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# Introduction

**CB: # 6\_UserConsent**

**- RAN3 action towards R3-211464 is needed?**

**- Support the user consent for location information reporting in RLF/CEF through the CRs to NG-AP TS 38.413 and Xn-AP TS 38.423 specifications? CRs for both Rel-16 and Rel-17?**

**- LS reply to SA3?**

(Apple - moderator)

Summary of offline disc [R3-222395](file:///D%3A%5CCMRI%20work%5C2022%20projects%5C3GPP%5CRAN3%20%23115%5CInbox%5CR3-222395.zip)

It is proposed to conduct the discussion into two phases:

* Phase 1: collect companies views on the issue
	+ Deadline:
* Phase 2: discuss the details of the LS and the CRs
	+ Deadline:

# For the Chairman’s Notes

Propose the following:

R3-20xxxa, R3-20xxxc merged

R3-20xxxc rev [in xxxg] – agreed

R3-20xxxd rev [in xxxh] – agreed

R3-20xxxe rev [in xxxi] – agreed

R3-20xxxf rev [in xxxj] – endorsed

Propose to capture the following:

**Agreement text…**

**Agreement text…**

**WA: carefully crafted text…**

Issue 1: no consensus

**Issue 2: issue is acknowledged; need to further check the impact on xxx. May be possible to address with a pure st2 change. To be continued…**

# Discussion

In R3-221703 [2], there is an observation that SA3, in their LS R3-211464 [5], communicated the requirement for RAN3 signalling to support the user consent for location information sharing in RLF/CEF.

|  |
| --- |
| SA3 understands that regulations for collection of location information could vary around the globe. In some regulations, user consent may not be required on the basis of other legal grounds. In other regulations, user consent may be required regardless.Therefore, SA3 opines that RAN2, RAN3, and SA5 do not need to make user consent mandatory for RLF/CEF cases but should provide a possibility so that the operator has an option to collect and handle user consent. SA3 also believes it is not required to update previous releases (R15 and prior). |

## Question 1: do you agree to specify the signalling to support user consent for location information sharing in RLF/CEF in accordance with SA3 LS?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| CMCC | No | This issue has been discussed in RAN2 for several meetings, and RAN2 didn’t agree to introduce user consent for SON and the current situation is no action. RAN3 is not the right group to discuss and make any decision on the user consent issue, that’s why RAN3 is put in CC in the LS. From the technical point of view, it has been allowed by the spec to use user consent for RLF. In summary, we are not fine to make any changes.  |
| Ericsson |  | We would like to clarify that we are in favour of enabling user consent in general. However, for this case we agree with CMCC that the issue of location reporting in RLF and CEF reports was discussed in RAN2 and the group could not agree with introducing such mechanism. The reason is that in the RRC specification, wherever the UE includes the location information, the term ‘if available’ has been included. This is for two purposes:1) For location information to be reported, the network needs to configure the UE with a configuration to make location information available or with a logged MDT configuration2) For location information to be reported, the UE must have turned on its corresponding receiver (GNSS etc.)Thus, based on existing RRC specifications the UE starts to make the location information available for reporting only if the network had configured the UE with either immediate MDT or logged MDT which are already subject to user consent AND the UE has its positioning received on. Therefore, a new mechanism for RLF/CEF user consent is not needed |
| Huawei | No | We have same view as CMCC and Ericsson. |
| Apple | Yes | To CMCC, can you please clarify where exactly in the specs “user consent for RLF” is supported? It is simply not there. To E///, your explanations are correct…but they have nothing to do with user consent. The language “if available” is there, but what if the location information is available but the user has not provided consent to use it?Then you mention MDT, but that’s a completely different feature altogether, nothing to do with RLF and CEF we are discussing here.  |
| ZTE | No | Same view as CMCC/Ericsson/Huawei |
| CATT |  | We also check with our RAN2 colleague and the feedback from our RAN2 colleague is similar with what CMCC and E/// said.The UE would try to have location information available in CEF/RLF/RRM measurement report/MDT report when the received *otherConfig* includes the *obtainLocation* .It seems RAN2 is Ok to use the same user consent for these cases. If there is really requirement to have different user consent, maybe it should RAN2 to send LS to RAN3. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Agree with Apple’s comments. It is possible that the location information is available, but the user has not provided consent to use it.The only existing user consent is for MDT (logged MDT and immediate MDT), but there is no user consent for SON reports or just the Location Information.In addition to RLF/CEF reports (which don’t require network configuration), we are also introducing new SON reports such as Successful HO Report in Rel-17 which can include Location Information. In case of SHR, the network should respect the user consent before even configuring the UE to report Location Information. We therefore think a separate user consent for Location Information in SON reports is important and should be introduced. |
| Samsung | Yes | The existing user consent is only for MDT as explained by QC. It is not used for RLF/CEF.We also agree the feature need to be supported in both RAN2 and RAN3. RAN2 will also discuss the issue in this meeting. |
| Nokia | No | Earlier discussion in RAN2 of the LS from SA3 did not trigger any extra corrections to Rel-16. The link between the proposed procedural text and RLF/CEF is unclear to us, and would be a RAN2 matter, so we believe RAN3 should not take action here unless guided by RAN2.  |

Furthermore, in R3-221703 [2], there is an observation that the LS from SA3 was provided in the context of the Rel-16 NR\_SON\_MDT WI. SA3 clearly indicated that there is no need to support the requested functionality in Rel-15 and prior, and therefore we should only do so for Rel-16 and Rel-17.

## Question 2: In which releases (Rel-15, Rel-16, Rel-17) user consent signalling should be introduced?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Preferred options | Comments |
| CMCC |  | No changes are needed for any releases |
| Ericsson |  | See above comments |
| Apple | Rel-16, Rel-17 | The SA3 LS was provided in the context of the Rel-16 WI and therefore the functionality must be supported from Rel-16 (and of course Rel-17). |
| Qualcomm | Rel-17 | Perhaps Rel-17 is enough. But OK with Rel-16 too |
| Samsung | Rel-16 Rel-17 |  |
| Nokia |  | See above comments |

In the TS 38.413 CR R3-221704 [3] it is proposed to add user consent IE to the following NG-AP messages: INITIAL CONTEXT SETUP REQUEST and HANDOVER REQUEST.

## Question 3: Which NG-AP messages (e.g. INITIAL CONTEXT SETUP REQUEST, HANDOVER REQUEST, other?) should carry the user consent IE?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Preferred options | Comments |
| CMCC |  | Not needed |
| Ericsson |  | See above comment |
| Apple  | Both | See our CR in R3-221704 |
| Qualcomm | Rel-17 | Perhaps Rel-17 is enough. But OK with Rel-16 too |
| Samsung | Both |  |
| Nokia |  | See above comments |

In the TS 38.423 CR R3-221705 [4] it is proposed to add user consent IE to the following Xn-AP messages: HANDOVER REQUEST and RETRIEVE UE CONTEXT RESPONSE.

## Question 4: Which Xn-AP messages (e.g. HANDOVER REQUEST, RETRIEVE UE CONTEXT RESPONSE, other?) should carry the user consent IE?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Preferred options | Comments |
| CMCC |  | Not needed |
| Ericsson |  | See above comment |
| Apple | Both | See our CR in R3-221705 |
| Nokia |  | See above comments |

In R3-221702 [1], there is a draft LS proposing to communicate our decisions to SA3, RAN2, and CT4.

## Question 5: Do you agree to liaise SA3 and other groups about our decisions?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Preferred options | Comments |
| CMCC |  | Not needed |
| Ericsson |  | An LS, if at all needed, should rather come from RAN2 |
| Apple | Yes | We should notify SA3 of our discussion.  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Nokia |  | Agree with Ericsson |

# Conclusion, Recommendations [if needed]

If needed
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