3GPP TSG-RAN WG2 Meeting #126 R2-240xxxx

Fukuoka, Japan, May 20-24th, 2024

**[POST125bis][019][Emergency Calls] Common solution (Lenovo)**

**Intended outcome: Discuss need for a common solution and possible solutions for a common framework**

**Deadline: two weeks**

**Please fill in the below table:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Contact person – Company** | **Email** |
| Prateek – Lenovo | pmallick@lenovo.com |
| **Naveen – Apple** | **naveen.palle@apple.com** |
| **Alexey Kulakov-Vodafone** | **Alexey.kulakov1@vodafone.com** |
| **Max—T-Mobile USA** | **Kun.lu7@t-mobile.com** |
| **Jussi – Nokia** | **Jussi-pekka.koskinen@nokia.com** |
| **vivo- Xiang Pan** | **panxiang@vivo.com** |
| **Eswar- ZTE** | **Eswar.vutukuri@zte.com.cn** |
| **Yulong-Huawei** | **shiyulong5@huawei.com** |
| **Qianxi – OPPO** | **qianxi.lu@oppo.com** |
| **Emre - Ericsson** | **emre.yavuz@ericsson.com** |
| **Salva – BT** | **Salva.diazsendra@bt.com** |

**Phase 1 Completed**: Deadline 29th April UTC 22:00

**Phase 2**: Deadline for Phase 2: May 3rd, UTC 12:00

Let’s start with clarifying the aim of the common solution, as:

1. Common solution for EM Calls aims only UEs which are capable of EM Calls.
2. Common solution aims at enabling EM Calls for EM call capable UEs that are otherwise barred in the cell either due to MIB barring or feature specific SIB1 barring.

Based on the discussion in Phase 1, the most acceptable and working solution seems: **One explicit bit in SIB1 to indicate if cell supports EM calls irrespective of the feature(s) supported in the cell**. This bit will replace (e)RedCap barringExempt-eRedCap bit and therefore does not pose any further signalling load in SIB1. This information is used by a UE capable of EM Calls, barred in the cell and having no suitable cell to camp on.

**Q1: Is an explicit 1-bit indication in SIB1 replacing *barringExempt-eRedCap* bit acceptable to your company? The 1-bit indication in SIB1 is to be used to indicate if cell supports EM calls irrespective of the feature(s) supported in the cell. It is to be used by a UE when it is considered barred in the cell and has no suitable cell to camp on, to obtain limited services.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company name | Yes/ No | Comments |
| ZTE | Yes, with some clarifications (please see the comments) | We would like to add that the above should only be the case if the UE can access the cell normally (i.e. there is no issue with supported bandwidth, duplex mode etc) and MIB is not set to barred. So, to be clear, in this case, we still need all the text below in Red (from the endorsed R2-2402903) which is to check that the UE can access the cell “normally” although it has fewer number of Rx antennas)- the only change is the actual SIB1 bit:----------------- When *cellBarredRedCap1Rx* is set to “barred” in SIB1, a RedCap UE that supports only 1Rx branch can consider the cell as acceptable cell, only if cell selection criteria are fulfilled as defined in clause 5.2.3, *cellBarred* in MIB is not set to “barred” and in SIB1, *barringExemptIndication* is set to “true” and, if the RedCap UE supports only half duplex FDD operation, *halfDuplexRedCapAllowed* is set to “true” and, *intraFreqReselectionRedCap* is present in SIB1; or-----------------Btw, the turquoise highlighted text above seems to be missing from R2-2402903 (and 3472)?? Shouldn’t this check also be there?? i.e. for the emergency calls for 2RX/1RX to be allowed the cell should support (e)redcap in the first place, right?? Similar text as above can then be reused for eRedcap (with the same “barringExemptIndication” bit and for both 1Rx and 2Rx cases). Then, for XR we can add similar text too (e.g. as below): ------------------ proposed text for XR -----When *cellBarred2RxXR* is included in SIB1, an XR UE that supports only 2Rx branches can consider the cell as acceptable cell, only if cell selection criteria are fulfilled as defined in clause 5.2.3, *cellBarred* in MIB is not set to “barred” and in SIB1, *barringExemptIndication* is set to “true”; or-----------------Finally, for NES since the barring is based on MIB, we don’t think we need to do anything. i.e. when the MIB is set to barred and the cellBarredNES is present (note that cellBarredNES being present indicates that cell is actually **not barred**), the NES UE will anyway consider the cell as suitable cell. So, for this case, we don’t think anything is needed for the exemption (since the NES UE can access the cell normally for everything including EM calls). Btw, an alternative for the above is to allow UEs by default without checking the “*barringExemptIndication*” bit. If the intention is to go this way, it is also fine, but then this should be used for all cases. In this scenario, we still need all the above checks for each feature (to ensure EM calls can be performed in the cell), but without the check for the *barringExemptIndication* bit.  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Q2: Can the same 1-bit indication in SIB1 be applicable to Rel. 17 UEs, specifically for RedCap UEs (i.e., *barringExempt-RedCap* is not required anymore) as well to obtain limited services? And for this purpose, a magic sentence in the Rel. 17 CRs is sufficient?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company name | Yes/ No | Comments |
| ZTE | Yes | One bit can indicate the barring exemption and we should capture that the barring exemption according to this bit is applicable only if the UE can access the cell normally please see the comment above.  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |