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# 1 Introduction

This document contains the summary of offline discussion for the following CB:

**CB: # SONMDT6\_MDT**

**- Priority handling for signalling logged MDT configuration between different RAT type?**

**- Cross-RAT logged MDT reporting?**

**- Signalling based immediate MDT in NR-DC?**

**- Check details of TPs**

(moderator - HW)

Summary of offline disc [R3-231873](file:///D:\RAN3\119be\Docs\R3-231873.zip)

Deadline for first round comment: **End of Thursday online session.**

# 2 Proposals for chair notes.

# 3 Discussion

## Issue 1: Signalling based MDT override protection

In R3-231711, a couple of proposals are made for enhancement to signalling based MDT override protection.

**Proposal 1: RAN3 to confirm the scenarios for inter-RAT scenario for signalling based logged MDT protection including the following:**

**Scenario 1: Inter-system :EPC –> 5GC**

**Scenario 2: Intra-system Inter-RAT and intra-5GC: LTE –> NR**

**Scenario 3: Intra-system Inter-RAT and intra-EPC: eNB –> en-gNB**

**Question 1: Are the scenarios above agreeable?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer to above question** | **Comments** |
| CATT | yes |  |
|  |  |  |

Then, the contribution has the following proposal for priority handling for signalling logged MDT configuration between different RAT type.

**Propose 2: NR requested M-based logged MDT should never override LTE s-based logged MDT.**

**Question 2: Is proposal 2 above agreeable?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer to above question** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Yes | m-based MDT never can override s-based MDT |
|  |  |  |

In the end, the contribution proposes the following RAN3 changes for the MDT data override protection issue.

**Proposal 3: OAM provides an LTE S-based logged MDT protection indicator to gNB when Operator’s policy need to protect LTE S-based logged MDT. The indicator should be conveyed from Core network to RAN and propagated during mobility.**

**Proposal 4: A new cause value introduce in NGAP to inform Core network and OAM that NR Signalling based logged MDT failed due to protection of LTE signalling based logged MDT.**

**Question 3: Are proposal 3 or 4 above agreeable?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer to above question** | **Comments** |
| CATT | no | No need to set priority for s-based MDT in different RAT.  If a UE is configured s-based MDT in NR, it means the performance of this UE in NR-RAN is not good, the OAM of NR want to trace it.  If a UE is configured s-based MDT in E-UTRAN, it means the performance of this UE in E-UTRAN is not good, the OAM of LTE want to trace it.  So, they are for different purpose, we cannot say which one is more important, no reason for us to set the priority for s-based MDT in different RAT. |
|  |  |  |

The contribution also proposes to send a LS to inform other groups.

The LS out and TPs will be treated in 2nd round if above proposals are agreed.

## Issue 2: Signalling based immediate MDT in NR-DC

In R3-231744, it states that due to lack of consensus on introducing an explicit indication “MN Only” from OAM to direct the gNB as MN to forward the *MDT-Configuration NR* IE to another gNB as SN in NR-DC case and companies think that confirmation from SA5 is needed.

Therefore, it is proposed to send a LS to SA5 for confirmation on the issue and the need of the indication.

The contents of the draft LS are cited here for collecting comments.

|  |
| --- |
| 1 Overall description In MR-DC case, and in signalling based MDT, the NG-RAN node may receive two MDT configurations from AMF via NGAP which are coming from OAM originally, one for MN and onefor SN. They are named as *MDT-Configuration NR* IE and *MDT-Configuration E-UTRA* IE in TS 38.413. And the MN will forward the second MDT configuration to the SN if received in MR-DC case.  However, in NR-DC case, only one *MDT configuration-NR* is configured to MN. There is ambiguity in NGAP spec that whether the gNB is allowed to initiate the MDT task towards SN for the UE.  RAN3 thinks that an indication from OAM is necessary to direct the gNB to forward the MDT configuration to SN for signalling based MDT in case of NR-DC.  RAN3 would like SA5 to confirm that support of signalling based MDT in NR-DC is need and whether an explicit indication from OAM to direct the gNB to forward the MDT configuration-NR to SN is needed or not. 2 Actions **To** SA5  **ACTION:** RAN3 kindly asks SA5 to feedback on above issue. |

Please provide your comments on the draft LS above below or in the draft in the draft folder directly.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **CATT** | From the perspective of OAM, it only has the demands of measuring LTE cell or NR cell. If LTE network is not good and need to measure, it will use MDT configuration E-UTRA. If LTE network is not good and need to measure, it will use MDT configuration NR. If both RAT need to measure, OAM will send both.  The procedural text about DC is only use for clarification one possible case if NG-RAN node receives a invalid RAT configuration, not to say gNB must identify the configuration is for MN or SN.  **Several concerns:**  1. OAM not know whether UE is in DC, so why the OAM will have the demand of identifying “MN only”  2． In FR1 with FR2 NR-DC case, which measurement threshold will be different in MDT configuration NR? And whether OAM can know the FR1 is MN or SN? |
|  |  |

# 4 Conclusion

# 5 Reference

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [R3-231711](file:///D:\RAN3\119be\Docs\R3-231711.zip) | (TPs for MDT BLCRs for TS 38.413)MDT Enhancements (ZTE) | other |
| [R3-231744](file:///D:\RAN3\119be\Docs\R3-231744.zip) | (TP for MDT BL CR for TS 38.413): Signalling based immediate MDT in NR-DC (Huawei, Deutsche Telekom, Orange, China Telecom, CMCC) | other |