3GPP TSG-RAN WG3 #114-e R3-215860

Online, Nov 1st - Nov 11th, 2021

Agenda Item: 11.2

Source: CMCC (moderator)

Title: SoD of Support for RedCap Capability Exchange

Document for: Discussion and Decision

# Introduction

**CB: # RedCap1\_UECapability**

**- Solutions on the table:**

**Sol1) Relying on OAM setting: CATT**

**Sol1bis) target’s rejection of an incoming HO of the RedCap UE: NEC (with new cause value)**

**Sol2) New Signalling solution: informati explicitly a type of RedCap UE indicator, such as the RedCap scheduled SIB content in Served Cell Information NR over the Xn Setup and Configuration messages: RadiSys, Reliance JIO, Samsung, CMCC, HW for Xn HO, ZTE, Qualcomm**

**- Introduce a new IE with the criticality set to “Reject” in the Source NG-RAN Node to Target NG-RAN Node Transparent Container to inform the target gNB about the handover of RedCap Ues for NG based HO? HW**

**- Add a list of non-supporting Redcap cells in: Xn HO Failure, Xn HO Request acknowledge, NG Target NG-RAN to Source NG-RAN Failure container, NG Target NG-RAN to Source NG-RAN transparent container? Add a new redcap IE with criticality reject in the Xn Handover message and NG Source NG-RAN to Target NG-RAN Transparent container? Nok**

**- In general do NOT introduce signaling mean to exchange the node capability, close this AI and wait for LS reply from RAN2? NEC**

**- Capture agreements and open issues**

(CMCC - moderator)

Summary of offline disc [R3-215860](file:///C%3A%5Czhmq%5C%E4%BC%9A%E8%AE%AE%5C3GPP%E4%BC%9A%E8%AE%AE%5CR3-114e%5Cagenda%5CInbox%5CR3-215860.zip)

We plan to divide the email discussion into two phases:

Phase1: Hope to reach the agreements on solutions for handling Redcap UE mobility before Friday, 5th November at 11:00am UTC.

Phase2: Depend on phase1 progress.

# For the Chairman’s Notes

TBD

# Discussion

## RedCap UE mobility Scenarios

Firstly, we need to confirm the possible mobility handling scenarios for RedCap UEs. Based on the capability of target cell, potential scenarios are summarized as follows.

1. Legacy gNB;
2. New gNB does not support RedCap UE;
3. New gNB where RedCap UEs are temporarily barred, e.g., for 1Rx or 2Rx RedCap UE;
4. New gNB supports RedCap UE

**Question 1: Do you agree above scenarios are valid and should be taken into account for RedCap UE mobility handling?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Yes, the definition of “support” could be discussed but these are fine as a start |
| Huawei | Yes, we have both static cases and temporal cases as listed above. |
| NEC | Just want to understand the meaning of “Legacy gNB” and “New gNB”. Can I understand that “New gNB” is the gNB that has at least one of Rel-17 function, “legacy gNB” means the gNB e.g. Rel-16 gNB? |
| Radisys | Yes, we should also consider Inter RAT mobility |
| Deutsche Telekom | We assume that the understanding of NEC is correct as this would fit with ours.C seems to be only a sub-scenario of D. |
| ZTE | Yes |
| Ericsson | Agree with Deutsche Telekom.  |

## Solutions

In last RAN3 meeting, solutions for handling Redcap UE mobility are discussed. Based on progress of last meeting and the input reference papers, two main potential options and pros and cons of the respective solution are summarized as follows.

*Sol1) Relying on OAM setting*

*Sol1bis) target’s rejection of an incoming HO of the RedCap UE*

*Pros: Do not introduce new signalling over Xn. Noted that a RedCap indicator IE in the Xn HANDOVER REQUEST message with criticality of “reject” may be needed in some scenario, e.g., scenario A.*

*Cons: A single solution is not applicable to all scenarios.*

*Sol2) New Signalling solution: signalling explicitly a type of RedCap UE indicator, such as the RedCap scheduled SIB content in Served Cell Information NR over the Xn Setup and Configuration messages*

*Pros: Support all scenarios.*

*Cons: gNBs need to perform configuration updates every time the cell changes its access restriction info.*

**Question 2: Which solution do you prefer to handle RedCap UE mobility? Do you agree the pros and cons of two solutions mentioned above?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Solution 2. We have a more detailed analysis in R3-214895, but bottom line is that solution 1 struggles to cover all scenarios, and then ends up in some proposals impacting signalling anyway. We see no justification to complexify when there is a very simple solution available. |
| Huawei | Solution 2. As also pointed out by Qualcomm, solution 2 supports the scenarios in one package. With new signaling via Xn, it shall work for all the cases where an Xn interface exist.  |
| NEC | Sol 1 i.e. relying on OAM setting is by default, if only for the expectation of “support” capability i.e. capability exchange, as the capability is rather unchanged frequently (e.g. capability is supported only when the software of a gNB is upgraded), then we think there is no need to further introduce signalling mean. |
| Radisys | We prefer Solution 2. Solution 1 creates inter vendor operable issues. We have provided a detailed discussion in R3-215497.  |
| Deutsche Telekom | Sol 1: From our perspective relying on OAM is sufficient as the support of RedCap UEs is a more or less static characteristic of a gNB. |
| ZTE | Solution2. OAM solution (solution1) only works for static configuration, but we think cell may change its barring status for RedCap. In addition, As pointed out by Radisys, Solution 1 creates inter vendor operable issues.Solution 1bis is not very efficient and will degrade the user experience. In addition, when the neighbour cell change its barring status, Solution 1bis may not be able to synchronize the barring status for redcap of neighbour cell. |
| Ericsson | How frequent the barring in the network will happen must be confirmed by RAN2. So, we prefer to wait for the RAN2 reply LS before agreeing on a solution.  |

If solution1 is chosen, some improvements are required to fulfill all scenarios, e.g., defining new cause values or using OAM to configure.

**Question 3: If solution1 is chosen, companies are invited to provide their views on if any signalling is needed to have a whole solution for all scenarios.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | OAM could for example cover whether a neighbour may be considered for handover or not (for RedCap UEs), for sure cause values will not work with legacy. Then for new nodes, you need at least 4 cause values to indicate different combinations of support or barring. But now this means the source must keep trying for all temporary barring cases. This is not a good design at all. |
| NEC | If talk about support capability set by OAM then the source will not try to handover RedCap UE to neigbour that does not support RedCap UE. |
| Deutsche Telekom | Same view as NEC. |
| Ericsson | Same view as DT and NEC if solution 1 is selected – no enhancement needed. In our view, RedCap barring in a network is a deployment aspect. When a network is deployed it is done so that all the network components are upgraded to support the feature in a consistent way. If a RedCap-supporting gNB is deployed, the same support must be for all gNBs in the area. Therefore, the number of HO requests trials won’t be an issue in our view. Also, no need for additional cause values. |

If solution2 is chosen, the procedures and some stage3 details exchanged between gNBs, e.g., capabilities broadcast in SIB1 for barring RedCap UEs, need to be specified.

**Question 4: If solution2 is chosen, companies are invited to provide theirs views on the impacted procedures and stage3 details.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | As shown in R3-214895, we should simply need to echo the broadcast parameters (functionally, not necessarily exactly same structure) in the *Served Cell Information NR* IE, with some suitable procedural text. Note (since this seems to be a concern) that this is not capability exchange. |
| Huawei | All we need to do is exchanging the capability, e.g. a redcap support indicator, via Xn setup/configuration update procedures. Note that we can even exchange more detailed capabilities, i.e. the capability to support RedCap UEs with 1/2 Rx branches. A way suggested by Qualcomm to echo the broadcast parameters may also work. |
| NEC | If this is for capability exchange and that capability is assumed not to change frequently, then OAM setting is enough. But if it is not for the purpose of capability exchange, then can consider other ways to realize. |
| Radisys | For solution 2, we have Ng, F1 and Xn impacts. The F1 and Xn impacts on Serving Cell configuration, Paging, HO is provided in our CRs R3-215157 and R3-215159 |
| ZTE | For solution 2, As shown in our R3-215788, we would like to introduce the Broadcast RedCap Barring information of the cell (e.g, cell barred for RedCap1RX, cell barred for RedCap2Rx) into the Served Cell Information IE over XN and F1 interface. |
| Ericsson | First, we would like to re-iterate the RAN3 good principles that we do not advertise about gNB capabilities over network interfaces.Then, if sol2 is selected (pending RAN2 LS reply), we should do it in a way that RedCap barring/activation in neighboring gNBs is not signaled as a capability. We can work on the examples given by QC/ZTE. Although F1 impacts are not needed, since the CU knows the cells for intra-gNB mobility. |

## Mobility handling of legacy target cell

According to the contribution [1][2], a new RedCap IE with the criticality set as ‘Reject’ is introduced in the source-to-target container to prevent handover from the RedCap UE to a legacy NG-RAN node.

**Question 5: Companies are invited to provide their views on whether criticality set as ‘Reject’ is needed and on which interface is needed.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | This is about NGAP. This could be ok, but depends on the parallel discussion on handling of criticality during NGAP handover, so it is hard to reach a conclusion now. Note that solution 2 in Xn automatically addresses some NGAP HO scenarios i.e. scenarios where NGAP is necessary even though Xn exists such as inter-AMF mobility. For other scenarios some form of trial-and-fail may be needed and can be discussed further.We would recommend trying to reach a way forward on Xn and marking NGAP scenarios not covered by that as FFS for next meeting. |
| Huawei | Yes. In cases where Xn interface is not available, we believe such method works. The method is a complement to solution 2. Details can wait for the progress of on-going RACS discussion. |
| NEC | NGAP can be discussed later. |
| Radisys | Agree with Qualcomm |
| ZTE | FFS.We are ok for this approach. But at last meeting, RAN3 has sent a LS to RAN2 to ask how access control will work for legacy gNBs. So we can wait the reply and discuss at next meeting. |
| Ericsson | No, does not look critical.  |

# Conclusion, Recommendations [if needed]

If needed
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