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# Introduction

This to handle offline discussion #204 clarifying what replies RAN2 should send to SA4 to the incoming LSes R2-2004381 and R2-2004382 [1] and [2].

# Discussion

## LS replies

It is the rapporteur’s understanding that R2-2004381 is also covered by R2-2004382, so RAN2 only needs to reply to R2-2004382 which contains the complete scope. The purpose of R2-2004381 is to highlight that the former “streaming indication” should be called “recording session indication” instead. The action to RAN2 is to implement the recording session indication, but that action is included in R2-2004382 also.

Q1: Does RAN2 agree that a reply only needs to be sent to R2-2004382?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No strong opinion. Maybe another option is that we could reply to R2-2004382 and additionally mention that the RAN2 reply has covered the R2-2004381. |
| Qualcomm | No strong view but a single reply (indicating reply to both) would be preferable. |
| ZTE | We share the same view with Huawei.  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | One LS back is acceptable, but it should address two original LSs (two list actions to RAN2) |
| Ericsson | Agree with Nokia. |

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

The second question is related to RAN2 actions and what to reply to SA5. Two input contributions have been provided in [R2-2004623](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004623.zip) and [R2-2005385](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2005385.zip). R2-2004623 proposes that RAN2 should implement what SA5 is asking for and R2-2005385 says that there is no time to implement it in rel-16. It can be noted that it is the third time that SA5 is asking RAN2 to implement the functionality and that a CR has been provided in [R2-2004624](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004624.zip).

Q2: Does RAN2 agree to implement the functionality requested by SA5? If the answer is No, please indicate the reason and an explanation that can be given to SA5 in a reply LS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In our contribution R2-2005385, we provided our analysis and suggestions. For the Q2 “Does RAN2 agree to implement the functionality requested by SA5?”, our suggestion is that there is no time to implement it in rel-16 from RAN2 point of view. If there is also extra work for RAN3, we think there is the same situation (i.e. no time to implement it in rel-16). It is noted that LTE Rel-15 QMC topic included both RAN2 and RAN3 parts.In addtion, regarding how to progress on it in the future, it is hard to judge for the moment because it may depend on technical aspects, 3GPP procedures and so on. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with Huawei’s comment: no time to implement it in rel-16 from RAN2 point of view.We think it would be possible to discuss related LTE enhancements in context of Rel17 NR WI on QoE. |
| ZTE | 1. Time limitation

We share the same view with the above two companies. Consider this is the last meeting of Rel-16, there is no time to discuss so many features in this meeting, especially some of these features need the cooperation with RAN3 like the propagation of the withInArea and temporary stop.1. Confusion checking

In addition, we have some confusion about the implementation of the recording session indication. It seems that the explanation in the LS is not as same as the description of QoE handover in LTE in the last TS28405. Further confirmation may be needed by SA5. In the SA5 LS, the explanation of the recording session indication is shown below:The streaming indication has changed name to be more general (cover other services than streaming) to Recording Session Indication. It is an attribute of one bit (0=not started, 1=started). Unfortunately there are still three occurrences of streaming indication in 28.405. They will be changed to Recording Session Indication in SA5#131e.From the explanation, we know that the recording session indication is a one bit indicator. 0 means the recording session is not started and 1 means the recording session has been started. Besides this, the indicator should not be in the measReportAppLayerContainer(R2-2004381). From our point of view, if the recording session is not started, there is no relevant QMC reporting and the NW can not receive any recording session indication which is set to 0. In other words, there is no use case for the recording session indication ==0.In addition, in current TS28405, the recording session indication is only used in the first measurement report from application to the MCE. This is not exactly fulfills the current definition of the recording session indication. SA5 may need to confirm the use case of the recording session indication. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | It should be noted that RAN2 had several discussions last year to analyze the SA5 spec and could not reach conclusion (as indicated to SA5 in R2-1916328), due to technical issues with the assumptions undertaken on the signaling. As we discussed last year (last time in RAN2#108) SA5 specification list requirements that are confusing and cannot be implemented in RAN2 as requested without further clarifications. E.g. Management/area based framework was supposed to not propagate during HO in RAN2 understanding. Nevertheless, areaScope handling in HO does not need to involve air interface signaling, as this is actually even redundant.As a simplest RAN support, one could understand that additional extensions are handled as and within transparent container, then Rel-16 extensions could be supported in RAN2, even without RRC changes. However, due to RAN3 support needed, further synchronization among group is needed to clarify intended behavior and outcome. |
| Ericsson | We think RAN2 should implement the functionality according to the request from SA5. It will not be possible to implement cross-group functionality if each working group does what they think is suitable. Not implementing this will cause mismatch between specifications in different groups. Companies should object in SA5 if they don’t like it. There is also a CR available which there is still time to review and update. The comment from Nokia regarding areaScope does not seem to be correct. The areaScope is never sent to the UE, neither inside, nor outside the configuration container and it is not proposed to be sent either. The reason for the withinArea is that the UE is not aware of the area and the network is not aware of when the session stops. Therefore, none of them can ensure that the measurements are stopped at the right time when the UE exists the area (the measurements are not allowed to be interrupted in the middle of the session).  |

# Summary and proposal

TBD
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