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# Introduction

**CB: # 97\_SignalingTNLassocAddr**

**- issue is acknowledged, i.e. unclarity in relevant SA2 specs; need to fix this**

**- whether to liaise SA2 now? Attempt LS**

**- where to capture relevant st2 statements? whether to agree XnAP CR now?**

(Nok - moderator)

Summary of offline disc [R3-211105](file:///D:\Yang%20Xudong\3GPP%20meetings\RAN3-111\CB\CB%20%23%2097_SignalingTNLassocAddr\Inbox\R3-211105.zip)

drLS to SA2: [R3-211106](file:///D:\Yang%20Xudong\3GPP%20meetings\RAN3-111\CB\CB%20%23%2097_SignalingTNLassocAddr\Inbox\R3-211106.zip)

# For the Chairman’s Notes

Propose the following:

**Agree following proposals:**

…

**Continue discussion on following:**

# Discussion

Online discussion acknowledged the issue and the fix.

When the target NG-RAN node has an available TNL association towards the TNL address as indicated by the *Signalling TNL association address at source NG-C side* IE, the target NG-RAN node should select the TNL association to create an NGAP UE TNLA binding for the UE. Otherwise, the target NG-RAN node should select other available TNL association towards the same AMF or an AMF from the same AMF set to create an NGAP UE TNLA binding for the UE.

The main question is whether the fix should be captured in the XnAP spec ([2]), or should be captured in the SA2 spec (e.g. TS23.502)

* Option 1: Capture the fix in the XnAP spec, e.g. contribution ([2]) for Rel-15 and mirror CR ([3]) for Rel-16. Also LS SA2 to fix the error in TS23.502
* Option 2: No RAN3 CR. Only LS SA2 to fix the error in TS23.502.

**Q1: Please share your view on the two options above, e.g. the preferred option.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Nokia | Option 1 is preferred.  If the majority prefer Option 2, we are ok to adopt the majority view. |
| Huawei | Take option 1 as base line, but no need to send LS.  Since in 23.502, section 4.2.7.2.2, we already have “Creating NGAP UE-TNLA-bindings during handovers”, I suppose this was already reflected what we want to do?  With this logic, maybe we just need to refer to 23.502 with some descriptions? |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Q2: Please share your view on the draft LS to SA2.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Huawei | See comments to Q1. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Q3: If company prefer Option 1, please share your comments on the draft CR (based on [2][3])**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Huawei | See comments to Q1. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Summary:**



**Potential Proposal:**

**...**

# Part II…[if needed]

If needed
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