**FS\_eNPN\_SEC conf call 210428**

**Attendance:** Helena Vahidi (Ericsson), Rajavelsamy R (Samsung), Anand Palanigounder (Qualcomm), Jean Trakinat (T-Mobile), Bo Bjerrum (Nokia), Duckey Lee (Samsung), Rong Wu (Huawei), Juan Deng (Huawei), Huli (Huawei), Wei Lu (Xiaomi), Abhijeet Kolekar (Intel), Hongjin Choi (Samsung), Francois Ennesser (Huawei), Chunhui Zhu (Spreadtrum), Ru Yan (CMCC), Nivedya (Samsung), Rohini (Samsung), Bo Zhang (Huawei)

(attendance according to Teams meeting chat record, affiliation according to my knowledge)

**Agenda:**

* S3-21dddd draft skeleton for draft CR
* S3-21eeee WID
* Draft\_S3-21HHHH Rel-16 CR to 33.501 on authentication method support

**S3-21dddd**

QC: reasonable start, will have a closer look

Huawei: generally fine, need to check whether more things need to be captured. The provisioning aspect is not captured. Proposal to capture explicitly in the conclusions.

QC: Provisioning is not completely out of scope. But should not do more than UP provisioning, and actual provisioning is out of scope of this release.

Huawei: Should align with SA2.

QC: SA2 specifies actions on UE and network after initial access and provisioning (e.g. GSMA). Then de-register and register. This is in our scope. But the actual provisioning protocol is out of scope.

Ericsson: We will need to discuss what exactly will be in Rel-17 scope.

Intel (in chat): We are fine with skeleton. For provisioning, agree with proposal on control plane provisioning can be out of scope for rel-17. For User plane provisioning, provisioning protocol can be out of scope.

**S3-21eeee**

QC: Expected output "CR(s) to TS 33.501"

Nokia: Objectives. Leave out the bullet points. Intention is just to follow the study.

Ericsson: We have tried to have general objectives, e.g. "security for SA2 work in topic A". The problem is that SA plenary has recently not accepted these.

Nokia: Then suggest to remove "primary" from authentication

Ericsson: The part with "primary" is about Key Issue #1.

Nokia: Might be fine, need to think about it.

Nokia: Discussions about how to update the "preferred" list. May need to conclude that. Could be easier to do the bullet list if we have the conclusions. Have we concluded that provisioning is totally out of scope?

Ericsson: Agree that it's easier to write objectives when conclusions are available. "Preferred list" in LSes from SA2. Initial thought that requests received by LS can just be worked on without WID, but let's think about formal inclusion in WID. Regarding provisioning: we will see what will be agreeable in the group and then whatever it is we will work on.

**Draft\_S3-21HHHH**

QC presents. Topic discussed at last conf call and meetings. There seems to be a misunderstanding about support of authentication methods in the TS. Based on the usage of "serving network" instead of "SNPN". Also add clarification Note, authentication method between UE and UDM. AMF needs to support both 5G-AKA and EAP framework. Serving network is clearly defined, includes AMF and not UDM. So original text is wrong.

Huawei: SNPN is for private use, no need to require both 5G-AKA and EAP methods. Customer should have the flexibility to choose. The first change is probably necessary, but does not affect our understanding. What about backwards compatibility with existing deployments?

QC: Want to clarify that UE and SNPN support any of the methods. Serving network does not include the UDM. Backwards compatibility should not be a problem, if an AMF does not support one of the methods could be updated. If e.g. UE and SNPN select 5G-AKA, then if the AMF does not support 5G-AKA then there is a problem.

Huawei: There are AMF in the field that only support one or the other, hence it is a backwards compatibility issue.

QC: SNPN has deployed AMF with only 5G-AKA, then EAP method cannot be used. No backwards compatibility issue.

Ericsson: So what if there is an AMF that does not support one of the methods, and UDM wants to use another. Huawei has proposed dynamic mechanism for the UDM to react. Better solution is to have a deployment where support of authentication methods in AMF and UDM is harmonized. AMF needs to be updated in that case. Dynamic just unnecessary complication at the UDM.

QC: Also problems in roaming cases. What happens if the AMF does not support but UDM and UE do. Probably not a problem in Rel-16. In roaming case Huawei's method would not work either.

Huawei: This is not correct. In solution, the UDM takes into account what authentication method is supported in the AMF.

QC: Then UDM needs to support all methods.

Huawei: Both AMF and UDM need to support at least one common method.

QC: If roaming operator 1 supports only 5G-AKA and roaming operator 2 supports only EAP, the UDM needs to support both.

Ericsson: On the CR, is there agreement on the first change but not on second?

QC: We would be fine with reasonable changes to the Note.

Huawei: first change is fine.

QC: Could even remove the note.

Huawei: more opinions? If the network only wants to use one method, should be ok?

QC: SNPN can choose to deploy only one method.

Ericsson: Deployments that support only part of the 5G specifications is always possible.

Huawei: If only one authentication methods supported, the solution is necessary.

Ericsson: Comments on the CR?

QC: Comments to the note are fine, could also be removed.

Huawei: Fine with the first change. Do not agree with the note.

Ericsson: Generally agree with the changes. Note could require clarifications.

Nokia: Reconfirm that Nokia is generally ok with the changes.

Huawei: Do not see the point with the CR still. Serving network defined in 33.501?

QC: TR 21.905(?) contains the definition of serving network.

Huawei: If the definition of serving network is not clear, then not fine.

QC: Common terms are defined in this TR. Will send reference.

Huawei: Need to have definition of the serving network clear.

**General comments:**

Nokia: please send out invite earlier

Ericsson: Yes, that could be good.

Huawei: Another round of conf calls?

Ericsson: No plan currently.

Huawei: Key Issue #2 allows proposing solutions but the solutions were not accepted to be added to the TR. Way forward for Key Issue #2?

Ericsson: Fear that a conf call would not help.

Huawei: Try to get agreement on the key points from the solutions. Try to select common technical points from all the solutions. For initial access for SNPN and PNI-NPN, some solutions cover provisioning as well. Will check offline and send email.