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# Introduction

**CB: # QoE2\_NRDC**

**- How to support QoE and RVQoE measurement and reporting for UEs in NR-DC scenarios:**

**Discuss the configuration of QoE on different cases, e.g. whether MN to configure the s-based QoE to UE, whether SN can trigger the activation of m-based QoE, which node to send the configuration to UE, which node to perform the UE selection?**

**QoE reporting can be done to both MN and SN? How to decide which leg is used for reporting? Which node to decide, e.g., MN? Overload handling? Which SRB to use for QoE reporting? Any XnAP coordination? Leave it to RAN2 decision? LS to RAN2?**

**Both MN and SN are allowed to configure RVQoE for UE? Whether MN and SN can configure the RVQoE to UE separately?**

**Whether RVQoE reporting over SN is allowed? UE only report to MN/SN or report to MN and SN independently? Whether it is necessary to share the RVQoE metrics between MN and SN via XnAP?**

**- Discuss on the MDT alignment of QoE and/or RVQoE. Both of the MDT results in MN and SN can be used for alignment with QoE/RVQoE? How to achieve the time alignment QoE and MDT in SN? QoE start indication should be sent to SN?**

**- Study on different mobility scenarios? e.g., MN initiated SN change, SN initiated SN change, etc. Signaling enhancement to support the QMC continuity in mobility scenario?**

**- Capture agreements and open issues**

(CU - moderator)

Summary of offline disc [R3-225011](file:///C:\Users\unicom\Desktop\Inbox\R3-225011.zip)

# For the Chairman’s Notes

# Discussion

The discussion will try to discuss the further details on the following topics for QoE in NR-DC: QoE configuration and reporting in NR-DC, RAN visible QoE configuration and reporting in NR-DC, QoE and MDT alignment in NR-DC, QoE measurement continuity in NR-DC and other miscellaneous points, the discussion will take the papers from [1] to [12] into account.

## Encapsulated QoE configuration in NR-DC

For QoE configuration in NR-DC, companies point out that s-based QoE and m-based QoE configuration should be discussed separately, the question is derived based on proposals in papers [2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11].

**Proposal 1: For s-based QoE configuration, MN is responsible to transmit the QoE configuration to UE.**

**Q1: Do you agree the above proposal 1?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| **Ericsson** | **Some issues need to be solved** | What if the OAM wants to configure the UE for QMC, but:   * Only SN is in area scope? OR * The MN does not support QoE?   Moreover, the OAM does not know whether the UE is in NR-DC. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

For m-based QoE, three scenarios need to be considered:

1. M-based QoE configuration is only received by MN;
2. M-based QoE configuration is only received by SN;
3. M-based QoE configuration is received by both MN and SN;

**Q2: Which node should be responsible for the UE selection for the above cases, and which node should send the QoE configuration to UE for the above cases, why?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | MN/SN | Comment |
| **Ericsson** | **See comment** | In our understanding, the **OAM does not know if a node is an MN or SN**. In any case the MN and SN should **inform each other** about their intention to configure the UE with an m-based QoE. In case both the MN and SN support QMC, the MN should have the final say in who configures the UE and where the SRB4 is set up. If SN is the only one supporting QMC, then it does not need a “permission” from the MN. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Encapsulated QoE reporting in NR-DC

If the node that configures the QoE measurement is overloaded, the network can configure the UE to report via another node. In [1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12], companies think it is necessary to send the QoE report either by MN or SN.

**Proposal 2: QoE reporting can be transmitted over both MN and SN, reporting leg indication to UE is included in the QoE measurement configuration. The configuration can be changed during the application session.**

**Q3: Do you agree the above proposal 2?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| **Ericsson** | **Partly agree** | The part that is **not agreeable** is the following: *“reporting leg indication to UE is included in the QoE measurement configuration*”. The reason is that the OAM, that assembles the QoE measurement configuration, does not know whether the UE is in DC. The decision about the reporting leg is taken by the RAN node configuring the UE for the measurements, which is for sure aware of NR-DC. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Q4: If QoE reporting can be transmitted over SN, which node is responsible to decide reporting from SN? e.g. overload handling case.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Answer | Comment |
| **Ericsson** | **See comment** | Does the question assume an overload scenario where reports are sent to MN, but the MN goes into overload and the reporting is moved to SN? Under that assumption, the MN instructs the UE to report to SN. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Q5: If QoE report is received by the SN, which option do you support?**

**Option 1: SN can forward the QoE reports to MCE directly, the QoE Reference, MCE IP address, alignment information should be transferred to SN via XnAP.**

**Option 2: SN forwards the QoE reports to MN and MN then sends them to MCE.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option1/2 | Comment |
| **Ericsson** | **Option 1** | No reason for the QoE reports to go to MN if the SN receives them from the UE. The MN cannot read these reports anyway. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Q6: If QoE report is received by the SN, which SRB can be used for QoE report in SN?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Which SRB? | Comment |
| **Ericsson** | **SRB4** | We should support setting up the SRB4 as an MCG, SCG or split bearer. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## RAN Visible QoE Configuration in NR-DC

The question is derived based on proposals in papers [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11].

**Q7: Do you agree that both MN and SN can generate the RAN visible QoE configuration separately? Do you agree that QoE reference ID and available RAN visible QoE metrics should be send from MN to SN?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| **Ericsson** | **Agree to first part only** | Let’s leave the second question aside for now, **the info exchanged during the MN-SN coordination needs more discussion**. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Q8: If SN can generate an independent RVQoE configuration, which node should send the configuration to UE?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | MN/SN | Comment |
| **Ericsson** | **SN** | However, the **MN should be informed about this**. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## RAN Visible QoE Reporting in NR-DC

The question is derived based on proposals in papers [2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11].

**There are two options for RVQoE reporting in NR-DC:**

**Option 1: UE reports RVQoE to only MN. MN can forward the RVQoE reports to SN if needed.**

**Option 2: UE can report RVQoE to MN and SN independently.**

**Q9: Which option do you prefer? Whether it is necessary to share the RVQoE report between MN and SN via XnAP?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option1/2 | Comment |
| **Ericsson** | **Option 2,** but see comment | Option 2 should be supported, but it should also be possible that the node receiving the RVQoE report forwards the report to the other node via XnAP. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## QoE and MDT alignment in NR-DC

The question is derived based on proposals in papers [1, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12].

**Q10: Whether both of the MDT results in MN and SN can be used for alignment with QoE/RVQoE? Whether the correlation information should be included in the QoE configuration and QoE report?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| **Ericsson** | **Later** | Given that **we have exceeded the max of 8 questions** (i.e., max number of questions in a CB per TU), and that **we do not even have the baseline** for QMC in NR-DC, we prefer leave this discussion for later. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Q11: How to achieve the time alignment of QoE and MDT in SN? Whether QoE start indication should be sent to SN?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| **Ericsson** | **Later** | Given that **we have exceeded the max of 8 questions** (i.e., max number of questions in a CB per TU), and that **we do not even have the baseline** for QMC in NR-DC, we prefer leave this discussion for later. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## QoE measurement continuity in NR-DC

The question is derived based on proposals in papers [2, 6, 8, 10, 12].

**Q12: Do you agree the following cases need to be considered for the QoE measurement continuity in NR-DC?**

1. **Secondary Node Change (MN/SN initiated)**
2. **Inter-Master Node handover with/without Secondary Node change**
3. **Master Node to gNB Change**
4. **gNB to Master Node change**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| **Ericsson** | **Later** | Given that **we have exceeded the max of 8 questions** (i.e., max number of questions in a CB per TU), and that **we do not even have the baseline** for QMC in NR-DC, we prefer leave this discussion for later. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Q13: Do you agree the following procedures should be used to transmit QoE related information for QoE measurement continuity for NR-DC? Any other procedures?**

1. **S-NG-RAN node Addition Preparation**
2. **Handover Preparation**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| **Ericsson** | **Later** | Given that **we have exceeded the max of 8 questions** (i.e., max number of questions in a CB per TU), and that **we do not even have the baseline** for QMC in NR-DC, we prefer leave this discussion for later. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Miscellaneous

Anything missing, companies are invited to list below.

# Conclusion, Recommendations

If needed
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