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# Introduction

**CB: # NRQoE3-Solutions**

**Main part:**

**- LTE-based solution can be used as a baseline?**

**- QoE configuration and report are delivered by RAN as transparent containers or real-time RAN side optimization should be considered? QoE metrics are visible to RAN for NR QoE management?**

**- both management-based and signalling-based solutions should be supported? Reusing Trace mechanism or introducing newly defined procedures? MDT user consent for management based QoE?**

**- a threshold-based and/or event-based mechanism to trigger the start and stop of QoE measurement collection?**

**- NR QoE reports from UE are delivered over a newly defined dedicated SRB type or via UP solution?**

**- The QoE measurement and reporting is supported in RRC\_CONNECTED state only?**

**- Mobility impact: whether inter-RAT and inter-system QoE measurement continuity should be supported? only signalling based QoE measurement is propagated to target node? support of QoE measurement under MR-DC scenario?**

**Additional part:**

**- the enhancement of QoE measurement reports with DC or CA indication of the UE for the measured application session? (E///)**

**- the enhancement of QoE measurement reports with mobility history information? (E///)**

**- network slices should be taken into account? (Samsung, ZTE)**

**- the segmentation of large QoE reports into multiple smaller QoE reports? RAN2 related? (E///)**

**- study a time-based event for activation of QoE measurement to enable the flexibility of QoE measurement activation within a certain predefined period of time? (E///)**

**- Capture agreements as TP for TR, revise/merge and check details, split work, if needed**

**- List open issues for next meeting in the summary**

(E/// - moderator)

Relevant papers:

1. R3-204706 QoE Configuration and reporting (Qualcomm Incorporated)
2. R3-204851 Framework for QoE measurement collection (Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell)
3. R3-205181 Initial Consideration On Study of NR QoE (ZTE)
4. R3-205182 TP for FS\_NR\_QoE (ZTE)
5. R3-205200 pCR for TR 38.8xx: NR QoE Management Framework (Ericsson)
6. R3-205201 pCR for TR 38.8xx: NR QoE Measurement Triggering, Configuration, Collection and Reporting (Ericsson)
7. R3-205281 NR QoE measurement overview (Huawei)
8. R3-205283 Potential RAN3 impacts about QoE measurement (Huawei)
9. R3-205359 Discussion on NR QoE solution for various service (CATT)
10. R3-205360 Discussion on NR QoE solution architecture and interface impact (CATT)
11. R3-205370 Some Considerations on QOE Collection in NR (China Telecommunications)
12. R3-205402 Discussion on NR QoE requirements and potential solutions (Samsung)
13. R3-205403 Discussion on NR QoE interface impact and solutions (Samsung)
14. R3-205439 NR QoE management (CMCC)
15. R3-204708 Interworking with LTE QoE (Qualcomm Incorporated)
16. R3-205183 Consideration on slice QoE measurement (ZTE)
17. R3-204707 QoE handling in handover (Qualcomm Incorporated)

# For the Chairman’s Notes

TBW

# Discussion

## The high-level solution

A clear majority of contributions propose to agree/discuss the specification of both the management- and signalling-based solution. On the other hand, paper [9] proposes a completely new solution for time-critical services. Meanwhile, paper [2] proposes to use MDT as baseline for NR QMC.

**Q1-1: Should both the management-based and signalling-based solutions be specified for NR QoE management?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** |
| Ericsson | Yes. We further think that we should consider enhancing the management-based solution so that it should be possible to configure measurements for specific UEs.In our view, the “LTE solution as baseline”:* Implies specification of signalling and management-based solution;
* Implies QMC delivery over SRB1;
* Implies QoE report transport over SRB4;
* Does not imply the reuse of Trace messages for signalling-based solution.

In addition, both the SID and paper [8] make a distinction between the LTE-based solution (including management-based and signalling-based solution) and the MDT-based solution, meaning that LTE as a baseline does not imply the reuse of Trace messages for NR QoE. |
| Qualcomm | Yes. Application layer measurement should be RAT agnostic. So, we should make NR QoE similar to LTE for easier interworking. MDT and LTE QoE are based on trace. If NR QoE continues to be based on trace, it is easier for correlation with radio measurements (MDT). |

The QMC in the LTE signalling-based solution is piggybacked in Trace messages. In that respect, paper [5] proposes to define a dedicated signalling-based solution for NR QoE management, that does not reuse Trace messages. Paper [10] proposes that RAN creates the measurement configuration and sends it to the OAM. Based on the critical mass in the proposals, the following question is formulated:

**Q1-2: What is your view on specifying a dedicated procedure for signalling-based solution?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** |
| Ericsson | We think that **a dedicated set of procedures** should be defined for signalling-based NR QoE. Trace/MDT and QoE management are two different features and the QoE signalling should not be piggybacked on Trace messages. Moreover, the signalling design for Trace messages is Trace-centric so thee would need to be more than a few “bug fixes” to invalidate the mandatory Trace-specific IEs in the existing messages. We should not mandate that the Trace Collection Entity and the entity collecting QoE measurements are the same.  |
| Qualcomm | As answered in last question, we think trace based architecture is easier for interworking with LTE and correlation with radio measurements (MDT). |

Papers [3], [10] and [14] argue that is preferable that QoE measurement configuration and reports are visible at the RAN. The same seems to be preferred by paper [12]. Meanwhile, paper [1] expresses a preference towards sending the two transparently over the RAN.

**Q1-3: Should the NR measurement configuration and QoE reports be visible at the RAN?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** |
| Ericsson | Yes, we believe that this is beneficial. |
| Qualcomm | For the services (MTSI, Video, AR, MBMS) with SA4 define QoE metrics, it should be up to gNB implementation to understand the SA4 defined QoE containers.It should be possible for RAN2/RAN3 to define new QoE containers which are understandable for RAN. |

## Transport of QoE measurement report

The majority of companies propose the reuse of LTE solution, where the QoE reports are carried over SRB4. This may be understood as an implicit preference towards carrying the QoE reports over a dedicated SRB4. Companies behind the papers [5], [11] and [14] are somewhat more concrete, explicitly capturing the preference towards CP solution in their proposals. Meanwhile, paper [13] discusses the QOE report transport over both CP and UP.

**Q2: Do you agree that NR QoE reports should be carried over CP, and, more specifically, over a newly defined dedicated SRB type, e.g. SRB4?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** |
| Ericsson | Yes. |
| Qualcomm | Yes, over CP. As to SRB type, it is up to RAN2 to decide. |

## Measurement configuration and reporting

Paper [1] proposes that UE Application layer measurement capability is included into UE Radio Capability Info Indication message.

**Q3-1: Should the UE Application layer measurement capability be included into UE Radio Capability Info Indication message?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** |
| Ericsson | Yes, this is in line with the LTE approach. |
| Qualcomm | Yes, 5GC needs the information to configure signalling based QoE. |

Papers [3], [6] and [14] propose to consider in NR QoE measurements the radio network layer measurements and radio layer configuration information. Some examples include mobility history information, CA and DC configurations, HO type used during the application session etc.

**Q3-2: Should radio network layer measurements and radio layer configuration information be considered in NR QoE measurements?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** |
| Ericsson | Yes. We think that the inclusion of information and measurements pertaining to the radio network layer is necessary in order to provide to the recipient of the measurements a complete view about the causes of QoE deterioration. |
| Qualcomm | No. The QoE and MDT (with radio measurements) can be correlated based on timestamp, location info, trace ID etc.  |

Papers [6], [10] discuss measurement triggering and stopping. For example, event- and time-based triggering, as well as triggering by RAN are considered.

**Q3-3: Should RAN3 discuss/introduce event- and time-based measurement triggering and stopping, as well as measurement triggering by RAN?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** |
| Ericsson | Yes. We think it is beneficial to monitor the QoE metrics at certain events. Since the RAN has a close view on the radio situation, we think that RAN should also be able to trigger the QoE measurements. |
| Qualcomm | Yes.  |

Papers [6] and [7] discuss measurement release, as well as reporting handling at RAN overload.

**Q3-4: Should RAN3 discuss/introduce the mechanisms for releasing QoE measurements and QoE report delivery at RAN overload?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** |
| Ericsson | Yes. We think that the network should be able to e.g. release a measurement or pause the reporting at overload. This is essential for measurement flexibility. |
| Qualcomm | Yes |

Papers [7], [8] and [11] discuss the QoE management support for SA, NSA and MR-DC.

***Q3-5: Should RAN3 discuss/introduce the QoE management support for SA, NSA and/or MR-DC?***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** |
| Ericsson | Yes, we think this is beneficial. Multi-connectivity has an impact on QoE and this should be considered in QoE management. |
| Qualcomm | Yes |

Paper [7] proposes that QoE measurement and reporting is supported in RRC\_CONNECTED state only.

**Q3-6: How should QoE measurements and reporting be handled in different RRC states?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** |
| Ericsson | We think that QoE measurement and reporting should of course be supported in CONNECTED state. We also think that the measurement configuration should not be released during the INACTIVE state, because we should avoid configuring the UE again and again every time it switches back to CONNECTED state. |
| Qualcomm | Application runs in AP (application processor) and is agnostic to RRC states. RRC state is managed by modem. QoE is measurement in application layer and therefore should be independent of RRC states. |

## NR QoE management at mobility

Paper [6] proposes that RAN3 should study the required information to be exchanged between RAN nodes to support QoE measurement handling upon mobility. Papers [8] and [17] propose mobility support only for signalling-based solution.

**Q4: Should RAN3 specify mobility support for both signalling- and management-based NR QoE management?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** |
| Ericsson | Yes. The mobility impact on QoE is very important, regardless of QoE management solution agreed. |
| Qualcomm | Yes. |

## Other non-essential issues – to be discussed at a later stage

* Interface impact - as proposed by [10], the interface impact (proposals in e.g. [13]) should be discussed only after the solution(s) have been chosen, and the rapporteur will follow that approach.
* Proposals regarding real-time NR QoE management, discussed in [10] and [13].
* Inter-RAT mobility discussed in papers [6] and [15].
* Slice-related proposals from [3], [12] and [16].
* Segmentation of QoE reports over RRC in [6].

# Conclusion, Recommendations

TBW