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# 1 Introduction

This document is to discuss solution direction for Signalling based Logged MDT configuration override protection, in inter-RAT scenario, according to the following scope:

* **[AT119bis-e][801][R17 SON/MDT] MDT override solution direction (Nokia)**

Compare the solution based on P2/3/4 in R2-2210797 with the solution in R2-2210301 and figure out the WF

Intended outcome: Report

Deadline: 04:44 UTC, Friday October 14th

Comments Deadline: 6:00PM UTC, Thursday October 13th

It collects summarizes proposals made in [1], [2], proposing to conclude how to achieve the override protection for LTE Logged MDT, when the UE moves to NR from LTE.

# 2 Contact List

Respondents to the email discussion are kindly asked to fill in the following table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Name** | **Email Address** |
| Nokia (Rapporteur) | Malgorzata Tomala | malgorzata.tomala@nokia.com |
| Qualcomm | Rajeev Kumar | rkum@qti.qualcomm.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Discussion

## 3.1 Agreed solution baseline

In RAN2#119-e, the following agreement was made [10]:

Agreement:

1 RAN2 confirms the valid scenario for Rel-18 inter-RAT scenario for signalling based logged MDT override protection is set by the WID:

a. Logged MDT is configured in E-UTRAN, the UE reselects to NR.

2 Rel-17 mechanism for signalling based logged MDT override protection in intra-NR scenario is the baseline for Rel-18 inter-RAT scenario.

Number of the contributions to RAN2#119bis-e assumed that existing Rel-17 solution, that enables Logged MDT type configuration from the NW, and an assistance information in uplink messages from the UE consists of a baseline for the Rel-18 enhancements. With that understanding majority of proposals were made for the Logged MDT configuration to support Signalling based MDT protection in inter-RAT scenario [1]. However, it was noted in [2], that the solution baseline if followed in inter-RAT scenario may impose significant UE complexity without much benefit, if adopted explicitly.

**Observation 1:** The agreement on adopting Rel-17 baseline to Rel-18 may result in different approaches for MDT configuration, reporting and data availability indication.

## 3.2 Alternate solutions for inter-RAT scenario

As noted in [2], there can be different methods defined to achieve LTE logged MDT configuration and report override protection:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| L.p. | Methods | Pro | Cons |
| 1 | Override protection by simultaneous LTE and NR configuration –   * A UE capable of maintaining separate memory (UE variable for storing logged MDT report and configuration) for LTE and NR memory can signal this capability in UE capability signaling * The network should ensure signaling-based logged MDT override protection in respective RAT * NR cell does not need to know if UE is configured with LTE logged MDT and if UE has LTE logged MDT unretrieved report available. | Simple solution –   * Requires onetime indication – no indication required upon cell change * No need for cross-RAT signaling * No need for cross RAT report | No drawback - |
| 2 | Override protection by cross-RAT signaling but no cross-RAT reporting of LTE logged MDT report -   * A UE capable of sending cross-RAT signaling can indicate that it is capable of indicating if UE is previously configured with logged MDT configuration or it has unretrieved logged MDT data * No signaling for cross-RAT availability indication * Upon reception of such indication, gNB does not configure UE with NR-logged MDT configuration | Induce additional requirements at the UE, however,   * Can save UE memory if shared memory at the UE for NR and LTE * Less complexity than cross-RAT logged MDT reporting | Requires cross-RAT signaling –   * Involves UE complexity with cross-RAT signaling during **every cell change** * LTE spec change to indicate and store the information at the UE if an LTE configuration is signaling based configuration |
| 3 | Override protection by cross-RAT reporting of LTE logged MDT report -   * A UE capable of sending cross-RAT report can indicate that it is capable of indicating if UE is previously configured with logged MDT configuration or it has unretrieved logged MDT data * UE can additionally indicate if it supports cross-RAT reporting of LTE logged MDT from NR to LTE * gNB does not configure NR logged MDT until it extracts unretrieved logged MDT and until logged MDT configuration remains valid | No benefit | Significantly high complexity |

As further noted in Qualcomm’s contribution in [2], to achieve the override protection for LTE logged MDT report and configuration when UE moves to NR from LTE (when previously configured with logged MDT in LTE), the simplest method is the following:

1. Override protection by simultaneous LTE and NR configuration: A UE capable of storing LTE and NR logged MDT configurations and reports simultaneously can signal this capability. Nothing is required from the network.

**Question 1**: Do you agree that nothing is required from the Network if override protection in inter-RAT scenario is realized by simultaneous LTE and NR configuration?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answers to Question 1 (If answered Yes – no need to answer to Q2)** | | |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Technical Arguments** |
| Qualcomm | Yes | I believe the WID considers the LTE signaling-based logged MDT protection only when UE moves to NR, i.e. when UE moves within EUTRA cells LTE signaling-based logged MDT protection is not supported. If UE supports simultaneous LTE and NR configuration by allocating separate memory and as LTE signaling-based logged MDT protection is not supported within LTE mobility, override protection in the inter-RAT scenario is realized by simultaneous LTE and NR configuration without any signaling enhancements.  We may need a UE capability signaling enhancement as mentioned in our paper such that the network can know that UE is capable of handling override protection of LTE logged MDT configuration without network involvement. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 1**: TBD.

**Proposal 1**: TBD.

### 3.2.1 Configuration

Yet, alternatively, the solutions aiming to follow the Rel-17 baseline, proposed in [4], [5], [7], [8], led to the following collective proposals in [1]:

**Proposal 2:** E-UTRA logged MDT configuration is enhanced to include ‘Logged MDT type’ indication, to indicate the UE is configured with Signaling-based Logged MDT in E-UTRA.

**Proposal 3:** The UE stores the received ‘Logged MDT type’ indication (as an extension to the other legacy E-UTRA Logged MDT configuration parameters).

The rapporteur understanding is that the Proposal 2 and Proposal 3 (extension of the LTE configuration for Logged MDT) are overlapping with all the Methods: Method 1, Method 2 and Method 3, according to the requirements (copied from the above Table):

* The network should ensure signaling-based logged MDT override protection in respective RAT (Method 1)
* if UE is previously configured with logged MDT configuration (Method 2, Method 3)

However, [2] notes that only for above Methods 2 and 3, LTE specifications change is required to signal UE if a received logged MDT configuration is a signaling-based logged MDT configuration.

**Question 2**: Do you agree that in order to ensure signaling-based logged MDT override protection in E-UTRAN (intra-EUTRAN), the extension of the **LTE LoggedMeasurementConfiguration,** with Logged MDT type indication, would be required in any case?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answers to Question 2** | | |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Technical Arguments** |
| Qualcomm | Please see comment | I believe proposals 2 and 3 are required for method 1 only if LTE signaling-based logged MDT override protection is supported within E-UTRAN (intra-EUTRAN), i.e., if LTE signaling-based logged MDT is configured at the UE then it cannot be overridden by LTE management based logged MDT. However, in my understanding, this is not within the scope of WI.  Therefore, based on current WID, i.e. override protection of LTE signaling-based logged MDT in NR, we do not need enhancements in proposals 2 and 3 if UE supports simultaneous LTE and NR configuration.  For methods 2 and 3, proposal 2 and proposal 3 will be required. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 2**: TBD.

**Proposal 2**: TBD.

### 3.2.2 Reporting

Further, [2] notes that to achieve the override protection for LTE logged MDT report and configuration when UE moves to NR from LTE (when previously configured with logged MDT in LTE), the most complex solution is Method 3, with cross-RAT reporting.

In that context, the follow-up, collective proposal in [1] was the following:

**Proposal 4:** In NR cell, the UE notifies the gNB about the Signaling-based Logged MDT from E-UTRA availability. FFS whether a new NR flag is introduced or the existing NR flag: *sigLogMeasConfigAvailable* is adopted.

The above Proposal doesn’t imply reporting yet, just availability of the data. However, the need for availability bit might be decided upon deciding the need for reporting in the other RAT.

In order, to model the reporting principles, it seems essential to prioritise one of the approaches, either:

* the UE should report E-UTRAN Logged MDT results in NR, or
* the UE shouldn’t report E-UTRAN Logged MDT results in NR.

**Question 3**: Do you agree that for LTE logged MDT configuration and report override protection in cross-RAT scenario it is beneficial to avoid of cross-RAT reporting of the Logged MDT data?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answers to Question 3** | | |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Technical Arguments if NO** |
| Qualcomm | No | In my understanding, the WI objective is achieved without cross-RAT reporting of logged MDT data from LTE to NR.  The only benefit is that by retrieving LTE-logged MDT data, NR cells can configure UE with NR-logged MDT. This is not within the scope of WI and the complexity associated with this is significantly high. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 3**: TBD.

**Proposal 3**: TBD.

### 3.2.3 Solution direction

Analysis on the pros and cons of the alternate solutions, led in the contribution in [2] to the following proposal:

Proposal 1: RAN2 is requested to down-select one option among option 1 and option 2 by analyzing the pro and cons.

The observations, and assumptions made behind the proposal, clarified generic handling of the LTE and NR configurations, UE capabilities, storing principles as well as principles on what the UE should indicate to the Network. Given the overview sets a baseline for categorization of different directions, it is proposed to discuss companies preferences on the options.

**Question 4**: Do you agree RAN2 should work out detailed solution taking as a baseline one particular Option from Method 1, Method 2 and Method 3 in [2]?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answers to Question 4** | | |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Technical Arguments** |
| Qualcomm | No | The UE implementation can be of two types:   1. separate memory allocation for LTE and NR logged MDT report 2. Common memory allocation for LTE and NR logged MDT report |
|  |  | If UE supports separate memory allocation for LTE and NR-logged MDT reports, then   * In our understanding, the standard should allow method 1.   If UE supports common memory allocation for LTE and NR-logged MDT reports, then   * In our understanding, then down the selection from methods 2 and 3 can be done by properly evaluating the signaling overhead and UE complexity. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 4**: TBD.

**Proposal 4**: TBD.

# 4 Conclusion

TBA
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