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# Introduction

This document is the report of the following email discussion,

* **[Post123][559][R18 SON/MDT] SON/MDT for NPN (CATT)**

Discussion the following FFS issues from FFS1-FFS3

Output: Report

Deadline: long

Please provide your comments before Sep. 26th, 00:00 UTC

# Contact Information

Participants are encouraged to leave their contact information in the following table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
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| Ericsson | Ali Parichehreh | ali.parichehreh@ericsson.com |
| vivo | Xiang Pan | panxiang@vivo.com |
| Nokia | Gyuri Wolfner | gyorgy.wolfner@nokia.com |
|  Huawei, HiSilicon | Jun Chen | Jun.chen@huawei.com |
|  CATT | Haocheng Wang | wanghaocheng@catt.cn |
|  Samsung | Aby K Abraham | Aby.abraham@samsung.com |
| Apple | Sasha Sirotkin | ssirotkin@apple.com |

# Discussion

In RAN2#123 meeting, agreements on SON/MDT for NPN achieved by companies are concluded as follows:

Agreements:

1 Include SNPN ID (list) in the logged MDT area configuration following RAN3 agreement to align with the future NPN evolution.

2 No new UE variables will be introduced for PNI-NPNs.

3 UE performs SNPN ID checking before transmitting the information for corresponding SON and MDT reports, upon the network requests for it.

4 Assuming ESNPN is supported, include a list of SNPN IDs in the logged MDT report.

In this email discussion, some FFS on SON/MDT for NPN are listed, and companies can discuss these issues in more detail:

FFS1: Include UE CAG subscription information in the RLF/HOF report:

- CAG subscription statues indication;

- CAG-only indication.

FFS2: RAN2 to discuss whether and how to address the loss issue of logged MDT report when UE switches between SNPN and PN and then send RAN2 decision to RAN3.

- Option 1: Introducing new variables for SNPNs;

- Option 2: Storing only the collected MDT measurements report (UE deletes the MDT configuration as legacy);

- Option 3: No enhancement is needed;

FFS3: RAN2 to discuss:

- Whether and how to introduce information reporting for OOC analysis involving NPN network;

- Whether and which to introduce other SON/MDT enhancements for NPN in this Release.

## UE CAG subscription information in the RLF/HOF report

Three options are summarized in [1] for UE to report for the UE CAG subscription information in the RLF/HOF report. Since “Allowed CAG list” has been excluded during the meeting, the rest options could be further discussed here:

* Option 1: CAG subscription statues indication (if the UE has subscription with any of the CAG IDs broadcast by the cell, and whether the UE only allowed to access CAG cells);
* Option 2: CAG-only indication;
* Option 3: Other information, if any.

**Question 1: Companies are invited to provide the views on whether and which option should be reported by UE for the UE CAG subscription information in the RLF/HOF report.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Nothing needed | After further checking, we think nothing is needed. A cell can act either as PLMN cell or CAG cell, so the CGI of the cell in the RLF report already describes whether/what CAGs a cell is supporting. For the sake of mobility robustness optimization, we don’t see any gain by including CAG the subscription information in the RLF report. We appreciate if companies discuss the use case of these information in the RLF report before deciding which information to log.  |
| Vivo | Option 2 | Upon receiving the RLF report, the source cell may optimize the HO-related parameters for some candidate target cells. With the CAG-only indication, the cells that do not support PNI-NPN can be excluded as candida cell. On the other hand, the NW can analyze whether there is a resource allocation issue with the indication if the resources of the public network and private network are separate.Besides, the indication is beneficial for operators to analyze the performance of PNI-NPN. |
| Nokia | Option 1 | The CAG memberships of the UE influence the UE and network behavior (e.g., during cell reselection, or the target cell selection at HO) and this may impact the service quality (e.g., delays and failures experienced during Hos). Therefore it is reasonable to send this indications to the NW in the report. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Nothing needed | We share similar views as Ericsson.For option 2, CAG-only indication has been defined in section 9.3.3.45 in TS 38.413, and thus last serving gNB can associate the information and UE RLF report to analyze issue. Thus, we see no strong need for UE to report CAG-only indication to network. |
| CATT | Option2 | A cell can act either as PLMN cell or CAG cell, but one CGI could be assoiated to multiple CAGs with the same PLMN ID and the same cell identity. So whether the UE was worked in a CAG-only manner when the RLF/HOF occurred can be a useful information to assist the performance analysis. |
| Qualcomm | Nothing needed | For option 2, similar view as Huawei. This is already known at the last serving gNB.Option 1 is not clear either. Whether UE has subscription or not to a CAG cell is internal to the UE or informed to the UE by the AMF via NAS signaling right? We never expose such subscription information to gNB and should continue to not expose. |
| Samsung | Nothing needed | We think that network already has this information.  |
| Apple | Nothing needed | Shared the view with E/// and QCOM |

## Loss issue of logged MDT report when UE switches between SNPN and PN

In RAN3 LS [2], RAN3 would like to check with RAN2 if there are any solutions to avoid the loss of stored logged MDT reports upon moving from a network of one type to another type, even upon deregistration. Based on the summary of discussion provided to the meeting RAN2#123, two solutions have been discussed by RAN2 so far:

- Option 1: Introducing new variables for SNPNs;

- Option 2: Storing only the collected public network MDT measurements report, so upon returning back to the PN, the PN can fetch the MDT report (UE deletes the MDT configuration as legacy);

So first of all, we have to decide whether and how to address the loss issue of logged MDT report when UE switches between SNPN and PN in RAN2.

**Question 2: Companies are invited to provide the views on whether and how to address the loss issue of logged MDT report when UE switches between SNPN and PN in RAN2:**

- Option 1: Introducing new variables for SNPNs;

- Option 2: Storing only the collected public network MDT measurements report, so upon returning back to the PN, the PN can fetch the MDT report (UE deletes the MDT configuration as legacy);

- Option 3: No enhancement is needed;

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option(1/2/3)** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Option 2 | First we would like to highlight that the mobility between public network (PN) and SNPN is much more frequent than mobility between PNs (moving between countries). Therefore, enhancement is needed to avoid unexpected deleting of at least MDT measurements for the public networkWe think Option 2 can be a compromise i.e., upon moving from PN to SNPN, the UE stores only the MDT report, (deletes the MDT configuration), and upon returning to the public network, the network can fetch the collected MDT measurements. |
| vivo | Option 3 | For mobility between PLMNs, such a problem may also occur when the UE moves from one network to another as long as the two networks are not equivalent. However, there is no enhancement mechanism for this problem in legacy.Besides, the coverage issue can still be identified by the MDT report from other UEs that do not switch between SNPN and PN.  |
| Nokia | Option 1 | There is a clear requirement from RAN3 to solve this issue. As SNPN coverage can be sporadic or limited, moving between SNPN and PLMN can happen frequently.The problem of option 2 is that it means no logged MDT for SNPN, which is a deviation from the objective of the work item. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 3 | Regarding the loss issue of logged MDT report between SNPN and PN, we understand that RAN3 indicated the issue in their LS. However, we wonder whether it is a corner case or not.As specified in TS 38.300, when the UE is set to operate in SNPN access mode, the UE only selects and registers with SNPNs. It is our understanding that SNPN Ues only camp on SNPN, and they seldom acccess PN. And smart phone users seldom access SNPN. In summary, the mobility between SNPN and PN for SNPN/PN Ues does not happen frequently, and then we do not think enhancements are needed.Perhaps operators can clarify the scenario and requirements. |
| CATT | Option 3 | We believe that a smart network can retrieve the required measurement result before being overwritten or cleared. The complexity introduced by this can be avoided in RAN2. |
| Qualcomm | Option 3 | Similar view as HW, CATT and Vivo.Seems to be a very corner scenario. There might be loss of logged MDT reports only if a UE set to operate in SNPN access mode and configured with logged MDT configuration went to RRC\_IDLE in SNPN, never came back to RRC\_CONNECTED in SNPN and moved to a PLMN.If the UE came back to RRC\_CONNECTED in SNPN, the network can retrieve the reports and avoid the loss.The same applies to PLMN 🡪 SNPN mobility as well. |
| Samsung | Option 3 | In our understanding this is not a critical issue and is a corner case. SON works in statistical way and some loss can be tolerated. Moreover, UE doesn’t keep any information with respect to the previously camped network after deregistration and there is no need to keep the logged MDT reports after deregistration.  |
| Apple | Option 3 | Agree that mobility between SNPN and PLMN should not happen requently so it is a corner case at best. |

If the answer of Q2 is ‘Option1’, a new SNPN specific variable for logged MDT needs to be introduced. Companies are invited to continue to discuss other detailed about this solution:

a) Whether to introduce storage limitation/ additional memory [3][4][5];

b) Considerations on logged MDT types (signalling/management based) [4].

**Question 3: Companies are invited to provide the views on which issue(s) listed above should be considered for the detailed specification impact involve the new SNPN specific variable for logged MDT.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **a/b** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | a) | We think that a new SNPN specific variable is a simple solution to avoid removing logged MDT reports when there is a switch between SNPN and PLMN. Introducing storage limitations is acceptable to avoid UE implementation issues. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Others

For out-of-coverage scenario, some companies propose to consider information reporting in RLF/HOF report and logged MDT report for out-of-coverage analysis:

1. UE access mode;
2. OOC cause (e.g., whether due to weak coverage or due to cell being barred);
3. SNPN OOC indication (e.g. in RA report, or CEF report, or new report).

**Question 5: Companies are invited to provide the views on whether and which information listed above can be introduced for OOC analysis involving NPN network:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **(None/a/b/c)** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | c | Out of coverage indication can be added to the RA report or CEF report. Details can be FFS. |
| vivo | None | For RLF report, if CAG-only indication is included in the RLF report, the network can analyze the reason for out-of-coverage based on this indication and noSuitableCellFound indication. For logged MDT report, UE includes anyCellSelectionDetected in the report if there is no suitable or no acceptable cell found. This indication is sufficient for out-of-coverage analyses since the network will consider there is a coverage hole only if all the UEs (including NPN-capable UE and non-NPN-capable UE) report anyCellSelectionDetected indication. |
| Nokia | None |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | None | Share similar views as vivo. |
| CATT | None |  |
| Qualcomm | None |  |
| Samsung | None |  |
| Apple | c | We think this is an important use case which can be addressed relatively easily  |

Some companies propose to consider other SON/MDT enhancement use cases for NPN networks. These use cases can potentially be considered quickly, based on the agreed principles made for RLF/HOF report and logged MDT:

1. **For CEF**: Include the SNPN ID into the VarConnEstFailReport and perform checking before sending CEF availability indication;
2. **For L2 measurement**: Report the NPN related information to the TCE together with the L2 measurement (e.g. throughput or data volume measurement);
3. **For RACH report**: UE logs NID in the RA report and checks if NID of the current SNPN matches the SNPN of the previously logged RA reports before logging a new RA report and before transmitting a RA report to the network;
4. **For MHI**: UE logs time spent in the SNPN network in an entry in the existing PN MHI report, and performs PLMN check before transmitting MHI report to network.

**Question 6: Companies are invited to provide the views on whether and which SON/MDT use case(s) listed above should also be considered for NPN enhancement in this Release.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **(None/a/b/c/d)** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | A and C and D | These are functionalities that should be supported in Rel-18 otherwise, it might lead to some privacy/security issues. |
| vivo | a, c, d | Enhancements on RLF and logged MDT can be reused for use cases a, c, d. Use case b) seems up to RAN3/SA5. |
| Nokia | A, C, D |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | A, C, D |  |
| CATT | B, D | Fo B, we think it is simple and necessary to include the NPN information to OAM, since the NPN capable UE may have high priority than other normal UEs for access control or for flow control.For D, we can simply introduce the NPN related information based on the discussed use cases. But for A and C, we should first decide whether the ESNPN should be applied for these SONMDT use cases. Then we should discuss whether the NPN ID should be included in the report. Especially for RACH report, since the RACH resource will not be allocated per SNPN, we do not think the NPN ID should be inside the RACH report. The relevant discussions for these cases are not simple, so we suggest that we only discuss simple cases such as B and D in this Release. |
| Qualcomm | A, C, D | **To CATT:** on A & C, even if E-SNPNs are not supported, UE should perform check before sending the RA Report and CEF Report collected in a different SNPN right? Also even for RLF Report, we have added NID in CGI. Makes sense to add NID in other reports as wellMotivation for B is not clear and perhaps not needed. |
| Samsung | See Comments | B and D are not needed. Can discuss on A and C |
| Apple | A and C |  |

**Question 7: Companies are invited to provide other issues may need to be discussed, if any.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Conclusion

If needed.
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