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# 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:\zhmq\会议\3GPP会议\R3-114e\agenda\Inbox\R3-215860.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. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 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. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

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. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

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. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 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. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Conclusion, Recommendations [if needed]

If needed
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