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**Attachments:**

# 1 Overall description

RAN3 thanks SA2 for the LS on FS\_XRM Ph2(R3-244045/S2-2407351) and kindly asks SA2 to consider the following RAN3 responses.

* ***Question1 [for SA4, RAN2 and RAN3]:***
  + *SA2 discusses indicating periodicity via in-band signaling (i.e. in GTP-U) for dynamic changes of the periodicity and kindly asks RAN2 and RAN3 to feedback on that approach.*
  + *To SA4: is it possible for application server to provide the periodicity to the PSA UPF in RTP header extension?*

**[RAN3 answer to Question1]:**

From RAN3 perspective, the control plane-based solution providing periodicity per QoS flow as part of the TSCAI is sufficient for semi-static periodicity case. Other potential cases need to be clarified by SA2, if any.

* ***Question3 [for RAN3]:*** *SA2 discusses to support available data rate exposure for GBR QoS Flow via user plane, and kindly asks RAN3 to provide feedback if any.*

**[RAN3 answer to Question3]:**

Before answer the question, RAN3 would like SA2 to clarify the definition of “available data rate”, and whether it is only below the GFBR, or between GFBR and MFBR, or even above MBFR; should it be periodic reporting, on demand reporting, or thresholds defined.

# 2 Actions

**To SA2**

**ACTION:** RAN3 kindly asks SA2 to take above answers into account and provide feedback if any.

# 3 Dates of next RAN3 meetings

RAN3#125bis 14th – 18th October 2024 Hefei, China

RAN3#126 18th - 22rd November 2024 Orlando, US