B.1 | Solution B.1 can address the SA2 issue and is also one straightforward solution. |
| MediaTek | B.2See comment for clarification on both B.2 and B.1 | We think B.3 to B.5 create unnecessary overhead and SPEC complexity. Parallel list is more straightforward approach.For both B.1 and B.2, we have to clarify that the **Parallel list (if present) should include the same number of entries and in legacy list**.For B.1, we should clarify that if NW include an entry with “empty” PagingRecord-v17xy (i.e. pagingCause-r17 is absent), this implies that the corresponding paging record is **non-voice**. It should be possible for NW to include a parallel list that all entries in the list are empty. With this understanding, B.1 will have similar function as B.2. But we are not sure whether companies have the same view.PagingRecord-v17xy ::= SEQUENCE { pagingCause-r17 ENUMERATED {voice} **OPTIONAL** -- Need N}  |
| Sharp | B.1 | Solution B.1 is easy and straightforward. |
| Samsung | B.4 (high priority) or B.1  | On the number of explicit paging cause codes: * We think a single paging cause is sufficient/efficient. If the UE is paged with the legacy paging record list, the UE knows that RAN node does not support the paging cause feature. If the UE is paged with newly defined paging record list (regardless of parallel or separate paging record list), the UE will know that it is paged due to non-voice service if the paging cause tagged with a certain UE is absent. From this perspective, we do not see any benefit to introduce two explicit paging causes.

On parallel vs. separate paging record list:* In our understanding, both B.1 and B.4 can address the scenario in SA2 LS. Please check how B.4 handles it i.e. Observation 6 in [8]. Hence, we prefer to go for B.4 in the sense that it is **more signalling efficient**.
 |
| Ericsson | B.2 | See the answers for B.2 in Table 3.Note that solutions B.1 and B.2 are conceptually the same. The only difference is the presence of the second cause in B.2 needed to address the issue raised in SA2 LS [17]. In fact, the capability exchange mentioned in B.1, is between UE and CN, but it does not take into accounts the RAN capability. So, if UE and CN supports the paging cause, but not the RAN, the cause will not be sent to the UE. |
| Intel | B2 or B1 (see comments) | Conceptually, B1 and B2 are similar. We don’t think B2 violates SA2 requirements (stage 3 signalling details are RAN2 responsibility). Nor do we think the overhead in B2 is a big issue. As MediaTek commented, it is not clear to us whether everyone has the same understanding on B1 and B2. Parallel lists normally have the same number of entries as the original list. In that case, B1 can provide the necessary information but it will be a bit strange to include a parallel list when none of the entries have a field present. On B2, as there are no other Rel-17 fields in PagingRecord-v17xy, we could also make pagingCause-r17 mandatory in B2.  |

**Summary:**

**10 companies responded:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Solution** | **Supporting companies** |
| **B.1** | **Vivo, Huawei/HiSilicon, Oppo, NEC, Sharp** |
| **B.2** | **MTK, Ericsson** |
| **B.2 or B.4** | **Qualcomm** |
| **B.4 or B.1** | **Samsung with B.4 (high priority)** |
| **B.2 or B.1** | **Intel** |

**None of the solutions got absolute majority, Solution B.1 and Solution B.2 got majority support (7/10 for B.1, 4/10 for B.2, 2/10 for B.4). Hence we propose that further discussion is needed to select the solution.**

**Proposal 3: FFS if B.1 (parallel list with 1 paging cause value “voice”) or B.2 (parallel list with 2 paging cause values “voice, other”) is the preferred ASN.1 coding approach.**

There was a proposal that RAN2 shall not add paging cause in RRC Paging message for EPS [6] hence we would like to collect your views if the solution proposal in NR can be applied to LTE to introduce paging cause. Please note that RAN2 has reached the following agreement in RAN2-113bis-e meeting.

* RAN2 does not intend to introduce alternative paging IDs for MUSIM paging (unless requested by SA2).

#### Q4: Can the solution proposal in NR to introduce paging cause be applied to LTE?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Answer (Yes or No) | Comments |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| NEC | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes | Please note that in the WID, it clearly specify that paging with service indication applies both to NR and LTE. |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Nokia | No | In our understanding for this WID we intend to minimise the LTE RRC impacts as much as possible. As most of the existing MUSIM devices in field are LTE, for this service type indication to be beneficial without radio interface changes is preferred. Moreover the privacy issue of sending service indication directly in paging was acceptable to SA3 for NR because the GUTI change is must for NR ,so it was acceptable for NR. As existing EPC systems will not change TMSI for every paging, still the paging cause of UE is traceble. This issue is not discussed in detail in RAN2. And we require views from SA3 on this issue. Based on the above, we propose to send LS to SA2 to consider alternative solution at NAS level for service type indication without RRC impact |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |

**Summary: 12 companies responded:**

* + **11 think that the same solution proposal in NR can be applied to LTE**
	+ **1 company does not think so and wants to send an LS to SA2 to consider alternative solution at NAS level.**

**Considering the majority view, we propose the following:**

**Proposal 4: The solution proposal to introduce paging cause in NR will be used for LTE.**

#### Q5: If the answer to Q4 is No, then please give the solution proposed for LTE.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposed solution for LTE |
| Nokia | NAS level solution from EPC to indicate this service type via other means is possible. One of the option is that EPC can assign different S-TMSI value for service type without impacting RRC paging.  |
|  |  |

**Summary: Since it’s only one company that prefers a different solution for LTE, we think there is no need to ask SA2 to consider NAS level solution for LTE.**

**Proposal 5: No need to send an LS to SA2 asking to consider a NAS solution to introduce paging cause in LTE.**

## AS-NAS interaction

The following agreement was made in RAN2-113bis-e:

**If RAN2 agrees to add a paging cause value (or any other information that could lead to a specific paging cause) in Uu paging message, RAN2 specifies the relevant UE behavior (i.e. inform or passing to the upper layer) upon its reception in both LTE and NR specifications.**

There are two cases depending on the RRC state: CN paging and RAN paging that are described below. Please note that the description is based on NR specifications.

### CN paging

For paging reception in RRC\_IDLE, the current behaviour [20] is that UE’s RRC forwards the ue-Identity and accessType (if present) to NAS. Following this behaviour, it’s natural if UE’s RRC forwards the paging cause to NAS and let NAS decide what to do, i.e., accept the paging or reject the paging.

#### Q6: Do you agree that for paging reception in RRC\_IDLE, UE forwards the paging cause to NAS and it’s up to NAS to decide on what to do i.e., accept the paging or reject the paging?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Answer (Yes or No) | Comments |
| Vivo | Yes |  |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| NEC | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |

**Summary: 12 companies responded and all agreed that for paging reception in RRC\_IDLE, UE forwards the paging cause to NAS and it’s up to NAS whether to accept or reject the paging. Hence we propose the following:**

**Proposal 6: For paging reception in RRC\_IDLE, UE forwards the paging cause to NAS. It’s up to NAS whether to accept or reject the paging.**

### RAN paging

For RAN paging reception in RRC\_INACTIVE, RAN2 has not discussed which layer (i.e. RRC or NAS) decides to accept/reject paging.

In addition, CT1 has sent reply LS on NAS-based busy indication and provided two options for AS-NAS interaction for RAN paging [16]. Both of them (Option 1 & 2) are listed below along with other possible options. CT1 also asked RAN2 if a paging cause, if any, indicated together with indication about RAN paging from AS layer to NAS layer.

**Option 1: the AS layer resumes the RRC connection upon receipt of RAN paging and then the AS layer informs the NAS layer an indication that the UE has transitioned to RRC\_CONNECTED state and indication about the RAN paging;**

**Option 2: the AS layer informs the NAS layer an indication about the RAN paging and the AS layer resumes the RRC connection based on a request from the NAS layer to the AS layer to transition to RRC\_CONNECTED state (the request from NAS layer is triggered by acceptance of RAN paging or the SERVICE REQUEST message containing the “NAS signalling connection release" indication);**

**Option 3: No need to specify AS-NAS interaction, up to UE implementation;**

**Option 4: Others, please give details if chosen this option.**

Considering the AS-NAS interaction options provided above and the open issue of which layer decides to accept/reject paging, we can discuss the AS-NAS interaction modelling for RAN paging.

#### Q7: For the AS-NAS interaction for paging reception in RRC\_INACTIVE, which of the above options do you prefer?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Answer | Comments |
| Vivo | Option 2 | NAS layer may decide not to send NAS busy indication if it judges the UE cannot do this, e.g., upper layer knows the service in another network is delay sensitive. And for this reason, the RRC resume procedure should not be initiated before NAS determination. And option 2 can enable an uniform UE behaviour when receiving RAN paging and CN paging. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Option 4.We would like to keep the legacy behaviour for RAN paging (i.e., RRC layer initiating RRC connection resume procedure when paging is received in RRC\_INACTIVE) as much as possible and hence provide a different solution. please see comments | AS layer decides whether to accept the paging or not. If AS layer rejects paging, it’s also up to AS layer to judge whether it can send busy indication or not. How the AS layer can judge whether it can send busy indication or not is up to UE implementation * + If AS layer accepts paging, it follows the legacy procedure to initiate RRC connection resume procedure and there is no need to send indication to NAS.
	+ If AS layer rejects paging and decides NOT to send busy indication, then there is no need to initiate RRC connection resume procedure and no need to send indication to NAS.
	+ If AS layer rejects paging and decides to send busy indication, it follows the legacy procedure to initiate RRC connection resume procedure and sends indication to NAS to trigger the SR procedure for busy indication.
 |
| OPPO | Prefer Option3 but can accept Option1 with modification | RAN paging indication from AS is just one trigger for NAS busy indication, some other trigger like application layer may also trigger NAS busy indication, we don’t find big issue to leave this to UE implementation, so we slightly prefer Option3.As for Option1 and Option2, Option2 has more spec effort than Option1. More addition, Option2 has no more benefit compared to Option1 from saving signalling perspective.But for Option1, we think RAN paging cause should also be forward to NAS if provided in paging message, so propose the following version:**Option 1: the AS layer resumes the RRC connection upon receipt of RAN paging and then the AS layer informs the NAS layer an indication that the UE has transitioned to RRC\_CONNECTED state and indication about the RAN paging and RAN paging cause if provided.** |
| Qualcomm | Option 2 or 3 | Since we only have NAS based busy indication in RRC Inactive, it would be cleaner if all the action in response to paging, whether RAN or CN-based paging, is done by the NAS. Then, all we need for AS is to pass the paging indication to the NAS. So, Option 2 is acceptable. It is also fine not to specify the AS-NAS interaction and leave it up to the UE implementation.  |
| NEC | Option 4 (otherwise, Option 2) | For Option 1, our concern is that it is not aligned with the CR provided in the LS from SA2 R2-2106970, as the UE has already transitioned to CONNECTED state.For Option 2, we think it is workable, although it is change the current UE behaviour upon reception of RAN paging. One aspect is that if the upper layer decides **not to** send busy indication, SA2/CT1 also need to specify UE behaviour that NAS shall initiate RRC Connection resume for INACTVE UE in case of paging reception. As another alternative, it is also possible to indicate the paging cause to the NAS layer at the same time when initiating RRC Resume procedure:  **Option 4: Upon receipt of RAN paging, the AS layer resumes the RRC connection and informs the NAS layer the indication (paging cause) about the RAN paging.**For this option, if the upper layer decides to send busy indication, the NAS layer can generate Service Request NAS message for busy indication, which can be transmitted when UE enters CONNECTED state later. And if the NAS or higher layer decides not to generate busy indication, then the NAS layer doesn’t have to response anything to AS layer. Note that we will not specify detail UE behaviour (e.g. cancelling/stopping resume procedure) when NAS layer generates Service Request message while AS layer is performing RRC Resume procedure. |
| MediaTek | Option 3 | Which layer decide to reject/accept the paging is completely UE internal behavior.  |
| Sharp | Option 2 | RAN2 has already agree that NAS-busy indication is used for both RAN paging and CN paging. So, when RAN paging is received, it should indicate to upper layer. When UE is busy in another network, it may even not send the busy indication. |
| Samsung | Option 2 |  |
| Ericsson | Option 3, but | It can be left to UE implementation, but if companies see a need to specify in standard, we are fine to go with majority. |
| Nokia | Option 3 with additional comments | In RRC-INACTIVE state it is upto UE to respond with RRC-Resume if it wants. If the AS layer decides to accept based on its internal awareness of the other MUSIM operation it can do without notifying to NAS. If it decides to respond with BUSY because of other USIM state NAS can be informed or UE can drop the page without informing NAS also. As both options are allowed it can be left to UE implementation |
| Xiaomi | Option 3 |  |
| Intel | Option 3 | It can be left to UE implementation. The external behaviour is clear – to respond positively to Paging, AS sends the ResumeRequest and NAS provides the busy indication for negative response. Further details on internal interaction can be left to UE implementation.  |

**Summary: 12 companies responded:**

* + **3 companies prefer Option 2**
	+ **5 companies prefer Option 3**
	+ **1 company prefers Option 4;**
	+ **1 company prefers Option 3 but can accept Option 1 with modification**
	+ **1 company prefers Option 2 or Option 3**
	+ **1 company prefers Option 4 or Option 2.**

**None of the options got absolute majority. Considering the responses, Option 2 and Option 3 (i.e. up to UE implementation) got the majority support. Hence we propose that further discussion is needed to select the preferred option.**

**Proposal 7: For the AS-NAS interaction for paging reception in RRC\_INACTIVE, FFS Option 2 or Option 3 (i.e. up to UE implementation) is the preferred solution.**

#### Q8: Can the above AS-NAS interaction principles for NR be applied to LTE?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Answer (Yes or No) | Comments |
| Vivo | Yes |  |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| NEC | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Nokia | No | As we propose that solution which avoid LTE impacts to be considered |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |

**Summary: 12 companies responded: 11 companies think that the AS-NAS interaction principles for NR can be applied to LTE. 1 company suggested to consider a solution that avoids LTE impacts. Considering the majority view, we propose the following:**

**Proposal 8: The AS-NAS interaction principles for NR are applied to LTE.**

## Specification Impact

The rapporteur understands that paging cause solution will impact 38.331 and potentially 36.331 (depending on the conclusion of Q4). In addition to the two specifications, do you think any other specs are impacted? If yes, please provide the specs.

#### Q9: In addition to the above specifications, do you think any other RAN2 specs are impacted? If yes, please provide the specs.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Answer (Yes or No) | Comments |
| vivo | Maybe TS36.300 and/or TS38.300 |  |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | No | Introduction of service indication in paging message is a Stage 3 design and thus there is no need to capture it in Stage 2 specs. |
| OPPO | No | 38.331 is enough. |
| Qualcomm | Maybe stage 2 | If busy indication is captured in stage-2, service indication should also be included for coherent handling. |
| NEC | Maybe stage-2 specs as it is related to busy indication |  |
| MediaTek | We see no strong need to have stage 2 description but open for discussion |  |
| Sharp | No |  |
| Samsung | Maybe stage 2 |  |
| Ericsson | No, but | We do not think it is essential to capture it in stage 2, but if companies see a need we are fine to capture something on stage 2. |
| Nokia | LTE specification impact to be concluded after discussion on the comments related to LTE impacts of RRC paging indicated in earlier sections |  |
| Xiaomi | No |  |
| Intel | May be Stage 2  | We think this is useful to capture in stage 2.  |

**Summary: 12 companies responded.**

* + **1 company suggested that LTE spec impact can be concluded based on the comments related to LTE impacts of RRC paging. However, since majority view was to apply the paging cause proposal for NR and AS-NAS interactions principles for NR to LTE, it can be concluded that 38.331 and 36.331 will be impacted.**
	+ **4 companies think there is no need to update stage 2 specs.**
	+ **5 companies think update of stage 2 specs may be needed.**
	+ **2 companies think it’s not essential to capture in stage 2 but open for discussion.**

**Considering the responses, we propose the following:**

**Proposal 9: Introduction of paging cause impacts 38.331 and 36.331 specs; FFS if it impacts stage 2 specs (38.300 and 36.300)**

## Other Comments

#### Q10: If there are any other issues for paging cause with service indication that rapporteur missed, please provide them below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| OPPO | For Q7, RAN paging cause delivery to NAS should also be considered. |
|  |  |

**Summary: Since there is no consensus on the preferred Option for AS-NAS interaction to receive paging in RRC\_INACTIVE, if RAN paging cause is delivered to NAS can be discussed together with Proposal 7.**

# Conclusions

Based on the inputs from companies during Phase 1 discussion, the following proposals are made:

**Proposal 1: Introduce paging cause by using the ”nonCriticalExtension” in the Paging record.**

**Proposal 2: No need to study solution proposals based on extending legacy Paging record.**

**Proposal 3: FFS if B.1 (parallel list with 1 paging cause value “voice”) or B.2 (parallel list with 2 paging cause values “voice, other”) is the preferred ASN.1 coding approach.**

**Proposal 4: The solution proposal to introduce paging cause in NR will be used for LTE.**

**Proposal 5: No need to send an LS to SA2 asking to consider a NAS solution to introduce paging cause in LTE.**

**Proposal 6: For paging reception in RRC\_IDLE, UE forwards the paging cause to NAS. It’s up to NAS whether to accept or reject the paging.**

**Proposal 7: For the AS-NAS interaction for paging reception in RRC\_INACTIVE, FFS Option 2 or Option 3 (i.e. up to UE implementation) is the preferred solution.**

**Proposal 8: The AS-NAS interaction principles for NR are applied to LTE.**

**Proposal 9: Introduction of paging cause impacts 38.331 and 36.331 specs; FFS if it impacts stage 2 specs (38.300 and 36.300)**

**Update after Phase 2 deadline:**

Only one company provided the comment that the summary in general looks reasonable. Hence the proposals from Phase 1 summary are kept as they are.

The proposals are reordered for online discussion as below:

**For easy agreements:**

**Proposal 1: Introduce paging cause by using the ”nonCriticalExtension” in the Paging record.**

**Proposal 2: No need to study solution proposals based on extending legacy Paging record.**

**Proposal 4: The solution proposal to introduce paging cause in NR will be used for LTE.**

**Proposal 5: No need to send an LS to SA2 asking to consider a NAS solution to introduce paging cause in LTE.**

**Proposal 6: For paging reception in RRC\_IDLE, UE forwards the paging cause to NAS. It’s up to NAS whether to accept or reject the paging.**

**Proposal 8: The AS-NAS interaction principles for NR are applied to LTE.**

**For further discussion:**

**Proposal 3: FFS if B.1 (parallel list with 1 paging cause value “voice”) or B.2 (parallel list with 2 paging cause values “voice, other”) is the preferred ASN.1 coding approach.**

**Proposal 7: For the AS-NAS interaction for paging reception in RRC\_INACTIVE, FFS Option 2 or Option 3 (i.e. up to UE implementation) is the preferred solution.**

**Proposal 9: Introduction of paging cause impacts 38.331 and 36.331 specs; FFS if it impacts stage 2 specs (38.300 and 36.300)**
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