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# Introduction

This document aims and gathering and summarizing the companies views for the following offline discussion:

* [AT121bis-e][221][QoE] LS replies to QoE (Huawei)

 Scope: Determine whether to send replies to LSs received from other groups (e.g. RAN3, SA4 and SA5) and attempt to provide RAN2 reply. If LS reply is agreeable, discussion should also determine what to reply and what the target groups are (for To and Cc).

 Intended outcome: LS out to SA4/SA5 in [R2-2304396](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_121bis-e/Docs/R2-2304396.zip) (if agreed).

 Deadline: Deadline 4

# Discussion

## LS to SA4 and SA5 on MBS broadcast

RAN2 sent an LS to SA4 and SA5 containing several questions related to QOE measurements in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state in [1]. SA4 and SA5 provided their replies in [2] and [3] respectively. Following these replies it was suggested to send further replies to SA4 in [4] and to SA5 in [5]. These draft reply LS(es) assumed that RAN2 would discuss and make agreements for some specific issues. Hence, before the need to send the LS(es) is discussed, the rapporteur suggests to check whether RAN2 can reach agreements on the related issues.

First issue is related to the SA4 reply LS provided in [2] where the following is indicated:

|  |
| --- |
| ***Question 1:*** *Can information about the applicable area scope of a QoE configuration be provided to the application layer in the UE as part of the QoE configuration container? If it can, how is this information defined at the application layer, e.g. does it indicate applicable tracking area, applicable cells etc.?***SA4 reply**: For QMC of 3GP-DASH Streaming, VR Streaming and MTSI, the area scope of a QoE configuration can be provided within the QoE configuration container and it can be indicated via the *Location Filter*, which can be a list of cell IDs and/or a geographic area expressed with one or more instances of *polygonList* and/or *circularAreaList*. Tracking area is not supported.***Question 2:*** *Can the application layer know the UE location on the proper level (e.g. tracking area, cell) and use this information to decide whether to start QoE measurements when triggering conditions are met?***SA4 reply**: The application layer can know the UE’s location on a proper level (e.g. cell ID, geographical coordinates). The QoE configuration is then evaluated by the client at the start of a QoE measurement and reporting session (“QoE session”) associated with a streaming session. This includes evaluation of any filtering criteria such as by geographical area or cell ID. When the trigger conditions are met, e.g. the UE is in the target area at the start of the session, the QoE session is started for QoE measurement and reporting.As a reminder, SA4 specifications assume that *LocationFilter* can only be included in the QoE configuration container, if geographical filtering is not handled on the network side, i.e. to avoid otherwise redundant location filtering at network and UE sides, as mentioned in TS 26.247 and TS 26.114. As for AS layer filtering, SA4 assumes that the area scope filtering will not be based on GNSS locations and polygon/circular shapes, but rather on radio network parameters like Cell Id or Tracking Area.  |

Based on this, the draft reply LS in [4] suggests to provide the following two pieces of information:

1. Clarify that for MBS broadcast services, the network will not perform area scope checking as this is infeasible to do so on behalf of the UEs which are in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state.
2. Indicate that considering SA4 feedback, RAN2 decided that area scope verification for QoE measurements applicable to RRC IDLE/INACTIVE states should be performed by the application layer.

Hence the rapporteur suggests to check whether this is agreeable to RAN2.

**Question 1: Do companies agree that the network will not perform area scope checking for MBS broadcast services as this is infeasible to do so on behalf of UEs which are in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Justification / comments** |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| China Unicom | No | The first piece of information and question seems to clarify that the network will not perform area scope checking for MBS broadcast services in all RRC states, which is not correct. In RRC\_CONNECTED state, the gNB can perform area scope checking for MBS broadcast services if Rel-17 NW-trigged area scope is reused. So we suggest to modify the question as below:**Question 1: Do companies agree that area scope checking for MBS broadcast services can be performed in RRC\_CONNECTED state, but not in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state as it’s infeasible to do so when the UE is in non-connected state?** |

**Question 2: Do companies agree that the area scope verification for QoE measurements for MBS broadcast services can be performed by the application layer?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Justification / comments** |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | No | We have listed a number of issues with the application layer handling the area in our contribution. The biggest problem is that the application doesn’t know the RRC state of the UE and therefore doesn’t know when it should handle the area (the UE should only handle it when the UE is in Idle or Inactive). We need to have a solution for this first in such case. Another issue is that each and every application needs to implement the area handling if this is agreed, instead of just doing it in one place in the UE AS. That increases the implementation cost and will probably lead to different handling by different applications, i.e. unpredicted behavior. Normally 3GPP chooses the simplest solution. Is there any reason to choose a more complex solution and put the area handling in the application layer? Is there any benefit with it that could motivate the extra complexity? |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| China Unicom | No | We support the NW can send the NW-trigged area scope information to the UE AS for checking. Using app layer area scope information is not a good idea, because it will make conflicts when both LocationFilter information and Network-trigged area scope exist in the network. You can image that when the UE transfer from idle to connected state or vice versa, two types of area scope exists, the network cannot decide which information will be used as baseline for QoE measurements. RAN2 is not clear how to resolve this conflict issue, obviously, coordinating both LocationFilter and NW-trigged area scope will cost lots of time and will cause more specs impacts than only NW-triggered is used for all RRC states. |

**Question 3: Do companies agree to send the LS to SA4 capturing RAN2 conclusion on the above?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Justification / comments** |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | No |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| China Unicom | No | SA4 don’t ask for RAN2 to reply a new LS, why we need to send the new LS to tell the conclusion? If RAN2 has made some agreements online that affect SA4, then a LS is needed. |

With respect to the reply to SA5, in [5] it was proposed to indicate that:

1. As a default behavior, when the UE’s buffer for storing QoE reports is full and a new report arrives, the UE should discard older report(s) to make room for the new one.
2. Providing selection policies from consumers to the UE would be beneficial, e.g. for the UE to decide which reports to discard in case the UE’s QoE buffer becomes full.

Again, before deciding whether/what to reply, the rapporteur would like to understand whether RAN2 can reach agreements on the above issues.

**Question 4: Do companies agree that, as a default behavior, when the UE’s buffer for storing QoE reports is full and a new report arrives, the UE should discard older report(s) to make room for the new one.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Justification / comments** |
| Lenovo | No | This default behaviour may make sense in case of limited storage space for QoE reports at the UE. However, we haven’t reached consensus yet wrt i) the minimum AS layer buffer size requirement; ii) in which layer to store QoE reports (AS layer and/or application layer). Depending on the minimum AS layer buffer size requirement RAN2 may decide on a hybrid solution (i.e. storing QoE reports in both AS and application layer) or on the solution in which application layer stores the QoE reports. In both cases a default behaviour wouldn’t then be needed. |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes | We agree to introduce time-based discard. But since RAN2 has not decided whether APP layer can store QoE report, the behavior can be different with regarding to the preferred layer to store QoE reports. |
| China Unicom | Yes |  |

**Question 5: Do companies agree that providing selection policies from consumers to the UE would be beneficial, e.g. for the UE to decide which reports to discard in case the UE’s QoE buffer becomes full.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Justification / comments** |
| Lenovo | No | See comments to Q4 above. |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes | Generally, we think FIFO discard policy is sufficient for MBS broad cast, but for other service type, different policy can be applied. |
| China Unicom | Yes | RAN3 has agreed to use assistant information, e.g. priority, we think it can also be used as selection policy for MBS broadcast service. |

**Question 6: Do companies agree to send the LS to SA5 capturing RAN2 conclusion on the above?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Justification / comments** |
| Lenovo | No | This can be deferred to next meeting when the issue on AS layer buffer size will be discussed and consensus can be reached wrt i) the minimum AS layer buffer size requirement; ii) in which layer to store the QoE reports (AS layer and/or application layer). |
| Ericsson | No |  |
| CMCC | No |  |
| China Unicom | No |  |

## LS to SA5 on SA5 eQoE CRs for NR

SA5 sent an LS to RAN2 in [6] informing about the agreement to include NR QoE in their specifications. SA5 also attached one of the CRs that has been agreed in SA5 (see [7]) and asked “to take the above information in account and if needed update relevant specification”. Based on this LS, the draft reply was proposed in [8] were several issues were identified. The rapporteur proposes to discuss two things:

1. Whether the issues indicated in [8] are valid.
2. Whether RAN2 needs to update any RAN2 specification based on SA5 LS.

**Question 7: Do companies agree with the following issues raised in [8] with respect to the CR in S5-232115 (see [7]):**

1. **Figure 4.6.1.1-1:**
	1. **Step 5: the parameters “transmissionOfSessionStartStop” and “ran-VisibleParameters” are missing in the RRCReconfiguration message.**
	2. **Step 6: the codepoint “report\_initial\_playout\_delay“ is not correct since it is not defined in the AT command +CAPPLEVMCNR and should be replaced by “report\_playout\_delay\_for\_media\_startup“.**
	3. **Step 6: the codepoint “ran\_visible\_release\_only“ can be removed since Figure 4.6.1.1-1 describes the activation of (encapsulated) QoE and RAN-visible QoE measurements.**
	4. **Step 11: the codepoint „report\_initial\_playout\_delay“ can be removed since it is not defined in the AT command +CAPPLEVMRNR.**
	5. **Step 12: the parameter „ran-VisibleMeasurements“ is missing in the MeasurementReportAppLayer message.**
2. **Figure 4.6.1.2-1: The same issues as in Figure 4.6.1.1-1 should be corrected.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Which issues do you agree with?** | **Justification / comments** |
| Lenovo | All | Proponent. We assumed that the Figures in the SA5 CR describe the activation of both (encapsulated) QoE and RAN-visible QoE measurements. |
| Ericsson | 1.1, 1.2, 1.4 and 1.5 | 1.3 The release of only RVQoE is done in the activation command in 27.007, so we think the current text is correct. |
| CMCC | All |  |

**Question 8: Do companies think any RAN2 specifications need to be updated based on SA5 LS?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Justification / comments** |
| Lenovo | No |  |
| Ericsson | No |  |
| CMCC | No |  |
| China Unicom | No |  |

The rapporteur thinks it is natural that in case any issues need to be corrected in SA5 specifications, RAN2 will have to inform SA5 about this, hence there is no separate question on the need for such LS.

# Summary

TBD
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