[95e-44-R17-IoT-NTN-WI] - Version 0.0.4
RAN

3GPP TSG RAN Meeting #95-e RP-220904

Electronic Meeting, March 17th – 23rd, 2022

Source: MediaTek Inc.

Title: Moderator's summary for discussion [95e-44-R17-IoT-NTN-WI]

Agenda item: 10.4.3

Document for: Report

1 Introduction

This email discussion is scheduled into Initial, Intermediate, Final (and if required Extended) rounds, as per the timeplan provided by the RAN Chairman, in UTC time as follows.

Table 1: Email discussion schedule

Initial Round comments	March 17th @08:00h – March 18th @11:00h
Intermediate Round comments	March 18th @15:30h – March 21st @11:00h
Mandatory quiet period	*March 18th @18:59h – March 20th @23:59h*
Final Round comments	March 21st @15:30h – March 22nd @11:00h
(Extended Round comments)	March 22nd @15:30h – March 23rd @11:00h

If necessary, draft revisions of the documents subject to this email discussion will be stored in inbox/Drafts/[95e-44-R17-IoT-NTN-WI] folder.

The documents subject to this email discussion are listed in the table below.

Table 2: Tdocs subject to email discussion

TDOC	Title	Source	Proposals

RP-220403	Rel-17 Specification Finalization	Nokia	**Proposal 1:** Remaining open items are accurately listed in the Rel-17 WI **status reports** for making timely and solid completion of Rel-17 specifications possible **Proposal 2:Exception sheets** are agreed for the Rel-17 core work items with remaining open items to ensure that all the companies in RAN WG1, WG2, WG3 and WG will focus on the same agreed open items during 2Q2022 and thereby enable aligned specifications across the RAN WGs. The documents highlights Proposals 1 and 2 apply to WI NB-IoT/eMTC support for Non-Terrestrial Networks.
RP-220749	Status report for WI NB-IoT/eMTC support for Non-Terrestrial Networks (NTN); rapporteur: MediaTek	RAN1	**SR** for WI NB-IoT/eMTC support for Non-Terrestrial Networks including outstanding issues.
RP-220750	Exception request: IoT NTN (RAN2)	Rapporteur	**Exception request** for WI NB-IoT/eMTC support for Non-Terrestrial Networks

The moderator expects the principle outlined in RP-220403 and used in RP-220749, RP-220750 is the goal of this email discussion. This goal is two-fold:

1. to accurately list the remaining open items for the IoT NTN WI in the corresponding SR (i.e. a potential revision of RP-220749)
2. in accordance with 1. to draft an Exception request for the remaining open items (i.e. a potential revision of RP-220750), subject to RAN#96e plenary approval.

The moderator thus proposes to organize this discussion as follows: first to come to a common view on an accurate list of the open items (using RP-220749 and RP-220750 as starting point) and second to reflect this

list as necessary in a potential revision of RP-220749 and RP-220750 (the moderator will provide the revision as necessary).

Should you have any general comment to the goal of this email discussion, please use the general comments form in §2.1 below.

2 Initial Round

RAN working groups declared the completion level of the IoT NTN WI as follows:

- RAN1: 100%
- RAN2: 98%
- RAN3: 100%
- (Overall: 99%)

NOTE: this Rel-17 WI has no RAN4 part.

The remaining open issues as listed in the status report in RP-220749 are quoted in the table below (Please note the moderator clarified what 8.14.1 and 8.14.2 refer to; and bulleted the open issues for RAN2 a~g).

Table 3: Remaining open issues listed in SR RP-220749

WG (reference)	**Remaining open issues**
RAN1 (see §2.1.2 of the SR)	Complete maintenance phase for AI 8.14.1 (Enhancements to time and frequency synchronization) and AI 8.14.2 (Timing relationship enhancements)
RAN2 (see §2.2.2 of the SR)	a) FFS regarding signaled ephemeris type (FFS if two, three of four types and the details on semantics) for discontinuous coverage b) FFS whether epoch time could be optional and be implicitly derived when not provided c) FFS whether to in addition to BCCH provide the option to share the information by dedicated RRC signaling for discontinuous coverage d) FFS whether anything need to be specified for AS-NAS interaction while the UE is out of coverage e) FFS if to introduce additional parameters for further enhanced spatial coverage prediction (like satellite footprint reference point, satellite coverage radius or elevation angle) for discontinuous coverage f) Parameters for prediction of discontinuous coverage and handling of the new SIB g) Signaling of remaining GNSS position validity duration to the network

RAN3 (see §2.3.2 of the SR)	100% of the items defined in the RAN3 WID objectives have been accomplished.

2.1 General comments

Should you have any general comments to the goal of this email discussion, please use the form below: no need to comment unless you fundamentally disagree with this goal.

Feedback Form 1: General comments to the goal of the email discussion

1 – Qualcomm Incorporated

The exception sheet in RP-220750 includes one more item for RAN2 compared to the items listed in the table above: (see ”Location Reporting - Address the FFS on UE location information reporting”).

It is unclear why that was not part of this discussion.

Also, the pdf export of the table of remaining open issues looks broken.

2 – MediaTek Inc.

Moderator: Responding to Qualcomm: Thanks for spotting an inconcistency between 749 and 750. Let’s consider among RAN2 open issues:

h) FFS on UE location reporting

2.2 Remaining open issues: RAN1

Q1: Please indicate in the form below whether or not you agree with the statement in the table “Remaining Open Issues” pertaining to RAN1, and if not, please indicate why.

Q2: If you do agree with the statement, please also indicate whether you agree this need *not* be listed in the Exception Request (this is the Moderator’s assumption).

Feedback Form 2: Initial Round: Remaining open issues: RAN1

1 – Qualcomm Incorporated

Agree with the rapporteur - the remaining issues can be resolved in RAN1 in the maintenance phase; and also agree there is no need to list in exception request.

2 – Apple GmbH

We agree that the remaining RAN1 issues can be addressed in maintenance phase, and they do not need to be listed in the exception request.

3 – HuaWei Technologies Co.

We also support the view from the rapporteur, the remaining issues can be handled in the maintenance phase as usual, and consequently no need to list them in the exception sheet.

4 – NOVAMINT

We agree with the rapporteur's view that RAN1 remaining issues can be addressed in maintenance phase so no need for an exception sheet.

5 – ZTE Corporation

Agree with the rapporteur's view that RAN1 remaining issues can be addressed in maintenance phase thus no need to include in the exception sheet.

6 – Intel Corporation SAS

In our view the remaining discussion in RAN1 corresponds to the maintenance phase, i.e. RAN1 is fixing potential issues in specification for already agreed features without introduction of new features.

So, we agree with the statement in the table "Remaining Open Issues" pertaining to RAN1.

We also agree that this need *not* be listed in the Exception Request.

7 – Sateliot

Agree with the rapporteur's proposal for RAN1

8 – Samsung Research America

We think any remaining issue can be handled in maintenance phase. No need for an exception request.

9 – Nokia France

More specifically, "details of method(s) to drop/insert per segment" should be added.

10 – Eutelsat S.A.

We also agree with the rapporteur's proposal on RAN1 aspects. No need to list in the exception sheet.

11 – MediaTek Inc.

Q1, Q2: we agree

12 – Lockheed Martin

We agree with the rapporteur's proposal.

2.3 Remaining open issues: RAN2

Q1: Please indicate using the form below which of the open issues, listed in the table "Remaining Open Issues" pertaining to RAN2, you agree with as is.

Q2: Please indicate using the form below which of the open issues, listed in the table "Remaining Open Issues" pertaining to RAN2, you would like to remove or clarify (and if so, please indicate the necessary changes).

Q3: Please indicate using the form below should you see any missing open issue from the listed open issues.

Feedback Form 3: Initial Round: Remaining open issues: RAN2

1 – Qualcomm Incorporated

For item g) in the list, the agreement in RAN2 was "P2: RAN2 will follow the RAN1 agreement that UE will report the remaining GNSS validity duration to the network. FFS: value range (not clear if the values of RAN1 agreement can be used). FFS which message". So, need for signalling was already agree, what is FFS is details and range. So, the item should be clarified as:

g) signaling details and value range for reporting remaining GNSS position validity duration to the network.

Related to this, the exception request document currently has "Address Signalling of GNSS position validity remaining time". This should be revised to "Address signalling details including value range of GNSS position validity remaining time for reporting to the network".

Additionally, we think we should clarify how each PLMN sharing the same RAN indicates support for discontinuous coverage, whether it is implicit indication common for all PLMNs sharing the RAN or explicit indication.

It is important to address it now in order not to have problem in the future as this is not a mere optimization. Therefore, we suggest adding following open issue (both in SR and exception request):

h) Clarify how each PLMN sharing the same RAN indicates support for discontinuous coverage, whether it is implicit indication common for all PLMNs sharing the RAN or explicit indication.

As explained in comment in 2.1, the exception sheet in RP-220750 has one more item compared to those listed above. That should be added as remaining open issue in the status report as well, e.g. as follows:

i) Address the FFS on UE location information reporting

Other items in the list are ok.

2 – Apple GmbH

We think only the most essential issues need to be addressed in Rel-17 IoT NTN. Following this direction, we think item c) and item e) in the list can be considered in Rel-18 IoT NTN.

3 – MediaTek Inc.

Moderator: Let's consider also for this discussion: h) FFS on UE location reporting

4 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software

Considering the limited time, we think only most essential issues should be resolved in Rel-17. So we think item a, b, f and g should be discussed in the next RAN2 meeting and the item c, d and e could be moved to Rel-18.

5 – Intel Corporation SAS

We agree with the list of open issues from the table above (in section 2 of this document).

6 – Lenovo (Beijing) Ltd

Lenovo:

We are OK to have the listed open issues. And we think at least the following should be determined in Rel-17: a) b) c) e) f), while other issues can be further studied in Rel-18.

7 – ZTE Corporation

We understand the listed remaining issues reflect the current status in RAN2. One minor comment on bullet b),we understand we also need to mention the epoch time is also for discontinuous coverage.

8 – Sateliot

Agree with the list of open issues included in the rapporteur's proposal for RAN2. And fine also with the consideration of items h) and i) as pointed out by QC.

9 – Samsung Research America

Deprioritization within the remaining issue can also be done in RAN2.

10 – Ericsson LM

Yes we think the list of open issues is correct, when including h), and these issues should be resolved to complete the work and have a well-functioning feature.

11 – HuaWei Technologies Co.

We understand a) b) f) g) is what we agreed to have but not yet completed and thus they need to be listed; we tend to agree that c) d) e) are not yet decided to be supported and are not essential to us, and we are fine with not having it; for h) proposed by QC, we understand it is not a remaining issue as this was never discussed in RAN2 before.

12 – Nokia France

We agree that item (i) needs to be added.

13 – NOVAMINT

We agree with the list of open issues.

We agree with the comment from ZTE on bullet b): the epoch time is also for discontinuous coverage.

We believe it is absolutely necessary to address the following issues in Rel-17 as they are key for market adoption: a) b) c) e) f)

For d) it is important at least to be clarified in Rel-17

14 – Eutelsat S.A.

We agree with the list as updated, with the following comments:

- c) is likely too much challenging for a proper implementation within the Rel-17 timeframe now, and could be rather considered in Rel-18

- h) is okay, but its implementation would depend on inputs from other WGs and on alignment to NR NTN solutions if/where applicable, so could be considered in the maintenance phase.

15 – MediaTek Inc.

We support a) b) c) d) e) f) g) and as suggested by Qualcomm ”UE location reporting” (it is indicated within the SR though was mistakenly not added to the list of open issues in the SR).

Response to Qualcomm (and also Huawei and Nokia):

- the proposed revision for g) “signaling details and value range for reporting remaining GNSS position validity duration to the network.”. This helps reduce scope of discussions in RAN2 based on RAN1 agreement and LS to RAN2.
- on the proposal ”Clarify how each PLMN sharing the same RAN indicates support for discontinuous coverage, whether it is implicit indication common for all PLMNs sharing the RAN or explicit indication.” - though not explicitly indicated in the SR, we understand this is a discussion that will need to be had in RAN2 given CN (MME) configuration and functionality (e.g. HLCOM) used to tackle discontinuous coverage (in addition to AS means) could differ between PLMNs and there is a need to ensure UEs do operate properly as a function of what the system (RAN+CN) supports (or doesn’t support). In our view this is not about broadcasting different ”discontinuous coverage-related info” per PLMN , but rather whether the ”discontinuous coverage-related info” broadcast by the RAN applies to all/some PLMNs sharing the RAN.

Response to ZTE: the clarification “the epoch time is also for discontinuous coverage.” is ok.

16 – MediaTek Inc.

Responding to Nokia: we cannot agree to the proposal

2.4 Remaining open issues: RAN3

Q1: Please indicate using the form below whether or not you agree with the statement in the table “Remaining Open Issues” pertaining to RAN3, and if not, please indicate why.

Feedback Form 4: Initial Round: Remaining open issues: RAN3

1 – Intel Corporation SAS We agree with the statement in the table “Remaining Open Issues” pertaining to RAN3.
2 – ZTE Corporation We agree with the statement.
3 – NOVAMINT We agree with the statement on the “Remaining Open Issues” pertaining to RAN3.
4 – Sateliot Agree with the statement
5 – Qualcomm Technologies Int We also agree with the statement. There is always a possibility that issues worked on in e.g. RAN2 may eventually require some minor alignment work, but this is business as usual, and certainly there is nothing to highlight for which RAN3 is lead.
6 – Eutelsat S.A. We agree with the statement on RAN3 status.
7 – MediaTek Inc. We agree with the statement and with Qualcomm view above.

2.5 Summary from the Initial Round

- **General**:
  - One company identified an inconsistency between the list of items in RP-220750 and RP-220749 i.e. RP-220749 was missing ”UE location reporting” listed in RP-220750. The moderator added this topic to the list under discussion.

- **Remaining open issues: RAN1**
  - 12 companies responded
  - 11 companies supported to complete, as per RAN1 conclusion, AI 8.14.1 (Enhancements to time and frequency synchronization) and AI 8.14.2 (Timing relationship enhancements) in RAN1’s maintenance phase and to not list these in the exception request

- 1 company requested to list ”details of method(s) to drop/insert per segment”

– **Remaining open issues: RAN2**

- 14 companies responded
- All companies agree items a) ~g) are open issues (with some possible additional clarifications) and UE location reporting
- 2 companies requested some clarifications of the open issues. Namely item g) and b). The moderator sees the clarifications are necessary to ensure consistency between SR and exception request.
- 1 company thought UE location reporting could be addressed in maintenance phase.
- 1 company requested listing RAN sharing aspect with discontinuous coverage - 1 company opposed this addition, 3 companies supported the addition. The moderator’s understanding is that by principle, RAN sharing is to be supported (as per Stage 1 requirements 22.101) unless explicitly agreed not to.
- Some companies view c) (possibly d)) and e) may not be essential. But there is no common view on this. The moderator’s view is to keep c)~e) listed - RAN2 may decide to downscope.

– **Remaining open issues: RAN3**

- 7 companies responded, all agreeing with RAN3 assessment that the work is complete

– **WAY FORWARD**

- In view of the above, the moderator proposes the updated list of open issues and associated ways forward in the tables below.
- Discussion on RAN3 is closed
- The moderator has uploaded draft interim revisions of the SR (749r01) and Exception Request (750r01) in the folder mentioned above.

Table 4: Way Forward: Remaining Open Issues - RAN1

Remaining Open Issues - RAN1	**Moderator Way Forward**
Complete maintenance phase for 8.14.1 and 8.14.2	Proceed in SR. Exclude from Exception Request. ***Discussion closed***
j) Details of method(s) to drop/insert per segment	***Discuss in intermediate round*** (note this topic relates to 8.14.1)

Table 5: Way Forward - Remaining Open issues - RAN2

Remaining Open Issues - RAN2	**Moderator Way Forward**
a) FFS regarding signaled ephemeris type (FFS if two, three of four types and the details on semantics) for discontinuous coverage	Proceed in SR and Exception Request. ***Discussion closed***
b) FFS whether epoch time **for discontinuous coverage**could be optional and be implicitly derived when not provided	Proceed in SR and Exception Request. ***Discussion closed***
c) FFS whether to in addition to BCCH provide the option to share the information by dedicated RRC signaling for discontinuous coverage	Proceed in SR and Exception Request. ***Discussion closed***
d) FFS whether anything need to be specified for AS-NAS interaction while the UE is out of coverage	Proceed in SR and Exception Request. ***Discussion closed***
e) FFS if to introduce additional parameters for further enhanced spatial coverage prediction (like satellite footprint reference point, satellite coverage radius or elevation angle) for discontinuous coverage	Proceed in SR and Exception Request. ***Discussion closed***
f) Parameters for prediction of discontinuous coverage and handling of the new SIB	Proceed in SR and Exception Request. ***Discussion closed***
g) Signaling **details and value range for reporting ~~of~~** remaining GNSS position validity duration to the network	Proceed in SR and Exception Request (note the text differs slightly in the exception request but is technically equivalent). *Discussion closed*
h) FFS on UE location information reporting	Proceed in SR and Exception Request. ***Discussion closed***
i) Clarify how each PLMN sharing the same RAN indicates support for discontinuous coverage, whether it is implicit indication common for all PLMNs sharing the RAN or explicit indication.	***Discuss in intermediate round***

3 Intermediate Round

3.1 General

Should you have any general comment, please use the following form.

Feedback Form 5: General comments

1 – MediaTek Inc. On the RTT calculation comment in the [flag] of RP-220749 - it is expected (by RAN2) that RAN1 documents in its specs agreements that have already been made on RTT formula (this has already been discussed in RAN1 and we expect this will be finalized in Q2). This need not be highlighted in the ER.
2 – Nokia France Thanks Mediatek for the clarification. Perhaps then this could be mentioned in the SR but does not need to be highlighted in the exception sheet.
3 – MediaTek Inc. Responding to Nokia: No worries. The SR already documents RAN1 agreement wrt RTT calculation - so we reckon it's fine as such esp. given the corresponding TP to 36.213 has been discussed as well in RAN1 already, so this in our view falls well within maintenance pertaining to 8.14.2.

3.2 Remaining open issues: RAN1

Q1: Please indicate using the form below whether you have any comment on item **j)** in **Table 4** above.

Feedback Form 6: Intermediate Round: Remaining open issues: RAN1

1 – Apple GmbH We think item j) is open, but it can be handled in RAN1 maintenance phase under AI 8.14.1. Hence, we do not need to list it in the exception request.
2 – Qualcomm Incorporated In our understanding, item in j) is anyway part of "uplink synchronization" which is already mentioned in the SR. If companies still want to capture something in SR, we suggest rephrasing to "Details of uplink segment gaps". Further, similar to other RAN1 open issues, this can be done in RAN1 maintenance and does not need to be captured in exception request.
3 – Intel Corporation SAS We prefer not to include this issue in the exception list since it can be resolved as part of maintenance phase, if needed
4 – MediaTek Inc. We do not see a need to indicate j) in the SR or ER beyond "maintenance phase" that is already indicated for AI 8.14.1 in the SR. In practice, RAN1 can continue discussion how to capture the RAN1#107-e agreements in the specifications in May meeting. RAN1 should prioritize LS to RAN2 to discuss specification of the single UE capability agreed in RAN1#107e (2021 Nov) in RAN2 specification TS 36.306.

5 – ZTE Corporation We prefer not to include this issue in the exception list since it can be resolved as part of maintenance phase, if needed.
6 – Lenovo (Beijing) Ltd We think this can be resolved as part of maintenance phase, so no need to be included in the exception list.
7 – Nokia France It seems that companies agree that item (j) is open. At least ”detailed method of UE pre-compensation per segment” should be stated in the SR.
8 – HuaWei Technologies Co. we share views from others as this issue can be handled in the usual maintenance phase, and there is no need to include in the exception sheet.
9 – Eutelsat S.A. We also think that item j) can be handled in the maintenance phase, and that there is no need to mention it in the exception sheet.
10 – Ericsson LM Agree with Nokia. It seems this is clearly one open issue and there is no harm including it as such.
11 – HUGHES Network Systems Ltd Agree with MediaTek

3.3 Remaining open issues: RAN2

Q1: Please indicate using the form below whether you have any comment on item **i)** in **Table 5** above.

Please note, as mentioned above, the moderator’s understanding is that, by principle, RAN sharing is to be supported (as per Stage 1 requirements in TS22.101) unless explicitly agreed not to.

Feedback Form 7: Intermediate Round: Remaining open issues: RAN2

1 – Apple GmbH There is no mention of RAN sharing in the WID and RAN2 has not discussed this topic at all. Technically, this is a new feature, not an open issue. If companies feel this is very important, then they can bring it to Rel-18 IoT NTN, but it seems too late for Rel-17 IoT NTN.

2 – Qualcomm Incorporated

We support capturing this open item.

In our understanding, RAN sharing may be enabled only in certain parts of the network. Some PLMN may share the RAN/satellites, of which some may be subject to discontinuous coverage while others may not be. If companies believe this does not happen in Rel-17, then this may as well happen in the future.

To preserve backward compatibility, it may be better to have e.g. 1 bit explicitly per PLMN to indicate whether it is supposed to provide coverage all the time or whether it is subjected to discontinuous coverage (in other words, whether the information in SIByy is to predict discontinuous coverage or not for the given PLMN). Or we need to discuss and figure out if this can be done implicitly while making sure of forward compatibility.

3 – CATT

Share the view with Apple, this is not discussed in Rel-17, and should not be in the open issue list. if needed, we can further work on that in Rel-18 discontinuous coverage objective.

4 – ZTE Corporation

Share similar view with Apple and CATT. Should not be included in the open issue list.

5 – MediaTek Inc.

We agree with Qualcomm.

6 – Lenovo (Beijing) Ltd

We agree with Apple that this has never been discussed in Rel-17 and there isno enough time left for new discussion. We can study this in Rel-18 if needed.

7 – NOVAMINT

We agree with Qualcomm

8 – Nokia France

In our view, this is not about broadcasting different ”discontinuous coverage-related info” per PLMN , but rather whether the ”discontinuous coverage-related info” broadcast by the RAN applies to all/some PLMNs sharing the RAN. We are not sure that this needs to be addressed in Rel-17.

9 – Ericsson LM

We agree with Nokia comment. This topic has not been discussed in RAN2 so far and Rel-17 should be closed now.

10 – HuaWei Technologies Co.

As we raised in the first round, this was never discussed in RAN2 before. It is unclear what are the corresponding scenarios, the discontinuous coverage is due to the case where the coverage provided by different satellites may have the gap, and thus this may be the same situation for multi-operators. Therefore we don’t think it is a remaining issue, it is rather a new issue which needs more time and if needed, can be considered in future release.

11 – Eutelsat S.A.

We think that it would be challenging to complete a comprehensive study for RAN sharing within the time remaining for Rel-17 and suggest this is brought up to Rel-18.

Also, how an explicit indication of continuous coverage support would impact RAN sharing implementation has to be better understood (noting discontinuous coverage will be typical for IoT services using NGSO constellations).

12 – HUGHES Network Systems Ltd

Support Qualcomm's view

3.4 Summary from the Intermediate Round

- **General**
  - Flag (RTT): **Moderator proposal:** ***Discussion closed. Flag resolved***
    - Two companies (Nokia and Rapporteur(MediaTek Inc.)) discussed the flag.
    - The Moderator's view, given the explanation provided is that the work does fall within maintenance phase for 8.14.2.

- **Remaining open issues: RAN1**
  - On "j) Details of method(s) to drop/insert per segment"
    - 11 companies responded.
    - All companies agree some work is outstanding, however it can be addressed in maintenance phase. Some support was expressed to document that in the SR.
    - The Rapporteur (MediaTek Inc.) also reminded of agreements reached in RAN1#107e / November 2021 on this matter.
  - **Moderator proposal:** ***Discussion closed. Flag resolved***
    - Not included in ER
    - SR clarified to add the following note to §2.1.2 Open issues: "Details of uplink segment gaps as agreed in RAN1#107-e will be addressed in maintenance phase in 8.14.1"

- **Remaining open issues: RAN2**
  - On "i) Clarify how each PLMN sharing the same RAN indicates support for discontinuous coverage, whether it is implicit indication common for all PLMNs sharing the RAN or explicit indication."

    - 12 companies responded
    - 4 companies supported adding i) to the list, 8 companies disagreed

- **Moderator proposal:** ***Discussion closed***
    - Not included in ER
    - Not included in SR
    - Forward compatibility (BCCH signaling) should be discussed (RAN2)

undefined

- **Moderator Conclusions:**
    - The Exception Request is available in the folder mentioned above (750r01 available in RP-220943).
        - The Moderator recommends approval of the Exception Request
    - The Status Report is available in the folder mentioned above (749r02 available in RP-220942).
        - The Moderator recommends noting/endorsing the Status Report
    - The Moderator recommends that for item "*i) Clarify how each PLMN sharing the same RAN indicates support for discontinuous coverage, whether it is implicit indication common for all PLMNs sharing the RAN or explicit indication.*" Forward compatibility (BCCH signaling) should be discussed [RAN2]
    - This discussion can be closed