PCC.I/DEC. 318 (XXXVIII-21)[1]

QUESTIONNAIRE ON INNOVATION IN SERVICE QUALITY MEASUREMENTS

The 38 Meeting of Permanent Consultative Committee I: Telecommunications/Information and Communications Technologies (PCC.I),

DECIDES:

1. To consult with the Members of CITEL's PCC.I on alternative means and approaches for measuring quality of service (QoS) and quality of experience (QoE).

2. To request that the Member States and Associate Members answer the questionnaire attached hereto.

3. To instruct the Rapporteur on the quality of telecommunication services to submit the results of the consultation at the 39 Meeting of Permanent Consultative Committee I.

4. To instruct the CITEL Secretariat to send this decision to all the members of CITEL's PCC.I.

ANNEX TO DECISION PCC.I/DEC. 318 (XXXVIII-21)

QUESTIONNAIRE ON INNOVATION IN SERVICE QUALITY MEASUREMENTS

Country:
Name of the person answering the questionnaire:
Country:
Position/Organization:
Contact: Email/Phone:

Questionnaire:

1. Has the Member State considered or is it in the process of modifying/improving traditional quality measurement approaches? (e.g., field measurements—drive tests, probes—in access and core network managers, direct access to OSS management systems, information reports from service providers, etc.)

   Yes ___ No ___

   If so, mark with an X which of the following aspects drives the modification or improvement:

   ☐ Costs associated with existing means of measurement
   ☐ Increasing the scope/geographic area/measurement period
   ☐ Improving representativeness (size and distribution of samples)
   ☐ Lightening the work load (counters, formulas, KPIs, volume of information, post-processes)
   ☐ Simplifying the regulations

[1] CCPI-TIC/doc. 5101/21

- ☐ Technologies, services or indicators not measured
- ☐ Publishing information for users
- ☐ The required quality certification mechanism
- ☐ Building or contrasting connectivity/coverage indices
- ☐ Complementing current approaches
- ☐ Changing from a punitive model to an informative model, or vice versa

2. With regard to the measurement mechanisms or alternatives listed in the following table, mark with an X the degree of knowledge/adoption.

Mechanism	Known	Under assessment	Suppliers identified	Contracting under way	Operative in government*	Operative in service providers
Crowdsourcing[2]						
Port Mirroring TAP[3]						
Port Mirroring SPAN[4]						
Hybrid Port Mirroring[5]						
CDR analysis						
Software (e.g., API[6]) installed on user modems						

* Include link to the measurement approach if available. Or to the publication with the findings.

3. Should the government or operators be assessing or using crowdsourcing, please state the measurement purposes, chosen according to the following table:

SCOPES	**Considered (YES / NO)**	**Network type (Fixed / Mobile)**
Determine network coverage		
Monitoring and comparison of network performance		
Verifying complaints		
Checking for licensing commitments		
Network planning		
Network optimization		

[2]Recommendation ITU-T E.812
[3]Insert a monitoring device to a passive TAP (Test Access Point) port of the interface to be measured
[4]Redirect traffic to then copy it and send said replica through a dedicated port for this purpose, known by some manufacturers as SPAN (Switch Port Analyzer)
[5]Implement a hybrid technique in which a monitoring device inserted in the interface to be measured, without redirecting traffic, proceeds to copy it and send it to the analysis equipment.
[6] Application Programming Interface. It can also be API independent software, e.g., using TR-069/143 protocols