2021-04-19

Minutes of the second teleconference for AMF re-allocation

Active participants: DOCOMO, Huawei, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Nokia, Qualcomm, ZTE, Ericsson (organizer).

Agenda for this teleconference

a. Discuss input documents with respect to solutions, solution evaluations, conclusions. Please disseminate any input documents at least 1 day earlier.

- ZTE

- Ericsson

Input documents are in <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/Email_Discussions/SA3/TSGS3_103e/FS_AMFREAL_SEC>

b. Proposals for discussion topics by participants for the progress of the study. Examples are discussions of solutions, evaluations or conclusions without the need for input documents.

c. AoB

--------------------------------------------------------------------------

--------------------------------------------------------------------------

Agenda item (a)

---

[ZTE] presented the input document which is a new solution proposal for AMF re-allocation. There was no objection to consider the new solution as a contribution towards the May meeting although the agreement in the group is that no new solutions should be submitted for the May meeting. The general comment was that more details were needed to understand the solution especially more details on steps 15-19. ZTE will bring an update towards the 3rd teleconference or the May meeting.

[Lenovo] requested clarifications on Step 13. The solution should cite section (B) in 5.15, TS 23.502.

[Huawei] How can the AMF associate the UE identity with the initial Registration Request ?

[ZTE] In step 19 the RRC connection is not released.

[Nokia] No UE impact ? The UCU is a new service, or ? Not sure if it can trigger a registration request.

[Ericsson] The UCU is an existing service that is used to pass serving network parameters to the UE such as NSSAIs. The UCU can trigger a registration request but I am not sure if the parameters part of the message can be empty.

[Qualcomm] Need more details for the solution description.

[ZTE] agreed to bring more details next time.

[Ericsson] presented the input document which showed a table with high level evaluation of the solutions against the criteria discussed in the previous teleconference. Moreover each solution had some comments in text. It was clarified that the intention of the document was not to necessarily create a similar content in clause 7 of the TR but to trigger discussion.

The discussion continued going through the document.

The result of the discussion is captured in the revised input document by Ericsson. Some comments are captured below. Please note that not all comments may have been captured.

[Lenovo] A new column should be added. This column needs to assess the solution according to conformance to the SA2 criteria.

[Nokia] what is the point of this criterion?

[Lenovo] SA2 procedures include a via-RAN option

[Nokia] The issue to be solved is AMF re-allocation. We should be open about the way we solve this.

[Lenovo] The issue is indirect re-allocation via RAN

[Huawei] The scope of the study is registration failure when there is a via RAN forwarding of the Registration Request. Do we change the scope of the study?

Agenda item (b) Proposals for other companies about what to discuss

None

Agenda item (c) AoB

None

Next steps

IN the next meeting we will go through the rest of the analysis about solutions 5, 7, 8, 9 from the Ericsson discussion paper and any new input documents.