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# Introduction

**CB: # 2\_EmergencyCall**

**- Work on** [**R3-244649**](file:///D:\3GPPmeeting\202402%20RAN3%20123\During%20meeting\Inbox\R3-244649.zip)**,** [**R3-244650**](file:///D:\3GPPmeeting\202402%20RAN3%20123\During%20meeting\Inbox\R3-244650.zip)**,** [**R3-244651**](file:///D:\3GPPmeeting\202402%20RAN3%20123\During%20meeting\Inbox\R3-244651.zip)

**- Reply LS to RAN2?**

**- Check whether the RAN paging issue is valid in** [**R3-244285**](file:///D:\3GPPmeeting\202402%20RAN3%20123\During%20meeting\Inbox\R3-244285.zip)**?**

(moderator - ZTE)

# For the Chairman’s Notes

# Discussion-First round

## Work on R3-244649, R3-244650, R3-244651

- Add co-source companies

- Remove “for (e)Redcap and 2RX XR UEs” in the text procedure

- Check TEI identifier with RAN2

**Check TEI identifier with RAN2**

After checking with our RAN2 colleague, there are two labels used because one set of CRs has the magic sentence in the cover sheet (for RedCap) and the other label is used for CRs that have no magic sentence.

R2-2405956 Introduction of barring exemption for RedCap UEs for emergency calls [RedCap\_EM\_Call] Apple, China Telecom, Vodafone, Verizon, TMobile USA, ZTE, Vivo, Ericsson, Nokia CR Rel-18 38.304 18.1.0 0380 5 B TEI18

=> Agreed

R2-2405957 Introduction of barring exemption for RedCap UEs for emergency calls [RedCap\_EM\_Call] Apple, China Telecom, Vodafone, Verizon, TMobile USA, ZTE, Vivo, Ericsson, Nokia CR Rel-18 38.331 18.1.0 4570 4 B TEI18

=> Agreed

=> FFS check in RAN2-127 if further clarifications are required to ensure that once the cell is considered acceptable according to new conditions, the UE doesn’t follow the procedures in 38.304 associated with cell barred case.

R2-2405958 Introduction of barring exemption for (e)RedCap and 2RX XR UEs for emergency calls [EM\_Call\_Exemption] Apple, China Telecom, Vodafone, Verizon, TMobile USA, ZTE, Vivo, Ericsson. Nokia CR Rel-18 38.304 18.1.0 0381 6 B TEI18

=> Agreed

I presume that, in our RAN3, we do not use magic sentence and have one set of CRs (38.423, 38.473, and 38.470) for all features (i.e. RedCap, eRedCap and XR). So, the following proposal is provided.

**Proposal 1: [EM\_Call\_Exemption] is used for TEI identifier.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | Yes | Agree with P1. |
| Nokia | Yes | OK. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Add co-source companies**

I guess all companies who have provided contributions will be co-sourced companies.

**ZTE, China Telecom, China Unicom, Nokia, Qualcomm Incorporated, Ericson, Huawei, CMCC**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | Yes | Agree with P1. |
| Nokia | Yes | OK. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Reply LS to RAN2?

Since many companies provided the reply LS, I think this reply LS is needed.

The following draft LS R3-244134 is simple and can be as baseline for detailed checking.

|  |
| --- |
| **R3-244134**  RAN3 thanks RAN2 for informing about the support of emergency calls for (e)RedCap UEs in barred cells.  RAN3 has assumed that the exemption also applies for incoming handovers and has agreed the corresponding attached RAN3 CRs for F1AP and XnAP. |

**Proposal 2: The reply LS is needed and works on R3-244134.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | Yes | Agree with P2. |
| Nokia | Yes | OK. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Check whether the RAN paging issue is valid in R3-244285?

***Proposal 3: RAN3 agrees to include (e)Redcap emergency call indicator in Xn RAN Paging message for emergency call back for neighbouring gNBs to page on cells where emergency barring exemption is allowed for RRC Inactive Paging for an emergency call back.***

After offline discussing with some companies, moderate provides the following information.

Without the **“(e)Redcap emergency call indicator”** within Xn Paging message, when the DL data of an emergency PDU session arrives, the neighbour gNB will broadcast Xn Paging in all of its controlled cells.

Then, for the cell(s) whose SIB1 does not broadcast this indicator “barringExemptEmergencyCall”, the Uu paging is useless and waste radio resource. However, the UE will not camp in this cell, so that, the UE will not miss Uu paging.

Companies agree to further discuss the RAN paging issue in the next meeting.

**Proposal 3: Whether the RAN paging issue is valid in R3-244285 can be discussed in the next meeting, by contribution driven.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | Yes | Agree with P3,  In my view, this issue also exists in CN paging procedure, we also fine to mark it as “To be continue…” if needed. |
| Nokia | Yes. | OK. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Conclusion, Recommendations

# References