3GPP TSG-RAN WG3 #114-e [R3-215867](https://ericsson-my.sharepoint.com/personal/filip_barac_ericsson_com/Documents/WORK/3GPP.exe/Meetings/RAN3%23113-e.exe/Meetings/RAN3%23113/chairnotes/Inbox/R3-214141.zip)

Online, 01 – 11 Oct, 2021

Agenda Item: 15.2.1.2

Source: Huawei (moderator)

Title: Summary of Offline Discussion on CB: # QoE3\_Configuration\_Report

Document for: Approval

# Introduction

**CB: # QoE3\_Configuration\_Report**

**- Check progress from other groups**

**- Discuss the detail information included in QoE configuration and report**

**- How to support per slice QoE measurements?**

**- Prioritization mechanism?**

**- Further discussion on RAN overload handling**

**- TPs if agreeable**

**- Capture agreements and open issues**

(HW - moderator)

Summary of offline disc [R3-215867](file:///C%3A%5C%5CUsers%5C%5Cy00239572%5C%5CAppData%5C%5CRoaming%5C%5CMicrosoft%5C%5CWord%5C%5CInbox%5C%5CR3-215867.zip)

# For the Chairman’s Notes

**For chairlady to copy:**

Detailed discussions

# Discussion [if needed]

Similar as what we did for previous meeting, the discussion will try to discuss the further details on the following topics: activation/deactivation, other configuration details on remaining open issues for slice configuration and reporting, overload handling, RAN visible QoE, radio related measurement&information and other miscellaneous points, the discussion will take the papers from [1] to [26] into account.

Please note that, for other topics which might impact NG, e.g. mobility support, we also have dedicated CB, for which moderator would leave the discussion there.

## Activation and deactivation

Moderator’s note: Since RAN3 received the LS from SA5 about their understanding on the activation and deactivation of QoE measurement, and there is another dedicated CB on activation and deactivation (CB: # QoE2\_Activation\_Deactivation), moderator would suggest we just wait the outcome of that CB and capture the agreement into the TP. Here maybe the only thing is to discuss is if it is enough to include QoE Reference in the Deactivation message.

### QMC Deactivate Message just includes a list of QoE Reference?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Yes | QoE Reference is globally unique, so simply indicating QoE Reference should suffice |
| ZTE | Yes | A list of QoE Reference would be enough. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Other configuration details

### Is there a need to introduce configuration modification procedure for the QMC over NG

This is mentioned in the RAN3 reply LS [25] but not concluded since RAN3 would like to check with SA5, since now RAN3 received LS from SA5 [26], RAN3 should provide an answer, companies are invited to provide your view.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Not yet | SA5 replied in [26] that “*SA5 does not specify the modification procedure for QMC so far (in UTRAN and LTE), existing deactivation and activation procedures could be used to modify the QMC. If RAN2 agree to consider QMC modification scenario, then whether modification of QMC is needed for NR in SA5 or not may require further study.”*Also, RAN3 also sent LS in R3-214471 to SA5 enquiring about modification in slice scope change, for which it has not received a reply yet. So, we propose to wait for SA5 reply to R3-214471 before discussing whether this is a need to introduce QoE modification. |
| ZTE | No | From the reply[26] of SA5, We don’t see any requirement from SA5 for the modification procedure. In our understanding, which is also mentioned by SA5, the activation and deactivation procedures would suffice, for modifying the existing QMC configuration, i.e., to deactivate the old configuration and activate with a new configuration. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

###  The QoE reference and MCE IP address are configured per QoE measurement

Moderator’s Note: In order to be precise, here the message structure goes like the following:

1. There is an IE named *UE Application layer measurement configuration List*, including a list of QoE measurements
2. For each QoE measurement in the list, there are IEs including: *QoE reference, Measurement Collection Entity IP Address* and Service Type, where the *QoE reference* is a unique ID.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Yes | RAN3 should follow SA5 reply LS and should support the configuration of the Measurement Collection Entity IP Address per QoE Reference |
| ZTE | Yes | Share the view with QC. RAN3 should follow the reply LS from SA5. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Whether to introduce a measurement configuration application layer ID over NG

Moderato’s Note: RAN2 agreed to introduce this IE over Uu, here the question is about whether there is a need to copy this IE in the configuration message over NG, other proposals related to this IE are left to the CB on mobility.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| Qualcomm | No | measConfigAppLayerID is the shortened version of QoE Reference used while sending QoE configuration over Uu. The mapping between measConfigAppLayerID and QoE Reference is maintained locally at NG-RAN and might be propagated to a target node upon mobility and this can be discussed in the CB on mobility. But we don’t any other reason to include this measConfigAppLayerID over NG.  |
| ZTE | No | Measurement configuration application layer ID is introduced by RAN2 over Uu, for more efficient radio transmission. From RAN3 perspective, QoE Reference is enough to work as the identifier of QoE configurations, where NG-RAN node stores and maintains the mapping between measConfigAppLayerID and QoE Reference. There is no need to introduce another ID over NG, which would mess up the configuration. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Agree that MBS and XR service types are not pursued in Rel-17 NR QoE management.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Whether to introduce the criteria, e.g. time-based, threshold-based or, event-based, for RAN to trigger/stop the QoE measurement

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| Qualcomm | No | OAM can trigger/stop QMC based on its own implementation and there is no need to standardize any new time/threshold/event-based criteria and signal it to NG-RAN or UE.Also, application layer already configures some time-based criteria for QMC within the QoE configuration container, e.g., via defining Measure-Resolution and Measure-Range for MTSI services. And some event-based criteria are being discussed under RVQoE and should be discussed in that CB. |
| ZTE | No | If RAN really needs to check some conditions before sending the configuration, e.g., for m-based QoE, we think this can be done by implementation. Besides, considering that there has been triggering conditions in application layer, as mentioned by QC, we don’t see the need to add the criteria in RAN side.Anyway, this is not a high priority issue in our understanding, which can be left to R18 if needed. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Slice configuration

It was agreed in last meeting to introduce slice info as an explicit IE over NG as part of configuration, the remaining issues are about how slice info is configured over Uu, how to reflect the slice info in reporting, and how to be handled in RAN visible QoE report.

Moderator’s note: 1) for the answers to the questions above, the answer could also be left to RAN2; 2) it is suggested to leave the issue that whether slice info should be included in the reporting container to SA4 (according to the LS, SA4 is considering this issue).

### Whether the slice ID should be configured as an explicit IE to UE over Uu?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| Qualcomm | No | SA4 reply LS in **R3-214716** states that a *QoE client can identify the PDU session and the corresponding S-NSSAI and DNN, over which the QoE session is running via the +CGDCONT? AT command*.RAN3 concurs from SA4 reply that **UE Application is aware of the mapping between the slice and service type** Hence UE access stratum doesn't need to do any slice scope check and there is no need to include any slice related identifier (e.g., S-NSSAI) as an explicit IE to UE over Uu. |
| ZTE | No | Share the view with QC. From the reply LS of SA4, application layer is aware of the mapping between slice and service type. So there is no need to add the slice info outside the container over Uu. Slice info inside the container over Uu is enough. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Whether the slice ID is included in the transparent reporting container or not?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Upto SA4 | SA4 reply LS in **R3-214716** states that *SA4 is considering updates to its QoE report format to include the S-NSSAI and DNN, whenever available*. Hence RAN3 can assume that a slice related identifier will be included within the QoE report container and can send LS to SA4 to confirm. |
| ZTE | Yes | According to R3-214716, the slice id would be included inside the container. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Whether to include the slice ID as an explicit IE together with QoE reporting container?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| Qualcomm | No | It is not clear on the benefits to include a slice related identifier as an explicit IE in the QoE report sent to NG-RAN as **slice related optimizations are mostly under the control of OAM**. Hence, there is no need to include any slice related identifier (e.g., S-NSSAI) outside the QoE report container over Uu i.e., visible to NG-RAN |
| ZTE | No | For RRM optimization based on RVQoE, considering the case that some PDU sessions might be corresponding to the same slice ID, PDU session information is of more use for the RAN to know which PDU session the report is associated with. So, we suggest to replace slice ID with PDU session ID . |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Whether PDU session(s) information should be included outside of QoE reporting container

Moderator’s Note: This might be overlapped with the CB: # QoE5\_RANVisible, companies could also share view here, moderator’s could coordinate to compose the final conclusion.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Discuss in CB #5 | We propose to discuss this in CB: # QoE5\_RANVisible |
| ZTE | Yes | As commented above, PDU session information is of more use for the RAN to know which PDU session the RVQoE report is associated with.We are fine to discuss this in CB#5 : ) |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Handling in case of RAN overload situation

There are many papers to discussion the case of RAN overload situation, including whether there is a need from OAM to configure something, is there a need to configure to the UE, and guidance needed for the UE to resume the reporting, etc.

### Whether to introduce prioritization mechanism of different service types or slices from OAM side, for RAN to consider to release or pause in case of RAN overload situation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| Qualcomm | No | We think that introducing a prioritization mechanism is unnecessary as the RAN node could control which service reporting is to be suspended or resumed based on its own implementation or preference. For example, an NG-RAN might choose to pause QMC for DASH streaming first and keep QMC for VR service running whereas this might not be desired by another NG-RAN. |
| ZTE | No | The RAN itself can know which QoE measurement to suspend by itself. For example, the RAN can suspend those with large report size or frequent report period. Actually in our understanding, the QoE reports would not have much influence on the overload situation. A prioritization mechanism may not be of much necessity. Anyway, this can also be considered in R18 if needed. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Whether to introduce prioritization mechanism of different service types or slices for the UE to send pending QoE reports after RAN overload is solved

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| Qualcomm | No | For the sake of simplicity, there is no need to define and indicate a prioritization list among different service types or slices to assist NG-RAN or UE to send pending QoE reports post RAN overload. |
| ZTE | No | As commented above, we think the QoE reports would not have much influence on the overload situation. A priority for reporting the pending reports is not necessary. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Whether a temporary stop and restart of QoE reporting should be indicated to MCE/OAM if such indication was sent to UE

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Check with SA5 | SA5 specification TS 28.404 indicates that the RAN node can send an indication about the temporary stop and restart to the OAM when it sends the request towards the UE(s). This indication could be used by the NG-RAN to inform OAM about the QMC status e.g., whether QMC is paused. Send LS to SA5 to check. |
| ZTE | Probably no | We don’t see much necessity of sending the indicator to MCE/OAM. The requirement of SA5 is not clear, RAN3 do not need to consider it at this stage. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Whether a temporary stop and restart of QoE reporting is applicable to other scenarios in addition to RAN overload

Moderator’s Note: moderator’s understanding is that if the answer is Yes to above question 3.4.3, company could share further comments to this question.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| Qualcomm | No | Don’t think so (at least SA5 specs don’t have any other scenario). Also, not sure why this question has to be related with question in 3.4.3. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Other miscellaneous

Moderator’s note: Anything missing, companies are invited to list below.

### Issue 1

### Issue 2

# Conclusion, Recommendations [if needed]

If needed
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