**SA3#119Adhoc-e Chair Notes**

| **Agenda**  | **Topic**  | **TDoc** | **Title**  | **Source**  | **Type**  | **For**  | **Notes**  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1  | Agenda and Meeting Objectives  | S3‑250001 | Agenda  | SA WG3 Chair  | agenda  |    |    |
|    |    | S3‑250002 | Process for SA3#119AdHoc-e  | SA WG3 Chair  | other  |    |    |
|    |    | S3‑250003 | Detailed agenda planning  | SA WG3 Chair  | other  |    |    |
| 3.1  | Reports and Liaisons related to topics in agenda  | S3‑250004 | LS on security aspects of Ambient IoT  | S2-2411049  | LS in  |    |    |
|    |    | S3‑250005 | LS on RAN2 outcome of Ambient IoT study  | R2-2411263  | LS in  |    |    |
|    |    | S3‑250006 | Reply to LS on Further Clarification for Ambient IoT Security  | S1-244920  | LS in  |    |    |
|    |    | S3‑250007 | LS on A-IoT Conclusions in SA WG2  | S2-2413035  | LS in  |    |    |
|    |    | S3‑250009 | Reply LS on clarifications on consent management  | SP-241934  | LS in  |    |    |
|    |    | S3‑250043 | Reply LS on security aspects of Ambient IoT  | OPPO  | LS out  | Approval  |   [CC3]: 043 and 071Oppo: no conclusion so both proposals can be notedSony: could come back after KI3 conclusionNokia: no more time to conclude the LS, so need to be notedE//: agree to note[CC3] |
|    |    | S3‑250071 | LS reply to LS on security aspects of Ambient IoT  | Nokia  | LS out  | Approval  |   [OPPO]: propose[OPPO]: propose to discuss in thread of S3-250041 and capture the agreed conclusion in replay LS[Ericsson]: Agrees with OPPO. Let us wait until KI#3 is concluded. |
|    |    | S3‑250130 | LS on User Consent aspects for Energy Saving  | Ericsson  | LS out  | Approval  |   [Nokia]: Provides comments.[Huawei]: comments to 250130[CC1]: Huawei: need some small modifications, sent emails on thatNokia: agree to send, and define where to document this is next meeting[CC1][Ericsson]: provides clarification and r1[Huawei]: S3-250130r2 available.[CC2]: 130r4, Bo presentsE//: what does without further changes meanNokia: avoid saying: no normative workHuawei: keep this open, will continue discussion over email.[CC2][Ericsson]: r3 is available.[Nokia]: Provides comments to R3 provides r4.[Huawei]: Request Clarification on difference between R3 and r4.[Nokia]: Provides answers to Huawei[Ericsson]: r4 is acceptable[Nokia]: Gently request confirmation for the compromise from Huawei.[Huawei]: revision to S3-250130r4[Nokia]: Provides answers to Huawei and propose changes.[Ericsson]: provides r5 including the content provided by Huawei and modified by Nokia[Huawei]: Provide comments to revision 5.[Nokia]: Fine with R5 and ask Huawei to reconsider.[Huawei]: response to r5.[Nokia]: response to Huawei[Huawei]: response to Nokia[CC3]; Nokia: can be noted |
| 5.2  | Study on the security support for the Next Generation Real Time Communication services phase 2  | S3‑250155 | Update KI#1: Third party specific user identities to include NEF-AF interface security  | Ericsson  | other  | Approval  |   [Huawei]: propose to be noted[Ericsson]: provides comments and requests for clarification[CC1] : Vlasios presentsHuawei: KI has been concluded, not ok to restgart to study on third party IDE//: ok needs to be there to be complete, not to reopen concluded discussionsNokia: if other groups read this new requirement, will they restart their discussion?Huawei: that was the concernNokia: if SA2 does something new, could SA3 investigate the security related to that new interfacechair: SA2 is not including a new KINokia: but maybe a new feature,QC: add note that this issue can be dealt with in conclusion of KI3, as exposure is in NEFE//: agree with QC, conclude here and move the procedure to KI3, therefore send LS to SA2 to inform that this issue is dealt with in KI3together with 156 (LS)Vlasios presentsE//: The text now reads that there is also some exposure in KI1, ask SA2 two questionschair: LS out is preferred from this meeting?E//: yesNokia: as KI1 is closed, add some EN or similar directly to KI3.E//: add: if SA3 wants to add third party identifier exposureQC: not change KI1, but be clear that this will impact third party ID partchair: suggest exact text over email[CC1][Huawei]: provides clarification |
|    |    | S3‑250131 | Solution#5 update for alignment with SA2 and addressing EN  | HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Nokia]: ask clarification[Ericsson]: Requests for clarifications before approval.[Huawei]: Provides clarification and revision.[Ericsson]: r1 needs changes[Ericsson]: Provide r2[CC3]: 131r2E//: Nokia and E// ok with r2Approved. |
|    |    | S3‑250089 | Updates to solution#6  | Samsung  | other  | Approval  |   [Nokia]: Comments on the contribution[Ericsson]: Requests for clarifications before approval.[Huawei]: Requests for clarification[Samsung]: Provides comments and r1.[Qualcomm]: Changes needed before approval[Qualcomm]: Further clarification[Samsung] provides r2.[Qualcomm]: r2 is OK[Ericsson]: r2 is fine[Huawei]: Fine with r2 |
|    |    | S3‑250090 | Evaluation updates for solution#6  | Samsung  | other  | Approval  |   [Nokia]: Comments on the contribution[Ericsson]: proposes changes.[Huawei]: Requests for clarification[Samsung]: provides comments and r1.[Ericsson]: is fine with r1.[Huawei]: Fine with r1 |
|    |    | S3‑250091 | Conclusion for Key issue#2  | Samsung  | other  | Approval  |   [Ericsson]: Proposes a merger of this document (0091) and 0132 to 0154 (baseline).[Samsung]: agrees to merge this contribution into 0154.[Ericsson]: As per the SA3 teleconference on Tuesday this document is merged to 0132. Please continue the discussion in the e-mail thread of 0132. |
|    |    | S3‑250132 | Conclusion to KI#2 of NG\_RTC  | HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Huawei]: Propose to merge 0091 and 0154 into S3-250132.[Ericsson]: proposes to merge this document and 0091 to 0154.[Huawei]: provide merged version and clarification.[Qualcomm]: Clarifications/changes need before approval[Ericsson]: Proposes to upload the revisions to the Inbox/Drafts[CC1]: 091, 132, 154E//: use 132r1 as baselineHuawei: r2 includes E// and QC comment, need to discuss if e2e protection is required, not needed according to HW, Samsung wants e2e chair: merger in 154?Nokia: ok with 132 as baselineHuawei: two options, EN or Note, both are okE//: commented on removing some of Nokia text, continue the discussion over email[CC1][Huawei]: Provides r2[Nokia]: Provides r3[Ericsson]: Provides r4[Qualcomm]: Provide proposal for correcting sentence[Huawei]: Provide r5[Ericsson]: Provides comments to r5[Samsung]: asks clarification to Ericsson.[Ericsson] supports r4 but not r5, responds to Huawei and Samsung about the token based solutions[Huawei]: Provides r6[Philips]: proposes rewording of the first EN[Qualcomm]: OK with r6[Ericsson]: r6 is fine[Nokia]: fine with r6[Philips] would be fine with the EN wording in r6. |
|    |    | S3‑250154 | Conclusion for KI2 IMS based Avatar Communication  | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell  | other  | Approval  |   [Ericsson]: Proposes that this document is the baseline for merger of 0091, 0132 and 0154.[Qualcomm]: Think Ericsson proposal could work as a way forward[Ericsson]: As per the SA3 teleconference on Tuesday this document is merged to 0132. Please continue the discussion in the e-mail thread of 0132. |
|    |    | S3‑250133 | Conclusion to KI#3 of NG\_RTC  | HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Ericsson]: comments on the document.[Huawei]: support Ericsson's opinion[CC1]: 133, 157Nokia: ok with 133 as baseline and add EN, Huawei: check r1Nokia: will provide r2chair: get LS ready[CC1][Nokia]: Provide r2 based on merged version[Ericsson]: r2 is fine[Huawei]: Fine with r2 |
|    |    | S3‑250157 | Conclusion for KI3 IMS DC capability exposure  | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell  | other  | Approval  |   [Nokia]: Baseline for merger of S3-250133 and S3-250157[Ericsson]: Comments on the document and merging[Huawei]: support Ericsson's first option.[Ericsson]: As per the SA3 teleconference on Tuesday this document is merged to 0133. Please continue the discussion in the e-mail thread of 0133. |
|    |    | S3‑250156 | LS on IMS support for AF authorization  | Ericsson  | LS out  | Approval  |   [Nokia]: Support the LS with comments[Ericsson]: requests for clarifications for producing a revision.[Nokia]: Provide clarification.[Ericsson]: provides r1.[Ericsson]: provides r2 with some corrections.[Ericsson]: provides r3 with the IMS avatar communication aspects in the LS[CC2]: 156r3, Vlasios presentsHuawei: need more time to checkNokia: interface will not be in scope, somehow the last paragraph is already clarified in SA2E//: SA2 has list of Interfaces that are out of scope, but not clear whether this is finalNokia: to get official feedbackE//: if there is conclusion in KI2, then keep it, otherwise remove the last paragraphNokia: could also include the paragraph, and then update the conclusions accordingly[CC2][Nokia]: Suggest check with SA2 colleague before tomorrow[Ericsson] responds to Nokia's proposal[Huawei]: fine with r3[CC3]: E//: this LS needs to include 132, so please upload the revision immediately132r6 goes into 156r3 as attachment |
| 5.9  | Study on security Aspect of Ambient IoT Services in 5G  | S3‑250047 | Generic conclusion on AIoT  | Huawei, HiSilicon  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Deutsche Telekom] : {Question for clarification}[Huawei]: provides clarification on the optionality issue[Deutsche Telekom] : highlights that optionality may result in no testcase for a well-defined use case[Huawei]: Provides minor clarification on SCAS tests[Deutsche Telekom] : thanks the quick additional clarifications and agrees on proposed way forward[Sony] : Provides r1.[KPN]: Disagrees with second bullet of conclusion and provides alternate suggestion.[Huawei]: Fine with the alternative formulation but highlights importance that intention is to reach a compromise and does not compromise security[Huawei]: provides r2 on top of r1 merging S3-250047, S3-250061, S3-250066 (pending Nokia confirmation) and S3-250159[Nokia]: Provides comments to R2.[Qualcomm]: proposes further changes before approval[Nokia]: Provides answers to Qualcomm.[Deutsche Telekom]: asks clarification on 'optional deployment', proposes changes.[Ericsson]: Comments. And Requires changes before approval.[Huawei]: provides r3 and leaves the requirement on optionality of support open for discussion during the call.[CC1]: 047r3 Noamen presentsSony: email regarding bullet #2, security between device and network Nokia: ok with first bulletE//: agree with Sony, no need for application layer securitySony: remove the application layer security part from bullet 2Huawei: remove bullet 2KPN: same views as SonyThales: 3 options, also both are possible, using the conclusion to make the work of the KI, not clear what is the handling here. Ok with removing the noteDCM: unclear whether that means network layer is required, need to be clear that network layer is optional if application security is there.IDCC: keep bullet, put the content of the Note into the bullet, because there are different ways of providing securityQC: agree with IDCC, keep second bullet as is, aligned with SA2 regarding storage of device IDE//: back to bullet1, too generic, what is meant by new services, e..g. could mean AMFHuawei: has responded to Nokia on this, example NDS/IPE//: too generic here, Huawei: for protection of backhaul and CN, and reference NDS IPDT: third bullet, needs to be clear whether support is optional or mandatory, current wording is not concluding on anythingHuawei: have this discussion on conf callKPN want to have mandatoryE//: should be mandatory to support, but optional to deployIDCC: overloading the device, depends on the type of service, writing optional/mandatory is not okHuawei: comment says need to take a decision on the conf callIDCC: so should be optional or mandatory based on AIoT servicechair: so expand to cover different use cases?QC: if mandatory to support, the impact may be high, prefer optionalE//: how is the use case determined, that is deployment, but it requires the support, so otherwise there will be device per use caseThales: network layer security needs to be mandatoryvivo: device type 1 capability is very limited, so opinion like IDCC and QC, i.e. optional to supportThales: bullet 4:disagree if PMN, so remove the bullet or limit to SNPN use caseDCM: credential holders AAA server is confusing, QC: credential holder AAA could be internal AioTF or externalDCM: so only for application layer securityQC: also for network layerDCM: for application layer security, ok with this, for network layer not sureQC: will try to rewordvivo: for SNPN case it could also be network layer[CC1][Thales]: disagrees.[Thales]: provides additional comments.[Huawei]: provides r4[Qualcomm]: proposes further revisions on top of r3 based on today's conf call discussion[vivo]: comment on Qualcomm's reply.[Sony]: provides r5.[Thales]: provides r6.[Huawei]: fine with r5 and asks Thales for clarifications on the alternative formulations for the credential storage statement.[Nokia]: Not fine with R4, R5 and R6 and propose changes.[Huawei]: clarifies intention of NOTE 2 which is a compromise[Deutsche Telekom]: highlights the need of NOTE 2[Nokia]: Propose changes to Note2 as a compromise[Lenovo]: asks for clarifications on the Note2[CC2]047r6Noamen presentsQC: need clarifcation why credential storage was not agreedThales: first agree on authentication methodNokia: remove that the usage is bound to inventory or command, ie. Remove the ieLenovo: is this only considering one type of device, needs to be clear, what requirements apply whereHuawei: some companies want flexibility, some want everything mandatory, take the decision in normative phase, therefore note 2E//: still unresolved whether we have a device per use case.Orange: overall security solution is undefined, network and application are options, there needs to be interaction between those two and in scope, application layer needs be in knowledge of the networkIDCC: instead of intended usage it is intended functionality in note 2Huawei: will provide revision need comments over emailOrange: need to look at interaction between network and application layer, need to have network layer security, can be looked at normative phase, who decides which way to chose, Nokia: could be in deploymentOrange: want to avoid fragmentation that will increase impact on networkOppo: need to look at concrete proposalsOrange: not make this conclusion nowHuawei: continue discussion on emailLenovo: understand note2, and support rewording to functionalityE//: what is the bundle of functionalities for device type 1? better if all devices have the same capabilities, otherwise wrong devices will be used in wrong use cases.Huawei: note 2 is not taking a stand, security mechanisms should be defined, and then we can see where this is goingE//: this is just postponing the discussion, Huawei: it is narrowing down the options, we can continue discussion over email[CC2][Ericsson]: disagrees on creating devices with various capabilities per use case[Huawei]: clarifies intention again that this is a compromise and is not favoring any approach.[Ericsson]: provides clarification and requests to rephrase bullet 1.[Huawei]: provides r9 for cleanups, remaining feedback and a last attempt on bullet 2 related to protection at the application layer.[Interdigital]: mostly likes r9 and provides further comments addressing improvement.[Nokia]: Nokia can accept R9.[Ericsson]: asks for clarification are requires changes on r9 before approval.[Huawei]: fine with r10 and formulation of the NOTE proposed by Ericsson. Will incorporate that in the next revision[Qualcomm]: proposes a change in r10 and Ericssons' comment[Interdigital]: OK with r10 and formulation of the NOTE proposed by Ericsson.Persistent question: Why do we need 2 mutually-redundant Editor Notes?[Huawei]: provides r11 incorporating some suggestions and responds to some of the feedback on b2[CATT]: ok with r11.[KPN]: Fine with r11.[Qualcomm]: is fine with r11[Orange]: ok with r11 as it is. We can take the topic on bullet 2 in the next meeting while resolving the EN. To us, this contribution cannot be considered as « hard agreements » anyway and it is subject to be rediscussed in a normal meeting. E-meetings are not good for meaningful technical discussions and should be banned if we want to provide good job in security of mobile networks.[Thales]: is fine with r11[Lenovo]: fine with r11[Philips] fine with r11[CC3]: E//: agreed Note says we need to define a map between device functionality and security capabilities, How shall that be done?Chair: in SA3E//: yesChair: in next meeting?E//: so have table in the TS for the mapping?Chair: could be possible way[CC3] |
|    |    | S3‑250061 | pCR to TR33.713 Generic conclusion  | CATT  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Sony] ask if this can be considered merged into S3-250047? |
|    |    | S3‑250066 | Proposal for a conclusion  | Nokia  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Sony] ask if this can be considered merged into S3-250047?[Nokia] Confirm - the content is merged into S3-250047. |
|    |    | S3‑250083 | Pseudo-CR-General conclusion for the architecture of AIoT  | China mobile  | pCR  |    |   [Qualcomm]: asks clarifications and revisions before approval[China Mobile]: Provide clarification[Thales]: provides comments.[China Mobile]: Provide more clarification[China Mobile]: Provide comments.[Nokia]: Provide comments and a way forward. Same comments as for 0084[China Mobile]: Provide r1.[Qualcomm]: provides further comments and asks further clarification before approval.[Interdigital]: Has reservations about SeGW. Agrees with QC.[China Mobile]: Provide clarifications[Nokia]: Provides comment to R1.[China Mobile]: Fine with the NOTE suggested by nokia, provides r2 for 0083 and 0084[Nokia] Nokia is fine to accept R2.[Interdigital] Points out to the contradiction between shall and may, proposes way forward, and asks for a change to get approved.[Thales]: provides comment/question to Interdigital.[China Mobile]: Provides clarification to Interdigital |
|    |    | S3‑250084 | Pseudo-CR-System architecture and security assumptions for AIoT services  | China mobile  | pCR  |    |   [Qualcomm]: asks clarifications and revisions before approval[China Mobile]: Provide clarification[Thales]: provides comments.[China Mobile]: Provide comments.[Nokia]: Provide comments and provide the way forward[China Mobile]: Provide same comments as for 0083, and upload R1[Qualcomm]: provides further comments and asks further clarification before approval (Same comments as 250083)[Interdigital]: Has reservations about SeGW in the proposed architecture.[Deutsche Telekom]: strongly supports the ,shall' statement for isolation in case the existing auth-framework is not reused.[China Mobile]: Provide clarifications[China Mobile]: Provide clarifications，the same as for 250083[Nokia]: Provides answers to Deutsche Telekom[Telecom Italia]: supports the 'shall' statement for isolation.[China Mobile]: Clarify 'the corresponding solution has to be removed and voided'[Nokia]: Provides a note as a compromise.[Thales]: provides comment.[Nokia]: Provide questions for clarification to Thales.[Thales]: provides answer.[Nokia]: Acknowledge the confirmation from Thales[China Mobile]: Fine with the NOTE, provides r2 for 0083 and 0084[Nokia] Nokia is fine to accept R2.[Interdigital] Points out to the contradiction between shall and may, proposes way forward, and asks for a change to get approved.[China Mobile]: Provide clarification, the same as for 250083 |
|    |    | S3‑250159 | Generic conclusion for AIoT  | Qualcomm Incorporated  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Sony] ask if this can be considered merged into S3-250047?[Qualcomm]: confirms 250159 is merged into 250047 |
|    |    | S3‑250028 | Update the scope in TR 33.713  | ZTE Corporation  | pCR  | Approval  |   [vivo]: proposes a further change before approval[Nokia]: Request changes.[ZTE] : Provide R1[vivo]: r1 OK. |
|    |    | S3‑250058 | Conclusion on KI#5 AIoT Authentication  | OPPO  | pCR  | Approval  |   [OPPO] : {Merged KI#5 conclusion contributions}OPPO announces the merge and close the discussion on other merged documents' threads: S3-250045, S3-250033, S3-250074, and S3-250111.Discussion and drafting is to be continued on the baseline S3-250058 document thread.Draft\_S3-250058-r1 can be found in the draft folder.[Sony] : Provides r2.[OPPO] : Accepts R2.[Qualcomm]: proposes further changes before approval (Provide r3)[Xiaomi]: proposes comments on r3[vivo]: proposes further changes before approval (Provide r4)[vivo]: Provides r5[oppo]: Provides r6 for 250058[Ericsson]: Gives comments. Disagrees with a few points and provides revision-7.[Nokia]: Provides comments and new revision - R8[CC1]: 058r8Oppo: prefer r6E//: prefer r7Thales: not ok with bullet 1, want mutual authenticationQC: original proposal asked only for one way authentication, not clear how mutual device authentication can be done for inventory only caseNokia: what is the restriction to do only one way authenticationQC: not sure what solution can do mutual auth without extra signallingCATT: agree with QC, mutual auth not possible in one way signallingHuawei: not reasonable to have mutual auth without adding extra signallingOppo: similar view as QC and Huawei, there is only one round trip, so mutual not possibleSony: is the request to actually authenticate before "attaching", then is it message authentication during inventory, or is it an authentication procedure, assumption is it is message authentication, not device auth?IDCC: majority opinion is that mutual authentication is not neededNokia: in RAN2 3step contention leaves room for mutual authenticationE//: re Sony's comment: is it message authentication or entity authentication, ok with one way for inventory only, DCM: key issue and conclusion are not matched, vivo: one way for inventory only is sufficient, too complex to implement mutual authenticationOppo: too much time on this key issue, show of hands? More people supporting one way onlyE//: why move on? Agree to make it more clear about what authentication we mean, it's about entity authentication, Oppo: disagree with message authentication being sufficientchair: can we get to interim conclusion in the documentHuawei: it is only interim conclusions anyways, maybe give control to pen holderE//: KI5 is about entity authentication KI4 is about message authenticationDCM: confusion is coming from use case inventory, rather than what is done for entity authenticationSony: have a different conclusion paper, for device type 1 use implicitly message authentication instead of device authenticationE//: too late to go back to what is the KI about[CC1][Thales]: disagrees.[Thales]: provides additional comments.[OPPO]: provides R9 to split the use case for inventory-only and for inventory-and-command as the Chair suggested during the call.[Qualcomm]: provides r10[Huawei]: prefer r9 and can live with r10.[Thales]: prefers r10 to continue discussion.[Xiaomi]: provide comments on r10[vivo]: prefer r9 for CC discussion.[Ericsson]: comments on both r9 and r10. Both needs change before approval.[CC2]: 058r9Orange: is there an AIoT subscription, different from credentials, replace ‘subscription’ with creentials’.Oppo: ok to removeDCM: authentication of network can be privacy enhancing, so depends on privacy mechanismNokia: support view of subscription of Orange, decide in inventory for mutual authenticationIDCC: agree that subscription is wrong, should be credentials and other parameters or policyE//: what is implicit authentication, Huawei: can be removedE//: in r8 there was a definition of challenge response mechanism, should be brought backOppo: not at this time too early to agree on the solutionE//: the definition was not solution specificOppo: note 3 is not neededQC: "credential is stored with Aiot device information" not clear sentence, note 2 is incomplete sentence[CC2][Nokia]: R11 uploaded to drafts as requested[OPPO]: Provide R12 based on inputs from CC#2[Nokia]: Nokia is fine with R12[Ericsson]: requires clarification and improve the language.[OPPO]: Provides improvement to Ericsson's proposal.[Xiaomi]: provide comments on r12[Qualcomm]: shares the same view as Oppo. Provide r14 that reflects the comment[oppo]: oppo is fine with R14 .[ZTE] : accept R14[Huawei]: fine with R14 .[Sony] : Some concerns with r14[oppo] : Sony raise a new technical discussion came from 250012 thread, so propose to continue this discuss in 250012 thread, and NOT in 250058.[vivo]: fine with R14 .[Lenovo]: Lenovo is fine with R14.[CATT]: We are ok with r14.[Sony] : Sony responds and seek further clarity on r14.[Sony] : Provides r15.[Qualcomm]: is fine with r15[Lenovo]: is fine with r15[Philips] fine with r15[Sony]: Provide Comment on r14 and request update (in case r15 cannot be considered)[CC3]: Sony: 012 to be notedHuawei: is there any content that can be savedSony: ok with 058r14Huawei: ok[CC3] |
|    |    | S3‑250045 | Discussion paper on the conclusion on key issue#5  | Huawei, HiSilicon  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Deutsche Telekom] : {Question for clarification}[OPPO] : {suggest to close this threats and continue the discussion on merged baseline S3-250058}Discussion and drafting is to be continued on the merged baseline document S3-250058 thread. |
|    |    | S3‑250033 | Conclusion for KI#5  | ZTE Corporation  | pCR  | Approval  |   [OPPO] : {suggest to close this threats and continue the discussion on merged baseline S3-250058}Discussion and drafting is to be continued on the baseline document S3-250058 thread.[ZTE] : OK to merge and discuss under S3-250058 |
|    |    | S3‑250012 | KI#5, Conclusions  | Sony  | pCR  | Approval  |   [vivo] : {provide wayforward}[Sony] : comments on the wayforward[Interdigital]: Provides comments and asks for clarification[Sony]: Ask Interdigital if the comments was on the correct paper.[Qualcomm]: asks further revision before approval if it is not merged into 250058[vivo] : propose to note or merge into 0058.[oppo] : propose to merge into 250058.[Sony] : Some concerns with S3-250058 r14, before ok to merge.[oppo] : Sony raise a new technical discussion and not align with 0048. So propose to NOT merge to 250058 and continue to discuss in this tread.[Sony] : Sony responds and seek further clarity.[Sony] : Provides r1.[oppo] : oppo provide respond.[Sony] : provide respond to oppo's answer.[Xiaomi] : provide clarification[Huawei] : provide clarification[oppo] : ask for clarification for sony[Ericsson]: it was supposed to be merged with 0058 but suddenly the thread resurrected. Objects the conclusion. Entity authentication cannot be achieved by message authentication. |
|    |    | S3‑250016 | Conclusion to key issue#5  | Lenovo  | pCR  | Approval  |   [vivo] : {provide wayforward}[Lenovo]: provide clarifications[Qualcomm]: asks clarifications and/or revisions before approval[Lenovo]: provides clarification and proposes that 0016 can be considered merged into 0058. |
|    |    | S3‑250074 | pCR to TR33.713 Conclusion#5  | CATT  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Deutsche Telekom] : {Question for clarification}[OPPO] : {suggest to close this threats and continue the discussion on merged baseline S3-250058}Discussion and drafting is to be continued on the baseline document S3-250058 thread.[CATT] : We are ok with the merger plan. Therefore, this thread has been closed and further discussion will be moved to the S3-250058 thread. |
|    |    | S3‑250111 | Conclusion for KI#5 in TR 33.713  | Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software  | pCR  | Approval  |   [OPPO] : {suggest to close this threats and continue the discussion on merged baseline S3-250058}Discussion and drafting is to be continued on the baseline document S3-250058 thread.[Philips] Closing S3-250111 thread as it is getting merged into S3-250058.[Xiaomi] Closing S3-250111 thread as it is getting merged into S3-250058. |
|    |    | S3‑250127 | KI#5 conclusions  | Philips International B.V.  | pCR  | Approval  |   [vivo] : {provide wayforward}[Philips] Closing S3-250127 thread as it is getting merged into S3-250058. |
|    |    | S3‑250139 | Conclusion for Key Issue#5 AIoT Authentication  | vivo  | pCR  | Approval  |   [OPPO]: propose to NOTE for this meeting.[vivo]: provide clarification.[Thales]: provides comments.[vivo]: provide reply.[OPPO]: provides comments and agree with Thales.[vivo]: propose to merge into 0058, and close E-mail thread. |
|    |    | S3‑250046 | conclusion on key issue#4  | Huawei, HiSilicon, OPPO, China Unicom  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Xiaomi]: provide clarification and fine with r2[Huawei]: fine with r2[Qualcomm]: proposes a change before approval[CC1]: 046r3E//: r4 is there, contains what is mandatory to support and what is optional to supportPhilips: same discussion as in the last discussion, Huawei: agree with Philips, bullet 1 is ok for Huawei, but main difference between r3 and r4QC: prefer r3Thales: prefer r4Huawei: remove first sentence of r4try to revise over email[CC1][Huawei]: provide r3 and update the merged contribution information[Ericsson]: Comments. Disagrees with r2 and r3. Provides r4.[Huawei]: provide r5 and remove the 'optional/mandatory' statement based on the discussion in the conference call.[Thales]: provides comments.[Sony]: Prefer r3 and provides comments.[Huawei]: provide r6[ZTE] : Support R6[Qualcomm]: supports r3, not fine with r4 and later versions[Ericsson]: Comments. Disagrees with r3, r5 and r6. Prefers r4.[Sony]: supports r3, disagree with r4 and later versions[ZTE] : Can live with R3[Lenovo]: fine with r3 as well[Philips] Generally OK with r3, but request clarification[vivo]: supports r3[CATT]: ok with r3, not ok with others.[Huawei]: provide clarifications and a way forward.[Nokia]: As a compromise Nokia can accept R3.[Philips] Fine with r3 and with proposed change to second bullet.[Qualcomm]: proposes to go with r3[Xiaomi]: fine with r3[Huawei] this email is to confirm whether additional change is required.[Ericsson]: requires changes on r3[Huawei] provides r7.[Qualcomm]: provides comments for r7[Huawei] provides clarification.[Philips] proposes rewording for clarity[Lenovo] agrees to Philips rewording proposal[Huawei] provides r8.[Xiaomi] r8 is fine[Huawei] provides way forwards.[Philips] Fine with the formulation proposed by Huawei[Huawei] provides r9.[CC3]: E//: r8 should be notedOppo: didn't see objection Sony: same viewE//: wanted to have mandatory support for integrity protectionHuawei: compromise on removing this bullet, only one company objecting, maybe endorse this to keep the progressE//: not agree therefore also can't endorseOrange: no need to go for working agreementChair: where was this decidedE//: was in the emailDCM: maybe cosigning companies can bring this merger again for the next meetingHuawei: that was the understanding with endorsingvivo: if E// has only one bullet as the problem, then we can follow HuaweiOrange: prefer to return with this contribution in three weeks for the next meetingE//: there is a major part of the comment still missingOppo: at least document what is the point objected to by E// and not reopen the discussion for the other partsOrange: not ok with forbidding discussionDCM: give a new number to R8, and bring it back to the next meetingNokia: maybe update the document now for only this one bullet[CC3] |
|    |    | S3‑250015 | Conclusion to key issue#4  | Lenovo  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Huawei]: Propose to merge the contribution into S3-250046 and use S3-250046 as baseline.[Lenovo]: agrees to merge the contribution into S3-250046 and use S3-250046 as baseline. |
|    |    | S3‑250032 | Conclusion for KI#4  | ZTE Corporation  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Huawei]: Propose to merge the contribution into S3-250046 and use S3-250046 as baseline.[ZTE] : OK to merge and discuss under S3-250046 |
|    |    | S3‑250073 | pCR to TR33.713 Conclusion#4  | CATT  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Huawei]: Propose to merge the contribution into S3-250046 and use S3-250046 as baseline.[CATT] : We are ok with the merger plan. Therefore, this thread has been closed and further discussion will be moved to the S3-250046 thread. |
|    |    | S3‑250110 | Conclusion for KI#4 in TR 33.713  | Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Huawei]: Propose to merge the contribution into S3-250046 and use S3-250046 as baseline.[Xiaomi]: Closing S3-250110 thread as it is getting merged into S3-250046. |
|    |    | S3‑250126 | KI#4 conclusions  | Philips International B.V.  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Sony] ask if this can be considered merged into S3-250046? |
|    |    | S3‑250138 | Conclusion for Key Issue#4 Information Protection  | vivo  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Qualcomm]: asks clarifications before approval[OPPO]: asks clarifications before approval[vivo]: provide clarification.[Qualcomm]: proposes to note in this meeting to focus on a high-level conclusion for inventory and command scenario |
|    |    | S3‑250041 | Conclusion on AIOT KI#3  | OPPO  | pCR  | Approval  |   [OPPO]: Provide revision 2.[OPPO]: Provide revision 3.[Philips] provides clarification and r4[Ericsson]: Requires modification before approval.[Philips] provides r5[OPPO]: Reply to Ericsson and seek clarification. Provides comments to R4 by Philips.[Qualcomm]: provides r6 (that contains proposed changes) before approval[Sony]: provides r7[Ericsson]: comments. Disagrees with making the mechanism optional. Provides revision 8.[Nokia]: provides r8[Nokia]: provides r9 ontop of R7[Sony]: Disagree with r8 and provides r10[Xiaomi]: disagree with r10[Lenovo]: agrees with r10, provides clarifications[Ericsson]: disagrees with r10.[Lenovo]: disagrees with Ericsson proposal[Ericsson]: Lenovo misunderstands Solution#29 and provides clarification to Lenovo.[Nokia]: Disagrees with R10.[OPPO]: Provide R11[Qualcomm]: provides further comments and asks a clarification/revision before approval[Interdigital]: supports R11 uploaded by OPPO.[OPPO]: Provide clarification.[Sony]: ok with r11.[ZTE] : Fine with R11[Philips] Asks for clarification before approval[OPPO] provide clarification[CATT]: We are ok with r11.[Nokia]: Not fine with R11 and provides R12.[Ericsson]: comments to r11 and r12. Neither is agreeable. r11 is better.[Ericsson]: corrects previous comments.[OPPO]: can live with R12 with NOTE1 removed[Qualcomm]: is fine with r12[ZTE] : prefer R11[Nokia]: Provides answers to OPPO and ZTE.[Sony]: Is ok with r11, Objects to r12.[Lenovo]: Is ok with r11[CATT]: ok with r11.[Qualcomm]: is not fine with r11[Sony]: Provides r13[Nokia]: is not fine with R11 nor R13.[Xiaomi]: provide a way forward and r14[Nokia]: Nokia is fine to accept R14[Sony]: Objects to r14[Lenovo]: Is ok with r14[Ericsson]:comments. Does not agree to any versions. Proposes to take r11 for further work[Huawei]: proposes a way forward[Sony]: We support Ericsson's way forward[OPPO]: provide clarification and R15[OPPO]: R15 is fine[ZTE] : Fine with R15[Qualcomm]: is fine with r15[Nokia]: Not fine with R15[Ericsson]: r15 is going in the right direction but does not agree with NOTE1.[Lenovo]: OK with R15[CATT]: ok with r15.[CC3]: Sony: objecting to r14chair: throw out everythingSony: did analysis, could live with r12Nokia: positions are mutually exclusive, so leave it for next timeHuawei: maybe also ok with r12E//: not ok with r12, r14 was the compromise, in r12 there is no guideline for any solutionOppo: r12 was ok as wellE//: there are not even principle base conclusionsDCM: treat similar to 046r12 gets new number, noted[CC3] |
|    |    | S3‑250011 | KI#3, Conclusions  | Sony  | pCR  | Approval  |   [OPPO]: Propose to merge the contribution into S3-250041.[Sony] : We are ok with the merger plan. Therefore, this thread is closed and further discussion will be moved to the S3-250041 thread. |
|    |    | S3‑250014 | Conclusion to key issue#3  | Lenovo  | pCR  | Approval  |   [OPPO]: Propose to merge the contribution into S3-250041.[Lenovo]: Agrees to merge the contribution into S3-250041. |
|    |    | S3‑250031 | Conclusion for KI#3  | ZTE Corporation  | pCR  | Approval  |   [OPPO]: Propose to merge the contribution into S3-250041.[ZTE] : OK to merge and discuss under S3-250041 |
|    |    | S3‑250072 | pCR to TR33.713 Conclusion#3  | CATT  | pCR  | Approval  |   [OPPO]: Propose to merge the contribution into S3-250041.[CATT] : We are ok with the merger plan. Therefore, this thread is closed and further discussion will be moved to the S3-250041 thread. |
|    |    | S3‑250125 | KI#3 conclusions  | Philips International B.V.  | pCR  | Approval  |   [OPPO]: Propose to merge the contribution into S3-250041.[Philips]: Agree to merge the contribution into S3-250041. |
|    |    | S3‑250075 | Conclusion for KI#2 in TR 33.713  | OPPO, Xiaomi  | pCR  | Approval  |   [OPPO]: provide revision 1[vivo]: r1 is OK.[Sony]: Suggests update to r1.[Nokia]: Nokia supports the proposal by Sony and provides R2 reflecting this change.[Xiaomi]: Supports R2.[Ericsson]: r2 is okay[ZTE] : Fine with R2[vivo]: R2 is OK.[OPPO]: r2 is OK. |
|    |    | S3‑250030 | Conclusion for KI#2  | ZTE Corporation  | pCR  | Approval  |   [OPPO]: Propose to merge S3-250030 into S3-250075[ZTE] : OK to merge and discuss under S3-250075 |
|    |    | S3‑250140 | Conclusion to KI#1  | OPPO  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Nokia] : Proposes to merge into S3-250013.[Ericsson]: Requires modification before approval.[OPPO]: Agree to merge the first change in 140 with 0013 and provides update to 0013 in R2. 140r1 is also updated to remove the proposed changes that were merged into 0013.[Nokia]: Fine with the changes provided in 140 R1.[Ericsson]: S3-250140 r1 is okay[Deutsche Telekom]: can't accept R1 - proposes new text for discussion[Deutsche Telekom]: provides -r2 with the proposed update. |
|    |    | S3‑250013 | Conclusion to key issue#1  | Lenovo  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Deutsche Telekom] : {Question for clarification}[Lenovo] : provides clarification[Deutsche Telekom] : Thanks for the clarification[ZTE] : propose to merge[Lenovo] : provides additional clarification[ZTE] : Ask for R1 before approval[Lenovo] : Asking ZTE to provide R1 with requested changes[ZTE] : Provide R1[Qualcomm]: prefers r1. Otherwise, proposes further changes in r2[Xiaomi]: provides comments and provides r3.[Philips] Asks for clarification before approval[Lenovo] fine with r3[Ericsson]: prefers r1. Disagrees with r2 and r3.[Sony] prefer r3[Philips] : Asks for further clarifications[Lenovo] : fine to consider enabling procedure as FFS[Xiaomi] : provide clarification, can live with r4 and prefer r1[Sony] : Provides r5[Philips] Fine with r5.[Lenovo] : fine with r5[Ericsson]: Agrees with the EN, provides r6[Sony]: r6 looks fine[Nokia] : Provides comments to R6 and provides R7 - Nokia is fine with R1, R3, R4 and R5.[OPPO]: Accepts R6[OPPO] : Either R6 or R7 is acceptable.[Ericsson]: prefers r6. Clarifies to Nokia.[Philips] provides r8[Huawei]: prefer r8.[ZTE] : accept R8[Xiaomi] : R8 is fine[Sony] : R8 is ok for us[Ericsson]: comments and provides r9[Sony] : R9 prefered by us[Nokia] : R8 is fine but cannot accept R9. Provides R10.[Lenovo]: asks clarifications on r10 and fine with r9[Nokia] : Answers to Lenovo[Lenovo]: is also fine with r10[Philips] proposes way forward[Nokia] Seems to be a feasible way forward we can accept - We need to review the revision before final acceptance.[Philips] provides r11[Philips] retracts r11 and propose that the pen holder takes care of implementing the proposed way forward in r12[Lenovo]: OK with r11[Sony]: r11 is ok[Xiaomi] r11 is fine[Lenovo] provides r12[Philips] fine with r12[Ericsson]: r12 is fine[Sony] fine with r12[Nokia] fine with r12[ZTE] : Fine with R12 |
|    |    | S3‑250029 | Conclusion for KI#1  | ZTE Corporation  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Nokia] : Proposes to merge into S3-250013.[Ericsson]: Requires modification before approval.[Ericsson]: correct previous comment and proposes to merge with 0013[ZTE] : OK to merge |
|    |    | S3‑250122 | KI#1 update: Addressing EN  | Philips International B.V.  | pCR  | Approval  |    |
|    |    | S3‑250026 | Update the KI#2 in TR 33.713  | ZTE Corporation  | pCR  | Approval  |   [ZTE] : OK to note |
|    |    | S3‑250042 | Update AIOT KI#3  | OPPO  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Qualcomm]: asks a clarification and revision before approval[OPPO]: provide clarification[Nokia]: Request clarification.[Ericsson]: requires clarification before approval.[OPPO]: provide R1 and clarification[Nokia]: Nokia accepts clarification and is fine with R1.[Qualcomm]: asks further revision before approval[OPPO]: provide R2[Qualcomm]: is fine with r2[Ericsson]: disagrees and proposes to note the document |
|    |    | S3‑250027 | Update the KI#3 in TR 33.713  | ZTE Corporation  | pCR  | Approval  |    |
|    |    | S3‑250123 | KI#3 update: Addressing ENs  | Philips International B.V.  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Qualcomm]: proposes a revision before approval.[Philips] provides clarification[Philips] requests feedback/approval[Qualcomm]: proposes to note as there is no consensus on KI#3 conclusion[Philips] proposes r1 reinstating the last EN.[Qualcomm]: is fine with r1 |
|    |    | S3‑250124 | KI#4 update: Addressing ENs  | Philips International B.V.  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Qualcomm]: proposes a revision before approval.[Philips]: provides clarification[Ericsson]: proposes to wait until the conclusion to KI#4 is made.[Philips] propose to approve, given that ENs are addressed in generic conclusions.[Philips] provides r1 reinstating EN related to whether information protection is mandatory[Qualcomm]: is fine with r1 |
|    |    | S3‑250134 | Update on Key Issue#6  | vivo  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Huawei]: asks revision before approval and proposes to remove the requirement.[Qualcomm]: asks a revision before approval.[Nokia]: Shares the view of Huawei and Qualcomm but proposes to Note.[vivo]: provide r1.[Nokia]: provide comments to R1[vivo]: provide R2 based on Nokia's comment.[Nokia]: Nokia is fine with R2.[Huawei]:fine with r2.[Qualcomm]: is fine with r2 |
|    |    | S3‑250024 | Resolving ENs in sol#6 in TR 33.713  | ZTE Corporation  | pCR  | Approval  |    |
|    |    | S3‑250025 | Evaluation for solution 6  | ZTE Corporation  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Thales]: proposes change[ZTE] : Provide R1[Thales]: is fine with r1. |
|    |    | S3‑250044 | addressing the editor's note in solution#4  | Huawei, HiSilicon  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Qualcomm]: proposes changes before approval[Nokia]: proposes changes before acceptable[Huawei]: provides r1 adding a clarification on the scope of the replay protection and clarifies that statement on limitations already exist in the evaluation.[Nokia]: provides answers to Huawei[Huawei]: asks for clarifications on the expected change[Nokia]: Provides r2 with changes making it acceptable to Nokia[Qualcomm]: Both R1 and R2 OK for Qualcomm[Huawei]: r2 is fine |
|    |    | S3‑250054 | Adding evaluation for solution#3  | Apple  | pCR  |    |   [OPPO]: Suggest changes.[Apple]: reply to OPPO.[OPPO]: Accept Apple's proposed change. |
|    |    | S3‑250055 | Update solution#8  | Apple  | pCR  |    |   [Thales]: proposes change[Qualcomm]: proposes changes before approval[Apple]: reply to Thales and QC.[CC3]: QC; ok with r1Thales: ok with r1[CC3] |
|    |    | S3‑250056 | Update solution#28  | Apple  | pCR  |    |   [OPPO]: Suggests revision.[Qualcomm]: proposes changes before approval[Apple]: reply to OPPO.[Apple]: reply to QC, request more clarification.[Qualcomm]: provides clarification[CC3]: QC; ok with r1Thales: ok with r1[CC3] |
|    |    | S3‑250057 | Update solution#31  | Apple  | pCR  |    |    |
|    |    | S3‑250059 | pCR to TR33.713 Update solution#9 to remove EN  | CATT  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Thales]: proposes change[CATT]: Thales' comment is addressed in r1.[Thales]: is fine with r1. |
|    |    | S3‑250067 | Proposal for a resolution to an EN concerning counter synchronisation  | Nokia  | pCR  | Approval  |    |
|    |    | S3‑250068 | Proposal for a resolution of an EN concerning alignment with RAN specifications  | Nokia  | pCR  | Approval  |    |
|    |    | S3‑250069 | Proposal for a resolution to an EN concerning device constrains  | Nokia  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Thales]: proposes change[Nokia]: Propose R1 and requests clarifications.[Qualcomm]: proposes a further change before approval[Thales]: answers to Nokia.[Nokia]: Provides answers to Thales and Qualcomm and request clarification.[Nokia]: Provides r2 and gently request Qualcomm to provide answers to previous provided questions.[Qualcomm]: is fine with r2 and provides a response |
|    |    | S3‑250070 | Proposal for a resolution to an EN concerning key identification  | Nokia  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Qualcomm]: Further justification before approval[Qualcomm]: Closing this thread as document number is wrong[CC3]: Nokia: to be approved |
|    |    | S3‑250076 | pCR to TR33.713 Update solution#30 to remove EN  | CATT  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Thales]: proposes to note the contribution. |
|    |    | S3‑250077 | Resolving ENs for AIoT Security Sol#37  | Xidian, OPPO  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Nokia]: Proposes changes before acceptable.[OPPO]: Provide R1.[Nokia]: Proposes changes to R1 before acceptable.[OPPO]: Provide R2 |
|    |    | S3‑250078 | Resolving ENs in Solution #42 of TR 33.713  | KPN N.V.  | pCR  |    |   [Interdigital]: Clarification and changes are needed to be approved.[KPN]: provides response to comments and revision r1 to address them.[Interdigital]: Clarification and changes are still needed to be approved.[KPN]: Provides r2 to address comments.[KPN]: Addresses comments.[Interdigital]: Provides an explanation and two alternatives for moving forward.[KPN]: Addresses comments and provides r3.[KPN]: Provides r4 to address editorial.[CC3]: 078r4 to be approved |
|    |    | S3‑250092 | Resolving EN in solution #22  | Samsung  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Nokia]: Proposes changes before acceptable.[Samsung]: provides clarification.[Nokia]: Provide answers to Samsung[OPPO]: provide comments[Samsung]: provides r1[Nokia]: Fine with R1. |
|    |    | S3‑250093 | Evaluation update for solution#22  | Samsung  | pCR  | Approval  |    |
|    |    | S3‑250094 | Resolving EN in solution #38  | Samsung  | pCR  | Approval  |    |
|    |    | S3‑250095 | Evaluation to solution #38  | Samsung  | pCR  | Approval  |    |
|    |    | S3‑250120 | Solution#1 update: Addressing ENs  | Philips International B.V.  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Philips] provides justification and r1.[Qualcomm] r1 OK |
|    |    | S3‑250121 | Solution#1 evaluation update  | Philips International B.V.  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Qualcomm]: Possibly needs changes before approval based on the discussion on S3-250120[Thales]: resubmits the comment with correct tdoc number.[Philips] requests clarification[Qualcomm] Request changes to align with update of S3-250120 before approval[Philips] provides r1[Qualcomm] r1 OK[Thales]: provides clarification.[Philips] provides clarification and asks for feedback.[Thales]: asks for EN.[Philips] provides r2 reinstating EN: 'Further evaluation is FFS'.[Qualcomm] r2 OK[Thales]: is fine with r2.[CC3}: Thales: should be r2 Philips: correct |
|    |    | S3‑250135 | Sol#10 update  | vivo  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Thales]: proposes change.[vivo]: provide r1.[Thales]: is fine with r1. |
|    |    | S3‑250136 | Sol#40 update  | vivo  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Thales]: proposes change.[vivo]: provide r1.[Thales]: is fine with r1. |
|    |    | S3‑250137 | Sol#41 update  | vivo  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Thales]: proposes change.[vivo]: provide r1. |
|    |    | S3‑250141 | Solution#3 update  | OPPO  | pCR  | Approval  |    |
|    |    | S3‑250142 | Solution#18 update  | OPPO  | pCR  | Approval  |    |
|    |    | S3‑250143 | Solution#19 update  | OPPO  | pCR  | Approval  |    |
|    |    | S3‑250010 | New KI: Reader Authorization for 5G Ambient IoT Services  | InterDigital, Inc.  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Qualcomm]: asks clarifications and revisions before approval[Nokia]: Support the view of Qualcomm and request further clarification.[Lenovo]: Supports Qualcomm and Nokia view.[Nokia]: Provides answers to interdigital.[Interdigital]: Replies to Nokia with additional clarification. This is just a repeat of unformatted messages.[Nokia]: Replies to Interdigital.[Interdigital]: Clarifies and answers Nokia's questions.[Nokia]: Provides answer to interdigital[Interdigital]: Clarifies and answers Nokia's question. Asks to focus on the KI rather that solutions.[Nokia]: Provides answers to Interdigital. |
|    |    | S3‑250080 | New key issue for secure storage in AIoT devices  | Ericsson, Thales  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Interdigital]: Requires clarifications.[Qualcomm]: asks clarifications before approval[vivo]: asks clarifications before approval[Thales]: provides answers.[Lenovo]: supports Interdigital opinion[Thales]: provides answer.[Ericsson]: Clarifies. Agrees with Thales[Interdigital]: Disagrees with Thales and Ericsson and provides detailed answers. |
|    |    | S3‑250081 | New Key Issue on Amplification of resource exhaustion by exploiting AIoT paging messages  | Ericsson  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Qualcomm]: asks clarifications and/or revision before approval[Huawei]: proposes a way forward to capture but close the issue in the TR[Lenovo]: asks clarifications, disagrees to the KI[Deutsche Telekom]: supports the proposed a way forward (of Huawei) or a modification of the requirement.[Ericsson]: provides revision 1.[Lenovo]: requires more clarification and proposal to change the EN.[Ericsson]: clarification to Lenovo, provides r2.[Lenovo]: fine with r2.[CC3]: Huawei: r2 not yet confirmed to be approvedE//: implements Huawei's way forwardHuawei: should be closed, not adding an ENE//: can be done for the next meetingHuawei: disagree with r2Oppo: please provide the details why this was not agreed over emailnew number, noted[CC3] |
|    |    | S3‑250082 | New key issue for Authenticated and authorized access to devices in Ambient IoT via 3GPP core  | Ericsson  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Qualcomm]: asks clarifications and revisions before approval[vivo]: asks clarifications before approval[Lenovo]: asks clarifications |
|    |    | S3‑250144 | Authorization of external AF for Inventory  | NTT DOCOMO INC.  | pCR  | Approval  | [Qualcomm]: proposes a revision before approval[vivo]: proposes revision before approval[NTT DOCOMO]: provides -r1[Qualcomm]: is fine with the provided clarification and also fine with r1[vivo]: r1 is OK |
|    |    | S3‑250145 | KI on attacking via external carrier wave  | NTT DOCOMO INC.  | pCR  |    | Chair: Noted, since the contribution is not aligned with agenda |
|    |    | S3‑250158 | Comments on S3-250145, “KI on attacking via external carrier wave”  | InterDigital, Inc.  | pCR  | Approval  | Chair: Noted, since the contribution is not aligned with agenda |
|    |    | S3‑250060 | pCR to TR33.713 New solution AIoT command message security protection procedure  | CATT  | pCR  | Approval  | Chair: Noted, since the contribution is not aligned with agenda |
|    |    | S3‑250079 | New Solution to KI#5  | Ericsson  | pCR  | Approval  |  Chair: Included in the agenda[Qualcomm]: asks clarifications and/or revision before approval[Thales]: proposes change.[Ericsson]: addresses the comments from Thales and Qualcomm. Provides r1[Thales]: is fine with r1.[Interdigital]: The PCR needs clarification and changes before approval.[Qualcomm]: asks further clarification/revision before approval[Ericsson]: clarifies, provides revision 2.[Interdigital]: The PCR needs final changes before approval.[Ericsson]: provides revision 3 as suggested by Interdigital.[Qualcomm]: is fine with r2[Lenovo]: requests Editors Note to make it agreeable.[Ericsson]: provides revision 4 by adding editor's note suggested by Lenovo.[Qualcomm]: is fine with r4[Lenovo]: fine with r4. |
|    |    | S3‑250085 | Pseudo-CR on New solution on AIoT privacy  | China mobile  | pCR  |    |  Chair: Noted, since the contribution is not aligned with agenda |
| 5.16  | Study on 5GS enhancements for Energy Saving  | S3‑250049 | Conclusion for KI#1  | Huawei, HiSilicon  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Nokia]: Propose to merge the contribution into S3-250062.[Huawei]: We are ok to merge S3-250049 into S3-250062, though we have comments on S3-250062 and will provide the respective comments in S3-250062 email thread.[Nokia]: Close discussion in this thread and continues in S3-250062. |
|    |    | S3‑250062 | Proposal for a conclusion to KI#1  | Nokia, Deutsche Telekom, BMWK, IIT Bombay  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Ericsson]: S3-250062 requires revision before approval.[Nokia]: Request clarification to comment provided by Ericsson and provide alternative way forward.[Deutsche Telekom]: Comments/update on the alternative way forward[Nokia]: Propose R1 including merge information and the NOTE proposed by Deutsche Telekom.[Ericsson]: r1 requires revision[Nokia]: Provides clarifications[Ericsson]: Provides clarifications[CC1]: 062r1Bo presentsE//: state the EIF is enforcement point, how it is done is not decided yet, inform SA2, as well as CT groups, but need to capture this sentence in SA3, options new spec, new annex to 33.501, or in annex V, not update annex V.Nokia: prefer not to have new specs or new Annexes, so prefer a section in Annex V with a table.chair: document in SA2Nokia: prefer update to annex VHuawei: not in scope of study to update annex V, prefer not to do thischair: what preferredHuawei: prefer separate AnnexNokia: why not considered in scope to add something to the Annex?Huawei: need separate discussion how handling of Annex V looks like.Nokia: need normative text in stage 2E//: Annex V should not be feature level. Could be added to SA2 spec.Nokia: similar to Annex X.7, E//: could also discuss a new placeholder DCM: maybe send LS and take the decision on how to document it in the nesxt meeting.[CC1][Nokia]: Provides R2[Ericsson]: r2 looks an acceptable way forward for this meeting[Nokia]: Gently request confirmation for the compromise from Huawei.[Huawei]: Revision to 250062r2.[Nokia]: provides changes to the proposal before new revision is provided.[Nokia]: provides R3 with the proposed changes and a refined version of the EN.[Ericsson]: r3 needs revision[Huawei]: Response to R3[Ericsson]: r3 needs revision (clarification on the previous comment)[Nokia]: Provides R4 - reverting to the original EN from Huawei.[Huawei]: Request rapporteur to provide final agreed version of R4[Ericsson]: r4 is ok[Huawei]: R4 version |
|    |    | S3‑250128 | Conclusion for KI#1  | Ericsson  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Nokia]: Propose to merge the contribution into S3-250062.[Ericsson]: Ok to merge the document into S3-250062, but S3-250062 requires revision.[Nokia]: Close discussion in this thread and continues in S3-250062. |
|    |    | S3‑250050 | conclusion to KI#2  | Huawei, HiSilicon  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Nokia]: Propose to merge the contribution into S3-250063.[Ericsson]: Propose to merge the contribution into S3-250063 and provides comment on S3-250050.[Huawei]: Acknowledge the Propose merger of S3-250050 into S3-250063 with comments.[Nokia]: Close discussion in this thread and continues in S3-250063. |
|    |    | S3‑250063 | Proposal for a conclusion to KI#2  | Nokia, Deutsche Telekom, IIT Bombay  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Nokia]: Propose r1, The merger of S3-250063 and S3-250129. Including Ericsson as source.[Deutsche Telekom]: fine with r1[Nokia]: Propose r2, The merger of S3-250063 and S3-250050. Including Huawei and HiSilicon as sources. Request further clarification based on comment provided.[Ericsson]: r2 is fine[Huawei]: Respond to S3-250063r2[CC1]: 063r2Nokia: what are the different levels of granularity?Huawei: mostly use existing authentication part, SA2 has defined multiple level of information gathering, single shot authorization won't help, need finer grained control on type of information being requested, QoS, UE, PDU level, Nokia: similar challenges in NWDAF and exposure, E//: NEF authorization issuer and verifier of token is the same, so no interop issue, so it is not needed to specify, support r2Huawei: single shot authorization can not necessarily handle everything, disagree with last sentence, try on email to fix thisNokia: HW could point out what exactly needs to be changed in the specs[CC1][IIT Bombay]: fine with S3-250063-r2[Huawei]: S3-250063r3 uploaded[Deutsche Telekom]: kindly asks some more details for the need of normative work.[Huawei]: responding to the comments for S3-250063r3[Deutsche Telekom]: thanks the details and is fine with r3[Nokia]: Provides r4 as a way forward.[Huawei]: Responds to R4.[Ericsson]: r3 is not ok. r4 is acceptable[Nokia]: Gently request confirmation for the compromise from Huawei.[Huawei]: Minor revisions to R4.[Ericsson]: EN update proposal from Huawei is not ok[Huawei]: EN revision[Nokia]: R6 In the draft folder including the new proposed EN by Huawei[Huawei]: Response to R6[Nokia]: As Ericsson for status on R6[Ericsson]: r6 requires revision |
|    |    | S3‑250129 | Conclusion for KI#2  | Ericsson  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Nokia]: Propose to merge the contribution into S3-250063.[Ericsson]: Ok to merge the contribution into S3-250063.[Nokia]: Close discussion in this thread and continues in S3-250063. |
|    |    | S3‑250048 | Resolve various EN's for KI#1  | Huawei, HiSilicon  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Nokia]: Propose to merge the contribution into S3-250064.[Nokia]: Close discussion in this thread and continues in S3-250048.[Nokia]: Correction, discussion continues in S3-250064. |
|    |    | S3‑250064 | TR cleanup  | Nokia  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Nokia]: Provides R1 containing the merger.[CC1]: 064r1, no comments |
|    |    | S3‑250065 | Presentation of Report to TSG: TR 33.766, Version 1.0.0  | Nokia  | TS or TR cover  | Information  |  [CC1]: plan is to conclude the TR in the next meeting, please check the cover sheet and let know any comments. |
| 5.18  | Study on security aspects of 5G Mobile Metaverse services  | S3‑250146 | Evaluation for Sol2 Authorization supporting spatial localization service with CCF  | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell  | pCR  | Approval  |    |
|    |    | S3‑250147 | Update Sol3 Authorization supporting spatial localization service with CCF  | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Ericsson]: Requests for clarifications before approval.[Nokia]: Provide r1.[Ericsson]: is fine with r1 |
|    |    | S3‑250148 | Update Sol5 Privacy protection during metaverse service discovery  | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Ericsson]: Changes are needed before aproval.[Huawei, HiSilicon]: Revision is needed before aproval.[Xiaomi]: provide comments[Nokia]: provide r1[Ericsson]: comments that the TS 33.501, Annex V does not apply to external exposure such as the SEAL and mobile metaverse[Ericsson]: Resending this comments in order not to fork the e-mail threads. Ericsson has comments that the TS 33.501, Annex V does not apply to external exposure such as the SEAL and mobile metaverse[Xiaomi]: fine with r1[Ericsson]: is fine with r1[Ericsson]: provides editorial comments before submission to the portal if this revision is approved[Huawei, HiSilicon]: is fine with r1. |
|    |    | S3‑250113 | 33.721: Update to Conclusion on Key Issue #2  | Xiaomi EV Technology  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Nokia]: We don't agree to remove the change.[Xiaomi]: provide clarification/response to the comments[Ericsson]: supports the position that the existing user consent framework cannot be used for external exposure[Nokia]: We still don't agree the removing.[Xiaomi]: provide r1[CC2]: 113r1, Wei presentsE//: change should keep the EN[CC2][Nokia]: Fine with r1. |
|    |    | S3‑250051 | Update on Solution #6-Digital asset request validation  | Huawei, HiSilicon  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Ericsson]: Proposes changes before approval[Nokia]: Provide comments[Xiaomi]: provide comments and ask questions for clarification[Huawei, HiSilicon]: replies to the comments and provide r1.[Xiaomi]: provide more comments on r1[Samsung]: Provides clarification[Huawei, HiSilicon]: replies to Xiaomi.[Xiaomi]: provide response to the clarification[Xiaomi]: provide response to the further clarification, propose to postpone the proposal |
|    |    | S3‑250088 | [TR 33.721] Update to solution#6  | Samsung  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Ericsson]: Maybe merge with 0051 to make it easier to follow the changes?[Huawei, HiSilicon]: Replies to Ericsson.[Nokia]: Question for clarification.[Samsung]: Provides clarification. Prefers not to merge into 0051 to avoid confusion.[Xiaomi]: provide comments and ask questions for clarification[Xiaomi]: provide response to response[Samsung]: Provides response[Samsung]: Provides r1 to address Xiaomi's concern.[Xiaomi]: fine with r1 |
|    |    | S3‑250150 | Update Sol8 authenticate and authorize DA client to create a digital asset  | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Ericsson]: Requests for clarifications about the removal of the GPSI as an example[Xiaomi]: ask questions for clarification[Nokia]: Provide r1[Xiaomi]: fine with r1 |
|    |    | S3‑250151 | Update Sol9 authenticate and authorize DA client to access a digital asset  | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Ericsson]: Requests clarifications before approval.[Xiaomi]: provide comments and ask questions for clarification[Xiaomi]: provide r1[Xiaomi]: fine with r1[Ericsson]: is fine with r1 |
|    |    | S3‑250034 | Conclusion for KI#3  | ZTE Corporation  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Ericsson]: Proposes this as a baseline but no strong preference.[ZTE]: OK to merge and use this document as baseline.[Huawei, HiSiliocn]: Fine to merge 0052 into this but with no strong preference for the baseline. Propose some update to the text.[Samsung]: S3-250034 is considered as baseline for conclusion of KI#3.[ZTE]: initial merger document r1 has been uploaded[Xiaomi]: provide comments and ask question for clarification[Nokia]: Propose r2[Nokia]: Add Xiaomi's comments[Xiaomi]: provide r3[CC2]: 034r3 Leyi presentsNokia: there are two solution on reusing CAPIF, discussion is ongoing, just minor comments need to be addressed, so the last bullet point can be brought backHuawei: mention of the interfaces should add references to spec defining them, bring back the deleted paragraphsXiaomi: not ok to bring back the CAPIF based bullet points as the solutions are still under discussionNokia: the open issues are for KI1, not for KI3[CC2][ZTE]: provide r4[Xiaomi]: provide r5 {https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg\_sa/WG3\_Security/TSGS3\_119AdHoc-e/Inbox/Drafts/draft\_S3-250034-r5%20Conclusion%20for%20KI%233.docx}[Xiaomi]: provide r6[Huawei, HiSilicon]: can live with r5.[Xiaomi]: not fine with r6 and provide comments[Nokia]: provide answer[Nokia]: provide r7[Xiaomi]: not fine with r7 and provide response[Samsung]: Provides way forward[Samsung]: Provides r8[Xiaomi]: provide r9[CC3]: 034r9Samsung: would r5 or r8 be acceptable? There was also r10, which was not acceptableNokia: can live with r9Huawei: r8 was last before the deadline. R9 includes EN on user auth?Samsung: no, only reformulation of ENHuawei: ok with r9[CC3] |
|    |    | S3‑250052 | Conclusion to KI#3 in TR 33.721  | Huawei, HiSilicon  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Ericsson]: Proposes to merge this document with other relevant documents, e.g. 0034 but no strong preference for the baseline. Comments on the document.[Huawei, HiSiliocn]: Fine to merge with other relevant tdocs with no strong preference for the baseline. Replies to Ericsson.[Samsung] : Proposes to merge this into S3-250034. Move the discussion under 0034. This thread is closed |
|    |    | S3‑250152 | Conclusion for KI3 Security aspects of digital asset container in 5G  | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Samsung] : Proposes to merge S3-250034 and S3-250052 into S3-250152 and use S3-250152 as baseline for conclusion for key issue#3.[Ericsson] provides comments, proposes another baseline (0034) but no strong preference.[Samsung] : Proposes to merge this into S3-250034. Move the discussion under 0034. This thread is closed. |
|    |    | S3‑250112 | 33.721: Evaluation of Solution 10  | Xiaomi EV Technology  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Nokia]: provide comments[Xiaomi]: provide responses to the comments[Xiaomi]: provide r1.[Nokia]: Fine with r1.[Ericsson] requests for clarifications about the term 'user' in the text[Ericsson]: requests for clarifications[Ericsson]: clarifies more[Xiaomi]: provide r2 {https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg\_sa/WG3\_Security/TSGS3\_119AdHoc-e/Inbox/Drafts/draft\_S3-250112-r2\_33.721\_Evaluation%20for%20Solution%2010.doc}[Ericsson]: is fine with r2. |
|    |    | S3‑250149 | Update Sol7 authorize avatar by metaverse service provider  | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Ericsson]: Requests for clarification for an issue similar to 0150[Nokia]: Provide clarification.[Ericsson]: Ericsson is fine with the document. |
|    |    | S3‑250114 | 33.721: Conclusion on Key Issue #4  | Xiaomi EV Technology  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Samsung] : Proposes to merge S3-250153 into S3-250114 and use S3-250114 as baseline for conclusion for key issue#4.[Ericsson] provides comments, proposes another baseline (0034) but no strong preference.[Ericsson] Withdraws the previous proposal for merging this document with 0034. This comment was meant for another documents.[Xiaomi]: provide merged version in r1[Nokia]: provide r2 for the merged version.[Ericsson] Changes are needed before approval.[Xiaomi]: provide response and r3[Nokia]: Fine with r3.[CC2]: 114r3, Wei presentsE//: use of terms user and user ID, be clear if it is about VAL user IDNokia: in latest spec by SA6 they also say user ID, Xiaomi: alignment with SA6 specification, maybe if mobile service is one type of VAL service, then user ID is VAL user ID[CC2][Xiaomi]: provide r4 |
|    |    | S3‑250153 | Conclusion for KI4 Authentication and authorization of digital representation  | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell  | pCR  | Approval  |    |
| 5.19  | Study on security aspects of CAPIF Phase 3  | S3‑250017 | KI#1.1-Further conclusions on ROF authentication  | Huawei, HiSilicon  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Huawei]: r1 is provided to merge S3-250017, S3-250102, S3-250116, and S3-250160.[Xiaomi]: provides r2[Ericsson]: provides comment, r1 is ok, r2 requires revision before approval[Lenovo]: Asks clarifications and revisions.Provides reference for ROF definitions from TS 23.222.[CC2]: 017r2Zander presentsE//: problem with definition of ROF. Lenovo: there is different understanding of ROF, Lenovo understanding is that ROF is part of UE, prefer to have an ENHuawei: agree with reference 23.222, but people can have different opinion, also ok with keeping second EN.Nokia: reformulate that how ROF is authenticated at CCF is FFS.Xiaomi: just adjust last sentenceChair: provide text for the EN.[CC2][Nokia]: provides EN[Huawei]: provides comments to Nokia's EN.[Nokia]: provides -r4[Huawei]: provides r5[Xiaomi]: provides r6[Lenovo]: r1, r5, r6 is okay.r2, r3, r4 is not clear/not okay.[CC3]: 017r6Huawei: waiting for confirmation, no objections, approved[CC3] |
|    |    | S3‑250102 | Further conclusion for key issue #1.1  | Ericsson  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Ericsson]: S3-250102 is merged into S3-250017. |
|    |    | S3‑250116 | TR 33.700-22KI#1.1 conclusion update  | Xiaomi communications  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Xiaomi]: merged into S3-250017. |
|    |    | S3‑250160 | KI1.1 ROF authentication conclusion  | Nokia  | pCR  |    |   [Nokia]: merged into S3-250017. |
|    |    | S3‑250018 | KI#1.2-Further conclusions on authorization information  | Huawei, HiSilicon  | pCR  | Approval  |    |
|    |    | S3‑250035 | Update to the conclusion for KI#1.2  | ZTE Corporation  | pCR  | Approval  |    |
|    |    | S3‑250053 | Conclusion on key issue #1.2 in TR 33.700-22  | China Telecom  | pCR  | Approval  |    |
|    |    | S3‑250103 | Further conclusion for key issue #1.2  | Ericsson  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Ericsson]: initial merger document r1 has been uploaded[Xiaomi]: provides r2.[Ericsson]: provides r3 and clarification.[Huawei]: revisions are required, either r1 or r2.Detailed comments are provided in the email thread.[Lenovo]: Needs clarification and revision before approval.[Ericsson]: provides clarification and r4[Nokia]: Agree with Lenovo. Request further updates.[Lenovo]: r4 is okay.[CC2]: 103r4, Ferhat presentsLenovo: why is EN only for later case, E//: can be moved to KI#3Xiaomi: note can be removed as this is not related to this KIChair: Ferhat to make the changeNokia: the note is important her to link to KI1.1Huawei: prefer to keep the note[CC2][Ericsson]: r5 addressing Huawei's comments is provided. r5 condionallty ok to Ericsson if the approved conclusion for KI#3 includes the removed EN about new authorization flow.[Chinatelecom]: Provide r6.[Ericsson]: prefers r5[Huawei]: further revisions to r5 and r6 are needed.Detained comments are provided in the email.[Xiaomi]: Provide r7[Ericsson]: provides r8[Xiaomi]: provides comment.[Ericsson]: provides reply to Xiaomi's question[Xiaomi]: is fine with r8[Huawei]: provides comments[Lenovo]: r8 is okay.[Huawei]: can live with r8 for now.[CC3]: Nokia: is this the latest version?E//: EN on resource owner is in r8Nokia: then it is ok[CC3] |
|    |    | S3‑250101 | Conclusion reformulation for key issue #1.2  | Ericsson  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Ericsson]: S3- 250101 is merged into S3- 250103. |
|    |    | S3‑250117 | TR 33.700-22KI#1.2 conclusion update  | Xiaomi communications  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Xiaomi]: merged into S3-250103. |
|    |    | S3‑250019 | KI#1.3-Further conclusions on granularity  | Huawei, HiSilicon  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Xiaomi ]: Provides comments.[Xiaomi ]: The comments to S3-250019 via this thread are revoked. |
|    |    | S3‑250118 | TR 33.700-22KI#1.3 conclusion update  | Xiaomi communications  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Xiaomi]: merged into S3-250164. |
|    |    | S3‑250164 | KI1.3 conclusion  | Nokia  | pCR  |    |   [Nokia]: baseline for merger of S3-250019, S3-250118, S3-250164[Nokia]: -r1 uploaded[Xiaomi] provides r2.[Xiaomi] provides comment.[Huawei] provides comments to r1 and r2.[Ericsson]: provides comments to r1 and r2, new revision is needed[Lenovo]: Needs clarifications and revisions.[Nokia]: provides responses.[Lenovo]: Provides response and asks revision.[CC2]: 164r2Lenovo: location is called resource level, so data type level is confusing, data type level will be removedE//: can try to provide the revisionHuawei: agree with E//Xiaomi: agree to give definition of feature level and service levelHuawei: service operation level is already defined in 23.222.Xiaomi: need to have a new definitionNokia: ok, will check the revision[CC2][Nokia]: fine to move forward like proposed.[Nokia]: -r4 provided. please check 23.222 clause 8.31. and 8.11 for examples of finer level (granularity)[Ericsson]: proposes a way forward[Huawei]: proposes changes and detailed comments.[Ericsson]: proposes changes and detailed comments.[Xiaomi]: supports r4 and provides comments[Ericsson]: r4 is not ok, provides a way forward[Lenovo]: r4 needs revision. Provides clarifications.[CC3]: 0164r4Xiaomi: how about r5Huawei: also not okNokia: not new text but from SA6Huawei: had some consistency issuesDCM: new numberOppo: provide the comments in emailHuawei: already there in previous email, were not addressednew number, noted[CC3] |
|    |    | S3‑250036 | Update to the conclusion for KI#2  | ZTE Corporation  | pCR  | Approval  |    |
|    |    | S3‑250039 | Conclusion for KI#2  | China Telecom  | pCR  | Approval  |    |
|    |    | S3‑250087 | Updates to conclusion for key issue#2  | Samsung  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Samsung] : Based on offline call S3-250087 is taken as baseline for conclusion of KI#2. draft\_S3-250087-r1 is available n draft folder for review.[Xiaomi] : provides r2.[Chinatelecom] : provides r3.[ZTE ]: Provide r4.[Lenovo] : Provides r5 to correct clarifications and to align with existing SA6 and SA3 specifications.Asks clarifications with suitable updates for the term learns used in TLS-PSK/PKI conclusions.[Ericsson] : Revisions r1, r2, r3, r4, r5 are not ok. A new revision is needed.[Samsung] : Samsung is fine with r5. Responds to Ericsson.[Ericsson] : provides clarification and r6.[Chinatelecom] : Agree with Samsung and respond to Ericsson. Request further updates.[Xiaomi] : provides some comments.[Chinatelecom] : Request further updates.[Chinatelecom] : Another comments for r6 and request further updates.[CC2]: 087r6, Rohini presentsE//: in r6, the common points are captured, the rest can be discussed in normative phase or continue study phaseXiaomi: need to reformulate the negotiation partNokia: all deleted text in 7.2.2 should become EN. so be more specific, Lenovo: can we take -r5 and add EN on method negotiation, delete the designated termE//: not ok with negotation steps, prefer to use existing mechanism, Samsung: prefer to continue the discussionE//: no need to keep removed text, no extra value.Nokia: maybe enhance the proposed sentence to say this will be treated during normative phaseLenovo: it is clear what we need to work on, precise gap identification in the text[CC2][Lenovo] : r7 is provided for the wayforward.[Samsung] :Provides r8[Nokia]: Provides r9[Ericsson] : r9 needs revision[Xiaomi] : provides r10[Ericsson] : r10 is not ok. Revision on r9 with the proposed change would be ok.[Ericsson] : r10 is not ok. Revision on r9 with the proposed change highlighted in yellow below would be ok.[Chinatelecom] : r9 needs revision[Ericsson] : provides response to Chinatelecom[Samsung] : provides r11[Chinatelecom] : provides r12.[Ericsson] : r12 provides revision before approval[Samsung] : Provides r13 including Ericsson's suggestion[Xiaomi] : Provides r14[Chinatelecom] : Provides r15[Ericsson] : provides reply to the comment from Xiaomi[Samsung] : Samsung can live with both r13 and r14. Provides clarification[Ericsson] : r13 is ok. A new revision is needed on r14 and r15.[Ericsson] : provides response and a way forward[Chinatelecom] : provides some comments[Xiaomi] : provides comments.[Samsung] : Provides r16[Ericsson] : r16 is ok for the sake of progress[Xiaomi] : is fine with r16[Chinatelecom] : is fine with r16[Lenovo] : r16 is okay.[Lenovo] : Lenovo would like to cosign. |
|    |    | S3‑250105 | Further conclusion for key issue #2  | Ericsson  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Ericsson]: S3-250105 is merged into S3-250087. |
|    |    | S3‑250119 | TR 33.700-22KI#2 conclusion update  | Xiaomi communications  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Xiaomi]: merged into S3-250087. |
|    |    | S3‑250165 | KI2 interconnect conclusion  | Nokia  | pCR  |    |   [Nokia]: merged into S3-250087. |
|    |    | S3‑250106 | Conclusion for key issue #3  | Ericsson  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Ericsson]: initial merger document r1 has been uploaded[Xiaomi]: provides comments.[Ericsson]: provides clarification[Lenovo]: The document needs revision before approval.[Ericsson]: provides clarification and r2[CC2]: 106r2, Ferhat presentsLenovo: don't understand the part of via backend server?E//: common approach to go via backend server, as a second solutionLenovo: should narrow down the conclusion to address only the issue at handHuawei: also concern with the backend server, unclear whether this is defined in RFC or SA6, EN is ok, could also add same EN in KI#1Nokia: too early, the details here are to much, not on same level as other KI conclusionsXiaomi: same view as NokiaE//: can make it more compact, keep third bullet as main point and keep EN in this KI, as it will be removed in other KI[CC2][Lenovo]: Provides clarification, r2 needs update.[Nokia]: provides -r3.[Ericsson]: provides -r4[Xiaomi]: provides -r5[Ericsson]: r5 is ok[Lenovo]: r5 is okay[Nokia]: r5 is okay[Huawei]: r5 is fine |
|    |    | S3‑250166 | KI3 conclusion  | Nokia  | pCR  |    |   [Nokia]: merged into S3-250106. |
|    |    | S3‑250107 | Conclusion for key issue #4  | Ericsson  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Ericsson]: S3-250107 is merged into S3-250167. |
|    |    | S3‑250167 | KI4 Nested API invocation conclusion  | Nokia  | pCR  |    |   [Nokia]: S3-250167 will be the baseline document for merging S3-250107 and S3-250167.[Nokia]: S3-250167-r1 uploaded.[Xiaomi]: provides comments[Ericsson]: requires revision before approval[Lenovo]: requires clarification before approval.[CC2]: 167r1, Anja presentsLenovo: is there any impact to API invokerNokia: will provide response via email[CC2][Lenovo]: Asks revision.[Nokia]: requires more time for study. Note in this meeting. |
|    |    | S3‑250108 | Conclusion for key issue #5  | Ericsson  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Ericsson]: S3-250108 is merged into S3-250168. |
|    |    | S3‑250168 | KI5 muliple API infovoker same RO conclusion  | Nokia  | pCR  |    |   [Nokia]: S3-250168 will be the baseline document for merging S3-250108 and S3-250168.[Nokia]: -r1 uploaded. Contradicting conclusion needs to be addressed.[Xiaomi]: provide comments.[Ericsson]: r1 requires revision before approval[Lenovo]: Asks clarifications and revision.[Nokia]: provides clarification and asks for noting. |
|    |    | S3‑250109 | Conclusion for key issue #6  | Ericsson  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Lenovo] : Document needs update before approval.Provides constructive way forward.[Xiaomi ]: Provides comments.[Ericsson] : provides clarification[Nokia]: asks for noting. |
|    |    | S3‑250020 | remove EN for KI#1.1  | Huawei, HiSilicon  | pCR  | Approval  |    |
|    |    | S3‑250021 | remove EN for KI#1.2  | Huawei, HiSilicon  | pCR  | Approval  |    |
|    |    | S3‑250097 | Resolving EN in key issue #1.2  | Ericsson  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Ericsson]: initial merger document r1 has been uploaded[Xiaomi]: provides comments[Huawei]: provides comments[Lenovo]: The document requires revision before approval.[Xiaomi]: provides some comments.[Ericsson]: provides clarification and r2[Xiaomi]: propose to note.[Ericsson]: ok to note the KI#1.2 update documents (S3-250097 and S3-250021)[Lenovo]: r2 is okay |
|    |    | S3‑250022 | remove EN in clause 6.4  | Huawei, HiSilicon  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Nokia]: Refine the EN or update inline.[CC3]: 022r2Huawei: only Ericsson commented, but later said it's ok[CC3] |
|    |    | S3‑250023 | editorial corrections in clauses 6.2 and 6.10  | Huawei, HiSilicon  | pCR  | Approval  |    |
|    |    | S3‑250037 | Updates to Solution#21  | Lenovo  | pCR  | Approval  |    |
|    |    | S3‑250040 | Update sol#17 to resolve EN  | China Telecom  | pCR  | Approval  |    |
|    |    | S3‑250086 | Update to solution#27  | Samsung  | pCR  | Approval  |  [CC3]: E//: r1 to be approved |
|    |    | S3‑250098 | Resolving ENs and evaluation of solution #11  | Ericsson  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Lenovo]: Ask clarifications.The document needs revision before approval.[Ericsson]: provides clarification and r1[Lenovo]: r1 needs revision.Example revision provided.[Ericsson]: r2 is provided[Lenovo]: r2 is okay |
|    |    | S3‑250099 | Resolving ENs and evaluation of solution #22  | Ericsson  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Lenovo]: Ask clarifications.The document needs revision before approval.[Ericsson]: provides clarification and r1[Lenovo]: Ask r2 to update the evaluation text.[Ericsson]: provides r2[Lenovo]: r2 is okay |
|    |    | S3‑250100 | Resolving ENs and evaluation of solution #26  | Ericsson  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Lenovo] : Needs clarifications before approval.[Ericsson] : provides clarification[Nokia] : request EN[Ericsson] : provides explanation[Lenovo] : Asks r1. Provides clarifications.[Ericsson] : provides r1[Lenovo]: r1 is okay[CC3]: E//: Nokia and Lenovo are ok with r4 |
|    |    | S3‑250161 | KI1.1 ROF authentication  | Nokia  | pCR  |    |    |
|    |    | S3‑250038 | Solution to address KI#6  | Lenovo  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Xiaomi]: provides comments.[CC3]: Lenovo: Xiaomi asked question, then object after the objection deadlineXiaomi: had several rounds of offline discussion, GPSI not needed in onboarding, so this new solution is not requiredLenovo: late objection and later offline E//: for the study phase it should be ok,r2 approved[CC3] |
|    |    | S3‑250162 | KI1.1 Solution 3 update  | Nokia  | pCR  |    |    |
|    |    | S3‑250163 | KI1.2 EN resolution in solution 7  | Nokia  | pCR  |    |   [CC3]: E//: provided revision, but was not addressedNokia: will implementE//: just add EN further evalution to be doneNokia: already thereHuawei: was that in original version?Nokia: yesApproved[CC3]  |
|    |    | S3‑250169 | TR correction  | Nokia  | pCR  |    |  [CC3]: Nokia: can be merged into 023 |
|    |    | S3‑250008 | Reply LS on terminology alignment between SA6 and SA3  | S6-245644  | LS in  |    |   [Huawei]: proposes to note it, no action for SA3. |
|    |    | S3‑250115 | Draft CR on TS 33.122  | Xiaomi communications  | draftCR  | Approval  |   [CC2]: 115-r1, Henry presentsdraft CRNokia: to use this as draft living CR, then bring pCRs to this, so this is okHuawei: not part of the agenda, so leave this outE//: prefer to work with Crs rather than living CR[CC2] |
|    |    | S3‑250096 | New solution for Authorization of API invoker on one UE accessing resources related to another UE  | Ericsson  | pCR  | Approval  |   [Xiaomi]: provides comments.[Lenovo] : Needs clarifications before approval.Additionally asks if new Solution to KI#1 and 3 is on agenda?[Ericsson] : Provides clarification and r1[Nokia] : request EN[Ericsson] : provides response to Nokia and Xiaomi[Xiaomi] : propose to note.[Lenovo] : Asks r2. Provided clarifications.Asks Xiaomi to give way forward with a suitable EN. As TR is a place where we are expected to study the different possible solutions, proposing ENs can help further discussions and clarifications without compromising the work progress.[Ericsson] : provides r2.Asks Xiaomi to give way forward with a suitable EN. The solutions trying to address key issues in the TR should not be prevented.Asks Nokia to clarify the EN request.[Ericsson] : provides r3 excluding onboardingAsks Nokia to clarify the EN request.[Lenovo]: r3 is okay[Xiaomi] : is fine with r3[CC3]: 096r3E//: need approval from XiaomiXiaomi: r3 okLenovo: r2 and r3 are okr3 approved[CC3] |
|    |    | S3‑250104 | Further conclusion for key issue #1.3  | Ericsson  | pCR  | Approval  |    |