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# Introduction

The following document includes a list of open issues for the following email discussion:

* [Post130][605][SONMDT] Running NR RRC CR (Ericsson)

Scope:

* + - Update the running CR

      Intended outcome:

* + - Updated running CR to be submitted to next meeting

     Deadline:

* + - Long

Companies are invited to provide feedback on open issue list by: **8th August 2025**

# Remaining open issues for specification TS 38.331

### Issues on MRO for CHO with candidate SCG

**Open issue RRC-1:**Avoiding duplicated measurement reports in SHR and SPR

**Issue description:**

In RAN2#129bis meeting, discussion on near failure scenarios for CHO with candidate SCG resulted in below FFS.

* FFS whether it is needed to avoid duplication of information in case of two reports being generated CHO with candidate SCGs, any redundancy (e.g., measurements) are recorded in the reports for PCell (i.e., in SHR, SPR).

And following the discussion in the meeting RAN2#130 we agreed the following.

* We will not add any optimizations to avoid duplicated info in correlated reports
* FFS if we add some correlation indication.

The scenario addressed in this FFS involves sub-optimal execution of both CHO and CPC procedures, where one or more SHR/SPR triggering conditions are met for each conditional cell change procedure, including PCell and PSCell. In such scenario the UE may have to log SHR and SPR at the same time. As noted in the previous meetings agreement, we need to investigate whether correlation of these reports are needed and if so, what solution should be adopted for this issue.

In general, two options to address this FFS were diiscussed.

* **Option A**. Adding a correlation indication beside the availability indication in RRC\_Complete messages (i.e., when UE indicates the availability of SHR and SPR it indicates the reports are correlated so network can fetch them and package them together for further analysis)
* **Option B**. Adding a correlation indication in the SHR and SPR reports

To accelerate the discussion and possibly down-select among the mentioned options, rapporteur would like to ask the companies to provide their views to the following question.

**Regarding Open issue RRC-1, companies are invited to provide comments on whether correlation indication is needed in case of both reports being generated in a CHO with candidate SCG execution scenario and if the correlation indication is deemed needed, please indicate which option (e.g. option A/B above) you do prefer.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **If yes, Option A/B** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Rapporteur summary:**

**Conclusion . …**

**Open issue RRC-2:**CHO with candidate SCG with execution of complementary CHO configuration

In RAN2#130 a scenario has been discussed that network provides a complementary CHO only configuration beside CHO with candidate SCGs and UE execute the CHO only configuration. Proponents would like to enhance RLF report and/or SHR with additional information indicating this scenario as a sub-optimal configuration to the network. In the end of the discussion the following has been agreed.

* We will look in to if/what to specify for the scenario with CHO with candidate SCG alongside a CHO-only configuration. Proponents should have clear and well-defined proposals next meeting preferably with text proposals.

Based on the above agreement, the rapporteur believes that companies can directly provide their input at the next meeting. However, since the chair’s note states “if” a solution is to be specified for this scenario, the rapporteur would like to address this point by inviting companies to share any concerns or immediate objections they may have regarding the issue being addressed in the next meeting.

**Regarding Open issue RRC-2, Companies are invited to share their view on addressing this issue in the next RAN2 meeting.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/disagree (to address this issue in the next meeting)** | **comment** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

If the majority of companies agree to address this issue at the next meeting, they are invited to submit contributions expressing their position on whether they wish to resolve the issue. If so, and as requested by the chair, companies should include a well-defined solution along with a corresponding text proposal. In the meantime, the following proposal will be considered provisional until the above question is addressed.

**Provisional Conclusion. Concerning the Open issue RRC-2 (CHO with candidate SCG with complementary CHO configuration), companies are invited to submit contribution with a text proposal addressing the issue and their proposed solution**

### Open issues on SON/MDT for slicing

**Open issue RRC-3:**NSAG logging on slice-based reselection failure

In the meeting RAN2#130 RAN2 discussed logging the NSAG information when the UE fails to find a suitable cell upon cell selection/reselection based on slice priorities. In the end RAN2 agreed to log the highest ranked NSAG information potentially in a report.

* We aim to specify that: If the UE supports slice-based cell reselection does not find any suitable cell in the frequencies corresponding to the highest ranked NSAG, the UE logs the highest ranked NSAG. FFS the need of cell or frequency info.

However, RAN2 didn’t converge on how to associate such information in a SON/MDT report. The main problem with this scenario is that the UE could not find a suitable cell in the frequency at which it searches for suitable cells based on the provided NSAG priorities. Therefore, in order to efficiently investigate this issue rapporteur’s proposal is that companies provide their input on how to fix this issue by providing a text proposal to the next meeting.

**Conclusion. Concerning the Open issue RRC-3 (logging highest ranked NSAG info associated with cell, freq etc.) companies are invited to submit their contribution addressing this issue with a text proposal reflecting their solution.**

### Open issues on MDT for NTN

**Open issue RRC-4:**Logging MDT in NTN when location is unavailable

Another open issue under discussion is related to logging MDT measurements in NTN network when the location information is not available or not obtained by the UE. Concerning this issue, we have the following agreement and FFS.

* If configured with additional geographical information, FFS if the UE logs the MDT data or not when it cannot obtain its location.

In general, there can be two solutions as described in the following.

* **Option A.** UE stops logging if it cannot obtain the location
* **Option B.** UE continues logging if it is registered within a PLMN included in the PLMN identity list or is registered within a registered PLMN at the time of receiving MDT configuration (this option follows legacy behavior).

In order to have more efficient progress, rapporteur would like to invite companies to provide their view in the following table.

**Regarding Open issue RRC-4 (logging MDT in NTN when location is not available), companies are invited to provide their preference and comment on option A or option B.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option A/B** | **comment** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Rapporteur summary:**

**Conclusion .…**

**Open issue RRC-5:**Granularity of distanceFromReference1, distanceFromReference2

In the meeting RAN2#130, and in response to the received LS from RAN3 [R3-252382] on optimizing location based CHO in moving scenario, it has been agreed that UE logs the distance from the UE to moving reference location of serving cell, and measured distance from UE to moving reference location of candidate cell in RLF report when RLF/HOF happens due to a location based CHO configuration.

* We go with option 2 (distance), unless we find critical issues with granularity.

However, the granularity of such distance information being logged by the UE is not discussed. In a solution during the running CR review phase, it is proposed to use the same granularity as eventD2. The proposed solution is described in the following

1. Since the distance thresholds for event D2 are in steps of 50m, distanceFromReference1and distanceFromReference2 also can be in steps of 50m.
2. it is proposed that if value is greater than 65535, 65535 can be reported.
3. The measured distance by the UE needn’t be a multiple of 50 always. For e.g., the value may be 10040m. In such cases, UE may round down to the nearest lower value of step and include in the report (If the UE rounds to the next higher value of step, it can give wrong information to the network. For e.g. if the network has configured a threshold of 10050 meters and the UE sends 201, network would interpret as the threshold is met while actually the distance is closer to the threshold, but not met.)

Based on the above analysis the following field description for the ***distanceFromReference1, distanceFromReference2*** is proposed.

***distanceFromReference1, distanceFromReference2***

This field indicates the measured distances between UE and the moving reference locations of the serving cell and of the associated neighbour cell if the conditional handover is based on *condEventD2*. Reported in steps of 50m, rounded down to the nearest step value. The maximum value 65535 means 65535 or larger.

While rapporteur thinks the proposed solution is a good way forward, prior to capturing this solution, rapporteur would like to understand if other companies agree to the proposed solution. Therefore, rapporteur would like to ask the companies whether they disagree to this solution and if so why.

**Regarding Open issue RRC-5 (granularity of distances in NTN), companies are invited to provide their view if they disagree to the proposed solution on the granularity of the distanceFromReference1, distanceFromReference2.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you disagree?** | **Comment if disagree** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Rapporteur summary:**

**Conclusion .…**

# Other identified open issues

Companies are invited to describe any other identified open issues not currently included within this document

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Other identified open issues? (please describe)** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Conclusions

[Conclusions for the next meeting]