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# 1. Introduction

This contribution tries to capture the offline discussion on QoE others in 11.4

# 2 For the Chairman’s Notes

# 3. Discussion

## 3.1 UE based or CN based solution

In last meeting, a WA is agreed:

**WA: UE based solution for IDLE QoE configuration retrieve in Rel-18 IDLE/INACTIVE QoE.**

Since SA2 has not discussed CN based solution yet, for sake of progress, following majority’s view, it is proposed to turn the WA to be agreement.

Proposal: turn the WA to agreement: WA: UE based solution for IDLE QoE configuration retrieve in Rel-18 IDLE/INACTIVE QoE?

**Companies’ view:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Samsung | We notice that a new reply LS from SA3 to RAN3 in R3-237738 has been received with the following information,  *SA3 would like to bring it to the notice of RAN3 that the QoE measurement configuration information, when stored in UE when it is in RRC\_IDLE state, should be stored in a manner to ensure that the privacy of the user is preserved.*  *Also the RAN node cannot be sure that the UE does not modify the data before returning it.*  However, the information provided by SA3 is quite vague in our understanding. The first quoted paragraph is more like a principle regardless of which solution we choose.  While for the second paragraph, it is unclear what does the ‘data’ refer to, and what is the consequence if the UE modifies the ‘data’. So the information provided is confusing.  As a consequence, we may need to further check with SA3. |
| China Unicom | We agree with moderator’s proposal.  Regarding the reply LS from SA3, we don’t see any privacy related information in the QoE configuration information except MCE IP address, and we already asked SA5 for the feasibility of MCE IP id.  As mentioned in the second paragraph about UE to modify the data, we are confused of the meaning of it, if UE can modify the QoE configuration information, UE can also modify the whole QoE report as well. Does it mean that RAN node cannot be sure of any reports from UE? |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 3.2 ‘unicast’ codepoint

According to the contributions, there is no need to add a codepoint for unicast in communication service mode IE in QoE configuration.

Proposal: there is no need to add a codepoint for unicast (including unicast, unicast and multicast) in communication service mode IE in QoE configuration?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Samsung | Agree. No need.  In addition, we do think that OAM does not care about whether the QoE measurements are collected using unicast/multicast/broadcast communication mode. So we tend to agree that the QoE measurement applicable to be measured during multicast/broadcast communication mode could also be measured in unicast mode; however, we do not need to introduce an additional IE to achieve this goal.  As a summary, our understanding is that,   * The QoE measurement pertains to any QoE Reference can always be performed in unicast mode. * Consequently, use BOOLEAN type instead of ENUMBERATED type for MBS Communication Service Type IE. (so the last meeting’s agreement may need to be reverted)   The above approach is more straight-forward and much simpler than the proposals in 3.2. |
| China Unicom | We agree with moderator’s proposal. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Some companies think that the ongoing QoE measurement for multicast service should be continued if the MBS service type is switched from multicast to unicast. Then they propose ‘Introduce another IE to indicate that the multicast QoE measurement should be continued if switched to unicast’.

Proposal: Introduce another IE to indicate that the multicast QoE measurement should be continued if switched to unicast???

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Samsung | See our comments above. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 3.3 MDT alignment

Whether MDT alignment information should be provided to new gNB? There is no consensus according to contributions.

Proposal: There is no consensus on whether MDT alignment information should be provided to new gNB. Not pursue it in rel-18??

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Samsung | Yes. As explained in our contribution, the MDT alignment information is mainly used for the case of the alignment of m-based MDT and m-based QoE.  When the UE connects to a new gNB from RRC idle/inactive, such MDT alignment information can be provided to the new connected gNB, so that if the new connected gNB has been configured with the same m-based MDT from OAM before, it can diretly configure the measurement subject to m-based immediate MDT to the UE, for the purpose of alignment of MDT and QoE. |
| China Unicom | we agree the MDT alignment indication can be provided to new gNB for potential alignment of MDT and QoE. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 3.4 other

Some company propose to specify separate Assistance Information IEs for the following two scenarios: Handling of QoE reports in case of full buffer at the UE and Pausing of QoE reporting during RAN overload.

Proposal: specify separate Assistance Information IEs for the following two scenarios: Handling of QoE reports in case of full buffer at the UE and Pausing of QoE reporting during RAN overload??

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Samsung | We slightly prefer a simpler approach in R18, i.e. do not need to define separate assistance information for two cases, unless we find a strong need to require both. |
| China Unicom | Not needed.  We don’t see the necessity to separate the two scenarios. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Proposal: High speed related issues: not pursue in Rel-18??????

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Samsung | Considering the time limitation, we could say no consensus on such issue. Because some companies think enhancement is needed while other companies think current spec is enough. |
| China Unicom | No strong views. High speed scenario can be naturally supported by configuring corresponding high speed cell from OAM.  We also agree with a simple way to support HSDN only scenario by adding a HSDN-only indicator. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 4. Conclusion

Based on the discussion in this paper, we propose the following:

# 5. Reference