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# Introduction

**CB: # URLLC\_RANenh**

**AMF provides Reporting control information to RAN for per UE:**

**- Introduce a new Clock Quality Reporting Control Information IE in the existing Time Synchronisation Assistance Information IE over NGAP? or AMF signals those control infor via new NGAP procedure?**

**- Introduce a new IE for Area scope of Time distribution?**

**- Encoding of Clock Quality Reporting Control Information?**

**RAN Reports TSS to AMF:**

**- Report TSS to AMF via NGAP based on gNB capability? or AMF acquires RAN TSS via OAM?**

**- How to report gNB capability of TSS reporting?**

**- Whether the TSS reporting configuration e.g, threshold is provided by AMF or pre-configured by OAM?**

**- Whether to use a new NGAP procedure or an existing procedure,e.g, NG SETUP REQUEST/RAN CONFIGURATION UPDATE to report timing synchronization status to AMF?**

**- Encoding of TSS Information?**

**Adapting traffic scheduling:**

**- Enhance existing NGAP TSC Assistance Information IE to include Burst Arrival Time Window, AMF Capability for adaptation, Periodicity Range, etc?**

**- Proactive RAN feedback to AMF via the response of PDU session resource setup/modify?**

**- Reactive RAN feedback to AMF via PDU session resource notify?**

**- What feedback information should be provided in the case of proactive or reactive feedback?**

**- Wait RAN2 progress of UL Scheduling adaptation**

**- Capture agreements and open issues**

(moderator - Nok)

Summary of offline disc [R3-231899](file:///C:\Users\q12059\AppData\Local\Temp\7zO023A30BE\Inbox\R3-231899.zip)

# For the Chairman’s Notes

**Propose the following:**

R3-231939 – agreed (TP for NGAP, objective 1)

R3-231940 – agreed (TP for NGAP, objective 3)

**Propose to capture the following:**

**RAN Timing Synchronisation Status Information can be the same or different between “groups of cells within a single gNB” (e.g., cells served by different gNB-DUs).**

Open Issues

**When the Clock Quality Detail Level is set to “metrics”, is there any additional information included in the Clock Quality Reporting Control Information (e.g. clock quality metrics subscribed by the UE)? To be continued…**

Baseline CR rapporteurs:

38.300 CATT

38.410 (if needed) Samsung

38.413 Huawei

38.423 Ericsson

38.470 (if needed) China Telecom

38.473 ZTE

37.480 (if needed) Nokia

37.483 (if needed) Qualcomm

2nd Round (2 topics)

**1) Continue discussing Question #3, i.e., decide on signalling framework for RAN TSS reporting over NGAP (taking into account latest SA2 decisions):**

Solution 1: AMF requests reporting of RAN TSS using a new Class 1 procedure, and gNB reports RAN TSS using a new Class 2 procedure.

Solution 2: gNB is configured via OAM to provide RAN TSS, and existing procedures are reused to report RAN TSS (NG Setup and RAN Configuration Update).

Solution 2A: gNB is configured via OAM to provide RAN TSS, and gNB reports RAN TSS using a new Class 2 procedure.

**2) Create and review TPs for XnAP (Ericsson) and F1AP (ZTE), based on relevant agreements from the NGAP TPs**

# Discussion (1st round)

Please provide your 1st round views (7 questions) by **9:00 UTC Thursday April 20th**, before the TRS\_URLLC online session.

## 5GS network timing synchronization status and reporting

### NGAP

There are many commonalities in the submitted papers. As a first step, it seems possible to merge many of the proposals into the following “baseline”:

|  |
| --- |
| For objective 1a (AMF providing clock quality reporting control information per-UE to the gNB):   1. Include a new *Clock Quality Reporting Control Information* IE in the existing *Time Synchronisation Assistance Information* IE. 2. The new *Clock Quality Reporting Control Information* IE includes Clock Quality Detail Level that can be set to “metrics” (clock quality metrics) or “indication” (acceptable/not acceptable indication).    1. If the Clock Quality Detail Level is set to “indication”, then *Clock Quality Acceptance Criteria* IE is included.   For objective 1d (gNB reporting node-level RAN timing synchronization status information towards the AMF, based on RAN timing synchronization status reporting configuration and gNB capability):   1. A new *RAN Timing Synchronisation Status Information* IE can be signalled towards the AMF    1. It contains Synchronisation State, Traceable to UTC, Traceable to GNSS, Clock Frequency Stability, Clock Accuracy, and Parent Time Source.    2. The encoding of Synchronisation State, Traceable to UTC, Traceable to GNSS, and Parent Time Source is ENUMERATED with codepoints aligned with TS 23.501.    3. The encoding of Clock Frequency Stability is FFS.    4. The encoding of Clock Accuracy is FFS, to be decided by RAN3 and should allow for different RAN implementations. 2. In which NGAP message(s) to include the *RAN Timing Synchronisation Status Information* IE requires further RAN3 discussion (**see Question #3**).   A draft TP capturing the above is in the CB folder, filename “**R3-23xxxx TP\_NGAP\_objective1**” |

Moderator’s comments:

* The above merges proposals from Nokia [3] (P1, P2, P3), Qualcomm [5] (P4, P5, P6), Ericsson [7] (P1, P2), CATT [8] (P1, P4, P5, P6), Huawei [11] (P4, P5), Samsung [13] (P1-1, P3), ZTE [15] (P1, P2, P6), and China Telecom [17] (P1).
* For item #2, there were several different proposals for how to encode the Clock Quality Detail Level. **The TP includes 2 options: Option A (CHOICE) and Option B (ENUMERATED).**
* For item #3, there is still some ongoing discussion in SA2 whether to e.g. add/remove certain enumerated values or to add/remove certain clock quality metrics. Therefore, a general Editor’s Note is included to indicate that the *RAN Timing Synchronisation Status Information* IE may be further refined based on SA2 and RAN3 progress.

**Question #1: Are the proposals listed in the box above agreeable? Please provide your comments below and/or directly in the draft TP. Please also indicate if you have a preference for the encoding of 9.3.1.x1 in the TP (Option A or Option B).**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comment* |
| Huawei | Agree with the proposals.  We prefer option 1 (Choice structure) on the Clock Quality Reporting Control Information, since it clearly provides two possible ways from the AMF.  Also related to the question2 below (whether the clock metrics are UE level or not), option 1 can easily indicate the UE level metrics if this has consensus. |
| Samsung | Agree with the proposals.  Regarding the encoding of the Clock Quality Detail Level, we’re fine with either option 1 or option 2. |
| Nokia | The listed proposals are agreeable. For the *Clock Quality Detail Level* IE, either of the encoding options are fine. |
| Ericsson | In principle fine with the proposal.  For Item 2 (AMF-> gNB) , Option A seems good, one choice is the metrics, another choice could be enumerated. |
| CATT | Agree with the proposals.  We also are fine with either option 1 or option 2 |
| Qualcomm | Agree with the Proposals.  We prefer option 1 (Choice structure) on the Clock Quality Reporting Control  For the Clock Quality Acceptance Criteria a range of values of Clock quality metrics (like an accuracy range or multiple lock states), will be provided from AMF to RAN to provide acceptable/not acceptable indication.  Hence both Choice IE “Metrics” and “Indication” should have a structure (like 9.3.1.x3 RAN Timing Synchronisation Status Information) under it to indicate clock quality metrics |
| China telecom | Agree with the proposals  we have no strong views on encoding options, either option 1 or option 2 is OK. |
| Deutsche Telekom | We are fine with the proposals.  Preference for Option A (choice). |
| ZTE | Agree with the Proposals.  We prefer option 1 (Choice structure) on the Clock Quality Reporting Control. |
| VZ | Fine with the proposals. Either option is okay. |
| Moderator’s summary:   * All companies agree with the proposals reflected in “R3-23xxxx TP\_NGAP\_objective1”, and there is consensus on Option 1 (choice structure) for encoding of the *Clock Quality Detail Level* IE. * Two companies indicate that the “metrics” choice should contain a SEQUENCE structure similar to the “indication” choice, although there is no agreement now on what it would contain (see Question #2). Therefore, perhaps an FFS placeholder can be added under the “metrics” choice. * “R3-23xxxx TP\_NGAP\_objective1” has been revised to “draft R3-231939” taking into account the above (revisions with username “moderator”).   Proposed conclusion:   * Agree to R3-231939 (TP for NGAP). | |

Clock Quality Detail Level is defined in TS 23.501 as follows: “*It indicates whether and which clock quality information to provide to the UE and can take one of the following values: clock quality metrics or acceptable/not acceptable indication.*”.

It seems that companies may be interpreting the “which” in this definition in two different ways:

* Interpretation 1: “Which” means which of the two possible values for Clock Quality Detail Level, i.e. clock quality metrics or acceptable/not acceptable indication.
* Interpretation 2: “Which” means which of the clock quality metrics to provide to the UE when the Clock Quality Detail Level is set to “clock quality metrics” (see Proposal 2 in [15]). This interpretation appears to assume that the UE is subscribed to a specific set of clock quality metrics, and only that set of metrics are delivered to the UE.

The implication to RAN3 signalling of these two interpretations can be seen as follows:

**For the case where Clock Quality Detail Level is set to “clock quality metrics”:**

**Option A: The Clock Quality Reporting Control Information additionally indicates which specific clock quality metrics are requested to be provided to the UE. When a RAN TSS report is triggered, it includes (based on gNB capability) only the requested clock quality metrics.**

**Option B: The Clock Quality Reporting Control Information does NOT indicate the clock quality metrics to provide to the UE, i.e., it is implicit that all clock quality metrics are requested to be provided to the UE. When a RAN TSS report is triggered, it includes (based on gNB capability) all clock quality metrics.**

Moderator’s comments:

* Option A appears to require support in the CN to convey the requested clock quality metrics over CN interfaces to the AMF. Therefore, it seems RAN3 should align with discussion/decisions in SA2.

**Question #2: Please state your view whether RAN3 signalling should support Option A or Option B.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comment* |
| Huawei | We think option A is the correct understanding, after internally checking with our SA2 colleague. Also, it is specified in TS 23. 501 that “following fields” (containing the clock metrics) are received form the UDM or TSCTSF which is per UE information.   * AMF also includes the clock quality reporting control information provided by the TSCTSF or received from UDM. Clock quality reporting control information may be present in the AF request or Access and Mobility Subscription data at the UDM, and contains the following fields: |
| Samsung | Our understanding is Interpretation 1. However, it seems be unclear in SA2.  To support Option 1, as moderator mentions, CN should indicate the clock quality metrics to provide to the UE, but in our observation, it is not mentioned in current SA2 spec.  So we think this issue should be FFS at this time and RAN3 should align it with discussion/decisions in SA2. |
| Nokia | We should align with SA2 (TS 23.502), which in our understanding means Interpretation 1 / Option B. The current TS 23.502 running CR (e.g. table 4.15.9.4-1) currently does not show any additional information being provided by the AMF when Clock Quality Detail level = “clock quality metrics”. If SA2 later agrees to introduce Option A then it can be easily added also by RAN3 (but has Option A even been proposed in SA2 – we could not find any discussion about it?). |
| Ericsson | Our understanding is Interpretation 1.  When it comes to the reporting in metrics form, we would like that gNB to determine how to send to UE in RRC, taking into account of the AMF “Metrics” information. i.e. gNB may only send a sub set of the parameters, based on gNB implementation. This is clear already in the LS we sent to SA2 at the last meeting and in WID. -> seems to be Option A above, if it is understood as we described. |
| CATT | We also the Interpretation 1 is right. |
| Qualcomm | Our understanding is Option A. The clock quality metrics subscribed by the UE will be sent to NG-RAN by AMF. |
| Deutsche Telekom | We tend to Option A, but as there seems to be no consensus on the interpretation in RAN3, we propose to contact SA2 on that topic. |
| ZTE | Our understanding is Option A. For the "metrics" based choice IE, AMF shall provide detail indication to NG-RAN for which metric(s) shall be provided to UE, in our paper [R3-231783], we suggest to use a string bitmap structure to indicate one or more metrics, seen below: |
| VZ | Agree to clarify with SA2 |
| Moderator’s summary:   * Four companies believe interpretation 1 is correct, while four companies believe interpretation 2 is correct. * There is no consensus. The TP in Question 1 includes an FFS under the “metrics” choice as a placeholder.   Proposed conclusion:   * Capture the following open Issue: **When the Clock Quality Detail Level is set to “metrics”, is there any additional information included in the Clock Quality Reporting Control Information (e.g. the specific clock quality metrics subscribed by the UE)?** | |

Regarding the signalling of *RAN Timing Synchronisation Status Information* IE from the gNB to the AMF, this is needed to address objective 1d:

|  |
| --- |
| 1. 5GS network timing synchronization status and reporting [RAN3, RAN2]:  d. gNB reporting node-level RAN timing synchronization status information towards the AMF, based on RAN timing synchronization status reporting configuration and gNB capability. [RAN3] |

All companies agree that the *RAN Timing Synchronisation Status Information* IE is transferred using non-UE associated signalling, but three different solutions have been proposed:

**Solution 1**: AMF requests reporting of RAN TSS information using a new Class 1 procedure.

* New AMF-initiated Class 1 procedure to enable the AMF to request RAN TSS information from the gNB.
* New gNB-initiated Class 2 procedure to enable the gNB to report RAN TSS information to the AMF.

**Solution 2**: gNB is configured via OAM to provide RAN TSS, and existing procedures are reused.

* Enhance the NG SETUP REQUEST and RAN CONFIGURATION UPDATE messages to optionally include RAN TSS information.

**Solution 3**: AMF requests reporting of RAN TSS information using new Class 2 procedure.

* New AMF-initiated Class 2 Timing Synchronization Status Reporting Control procedure to request RAN TSS information from the gNB.
* New gNB-initiated Class 2 Timing Synchronization Status Report procedure to report RAN TSS information
* New gNB-initiated Class 2 Timing Synchronization Status Reporting Failure Indication procedure to enable gNB to indicate RAN TSS information reporting failure.

Moderator’s comments:

* The focus of this question is on reporting of RAN TSS information over NGAP. **Similar functionality is also needed over F1AP which is addressed in Question #4.**
* Company views seem to be influenced by their interpretations of the following text in SA2:
  + TS 23.501 states that “*RAN nodes may be pre-configured with the thresholds for each timing synchronization status attribute*”.
  + TS 23.502 running CR (currently under review in SA2) shows a step in clause 4.15.9.X.Z where the AMF sends an N2 message to the NG-RAN and states “*The TSCTSF sends the configuration of the NG-RAN timing synchronization status reporting to the NG-RAN via AMF using Namf\_NonUeN2MsgTransfer. The AMF interacts with NG-RAN to configure the reporting using N2 signaling.*”.
* Whether and how the gNB reports its time synchronisation status reporting capabilities should be considered.

**Question #3: For RAN TSS reporting over NG, which solution(s) is acceptable and why?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comment* |
| Huawei | Solution 2.  We understand OAM based approach is sufficient. And we think this is already captured in the RAN3 LS to SA2/RAN2 at the last meeting (in R3-230811).   * RAN3 assumes that a gNB may report all, some, or none of the attributes *based on the gNB implementation*, i.e. gNB makes the final decision on whether it performs time status reporting. Encoding details for these attributes require further RAN3 discussion and will be determined during the work item phase. RAN3 assumes that SA2 will align to RAN3 when it comes to the attributes and encoding.   Also, the TS 23.502 running CR is not officially merged into the spec, and can be corrected possibly at this April meeting. |
| Samsung | Solution 1 or Solution 3,  We think the threshold could be configured to the gNB by OAM, but whether to provide the time status reporting to the AMF should be controlled by the AMF. If not, unnecessary information may be provided from the gNB to the AMF. |
| Nokia | We should align with SA2, which in our understanding means Solution 1 or 3 as shown in the current TS 23.502 running CR (clause 4.15.9.X.Z). We prefer Solution 1 (over solution 3), since there are benefits to having a Class 1 (rather than Class 2) request, e.g. gNB can indicate the RAN TSS it is able to provide (based on the gNB implementation) in the Response message.  The text highlighted by Huawei does not hint at any of the 3 solutions. It simply states that whatever the gNB is requested to provide (either by AMF or OAM), the gNB is not mandated to provide it – it provides only what it is capable of providing which is up to gNB implementation.  Solution 2 does not seem viable. The purpose of the NG Setup procedure is “to exchange application level data needed for the NG-RAN node and the AMF to correctly interoperate on the NG-C interface”. The RAN TSS has nothing to do with the operation of the NG-C interface. It seems solution 2 “hijacks” an existing procedure for an entirely different purpose. If SA2 decides that gNB is configured via OAM to provide RAN TSS (rather than requested by AMF), then it seems a new gNB-initiated Class 2 procedure is needed (e.g. just the Report procedure of Solution 1 or solution 3) – but in our understanding this is not aligned with TS 23.502 (nor proposed by any company in SA2?). |
| Ericsson | Solution 2.  gNB based on the OAM configuration to report. i.e. if there is no OAM configuration, there is no such requirement. |
| CATT | Agree with SS. But currently SA2 spec does not include how to subscriber the RAN TSS report from AMF |
| Qualcomm | Solution 1  We prefer Solution 1 as it is simple and straightforward and aligns with the existing RAN3 procedures. A class 1 message is required to request the reporting of TSS. If the reporting of TSS cannot be satisfied by NG-RAN, NG-RAN should be able to send a failure message. |
| China Telecom | Solution 1. Agree with QC and Nokia |
| Deutsche Telekom | Preference for Solution 1. |
| ZTE | Solution 2.  We prefer OAM based solution, that is OAM configures whether to report TSS and the thresholds at the gNB, then if configured, the gNB sends TSS to AMF via NG SETUP REQUEST and RAN CONFIGURATION UPDATE message. |
| VZ | Prefer Solution 1, leaning towards Nokia and QCOM. |
| Moderator’s summary:   * Seven companies support Solution 1 (of which one company also supports Solution 3), while three companies support Solution 2. * Regarding Solution 2, a concern was raised regarding reuse of “interface management” procedures to transfer non-NG related information towards the TSCTSF. An alternative to Solution 2 would be to introduce a new gNB-initiated Class 2 procedure.   Proposed conclusion:   * Eliminate Solution 3 (only one proponent, who is also OK with Solution 1). * Add a Solution 2A: “gNB is configured via OAM to provide RAN TSS, and gNB reports RAN TSS using a new Class 2 procedure”. * Continue to discuss solutions 1, 2, and 2A in the 2nd round, taking into account latest SA2 decisions. | |

### F1AP impacts

It is also necessary to signal the *RAN Timing Synchronisation Status Information* IE from the gNB-DU to the gNB-CU. This is motivated by two different objectives:

|  |
| --- |
| 1. 5GS network timing synchronization status and reporting [RAN3, RAN2]:  b. gNB delivering 5G Clock quality information to the UE in RRC\_CONNECTED state, based on the clock quality reporting control information and gNB capability. [RAN2, RAN3]  Note 1: Details of the 5G clock quality information will be decided by RAN3.  d. gNB reporting node-level RAN timing synchronization status information towards the AMF, based on RAN timing synchronization status reporting configuration and gNB capability. [RAN3] |

In other words, the F1AP signalling needs to support not only the reporting towards the AMF (objective 1d discussed in Question #3), but also the reporting towards the UE (objective 1b) that is based on the per-UE Clock Quality Reporting Control Information. In principle, the same three solutions can be considered:

**Solution 1**: gNB-CU triggers reporting of RAN TSS information using new Class 1 procedure

* New CU-initiated Class 1 procedure to enable the gNB-CU to request RAN TSS information from the gNB-DU.
* New DU-initiated Class 2 procedure to enable the gNB-DU to report RAN TSS information to the gNB-CU.

**Solution 2**: gNB-DU provides RAN TSS using existing procedures

* Enhance the F1 SETUP REQUEST and GNB-DU CONFIGURATION UPDATE messages to optionally include RAN TSS information.
* gNB-DU provides RAN TSS information based on OAM configuration.

**Solution 3**: gNB-CU triggers reporting of RAN TSS information using new Class 2 procedure

* New CU-initiated Class 2 Timing Synchronization Status Reporting Control procedure to request RAN TSS information from the gNB-DU.
* New DU-initiated Class 2 Timing Synchronization Status Report procedure to report RAN TSS information
* New DU-initiated Class 2 Timing Synchronization Status Reporting Failure Indication procedure to enable gNB-DU to indicate RAN TSS information reporting failure.

Moderator’s comments:

* Because the disaggregated RAN architecture is transparent to SA2, the reporting over F1AP has not been discussed in SA2 and the solution seems entirely RAN3 scope.

**Question #4: For RAN TSS reporting over F1, do you have the same preference as NG (i.e., align the solutions over NG and F1)? If not, which solution(s) is acceptable over F1 and why?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comment* |
| Huawei | Yes, to have same/unified signalling approach for F1AP and NGAP. |
| Samsung | Yes in principle, but at this time, we’re not sure whether the detail F1AP procedure should be the same as NGAP procedure. |
| Nokia | Yes (solution 1), although details of the F1AP procedure may be different than NGAP. |
| Ericsson | The existing “Reference Reporting Procedure” can be extended to include the “time status reporting as optional”. |
| CATT | Yes, it is better to align with NG. |
| Qualcomm | Yes to have a unified solution. Same preference as NG |
| China Telecom | Yes. Same signalling procedure for F1AP and NGAP |
| Deutsche Telekom | Alignment with NGAP preferred, i.e., Solution 1. |
| ZTE | Yes, it is better to align with NG. |
| VZ | Yes. The same approach for both NGAP and F1AP, i.e., soluion-1. |
| Moderator’s summary:   * Nine companies have the same solution preference for F1AP as NGAP * One company prefers to reuse the existing Reference Time Information Report procedure over F1AP.   Proposed conclusion:   * Wait for conclusion for NGAP, then confirm whether the same solution is acceptable for F1AP. | |

### UE in RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_INACTIVE

Although objective 1c is primarily RAN2 scope, there are several proposals related to this objective:

1. “*Cells within the single gNB sharing the common clock characteristics shall be grouped together by OAM to indicate common clock quality information to the UE via Event ID.*” (P7 in 1264)
2. “*Send a LS to RAN2 that from RAN3 perspective, RAN does not include another scope field of the report ID, but only broadcast the Event ID in SIB9.*” (P7 in 1412)
3. “*The value range for Event ID should be at least 65536.*” (P5 in 1195)

Regarding item #2, RAN3 already sent an LS to SA2/RAN2 at the last meeting (in R3-230811) which included the following information:

|  |
| --- |
| **For the question**: “*SA2 would like to kindly request RAN2 and RAN3 to provide feedback whether both scopes (group of cells per gNB, group of cells across gNBs) can be beneficial and supported.*”  **RAN3 answer**:  - Depending on gNB topology, clock quality information can be the same for some or all cells of a gNB. Also, topologies can exist where clock quality information is different between “groups of cells within a single gNB” (e.g. cells served by different gNB-DUs).  - RAN3 understands that it shall be possible for NG-RAN to ensure that UEs are kept in RRC\_IDLE or RRC\_INACTIVE state when moving between cells of a gNB with the same clock quality. From RAN3 point of view, this can be supported with just the “Event ID”.  - RAN3 does not see a need to support “group of cells across gNBs” in Release 18, considering its limited applicability and the likely specification effort (e.g. coordination of the reference report ID over the Xn interface). |

Therefore, an additional LS to RAN2 does not seem needed at this point. However, it would be useful to capture a formal RAN3 agreement that clock quality information can be cell-level information since this impacts RAN3 signalling. For example:

**RAN Timing Synchronisation Status Information can be the same or different between “groups of cells within a single gNB” (e.g., cells served by different gNB-DUs).**

**Question #5: Can the above be captured as a RAN3 agreement? Anything else related to objective 1c that would be useful to capture as a RAN3 agreement?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comment* |
| Huawei | Agree.  We want to point out that this agreement (even made at previous meeting) would have impact on objective 4 (RAN to report the TSS information to the AMF). Please see P3 below in our paper in R3-231412. Then we suggest this can be discussed in the Round 2.   * Introduce a choice structure for RAN timing synchronization status report (either node level or cell list level) from the gNB (gNB-CU) to the AMF over the NGAP interface, in the NG SETUP REQUEST message and RAN CONFIGURATION UPDATE message.   And we also suggest to send LS to RAN2 on the 5G clock quality information to the UE. But we are fine to send at next meeting till the clock quality information is clearer. |
| Samsung | Yes, we can agree. We don’t see other high-level agreement for objective 1c. |
| Nokia | Agree. |
| Ericsson | It is unclear what this “agreement” is leading to?  In our view, “Event ID” is over SIB, it shall not impact RAN interfaces.  We also would like to point out that to report from gNB to AMF is at “Node” level. |
| CATT | agree |
| Qualcomm | Agree.  Based on SA2 agreement, the TSS information needed at AMF is at node level. AMF does not need Cell level TSS information. Hence we think the reporting of TSS information to AMF from NG-RAN can be at node level and to the UE from NG-RAN can be at a cell level or group of cells. |
| China Telecom | agree |
| Deutsche Telekom | Agree |
| ZTE | Agree.  RAN3 needs to discuss how this agreement affects TSS reporting on NGAP, whether AMF needs to know cell level information or DU level information. |
| VZ | Agree |
| Moderator’s summary:   * Nine companies are fine to capture the agreement, and there are no objections   Proposed conclusion:   * Capture the agreement: “**RAN Timing Synchronisation Status Information can be the same or different between “groups of cells within a single gNB” (e.g., cells served by different gNB-DUs).**”. | |

### Not treated at this meeting

Since this is the first meeting of the work item and there is limited time allocation, some proposals are left for potential discussion at a future RAN3 meeting (contribution driven):

* Potential E1AP impacts, as mentioned in [5] (P1, P3) and [17] (P2).
* Potential impacts of mobility, as mentioned in [7] (P3).
* Whether reporting thresholds are provided by AMF or configured via OAM, as mentioned in [15] (P7).
* Area Scope of Time Distribution, as mentioned in [15] (P3).

## RAN feedback for low latency communication

There are many commonalities in the submitted papers, and it seems possible to merge proposals into the following “baseline”:

|  |
| --- |
| For objective 3 (Adapting downstream and upstream scheduling based on RAN feedback for low latency communication):   1. In the existing *TSC Assistance Information* IE, include a CHOICE between RAN feedback type “proactive” and “reactive”.    1. If CHOICE is “proactive”, then *Burst Arrival Time* *Window* IE and optionally *Periodicity Range* IE are included.    2. If CHOICE is “reactive”, then *Capability for BAT Adaptation* IE is included. 2. For proactive feedback, TSC Feedback Information (Burst Arrival Time Offset and optionally Adjusted Periodicity) can be provided for downlink and/or uplink in:    1. *PDU Session Resource Setup Response Transfer* IE of the PDU SESSION RESOURCE SETUP RESPONSE message, and    2. *PDU Session Resource Modify Response Transfer* IE of the PDU SESSION RESOURCE MODIFICATION RESPONSE message.    3. Inclusion in other NGAP messages require further RAN3 discussion (**see Question #7**). 3. For reactive feedback, TSC Feedback Information (Burst Arrival Time Offset) can be provided for downlink and/or uplink (support for uplink is FFS pending RAN2) in:    1. *PDU Session Resource Notify Transfer* IE of the PDU SESSION RESOURCE NOTIFY message when sending a “not fulfilled” notification.   A draft TP capturing the above is in the CB folder, filename “**R3-23xxxx TP\_NGAP\_objective3**” |

Moderator’s comments:

* The above merges proposals from Nokia [4] (P1-P4), Qualcomm [6] (P1-P4), Ericsson [7] (P5-P6), CATT [9] (P1, P3), Huawei [11] (P8), Samsung [13] (P1-1, P3), ZTE [15] (P1, P2, P6), and China Telecom [17] (P4).
* For item #3, support for reactive feedback for uplink is pending RAN2. This is captured in the TP by an Editor’s Note in subclause 9.3.1.z4.

**Question #6: Are the proposals listed in the box above agreeable? Please provide your comments below and/or in the draft TP.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comment* |
| Huawei | Agree |
| Samsung | Agree |
| Nokia | Agree |
| Ericsson | To 1): We do not see the need to specify “proactive” to “reactive” over the signalling.  *[Moderator]: This is intended to align with SA2. See TS 23.501 where “proactive” and “reactive” are clearly defined (5.27.2.5.1) and there are dedicated sub-clauses for proactive (5.27.2.5.2) and reactive (5.27.2.5.2).*  To 2): it is unclear how gNB could obtain the UL offsets  *[Moderator]: This is captured in an Editor’s Note, i.e., “Editor’s Note: Whether uplink is supported for reactive feedback is FFS pending RAN2.”.*  To 3): Using Notify procedure might be fine, but we need to discuss the benefit and also see RAN2 progress. |
| CATT | Agree |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 1 – disagree  We do not understand why a choice structure is needed for Proactive and Reactive. The IEs can be provided as optional IEs within the same TSCAI.  *[Moderator]: CHOICE is often used when there are mutually exclusive options, in this case the CN can request proactive (only), reactive (only), neither, but not both. CHOICE avoids abnormal scenarios.*  Moreover, based on SA2 agreement, either Periodicity or Periodicity Range will be provided. But in the current TSCAI structure Periodicity is a mandatory IE. Hence a note should be added to say that Periodicity will be ignored, if Periodicity Range is provided.  *[Moderator]: TS 23.501 states “If the RAN also receives a Periodicity Range along with the Periodicity in the TSCAI…”, so it seems already understood that both IEs are received. However, semantics could be added at a future RAN3 meeting based on contributions.*  Proposal 2 – Agree  Proposal 3 – Do we need the semantics in TSC feedback information for Reactive Feedback as “*Applicable when the Notification Cause IE is set to “not fulfilled”*?  The updated BAT offset and Periodicity is sent in the PDU Session Notify when the current values are not met. This is a similar behaviour across any config update messages. We think coupling the IE with cause value is not needed.  *[Moderator]: Semantics description can be removed. Proponent(s) can propose to readd at a future RAN3 meeting based on contributions.* |
| China Telecom | agree |
| Deutsche Telekom | Agree |
| ZTE | For P1, we share some view with E/// and Qualcomm. The RAN node can identify it is proactive or reactive feedback, based on the presence of those optional IEs.  Agree P2, P3. |
| VZ | Agree |
| Huawei2 | To reply QC’s comments on P1:  In TS 23.501, it has a note to say that the periodicity range can only be sent with the periodicity.  *NOTE 4: The Periodicity Range can only be provided together with Periodicity when Burst Arrival Time and Burst Arrival Time Window are present.* |
| Moderator’s summary:   * Seven companies agree with the proposals reflected in TP in “R3-23xxxx TP\_NGAP\_objective3” without any comments. * Three companies have questions/comments. Responses from moderator’s point of view are provided in the comments table. * As a result of one of the comments, the semantics description was removed from the *PDU Session Resource Notify Transfer* IE. * “R3-23xxxx TP\_NGAP\_objective3” has been revised to “draft R3-231940” taking into account the above (revisions with username “moderator”).   Proposed conclusion:   * Agree to R3-231940 (TP for NGAP). | |

For proactive feedback, it is proposed in [11] that the TSC Feedback Information (Burst Arrival Time Offset and optionally Adjusted Periodicity) can also be provided for downlink and/or uplink in:

1. *Associated QoS Flow List* IE in PDU SESSION RESOURCE SETUP RESPONSE message
2. *QoS Flow List with Data Forwarding* IE in HANDOVER REQUIRED Response message
3. *Path Switch Request Transfer* IE in PATH SWITCH REQUEST message

**Question #7: Are (a), (b), and (c) listed above agreeable?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comment* |
| Huawei | For b) and c), we think these changes are needed to support connected mobility, since during the handover procedure, the target gNB need to report its suggested TSC feedback information to the CN.  For a), we are fine not to have it, given that the IE can be directly included within the *PDU Session Resource Setup Response Transfer* IE of the PDU SESSION RESOURCE SETUP RESPONSE message |
| Samsung | We think b) and c) might be required and are open for discussion.  And the RAN feedback type information (added in the TSC Assistance Information IE) should be provided to the target gNB during Xn handover. (XnAP impact) |
| Nokia | The intention of (b) and (c) seems fine and could be added to the TP. Regarding (b), it should be HANDOVER REQUEST ACKNOWLEDGE (i.e. within the *Handover Request Acknowledge Transfer* IE)?  For XnAP impacts, we can potentially discuss this in the 2nd round (e.g. based on NGAP agreements from the 1st round). |
| Ericsson | We think it is only needed in PDU session setup and handover request.  Not in Path Switch, it will be too later to send feedback. |
| CATT | All are agreeable |
| Qualcomm | We are open to discuss further on a) and b).  We agree c) is needed. |
| ZTE | b) and c) are ok for us |
| VZ | Follow majority view. |
| Moderator’s summary:   * There appears to be consensus for (b), adding the TSC Feedback Information in the HANDOVER REQUEST ACKNOWLEDGE. * For PATH SWITCH REQUEST, seven companies support adding TSC Feedback Information while one company does not.   Proposed conclusion:   * Add TSC Feedback Information in the *QoS Flow List with Data Forwarding* IE of the *Handover Request Acknowledge Transfer* IE of the HANDOVER REQUEST ACKNOWLEDGE. * Add TSC Feedback Information in the *Path Switch Request Transfer* IE of the PATH SWITCH REQUEST with FFS. * R3-231940 has been updated with the above. | |

# Discussion (2nd round)

[TBD]

# Conclusion, Recommendations [if needed]

See section 2.
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