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# Introduction

|  |
| --- |
| **CB: # 7\_UserConsent****- To reuse the existing user consent for m-based MDT also for UE location acquisition in RLF, SCG failure and CEF reporting cases? Apple, Huawei, BT, Orange****- LS reply to other groups**(Apple - moderator)Summary of offline disc R3-223726 |

Note: the text “- RAN3 has agreed to enable the optional inclusion of the Management Based MDT PLMN List IE in the NG: UE CONTEXT MODIFICATION REQUEST message? E///” has been removed as it belongs to a different CB.

# 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

## General

The moderator observes that all the papers submitted to this topic are aligned on the main intention to re-purpose the existing user consent for MDT signaling to be also applicable to user location reporting in RLF/CEF reports. Therefore, what remains to be discussed is the technical differences between the CRs submitted.

Furthermore, considering the timeframe, it is important to leave time to polish the CRs themselves, therefore the moderator proposes to conduct this discussion in two phases:

1. Collect feedback on technical differences between the CRs submitted
2. Polish the CRs

With this in mind, please provide your feedback to the questions asked below (for the first phase) till the end of Wednesday.

## Phase 1

Question 0: Is there any RAN3 specification changes needed?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Answer | Notes |
| CMCC | No | A lot of discussions happen in the past RAN2/RAN3 and RAN plenary. There is still no agreement to make specifications changes. No consensus was reached on a way forward and the summary in RP-220900 was noted. |
| Vodafone | No | In our view the existing signaling should be re-used, so, we think there should not be any ASN1 changes, but there might be a need for Stage 2 changes…  |
| Ericsson |  | We do not foresee any Stage 3 changes on tabulars and ASN.1. We could at best envisage changes in the procedure descriptions for the sake of repurposing of the MDT User consent. We believe that the changes anyhow need to be validated by SA5 and SA3, so no official agreements can be taken at this point in time in RAN3.We need anyhow to clarify what “user Location Information” is. Namely, the user location information in question should be specified to be “detailed UE geographical location information (i.e. LocationInfo-r16 in TS38.331)”. Failure to clearly spell out such detail may lead to misinterpretation of what user consent should apply to. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Procedural descriptions need to change to indicate the MDT user consent also applies to user consent for location information. |

In R3-223147 it is proposed “*to modify the NG-AP TS 38.413 and the Xn-AP TS 38.423 specifications (and potentially also the S1-AP TS 36.413 and the X2-AP TS 36.423) to repurpose the MDT user consent signaling to be applicable to location information in RLF/CEF as well*.” while the proposal in R3-223212 is “*to reuse the existing user consent for m-based MDT also for UE location acquisition in RLF, SCG failure and CEF reporting cases*”.

**Question 1: Which additional features (RLF report, CEF report, CSG failure report, other) the existing user consent for MDT signaling should be applicable to?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Answer | Notes |
| Apple | RLF report, CEF report, and CSG failure report | User consent should be applicable to all these features where the network may request precise user location. |
| Vodafone | RLF report, CEF report | Actually, SA3 mentioned only 2 features in their LS. This work should be driven by SA3 requirements in our view, especially if we like to extend the framework to be applicable for other features. |
| Ericsson | RLF report, CEF report |  |
| BT | RLF report, CEF report, SCG failure report | As per RAN2 response in R2-2006372 |
| Qualcomm | All | Every UE report where location information is sent needs user consent. |

All the CRs propose to amend the definition of the “MDT PLMN List” IE to apply to the new features. The differences are only in the procedural text. In R3-223213 it is proposed to modify the procedural text for Handover Request, whereas R3-223149 propose to modify: Initial Context Setup Modification Request, UE Context Modification Request, Handover Request, and Path Switch Request Acknowledge.

A note from the moderator: it appears that all the procedures in which user consent may be signaled should have appropriate clarifications, i.e. not just the Handover Request.

**Question 2: Do you agree that all the procedures (Initial Context Setup Modification Request, UE Context Modification Request, Handover Request, and Path Switch Request Acknowledge, other?) in which the user consent may be signaled should have appropriate clarifications of the new meaning of the IE?**

**If you believe that some procedures should be excluded, please explain why.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Answer | Notes |
| Apple | Initial Context Setup Modification Request, UE Context Modification Request, Handover Request, and Path Switch Request Acknowledge | Currently, the procedural text in all these reads “If the Management Based MDT PLMN List IE is contained in the XYZ message, the NG-RAN node shall, if supported, use it to allow subsequent selection of the UE for management based MDT defined in TS 32.422”. Obviously, if the IE is now used for other purposes as well, it should be clearly stated in the procedural text for all the relevant procedures. |
| Vodafone |  | Agree, we need to check and update the text for corresponding procedures. |
| Ericsson |  | If the changes are finally agreed, then the Initial Context Setup, UE Context Modification, Handover Preparation, and Path Switch procedures descriptions should be modified. However, before anything can be agreed we need to:1. Spell out that the location information to which the MDT user consent would apply consists of detailed UE geographical location information (i.e. LocationInfo-r16 in TS38.331)
2. Send an LS to SA3 and SA5 asking for guidance about the principle to apply when re-purposing the MDT User Consent.
 |
| BT |  | Agree to update the procedure descriptions for the listed procedures. |
| Qualcomm |  | Same view as Apple. |

The issue has been initially raised in the context of the Rel-16 SON/MDT WI. SA3 in their LS clarified that there is no need to support this in Rel-15 and prior releases.

**Question 3: Which release(s) (Rel-16, Rel-17, etc) the changes should be applied to?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Answer | Notes |
| Apple | Rel-16, Rel-17 | We should follow the SA3 requirement, which was to support this since Rel-16.  |
| Vodafone |  | If there are no signaling changes, R16 might be ok |
| Ericsson | Rel17 | This is not an essential correction because there are already means to configure the network to avoid user location reporting in RLF and CEF reports. Changes from Rel17 would be sufficient. |
| BT | Rel17 | We think R17 would be sufficient  |
| Qualcomm | Rel-16, Rel-17 | Same view as Apple |

In R3-223215/R3-223216 it is proposed to adopt the changes also in TS 36.413/36.423.

**Question 4: Should the changes be applied to E-UTRAN (in addition to NG-RAN) as well?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Answer | Notes |
| Apple | Both |  |
| Vodafone | Both |  |
| Ericsson | Prefer to affect only NG-RAN |  |
| BT | Both |  |
| Qualcomm | Both |  |

Since this has been a long-standing issue, triggered by another WG, it is reasonable to notify all the relevant groups about our decisions.

**Question 5: Which WGs (RAN2, SA2, SA3, SA5, CT4, others?) should be liaise about these decisions?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Answer | Notes |
| Apple | At least SA3, RAN2, SA5 and CT4 |  |
| Vodafone | It should go to SA3, all other groups on cc, as I am not sure what their actions should be. |  |
| Ericsson | SA3 and SA5 need to be in the “To” list. RAN2 may be in Cc | We need to point out that RAN3 is discussing how to apply user consent to some information in the RLF/CEF reports. RAN3 is not the group of competence when it comes to identifying which information should be considered “sensitive” and therefore subject to user consent. Nevertheless, most companies in RAN3 and RAN agree that user location information is “sensitive” and therefore it should be under user consent.RAN3 should therefore LS SA3 to * Confirm that RAN3 believes that detailed user location information (such as LocationInfo-r16 in TS38.331) is sensitive and check if such assumption is correct and
* To clarify once and for all whether there is any specific principle on the basis of which information that is subject to user consent can be identified.

It would be good to converge on answers to the question above to avoid speculating about what user consent should applies to in the future. |
| BT | At least SA3, RAN2, SA5 |  |
| Qualcomm | SA3, SA4, RAN2 |  |

# Conclusion, Recommendations [if needed]

If needed
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