3GPP TSG-RAN WG3 Meeting #119bis-e R3-231925

E-meeting, 17 – 26 April, 2023

**Agenda item: 9.2.4**

**Source: Nokia - moderator**

**Title: Summary of discussions on** **CB: # 56\_QoEALMC**

**Document for: Approval**

# 1 Introduction

This paper provides summary of discussions at RAN#119bis-e on:

**CB: # 56\_QoEALMC**

**- Check the details with companies**

(moderator - Nok)

This SoD collects comments on the use of the auxiliary "can" in stage 2 description for QoE, based on:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [R3-231634](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG3_Iu/TSGR3_119bis-e/Docs/R3-231634.zip) | Clarification of Application Layer Measurement Collection (Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell) | draftCR to TS 38.300 (cat. F, Rel-17) |

Please provide your comments by Monday the 24th at 12 UTC.

# 2 For the Chairman’s Notes

[To be completed]

# 3 Discussion

## 3.1 Use of ‘can’ vs. ‘may’ in TS 38.300 clause 21

The cover-page of R3-231634 provides background for the proposed changes in ‘reason for change’ as follows:

In the description of Application Layer Measurement Collection several occurrences of the auxiliary "can" don’t comply with TS 21.801 Specification drafting rules annex E: "Can" is used for statements of possibility and capability, whether material, physical or causal.

TS 21.801 also indicates for the auxiliary "may":

* “*a course of action permissible within the limits of the 3GPP TS or 3GPP TR*”.
* "May" signifies permission expressed by the standard, whereas "can" refers to the ability of a user of the standard or to a possibility open to him.

Due to the extensive use of the auxiliary "can", the user of the specification cannot determine whether the described course of action is permissible within the limits of the 3GPP TS for several aspects of Application Layer Measurement Collection.

Furthermore, the usage of "can" for Application Layer Measurement Collection is inconsistent with the rest of stage 2.

Relative to the latest statement, it can be observed a significantly higher ratio for the use of ‘can’ compared to ‘may’ in the stage 2 description of QoE (TS 38.300 clause 21) than in the other parts of TS 38.300.

In addition to the referred TS 21.801 annex E, further background can be found in TS 21.801 clause 6.6.1:

### 6.6.1 Verbal forms for the expression of provisions

A 3GPP TS does not in itself impose any obligation upon anyone to follow it. However, such an obligation may be imposed, for example, by legislation or by a contract. In order to be able to claim compliance with a 3GPP TS, the user needs to be able to identify the requirements that are obligatory. The user also needs to be able to distinguish these requirements from other provisions where there is a certain freedom of choice.

Clear rules for the use of verbal forms (including modal auxiliaries) are therefore essential. Annex E gives, in the first column of each table, the verbal form that shall be used to express each kind of provision. The equivalent expressions given in the second column shall be used only in exceptional cases when the form given in the first column cannot be used for linguistic reasons.

During the online discussion, some companies commented that some of the proposed changes of ‘can’ to ‘may’ were not needed.

**Q1: Please indicate whether any of the proposed changes in R3-231634 should be kept as ‘can’.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| **Ericsson** | Do you have any exact stats about how much QoE chapter overdid ‘can’? 😊 We have marked the ‘cans to stay’ in the TP. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 4 Conclusion, Recommendations [if needed]

If needed