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# 1 Introduction

This document relates to the following e-mail discussion:

* [Post123bis][617][QoE] 38.331 CR update and open issues (Ericsson)

      Scope: Running CR update and open issues

      Intended outcome:

* Endorsed running CR
* List of open issues for TS 38.331 (separate document)

      Deadline: Long

Contact information:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Contact Name, Email** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 2 Discussion

As part of the review of the RRC CR, some open issues were identified.

## 2.1 Session status indication

RAN2 made the following agreement:

* Session status indication can be transmitted from UE to gNB when the UE moves from RRC IDLE/INACTIVE to RRC\_CONNECTED state. Detailed RRC procedures are FFS in RAN2.

It is an open issue in which message the session status indication should be transmitted when the UE transfers to RRC\_CONNECTED. Two options have been identified:

Option 1: The session status indication is transmitted in *MeasurementReportAppLayer* message.

Option 2: The session status indication is transmitted in Msg5, i.e. *RRCSetupComplete* or *RRCResumeComplete*.

Question 1: In which message do you think the session status indication should be transmitted when the UE transfers to RRC\_CONNECTED?

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

Summary question 1:

No comments were uploaded. It is proposed to discuss the issue online.

1. Discuss whether the session status indication should be sent in MeasurementReportAppLayer or in Msg5.

## 2.2 measConfigAppLayerId

The RRC rapporteur suggested to add the second sentence in the field description for *measConfigAppLayerId*:

***measConfigAppLayerId***

The field contains the identity of the application layer measurements. When application layer measurements are configured for an SCG, the *measConfigAppLayerId* is obtained according to TS 38.423 [37], clauses 8.3.1 and 8.3.3.

The reason for the addition is that it is otherwise not clear in RRC how the measurements for the MCG and the SCG are separated. On the other hand, the addition is related to network behaviour.

Question 2: Do you agree with the addition to the field description for *measConfigAppLayerId*?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Summary question 2:

No comments were uploaded. It is proposed that the text is kept in the running CR for now as the text was proposed by the RRC rapporteur. Companies can provide comments in the next round of CR review.

## 2.3 Outstanding issues impacting RRC but treated in other e-mail discussions

The following outstanding issue treated in e-mail discussion [Post123bis][618][QoE] 37.340 CR update and open issues (Nokia) is related to RRC:

**Question 5**: **Do companies agree that, when SN is released, all the QoE measurements configured by the SN should be released (i.e., there is no need to indicate to UE which QoE configurations should be released or kept)?**

The following outstanding issues treated in e-mail discussion [Post123bis][616][QoE] 38.300 CR update and open issues (China Unicom) are related to RRC:

**Q1a: Do companies agree that RAN2 can make working assumptions: when UE moves to RRC\_IDLE state, the UE will store QoE configurations it received in RRC\_CONNECTED/RRC\_INACTIVE state in the AS layer?**

**Q1b: Do companies agree to introduce a new 1-bit indication in msg5 to represent the availability of QoE measurement configurations stored in the UE if UE based solution is supported?**

**Q1c: Which option do you prefer to use for transmitting QoE configurations info to the gNB if UE based solution is supported?**

**Option 1: UE information request/response procedure**

**Option 2: QoE measurement reporting procedure**

**Option 3: Using msg5 to retrieve QoE configurations.**

**Q2a: Do companies agree that RAN2 can make working assumptions: when UE moves to RRC\_IDLE state, the UE will store the following information per QoE configuration?**

**– QoE reference.**

**– The ID of the Measurement Collection Entity.**

**– The measConfigAppLayerID.**

**– Service type.**

**– QoE measurement type (s-based or m-based measurement) for MBS broadcast service.**

**– AS layer based area scope info.**

**Q3: Do companies agree to store RVQoE configurations in RRC\_IDLE state?**

**Q4a: Do companies agree to explicitly inform APP layer whether the UE is currently inside area scope or out of area scope via AT command?**

**Q6: Do companies agree to provide priority information to UE about buffering for the UE to decide which reports to discard in case the UE’s QoE buffer becomes full?**

**Q7: Do companies agree that UE need to check the PLMN of the target gNB when reconnecting from RRC\_IDLE to RRC\_CONNECTED state?**

It is proposed to await the outcome of these two discussions and make additions in RRC when related agreements have been made, i.e. at RAN2#124.

In addition, impacts due to IRATHO have not been discussed yet. It is the rapporteur’s understanding that the possibility to release QoE measurements as part of the IRATHO procedure needs to be added. This can be discussed based on contributions to RAN2#124.

# 3 Summary

Based on the discussion above, the following is proposed:

[Proposal 1 Discuss whether the session status indication should be sent in MeasurementReportAppLayer or in Msg5.](#_Toc149551353)