3GPP TSG-RAN WG2 Meeting #116e Tdoc R2-21xxxxx

November 1st - 12th 2021

Agenda: 8.14

Source: Ericsson

Title: Summary of e-mail discussion [080] Mobility

Document for: Discussion, Decision

# 1 Introduction

In this document the following e-mail discussion is handled:

* [Post116-e][080][eQoE] Mobility (Ericsson)

Scope: Discuss whether RAN2 intends to fulfil the SA4 requirements related to mobility, what those requirements are (e.g. based on different case). Determine whether we need further clarifications by LS, and if so LS approval. In case there is need (in order to converge on mobility in general), the non-LS part of this discussion can continue in a long email discussion (and then the report is then for next meeting).

Intended outcome: Approved LS out, Report

Deadline: Short 2 (not for RP)

Contact information:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Contact Name, Email** |
| Ericsson | cecilia.eklof@ericsson.com |
| Samsung | s90.jeong@samsung.com |
| vivo | panxiang@vivo.com |
| ZTE | Liu.yansheng@zte.com.cn |
| Huawei | dawid.koziol@huawei.com |
| Intel | ziyi.li@intel.com |
| Qualcomm | jianhua@qti.qualcomm.com |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 2 Discussion

## 2.1 Possible LS to SA4

In RAN2#116e RAN2 discussed the SA4 requirements related to mobility, described in TS 26.247 clause 10.1. RAN3 previously sent an LS to SA4 (cc: RAN2) in R2-2106945 asking for clarification of the requirement and SA4 replied in R2-2109384. There were different views in RAN2 of what the reply means. An LS to SA4 for clarification could be one option to be able to proceed in RAN2. The requirement:

“*The QoE configuration shall only be checked by the client when each session starts, and thus all logging and reporting criterias for an ongoing session shall be unaffected by any QoE configuration changes received during that session. This also includes evaluation of any filtering criterias, such as geographical filtering, which shall only be done when the session starts. Thus changes to the QoE configuration will only affect sessions started after these configuration changes have been received.”*

Question 1: If RAN2 would send an LS to SA4 for clarification of their requirement in TS 26.114, what do you think the question(s) should be?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** |
| Ericsson | We could ask SA4 to describe the wanted network and UE behaviour related to mobility and release, e.g. when the UE moves out of the area and there is an ongoing session. Also, we could ask about the expected behaviour if the network needs to release the measurements for some other reason. |
| Samsung | In RAN2#116e, RAN2 showed different views on whether or not ongoing session is affected in case of release of QoE configuration. In our understanding, in LS (i.e., R2-2109384), SA4 clarified "*the logging and reporting criteria for ongoing session should be affected when the client receives a release of the QoE configuration."*. However, there were some companies who have different understanding (i.e., ongoing session is NOT affected in case of release of QoE configuration). Therefor we are fine to ask SA4 to clarify this issue. |
| vivo | We would ask SA4 the following:  - What is the intention to continue the QoE measurement when the UE moves out of the target Area Scope?  - How to utilize the QoE measurement outside the target Area Scope?  - If the intention is to collect the QoE at the edge of specific cells, is it feasible that just extend the Area Scope, i.e., adding the neighbour cells into the target Area Scope?  - Whether SA4 has any concern about the current Area Scope checking solution of RAN side (without session start/end indication from UE). Worth noting that RAN side solution will not introduce spec impact on the current client behaviour, that is, the target Area Scope is checked by RAN node.  - If the RAN node needs to check the QoE session state when UE moves out of the target Area Scope, the QoE session state may always be exposed to RAN node, which will introduce user privacy concerns, is it acceptable from SA4 perspective? |
| ZTE | How to handle a QMC session in the following scenario and explain their understanding:   1. UE moves out of the areascope with an ongoing QMC session 2. UE moves out of the areascope with a not ongoing QMC session(e.g. not activated QoE session, QoE session with paused QoE reporting flag). |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | There are two different aspects that need to be considered, related to two different questions from RAN3 posed in R2-2106945. It seems the confusion comes from the fact that these two aspects are mixed.  First question from RAN3 was:   |  | | --- | | *Q1: Will the requirement for configuration changes of ongoing QMC sessions be applicable also for NR QMC?* |   This requirement comes from TS 26.247, clause 16.3 and it is quoted directly in the RAN3 LS, as follows:   |  | | --- | | RAN3 is discussing, in the context of NR QMC, the following SA4 requirement described in TS 26.114 clause 10.1, TS 26.247 clause 16.3, which was defined for QMC in UMTS and LTE.  *“The QoE configuration shall only be checked by the client when each session starts, and thus all* ***logging and reporting criterias******for an ongoing session******shall be unaffected by any QoE configuration changes received during that session****. This also includes evaluation of any filtering criterias, such as geographical filtering, which shall only be done when the session starts. Thus changes to the QoE configuration will only affect sessions started after these configuration changes have been received.”* |   The yellow part refers to geographical filtering, i.e. checking area scope, and it says it should only be done when the session starts. Since the answer to this question from SA4 was simply: “Yes.”, it is clear that this requirement should be met and the gNB should not release an ongoing QoE measurement even if the UE moves out of the area scope.  Then, the second question was about the UE behaviour when the release is received. RAN2 already agreed that the network may release QoE configuration any time and SA4 just confirms this. It does not mean that the gNB should release ongoing QoE configurations when the UE moves out of area scope as suggested by some companies.  To us, the situation is clear based on the current reply:   1. In normal circumstances, gNB should not release the QoE configuration for ongoing QoE session, no matter whether UE is moving out of area scope or not (see reply to Q1 from SA4). 2. If the gNB sends release for QoE configuration, the QoE configuration is released by the UE, no matter whether it is ongoing or not (see reply to Q2 from SA4).   We would prefer not to unnecessarily bother SA4 with another LS, but in case companies interpret this differently, then we are OK to ask to confirm bullet 1 above (bullet 2 seems clear). We should just focus on the SA4 preferred behaviour, no need to ask for motivations etc. |
| Intel | Agree with Ericsson’s comment and we are fine to check with SA4 for further clarification. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine to ask SA4, with the following questions  1) What is the intention to continue the QoE measurement when the UE moves out of the Area Scope?  2) It is noticed that SA4 specification already defines the application layer QoE configuration, including the location filter information will be provided to UE client, and UE client will check whether to initiate QoE session based on the location filter information. RAN2 would like to ask whether such application layer mechanism already satisfies the requirement “*This also includes evaluation of any filtering criterias, such as geographical filtering, which shall only be done when the session starts.”;* if no, what ‘s the different of RAN level geographical filtering and application layer level geographical filtering? |
| Ericsson | We also think we can ask the difference/relation between the area that the gNB has and the area defined inside the container. |
| CATT | About the area scope controlled in the container or out the container, in 26.247 and 26.114, SA4 mentioned as below:  *Note that if geographical filtering is handled on the network side (i.e. QoE reporting is turned on/off by the network depending on the UE location), no LocationFilter should be specified in the QoE Configuration, as this would mean two consecutive filterings.*  From the above quote, the area scope in container will be omitted if the NW handles the area scope. So we don’t need to ask question related to this issue.  But one issue like as Huawei said as below:  *1.In normal circumstances, gNB should not release the QoE configuration for ongoing QoE session, no matter whether UE is moving out of area scope or not (see reply to Q1 from SA4).*  *2.If the gNB sends release for QoE configuration, the QoE configuration is released by the UE, no matter whether it is ongoing or not (see reply to Q2 from SA4).*  These two behaviors may be conflicting when we use the NW handle the area scope solution. i.e. when UE moves out the area scope, the NW will send release to UE. If we follow the item2, the ongoing session will be released but the behavior does not obey the item1.  So we may have two approach, one is RAN2 to specify the different release type. Another approach is that we state our solution about he area scope and check how to handle this issue from their specification with SA4 |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Summary: Several questions were listed above, so it seems to be relevant to send an LS. An LS is drafted separately.

There is also a second part of the e-mail discussion related to whether to fulfil the SA4 requirement and how to converge on mobility in general. Please provide feedback related to this part in question 2.

Question 2: Is there something related to the SA4 requirement that could be discussed already now? Is there some other mobility issue that needs to be discussed?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** |
| Ericsson | We think we can discuss different solutions related to the SA4 requirements and the pros and cons of the different solutions. When the reply is received, we can decide what to do.  We would like to discuss different options related to fullConfig from a technical point of view. |
| Intel | We suggest discussing the full solution of mobility issue, not limited to fullConfig. This includes procedure of normal handover, RRC Resume, RRC Setup including to legacy gNBs, Rel-17 gNBs not supporting the feature, e.g. what to be released/setup and how, forward compatibility, RRC ID handling at AS layer, whether is AS layer or application layer to be responsible for the release of application layer measurement report, etc. |
| CATT | Contribution driven for the mobility issue discussing. Forward compatibility should be the imported fact since the RAN-visible QoE will be discussed in RAN2 soon. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 3 Conclusion
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