3GPP TSG-RAN3 Meeting #109-E R3-205615

E-meeting, 17 – 28 August 2020

Agenda Item: 31.3.2

Source: Ericsson

Title: SoD for NodeNameType

Document for: Discussion, Decision

# Introduction

This is a summary of offline discussions for the topic of Node Name Format.

**CB: # 83\_NodeNameType**

**- visible string vs. choice? (octet string seems like a proprietary option)**

**- how to best support Chinese characters?**

(E/// - moderator)

Summary of offline disc [R3-205615](file:///C:\Users\aarjona\Documents\002%20-%20RAN3%20meetings%20docs\00%20-%202020%2008%20RAN3%20109-e\Inbox\Drafts\CB%20%23%2083_NodeNameType\Inbox\R3-205615.zip)

# For the Chairman’s Notes

Following agreements were proposed on the first round of offline discussion:

**Proposal: It is proposed to agree to solutions based on Solution 3 (R3-205278, R3-205279, R3-205280) and generate CRs for TS38.473, TS38.413 and TS38.463**

# Discussion

## Problem description

The discussion online compared three types of solutions:

1. Solution based on new node name IE in VisibleString format (R3-204784, R3-204785, R3-204786)
2. Solution based on new node name IE in OCTET STRING format (R3-205191, R3-205192, R3-205193)
3. Solution extending Solution 1) to a choice structure where two encoding variants are available (R3-205278, R3-205279, R3-205280)
   1. One in VisibleString
   2. One in *UTF8 String*
4. Solution extending solution 1 to be of SEQUENCE format, supporting both VisibleString and UTF8String IE types as its parameters

During online discussion it was determined that the OCTET STRING format solution is proprietary and not interoperable.

Given that Solution 3 seems to cover also Solution 1, the following is proposed:

**Proposal: It is proposed to agree to solutions based on Solution 3 (R3-205278, R3-205279, R3-205280) and generate CRs for TS38.473, TS38.413 and TS38.463**

Companies are invited to provide their comments to the above proposal.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Solution | Comments on solution |
| Nokia | Solution 1 or Solution 4 | Disagree with the proposal.  In our view, Solution 3 adds unnecessary complexity and will bring additional burden to the O&M system, as multiple formats may need to be supported. Further, IOT may be even more complex as the new IE itself has multiple formats which may not be compatible between nodes.  Furthermore, considering ANR purpose and legacy OSS systems, we see relevant that any new types introduced are made in a way to avoid affecting these functions and systems as much as possible.  Solution 1 can address the need for additional special characters in a simple way.  For purpose of Chinese character support, an alternative which we see as having lower impact to legacy deployments (namely Solution 4) is to make the Extended Node Name IE of type SEQUENCE of extensible type, and having two parameters respectively. One for VisibleString IE type Node Name and other for UTF8String IE type Node Name. |
| Huawei | 3 | As commented by moderator, solution 3 covers solution1, and also reflects the intention of solution 2. |
| ZTE | 4 | We also support Chinese character, then option 3/4 are both ok to us.  As point out by Nokia, option 3 may have to support multiple formats which is not good for a MNO. Therefore we slightly prefer option 4. |
| Verizon | Solution 1 or Solution 4 | Concur with Nokia’s views above. Solution 1 allows additional characters in a simple way. Solution 4 allows for legacy characters and also non-Latin characters where required. |

# Conclusion, Recommendations [if needed]

If needed