Summary

Variant of RAN-R18-WS-crossFunc-LG Uplus Version 0.0.2

RAN

3GPP TSG RAN Rel-18 workshop RWS-210630

Electronic Meeting, June 28 - July 2, 2021

Agenda Item: 4.3

Source: LG Uplus

Title: Email discussion summary for RAN-R18-WS-crossFunc-LG Uplus

1 Introduction

This email discussion summary covers the following document:

RWS-210282 ”LG Uplus views on Rel-18 Cross-Functionalities area”

2 Round 1 Q&A

2.1 Comments to the Tdoc

Feedback Form 1: Comments to the Tdoc

1 – BBC **MBS** BBC supports the evolution of NR MBS under Rel-18 and the topics you propose generally seem relevant to us as potential enhancements for NR MBS.
2 – Qualcomm Incorporated On MBS: what additional enhancements for MBS group management with adaptive MCS beyond Rel-17 are you considering?

2.2 Questions to the Tdoc

Feedback Form 2: Questions to the Tdoc

2.3 Answers by moderator

Table 1: Answers by moderator

	Questions (similar questions are merged)	Answers
1	BBC supports the evolution of NR MBS under Rel-18 and the topics you propose generally seem relevant to us as potential enhancements for NR MBS.	Thanks so much for your comment and we think this NR MBS has full potential to be used for many applications with spectral-efficient manner.
2	On MBS: what additional enhancements for MBS group management with adaptive MCS beyond Rel-17 are you considering?	Thanks for the comment and so far I believe NACK based feedback for RRC-connected UE was included in Rel-17 NR MBS while other states will not be considered and also how to deal with the bad group or the bad member of that group can be discussed more where it might be implementation or optimizing issue.

3 Round 2 Q&A

3.1 Comments to the Tdoc

Feedback Form 3: Comments to the Tdoc

1 – HuaWei Technologies Co.

Q1. Regarding ”defining methods/criteria for XR traffic quality evaluation”, do you mean a new method-/criteria for XR traffic quality evaluation is needed? We also see some value on studying on a better metric for XR quality evaluation in RAN, since the current KPI for XR evaluation in RAN1 may not be enough to reflect user experience.

Q2. Do you have any specific consideration on what kind of parameters/factors is useful to define such a metric?

3.2 Questions to the Tdoc

Feedback Form 4: Questions to the Tdoc

3.3 Answers by moderator

Table 2: Answers by moderator

	Questions (similar questions are merged)	Answers
1	Q1. Regarding ”defining methods/criteria for XR traffic quality evaluation”, do you mean a new method/criteria for XR traffic quality evaluation is needed? We also see some value on studying on a better metric for XR quality evaluation in RAN, since the current KPI for XR evaluation in RAN1 may not be enough to reflect user experience. Q2. Do you have any specific consideration on what kind of parameters/factors is useful to define such a metric?	Thanks for the comment and questions. I think it would be better to answer together for the two questions as follows. Overall it seems that we have similar understanding. Checking and manaing the frame integrity and defining the XR Quality Index(XQI) with packet loss information, delay, and some XR-specific parameters that you introduced in RWS-210439 seem a interesting approach where still we are open to discuss and hear more and basically we wanted to make the direction rather than the specific solution or parameters here. However, if I can share my opinion after getting through other XR-related contributions, maybe the view point identifier(VPI) mentioned in Nokia’s RWS-210070 and how much each QoS flow is coming soundly can be the one way of evaluation in addition to Huawei’s idea.
2		

4 Summary

For round1, BBC and Qualcomm asked about MBS and the answer for each question was provided. For round2, Huawei raised questions regarding XR and the answer was provided.