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# 1 Decision/action requested

***The group is asked to discuss and agree on the proposal.***

# 2 References

[1] 3GPP TR 28.867: “Closed control loop management” v0.3.0

# 3 Rationale

Use cases 5.16 and 5.17 in this TR are overlapping as they both are concerned with intent negotiation. This pCR aggregates the two into a single use case without losing any of the contained features.

# 4 Detailed proposal

|  |
| --- |
| **First Change** |

5.10. Use case 10: CCL-impact-assessment and resolution

5.10.1 Description

5.10.1.1 Overview

Besides having direct conflicts for parameter values, CCLs may also have direct and indirect effects for their goals and metrics, i.e. where actions on one CCL affect the goals and metrics of other CCLs. Impact assessment includes capabilities for evaluating the direct and indirect effects of CCL actions and determining measures for remediation. The scope affected by the actions of the CCL is the impact-scope and is different from the measurement scope, i.e., the scope where the CCLs measure and control scope, i.e., the scope where they act.

5.10.1.2 impact on known/bounded impact-scope

For some Closed Control Loops, the expected impact of the action may be known to the Closed Control Loop or coordination functionality governing the CCL. The scope affected by these actions is derived from the (candidate) actions executed by the CCL (or their descriptions). A CCL coordination functionality may wish to evaluate the known impact scope and needs to rely on information from MnS producers of other Closed Control Loops to:

1. determine if there are unwanted outcomes.
2. diagnose if the executed action(s) is/are responsible for those outcomes, especially for the case where multiple Closed Control Loops have concurrently taken actions, and
3. determine what needs to be done to undo the degradation and to avoid it in future.

5.10.1.3 impact on unknown impact-scope

For some CCLs, the impact-scope affected by the actions of a CCL A may not be known a priori. For example, for a CCL A that adjusts transmit power of a cell (e.g. to minimize interference), the exact neighbour cells and related CCLs acting on those cells that shall be affected by any transmit power decrease or increase cannot be explicitly enumerated. Any negative effects cannot be easily anticipated, and most may not be easily resolvable by simple if-then-else rules. Instead, the MnS producer of a CCL A should interact with MnS producers of the other CLLs or with a coordination functionality to identify actions that lead to negative outcomes and flag them accordingly. Thereby, after the CCL A takes an action on the network,:

1. MnS producer of CCL A or the coordination functionality notifies all other CCLs or MnS producers of all other CCLs that an action has been executed that may affect those CCLs. The action is expected to have impact is a specified time, called the impact-time, which depends on the use case. Fr example the impact of load balancing action can be evaluated in a few seconds while the impact of a handover decision can take several minutes or hours. The notification should include the length f this impact time which indicates the time at which an observed impacts should be reported.
2. after a preset monitoring period equivalent to the notified impact time, the MnS producers of the impacted CCLs report (directly or through the coordination functionality) the impact that CCL A had, i.e., the impact that CCL A’s action had to their performance metrics or goals. The impact may be reported an index say in the range [0,10] where 0 implies an unacceptable action and 10 implies a good action.
3. MnS producer of CCL A or the coordination function derives an appropriate remediation, e.g. by reconfiguring the candidate actions of the acting CCL (i.e. CCL A) or by undoing the action.

Note: that this section needs further clarification.

5.10.2 Potential Requirements

REQ-CCL-IMPACT-1: The CCL MnS producer should support a capability enabling an MnS consumer to receive information on the impacts of the CCL on a particular impact-scope and the actions that caused such impacts.

Note A1: The MnS consumer may for example be another CCL or a CCL impact coordination function

Note A2: the information enables the MnS consumer to determine if there are unwanted outcomes resulting from actions of the CCL and to propose what needs to be done to undo the degradation.

REQ-CCL- IMPACT-2: The CCL MnS producer should support a capability enabling an MnS consumer to notify the MnS producer of the actions of another CCL that may affect the MnS producer’s CCL.

Note B1: The MnS consumer could for example be a CCL impact coordination function

Note B2: The MnS producer represents the CCL which may be potentially impacted when a CCL A executes an action that may affect the goals or metrics of the MnS producer’s CCL

REQ-CCL- IMPACT-3: The CCL MnS producer should support a capability to report to an MnS consumer what the impact that the action had to the goals of the MnS producer's CCL.

Note 1: The MnS producer represents impacted CCL or MnF or a coordination function representing the impacted CCL or MnF.

Note 2: MnS consumer may for example be a coordination function or an acting CCL that took an action that has impacted the MnS producer’s metrics.

Note: the use of metrics for this requirement is FFS.

REQ-CCL- IMPACT-4: The CCL MnS producer should support a capability enabling an MnS consumer to propose to MnS producer the appropriate remediation against the noted impact, e.g. the reconfiguration of the candidate actions of the acting CCL.

Note 3: MnS consumer may be the CCL impact coordination function or another CCL or management function

Note 4: The MnS producer may be the acting CCL or the impacted CCL

5.10.3 Potential Solutions

5.10.3.1 solution for detection of actual indirect targets conflicts via impact on unknown or unbounded impact-scope

Note: This solution focusses on the requirement on

* Detection of actual indirect targets conflicts

Required capabilities and interactions.

For impacts on an unknown impact-scope, the CCL that took action or its coordination CCL cannot determine the impact and has to collect that form the affected entities. So,

* + The CCL that took action or its coordination CCL should be enabled to notify the affected MnS consumers (e.g., other CCLs) of 1) the fact that an action has been taken that may affect them, 2) that they need to provide feedback on how impact there has been and 3) when they need to provide that feedback.
	+ To enable the affecting CCL to determine how much impact it had on the other CCL, the affected CCLs can provide their evaluation of the impacts as an index that indicates the degree to which the action was good or bad to their objectives.

5.10.3.x.2 Information objects to realize required capabilities and interactions

* 🡪 introduce on the CCL an attribute representing, for each action taken, the time at which any affected MnS consumers (e.g., other CCLs) should provide their evaluation of the impact of the action. The time may be called cCLActionImpactTime. The cCLActionImpactTime should be notifiable, e.g. the coordination CCL or other CCLs which may be affected can subscribe to notifications on the cCLActionImpactTime.
	+ 🡪 introduce on the CCL an attribute representing for each action taken, an index that quantifies the evaluation of the impacts from each affected CCL. The index may be called an Action Quality Indicator (AQI), say in the range [0,10] where “0” indicates that the action was completely unacceptable and should never be reused in that context while “10” indicates that the action had very good outcomes for the reporting CCL. The AQI may be used by a coordination CCL to compute the aggregate impact form multiple affected CCLs and configure the acting CCL with a single AQI value. Based on the aggregate AQI the coordination CCL may also propose a response action, e.g., to reverse the action that was taken.

5.10.4 Evaluation of solutions

The potential solution described in clause 5.10.3 is a fully NRM-based approach that extends the existing NRM to realise capabilities for assessment and resolution of CCL impacts in known or unknown scopes. The solution enables the CCL to indicate when they have taken action that need to be evaluated as well as to inform affected entities when and how to provide their evaluations. It also allows the MnS consumers to trigger “undo” actions in scenarios where the actions are found to be undesirable.

Therefore, the solution described in clause 5.10.3 is a feasible solution for CCL-impact-assessment and resolution.

# 6. Conclusions and Recommendations

* It is recommended to move on to the normative specification development phase for the use case on CCL-impact-assessment, the normative specification development should follow the solution outlined in clause 5.10.3.