3GPP TSG-RAN WG3 #116-e R3-223677

Online, 9. – 19.05 2022

Agenda Item: 9.1.1.1

Source: Nokia (moderator)

Title: Summary of Offline Discussion on SON corrections (CB #SONMDT1)

Document for: Approval

# Introduction

**B: # SONMDT1\_SON**

**- SHR: Stage2 updates, SHR forwarding, stage3 updates on semantic description?**

**- UE History Information for MR-DC: The SN always sends the collected SN UHI to the MN in the SN change required, the SN released request acknowledge, and the SN release required messages? For the SCG UE information from the SN, if the stay time for one PSCell exceeds the maximum value, the SCG UE information contains several entries with the same PSCell identity? Stage2 updates and stage3 updates if needed**

**- PSCell change failure: Options for SCG failure context storage, text clean up**

**- Load balance enhancement: Align the semantics descriptions of the SSB Area PRB usage between Xn and F1? Add description on load balance for EN-DC scenario?**

**- Energy saving: Update stage 2 description section 5.13 in TS 36.410 and section 5.10 in TS 38.410 for Intra-system Energy saving? NGAP clauses 9.3.3.56/57/58 - keep "inter-RAT" and replace NG-RAN CGI with NR CGI (+ corresponding ASN.1 updates)? RAN3 to discuss whether to replace NG-RAN node by gNB in TS 38.300 clause 15.4.2.2.?**

**- Inter-system load balance: Update ‘PRB usage’ in section 15.5.1.5 of TS 38.300 and in section 22.4.1.2.4 of TS 36.300 for inter-system load balancing to clearly define RAN node behavior? Update the IE description and the semantic description for NR Composite Available Capacity IE? Name issue of Sub-IEs and sub-sub-IEs name? Misalignment among specs?**

**- RACH optimization: Update the description of the Neighbour NR Cells for SON List IE and the maxServedCellforSON range bound in clause 9.3.1.215 to indicate that they may be used by the gNB-DU for PRACH conflict resolution purposes (as opposed to SON purposes)? Add description on RACH optimization for EN-DC scenario,There is no procedure on signalling of RACH information from for CU/DU split scenario?**

**- CCO: CCO Issue Detection over Xn with one value? Update the range of Coverage Modification Item IE and SSB Coverage Modification Item IE? Fix presence of CCO Assistance Information? Stage2 and stage3 updates if needed**

**- Mobility enhancement: The HANDOVER REPORT is enhanced to separate the per-preparation Mobility Information from the post-execution Mobility Information? Stage2 and stage3 updates if needed**

**- Provide CRs if agreeable, split the work among topics**

(Nok - moderator)
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# 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 (1st round)

## SCG MRO corrections

The solution agreed at RAN3 assumes that in case the S-RLF is reported from a pre-Rel.17 UE, the MN may inquiry the last serving SN if there was any PSCell change (or, more generally, if it considers that fault is due to its actions). The last serving SN responses only if it does not “consume” the report and the response does not contain any information – therefore, the MN must store the S-RLF context for some implementation-specific time. To address it, following solutions are considered:

1. In [34], it is proposed to keep the solution as is, with a clarification on the implementation-specific timer.
2. Also in [34], an options is discussed, but not preferred, that the last serving SN responses with the full information that it received from the MN; thus, the MN does not need to store the S-RLF context while waiting for the response.
3. In [1], it is proposed to make the last serving SN respond always, so that the MN does not need to store the information too long; this requires adding a flag in the message from the last serving SN.

**Question 1: Please, indicate which of the options listed above is preferred: no optimisation of resource usage at the MN (option 1), or optimisation according to one of the two other solutions (options 2 or 3)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Preferred option | If the answer is negative, please, explain why not. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Other corrections to concern:

1. [XnAP]Removing the “suitable cell ID” that was apparently left accidentally in the ASN.1 code [40,12,18];
2. [XnAP] Correction of the source and failed cell ID type [12];
3. [XnAP] An edit of the description of the SCG Failure Transfer procedure, alternatives proposed in [18] and in [33];
4. [TS37340] Correction of the description in 10.18.1, alternatives proposed in [31] and in [6].
5. [XnAP] Adding procedural text for Source PSCell CGI IE and Failed PSCell CGI IE in SCG Failure Information Report procedure proposed in [12] and in [37]

**Question 2: Please, indicate if you have concerns regarding any of the above corrections. In case of alternative proposals, please, indicate which one you prefer.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment, if there are any objections |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## SCG UHI corrections

In [7,14], it is proposed to clarify in stage-2 that once the UE stays in a cell longer than the max value of the dwell time, a new entry for this PSCell is opened in the SCG UHI.

**Question 3: Please indicate, if you disagree with this clarification.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment, if there are any objections |
|  |  |
|  |  |

The overall description of SCG UHI handling has been proposed to be clarified: proposals are provided for the stage-2 in [7,14,31] or for stage-3 [24].

**Question 4: Please indicate, if you disagree with this clarification, or where and how to introduce it, if you have a preference.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment, if there are any objections |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## SHR corrections

In [13], it is discussed that the target node shall send to the source node not only the report from the UE, but also C-RNTI of the source cell and the Mobility Information (if provided).

**Question 5: Please, indicate, if you have any concern with the above functional correction.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment, if there are any objections |
|  |  |
|  |  |

In addition, there are smaller corrections proposed:

1. In [24,33,36,37,40,41] it is proposed to add the semantics description for the SHR container in various specifications.
2. In [13,24] adding a proper stage-2 description of the SHR reporting is proposed.

**Question 6: Please, indicate, if you have any concern with the above corrections.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment, if there are any objections |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Inter-system MLB corrections

In [11], it is proposed to add a start-stop and failure indication mechanism to the inter-system load reporting.

**Question 7: Please, indicate, if you have any concern with the above functional corrections.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment, if there are any objections |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Other corrections:

1. In [10,24], the way the CAC is encoded in inter-system load reporting is corrected.
2. In [24, 42], the number of RRC connections is modified so that it offers the available number of RRC connection in reference to the maximum number.
3. Also in [24], the semantics of the PRB usage are proposed to be corrected.
4. In [11], some IE names are corrected.

**Question 8: Please, indicate, if you have any concern with the above corrections.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment, if there are any objections |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## MLB corrections

Only minor issues have been identified:

1. In [36], the usage of the per-MIMO PRB reporting is clarified in F1AP.
2. In [37], the semantics of the SUL load reporting is corrected in XnAP.
3. In [17], the semantics of PRB reporting are aligned with other parts of the description in F1AP.
4. In [31], a very short description of load reporting in case of EN-DC is added to stage-2.

**Question 9: Please, indicate, if you have any concern with the above corrections.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment, if there are any objections |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## CHO MRO corrections

Following corrections are proposed:

1. In [2], it is discussed that the Mobility Information may be provided twice (in the HO REQUEST and in the SN STATUS TRANSFER), but may be reported only once – and it is not clear which of the two reports is to be included in the HANDOVER REPORT. Therefore, a separate CHO-related Mobility information is proposed to be added in the latter message.
2. In [19], it is proposed to remove from the TS 38.300 the case where DAPS HO is successful after the link to the source node fails – apparently, RAN2 handles it as part of a successful HO report.
3. Also in [19], it is proposed to remove the MeasObject container and to clarify the semantics of the ReportConfig container.
4. A smaller edit to the description of the SN STATUS TRANSFER is proposed in [33].

**Question 10: Please indicate, if you disagree with any of the above corrections, or have suggestions for amendments.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment, if there are any objections |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Energy saving corrections

**Signalling function description:** In 3568 and 3573 it is proposed to document the newly added inter-system energy saving functionality in respectively S1 and NG Configuration Transfer function description (TS 36.410, TS 38.410).

**Question 11: Please provide your view on the CRs in 3568 and 3573.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Supported inter-system use cases:** 3173 section 2.2 provides a discussion relative to inconsistent description in NGAP clauses 9.3.3.56/57/58. Two possible solutions are discussed:

* Solution 1: Replace "inter-RAT" with "inter-system" in the mentioned IEs (and hence provide support for scenario involving E-UTRA capacity booster cell not under control of an eNB but under control of an ng-eNB only)
* Solution 2: Keep "inter-RAT", and replace the NG-RAN CGI with NR CGI in the mentioned IEs (hence focus on NR capacity booster cell), + corresponding ASN.1 updates. This solution could also be completed by replacing "NG-RAN node" by "gNB" in TS 38.300 clause 15.4.2.2.

**Question 12: Please provide your preference and comments with regards to the solutions above.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Preferred solution (1 or 2) | Comment |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## RACH optimization corrections

**TS 36.300:**

3175 is a CR to TS 36.300 proposing to add description on RACH optimization for EN-DC scenario.

**Question 13: Please provide your view on the CR in 3175.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**TS 38.401:**

3263 is a CR to TS 38.401 proposing to document signalling of RACH information over F1 for CU/DU split scenario.

**Question 14: Please provide your view on the CR in 3263.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**F1AP:**

The following proposal is made in 3173 section 2.3: Update the description of the Neighbour NR Cells for SON List IE and the maxServedCellforSON range bound in clause 9.3.1.215 to indicate that they may be used by the gNB-DU for PRACH conflict resolution purposes (as opposed to SON purposes)? (TP in annex B of 3173).

**Question 15: Please provide your view on the proposed F1AP clarification.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
|  |  |
|  |  |

The following procedural text update is made in 3063 (F1AP gNB-CU Conf Update, clause 8.2.5.2):

- If the *Neighbour NR Cells for SON List* IE is present in the *Cells for SON Item* IE, the gNB-DU may take the PRACH configuration of neighbour cells included in the *Neighbour NR Cells for SON List* IE into consideration when adjusting the PRACH configuration of the served cell These may include the appropriate frequency mode IEs within the *NR Mode Info Rel16* IE, the *SSB Positions in Burst* IE and the *NR Cell PRACH Configuration* IE..

**Question 16: Please provide your view on the proposed F1AP procedural text update.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## CCO corrections

**CCO Issue Detection over Xn**

3559 provides the argument that if a gNB detects a capacity issue, it can directly offload its UEs via handover procedure or change the cell selection/reselection parameter. So indication of a capacity problem to its neighbour is not needed. It is proposed to introduce a *CCO Issue Detection* indicator (optional, single code-point "coverage", extendible). A corresponding XnAP CR is submitted in 3560.

**Question 17: Please provide your view on introduction of the *CCO Issue Detection* indicator and other comments to the XnAP CR in 3360.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Stage 2 updates**

3424 is a CR to TS 38.300 proposing updates of the text for CCO, and 3425 proposes stage 2 updates to TS 38.401.

**Question 18: Please provide your view on the CRs in 3424 and 3425.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**F1AP procedural text update**

3063 proposes enhancements of procedural text for F1AP gNB-CU Conf Update, clause 8.2.5.2.

**Question 19: Please provide your view on the procedural text changes proposed in 3063.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Other stage 3 corrections**

Miscellaneous stage 3 updates for CCO are proposed in 3063, 3313 and 3574. (And please indicate if the moderator missed CCO stage 3 updates submitted in other tdocs).

**Question 20: Please provide comments if you disagree with any of these miscellaneous corrections.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Conclusion, Recommendations [if needed]

If needed
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