3GPP TSG-RAN WG2 Meeting #111 Electronic R2-20xxxxx

Elbonia, 17 – 28 August 2020

**Agenda item: 6.2.5**

**Source: Nokia (Summary Rapporteur)**

**Title: Summary of [AT111-e][030][IAB] UE capabilities (Nokia)**

**WID/SID: NR\_IAB - Release 16**

**Document for: Discussion and Decision**

# 1 Introduction

This is to provide a summary of TDocs submitted for IAB UE capabilities under AI 6.2.1 and 6.2.5 which include [1-6].

* [AT111-e][030][IAB] UE capabilities (Nokia)

Scope:

Deadline: Short UE cap

# 2 Summary

The discussion paper in [1] proposes to introduce the following IAB specific capabilities:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Proposal 1: Add the following parameter for Feature 4-1 in 38.306:***   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ***Definitions for parameters*** | Per | M | FDD-TDD DIFF | FR1-FR2 DIFF | | ***intraAndInterF-MeasAndReport-IAB-r16***  Indicates whether the IAB-MT supports NR intra-frequency and inter-frequency measurements and at least periodical reporting. Note: It is up to the IAB node to set the capability bit | UE | Yes | Yes | No |   ***Proposal 2: Add the following parameter for Feature 7-1, component 2) in 38.306:***   | Definitions for parameters | Per | M | FDD-TDD  DIFF | FR1-FR2  DIFF | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ***handoverInterF-IAB-r16***  Indicates whether the IAB-MT supports inter-frequency HO. It indicates the support for inter-frequency HO from the corresponding duplex mode if this capability is included in *fdd-Add-UE-NR-Capabilities* or *tdd-Add-UE-NR-Capabilities*. It indicates the support for inter-frequency HO in the corresponding frequency range if this capability is included in *fr1-Add-UE-NR-Capabilities* or *fr2-Add-UE-NR-Capabilities*. | IAB-MT | No | Yes | Yes | |

Companies are invited to provide their views whether they agree with the proposals.

**Q1: Do you agree with the proposals in [1]? If not, please provide comments.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preference (Y/N)** | **Detailed Comments** |
| Ericsson | Y | The ***intraAndInterF-MeasAndReport-IAB-r16*** field should be “Per IAB-MT”.  The word “Note” should also be removed. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | N | It seems we can just apply the corresponding UE capabilities and add into the existing definition the applicability for the IAB-MT. |
| LG | N | We do not see the need to introduce the same capability bits for IAB MT, since the capability attributes for IAB MT are exactly the same as UE. Instead, we think the existing ***intraAndInterF-MeasAndReport*** *can be reused* |
| AT&T | Y | Agree with Ericsson for Proposal 1. We believe it is better to introduce a new IE since the description text of ***intraAndInterF-MeasAndReport*** is not fully applicable to IAB: “This field only applies to NE-DC and SN configured measurement when (NG)EN-DC is configured. For NR MCG, this feature is mandatory supported,” and would also need to be updated to reflect the RAN Plenary decision.  Also, ***handoverInterF*** cannot be reused becauseit is optional for IAB-MTs and it seems cleaner to have a separate IE. |
| Samsung | Y | Agree with AT&T. |

The CR in [2] proposes changes to TS 38.306 based on the conclusions agreed by RAN Plenary and captured in [RP-201292](http://3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/TSG_RAN/TSGR_88e/Docs/RP-201292.zip). The changes intend to clarify accordingly *eventA-MeasAndReport* and *intraAndInterF-MeasAndReport* features support.

Companies are invited to provide their views whether they agree with the changes.

**Q2: Do you agree with the changes proposed in [2]? If not, please provide comments.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preference (Y/N)** | **Detailed Comments** |
| Ericsson | N | Regarding ***eventA-MeasAndReport,*** this parameter was not discussed during the plenary. Rather only the capability related to intra-NR measurements and inter/intra freq. HO were discussed.  Regarding ***intraAndInterF-MeasAndReport,*** we prefer to create a separate field specific for the “IAB-MT” as in Q1 |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Y | Please note, the RP-201292 Final Summary: Topic 2-P2:  T2-P2’’: The following Rel-15 Layer-2 and Layer-3 UE Features are is mandatory with capability signaling for wide-area and local-area IAB-MTs (it is up to IAB node to set the capability bit, and the feature will not be captured into the minimum set table specified in TS 38.306):  4-1          Intra-NR measurements and reports  Also 38.822, explicitly listed event A-based measurements. |
| LG |  | We think eventA-MeasAndReport is mandatory with capability signalling for IAB MT. I.e. same as UE. Then we think no changes is needed.  We do not see the need to introduce the same but separate capability bits for IAB MT. Existing capability can be reused. |
| AT&T |  | Ok for ***eventA-MeasAndReport*** to be mandatory with capability signaling. For ***intraAndInterF-MeasAndReport*** see our response to Q1 |
| Samsung | N | Similar reasoning as Ericsson. Please also see our response to Q1. |

The CR in [3] proposes additions into TS 38.300 to implement the following agreement:

* ***R2 to specify that IAB-MTs can make use of the UE capability signaling framework (including specification of minimum set). Whether it is actually used for e.g. Wide Area IAB-MTs may be up to implementation.***

|  |
| --- |
| 7.5 UE Capability Retrieval framework  The UE reports its UE radio access capabilities which are static at least when the network requests. The gNB can request what capabilities for the UE to report based on band information. The UE capability can be represented by a capability ID, which may be exchanged in NAS signalling over the air and in network signalling instead of the UE capability structure.  In IAB, it is optional for an IAB-MT to support UE capability Retrieval framework and the related signalling. In case IAB-MT does not support UE capability Retrieval framework, IAB-MT capabilities are assumed to be known to the network by other means, e.g. OAM |

Alternatively, the CR in [4] proposes the following change with a new section added into TS 38.300:

|  |
| --- |
| 4.7.4.5 IAB-node Capability Signaling IAB-MTs can make use of the UE capability signaling framework (including specification of minimum set). Whether it is actually used for e.g. Wide Area IAB-MTs may be up to implementation. |

The companies are invited to provide their views for the above proposals and, especially, which CR should become a baseline for Stage-2 CR reflecting the RAN2#110 agreement.

**Q3: Which CR do you agree to become a baseline to implement the above agreement? If not agreeable, please provide comments.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preference ([3]/[4])** | **Detailed Comments** |
| Ericsson | [3] | In TS 38.300 there is already a section 7.5 which can be used for this purpose as in [3] |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | [3] |  |
| AT&T | [3] |  |
| Samsung | [4] | While [4] is our own submission and our first preference, we can accept [3] as well. |

The CR in [5] proposes to add MAC capability *lcid-ExtensionIAB* of IAB-MT defined in TS 38.306 into TS 38.331. Rapporteur notes that this parameter seems to have been mistakenly left out from TS 38.331.

Companies are invited to provide their views whether they agree with the change.

**Q4: Do you agree with the change proposed in [5]? If not, please provide comments.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preference (Y/N)** | **Detailed Comments** |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Y |  |
| LG | Y |  |
| AT&T | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |

The CR in [6] proposes changes to TS 38.306. The changes intend to clarify:

* Optional features for IAB-MT are: *multipleTCI, pdsch-MappingTypeA, pucch-F2-WithFH, pucch-F3-WithFH*;
* Mandatory features for IAB-MT with capability signalling are: *eventA-MeasAndReport, intraAndInterF-MeasAndReport*
* Support at least one of the two features for IAB-MT is: *drb-IAB-r16* or *non-DRB-IAB-r16*.

Companies are invited to provide their views whether they agree with the changes.

**Q5: Do you agree with the changes proposed in [6]? If not, please provide comments.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preference (Y/N)** | **Detailed Comments** |
| Ericsson | Y to 1st and 2nd change  N to 3rd change | We are fine with the intention of “except for IAB-MT”, but then we wonder what is the reason of having “Per UE”. Is it assumed in this specification that whatever is “Per UE” is also per IAB-MT?  Regarding the change on DRB support, we do not think that is needed. It was agreed that DRB support is not mandatory, hence even with the proposed changes there is no guarantee that the IAB-node will work properly if it only support DRB operations. So in short, the change does not seem to bring any particular value. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Intention is OK | In 4.2.15.1 it is already said:  “Table 4.2.11.1-1, Table 4.2.11.1-2 and Table 4.2.11.1-3 capture feature groups, which are mandatory for an IAB-MT. All other feature groups or components of the feature groups as captured in TR 38.822 [24] as well as capabilities specified in this specification are optional for an IAB-MT, except for the features which are explicitly indicated as not applicable to IAB-MT.”  We are in principle OK with 3rd proposal on DRB support but think this is not crucial. |
| LG |  | For those capabilities that are currently mandatory with signalling for both normal UEs and IAB-MTs, existing capabilities can be reused with no change. eventA-MeasAndReport, intraAndInterF-MeasAndReport are as such capabilities.  For those capabilities that are currently mandatory with signalling for UE but now are optional for IAB-MTs, we cannot avoid specification changes. multipleTCI, pdsch-MappingTypeA, pucch-F2-WithFH, pucch-F3-WithFH are as such capabilities. Regarding the changes of specifications, the approach [6] proposing to add “except for IAB-MT” seems fine in general. But with this approach, we may need to discuss how to interpret the “M” field. Or, we can introduce the same capability bits dedicated for IABs for those capabilities. |
| AT&T |  | We prefer to add new capability bits for UE mandatory features which are optional for IAB-MTs in order to avoid impact on the legacy signaling or issues with the “M” field as pointed out by LG. |
| Samsung | Y in principle to all changes, but… | Similar concerns as LG and AT&T. |

# 3 Conclusion

TBD
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