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# Introduction

This document is for the discussions of the following topic [1]

|  |
| --- |
| * [AT114e][802][SON/MDT] Reporting on demand SI related information (CATT)   Collect companies’ views on the four options:  Option 1: Extend Logged MDT  Option 2: Extend RA report  Option 3:  Extend RA report to include successful on-demand SI related information  Extend CEF report to include failed on-demand SI related information  Option 4:  Extend RA report to include successful on-demand SI related information  Introduce a new report to include failed on-demand SI related information  Collect the option based on majority views.  Intended outcome: Email discussion report  Deadline:11:00 UTC, May 25 |

In section 2 views from companies are collected, based on which some potential conclusions. Section 3 gives a summary of the discussions and conclusions.

Participants to this discussion are invited to kidly leave their contact in the table below, for potentially further checkings.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Company | Email |
| Rajeev Kumar | Qualcomm | rkum@qti.qualcomm.com |
| Jun Chen | Huawei, HiSilicon | jun.chen@huawei.com |
| Wen-Ming | vivo | ming.wen@vivo.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Discussion

Background

Before collection of views on these options, more background information is provided.

Firstly four options for on demand SI information report have been listed in [2]. Based on that summary, some discussions were had some brief discussions during the online session. Then if one takes a closer look at the related contributions, companies have provided some reasoning as to why an option is preferred. These are listed below for information.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **#** | **Supporting contribution and main reasoning therein** |
| Option 1:  Extend Logged MDT ‎ | R2-2104932  The RACH report is only used for successful random access in legacy mechanism.  It is inappropriate that successful and failed information are recorded in two reports. |
| R2-2105840  Current RA procedure only considers successful case, including the failed case will change the existing behavior.  Logged MDT allows logging of both successful and failure on-demand SI information without impact on RA report, while also provide NW the flexibility to decide whether configure with interested area for UE to report on-demand SI related information. |
| R2-2106036  The RA report logs the information related to the successful RACH procedures. Furthermore, the objective of logging the on-demand SI-related information is to optimize the broadcasting and non-broadcasting SIs sets rather than optimizing the RACH procedure. |
| Option 2:  Extend RA report | R2-2105884  RA-report and on-demand SI report will have common information and RA procedure and on-demand SI procedure are tightly related.  Extension of RA-report seems to be the simplest way and based on the on-demand SI report information, the network may be able to further optimize RACH resources.  If new report is defined for on-demand SI, duplicated information will be reported. |
| R2-2106057  Since the SI request operation is performed through the random access, it is reasonable to extend RA Report to log the SI-request related information.  The RA Report is required to be improved so that it can consider even failed RA, but the failed RA should be related to on-demand SI request only. |
| Option 3:   * Extend RA report to include successful on-demand SI related information * Extend CEF report to include failed on-demand SI related information | R2-2106004  Most components of the information to be logged for on-demand SI report is available in RACH report for RACH purposes.  Logging on-demand SI information in RACH report allows the network to gather more insights without additional overhead.  CEF report also contains the information related to RA information and thus for failed SI requests one can easily reuse the CEF report. |
| Option 4:   * Extend RA report to include successful on-demand SI related information * Introduce a new report to include failed on-demand SI related information | R2-2106152  For Msg1/Msg3 SI success, we think they are part of successful RACH procedure and Msg1 based and Msg3 based indicators are sufficient for indicating on demand SI types.  For Msg1/Msg3 SI failure, it is different from CEF report because the intention is to just get specific Sis. In addition, some fields in CEF report are mandatory and they are not suitable for on demand SI case.  For RLF report, it is used for UEs in RRC\_Connected mode, so it is not suitable for on demand SI failure indication. |

Discussions

In the following, views are invited regarding which of these options companies would prefer. Also, comments are welcome, especially new reasonings or arguments that have not already covered by those that have been listed above.

**Q1 Which Option do you prefer, and further reasonings or comments if any?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company Name** | **Which Option** | **Further comments if any (especially new reasonings or arguments that have not already covered)** |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 | In our understanding, the purpose of logging of on-demand SI is not the RACH optimizations. Therefore, RA-report should consider more critical aspects, where RACH optimization play significant rols, for example initial access and others.  Furthermore, as previously mentioned, RA-report is expected to log only success scenario, therefore logged MDT remains the better choice in our understanding. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 4 | Among option 2/3/4, the same part is:   * **Extend RA report to include successful on-demand and SI related information**   And the difference is where to put the failure info.   * For using RA report extension, we do not want to change the original purpose, and we think there are extra complexities if including failure info in RA report * For using CEF report, we think CEF and on-demand SI failure are different cases, and there are some mandatory Ies in CEF reports which may not be suitable for on-demand SI failure   Regarding option 1, basically we are open and we have the following technical comments:   * Firstly, we think on-demand SI optimization is more like SON features because RAN can directly use such info for optimizing on-demand SI transmission * Secondly, coupling with logged MDT means mandatory Ies are shared between legacy logged MDT and on-demand SI, e.g. trace related info. In addition, in Rel-16 logged MDT configuration, report type is mandatory (periodical or event trigger), and it may be an issue whether to introduce a standalone report Type or to allow “combinations” (e.g. co-existence of legacy logged MDT and on-demand SI) * Thirdly, if RA report is to be added into logged measurement results, it means that the storage will be shared between different measurement functionalities, so we wonder whether the effect of legacy logged MDT will be compromised or not |
| vivo | Option 3 or 4 | **Option 1:** We don’t want to couple logged MDT and on demand SI optimization, those are two features. The latter one is more like RA/CEF report, don’t see the need to incorporate this feature into logged MDT.  In case logged MDT configuration is not configured by NW, UE cannot record SI request info, or when it is configured, area restriction shall be taken into account which limits the flexibility of such a report.  **Option 2:** not comply with the design of RA report.  **Option 3:** we see the benefits of reusing the CEF to include the on-demand SI report. As for the mandatory fields in CEF that not suitable for on-demand SI report mentioned by HW, one possible solution to make it workable for this case may be to set those IEs to value ‘0’.  **Option 4:** We are also open for this solution, but option 3 should override this option if option 3 is feasible. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary of Q1**

TBD (will try to summarize further reasonings or arguments if any, and count company preference for the options)

# Conclusion

TBD
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