**Notes of SA2#139E\_CC#1**

# Opened: 01 June 2020, 12.30 UTC = 14.30 CEST

~ 150 people attended the conference call

**Attendees**: The following companies were recorded as present (list not exhaustive or verified)

Alibaba

Allot

Apple

ASTRI

AT&T

Broadcom

BT

Cablelabs

CATT

Charter

China Mobile

China Telecom

China Unicom

Cisco

Convida Wireless

Deutsche Telekom

DOCOMO

Ericsson

ETRI

FirstNet

Frauenhofer

Futurewei

Huawei

Intel

Interdigital

ITRI

IPCom

KDDI

KPN

Lenovo

LGE

Matrixx

MediaTek

Motorola Mobility

Motorola Solutions

NEC

Nokia

NTT DOCOMO

OPPO

Orange

OTD

Perspecta Labs

Philips

Qualcomm

Samsung

Spirent

Telefonica

Tencent

T-Mobile USA

Thales

TNO

Umlaut

Verizon

Vivo

Vodafone

ZTE

Puneet Jain (SA WG2 Chairman) chaired the conference call. Notes were taken by Maurice Pope (MCC).

NOTE: Meeting notes are not exhaustive and may not contain all the comments made during the conference call.

Opening statements by SA WG2 Chairman: It is intended to go through the documents marked at "for CC#2" in the Chairman’s notes.

**S2-2003606**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

Huawei made objection to r05 during e-meeting. S2-2003606r04 was revised to S2‑2004343, which was approved.

**S2-2004140**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

Qualcomm made objection to r04 during e-meeting. S2-2004140r03 was revised to S2‑2004345, which was approved.

**S2-2004175**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

MediaTek made objection to r02 during e-meeting. S2-2004175 was noted.

**S2-2003584**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

Initially marked as noted. S2-2003584r03 was revised to S2‑2004437 which was approved.

**S2-2004236**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

Ericsson commented there were off-line discussions to add 2 editors notes. Huawei commented there were off-line discussions to add 2 editors notes and will withdraw their objection. S2-2004236r01 was revised to S2‑2004424 which was approved.

**S2-2003594**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

Ericsson commented that off-line discussions resulted in R03 in the Drafts folder for consideration. S2-2003594 was revised to S2‑2004438, which was approved.

**S2-2003660**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

The SA WG2 Chairman asked whether r03 can be agreed. There was an objection to this and r05 was considered. Nokia commented that this removes too much and makes the solution unworkable, but could accept this for progress. S2-2003660R05 was revised to S2-2004426, which was approved.

**S2-2003985**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

It was noted that Security Aspects need to be evaluated by SA WG3 and should be added to the S2-2003985r03. S2-2003985r03 was revised to S2-2004430, which was approved.

**S2-2004199**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

S2-2004199r06 was revised in S2‑2004440, which was approved.

**S2-2003712**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

S2-2003712r13 was corrected and revised in S2‑2004439 which was approved.

**S2-2004126**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

An off-line draft update was available in the Drafts folder. This was revised to TD S2‑2004441, which was approved.

**S2-2003705**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

An off-line draft update was available in the Drafts folder. This was revised to TD S2‑2004442, which was approved.

**S2-2004124**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

S2-2004124r04 was revised to TD S2‑2004443, which was approved.

**S2-2003618**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

This was left to check related documents. This was approved.

**S2-2003704**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

This was left to check related documents. S2-2003704r04 was revised to TD S2‑2004444, which was approved.

**S2-2004241**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

This was left to check related documents. This was approved.

**S2-2004242**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

Vodafone suggested taking r05 as a basis rather than r07, which doesn't align with the CR in S2-2004248r04. S2-2004242r04 was revised, removing **'capability'** from the action, to TD S2‑2004445, which was approved.

**S2-2004476**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

This was left open to attach the approved CRs. This was approved.

**S2-2004193**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

This was no longer needed for the LS and was noted.

**S2-2004188**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

S2-2004242r07 had been provided in the Drafts folder. This was revised to TD S2‑2004446. This was approved.

**S2-2003685**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

S2-2003685R01 was proposed. Nokia suggested agreeing the original version. Huawei objected to the original version and R01. This was postponed.

**S2-2003686**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

Ericsson commented that the BBF are awaiting this response and suggested that the LS indicates that further discussion will be held, and LS response will be sent from the next SA2 meeting. It was suggested to add the issue into the report, and this was postponed.

**S2-2003864**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

S2-2003864r02 was considered. Ericsson reported that there was off-line discussion with Nokia and r05 was uploaded to the Drafts folder. S2-2003864r05 was revised to TD S2‑2004447, which was approved.

**S2-2003865**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

Mirror to S2-2003864. This was revised to TD S2‑2004448, which was approved.

**S2-2004283**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

Qualcomm had objected to this. This was noted.

**S2-2003772**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

S2-2003772r03 was considered. Nokia objected to this proposal. This was noted.

**S2-2004274**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

Nokia objected to all versions of this proposal. This was noted.

**S2-2004436**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

This was S2-2004074r02. Ericsson withdrew their objection, and this was approved.

**S2-2003923**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

Ericsson objected to S2-2003923r02 of this proposal but could accept to add an editor’s note. Nokia did not accept to add the restriction of an editor’s note. This was postponed.

**S2-2003924**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

This was postponed.

**S2-2003793**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

Nokia objected to S2-2003793r03. This was noted.

**S2-2004132**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

Nokia objected to S2-2004132r01. Ericsson suggested further discussing this over a CC. This was noted.

ZTE suggested that all KI#7 documents should then be noted as KI#7 is incomplete and there is disagreement. AT&T and NEC didn’t agree with ZTE proposal.

**S2-2003646**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

ZTE commented that they could only accept r01, but the original was approved. Ericsson commented that the original was on a higher level and the differentiation of cells within the same TA needs to be further discussed. **This was then noted (a change from approved in the Chairman’s Notes).**

**S2-2004363**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

S2-2004205r12 was revised to this S2-2004363. Deutsche Telekom provided S2-2004205r14 in the Drafts folder. The changes were reviewed on-line (NOTE X and penultimate NOTE change). S2-2004205r14 was agreed and revised in S2‑2004363, which was approved.

**S2-2003963**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

S2-2003963r01 was proposed. S2-2003963r01 was revised to S2-2004522 with a note in Chairman’s note that CAG will be removed. S2-2004522 was pre-approved. Huawei objected to trying to approve a document provided only 10 minutes before the call. S2-2003963r01 (with CAG) was not agreeable either. **S2-2003963** was then noted. **S2-2004522** was removed from the Chairman’s note.

**S2-2004024**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

Objection from Orange was withdrawn. This was approved.

**S2-2004342**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

Intel clarified the wording of updated editor’s note in the final version: '*Editor's note: SA1 needs to clarify the service requirements for the solution and CT1 needs to confirm the solution and therefore the network selection proposal in this solution is FFS.*' This remained approved.

**S2-2004368**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

OPPO asked for some editorial corrections on this before uploading. As it had already been uploaded the Rapporteur was asked to remove the embedded comments.

**S2-2004253**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

Deutsche Telekom sustained their objection to this, and it remained noted.

**S2-2003611**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

Ericsson reported that an update to the objected to S2-2003611r03, was provided in the Drafts folder as S2-2003611r04 which was agreed to by the objecting companies. There were issues raised on this by Nokia and this remained noted.

**S2-2003593**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

Ericsson reported that an update to this was provided in the Drafts folder as S2-2003593r07, correcting the SA WG3 TD number in 2 editor's notes. S2-2003593r07 was agreed and revised in TD S2‑2004449, which was approved.

**S2-2003632**

**Discussion and conclusion:**

ZTE reported that S2-2003632r03 had been further discussed off-line and the objections were withdrawn. Ericsson confirmed that their objection is withdrawn. S2-2003632r03 was agreed and revised in TD S2‑2004450, which was approved.

# AoB

**The SA WG2 Chairman reminded delegates that Ph1 revisions need to be uploaded to the INBOX by the deadline: 16:00 UTC Monday 8 June 2020.**

**SA2#139E CC#3 scheduled for 13:00 – 15:00 UTC on Monday 8 June will only be held if necessary. The SA WG2 Chairman will inform people whether it is to be held and provide an agenda for it on the e-mail list, by 00:00 UTC Monday 8 June. Companies were requested to provide topic for discussion on CC#3 to SA2 Chairman.**

**E-Mail comments Tags: Delegates were asked to keep comments short to keep the Chairman’s notes readable and also do double-check the <<START>> and <<END>> Tags are correctly formatted so that they can be captured correctly in the Chairman’s Notes.**

NOTE: MCC asks delegates to ensure their comment text is "unique" for each of their comments to a particular TD number, as the extraction tool checks for any existing text before adding the new comment.

# Closed: 08June 2020, 14:45 UTC = 16.45 CEST