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# 0 Introduction

This contribution provides summary of offline discussion on Average Window (AW) introduction in Alternative QoS Parameters (AQP) as captured in chair notes:

|  |
| --- |
| **RAN3 agrees on understanding 1****CB: # 1\_AverageWindow****- Check whether any CRs are needed for understanding 1, and attempt convergence****- Reply LS to SA2?**(Ericsson - moderator) |

# 1 For the Chair’s Notes

This section to be updated later [TBD]

# 2 Discussion

## 2.1 Proposed CRs to capture understanding 1:

RAN3 has agreed online on understanding 1 described below:

|  |
| --- |
| **Understanding 1:** NG-RAN node will re-use the same value as the averaging window configured in the QoS profile to determine whether the QoS profile can be fulfilled and which alternative QoS profile can be used as reference if the QoS profile is not fulfilled.  |

It is proposed to check whether any CRs can be endorsed to capture understanding 1 in the RAN3 specifications; based on the proposed CRs available this meeting, there are two versions for discussion:

1. A set of CRs to NGAP, XnAP, F1AP, E1AP and TS 38.300 have been provided by **Ericsson. Now co-signed by CATT, Qualcomm and Jio Platforms**. Below an extract of the proposed change to **NGAP [1]:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9.3.1.151 Alternative QoS Parameters Set ListThis IE contains alternative sets of QoS parameters which the NG-RAN node can indicate to be fulfilled when notification control is enabled and it cannot fulfil the requested list of QoS parameters.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IE/Group Name** | **Presence** | **Range** | **IE type and reference** | **Semantics description** | **Criticality** | **Assigned Criticality** |
| **Alternative QoS Parameters Set Item** |  | *1..<maxnoofQoSparaSets>* |  |  |  |  |
| >Alternative QoS Parameters Set Index | M |  | 9.3.1.152 |  | - |  |
| >Guaranteed Flow Bit Rate Downlink | O |  | Bit Rate 9.3.1.4 |  | - |  |
| >Guaranteed Flow Bit Rate Uplink | O |  | Bit Rate 9.3.1.4 |  | - |  |
| >Packet Delay Budget  | O |  | 9.3.1.80 |  | - |  |
| >Packet Error Rate  | O |  | 9.3.1.81 |  | - |  |
| >Maximum Data Burst Volume  | O |  | 9.3.1.83 | Maximum Data Burst Volume is specified in TS 23.501 [9]. This IE may be included if the *Delay Critical* IE is set to "delay critical" and is ignored otherwise. | YES | ignore |
| >Averaging Window | O  |  | 9.3.1.82 | Averaging Window is specified in TS 23.501 [9]. This IE has the same value as the *Averaging Window* IE present in *QoS Flow Level QoS Parameters* IE in 9.3.1.12. | YES | ignore |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Range bound** | **Explanation** |
| maxnoofQoSparaSets | Maximum no. of alternative sets of QoS Parameters allowed for the QoS profile. Value is 8.  |

 |

The above CR aligns with understanding 1 and also with TS 23.501 specifications that mentions “*An Alternative QoS Profile represents a combination of QoS parameters PDB, PER, Averaging Window and GFBR to which the application traffic is able to adapt.”*

1. The second proposed change is from Nokia CR [2], where an extract is provided below:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9.3.1.18 Dynamic 5QI DescriptorThis IE indicates the QoS Characteristics for a Non-standardised or not pre-configured 5QI for downlink and uplink.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IE/Group Name** | **Presence** | **Range** | **IE type and reference** | **Semantics description** | **Criticality** | **Assigned Criticality** |
| Priority Level | M |  | 9.3.1.84 | Priority Level is specified in TS 23.501 [9]. | - |  |
| Packet Delay Budget | M |  | 9.3.1.80 | Packet Delay Budget is specified in TS 23.501 [9]. This IE is ignored if the *Extended Packet Delay Budget* IE is present. | - |  |
| Packet Error Rate | M |  | 9.3.1.81 | Packet Error Rate is specified in TS 23.501 [9]. | - |  |
| 5QI | O |  | INTEGER (0..255, …) | Indicates the dynamically assigned 5QI as specified in TS 23.501 [9]. | - |  |
| Delay Critical | C-ifGBRflow |  | ENUMERATED (delay critical, non-delay critical, …) | Indicates whether the GBR QoS flow is delay critical as specified in TS 23.501 [9]. | - |  |
| Averaging Window | C-ifGBRflow  |  | 9.3.1.82 | Averaging Window is specified in TS 23.501 [9]. When Alternative QoS parameters sets are indicated for the QoS flow, this Averaging Window applies to all. | - |  |

 |

This CR is also technically correct wrt understanding 1, however may be considered ambiguous as can be understood that each QoS profile selects and uses the average window indicated in the qos parameter of the qos flow. But RAN does not select the AQPs, only use them as a reference to currently fulfilled QoS.

**Q#1: Companies are invited to share their opinions on which CR, if needed, can capture understanding 1:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **CR version [1] (E/// et al.) or [2] (Nokia)** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | [1] | [1] better aligns with SA2 spec and understanding 1, also can be future proof, if the specification evolves to allow other understandings in the future (by simply removing the semantics). |
| Nokia | [2] | The release 18 specification is frozen. Nokia disagrees to add any new IEs because stage 3 prevails for frozen releases as per our rules. New IE may also create useless issues (e.g. if received value happens to be different..). |
| Huawei | [2] | Apparently, R3 should not add new IE for averaging window in stage 3. If some clarification for understanding is needed, we think Nokia’s version is good enough. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 2.2 LS reply to SA2?

Some companies propose to send an LS to SA2 to reply with RAN3 conclusion.

The SA2 LS mentions:

|  |
| --- |
| **2. Actions:****To RAN3****ACTION:** SA2 kindly asks RAN3 to decide how to select and use the averaging window when AQP are present in the NG-RAN. |

The LS action mentions that SA2 leaves it completely to RAN3 to decide on usage of AW in AQP, thus SA2 does not expect an answer that will require action for them to take. In our view an LS reply is not necessary.

Q#2: Whether LS reply is needed to SA2:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | LS reply is not needed. In our understanding, SA2 have agreed to not change their specifications.  |
| Nokia | OK for LS: SA2 asked RAN3 to decide so RAN3 needs to communicate RAN3 decision to SA2. |
| Huawei | We think the SA2 needs to be informed, they ask RAN3 to decide how to handle the issue, we should inform them our agreements. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 3 Conclusion
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