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# 1 Introduction

This document captures the outcome of this email discussion:

* [AT113-e][887][NR/R17 SON/MDT]  Indication of candidate target cell (Ericsson)

- Based on the agreements that “In the RLF report for CHO, the UE includes of the latest radio measurement results. FFS: to indicate whether or not it is candidate target cell.”.

- Figure out the necessity of introducing the indication.

 Intended outcome: Agreeable WF

 Deadline: Thursday 04/02/2021

Companies inputs to this email discussion are appreciated by the 4th February 2021 1200 UTC.

Related to this topic, the following agreements has been reached in RAN2#113-e:

Agreements:

1 Include in the RLF report the “Time elapsed since CHO execution until connection failure”. How to convey this information is FFS. (email discussion 886, Qualcomm)

2 Reuse the following legacy timers in the RLF report also for CHO: timeUntilReconnection, timeSinceFailure.

3 In the RLF report for CHO, the UE includes of the latest radio measurement results. FFS: to indicate whether or not it is candidate target cell. (email discussion 887, Ericsson)

The objective of this email discussion is to clarify the following FFS: “to indicate whether or not it is candidate target cell”.

# 2 Discussion

In the email discussion [Post112-e][853][NR R17 SON/MDT] R17 Information needed in UE report for CHO cases (Ericsson) available in R2-2101451 (section 2.2 and section 2.3), majority of companies believed that it is beneficial to include the latest radio measurement results of the candidate target cells in the RLF-report. Hence the following question is asked:

**Q1: Do you see beneficial to include the latest radio measurement results of the candidate target cells in the RLF-report? Please provide also your explanation.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| **Qualcomm** | Neighboring cell measurements should be sufficient. If target cell are best neighboring cell they will be reported by the UE in the neighboring cell measurements  | We believe that latest radio measurements of the candidate target cell can be part of the neighboring cell measurements. Furthermore, prioratizations of the candidate cell may not be needed, the network can use the configuration sent and obtained measurement to determine the radio measurements of the candidate target cells. Moreover, in our understanding, the network might be more be interested in knowing which cells are the best cells irrespective of whether they are part of candidate target cell list or not. |
| **oppo** | Yes  | The network needs to have candiate target cells in the RLF report to see if the candidate target cells were previously nominated well or not. |
| **vivo** | Yes | We need to discuss two issues separately.1. Firstly, whether the latest radio measurement results of the candidate target cells are needed. **(same as Q1)**
2. Secondly, how to make NW be aware of such information.

For issue a), we agree that the latest radio measurement results of the candidate target cells are needed, otherwise the NW cannot perform further optimization.For issue b), the controversial part is whether the neighboring cells would cover candidate target cells? If the answer is yes, then we don’t need to duplicate the measurement results, but if they are partially overlapped, it seems neccesarry to include the candidate target cells that are not covered by neighboring cells to the report. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

The next question is on whether RAN2 sees beneficial to include indication of whether a cell measurement result included in the RLF-report is associated to a CHO candidate target cell or not.

Rapporteur notes that the answer to this question is strictly related to whether the source cell can keep the UE context for long time, i.e. at least until the RLF-report is sent, so that the network can retrieve the cell identities of the configured target cells and match them with the radio measurement results included in the RLF-report.

**Q2: Do you see beneficial to include an indication indicating whether a neighbor cell, included as part of neighbor cell measurement result, is associated to a CHO candidate target cell or not? Please provide your explanation**

* **Option 1: Yes**
* **Option 2: No**
* **Option 3: Wait for RAN3 to confirm whether the source cell can keep the UE context, at least up to the point the RLF-report is received by the source cell**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred Option** | **Comments** |
| **Qualcomm** | Option 3  | Wait for RAN3. |
| **oppo** | Option 1 | In our opinion, it is very hard to say when the RLF-report could be received by the source gNB. Note that it is up to gNB implementation to decide whether to retrieve the RLF report from the UE or not, even though the rlf-InfoAvailable-r16 was set as true. Frankly, the UE might experience several times of handover before the RLF-report bing retrieved by the network via air interface at the end. Therefore, it is also hard to say how long time should the source gNB store the UE context, especially in cases there are lots of UE camping/accessing to the source gNB. |
| **vivo** | Option 3 | We understand oppo’s concern, but still would like to wait for RAN3 progress. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Conclusion

To be updated