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# 1 Introduction

This document contains a summary of SON/ANR documents from agenda item 7.2.4 as referenced in Section 4 in order to facilitate decision making at RAN2#109bis-e.

# 2 Summary

## 2.1 Summary of open issues related to FFS from previous meetings

The following proposals are covered in this section

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [4] | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 1: Confirm the Working assumption that the ANR report is discarded after 96 hours.  Proposal 2: ANR measurement report is discarded upon RAT change.  Proposal 3: There is no need for a time indication of when the measurements were performed in the ANR measurement report.  Proposal 4: The RLF report is discarded upon returning to idle if rlf-InfoAvailable has been reported.  Proposal 5: RLF report is discarded upon RAT change.  Proposal 6: The re-establishment cell ID is included in the RLF report. |
| [5] | ZTE | Proposal 1: Confirm the working assumption that the validity timer is fixed to 96 hours.  Proposal 2: It’s suggested to include timeSpent information in ANR report to indicate the elapsed time since the generation of ANR record. And the value range of timeSpent is suggested to be INTEGER (0..5760) with unit of minutes.  Proposal 3: The re-establishment cell id need to be included in the RLF report as an optional IE.  Proposal 4: UE can discard RLF in the following cases:   After 48 hours if not fetched.   Power off or detach.   Reporting rlf-InfoAvailable and returning to idle. |

### 2.1.1 Potential Easy agreements

Proposal 1 of [4] and [5] are the same.

[4] Proposal 1: Confirm the Working assumption that the ANR report is discarded after 96 hours.

[5] Proposal 1: Confirm the working assumption that the validity timer is fixed to 96 hours.

It is proposed to confirm, based on company input so far.

**Proposal S1-1: Confirm the Working assumption that the ANR report is discarded after 96 hours.**

**Company views (to be completed during the meeting)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree (yes/no)** | **Comments** |
|  | yes/no |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | yes |  |

Proposal 2 of [4].

[4] Proposal 2: ANR measurement report is discarded upon RAT change.

It is proposed to confirm, based on company input so far.

**Proposal S1-2: ANR measurement report is discarded upon RAT change.**

**Company views (to be completed during the meeting)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree (yes/no)** | **Comments** |
|  | yes/no |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | yes |  |

Proposal 6 of [4] and proposal 3 of [5] are the same:

Proposal 6: The re-establishment cell ID is included in the RLF report.

Proposal 3: The re-establishment cell id need to be included in the RLF report as an optional IE.

It is proposed to confirm, based on company input so far.

**Proposal S1-3: Re-establishment cell ID is included in the RLF report.**

**Company views (to be completed during the meeting)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree (yes/no)** | **Comments** |
|  | yes/no |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | yes |  |

### 2.1.2 Needs further discussion

Proposal 3 of [4] and proposal 2 of [5] address the same issue but with opposite view.

[4] Proposal 3: There is no need for a time indication of when the measurements were performed in the ANR measurement report.

[5] Proposal 2: It’s suggested to include timeSpent information in ANR report to indicate the elapsed time since the generation of ANR record. And the value range of timeSpent is suggested to be INTEGER (0..5760) with unit of minutes.

Since there are opposing views, the following “positive” proposals are put forward for d**i**scussion.

**Proposal S1-4a: [FFS] Include timeSpent information in ANR report to indicate the elapsed time since the generation of ANR record**

**Company views (to be completed during the meeting)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree (yes/no)** | **Comments** |
|  | yes/no |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | no | From the network point of view, we are not quite sure how this indication would be used, as we expect the network deployment to be stable during the ANR measurements (e.g. during the next 96 hours following the configuration), so it should not really matter when the measurements are performed |

**Proposal S1-4b: [FFS] timeSpent is defined as INTEGER (0..5760) with unit of minutes**

**Company views (to be completed during the meeting if you answered “yes” to S1-3a)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree (yes/no)** | **Comments** |
|  | yes/no |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | see answer to S1-4a  if RAN2 agree to have an indication we would prefer to name the parameter *timeStamp* |

Proposals 4 and 5 of [4] and proposal 5 of [5] propose various cases in which RLF report is discarded.

[4] Proposal 4: The RLF report is discarded upon returning to idle if rlf-InfoAvailable has been reported.

[4] Proposal 5: RLF report is discarded upon RAT change.

[5] Proposal 4: UE can discard RLF in the following cases:

 After 48 hours if not fetched.

 Power off or detach.

 Reporting rlf-InfoAvailable and returning to idle.

One of the options was already agreed in the previous meeting, RAN2#109-e:

🡺 RLF report is discarded after 48 hours if not fetched.

Since there multiple additional options, the following “positive” proposal is put forward for d**i**scussion.

**Proposal S1-5: [FFS] RLF report is discarded in the following cases:**

1. **Reporting rlf-InfoAvailable and returning to idle.**
2. **RAT change**
3. **Power off or detach.**
4. **(already agreed) after 48 hours if not fetched**

**Company views (to be completed during the meeting)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree (yes/no)** | **Comments** |
|  | (a) – yes/no  (b) – yes/no  (c) – yes/no |  |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | (a): yes  (b): yes  (c): yes | (a): same as agreed for ANR  (b): because inter-RAT mobility is not supported in NB-IoT  (c): same as legacy |

## 2.2 Summary of new proposals

The following proposals are covered in this section

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [1] | Ericsson, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, ZTE Corporation | Proposal 1 Send a LS to RAN4 to verify that the ANR measurements specified by RAN2 would work fine. |
| [2] | Ericsson | Proposal 1 UE stores the CE level of the Last Serving Cell for RLF  Proposal 2 UE stores the CE level of serving cell when ANR measurement is being performed.  Proposal 3 UE stores the change of CE level and corresponding RSRPs when ANR measurement is being performed.  Proposal 4 UE stores the CE level of the target cell during ANR measurement when possible. |

### 2.2.1 Needs further discussion

The following proposal regarding sending an LS to RAN4 is made in [1]

Proposal 1 Send a LS to RAN4 to verify that the ANR measurements specified by RAN2 would work fine.

**Proposal S2-1: [FFS] Send a LS to RAN4 to verify that the ANR measurements specified by RAN2 would work fine.**

**Company views (to be completed during the meeting)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree (yes/no)** | **Comments** |
|  | yes/no |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | no | We do not see the need for this. This is the same approach as MDT in LTE.  Note that the whole point of using ell reselection measurements was to avoid impact on RAN4 |

The following proposals related to the storing of CE level information are made in [2]

Proposal 1 UE stores the CE level of the Last Serving Cell for RLF

Proposal 2 UE stores the CE level of serving cell when ANR measurement is being performed.

Proposal 3 UE stores the change of CE level and corresponding RSRPs when ANR measurement is being performed.

Proposal 4 UE stores the CE level of the target cell during ANR measurement when possible.

**Proposal S2-1: [FFS] UE stores the following CE level information :**

1. **CE level of the Last Serving Cell for RLF.**
2. **CE level of serving cell when ANR measurement is being performed**
3. **Change of CE level and corresponding RSRPs when ANR measurement is being performed**
4. **CE level of the target cell during ANR measurement when possible**

**Company views (to be completed during the meeting)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree (yes/no)** | **Comments** |
|  | (a) – yes/no  (b) – yes/no  (c) – yes/no  (d) – yes/no |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | (a) –no  (b) –no  (c) –no  (d) –no | A general comment is that the concept of CEL only exists in MAC in the context of the NPRACH resource selection so it not applicable here. In any case, RSRP measurement provide a more accurate information.  (c): do not really understand what is proposed. |

# 3 Conclusions (to be updated following offline)

**Potential easy agreements:**

**Proposal S1-1: Confirm the Working assumption that the ANR report is discarded after 96 hours.**

**Proposal S1-2: ANR measurement report is discarded upon RAT change.**

**Proposal S1-3: Re-establishment cell ID is included in the RLF report.**

**Needs further discussion:**

**Proposal S1-4a: [FFS] Include timeSpent information in ANR report to indicate the elapsed time since the generation of ANR record**

**Proposal S1-4b: [FFS] timeSpent is defined as INTEGER (0..5760) with unit of minutes**

**Proposal S1-5: [FFS] RLF report is discarded in the following cases:**

1. **Reporting rlf-InfoAvailable and returning to idle.**
2. **RAT change**
3. **Power off or detach.**
4. **(already agreed) after 48 hours if not fetched**

**New proposals for further discussion:**

**Proposal S2-1: [FFS] Send a LS to RAN4 to verify that the ANR measurements specified by RAN2 would work fine.**

**Proposal S2-1: [FFS] UE stores the following CE level information :**

1. **CE level of the Last Serving Cell for RLF.**
2. **CE level of serving cell when ANR measurement is being performed**
3. **Change of CE level and corresponding RSRPs when ANR measurement is being performed**
4. **CE level of the target cell during ANR measurement when possible**

# 4 List of referenced documents

1. [R2-2003131](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs/R2-2003131.zip) To Verify ANR Measurements Ericsson, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, ZTE Corporation discussion Rel-16
2. [R2-2003133](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs/R2-2003133.zip) Logging of CE Level for RLF and ANR measurements Ericsson discussion Rel-16
3. [R2-2003139](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs/R2-2003139.zip) Draft LS to RAN4 on ANR Measurements Ericsson [To be RAN2] LS out Rel-16 NB\_IOTenh3-Core To:RAN4
4. [R2-2003247](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs/R2-2003247.zip) SON remaining issues Huawei, HiSilicon discussion Rel-16 NB\_IOTenh3-Core
5. [R2-2003291](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs/R2-2003291.zip) Remaining FFSs for SON in NB-IoT ZTE Corporation, Sanechips discussion Rel-16 NB\_IOTenh3-Core