|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda** | **Topic** | **TDoc** | **Title** | **Source** | **Type** | **Notes** | **Decision** | **Replaced-by** |
| 1 | Agenda and Meeting Objectives | S3‑220001 | Agenda | SA WG3 Chair | agenda | >>CC\_1<<  [Chair] presents  >>CC\_1<< | approved |  |
|  |  | S3‑220003 | Process for SA3#106e meeting | SA WG3 Chair | other | >>prep call<<  [Chair] presents with adjustment on agenda.  [Ericsson] requests to move one group of AI#4.9(onboard) from week 2 to week1 as SA2 is waiting for results.  [HW] proposes to give priority for R-17, and requests to move AIs with exceptions to week1. (MEC, Prose, ??)  [Chair] would ask status update from rapporteurs and decides how to adjust agenda.  [Nokia] requests to move all groups of AI#4.9 as contributions in other group are dependent with requested group.  ---status update---  [Apple] 5GFBS would like to set conclusion which may get consensus as R17 and others can be R18.  [Chair] does not like to split AI into 2 weeks. And proposes not to continue discussion on other parts  [SIV] no show.  [Ericsson] FS\_Auth\_enh needs to reply LS. TR could be seen as completed.  [HW] FS\_edge\_sec is already concluded, proposes to keep discussion raised by Apple in normative work phase. WI still has some left issues, shall be solved in this meeting.  [Chair] asks whether proposal is to move AI#4.10 instead of AI#5.4 in week 1.  [HW] confirms.  [QC] comments moving too much will confuse people.  [Chair] proposes to move AI#4.10 in week 1, no one object.  [CATT] Prose, SID is 80%, already sent for approval. 14 contributions still for TR, 8 for conclusion. Pending issue still needs discussion. Open issue will go in R18. So TR can be closed in this meeting. WID is 45%. Pending issues (CP solution) needs details, needs to reach consensus. Approval is expected to be reached in this meeting and reply to other WG, no more ENs.  [Chair] how to complete?  [IDCC] too many papers, proposes to merge and 1-2 confcalls to speed up.  [Chair] major issue comes from work item in week2, proposes to have offline call and merging way forward in next Monday call.  [QC] comments about the work load.  [CATT] proposes to have 3 days for SI and others for WI.  [Chair] will allocate 1 slot for WI discussion in week 1, then offline discussion encouraged, keep normative work in week 2 still.  [HW] comments Monday cc is very early as there is nearly no discussion spread.  [Chair] clarifies the cc will be used for merger only. No technical/email discussion in week 1. It just uses to help fast handling in week 2.  [QC] comments.  [HW] MBMS TR has been sent for approval. 100%. for TS, no major issue. LS from SA2 needs to treat, should go into R18 study.  [Chair] questions on completion percentage.  [HW] TR can be 100%, TS has leftover issue.  [CMCC] 5GMSG TR 95% only cleanup needed. TS left EN only and could be 100% after this meeting.  [CMCC] eNA TR 90%, all EN convert to Note by Edithelp. So 100% can be marked. TS needs to wait for the consensus of user consent in week 1.  [Ericsson] AMF\_Reallocation is concluded. Only 1 contribution, so it could delay to week 2.  [Chair] can use slot directly.  [Samsung] IAB is 100% completed. No open issue. Needs to send for approval.  [Chair] asks why not 100% last meeting.  [Samsung] no coversheet prepared last meeting.  [Nokia] eSBA should go to R18, no percentage prepared right now. Will push conclusion next meeting. R17 related discussion will also has related CR for normative work  [HW] slicing2 has left 2 open issues in study. 1 for SA3 only(pending conclusion), and 1 dependent from SA2 but SA2 goes into R18. propose to align with SA2 to shift last one to R18.  [Nokia] NSWO. TR left cleanup.  [eNPN] no major issue. 90% already, all left should be solved in this meeting.  [UAS] TR 100%, TS two types open issue left. Has very little impact on stage 3.  [UC3S] normative work 85%. two EN left. Hope to solve those ENs in this meeting.  ---status update---  [Chair] proposes to promote SDT and UPIP related contribution based on RAN2 request.  [Ericsson] not too much incoming LS for week 1.  [HW] asks the conclusion on AI#4.9, whole group or only 1 group?  [Chair] 1 group plus contributions request by Helena.  [HW] proposes to promote some other contributions as requested by CT group.  [Ericsson] proposes to move whole group if more contribution requests  [Chair] whole groups.  [QC] comments  [Chair] **repeats the conclusion: Prioritized 3, 4.4, 4.14, 4.19, 4.9 and 4.10 are added in week 1.**  ---new delegate welcome---  Welcome: Anbin Kim from LGE, Mohsin Khan from Ericsson, Henry from Xiaomi, Helena Flygare from Ericsson, Saurabh Khare from Nokia, Rakshesh P Bhatt from Nokia  ---new delegate welcome---  >>prep call<< | noted |  |
| 2 | Meeting Reports | S3‑220002 | Report from SA3#105e | MCC | report | >>CC\_1<<  [Chair] presents  >>CC\_1<< | approved |  |
|  |  | S3‑220004 | Report from last SA | SA WG3 Chair | report | >>CC\_1<<  [Chair] presents, r1 in draft folder  [HW] clarifies 107 should be online meeting as it is before Q2 plenary meeting.  [Cablelabs] asks what we should decide for 107-bis  [Chair] clarifies whether SA3 is ready to go ahead with the face to face meeting arrangements for the SA3 meeting in Bath. ETSI Coordinators need to confirm the meeting with hotel. Everyone is requested to consider this, will come back on Friday to decide.  >>CC\_1<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220005 | Meeting notes from SA3 leadership | SA WG3 Chair | report |  | withdrawn |  |
|  |  | S3‑220006 | Meeting notes from SA3 leadership | MCC | report |  | Reserved |  |
| 3 | Reports and Liaisons from other Groups | S3‑220007 | LS on new parameters for SOR | C1-214118 | LS in | >>CC\_5<<  [Docomo] presents status.  415/416 are corresponding contributions  431 are corresponding draft LS out >>CC\_5<<  431 is postponed so this LS is also postponed. | postponed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220008 | LS on Using CP-SOR as a secured information transfer mechanism between HPLMN and UE | C1-217163 | LS in | >>CC\_5<<  [Docomo] presents and proposes noted  [Chair] noted  **1st challenge deadline** >>CC\_5<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220009 | LS on the User Controlled PLMN Selector with Access Technology in Control plane solution for steering of roaming in 5GS | C1-217358 | LS in | >>CC\_5<<  [VC] presents  [Chair] noted  **1st challenge deadline** >>CC\_5<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220010 | [FSAG Doc 92\_003] Reply LS on attack preventing NAS procedures to succeed | C1-217378 | LS in | >>CC\_5<<  [Docomo] presents and proposes to note.  [HW] agrees to note  [Chair] noted  **1st challenge deadline.** >>CC\_5<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220011 | LS on Disaster Roaming Enabled Indication | C1-217427 | LS in | [LGE] : This LS should be noted | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220012 | LS-Reply on Home Network triggered re-authentication | C4-215437 | LS in | >>CC\_5<<  [Samsung] presents  [Chair] noted  **1st challenge deadline**  >>CC\_5<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220014 | Reply LS on RAN2 agreements for MUSIM | R2-2111329 | LS in | >>CC\_5<<  [VC] presents  [Chair] noted  **1st challenge deadline** >>CC\_5<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220015 | LS on RAN2 agreements for paging with service indication | R2-2111330 | LS in | >>CC\_5<<  [Chair] noted  **1st challenge deadline**  >>CC\_5<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220016 | Reply LS on UP security policy update | R2-2111527 | LS in | >>CC\_5<<  [VC] presents and proposes to note  [Chair] noted  **1st challenge deadline** >>CC\_5<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220025 | Reply LS on Using N32 for Interconnect Scenarios | S2-2109334 | LS in | >>CC\_5<<  [Docomo] presents and proposes to note  [Chair] noted  **1st challenge deadline** >>CC\_5<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220026 | Reply to LS on Resynchronisations | ETSI SAGE | LS in | >>CC\_5<<  [Ericsson] presents and volunteers to draft reply  [Chair] asks how to reply [Ericsson] clarifies propose to reply since AuTh-Enhancements study is concluded.  [HW] comments, have some concerns.  [Chair] requests to continue discussion over email and then formulate the reply. >>CC\_5<<  [Ericsson]: Provides r1 of a draft LS reply to ETSI SAGE.  [Huawei]: Provides r2.  [Thales] : provides r3.  [Ericsson]: requests for clarifications for r2.  [Huawei]: Provides clarification.  [Ericsson]: Provides r4.  >>CC\_7<<  [Ericsson] presents status  >>CC\_7<<  [Thales] : is fine with r4.  [Nokia]: support the LS.  [Thales] : fine with r4. | replied to | R4 |
|  |  | S3‑220027 | Reply LS to CT3 Questions and Feedback on EVEX | S4-211647 | LS in | >>CC\_5<<  [QC] presents  [Chair] noted  **1st challenge deadline** >>CC\_5<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220028 | LS Reply on QoE report handling at QoE pause | S5- 216417 | LS in | >>CC\_5<<  [Chair] noted  **1st challenge dealine**  >>CC\_5<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220030 | Non-Support of Ciphering Algorithm GEA1 | GCF | LS in | >>CC\_5<<  [VC] presents and proposes to have a reply  [QC] there is a CR  [Chair] asks question  [QC] clarifies >>CC\_5<<  >>CC\_7<<  [QC] presents draft reply is ready as r1, presents it behaves as a placeholder now.  [HW] comment.that GEA1 was prohibited earlier.  [QC] clarifies  [HW] suggests to give more information on that.  [VF] comments  [Apple] comments  [Docomo] comments  [MCC] clarifies  [Chair] asks QC to take resposibility for future action on GEA1 prohibition if it needs further reflection in other specs.  >>CC\_7<<  [Qualcomm]: Uploaded draft\_S3-220030-r1 to promote discussion on a response  [Apple]: Provides input for the reply. SA3 has agreed CRs prohibiting to use GEA1, and not recommending GEA2 from R11  [Qualcomm]: Provides response to Apple  [Apple]: Provides wording for the reply LS.  [Qualcomm]: Provides response to Apple  [Apple]: Agree with QC’s proposal.  [Qualcomm]: Provides r2  [Deutsche Telekom] : agrees to the proposal, asks clarification  [Qualcomm]: provides a response to DT | replied to | R2 |
|  |  | S3‑220031 | New Name for ETSI TC SCP | ETSI TC SCP | LS in | >>CC\_5<<  [Samsung] presents  [Chair] noted  **1st challenge deadline**  [HW] asks whether SA3 needs to update reference related this group, just editorial.  [MCC] clarifies  >>CC\_5<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220032 | LS on consideration of a new work on ITU-T M.fcnhe: "Framework of communication network health evaluation" | ITU-T SG2 | LS in | >>CC\_5<<  [VC] presents  [Chair] noted  **1st challenge deadline**  >>CC\_5<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220033 | LS on Energy Efficiency as guiding principle for new solutions | SP-211621 | LS in | >>CC\_5<<  [VC] presents  [Chair] it’s general principle. Noted  **1st challenge deadline** >>CC\_5<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220034 | Reply LS to GSMA Operator Platform Group on edge computing definition and integration | SP-210003 | LS in | >>CC\_5<<  [VC] presents  [Chair] noted  **1st challenge deadline** >>CC\_5<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220037 | Reply on security protection of RRCResumeRequest message | R3-221183 | LS in | >>CC\_2<<  [Docomo] presents, reply is not exactly what we asked.  [Apple] comments that SA3 should go ahead with the solution.  [QC] comments on the complexity of the solution.  [CableLabs] comments that issue has been prolonging for many meetings.  [HW] comments  [Chair] : continue discussion over email.  >>CC\_2<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220038 | LS on opens issues for NB-IoT and eMTC support for NTN | R3-221406 | LS in | >>CC\_5<<  [VC] presents  269 is corresponding draft LS reply  [Chair] : continue discussion >>CC\_5<< | replied to | 269 |
|  |  | S3‑220039 | Reply LS on LTE User Plane Integrity Protection | R3-221473 | LS in | >>CC\_1<<  [VF] presents  >>CC\_1<<  [Huawei]: provides r1.  For Q1, it is important to address the backward compatibility issue and hence to have a mitigation in place should this happen. For Q2, we propose to align the behaviour with 5GS.  [Vodafone]: replies to Huawei asking for clarifications.  [Huawei]: provides clarifications on the points raised by Vodafone and Ericsson.  [Vodafone]: replies to Huawei.  [Qualcomm]: r1 not acceptable. Provides r2  [Ericsson]: r1 not acceptable to us. We support r2.  [Huawei]: proposes changes to Q2 reply but disagrees with current Q1 reply.  [Qualcomm]: responds to Huawei proposal  [Huawei]: provides r3  [Ericsson]: provides comments to r2 and r3  [Qualcomm]: requests a revision of r3  [Huawei]: Provides clarification.  [Qualcomm]: provides clarification  [ZTE]: provides way forward  [Vodafone]: supports Qualcomm’s R3 change  [Huawei]: for the sake of progress accepts Qualcomm’s proposal on top of r3.  [Ericsson]: provides r4 in draft folder  [Huawei]: points out that the changes proposed to Q2 reply were not implemented  [Qualcomm]: fine with r4  [Ericsson]: questions to Huawei  [Qualcomm]: requests clarifications  [HW] replies to Ericsson and QC (notes captured by VC)  [Ericsson[ asks whether HW can accept r4 as there is no big difference. (notes captured by VC)  [Huawei]: points out again that the changes proposed to Q2 reply were not implemented  [Ericsson]: r5 of S3-220302 is uploaded.  [Huawei]: fine with r5.  [Qualcomm]: prefers r4.  [Qualcomm]: objects r5  [Huawei]: points out that the second sentence in Q2 reply in r4 is not relevant for the question.  [Qualcomm]: responds to Huawei  [Huawei]: responds to Qualcomm  [Huawei]: for the sake of progress we are fine with bringing back the second sentence to Q2’s answer.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_1<<  New r6 will be prepared based on the comments give on the meeting.  [Chair] will be extended to week 2 for further discussion before approval.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_1<<  [Ericsson]: r6 of S3-220302 was uploaded last Friday and it was agreed in the CC on Monday. r6 of S3-220302 has the new Tdoc number S3-220464. | replied to |  |
|  |  | S3‑220040 | TCG progress - report from TCG rapporteur | InterDigital, Inc. | other | >>CC\_5<<  [IDCC] presents  **1st challenge deadline** >>CC\_5<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220043 | Reply LS on energy efficiency as guiding principle for new solutions | S5-221501 | LS in | >>CC\_5<<  [VC] presents  [Chair] noted  **1st challenge deadline** >>CC\_5<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220045 | Reply LS on NTN specific User Consent | R2-2201754 | LS in | [Huawei]: Propose to reply.  [Huawei]: Clarify this group was already determined in Week2 according to the latest agenda.  >>CC\_5<<  [VC] presents  143/190/272/428/271 are corresponding contributions  [HW] comments already on 190/428  [Xiaomi] comments  [Nokia] comments  [Ericsson] agrees with Xiaomi and Nokia. There are two ways that one for R18 and one for R17. RAN request for R17.  [Chair] asks question. Do we need to do much work for R17?  [Ericsson] clarifies  [Chair]we could not wait for other WG and respond in R17  [HW] prefers to postpone to R18  [Xiaomi] proposes way forward. Not too much impact and can be made in R17.  [Chair] asks questions.  [Xiaomi] replies.  [Apple] unlikely finish work in R17, prefer to postpone to R18.  [Docomo] asks question. What is impact for SA3 R17 work if the issue is not solved currently.  [Xiaomi] clarifies, RAN2 could not work if SA3 has no solution.  [Chair] comments there is general security description in TS 33.501.  [HW] clarifies it is different  [Chair] asks HW to lead the discussion and take 190 as baseline [HW] is ok with the request. >>CC\_5<< | postponed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220046 | Further reply on QoE report handling at QoE pause | R2-2201862 | LS in | >>CC\_5<<  [VC] presents  [Chair] noted  **1st challenge deadline** >>CC\_5<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220047 | Reply LS on security protection of RRCResumeRequest message | R2-2201864 | LS in | >>CC\_2<<  [Docomo] gives brief introduction, reply is not exactly against what we asked. But basically R2 want RAN plenary to decide.  >>CC\_2<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220048 | LS on UE providing Location Information for NB-IoT | R2-2201957 | LS in | >>CC\_5<<  [Ericsson] presents  [Chair] noted  **1st challenge deadline** >>CC\_5<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220049 | LS on security concerns for UE providing Location Information for NB-IoT | R2-2201958 | LS in | >>CC\_5<<  [Ericsson] presents  273, 144 and 425 are corresponding reply contributions  [Xiaomi] will hold the pen >>CC\_5<< | replied to | 273 |
|  |  | S3‑220050 | LS on RAN3 impacts for non-SDT handling | R2-2201977 | LS in |  | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220051 | LS on Security for Small Data Transmission | R2-2201983 | LS in | >>CC\_1<<  [VC] presents.  [Chair] proposes way forward for discussion, an offline call on Tuesday, 1hr before the official CC.  >>CC\_1<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220052 | LS on UE location during initial access in NTN | R2-2202057 | LS in |  | withdrawn |  |
|  |  | S3‑220053 | LS on UE location during initial access in NTN | R2-2201881 | LS in | >>CC\_5<<  [Ericsson] presents  [Chair] noted  **1st challenge deadline** >>CC\_5<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220085 | Reply LS on Security for Small Data Transmission | ZTE Corporation | LS out | [Intel]: Discussion will be in S3-220152 Closing thread. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220086 | Discussion on security of SDT | ZTE Corporation | discussion | >>CC\_1<<  [ZTE] presents  [Nokia] comments and provides way forward  [Chair] proposes to have offline cc tomorrow tgo proceed.  >>CC\_1<<  [ZTE]: r1 is provided.  [Intel]: Discussion will be in S3-220152 Closing thread. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220143 | NTN - Reply LS on NTN specific user consent (R2-2201754) | Apple | LS out | [Huawei]: Generally fine with this proposal. Suggest to merge this one with S3-220190.  [Huawei]: Clarify this group was already determined in Week2 according to the latest agenda.  [Nokia]: Input for LS response for NTN specific user consent (R2-2201754).  [Huawei]: Propose to close this thread. Suggest to move the discussion to S3-220190 thread.  [Apple]: Propose to merge to S3-220190 and close this thread. Let’s keep discussion under 190. Thanks. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220144 | NTN - Reply LS on NTN specific user consent (R2-2201958) | Apple | LS out | >>CC\_5<<  [Apple] has similar view  >>CC\_5<<  [Xiaomi]: proposes to merge 144 into 273  [Apple]: Happy to merge 144 into 273  [Nokia]: Input for LS response for NTN specific user consent (R2-2201958). | merged | 273 |
|  |  | S3‑220151 | Discussion on Security Issues with SDT | Intel | discussion | >>CC\_1<<  [Intel] presents. Fine with way forward in offline call.  >>CC\_1<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220152 | Reply LS on Security of Small data transmission | Intel | LS out | >>CC\_2<<  [VC] presents progress on offline discussion and output  [IDCC] it is the agreement as shown from VC  [Nokia] comments on bullet 1 and bullet 3 need to be removed.  [Docomo] comments and proposes to continue study this  [Chair] does not agree to have further study, it should be part of R17.  [Docomo] needs to give clear message to RAN  [ZTE] comments it is new issue and may have security issues.  [QC] answer Docomo’s question.  [Nokia] comments thatthere are no requirements t not to reuse keys or I-RNTI.  [Intel] has couple of comments.  [IDCC] considers comments may ruin the progress made in offline call, suggests to focus on what we can agree.  [HW] supports Nokia comment, proposes to remove bullet 1 & 3.  [Chair] asks to collect bullets that reach consensus only.  [CATT] requests to upload latest version onto draft folder and give feedback after internal discussion.  [VC] clarifies r1 is available on FTP.  >>CC\_2<<  [Samsung]: uploads r1, based on the offline discussions on SDT  [Intel]: Fine with r1 and provides some more comments  [Qualcomm]: provide some more comments.  [Huawei]: Not convinced for bullet b) and c).  [ZTE]: doesn't agree with Huawei's view.  [Nokia]: New revision draft\_S3-220152-r2-NOK.docx available for review.  >>CC\_3<<  [Intel] presents r2  [Nokia] presents r2-NOK  [QC] comments current solution is not complete and challenge feasible.  [HW] comments and requests to keep email discussion  [ZTE] is general ok with r2-NOK but has minor comments on last sentence.  [Apple] comments not accurate description about c), requests email discussion.  [Oppo] comments, requests stronger statementment on a).  [IDCC] comments on d), to change “there is SA3 ...” to “there may be SA3 ...”  [Intel] comments, does not agree with IDCC’s proposal  [Nokia] comments  [QC] comments, not agree with IDCC’s proposal.  >>CC\_3<<  [ZTE]: generally fine with r2 and provides r3 with minor changes.  [OPPO]: provides minor wording changes in Bullet a) in r4 based on OPPO comment during the conference call.  [Intel]: Provides r4.  [CATT]: Provide r6.  [Huawei]: Upload R6 in the draft folder.  [Ericsson]: provides our comments and our view.  [ZTE]: doesn't agree with Huawei's r6, provides response to Ericsson and brings r7.  >>CC\_4<<  [Intel] presents status(r8)  [Nokia] comments, is ok with latest one  [CATT] comments on coversheet  [Intel] is fine with r8  [Ericsson] needs to check.  [Chair] will put for next challenge deadline, need to send R2 ASAP.  >>CC\_4<<  [Ericsson]: doesn't agree with ZTE responses.  [ZTE]: proposes more response to Ericsson.  [Nokia]: R8 available with minor update in d)  [Intel]: R9 available with LS number update which was wrong  [OPPO]: Requests minor editorial change to R9  [Intel]: Uploaded R10 with English fixes. Accepted changes over changes from r9.  [ZTE]: fine with r10.  [Huawei]: Require further revision based on R10.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_1<<  [ZTE] asks final status  [HW] would like to provide r11, but can live with r10.  [Nokia] prefers to keep r10  [HW] can live with r10  [Chair]: Keep R10 as the final version.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_1<<  [Nokia]: Fine with R10.  [Intel]: Uploaded to portal with new TDOC number S3-220463 | approved | R10 |
|  |  | S3‑220165 | Reply LS on Multicast paging with TMGI | Huawei, HiSilicon | LS out | >>CC\_5<<  [HW] presents  >>CC\_5<<  [Huawei]: provide r1 based on the agreement in the thread of S3-220333.  [Ericsson]: OK with r1. | approved | R1 |
|  |  | S3‑220189 | Reply LS | Huawei, HiSilicon | LS out |  | withdrawn |  |
|  |  | S3‑220190 | Reply LS on user consent for NTN | Huawei, HiSilicon | LS out | [Huawei]: propose to merge S3-220190 and S3-220143 by taking S3-220190 as baseline.  [Apple]: Fine with R1.  [Ericsson]: Requests for clarifications for handling the LS reply and the topic.  [Xiaomi]: concurs Ericsson’s view on the merger and cannot agree on r1  [Qualcomm]: revision needed  [Huawei]: Agree with Qualcomm’s view. I uploaded the r2 by accepting the text proposed.  [Xiaomi]: questions for clarification in r2  [Apple]: Fine with R2.  >>CC\_7<<  [HW] presents status.  [Xiaomi] comments current draft is not clear for R2 WG. They don’t know how to do the UC enforcement in the base station based on this content.  [HW] provides compromised way forward.  [Xiaomi] is not convinced, with the proposal, need concrete guidance, rather general description.  [Apple] comments current there is no detailed solution, can work on it but currently no solution right now. So that is only guidance can give RAN2.  [Xiaomi] asks to give clear answer to RAN2.  [Apple] proposes way forward.  >>CC\_7<<  [Qualcomm]: responds to question from Xiaomi.  [Xiaomi]: provides r3  [Apple]: provides r4, propose to reply to RAN2 LS more straight forward.  [Ericsson]: Fine with r3 but not fine with r4.  [Xiaomi]: disagree with r4  [Qualcomm]: also fine with r3 but object to r4  [Huawei]: also fine with r3 but not OK with r4.  [Apple]: Disagree with R3, providing R5 based on R3.  [Xiaomi]: disagree with r5 and r4  [Qualcomm]: objects r5 (& any subsequent revision f which does not include essential part in the last para of r3).  [Apple]: disagree with R3, prefer R5. If no consensus could be reached in this meeting, Apple is fine to postpone the reply to next meeting.  [Qualcomm]: responds to Apple.  [Ericsson]: Disagree with r5. Asks for clarifications  [Xiaomi]: only fine with r3 and provides more clarification  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_2<<  [HW] presents status  [Xiaomi] doesn’t agree to postpone as R2 is waiting and only one objection only  [Apple] clarifies  [Chair] asks if it helps to give a bit more time to solve this time. If it helps, email approval can be made, or postpone to next meeting.  [Xiaomi] requsts to note this instead of postpone if there is no consensus.  [Mavenir] has concern to have email approval.  [HW] asks whether r2 could be accepted by Xiaomi.  [Ericsson] comments.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_2<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220201 | Reply LS on CT6 | THALES | LS out | >>CC\_1<<  [Thales] presents  >>CC\_1<<  [Qualcomm]: does not agree with the content in the proposed LS; instead prefers the content proposed in S3-220338.  [Thales] : proposes to merge S3-220201 into S3-220338 and continue discussion within S3-220338 email thread.  [Qualcomm]: accepts the merger proposal from Thales and close this thread. | merged | 338 |
|  |  | S3‑220216 | Discussion integrity protection for UE capability indication in UPU | Ericsson | discussion | >>CC\_1<<  [Ericsson] presents  [Chair] 217 as reply LS to continue discussion.  >>CC\_1<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220217 | Draft reply LS on UE capability indication in UPU | Ericsson | LS out | [Samsung] : Question for clarification on the SA3 LS to CT1 (S3‑212272 {https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg\_sa/WG3\_Security/TSGS3\_103e/Docs/S3-212272.zip} ) from SA3#103 meeting.  [Qualcomm]: provides r1 of 217.  [Huawei]: disagree with r1.  [Qualcomm]: responds to Huawei  >>CC\_3<<  [Ericsson] presents r1  [HW] comments there should be end-to-end protection. Would like to change last para.  [QC] comments, consider not give freedom to CT1 to select.  [Lenovo] asks question for clarification  [Chair] asks concrete proposal  [Lenovo] proposes to continue offline discussion.  [Chair]: it is related to MINT which is R17 feature. Not to respond may impact stage 3.  Proposes way forward.  [Ericsson] provides compromised way forward.  [HW] is ok with Ericsson’s proposal.  >>CC\_3<<  [Lenovo]: Asks clarification.  [Qualcomm]: provides requested clarification  [Ericsson]: Fine with r1 for the sake of progress. Proposes that Qualcomm takes over the pen for this LS. (As decided in Conf call 3.)  [Qualcomm]: provides r2 with contact change Ericsson requested  [Qualcomm]: requests to ignore the wrong tdoc attached in the below. 217-r2 on the server is the latest revision for this thread.  [Huawei]: requests revisions before approval.  [Qualcomm]: requests clarification  [Huawei]: responds to Qualcomm  [Qualcomm]: responds  [Ericsson]: Fine with r2  [Huawei]: responds and requires revisions  [Ericsson]: responds to Huawei.  [Qualcomm]: concurs with Ericsson  [Huawei]: agree with r2 for sake of progress  [Lenovo]: r2 is okay  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_1<<  R2 approved  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_1<< | approved | R2 |
|  |  | S3‑220238 | Discussion on UE capabilities indication in UPU | Huawei, HiSilicon | discussion | >>CC\_1<<  [HW] presents,  >>CC\_1<<  [Ericsson] : This discussion paper can be noted. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220269 | Reply LS on opens issues for NB-IoT and eMTC support for NTN | Xiaomi Technology | LS out | >>CC\_3<<  [Xiaomi] presents  [HW] in general supports there is no privacy issue but still has comment. >>CC\_3<<  [Huawei]: provide comments and request revision.  [Xiaomi]: provides revision r1  [Huawei]: fine with r1.  [Ericsson]: is fine with r1. Provides editorials.  >>CC\_7<<  [Xiaomi] presents status  >>CC\_7<<  [Xiaomi]: accept Ericsson’s editorial suggestion | approved | R1 |
|  |  | S3‑220270 | Reply LS on User Consent Updating | Xiaomi Technology | LS out | [Huawei]: Not OK with the current version.  [Xiaomi]: Based on the discussion in the thread of 378, the merged version is provided in the revision of 270.  [Xiaomi]: provides clarification  [NTT DOCOMO]: provide additional information  [Xiaomi]: provides r2  [Huawei]: Fine with R2.  [Nokia]: request update to -r2; suggests to replace “earliest convenience” and “earliest possible” with a concrete statement with: “in its next messaging onwards” to be precise and not leaving roam for interpretation. if this is not possible from RAN perspective, they can tell us.  [Xiaomi]: provides r3  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_1<<  [Ericsson] r3 is too late.  [Nokia] clarifies.  [Docomo] is fine with Ericsson last proposal, which is on tope of r3.  (that should be r4)  [Ericsson] is volunteer to provide r4  [Chair] r4 is approved. >>CC\_wrap\_up\_1<<  [Ericsson]: r3 needs to be revised to answer form SA3 “SA3 believes that the update of such information shall be signalled to the RAN as soon as the update occurs”  [Xiaomi]: provides r5  [Ericsson]: approves r5 | approved | R5 |
|  |  | S3‑220271 | Reply LS on NTN specific User Consent | Xiaomi Technology | LS out | [Huawei]: Not OK to rush the new use case NTN user consent in Rel-17 because of timebeing.  [Xiaomi]: responds to the comments  [Apple]: Same comment with 272, this is a competing proposal with thread S3-220190 which already got the consensus of majority, we prefer to have discuss there and note this one. Thanks Xiaomi for the effort.  [Xiaomi]: declare merging 271 into 190  [Apple]: Also support merging 271 into 190. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220272 | Proposal for NTN Specific User Consent | Xiaomi Technology | discussion | [Huawei]: propose not to endorse the solution at the late R17 stage and ask for clarifications.  [Xiaomi]: provides response to the comments  [Apple]: this is a competing proposal with thread S3-220190 which already got the consensus of majority, we prefer to have discuss there and note this one. Thanks Xiaomi for the effort. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220273 | Reply LS on security concerns for UE providing Location Information for NB-IoT | Xiaomi Technology | LS out | >>CC\_5<<  [Xiaomi] presents  >>CC\_5<<  [NTAC] Requests clarification / amendment  [Qualcomm]: provide comments.  [Xiaomi]: provides revision r1  [Apple]: Not fine with R1. Providing R2, adding the sentence “Besides NAS security establishment, user consent is also needed before acquiring the location information.” for Q2.  [Apple]: Not fine with R1. Providing R2, adding the sentence “Besides NAS security establishment, user consent is also needed before acquiring the location information.” for Q2.  [NTAC] Objects to new sentence in R2, proposes r3.  [Huawei]: provided r4.  [Xiaomi]: provides r5  [NTAC]: Fine with r5 or r4.  [Qualcomm]: is okay with r5  [Apple]: Prefer R5, which has simpler text, and covers all the situations that may require user consent.  [Huawei]: Fine with r5.  >>CC\_7<<  [Xiaomi] presents status, r5 seems get concensus, no comments  [Docomo] comments on last sentence, needs to refine this sentence.  [Xiaomi] clarifies  >>CC\_7<<  [Xiaomi]: provides r6  [Xiaomi]: provides r6  [Xiaomi]: provides r7  [Apple]: Fine with r7  [NTAC]: Fine with r7 | approved | R7 |
|  |  | S3‑220302 | Draft Reply LS on LTE User Plane Integrity Protection | Ericsson | LS out | >>CC\_1<<  [Ericsson] presents  [HW] comments not simple to send back or not. Need to consider backward capability  [VF] clarifies.  [QC] comments  [Chair] proposes to discuss via email and come back Wednesday.  >>CC\_1<<  (Discussion in 039 thread)  >>CC\_3<<  [Ericsson] presents r2  [HW] provides comments on r2  [VF] comments  [Chair]: keep discussion going.  >>CC\_3<<  >>CC\_4<<  [Ericsson] presents status  (email discussions are in 0039 --VC)  [HW] presents r3  [Ericsson] is ok in both r2 and r3, is neutral, but needs QC confirmation  [Chair] continue email discussion  >>CC\_4<<  >>CC\_5<<  Latest version currently is r6  [Chair] presents status and presents QC is ok of r6 by offline message  [QC] confirms  It will be sent out after the call. >>CC\_5<< | approved | R6 |
|  |  | S3‑220338 | Reply LS on CT6 | Qualcomm Incorporated | LS out | >>CC\_1<<  [QC] presents  [Thales] clarifies based on QC’s doc  [HW] asks whether would like to standardize the EAP authentication methods, credentials are different in different methods.  [Thales] does not specify EAP method, but standard credential  [HW] asks for clarification about other kind of credential like certificate  [Thales] clarifies  [HW] comments to ME.  [Docomo] does not consider SA3 should be involved.  [Thales] considers no need to involve SA3 from Thales point of view, but other company asks to do that.  [Chair] proposes to keep discussion and come back Wednesday.  >>CC\_1<<  [Thales] : provide comments.  [Qualcomm]: responds to Thales  [Thales] : answers to Qualcomm.  >>CC\_3<<  [Thales] introduces current status.  [QC] comments  [Thales] is fine with QC’s clarification. But has another comment  [Docomo] asks question for clarification about user ID authentication password and comments  [Chair] asks to keep dicussion in email.  >>CC\_3<<  [Deutsche Telekom] : provides comments  [Telecom Italia]: agrees with Thales  [Thales] : provides r1.  [Qualcomm]: responds to the comments and r1; provides r2  [Deutsche Telekom] : is fine with -r2; comments  [G+D]: agrees with Thales -r1 and objects to -r2 proposed by Qualcomm; comments  [Telecom Italia]: agrees with Thales -r1 and objects to -r2 proposed by Qualcomm; comments  [Ericsson] : is fine with -r2  [Thales] : objects r2 and proposes r3.  >>CC\_4<<  [Thales] presents status.  [Chair] continue the email discussion  >>CC\_4<<  [Deutsche Telekom] : does not agree with -r3 and proposes -r4 and provides reasoning behind.  [Thales] : provides comments.  [Qualcomm]: provides r5  [Deutsche Telekom] : agrees to -r5  [Ericsson] : fine with -r5  [Huawei] : fine with r5  [Thales] : provides r6.  [Deutsche Telekom] : fine with -r6  [Qualcomm]: fine with r6  [Telecom Italia]: agrees to -r6  [Huawei]: ok with r6  [Ericsson]: ok with r6 | approved | R6 |
|  |  | S3‑220377 | Discussion on LS on Security for Small Data Transmission | Nokia Corporation | discussion | >>CC\_1<<  [Nokia] presents  >>CC\_1<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220380 | Reply LS on Security for Small Data Transmission | Nokia Corporation | LS out |  | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220415 | CR to 33.501 to protect additional SoR information (CPSOR-CMCI) (future proof alternative) | NTT DOCOMO INC. | CR | >>CC\_5<<  [Docomo] presents  [Thales] asks questions for clarification  [Docomo] clarifies  [Docomo] asks which one (415/416) will be used as baseline for further discussion  [Chair] suggests 415 >>CC\_5<<  MCC provided some minor comments.  [NTT DOCOMO]: prefer S3-220415 to 416, update to cover sheet of 220415 is provided accordingly.  [Qualcomm]: prefer 415 to 416 as well. Needs clarifications/updates  [Ericsson]: revision needed  [NTT DOCOMO]: provides revision according to QC comment as -r2  >>CC\_7<<  [Docomo] presents status  Continue email discussion  >>CC\_7<<  [Qualcomm]: needs further updates  [Ericsson]: provides r3  [Thales] : ask question and provide comments.  [NTT DOCOMO]: ask for clarification  [Ericsson]: replies to Thales  [Ericsson]: replies to Thales | agreed | R3 |
|  |  | S3‑220416 | CR to 33.501 to protect CPSOR-CMCI information only (alternative to S3-220415) | NTT DOCOMO INC. | CR | [Ericsson]: (Adding missing tdoc nr to subject line) prefer 415 to 416 as well  [Qualcomm]: fine with r3. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220421 | Reply LS on Reply LS on security protection of RRCResumeRequest message | Nokia Corporation | LS out | [Huawei]: revision is needed. Pending on the discussion of the conclusion and WID.  [Ericsson]: Supports. Proposes to merge with S3-220135.  [Nokia]: Agree to merge with S3-220135.  [Qualcomm]: propose to note this as the discussion was moved to S3-220135 | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220424 | Discussion on RAN 3 | VODAFONE | discussion | >>CC\_1<<  [VF] presents  >>CC\_1<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220425 | Discussion on LS on security concerns for UE providing Location Information for NB-IoT | Nokia Corporation | discussion | >>CC5<<  [Nokia] has similar view with Apple and Xiaomi  >>CC\_5<<  [Xiaomi]: proposes to merge 425 into 273 | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220428 | Reply LS on Reply LS on NTN specific User Consent | Nokia Corporation | LS out | [Huawei]: propose to be merged into S3-220190.  [Nokia]: We agree to merge S3-220428 and S3-220190.  [Xiaomi]: does not agree with the reply in 428 | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220431 | draft-Reply LS on new parameters for SOR | NTT DOCOMO INC. | LS out | >>CC\_5<<  [Docomo] presents >>CC\_5<<  [Thales] : proposes change  [NTT DOCOMO]: ok to include. -r2 is available.  [Qualcomm]: not ok to add Thales proposed text to this LS  [NTT DOCOMO]: ok with either.  [Thales] : disagree with r1 and provide clarification.  [Qualcomm]: sustain objection to add these sentences to this reply LS.  [Thales] : provide comments.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_2<<  [Thales] clarification is needed before approval, the comments from Thales are not solved.  [Ericsson] asks to go email approval next week  [QC] has concern to have another conf call next week.  [Docomo] is ok to add sentence but it may not necessary, is fine whether it sends or not this time.  [Thales] proposes to postpone to next meeting.  [QC] asks whether LS is needed or not if CR is agreed.  [Ericsson] is ok to send LS next meeting.  **LS is postponed.**  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_2<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3-220443 | Further Operator Platform Group questions following SDO Workshop | GSMA forwarded by SA6 | LS in | >>CC\_7<<  [Samsung] presents, but SA3 need to reply to question1.  [HW] comments SA2 has draft reply, but agrees answer to Q1 should come from SA3.  [Chair] requests Samsung to draft reply LS.  >>CC\_7<<  [Samsung]: Provides draft reply LS r1.  [Ericsson] : proposes to postpone the LS  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_2<<  [Samsung] requests to send it out in this meeting.  [Ericsson] requests to postpone as it is not urgent  [HW] considers it is urgent  [Samsung] comments it is important. Or WG is waiting for SA3 reply  [Ericsson] is ok not to postpone.  [Samsung] currently version is r2  LS reply (S3-220571) as new LSout being sent to SA plenary for consolidation and forwarding to GSMA.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_2<< | noted |  |
| 4 | Work Areas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.1 | New WID on Security Assurance Specification for Management Function (MnF) | S3‑220149 | Discussion paper on SCAS for 3GPP defined Management Function | Nokia Germany | discussion | [Huawei]: proposes not to endorse anything for now since the work will be recorded in a living document anyway. We can revise and adapt our approach later if there is a need. For now, we prefer the more conventional approach.  [Nokia]: Response. Fine to note the discussion paper. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220150 | Revise generic network product to support management function | Nokia Germany | CR | [Huawei]: proposes to integrate this into the living document  [Nokia]: Response. Will reserve tDoc and convert it to “other” type after the 3GU portal is re-opened.  [Nokia]: uploaded converted version.  [Huawei]: r1 looks fine | Approved and converted to draft CR | R1 |
|  |  | S3‑220153 | add annex for aspects specific to MnF network product class | Nokia Germany | CR | MCC didn’t agree with adding an empty clause/skeleton with editor’s notes (annex XX.2) in a specification under change control. TR 33.921 is not a draft spec. For these cases draft CRs are used, so Annex xx.2 can be worked out during several meetings and added to the specification once it is ready.  As for the comment in the figure, MCC commented that colors were no longer forbidden so it is OK to use them.  [Huawei]: requires changes and proposes a way forward  [Nokia]: Response and revise.  MCC confirmed the input to the draft CR process.  [Huawei]: provides r2  [Nokia]: thanks and provides r3  [Huawei]: r3 looks fine | Approved and converted to draft CR | R3 |
|  |  | S3‑220172 | MnF SCAS Skeleton | Huawei, HiSilicon | pCR |  | approved |  |
|  |  | S3‑220173 | MnF SCAS Scope | Huawei, HiSilicon | pCR | [Nokia]: Comment. Suggest to add a note.  [Huawei]: provides r1 based on Nokia’s comments | approved | R1 |
|  |  | S3‑220186 | Living document for MnF SCAS: draftCR to TR 33.926 | Huawei, HiSilicon | draftCR | [Nokia]: Comment. Suggest to remove X.1 as the more concrete description was reflected in 220153.  [Huawei]: proposes a way forward  [Nokia]: Thanks for clarification!  [Huawei]: provides a preliminary revision r1 of the living document incorporating content from 0150\_r1 and 0153\_r3.  [Nokia]: fine with content and questions for process.  [Huawei]: provides clarifications  [Nokia]: thanks for clarification.  [Huawei]: provides clean revision (r2) of the living document including the history in the coversheet based on Nokia’s comments. | approved | R2 |
| 4.2 | New WID on SECAM and SCAS for 3GPP virtualized network products | S3‑220121 | proposal to add scope of TR33.936 Security Assurance Methodology (SECAM) for 3GPP virtualized network products | China Mobile | pCR |  | approved |  |
|  |  | S3‑220122 | proposal to add skeleton of TR33.936 Security Assurance Methodology (SECAM) for 3GPP virtualized network products | China Mobile | pCR |  | approved |  |
|  |  | S3‑220123 | proposal to add scope of TR33.927 Security Assurance Specification (SCAS) threats and critical assets in 3GPP virtualized network product classes | China Mobile | pCR |  | approved |  |
|  |  | S3‑220124 | proposal to add skeleton of TR33.927 Security Assurance Specification (SCAS) threats and critical assets in 3GPP virtualized network product classes | China Mobile | pCR |  | approved |  |
|  |  | S3‑220125 | proposal to add scope of TS33.527 Security Assurance Specification (SCAS) for 3GPP virtualized network products | China Mobile | pCR |  | approved |  |
|  |  | S3‑220126 | proposal to add skeleton of TS33.527 Security Assurance Specification (SCAS) for 3GPP virtualized network products | China Mobile | pCR |  | approved |  |
| 4.3 | New WID on Mission critical security enhancements phase 3 | S3‑220056 | [33.180] R18 Clarification requested by ETSI Plugtest (mirror) | Motorola Solutions Danmark A/S | CR |  | withdrawn |  |
| 4.4 | Security Assurance Specification for Service Communication Proxy (SECOP) (Rel-17) | S3‑220386 | Reference to SCP-specific requirements | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR | [Ericsson] : proposes updates  [Nokia] : provides -r1 accordingly.  [Ericsson] : r1 is fine | agreed | R1 |
|  |  | S3‑220387 | Reference to other 3GPP specs | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR |  | agreed |  |
| 4.5 | Security Assurance Specification for 5G NWDAF (Rel-17) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.6 | Authentication and key management for applications based on 3GPP credential in 5G (Rel-17) | S3‑220087 | Add a Note about the Kaf refresh | ZTE Corporation | CR | [Qualcomm]: in principle ok but request a revision  [ZTE]: Provide a new version.  [Qualcomm]: fine with r2. | agreed | R2 |
|  |  | S3‑220088 | Add function description about AAnF in 4.2.1 | ZTE Corporation | CR | [Ericsson]: This contributions may need to be revised to include the conclusion of the contribution S3-220286.  [ZTE]: Ask for clarification.  [Ericsson]: Ericsson is fine with the contribution. | agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220089 | Clarification on the NF consumer in 6.6.1 | ZTE Corporation | CR | [Ericsson]: Proposes changes.  [ZTE]: Provide way forward.  [Ericsson]: The previous proposal by Ericsson was sufficient.  [ZTE]: Ask for clarification.  [ZTE]: Provide R1.  [Ericsson]: Ericsson is not fine with R1. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220090 | Clarification on UDM manage AKMA subscription data in 4.2.5 | ZTE Corporation | CR | [Ericsson]: Propose not to pursue as the proposed changed in not essential.  [ZTE]: Provide clarification.  [ZTE]: kindly ask if Ericsson is fine.  [Ericsson]: is not fine with this contribution. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220285 | Clarification on AKMA Application key retrieval | Samsung, ZTE | CR | [Qualcomm]: proposes to not pursue  [Samsung]: Disagree with Qualcomm's comment and provides clarification.  [Ericsson]: Asks for clarifications.  [Samsung]: Provides clarification that if AKMA service need exception as like Emergency service to access the service without valid credentials, then it needs SA1/3 requirement first.  [Samsung]: Provides clarification that if AKMA service need exception as like Emergency service to access the service without valid credentials, then it needs SA1/3 requirement first.  >>CC\_8<<  [Samsung] presents status.  [Ericsson] clarifies Ericsson’s comments  [CMCC] agrees with Ericsson, prefers proposals in 301, to keep the ‘may’ option as it is. Not convinced having changes in current text .  [Samsung] clarifies the revision is related to key expire.  [Ericsson] clarifies it is already discussed in TR phase.  [Chair]: Please continue discussion over email.  >>CC\_8<<  [Samsung]: Provides clarification that if AKMA service need exception as like Emergency service to access the service without valid credentials, then it needs SA1/3 requirement first.  [ZTE]: Support this, but also fine with use 'may' in 6.4.2.  [Samsung]: Provide comments and asks clarification to CMCC and Ericsson  [CMCC]: Provides clarifications  [Ericsson]: Provides clarification  [Samsung]: provides justification  [Ericsson]: Asks for clarifications.  [Samsung]: provides reformulated text and asks Ericsson's view  [Samsung]: Request to minute in the meeting report for S3-220285.  There is no agreement made on the ambiguity of using expired Kaf. Without which the AKMA spec remains unclear and there is possible violation of security principle by AF (using expired key), which is a serious issue.  [Samsung]: Request to minute in the meeting report for S3-220285. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220286 | New AAnF application key get service without SUPI | Samsung, Verizon | CR | [Qualcomm]: requires changes  [Samsung]: Provides r1 and clarification to Qualcomm  [Qualcomm]: objects to the CR.  [Samsung]: Provides clarification to Qualcomm  [Verizon]: Support r1  [CMCC]: Requests clarifications from Samsung.  [Qualcomm]: maintains objection and requests further clarification  [Samsung]: Provides clarification to CMCC and Qualcomm  [Ericsson]: Provides understanding, asks for clarifications.  [Qualcomm]: responds to Samsung and Ericsson.  [Samsung]: Uploads r2 and provides clarification  [Ericsson]: Provides explanation, asks for clarification.  [Qualcomm]: in principle, ok with r2 but requires some updates for better readability and fixing formatting issues  [Samsung]: Thank you Qualcomm for r3. Fine with r3.  [Ericsson]: Not entirely happy with r3 with respect to the external AF handling but will consider r3 further.  [Ericsson]: Could be fine with r3. Needs 6.2.1 General clause and renumbering other clauses to describe the two use cases. | agreed | R3 |
|  |  | S3‑220301 | Clarification on indication to UE when KAF is expired | LG Electronics France | CR | [Qualcomm]: requires revision  [LG]: provides revision, R1.  [Qualcomm]: ok with r1. | agreed | R1 |
|  |  | S3‑220304 | Clean up for TS 33.535 | LG Electronics France | CR |  | agreed |  |
| 4.7 | Enhancements of 3GPP profiles for cryptographic algorithms and security protocols (Rel- 17) | S3‑220317 | Discussion on Ua security protocol identifier for PSK TLS 1.3 | Qualcomm Incorporated | discussion | [Qualcomm] : propose to Note as it is a discussion paper | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220318 | Adding a Note about the new Ua security protocol identifier for TLS 1.3 | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR | [Thales] : provide comments  [Ericsson] : propose to note | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220319 | Adding a new Ua security protocol identifier for TLS 1.3 | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR | [Thales] : have question  [Qualcomm] : provides and answers  [Ericsson] : have question  [Qualcomm]: provide an answer  [Ericsson] : propose to note  [Thales] : propose to note. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220407 | Adding Reference to RFC 7235 in TS 33.203 | Ericsson | CR |  | agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220408 | LS on eCryptPr | Ericsson | LS out | [Huawei]: points out that such general LSes to summarize stage 2 group work to stage 3 groups are not needed  [Ericsson] : Clarifies  [Qualcomm]: Questions the need for the proposed LS | noted |  |
| 4.8 | Security Aspects of Enhancements for 5G Multicast-Broadcast Services (Rel-17) | S3‑220022 | LS on Multicast paging with TMGI | S2-2107995 | LS in | >>CC\_5<<  [QC] presents.  165 and 333 are corresponding draft reply  QC will hold the pen >>CC\_5<< | replied to | 165 |
|  |  | S3‑220091 | Resolve the EN in 5MBS | ZTE Corporation | CR | [Huawei] :propose to merge S3-220091 into S3-220162.  [ZTE] :fine to merge and hope to see the new version. | merged | 162 |
|  |  | S3‑220092 | Clean up for 5MBS | ZTE Corporation | CR | [Huawei] :propose to merge S3-220092 into S3-220164.  [ZTE] :fine to merge and hope to see the new version. | merged | 164 |
|  |  | S3‑220162 | Resolution of authorization issue | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR | [Huawei] :provide r1 to merge S3-220091 and S3-220332 into S3-220162.  [Qualcomm]: provide r2  [Huawei] :provide r3.  [ZTE]: Provide comments on the clause affected.  [Huawei] :provide r4 addressing the comment from ZTE.  [Qualcomm]: is okay with r4 | agreed | R4 |
|  |  | S3‑220163 | update to User-plane procedure for MBS security | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR | [Qualcomm]: propose to not pursue. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220164 | Corrections and clarifications in the security mechanisms for MBS | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR | [Huawei] :provide r1 to merge S3-220092 into S3-220164.  [ZTE] :Comments about the cover sheet.  [Huawei] :provide r2. | agreed | R2 |
|  |  | S3‑220184 | Secondary authentication for MBS sessions | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR | [Ericsson] :propose to postpone until SA3 gets LS reply from SA2.  [Huawei] :propose to note the contribution as the reply LS from SA2 is not received . | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220225 | Clarification on AS security aspect in 5MBS | LG Electronics Inc. | CR | MCC commented that this was more cat-F than cat-D.  [Qualcomm]: provide a comment.  [LGE]: provides r1 based on Qualcomm’s comment  [Huawei]: supports r1 and Huawei would like to cosign.  [LGE]: provides r2 adding Huawei as co-signer | agreed | R2 |
|  |  | S3‑220292 | PDCP COUNT check for MRB | Samsung | CR | [Huawei]: clarification required before approval.  [Samsung]: Provides clarification.  [Huawei]: provide comment.  [Qualcomm]: propose to not pursue this contribution.  [Ericsson]: propose to not note.  [Samsung]: Disagree with the comments from Qualcomm and Ericsson. Provides clarification and asks how service/application layer protection address the PDCP COUNT desync issue. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220293 | MBS capability exchange and delivery method | Samsung | CR | [Qualcomm]: propose to not pursue this contribution  [Ericsson]: propose to not pursue  [Samsung]: asks Qualcomm and Ericsson, whether the decision on 'For security protection of MBS traffic, control-plane procedure and user-plane procedure are optionally supported in service layer.' is challenged now, | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220294 | Security indication in MBS security context | Samsung | CR | [Huawei]: proposed change.  [Qualcomm]: propose revision  [Samsung]: Provides clarification  [Huawei]: Provides clarification  [Samsung]: Provides clarification  [Huawei]: Provides comments.  [Samsung]: Provides clarification  [Huawei]: asks way forwards.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_2<<  [HW] presents status  [Samsung] requests to agree instead of note  [QC] comments revision is needed.  [HW] comments the revision is required but not addressed.  [Samsung] clarification is given.  [HW] clarification is not convinced, requests to extend to email approval  [Chair] set email approval for this.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_2<< | Left for email approval |  |
|  |  | S3‑220332 | pCR to the draft CR: EN resolution | Qualcomm Incorporated | other | [Huawei] :propose to merge S3-220332 into S3-220162.  [Qualcomm]: provide r1 as the original contribution used a wrong template. | merged | 162 |
|  |  | S3‑220333 | Reply LS on Multicast paging with TMGI | Qualcomm Incorporated | LS out | >>CC\_5<<  [QC] presents  [HW] comments  [QC] clarifies  [Ericsson] comments >>CC\_5<<  [Huawei]: provides a concreate proposal.  [Ericsson]: ok with the concreate proposal.  >>CC\_7<<  [QC] presents status.  [HW] comments, there is no agreement yet.  [QC] clarifies it is R17 feature.  [HW] comments there is no time to develop solution. Time window is limited.  [Chair] tries to give a way forward.  [QC] replies to HW’s comment.  [Ericsson] proposes a way forward: maybe could send general description in LS to SA2.  [Ericsson] asks to track 165-r1  [HW] no need to open that  Continue discussion  >>CC\_7<<  [Huawei]: provides r1.  [Ericsson]: OK with r1.  [Qualcomm]: propose Longhua - Huawei to be the contact person.  [Huawei]: propose to use S3-220165 as baseline and reflect the agreement in the revision of S3-220165. | merged | 165 |
| 4.9 | Security Aspects of eNPN (Rel-17) | S3‑220017 | Reply to LS on support of PWS over SNPN | S1-214049 | LS in | [Ericsson] : proposes to note the LS | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220019 | Reply LS on UE capabilities indication in UPU | S2-2106703 | LS in | >>CC\_1<<  [Ericsson] presents and proposes to note  >>CC\_1<<  [Ericsson] : Propose to note (as indicated in conf call 1) | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220020 | Reply LS on updating the Credentials Holder controlled lists for SNPN selection | S2-2106705 | LS in | >>CC\_1<<  [Ericsson] presents  [Docomo] not sure whether to combine two discussion. It seems different.  Proposes incoming LS sould be open and replied.  Proposes to merge 217 to 431.  Proposes to keep separate.  [Ericsson] is also consider separate discussion.  >>CC\_1<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220024 | LS on support of DCS variants in UE Onboarding Architecture | S2-2109258 | LS in | [Ericsson] : proposes to discuss the reply in the thread for S3-220197 | replied to | 197 |
|  |  | S3‑220035 | Reply LS on IMEI for Non-Public Networks/Private Networks without using USIM | GSMA | LS in | [Ericsson] : proposes to note the LS | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220036 | Reply LS on UE capabilities indication in UPU | C1-220811 | LS in | >>CC\_1<<  [Ericsson] presents  >>CC\_1<<  [Ericsson] : Draft reply available in S3-220217 (as indicated in conf call 1) | replied to | 217 |
|  |  | S3‑220155 | Clarifcation and corrections to UE Onboarding in SNPNs | Intel | CR | MCC reminded that the comment in I.9.2.X should be removed before the document was agreed.  [Ericsson] : proposes to merge in S3-220335 | merged | 335 |
|  |  | S3‑220188 | Clarification on MSK and anonymous SUPI usage | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR | [Lenovo]: Clarification and Revision required.  [Qualcomm]: revision is needed  [Huawei]: Provides clarification and reply.  [Ericsson]: revision is needed  [Lenovo]: Provided r2 along with Clarifications.  [Huawei]: Provide more clarifications.  [Lenovo]: Provides additional clarification.  [Qualcomm]: provides requested clarification  [Huawei]: Provide R3 for sake of progress.  [Nokia]: Nokia is fine with the resolution in R3.  [Ericsson]: provides r4 with changes to cover sheet only  [Lenovo]: Okay with r4.  [CableLabs]: provided r5 by removing NOTE 1.  [Qualcomm]: requires a revision.  [Huawei]: Provides R6 accordingly.  [Ericsson]: Cannot find r6  [Huawei]: R6 is available.  [Lenovo]: r6 needs revision.  [Qualcomm]: responds to r6  [Lenovo]: Provides clarification.  [Huawei]: Sugges the EN for the progress. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220193 | Resolution of editor | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | other | [Xiaomi] : requests clarification | withdrawn |  |
|  |  | S3‑220194 | Resolution of editor notes related SUPI usage and forwarding | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | other |  | withdrawn |  |
|  |  | S3‑220195 | Resolution of editor notes related UDM selection | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | other |  | withdrawn |  |
|  |  | S3‑220196 | Resolution of editor notes related to protocol between NSSAAF and AAA. | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | other |  | withdrawn |  |
|  |  | S3‑220197 | REPLY LS on support of DCS variants in UE Onboarding Architecture | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | LS out | [Ericsson] : updates are required  [Lenovo] : Requires revision.  [Nokia] : Provides clarification to proposes changes by Ericsson and Lenovo.  [Ericsson] : replies to Nokia  [Nokia] : replies to comments from Ericsson and provide R1 proposing resolutions.  [Lenovo] : Lenovo is okay with r1.  [Qualcomm]: requires revision  [Ericsson] : provides r2  [Nokia] : Requires changes to R2 before acceptable  [Ericsson] is fine to wait until 355 conclusion has reached (notes captured by VC)  [Intel]: Minor Editorial changes request to r2  [Nokia]: Provides r3 which includes Intels comments.  [Intel]: r3 is fine.  [Lenovo]: r3 is okay | approved | R3 |
|  |  | S3‑220215 | UDM interaction for anonymous SUCI | Ericsson | CR | [Huawei]: Requires revision.  [Qualcomm]: Questions the need for this CR  [Ericsson]: Provides clarifications  [Lenovo]: Objects the current form of the contribution.  Requires clarification and revision.  [Ericsson]: Responds and provides revision r1  [Huawei]: We are also fine with Sheeba’s comments. For R1, we are still not OK.  [Ericsson]: Responds to Huawei  [Lenovo]: Provides clarification  [Ericsson]: Responds to Lenovo  [Ericsson]: Agree with Ericsson.  [Lenovo]: Asks question on the benefits of using keyword ‘anonymous’.  Provides additional clarifications.  [Ericsson]: Explains the use of ‘anonymous’  [Nokia]: Provides comments to r1 and requests update.  [Qualcomm]: proposes to not pursue  [Ericsson]: replies and provides r3 (and r2, which had spelling error, corrected in r3)  [Nokia]: Requires update.  [Ericsson]: provides r4  [Huawei]: disagree with r4, more clarification is needed.  [Ericsson]: provides r5 and clarifications to Hua  [Huawei]: Answer to Ericsson, further clarification is still needed.  [Ericsson]: provides r6 and clarifications to Hua  [Huawei]: Provides R7 in the draft folder.  [Lenovo]: Do not agree to the changes.  Clarifications provided.  [Ericsson]: provides r8  [Ericsson]: asking Lenovo to reconsider for the sake of progress  [Lenovo]: Provides clarification.  [Qualcomm]: withdraws objection and fine with this CR in r7 going forward as 6.12.X is now removed | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220218 | Anonymous SUCI for initial access | Ericsson | CR | [Lenovo] : Objects to the current form of the contribution.  Requires revision and propose to merge S3-220218 in S3-220435.  [Ericsson] : rejects merge proposal and provides clarification  [Qualcomm]: proposes to not pursue.  [Lenovo]: Accepts to handle S3-220218 as standalone without merger.  But S3-220218 is not clear on its own.  [Ericsson]: Provides clarifications and asks QC to rethink proposal not to pursue  [Qualcomm]: withdraws the proposal to not pursue – instead proposes r1  [Ericsson]: Thanks Qualcomm for providing revision and provides minor update in r2.  [Huawei]: Disagree the removal of the reference to Annex B.  [CableLabs]: request an editorial change.  [Qualcomm]: Qualcomm fine with r2; supports it over r1  [Lenovo]: Do not agree to r2.  Provides clarification. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220219 | Removing Editor | Ericsson | CR | [Lenovo] : Objects to the contribution.  [Ericsson]: Provides revision (r1) and clarifications | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220220 | Removing Editor | Ericsson | CR | [Ericsson]: r1 provided (merge of S3-220220 and S3-220418) .  [CableLabs]: Provided comments.  [Qualcomm]: revision is needed  [Ericsson]: providing revision r2  [Qualcomm]: r2 not acceptable  [CableLabs]: ok with r2 and provide comments to Qualcomm.  [Qualcomm]: responds to Cable Labs  [Ericsson]: providing revision r3 making SUPI mandatory in step 7  [Qualcomm]: fine with r3 | agreed | R3 |
|  |  | S3‑220221 | Removing Editor | Ericsson | CR | [Nokia] : Propose to merge into S3-220420  [Ericsson ] : Agree to merge into S3-220420  [Nokia] : Mail discussion on this CR is discontinued as the CR is merged into S3-220420. Please continue the discussion there. | merged | 420 |
|  |  | S3‑220239 | DP-loss of control of preferred SNPN list in eNPN | Huawei, HiSilicon | discussion | [Qualcomm]: propose to note.  [Huawei]: responds to Qualcomm.  [Qualcomm]: responds to Huawei.  [Huawei]: further clarifications  [Ericsson] : proposes to note, comments  [Huawei] : responds to Ericsson  [Philips] Agrees with the issue. Not sure about solving it in release 17.  [Ericsson] : replies to Huawei  [Huawei] : further clarifications | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220240 | SN name verification in eNPN | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR | [Qualcomm]: proposes to not pursue  [Huawei]: responds to Qualcomm  [Ericsson] : proposes to not pursue | not pursed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220253 | Removing Editor | Ericsson | CR | [Huawei]: Suggest to merged into S3-220188 and discontinue this email thread.  [Lenovo]: Requires clarification as the justification and the removal of the EN are not aligned.  [Qualcomm]: proposes merge with S3-220188 and continue the discussion there. If merger is not agreed, then requires revision before agreement.  [Ericsson] : fine to merge in S3-220188  [Lenovo] comments (notes captured by VC)  [Qualcomm]: provides clarification to Lenovo.  [Ericsson] : clarifies to Lenovo  [Lenovo] : requires revision.  Provides clarification.  [Lenovo] : Disagrees with S3-220253.  Consensus not reached. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220254 | Removing Editor | Ericsson | CR | [Nokia] : Propose to merge into S3-220417  [Ericsson] : agree to merge in S3-220417  [Nokia] : Mail discussion on this CR is discontinued as the CR is merged into S3-220417. Please continue the discussion there. | merged | 417 |
|  |  | S3‑220255 | Removing Editor | Ericsson | CR |  | agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220256 | Removing Editor | Ericsson | CR | [Ericsson] : can be merged in S3-220335  [Ericsson] : can be not pursued instead of merged into S3-220335 | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220257 | Editorial for the Figure on key hierarchy for Credentials Holder using AAA | Ericsson | CR | [Huawei]: Propose to noted this contribution. I suspect this document using the wrong baseline of TS33.501. The latest version of TS33.501 already fixed this issue. There is no need this proposal S3-220257.  [Huawei]: withdraw the objection. | agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220335 | Clarifcation and corrections to UE Onboarding in SNPNs | Qualcomm Incorporated, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR | [Ericsson] : proposes r1, and proposes to merge S3-220155 and S3-220256 into this  [Intel] : Uploaded r2 for the merged version to not to deviate from the working agreement. Requests clarification on IEC 62443.  [Huawei]: Require clarification on UDM involvement. Don’t think this is clear enough addressed in R2.  [Qualcomm]: provides comments on r1/r2  [Lenovo]: Comments provided, r2 needs revision.  [Nokia]: Comments to r2 and request a revision.  [Thales] : provide comments to Note x in clause I.9.2.2  [Intel] : r3 is uploaded  [Ericsson] : Provides r4 which captures the current status after the offline call.  [Ericsson] : Provides r5 and r6 (= r5 with removed changes over changes)  [Nokia] : Provides comments to R6.  [Lenovo] : Requires revision and clarification.  [Intel] : Provides comments to R6 and requires updates to r6  [Qualcomm]: provides r7; further provides responses to the comments on r6  [Nokia]: Nokia is fine to accept R7.  [Ericsson] : minor change proposal to r7  [Intel] : changes requested for r7  [Nokia] : Adds comments to comments from Ericsson and Intel.  [Lenovo] : r7 is not acceptable. Requires revision.  Clarifications provided.  [Qualcomm]: provides r8 and some clarifications  [Nokia]: Nokia is fine with R8  [Lenovo]: r8 is okay.  [Qualcomm]: thanks Lenovo for accepting compromise r8.  [Intel]: r8 is fine by us.  [Ericsson] : can live with r8, but please remove Ericsson as cosigning company and S3-220256 from the merger | agreed | R8 |
|  |  | S3‑220417 | Resolution of editor | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR | [Nokia] : S3-220254 is merged into S3-220417. R1 can be found in the draft folder.  [Ericsson] : provides r2  [Qualcomm]: requests clarification/revision  [Xiaomi] : requests clarification  [Nokia] : Provides answers to Xiaomi:  [Xiaomi] : requests revision  [Nokia] : Provides R3  [Ericsson] : asks for clarification, proposes to use r2 as basis  [Xiaomi] : is ok with R3  [Ericsson] : Provides R4 addressing the baseline issue.  Correction: R4 was provided by Nokia  [Ericsson] : r4 is fine  [Qualcomm]: fine with r4 | agreed | R4 |
|  |  | S3‑220418 | Resolution of editor notes related SUPI usage and forwarding | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR | [Ericsson] : Propose to merge into S3-220220  [Nokia] : Accepts the proposal to merge.  [Ericsson] : Mail discussion on this CR is discontinued as the CR is merged into S3-220220. Please continue the discussion there. | merged | 220 |
|  |  | S3‑220419 | Resolution of editor notes related UDM selection | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR | [Thales] : asks question for clarification.  [Nokia] : Provides answers.  [Thales] : ask further question  [Nokia] : Provides answers in R1.  [Thales] : a change is need for r1.  [Nokia] : Provides correction in R2.  [Thales] : fine with r2. | agreed | R2 |
|  |  | S3‑220420 | Resolution of editor notes related to protocol between NSSAAF and AAA. | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR | MCC pointed out that notes must be informative, so Note X cannot give a recommendation.  [Nokia] : S3-220221 is merged into S3-220420 and provided as R1 in the draft folder. The revision also addresses the comments by admin.  [Huawei]: Ask the revision uploaded.  [Nokia]: Provides R1 in draft folder.  [Qualcomm]: ME impact should be unchecked.  [Nokia]: Provides R2 addressing the comments from Qualcomm. | agreed | R2 |
|  |  | S3‑220435 | Update to Clause 1.9 for Onboarding Initial Access | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | CR | [Ericsson] : should be not pursued  [Lenovo] : Provides clarification to Ericsson’s question.  [Lenovo] : Provides r1.  [Philips]: Requires revision  [Lenovo]: Provides clarification  [Lenovo]: Provided r2  [Philips] Requires additional revision  [Lenovo] Provides r3 that address Philips’s comments.  [Philips] Agrees r3  [Ericsson] : disagrees with r1/r2/r3  [Lenovo] : Provides clarification.  Do not agree to Ericsson’s comment.  [Xiaomi] : requests for clarification.  [Lenovo] : provides clarification. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3-220445 | LS on UE onboarding with primary authentication without using DCS | Ericsson | LS out | [Ericsson] : provides first draft (r2) of LS to SA2 on UE onboarding with primary authentication without using DCS  [Nokia] : Requires clarifications before acceptable.  [Qualcomm]: proposed content of the LS not acceptable  [Ericsson] : clarifies  [Nokia] : requests further clarifications | noted |  |
| 4.10 | Security Aspects of Enhancement of Support for Edge Computing in 5GC (Rel-17) | S3‑220029 | Reply LS on EAS and ECS identifiers | S6-212490 | LS in | [Huawei] : Propose to note the LS. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220093 | Authentication based on AKMA between EEC and ECS in clause 6.2 | ZTE Corporation | pCR | [Huawei] : Propose to merge the solution with 0231/0289/0351.  [ZTE] : is fine to merge. | merged | 351 |
|  |  | S3‑220094 | Authentication based on AKMA between EEC and EES in clause 6.3 | ZTE Corporation | pCR | [Ericsson] : Proposes to have the discussion in 220351 email thread and use 220352 as the merger for EEC-EES authentication contributions | merge | 352 |
|  |  | S3‑220137 | MEC - TS - Negotiation procedure for the authentication and authorization | Apple | pCR | [Huawei] : Propose to discuss how to support the AKMA/GBA in the EEC/ECS/Home network side at first in the S3-220351 thread. | merge | 351 |
|  |  | S3‑220138 | MEC - TS - Authentication between EEC and ECS based on TLS-PSK | Apple | pCR | [Ericsson] : proposes to note the contribution  [Qualcomm] : proposes to note the contribution | Noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220146 | Discussion on selection between options on Edge | OPPO | discussion | [Ericsson] : thanks for the discussion paper and since it is a discussion paper, proposes to note | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220148 | New solution: Authentication algorithm selection between EEC and ECS, EEC and EES | OPPO | pCR | [Huawei] : Propose to discuss how to support the AKMA/GBA in the EEC/ECS/Home network side at first in the S3-220351 thread. | merge | 351 |
|  |  | S3‑220154 | MEC-TS-Enhanced Authentication between EEC and ECS based on TLS-PSK addressing the key diversity issue | Apple Computer Trading Co. Ltd | pCR | [Huawei] : request clarification.  [Ericsson] : proposes to note the contribution  [Qualcomm] : proposes to note the contribution  [Apple] : provides clarification.  [Apple] : provides clarification to QC.  [Ericsson] : provides clarification  >>CC\_4<<  [Apple] presents  [HW] proposes to discuss whether it is needed or not as rapporteur.  [Chair] asks which company supports this, there is no support other than Apple.  >>CC\_4<<  [Apple] : provides more clarification  [Ericsson] : provides clarification | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220157 | Corrections to EDGE reference and editorials | Intel | pCR |  | approved |  |
|  |  | S3‑220158 | Removal of EN related to identifiers for EES and ECS authentication and authorization. | Intel | pCR | [Huawei] : requires clarification.  There is no ECS ID definition in SA6, if we need that ,we should define at first.  [Huawei] : requires clarification.  There is no ECS ID definition in SA6, if we need that ,we should define at first.  [Huawei] : Thanks for your clarification. Then, I have no issues.  [Qualcomm] : Proposes an editorial clarification of the added text  [Intel] : Uploaded r1 with editorial corrections.  [Qualcomm] : OK with r1  [Huawei] : OK with r1. | approved | R1 |
|  |  | S3‑220176 | Refer to User consent Requirements for MEC | Huawei, HiSilicon | pCR | [Ericsson] : proposes update  As mentioned in the S3-220187 email thread, user consent related text can be added to EC TS instead of TS 33.501.  [Ericsson] : provides clarification and proposes further update  All the details in S3-220187 are not needed. Referring to 33.501 Annex V and SA2 EC TS would be enough.  [Huawei]: ask to provide the reference from SA2 EC TS and upload the R1 in the draft folder.  [Ericsson] : provides r1 and clarification  [NTT DOCOMO] provide rewording  [Ericsson] : comments on the proposal of NTT DOCOMO  [NTT DOCOMO]: requires different rewording  [Ericsson] : provides clarification/explanation  [NTT DOCOMO]: fine with Ericsson's proposal  [Ericsson] : provides r2  [Huawei]: Provide R3 in the draft folder.  [Ericsson] : comments on r3 and would like to co-sign.  [Huawei]: Upload R4 with the changes proposed by Ericsson.  [Ericsson] : r4 is ok | approved | R4 |
|  |  | S3‑220203 | Authentication and authorization between EEC and ECS | THALES | pCR | [Huawei] : request clarification.  [Thales] : responds to Huawei.  [Ericsson] : comments on key diversity  >>CC\_4<<  [Thales] presents rationale  [Chair] asks which company supports this.  [Apple] supports this way forward in general.  [Docomo] comments.  [Oppo] questions.  [Thales] answers.  [HW] clarifies.  [QC] comments  [Apple] clarifies  [Docomo] still has concern  [HW] proposes way forward  -----  Supporter 203/205: Apple, Thales.  Dont’ want 203/205 included in R17: Oppo, QC, ZTE, HuaWwei, CMCC, Ericsson  -----  [Chair] requests to consider 203/205 in later release.  >>CC\_4<< | Noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220205 | Authentication and authoriation between EEC and EES | THALES | pCR | [Ericsson] : Comments of key diversity and proposes to have the discussion in 220351 email thread and use 220352 as the merger for EEC-EES authentication contributions  [Thales] : fine with the proposal to use S3-220352 as the merger. | merge | 352 |
|  |  | S3‑220231 | EC: Authentication and Authorization between EEC and ECS | Huawei, HiSilicon | pCR | [Ericsson] : proposes to have the discussion in 0351 thread | merge | 351 |
|  |  | S3‑220232 | EC: Authentication and Authorization between EEC and EES | Huawei, HiSilicon | pCR | [Ericsson] : proposes to have the discussion in 220351 email thread and use 220352 as the merger for EEC-EES authentication contributions | merge | 352 |
|  |  | S3‑220289 | Authentication and authorization between EEC and ECS/EES | Samsung | pCR | [Huawei] : Propose to discuss how to support the AKMA/GBA in the EEC/ECS/Home network side at first in the S3-220351 thread, and comment on the security method selection. | merge | 351 |
|  |  | S3‑220315 | Specifying EEC to ECS/EES security | Qualcomm Incorporated | pCR | [Huawei] : Propose to discuss how to support the AKMA/GBA in the EEC/ECS/Home network side at first in the S3-220351 thread.  [Qualcomm]: Ok with Huawei’s proposal on having discussions in S3-220351  [Apple]: propose to note this one, since the same discussion is under the thread of S3-220351. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220346 | Discussion on having AKMA and GBA in EC from interoperability and future-proof point of view | Ericsson | discussion | [Qualcomm] : proposes to note the contribution as it is just for discussion | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220351 | Authentication and authorization between EEC and ECS | Ericsson | pCR | [Huawei] : Initiate the discussion on the capability of EEC/ECS/Home network.  [Ericsson] : Proposes to continue the discussions in this email thread considering 220351 as the merger  [Qualcomm] : Provides input on Qualcomm’s position  [Huawei] : Provides input on Huawei’s position, and welcome other positions.  [OPPO] : Proposes changes.  Change 1  Deleting “TLS 1.3 with AKMA shared key and TLS 1.3 with GBA shared key shall be supported by the EEC and ECS.”  Adding “TLS 1.3 with AKMA shared key or TLS 1.3 with GBA shared key shall be supported by the EEC and ECS.  Change2  Deleting “The UE shall support AKMA and GBA features”  Change3  Adding “Editor’s Notes: How to decide whether to support GBA or AKMA on UE is FFS.”  [Apple] : Provides input on Apple's position regarding to the key questions.  [Huawei] : Provide clarification Oppo.  [NTT DOCOMO]: provides further input. Need to see final version of 351 before agreeing.  [Ericsson]: provides input  [OPPO] : Provides input.  [Huawei]: provides input  [NTT DOCOMO]: not convinced by Ericsson input  [Apple]: Provide input, still have concerns  [Huawei] : Provides Huawei inputs.  [Ericsson] : providers further inputs  >>CC\_4<<  [HW] presents status.  [Docomo] comments, proposes one solution is better, rather than multiple solutions. Prefers to TLS with certificate (for server authentication), if a solution is not agreed in this release, then also it is not a big issue, it can be addressed by configuration.  [Vivo] comments  [Oppo] comments UE does not need to support GBA/AKMA at the same time, and don’t support to make mandatory support.  [Thales] clarifies  [Apple] agrees with Oppo, no need to mandatory support in UE side, and technical details are still needs to be discussed.  [VF] comments  [Chair] proposes to keep documents open and extends to next week. EDGE resolutions can be taken up as early as Monday.  [QC] comments, supports extending to next week.  >>CC\_4<<  [Ericsson] : provides a discussion paper  [NTT DOCOMO]: proposals for show of hands don't seem to be complete.  [Huawei] : Provide inputs, and remind the show of hands in Tuesday if needed.  [OPPO]: Proposal of show-hands lacks UE options.  [vivo]: If show-hands is the last option, agree with OPPO’s proposal.  [Apple]: if we have to go for show of hands, then more options for show of hands need to be added, i.e. options without mandating UE to support AKMA and GBA.  [Huawei] : provide clarification.  [Xiaomi]: proposes more options for what UE needs to support  [vivo] : provide comments.  [Thales] : provide comments.  [Thales] : provide clarification.  [CMCC] : provides comments.  [vivo] : provide clarification.  [vivo] : provides clarification.  [Xiaomi]: provides response to the comment  [Apple] : provide comments.  [Ericsson] : provide comments  [Intel]: support options provided by Apple  [Thales]: provide comments regarding option C.  [Apple]: responds to Thales’ comments  [Huawei] : Thanks for all the comments. I will prepare a document collecting all the issues left for the offline discussion today.  [Ericsson] : proposes other options for discussion  [Huawei] : Thanks for your proposals. Will include them for discussion.  [Huawei] : Document for offline discussion was uploaded.  [Huawei] : upload r1 cosigned by Huawei.  [Huawei] : upload r2 with minor change by adding the ”or” in the procedure.  [Deutsche Telekom] : upload -r3 cosigned by DT  [OPPO] : Proposes to delete “The UE shall support AKMA and GBA features and” in r2 in order to make progress.  [Apple] : Disagree with the current version R2.  [Apple] : Disagree with the R3 with the same rational as R3 and R2 has the same content.  [Huawei] : response to Apple’s comments.  [Huawei] : supports r3 and co-signs.  >>CC\_5<<  (VC to record show of hand draft doc without contribution number)  [HW] proposes show of hand draft.  [Chair] no show of hand today, will allocate slot tomorrow for discussion and decision. >>CC\_5<<  >>CC\_6<<  [HW] presents status and propose show of hands.  [Docomo] comments.  [Oppo] shares Docomo’s concern.  [Apple] shares same concern.  [Xiaomi] has same concern.  [Vivo] has same concern.  [Ericsson] comments.  [CableLabs] has same comments.  [Docomo] comments no option, proposes to have offline conf-call.  [Chair] asks whether it is helpful to have a call tomorrow.  [HW] is ok to arrange the call.  [Chair] sets the offline call. >>CC\_6<<  >>CC\_7<<  [HW] presents status and questsions.  [Docomo] comments current option is not well reflect the concern.  [Apple] comments not know how to vote for this option  [Thales] comments  [HW] replies to Docomo and Apple  [Oppo] not against option but has concern on UE side, proposes to change option A.  [Vivo] shares same view with Oppo.  [Apple] replies to Thales.  [Chair] asks whether each options is feasible for R17.  [Docomo] comments that is not work  [QC] comments on option B.  [HW] replies  [Thales] comments  [QC] comments  [Apple] comments  [Samsung] think option A works  [CMCC] considers option work  [ZTE] support A.  [Thales] support A  [Xiaomi] can’t support A, doesn’t agree UE support both.  ---show hands----  Option a) Ericsson, Samsung, HW, CMCC, Thales, QC, TIM, DT, MSI, ZTE  Option b) Lenovo, Oppo  (newly added) neither option a nor option b: Apple, Docomo, vivo, Oppo, Verizon, Lenovo, Xiaomi  [Chair] asks feasible way to move forward.  [Apple] would like to bring certificate option back on the table.  [Thales] certificate option is against the conclusion in the TR.  [Apple] does not consider certificate option is not against the conclusion in the TR.  [HW] agrees to Thales.  [Vivo] comments.  [Docomo] if follow the conclusion, only one solution should be selected, not two solutions.  [CableLabs] certificate should be an option if there is no feasible conclusion.  [Verizon] shares same view with CableLabs.  [Lenovo] prefers Docomo’s proposal.  [Samsung] proposes to set GBA as mandatory and AKMA as optional  [Xiaomi] prefers to use certificate, plan B is to go as Docomo suggested.  [Chair] comments there may not have consensus, maybe need to be solved in SA plenary.  [HW] requests to solve issue in SA3  [Chair] requests to make further discussion and will discuss whether option a is feasible tomorrow. If no other feasible solution, option a should be set as working agreement  ---show hands---  >>CC\_7<<  >>CC\_8<<  [HW] presents status. 351 is well supported.  [Docomo] comments that this doesn’t address the issues that have been raised.  [Chair] requests to have a deployable solution  [Verizon] has similar comment as Docomo, need to choose a deployable solution, choose one of AKMA/GBA.  [CableLabs] does not agree with any option here, Certificate based vs AKMA vs GBA, leave it open.  [Apple] comments 351 is conflicting with conclusion from TR.  [Nokia] comments Certficate base authentication can be the default, in addition AKMA or GBA can be supported, our preference is AKMA.  [Intel] has same comments with Apple.  [Thales] points out the conclusion is optional use, rather than optional implementation. Optional use needs mandatory implementation.  [Mavenir] comments optional choose one of them does not mean deployable. Agrees with Thales’ comment  [HW] we are re-opening the discussion. Clarifies the ‘option a’ (draft\_EDGE options for show of hands .. document)\_is workable.  [Oppo] doesn’t see how ‘option a’ aligns with TR conclusion.  [QC] clarifies, and is ok with option a.  [Chair] considers main concern from the support on both AKMA and GBA, requests to have show of hands on those.  [Lenovo] prefers AKMA  [Xiaomi] comments why to rule out TLS.  [Chair] clarifies Certificate based TLS is not ruled out.  [Docomo] comments whether it could extend another meeting cycle.  [Apple] comments to add more options  [HW] proposes to add certificate option only as way forward in this release  [CableLabs] agrees with HW’s proposal.  [Intel] agrees HW’s proposal  [Docomo] can live with that  [CMCC] has concern to break working procedure  [Thales] agrees with CMCC  [Verizon] agrees with HW’s proposal.  [Apple] agress with HW’s proposal.  [Lenovo] agrees both proposal.  [ZTE] disagress HW’s proposal  [Oppo] propose to postpone to R18, supports HW’s proposal  [CableLabs] replies to concerns raised on not aligning with TR  [CMCC] clarifies certificate base authentication is not covered in TR conclusion.  [Chair] doesn’t think certificate based TLS is not ruled out., what is captured in the notes, is details are out of scope.  [QC] comments, now we are discussing a solution based the NOTE in the TR conclusion.  [Chair] requests to set certificate as default.  [HW] shows option D as matching this.  [QC] comments on GPSI-IP translation as additional point in option D, which is not agreed.  [Docomo] comments same  [Thales] comments, request to revise EEC: TLS (Authentication method is based on deploy method)  [MSI] asks question  [Docomo] supports Thales.  [QC] comments similar to Thales  [HW] requests to state certificate  [CableLabs] agrees to HW  [Samsung] presents way forward  [Verizon] confused with Samsung’s proposal  [Thales] objects to mention certificate  [Samsung] clarifies  [Verizon] comments  [QC] proposes an agreements.  **TLS authentication methods shall be used. Details of TLS authentication methods (e.g. client certificate, AKMA, GBA based TLS authentication) is out of scope of the current document.**  [Chair] sets this as working assumption  [HW] is fine with working assumption and will try to make a revised contribution and approve it to finish r17 work.  >>CC\_8<<  [Thales] : supports r3 and co-signs.  [CMCC] : provides r4 and co-signs.  [Qualcomm] : provides a comment to several revisions  [NTT DOCOMO]: request to standardize only one solution to avoid interoperability nightmare in deployment.  [Huawei] : provides r5 by removing the IP translation for the sake of progress. Thanks.  [CableLabs]: keep the current conclusions in TR that TLS with GBA, AKMA, and client certificate are all optional.  [Intel]: Object to mandating TLS with AKMA and GBA for the Client. We support to have all the methods optional on the client.  [Ericsson] : provides r6 that captures the agreement made in the SA3#106 CC-W2/D4  [Huawei] : In general fine with the r6. One minor comments, how about removing the GPSI part.  [Huawei] : For the sake of progress, Huawei withdraw the minor comments. And Agree with r6.  [Ericsson] : responds to Huawei  [Thales] : provides comment.  [Ericsson] : asks clarification for source company  [Thales] : provide answer.  [Intel] : please add Intel as co-signer and source  [Samsung] : Please add Samsung as co-signer  [CMCC] : is fine to stay in the source list. | approved | R6 |
|  |  | S3‑220352 | Authentication and authorization between EEC and EES | Ericsson | pCR | [Huawei] : Initiate the discussion on the capability of EEC/EES/Home network.  [Ericsson] : Proposes to have the discussion in 220351 email thread and return back to this contribution  [Huawei] : upload r1 cosigned by Huawei.  [Ericsson] : provides r2 that captures the agreement made in the SA3#106 CC-W2/D4  [Huawei] : fine with r2. Thanks for the efforts.  [Ericsson] : asks clarification for source company  [Thales] : provide answer.  [Intel] : please add Intel as co-signer and source  [Samsung] : Please add Samsung as co-signer | agreed | R2 |
|  |  | S3-220533 | Presentation of Specification to TSG: TS 33.558, Version 0.4.0 for approval | Huawei, HiSilicon | TS/TR cover |  | Left for email approval |  |
| 4.11 | TLS protocols profiles for AKMA (Rel-17) | S3‑220095 | Add description about error case in annex B | ZTE Corporation | CR | [Ericsson]: Asks for clarification if the CR is needed as it proposes error handling typically left for stage 3.  [ZTE]: Provide clarification.  [ZTE]: kindly ask if Ericsson is fine.  [Ericsson]: These details described in the CR could left for stage 3.  [Ericsson]: Proposes not to pursue.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_2<<  [QC] presents status  [Ericsson] clarifies the position should be not pursued.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_2<< | not pursued |  |
| 4.12 | Security aspects of Uncrewed Aerial Systems (Rel-17) | S3‑220018 | Reply LS on 3GPP SA1 clarifications on problematic UAV | S1-214238 | LS in | [Huawei]: Propose to Note, no action is required from SA3 (cc). | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220076 | Update to UUAA-MM procedure | InterDigital Finland Oy | pCR |  | Approved |  |
|  |  | S3‑220119 | security between UAS-NF and USS | Huawei, HiSilicon | pCR | [Qualcomm] : propose this contribution is merged into S3-220311 as this touches on similar issues | merged | 311 |
|  |  | S3‑220120 | remove EN in 5.2.1.5 UUAA revocation | Huawei, HiSilicon | pCR | [Huawei]: 120 and 432 are merged into 120r1  [Lenovo]: r1 is okay.  Comments on minor editorial.  [Qualcomm]: Paper requires changes before it can be approved  [Ericsson] : request clarification  [Huawei] : response to Qualcomm and Ericsson.  [Huawei]: response to Lenovo.  [Lenovo] : Provides clarification to Qualcomm and Ericsson.  [Ericsson] : Provides clarification for the comment  [Lenovo] : Provides clarification.  [Qualcomm] : Provides a comment  [Lenovo] : Provides some clarification.  [Ericsson] : comments  [Lenovo] : Clarifies. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220181 | Resolve EN about USS Identifier | Huawei, HiSilicon | pCR | [Ericsson] : request clarification/update before approval  [Interdigital] : suggests second part of the NOTE wording using existing similar NOTE in different clause  [Qualcomm] : propose this contribution is merged into S3-220311 as this touches on similar issues  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: ok with the merger plan. | merged | 311 |
|  |  | S3‑220311 | Protection of UAS NF to USS interface | Qualcomm Incorporated | pCR | [Huawei, HiSilicon]: Require further clarification and revision before approval.  [Interdigital]: shares similar views as Huawei on new NOTE2 wording  [Qualcomm]: Provides an r1 to try to satisfy comments  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: Provides an r1 to try to satisfy comments  [Interdigital]: OK with r1 | approved | R1 |
|  |  | S3‑220312 | Additional of further 5G pairing cases | Qualcomm Incorporated | pCR | [Huawei]: fine in principle, minor revisions proposed.  [Lenovo]: Requires revision to be agreeable.  Comments provided.  [Lenovo]: Additional clarification provided.  [Qualcomm]: Provides r1  [Lenovo]: Requests minor revision.  [Lenovo]: Requires revision, provides additional clarification.  [Qualcomm]: Provides r2  [Lenovo]: r2 is okay.  [Huawei]: r2 is fine | approved | R2 |
|  |  | S3‑220313 | Adding details of UUAA procedure in 4G | Qualcomm Incorporated | pCR | [Huawei]: Request modification and clarification.  [Lenovo]: Requires revision to be agreeable.  Comments provided.  [Qualcomm]: Provides r1  [Lenovo]: r1 Requires to be agreeable.  [Qualcomm]: Provides r2  [Lenovo]: r2 is not okay.  [Qualcomm]: Provides response  [Lenovo]: Provides way forward with an EN  [Qualcomm]: Provides r3  [Lenovo]: r3 is okay  [Huawei]: r3 is fine | approved | R3 |
|  |  | S3‑220314 | Details of pairing in EPS | Qualcomm Incorporated | pCR | [Huawei]: Request clarification.  [Lenovo]: Requires revision to be agreeable.  Comments provided.  [Qualcomm]: Provides r1  [Lenovo]: r1 requires revision before it can be approved.  [Qualcomm]: Provides r2  [Lenovo]: r2 is not okay.  [Qualcomm]: Provides response  [Qualcomm]: Provides r3  [Lenovo]: r3 is okay  [Huawei]: r3 is fine | approved | R3 |
|  |  | S3‑220429 | Update to Clause 5.2.1.1 General | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | pCR | [Lenovo]: r1 is provided to correct an error.  [Interdigital] : supports need for AMF to inform SMF that UUAA-MM was performed. Ask for clarification on the parameter used for that.  [Lenovo] : Thanks for Interdigital’s support and feedback.  Provides r2.  [Interdigital] : OK with r2.  [Qualcomm]: proposes a possible additional changes are necessary  [Lenovo]: Accepts Qualcomm proposal.  Provides r3.  [Qualcomm]: r3 requires changes before approval  [Lenovo]: Provides r4.  [Qualcomm]: r4 is OK | approved | R4 |
|  |  | S3‑220430 | Resolving EN for UUAA re-authentication | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | pCR | [Huawei]: Clarification required.  [Lenovo]: Clarification and revision r1 provided.  [Huawei]: Further comments.  [Qualcomm]: Changes are needed before approval  [Lenovo]: provides r2 with clarification.  [Qualcomm]: r2 requires changes before it can be approved  [Lenovo]: requests clarification. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220432 | Resolving EN for UUAA Revocation | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | pCR | [Huawei]: propose to merge with 120.  [Lenovo]: Accepts to merge with 120. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220433 | Resolving EN for UAS data security | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | pCR | [Ericsson] : requires revision before approval  [Qualcomm] : requires changes before approval  [Lenovo] : provides r1 with clarification.  [Ericsson] : r1 requires revision before approval  [Lenovo] : Accepts the feedback from Ericsson but seeks additional clarification from Ericsson.  [Ericsson] : provides clarification  [Lenovo] : provides r2.  [Qualcomm] : provides further comments  [Lenovo] : provides clarification. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220434 | UUAA and Pairing Alignment update to 33.256 | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | pCR | [Qualcomm] : propose changes to make the contribution acceptable  [Lenovo] : provides clarification and r1.  [Qualcomm] : provides a clarification  [Lenovo] : Provides r2.  [Qualcomm] : Provides feedback on r2  [Lenovo] : Clarifies the understanding.  [Qualcomm]: Responds to proposal  [Lenovo]: Asks question for clarification  [Qualcomm]: Provides a response  [Lenovo]: Provides r3.  [Qualcomm]: Qualcomm is not Ok with r3 | noted |  |
| 4.13 | Security Aspects of Proximity based services in 5GS ProSe (Rel-17) | S3‑220063 | TR 33.847 Updates to conclusions for KI 2 and KI 3 | MITRE Corporation | CR | >>CC\_5<<  (VC note: it is used to track way forward discussion which has no contribution number)  [CATT] presents status and ask questsion: do we need SGI for R17  [Chair] new anchor function means new interface and new service, concern on timing.  [CATT] clarifies the other way face same issue.  [Thales] comments  [Docomo] comments it is not good way to sacrifice security to meet other WG workload.  [CableLabs] agrees with Thales and Docomo.  [CATT] clarifies either solution can continue but if no TS required, no SBI support.  [HW] comments.  [IDCC] comments and proposes way forward  [HW] agrees with IDCC’s way forward.  [Ericsson] asks question for clarification  [Chair] clarifies status and proposes offline call tomorrow (UTC 13:00-14:00) to seek possible merger.  [IDCC] presents concrete merger proposal.  [CATT] has concern to make merger directly, asks to answer question firstly  [Thales] there is no time for show of hands now.  [Chair] asks VC(Minpeng) to chair offline discussion and try to discuss the question and get conclusion.  [Vivo] records position and would like to share with rapporteur.  >>CC\_5<<  >>CC\_6<<  [VC] presents notes from offline discussion  [Thales] comments that is fine to use EAP-AKA’ but wonder why 5G AKA could not be involved.  [Oppo] prefer one rather than both.  [IDCC] based on contributions submitted in this meeting, EAP-AKA’ is feasible in this meeting, 5G AKA need more time. It’s time issue.  [Xiaomi] has same opinion with Oppo, encourage only one solution.  [Thales] asks whether it is possible to add 5G AKA in next meeting.  [MCC] clarifies that will be considered as new feature, so an exception is needed.  [Oppo] clarifies to prefer one Authentication method only, not to specify 5G AKA.  [HW] share same view with IDCC. EAP-AKA’ is easier to complete.  [Chair] make EAP-AKA’ as priority solution in this meeting. That is agreement.  [IDCC] proposes to use 372 as baseline to keep inline with current conclusion for question group 1.  [Chair] requests to set 372 as basis as the conclusion made from question group 1.  [Verizon] comments, has concern whether operator can use that. 5G AKA is currently used in operator.  [Chair] clarifies 5G AKA can be introduced later  [Verizon] currently using 5G AKA  [HW] is ok to use 372 as baseline.  [Thales] asks to extend further discussion for 5G AKA in next meeting.  [QC] comments choosing 5G AKA may have huge impact about changes/update.  [IDCC] 288 revision has implemented the conclusion of question 2.1  [HW] comments  [IDCC] is ok with HW proposal.  [IDCC] clarifies status about question 2.2  [IDCC] presents status.  [Chair] proposes to make progress based on question group 1 and 2, and may be show of hands on question group 3.  [IDCC] asks question  [Chair] asks rapporteur to refine the questions for show of hands tomorrow so that it is easy to resolve.  >>CC\_6<<  >>CC\_7<<  [Chair] requests to discuss pending issue  [CATT] presents newly designed question.  [IDCC] comments and clarifies  [HW] comments to change the question  [CATT] comments the solution should keep in line with existed solution in TS, requests to consider solution with major support  [HW] asks to separate question about PRUK and PRUK ID  [IDCC] clarifies, PRUK ID is bound  [HW] clarifies  --show of hands--  Question 3.1:  Yes: IDCC, LGE, CATT, Samsung, ZTE, Oppo, Xiaomi.  No: Ericsson, HW, QC  [Chair] requests to set ‘yes’ as working agreement.  [Ericsson] comments  [Oppo] could support no if there is workable solution, but there is no such solution.  Question 3.2:  A) IDCC, HW, LGE, Samsung, Oppo, Xiaomi, CATT  B)Ericsson, QC, ZTE  [Ericsson] comments to remove AUSF from option A  [IDCC] comments to remove AUSF but can go general level first.  [HW] asks whether possible to include NF mentioned in TR phase but not proposed this time.  [Chair] requests to set option a) as working agreement.  Q3.3:   1. HW 2. LGE, IDCC, CATT, Samsung, ZTE 3. (obsoleted)   [CATT] clarifies  [Ericsson] comments to vote solution instead of question.  [IDCC] comments the UDM solution is on the table  [HW] AUSF has contribution so proposes to keep email discussion  [IDCC] clarifies  [Ericsson] comments UDM solution is not supported.  [IDCC] clarifies  [Chair] requests to capture requirement first and go proceed.  [IDCC] asks to set a concrete paper as baseline for further discussion.  [Chair] requests to set UDM as the node storing PRUK as working assumption  --show of hands--  [CATT] asks to let IDCC to hold the pen for draft merger/output.  [Ericsson] asks whether it is possible to send LS to SA2 to mention the interface to PKMF.  [CATT] clarifies there are several way besides sending LS out.  [Chair] requests to send LS to SA2 to give a clear announcement.  >>CC\_7<< | withdrawn |  |
|  |  | S3‑220072 | Provisioning and refresh of 5G ProSe long-term credentials | KPN N.V. | pCR | [KPN] Provides -r1 without editor’s notes.  [Thales] : proposes not to pursue this CR.  [Qualcomm]: disagree with both original contribution and r1.  [KPN] Asks for clarifications and reconsideration of position.  [Thales] : provide answers.  [KPN] Provides clarification and asks questions.  [Thales] : provide answer.  [KPN] Ask for clarifications  [Thales] : provide answer.  [KPN] provides response | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220074 | Discussion paper on provisioning and refresh of 5G ProSe long-term credentials | KPN N.V. | discussion | [Thales] : provide comments and proposes to note this discussion paper.  [Huawei] The first change shall be reverted before approval.  [Huawei]withdrawn comment to this contribution. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220079 | Update to U2N Security procedure over User Plane when using GBA Push | InterDigital Finland Oy | pCR | [Qualcomm]: propose to not pursue this contribution.  [Ericsson]: propose to not pursue this contribution.  [Thales] : provides comments.  [Interdigital] : asks for clarification on recovery. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220080 | NSSAA for Remote UE with L3 U2N relay without N3IWF | InterDigital Finland Oy | pCR | [Ericsson] : proposes to note this contribution as NSSAA was not concluded in the TR 33.847 last week  [Interdigital] : accept to note as per TR 33.847 conclusion on NSSAA last week. Hopefully we can properly address this gap in Rel-18. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220096 | Add a clause about key hierarchy for user plane | ZTE Corporation | pCR | [Ericsson] : provides comment, updates needed.  [ZTE]: Provide r1.  [Qualcomm]: provide a comment.  [ZTE]: Provide R2.  [Ericsson]: we are fine with R2. | approved | R2 |
|  |  | S3‑220097 | Add an EN in clause 6.3.3.2.2 | ZTE Corporation | pCR | [Ericsson] : provides questions  [ZTE]: Provide clarification.  [Qualcomm]: request revision  [ZTE]: Provide R1.  [Ericsson]: we are fine with r1.  [Qualcomm]: is okay with r1 | approved | R1 |
|  |  | S3‑220098 | Add some abbrevations for Prose | ZTE Corporation | pCR |  | approved |  |
|  |  | S3‑220099 | Clarficaiton on PKMF act as AKMA AF in clause 6.3.3.2.2 | ZTE Corporation | pCR | [Qualcomm]: request revision  [ZTE]: ask for clarification.  [Qualcomm]: provide clarification  [ZTE]: Provide R1.  [ZTE]: kindly ask if Qualcomm is fine with R1.  [Qualcomm]: is okay with r1 | approved | R1 |
|  |  | S3‑220100 | Clarification on AUSF instance store in UDM | ZTE Corporation | pCR | [Ericsson] : provides questions and prefer to note unless someone can clarifies  [ZTE]: Provide clarification.  [Ericsson]: withdraw proposal to note, thanks for clarification, then the discussion will continue in 288 | merged | 288 |
|  |  | S3‑220101 | Clean up the step 10-14 in clause 6.3.3.3.2 | ZTE Corporation | pCR |  | approved |  |
|  |  | S3‑220102 | CR to 33.501 about AUSF instance store in UDM | ZTE Corporation | CR | [Ericsson] : propose to note  [ZTE]: provide clarfication.  [Ericsson]: provides comments  [ZTE]: ask for clairfication.  [Ericsson]: provides comments | notpursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220103 | Update the PC5 key hierarchy over control plane | ZTE Corporation | pCR | [Ericsson] : ask for clarification  [ZTE]: Provide clarification.  [Ericsson]: thanks, then I will check 288 | merged | 288 |
|  |  | S3‑220104 | Update the step 2-5 in clause 6.3.3.3.2 | ZTE Corporation | pCR |  | approved |  |
|  |  | S3‑220131 | Address the EN on the UE-to-Network Relay security procedure over control plane | OPPO | pCR | [Ericsson] : propose to note  [CATT]: Propose to note this contribution as it needs firstly to be studied in the TR. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220147 | Remove the EN on privacy of PRUK ID | ZTE Corporation | pCR | [Qualcomm]: propose to not pursue | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220161 | Procedure for secondary authentication without N3IWF | LG Electronics Inc., InterDigital | pCR | [Qualcomm]: require revision before being agreed  [LGE]: provides r2 based on Qualcomm’s comment and also provides feedback  [LGE]: provides r3 as the latest one  [Ericsson]: comments to r3, requires revision  [LGE]: declares r4 based on Ericsson’s comment  [Interdigital]: provide r5 towards QC’s comment #8  [Ericsson]: r5 needs to be updated  [Qualcomm]: provide further feedback and require revision before it’s agreed.  [Ericsson]: provide further feedback and requires revision.  [LGE]: provides r6 and further feedback.  [Nokia]: comments and ask clarification.  [LGE]: provides feedback to Nokia and r7.  [LGE]: provides r8 for some corrections.  [Nokia]: answer for your question.  [LGE]: provides feedback to Nokia and asks Qualcomm and Ericsson to confirm if r8 is fine for them.  [Qualcomm]: request a revision and ask a question  [LGE]: provides feedback to Qualcomm and r9.  [LGE]: kindly asks if Qualcomm is fine with r9.  [Qualcomm]: is okay with r9  [LGE]: kindly asks Ericsson’s final position on this contribution.  [Ericsson]: stays neutral, will not note | approved | R9 |
|  |  | S3‑220179 | Clarification the security policy used during restricted discovery | Huawei, HiSilicon | pCR | [Xiaomi]: proposes to merge 179 into 276 and 277  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: ok with the merger proposal. | merged | 276 |
|  |  | S3‑220180 | Security procedures for L2 UE-to-Network relay | Huawei, HiSilicon | pCR | [Xiaomi]: proposes merging 180 and 373  [Qualcomm]: ask a question and provide a comment. Would S3-220373 be merged into this,  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: Request further clarification.  [Qualcomm]: provide answer  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: Provides r2.  [Philips]: asks a question.  [Ericsson]: we are fine with merging 373 into 180.  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: response to Philip and Ericsson.  [Xiaomi]: provides comments and asks questions for clarification  [Qualcomm]: provide a comment.  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: provide r3.  [Qualcomm]: ask a question  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: response to Qualcomm.  [Xiaomi]: fine with r3  [Ericsson]: could you indicate in the header this is a merger with 373  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: Provide r4 to indicate in title and rationale that this is merger of 0373.  [Ericsson]: We are fine with r4  [Qualcomm]: is okay with r4 | approved | R4 |
|  |  | S3‑220182 | Resolving the ENs on authentication procedure in control plane security procedure | Huawei, HiSilicon | pCR | OPPO proposes to NOTE this contribution. | merged | 288 |
|  |  | S3‑220183 | Resolving the EN on the usage of 5GPRUK ID | Huawei, HiSilicon | pCR | [Qualcomm]: this document should be noted based on the agreement  [Qualcomm]: resend after removing the unnecessary content.  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: this document should be noted based on the agreement | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220185 | Clarification on procedures for PC5 establishment in UE-to-Network relay scenario | Huawei, HiSilicon | pCR |  | approved |  |
|  |  | S3‑220198 | Procedure for secondary re-authentication and revocation of Remote UE over L3 U2N Relay without N3IWF | LG Electronics Inc., InterDigital | pCR | [Qualcomm]: propose to not pursue this contribution.  [LGE]: provides feedback to Qualcomm and asks to reconsider.  [Ericsson]: propose to note this contribution  [LGE]: declares r1 based on Ericsson and Qualcomm comment.  [LGE]: asks Qualcomm and Ericsson to confirm if r1 is fine for them.  [LGE]: kindly asks if Qualcomm and Ericsson are fine with r1.  [LGE]: just resending as a reminder in case Ericsson and Qualcomm have missed this email thread.  [LGE]: requests the rapporteur to reconsider the final status | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220208 | pCR to TS33.503 Clause 3 Definitions of terms and abbreviations | CATT | pCR |  | approved |  |
|  |  | S3‑220209 | pCR to TS33.503 Clause 4.2 Add new reference point between PKMF and UDM | CATT | pCR | [Ericsson] : provides comments/questions  [CATT] : Response to Ericsson’s comment。  [Ericsson] : Response to CATT. Great news! We support.  [Interdigital]: A proper official confirmation from SA2 is needed, e.g., LS.  [Ericsson]: provided a draft LS to SA2  [Ericsson]: draft LS is now uploaded in draft\_S3-220505-r1 in draft folder  >>CC\_8<<  [Ericsson] presents  >>CC\_8<<  [CATT] : Provide r2: change Npc10 to Npcxx.  [Ericsson] : Fine with r2 | approved | R2 |
|  |  | S3-220505 | Draft LS to SA2 | Ericsson | LS out | [Ericsson]: draft LS is now uploaded in draft\_S3-220505-r1 in draft folder | approved | R1 |
|  |  | S3‑220210 | pCR to TS33.503 Clause 6.3 Support SUCI in security procedure over User Plane | CATT | pCR | [China Telecom] There are issues for clarification in the authorization check procedure  [CATT] Response to China Telecom  [Ericsson] : we requests some updates  [CATT] : Provide r1. Bullets 3 and 4 under step 4c have been put back the old text.  [Qualcomm]: request a wording change.  [CATT]: r2 is available. It addresses Qualcomm’s comment.  [Nokia]: comments. Figure and description are not fully aligned  [CATT]: Provide r3 to address Nokia’s comment  [CATT]: Provide r3 to address Nokia’s comment  [Qualcomm]: is okay with r3  [Ericsson]: Provide comments to r3  [Ericsson]: we are fine with r3  [CATT]: Provide r4, updated based on comments.  [Ericsson]: fine with r4 | approved | R4 |
|  |  | S3‑220211 | pCR to TS33.503 Clause 6.3 Update security procedure over Control Plane | CATT | pCR | OPPO proposes to NOTE this contribution.  [China Telecom] Ask for clarifications and modifications about the S3-220211.  [CATT] Response to China Telecom  [Interdigital] currently working on a rev for the sake of time in line with the points discussed during the CC (i.e., SUCI mandatory)  [Interdigital] declares r1 as previously announced with SUCI mandatory for PRUK retrieval from UDM.  [Interdigital] declares r2. Fixed typo in r1 file name and some re-wording for clarity.  [Qualcomm]: disagree with mandatory SUCI in DCR.  [Interdigital]: replies that Qualcomm’s objection goes against the agreed way forward from today’s CC. Asks to not slow down progress.  [Qualcomm]:provide answer and sustain objection.  [ZTE]: agree with Qualcomm's view and not fine with r2.  [CATT]: Provide solution proposal for way forward.  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: provide clarifications.  [Ericsson]: provides objections to using only temporary input as PRUK ID to UDM and AUSF.  >>CC\_8<<  [IDCC] presents status, there is deadlock in merger process, contradicting contributions on Key storage in UDM. May be a way forward is to store the keys in new ProSe Anchor Fn.  [HW] objects to use SUCI every time UE invokes PRoSe  [Chair] asks questions, what is the technical issue in storing PRUK and PRUKID in UDM?  [QC] comments and clarifies the position.  [CATT] comments storing PRUK/PRUK ID in UDM has no technical problem.  [Ericsson] has concern, UDM is not meant to store temporary keys like PRUK and PRUKID. This is against design principles  [ZTE] SUCI should not be mandatory to send  [Ericsson] clarifies and doesn’t agree with ZTE’s comment  [CATT] proposes another way forward, to follow IDCC’s proposal on new ProSe Anchor Fn.  [Chair] asks to make extension on ProSe work, we need more time to complete the work.  [QC] is ok with CATT proposal, to use anchor function.  [IDCC] comments and ask to make clear position right now on new Anchor Fn, in order not to make endless debate next time.  [CATT] proposes to make a general solution than nothing to let CT4 has work in some extent.  [ZTE] is fine to use new anchor function  [HW] comments to choose not store PRUK/PRUK ID.  [Samsung] propose to keep decision pending and send LS out to SA2 to collect their opinion.  [CATT] Key storage is SA3 scope  [Chair] clarifies, key storage is within SA3 scope, LS exchange with SA2 will take more meeting cycles, not feasible now.  [QC] comments to use anchor function and set EN whether such anchor function can be integrated into UDM  [HW] we might delay work more than 1 quarter.  [IDCC] can provide general solution with some feedback and would be good start for next meeting.  [Chair] suggests to keep anchor function and need extension, requests CATT to prepare exception sheet.  [HW] is ok with the way forward.  [CATT] request Ericsson to change position.  [Chair] suggests to set EN on where to store the PRUK/PRUK ID.  >>CC\_8<<  [Interdigital]: tentative summary of current status for PRUK ID usage for way forward discussions  [Qualcomm]: ask for clarification  [CATT]: Confirm S3-220211 is merged into S3-220288. Also OK to the merger plan. | merged | 288 |
|  |  | S3‑220213 | pCR to TS33.503 Consistent term usage | CATT | pCR |  | approved |  |
|  |  | S3‑220274 | 33.503: Corrections for Network Domain Security | Xiaomi Technology | pCR | [Huawei] The first change shall be reverted before approval.  [Xiaomi]: provides clarification  [Xiaomi]: provides r1  [Huawei]: fine with r1 | apporved | R1 |
|  |  | S3‑220275 | 33.503: Issues for Clarifiacation in Open Discovery | Xiaomi Technology | pCR | [China Telecom] There is a clarification of this issues.  [Xiaomi]: provides response to the comment  [China Telecom] Add additions to comments.  [Xiaomi]: provides r1 based on the clarification  [Qualcomm]: disagree with both original contribution and r1.  [Huawei]: disagree with both original contribution and r1.  [Xiaomi]: provides clarification  [Xiaomi]: request clarification again on the reason of objecting  [Qualcomm]: provide a clarification.  [Xiaomi]: ask further questions for clarification  [Qualcomm]: propose a revision.  [Xiaomi]: provides r2 based on the clarification  [Xiaomi]: asks for confirmation on r2  [Qualcomm]: is not fine with r2.  [Xiaomi]: raises concern | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220276 | 33.503: Proposed Changes in Model A Discovery | Xiaomi Technology | pCR | [Huawei, HiSilicon]: Provides r1 as discussed under thread of S3-220179.  [Qualcomm]: requests a clarification and revision before approval.  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: requests a clarification and revision before approval.  [Qualcomm]: requests further revision before approval.  [Xiaomi]: provides response and r2  [Nokia]: comments and question for clarification on r2  [Xiaomi]: provides response and r3  [Huawei, HiSilicion]: Ask question, provides response and r4  [Xiaomi]: fine with r4  [Qualcomm]: requests further revision.  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: Reponse to Qualcomm’s comment.  [Xiaomi]: provides r5 and response  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: provide r6 and seek to make progress due to limited time.  [Xiaomi]: not fine with r6  [Qualcomm]: requests further clarification.  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: response to Xiaomi, ok with both r6 and r5.  [Xiaomi]: still prefers r5 and provides clarification  [Philips] provides comments and proposes to further clarify UE-to-NW relay discovery in next meeting.  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: Can live with the EN.  [Philips]: Responds to Huawei. Is fine with r6. Prefers r5.  [Xiaomi]: asks for confirmation on r5  [Qualcomm]: is only fine with r6.  [Xiaomi]: fine with r6 | approved | R6 |
|  |  | S3‑220277 | 33.503: Proposed Changes in Model B Discovery | Xiaomi Technology | pCR | [Huawei, HiSilicon]: Provides r1 as discussed under thread of S3-220179.  [Qualcomm]: requests a clarification and revision before approval.  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: propose to discuss under 276 to avoid duplicate discussions.  [Xiaomi]: provides r2  [Nokia]: comments and question for clarification on r2  [Xiaomi]: provides response and r3  [Huawei, HiSilicion]: Ask question, provides response and r4  [Huawei, HiSilicion]: provide r5 as r4 was uploaded with mistake.  [Xiaomi]: provides r6  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: provide r7 and seek to make progress due to limited time.  [Xiaomi]: not fine with r7  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: response to Xiaomi, ok with both r6 and r7.  [Philips] provides comments and proposes to further clarify UE-to-NW relay discovery in next meeting.  [Xiaomi]: requests rapporteur to update the final status  [Qualcomm]: is only fine with r7.  [Xiaomi]: fine with r7 | approved | R7 |
|  |  | S3‑220278 | 33.503: PC5 Security Policy Privisioned by PKMF | Xiaomi Technology | pCR | [China Telecom] There is a clarification about the S3-220278.  [Xiaomi]: provides r1  [Qualcomm]: requests revision before approval, and provides r2 with the changes.  [Xiaomi]: provides r3  [Huawei]: ask for clarification  [Xiaomi]: provides clarification  [Qualcomm]: is fine with r3, but it has one typo  [Xiaomi]: fine with r3  [Xiaomi]: provides r4  [Ericsson]: requires updates  [Xiaomi]: provides clarification and r5  [Xiaomi]: requests rapporteur to update the final status  [Ericsson]: fine with r5  [Qualcomm]: is fine with r5. | approved | R5 |
|  |  | S3‑220279 | 33.503: PC5 Security Policy Handling during CP-based Security Procedure | Xiaomi Technology | pCR |  | approved |  |
|  |  | S3‑220280 | 33.503: PC5 Security Policy for L2 U2N Relay | Xiaomi Technology | pCR | [Qualcomm]: requires revision, and provides r1 with changes.  [Xiaomi]: requests uploading of r1  [Xiaomi]: providing r2  [Qualcomm]: requests revision before approval.  [Xiaomi]: accepts the comment and provides r3  [Qualcomm]: comments in r3.  [Xiaomi]: provides r4  [Xiaomi]: requests rapporteur to update the final status  [Qualcomm]: is fine with r4. | approved | R4 |
|  |  | S3‑220288 | Resolving EN in ProSe CP based solution | Samsung, Interdigital, LG Electronics | pCR | >>CC\_1<<  [way forward for CP-based solution]  [CATT] presents and asks to give answer for proposed question.  [HW] comments to re-order the question, to ask group 4 question first.  [Ericsson] comments on Question 1.  [CATT] clarifies  Q4:  [ZTE] question for clarification. What is it user for about AV on group 4?  [CATT] clarifies  [IDCC] comments, a new service would has less impact.  [Oppo] comments 5G-AKA/EAP-AKA could not be seen as new services.  [HW] comments  [IDCC] comments  [ZTE] considers not big issue to set as new service.  Q1:  Q1.1  ZTE,IDCC:yes  Ericsson insists on No,  [HW] comments  [CATT] clarifies Q1.2 can answer Ericsson’s comment  [IDCC] clarifies  [CATT] has no strong opinion on this.  [Chair] proposes to use Prose Anchor Function  [HW] comments  [Chair] asks whether to mitigate HW concern by making such function optional  [QC] comments  [IDCC] proposes to keep discussion in separate conf call until conclusion work out  [Oppo] comments the impact should be either UE impact or network impact, to store PRUK/PRUK ID.  [Samsung] comments  [HW] is not happy to introduce Q1.1.  [Chair] has concern on incomplete solution if that is the way forward proposed by HW.  [HW] comments  [Samsung] comments  [There is no conclusion on Q1.]  [Chairs] asks if we want to solve this in R17, what should we do?  [Chair] suggests way forward, to make merger  [Chair] asks IDCC to take lead for the merger. IDCC is ok to do that.  >>CC\_1<<  OPPO proposes to NOTE this contribution.  [Interdigital] declares r1 merger of S3-220100, S3-220103, S3-220104. Propose this as baseline for new service operations update  [ZTE]: Thanks Interdigital for merger and prvide some comments.  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: Ok to use this as baseline of step 5, 6 and 10 and the new srvice operation name. Propose to add one more EN to address. Propose to move the 5GPRUK reusing issue to other thread.  [Interdigital] replies to ZTE and Huawei. Proposes to continue PRUK storage discussion in S3-220371.  [Interdigital] declares r2.  [Qualcomm]: provide a comment and request a revision  [Interdigital]: declares r3 address Qualcomm’s comment.  [Qualcomm]: ask a question.  [Interdigital]: provides guidance for merged input comments  [Qualcomm]: provide feedback  [ZTE]: provide R4.  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: Revision required before approval.  [CATT]: Provide r5 for the merger of S3-220367  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: Revision required before approval. Support the merger plan.  [Interdigital]: requests to keep the pen for proper coordination of complex merger.  [ZTE]: Provide way clarification.  [Interdigital]: clarifies  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: provide reply to the clarification.  [Interdigital]: declares r6 addressing comments from Qualcomm and Huawei. Removal of PRUK and EAP-AKA’ text prior to merger of 372 and 371.  [Interdigital]: replies to Huawei for wording suggestion  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: Fine with the version provided by Interdigital.  [Interdigital]: declares r7 merger of 372. Not proceeding with merger of 371 because of objections from CATT and Huawei.  [ZTE]: Provide comments.  [Nokia]: comments for consideration and question for clarification on r7.  [Interdigital]: replies to ZTE. Provides r8.  [ZTE]: Fine with R8.  [Interdigital]: replies to Nokia.  [Ericsson]: Provide comments.  [Interdigital]: Provide replies and r9  [Ericsson]: Provides an update in r10 with a new EN  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_2<<  [CATT] presents status, would like to know which version could be accepted to be merged into TS  [IDCC] prefers r9/r10 in major, but HW could not accept any revision after r7.  [HW] only accept r7  [ZTE] suggests to use R9 and left for email approval  [CATT] doesn’t consider email approval help, asks to decide which version.  [Chair] asks whether r7 is ok.  [IDCC] is ok as r7 has implemented most important features.  [QC] has concern as there is no time to check whether QC object r7.  [Chair] Request to take r7 as the agreed base in this meeting and expand in next meeting.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_2<<  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: Not agree with the revisions based on the comments received after UTC 11:00 deadline.  [Interdigital]: asks to Huawei reconsider and accept at least r9. | approved | R7 |
|  |  | S3‑220324 | CR on PRUK ID format | Qualcomm Incorporated | pCR |  | approved |  |
|  |  | S3‑220325 | Discussion on potential security mechanisms for protecting ProSe Disocovery message | Qualcomm Incorporated | discussion |  | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220326 | CR to ProSe TS | Qualcomm Incorporated | pCR | [Philips] Proposes to merge S3-220326 and S3-220361/S3-220362. Provides proposal on how to merge.  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: Ask for further clarifications and potential revisions.  [Qualcomm]: provides clarifications  [Xiaomi]: provides some comments.  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: Provides revision to reflect the output based on discussion with QC.  [Philips]: provides input.  [Qualcomm]: provides r3 and further clarifications  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: Fine with r3.  [Xiaomi]: provides some comments.  [Philips] Revision required.  [Qualcomm]: provides further clarifications  [Xiaomi]: provides r4  [Nokia]: ask clarification.  [Philips] Provides comments.  [Qualcomm]: provides r5 with further clarifications  [Qualcomm]: provides answers on Philips’ comments.  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: Fine with r6 and propose to add ‘Huawei, HiSilicon’ as co-signer.  [Xiaomi]: requests for revision  [Qualcomm]: provides r7 with further clarifications.  [Xiaomi]: requests a revision before acceptance.  [Philips]: asks for revision.  [Qualcomm]: provides r8.  [Xiaomi]: is ok with r8.  [CATT]: Fine with r8.  [Qualcomm]: provides r9 (added Xiaomi as a co-signer).  [Philips]: provides comments.  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: Fine with the ENs from our side.  [Qualcomm]: disagree with the proposed ENs, and propose to go with r9, which was agreed by CATT, Xiaomi, HW, and (possibly) Nokia.  [Philips]: reflects.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_2<<  [CATT] presents status, and request to decide which version can be approved  [Philips] comments.  [CATT] asks to left for email approval  [Chair] leaves it for email approval.  [QC] asks which version will be used to email approval.  [Chair] r9  [Chair] asks whether it is acceptable to keep r9 and discuss it next meeting for Philips  [CATT] requests to limit the discussion scope on whether EN could be added. It does not help to re-open other point.  [Chair: 326-r9 under email approval.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_2<<  [Rapporteur]: r9 or other version is for email approval. If there are no comments, r9 is approved. Approved version must be accepted by all comments. | left for email approval | R9 |
|  |  | S3‑220327 | CR to ProSe TS | Qualcomm Incorporated | pCR |  | approved |  |
|  |  | S3‑220328 | CR to ProSe TS | Qualcomm Incorporated | pCR | [Philips] clarification required.  [Qualcomm]: provides a clarification.  [Huawei]: Previous comment is from Huawei, rather than Qualcomm. Revision is needed before approval.  [Qualcomm]: provide comments.  [Huawei]: provide r2.  [Qualcomm]: is fine with r2. | approved | R2 |
|  |  | S3‑220340 | TR 33.847 | MITRE Corporation | CR |  | withdrawn |  |
|  |  | S3‑220357 | Managing and provisioning of discovery keys | Philips International B.V. | pCR | [Philips] Provides draft\_S3- S3-220357-r1. Includes MITRE as co-signing company. This CR relates to 6.1 and 6.3.3.  [Qualcomm]: propose to not pursue this contribution.  [Philips]: provides input and kindly requests to consider the contribution. Many technical details are missing. Request to at least include a NOTE where/if required. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220360 | Clarification Source Authenticity | Philips International B.V. | pCR | [Qualcomm]: disagree with the proposed changes.  [Philips]: disagrees with way forward suggested by Qualcomm. Source authenticity is a requirement in 6.1.3. If the text is placed in an annex, then there is no information about how TS 33.503 addresses this requirement. Philips asks kindly to accept proposed text.  [Nokia]: comments.  [Philips] provides revision.  [Philips] provides revision with the text in an annex.  [Qualcomm]: requests further revision before approval.  [Philips]: r3 available.  [Philips]: asks for confirmation on r3  [Qualcomm]: is fine with r3. | approved | R3 |
|  |  | S3‑220361 | Protection of longer discovery messages (simple) | Philips International B.V. | pCR | [Philips] Provides draft\_S3-220361-r1. This update includes only changes compared with TS 33.303. If authors of S3-220326 agree to merge, we can continue discussion there.  [Xiaomi] Provides some comments.  [Philips] provides input.  [Xiaomi] provides input.  [Philips] provides input and asks Xiaomi whether previous question is clarified.  [Xiaomi] provides input.  [Philips] The issue mentioned by Xiami is not clear. Philips asks for clarification.  [Xiaomi] provides clarification  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: start this thread as the contribution may have some dependency.  [Philips] Provides input. The construction is secure since the KDF is applied every time to a different bitstring s\_i so that a long keystream can be generated.  [CATT]: Propose to note this contribution as it contains contents that are neither the conclusion of the TR nor addressed by the EN in the TS.  [Philips]: Disagrees with the reason for noting this document.  [CATT]: Withdraw my previous comment  [Qualcomm]: propose to note this contribution. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220362 | Protection of longer discovery messages (more efficient) | Philips International B.V. | pCR | [Huawei, HiSilicon]: Correct the thread name.  [Philips]: provides feedback.  [CATT]: Propose to note S3-220362 as it contains contents that are neither the conclusion of the TR nor addressed by the EN in the TS.  [Philips]: thinks that this document focuses on the EN in the TS. So we disagree on the reason.  [Qualcomm]: propose to note this contribution. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220365 | Resolving EN in user plane solution for UE-to-network relay | Ericsson | pCR | [Nokia]: Minor comments. Suggest to reword a bit for completion.  [Ericsson]: accepts the proposal from Nokia and r1 is uploaded.  [Qualcomm]: provide editorial comments.  [Ericsson]: provides r2 | approved | R2 |
|  |  | S3‑220366 | Discussion on the SBA services to support Prose authentication | Ericsson | discussion |  | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220367 | SBA service operations for Prose CP based solution for L3 U2N security | Ericsson | pCR | OPPO proposes to NOTE this contribution.  [CATT]: Proposes to merge this contribution into S3-220288.  [Ericsson]: fine with merger of 367 into 288. | merged | 288 |
|  |  | S3‑220369 | Definitation of functional entity PKMF | Ericsson | pCR | [Nokia]: comments and ask clarification.  [Philips] provides comments  [Ericsson]: I have provided r1 and comments inline below  [Ericsson] provides comments and r1  [Nokia]: answer your questions.  [Ericsson]: provides comments  [Nokia]: confirmation.  [Ericsson]: r3 uploaded | approved | R3 |
|  |  | S3‑220370 | PC5 security policies in User plane solution for ProSe UE-to-network relay | Ericsson | pCR |  | approved |  |
|  |  | S3‑220371 | Prose Anchor Function to handle PRUK and PRUK ID | Ericsson | pCR | [Ericsson] : provides comments and r1 of S3-220371  [Interdigital]: propose to hold off effort on PAnF until clear way forward is decided with the group.  [Interdigital]: declares an r2 with PAnF for PRUK/PRUK ID storage following a prior offline discussion with Ericsson and as mentioned during today CC  [ZTE]: provide comments.  [Interdigital]: replies to ZTE and provides r3.  [Ericsson]: provides r4.  [Interdigital]: provides some additional thoughts on RSC, SUPI for use with PAnF  [Qualcomm]: provide r5.  [Huawei, HiSilion]: Disagree with the step 5-6 in the r5 and provide r6.  [ZTE]: Provide comments and ask for clarification.  [Interdigital]: provides comments. Replies to ZTE comment  [Ericsson]: provides r7  [IEricsson]: explaines updates in r7  [IEricsson]: explaines updates in r7  [CATT]: Propose to note this contribution and related content merged into this contribution, and stop to discuss where the 5G PRUK and 5G PRUK ID store. Rapporteur will ask for one meeting cycle exception for it.  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: Propose to note this, because the mechanism is different from the conclusion, and have no time to evaluate too many changes.  [Interdigital]: Ask (Wei) Rapporteur for clarification on exception sheet. Noting good progress made on PAnF should not be wasted.  [Ericsson]: Supports Interdigital | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220372 | Authentication flow over PC5 for Prose CP based solution for L3 U2N security | Ericsson | pCR | [Interdigital] Proposes that S3-220372 to be used as baseline for authentication message details  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: OK with the proposal and provide suggestions.  [Ericsson]: r1 is available and uploaded  [Interdigital]: provide r2 adding UDM selection of authentication method  [Qualcomm]: provide comments (without revision at this time)  [ZTE]: Provide comments.  [Interdigital]: replies to ZTE. Re:AUSF instance vs merger plan  [Interdigital]: asks Ericsson and Qualcomm for coordination for next rev to address Qualcomm comments.  [Ericssonl]: we (Ericsson and QC) can provide a next revision after the CC today.  [Ericssonl]: Ericsson and Qualcomm have revised and uploaded r3  [Intedigital]: is fine with r3  [Qualcomm]: identified one missing change.  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: propose to add modifications to r3 and provide r4.  [Intedigital]: propose r4 is ready for 288 merger  [Ericsson]]: Ericsson is fine with r4  [Interdigital]: declare 372 merged into 288. This thread should be considered closed now. | merged | 288 |
|  |  | S3‑220373 | Update for Security Procedure of Communication with 5G ProSe Layer-2 UE-to-Network Relay | Ericsson | pCR | [Xiaomi]: proposes merging 373 and 180  [Ericsson] : S3-220373 is merged into S3-220180 and the discussion on 373 is moved to S3-220180. | merged | 180 |
|  |  | S3‑220374 | Correction of the reference for 5G ProSe Layer-3 UE-to-Network Relay Disocvery | Ericsson | pCR | [Qualcomm]: request clarification  [Qualcomm]: propose to note this document | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220375 | Removal of PRUK ID in CP based solution | Ericsson | pCR | [CATT]: This document should be noted based on the agreement | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220376 | ProSe: New service operations in the user plane solution for ProSe UE-to-network relay | Ericsson | pCR |  | approved |  |
|  |  | S3‑220436 | pCR to TS33.503 Add new clause for network function service description | CATT | pCR | [Qualcomm] : proposes to note the contribution as it is just for discussion  [Qualcomm] : please ignore above comments as sent against document number  [Ericsson] : provides comments to the SBI for the PKMF and we prefers 376 from Ericsson  [Ericsson] : provides comments to the SBI for the UDM and AUSF, and we prefer the SBI services provided in 367  [CATT]: Provide r1. It only contains the clause title: ”7 5G ProSe Services”. | approved | R1 |
|  |  | S3‑220441 | Integrity protection for UE-to-NW relays | Philips International B.V. | pCR | [Qualcomm]: propose to note this contribution. There was no such solution evaluated during the study, thereby, no conclusions were made regarding this feature.  [Philips] Disagrees with the reason for objection. Objection is due to non-valid non-technical argument. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220442 | Long term identifier updates for UE-to-NW relays | Philips International B.V. | pCR | [Qualcomm]: propose to note this contribution as there is no conclusion regarding this feature. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3-220521 | Rel-17 Work Item Exception for 5G\_ProSe Security Aspects | CATT |  | [Rapporteur]: draft Exception sheet for 5G ProSe Security WID is available in the Draft folders.  [Philips]: asks also UE-to-NW relay discovery details and addressing of remaining Editor's notes to be added to exception sheet  [LGE]: asks also secondary authentication details to be added to exception sheet  [Ericsson]: asks also to add a new Prose anchor function may be defined to exception sheet  [Rapporteur]: Provide r1  [Philips] comments on r1  [Rapporteur]: Provide r2  [Ericsson]: asks to modify “may” to “shall” so the sentence would say “A new Prose anchor function shall be defined for storage of 5G PRUK keys.”  [Qualcomm]: ask what kind of details on the security of UE-to-NW relay discovery procedures are missing.  [Ericsson]: asks to modify “may” to “shall” so the sentence would say “A new Prose anchor function shall be defined for storage of 5G PRUK keys.”  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_2<<  [CATT] presents, and points out r2 has too much extension then the point than original version  [Ericsson] comments  [CATT] does not agree with Ericsson  [IDCC] has same understanding with Ericsson, should be clear stated the reason.  [HW] proposes to make offline call to reach consensus as exception sheet will go under email approval.  [LGE] supports latest version to capture all point needs work.  [Chair] requests to go email approval withr2 content.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_2<<  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: Propose to add task related to restricted discovery.  [Rapporteur]: r2 is for email approval. | Left for email discussion | R2 |
| 4.14 | Security Aspects of User Consent for 3GPP services (Rel-17) | S3‑220023 | Reply LS on user consent | S2-2109089 | LS in | [Huawei]: Propose to reply.  [Ericsson]: Propose to take the LS it into account. No further LS exchange is needed.  [Huawei]: ask further question.  [Qualcomm]: Agree with Ericsson that no further LS exchange is needed – this can be noted.  [Nokia]: Agrees that LS can be noted. Suggests to work on small CR to add DCCF in the relevant Annex. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220041 | LS on User consent Updating | R3-221210 | LS in |  | replied to | 270 |
|  |  | S3‑220175 | User consent requirements and procedures for eNA | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR | MCC reminded the authors that the word“must” is not allowed in 3GPP specifications. The CR should also be cat-B, not F since a new procedure with requirements was being added.  [Ericsson] S3-220175 is not needed, we suggest that a single line in eNA normative work for UC should be enough e.g. 'User consent for eNA shall comply with TS 33.501 (Annex V) and TS 23.288.'  [Huawei]: Provide the clarification and way forward.  [Nokia]: Propose to close this thread and comment on 0191 instead.  [Ericsson]: Clarifies that all the details in S3-220175 is not needed and propose to update the document S3-220191 with the following text “User consent for eNA shall comply with TS 33.501 (Annex V)”  [Ericsson]: Objection  [China mobile]: Propose to resolve this in UC3S topic, not in eNA topic.  [Huawei]: Provide clarification. We can discuss S3-220191 in eNA topic, we can do revision here, there is no controversial issue.  [China mobile]: Fine with discuss 0191 in eNA topic and take reference to UC3S. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220177 | Delete Editor's Note in UC3S | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR | [Nokia] : {Propose to merge this tdoc into S3-220383 {https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG\_SA/WG3\_Security/TSGS3\_106e/Docs/S3-220383.zip} since overlapping, but 383 addressing more. Pls comment under thread 0383}  [Huawei]: Propose to use the S3-220177-r1 as the baseline to continue the discussion and close this thread.  [Xiaomi]: asks question for clarification and provides comment for change.  [Huawei]: Provide r2.  [Nokia] :-r2 was uploaded by Nokia, can HW pls provide -r3 on top of the integrated text from 383 in 177  [Ericsson]: Revision needed.  [Xiaomi]: suggest to remove the sentence about expiry timer  [Huawei]: Provides R3.  [Nokia]: Revision R3 not available  [Huawei]: Uploaded 177 R3.  [Xiaomi]: asks a further question for clarification.  [Huawei]: Provides clarification.  [Xiaomi]: fine with r3  [Ericsson] requires changes to R3; asks to tick “Core Network” in the cover sheet; asks to put Ericsson in Source; objects to removal of “This means that there is no expiry/validity timer for the user consent parameters stored in the subscription data” from V.2; asks to clarify consumer and enforcement NFs in V.4; asks to edit the note in V.4.  [Nokia] : -r4 uploaded, in principle ok, but some additions/updates needed, reasoning provided in mail  [Nokia] : response to Ericsson; since mail overlapping it is asked to work from-r4 for addressing comments and provides feedback  [Ericsson] objects to r4, our former comments and proposals to -r3 still valid.  [Huawei]: provides r5.  [Ericsson] changes needed on r5, it does not reflect our former comments and proposals to -r3,  [Nokia] update to -r5 needed; see ERI comments & please correct “possessed and \*\*\*collected\*\*\*”. maybe this is a typo and you meant “processed” which includes collecting,  [Huawei]: upload r6 with the suggestions accordingly. I prefer the typo issue is addressed next meeting.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_1<<  [HW] presents status  R7 is ready, Nokias agreed with r7  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_1<<  [Nokia]: do not agree. if it is a type, then correct 2x. otherwise add on possessing also “collecting” data, otherwise we cannot agree  [Huawei]: fix “possess issue” in the r7 accordingly.  [Nokia]: thanks Huawei for addressing it. | agreed | R7 |
|  |  | S3‑220187 | User Consent Requirements and Procedures for MEC | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR | MCC reminded the authors that the word“must” is not allowed in 3GPP specifications. The CR should also be cat-B, not F since a new procedure with requirements was being added.  [Ericsson] suggest that a single line in MEC normative work for UC should be enough e.g. 'User consent for MEC shall comply with TS 33.501 (Annex V) and TS {MEC TS}  [Huawei]: Provides the answer and give more background.  [Ericsson] objects | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220378 | Reply LS on User consent Updating | Ericsson LM | LS out | [Xiaomi]: Propose to be merged into 270  [Ericsson]: Acknowledge the similarities of the documents 270 and 378, and approve a merger of the documents. For readability reasons, we suggest to keep a short description of the incoming LS in the reply.  [Huawei]: Not OK with this.  [Xiaomi]: the merger is provided in the revision of 270 | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220383 | User consent revocation | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR | [Huawei]: Propose to discontinue this thread instead of discussing the merger under S3-220177 thread.  [Nokia]: -r1 uploaded, removing content merged in 0177. However, Nokia does not agree on closing the thread, in V.2 a NOTE is related to revocation service. Thus, it is legitimate to add the definition. Thus, keep this thread open for this and discuss -r1  [Huawei]: Revision is needed.  [Ericsson]: Objection | merged | 177 |
|  |  | S3‑220384 | User consent enforcement point | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR | [Huawei]: Revision is required.  [NTT DOCOMO]: requests rewording.  [Nokia]: provides -r1 based on proposal  [NTT DOCOMO]: suggest clearer wording  [Ericsson]: suggest changes  [Huawei]: Suggest more changes.  [NTT DOCOMO]: disagree with Huawei's proposal  [Nokia]: provides -r2 as a sketch, -r3 will be created after agreement on the -r2 sketch  [Huawei]: Require further revision.  [Ericsson]: Approves -r2, asks to put Ericsson in Source;  [NTT DOCOMO] points out problem in r2  [Nokia] propose to finalize in telco or before  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_1<<  [Nokia] comments , latest one is r3  [Nokia] comments whether there is impact on other WI/stage 3 impact about EN.  [HW] clarifies there is no stage 3 impact.  [MCC] if there is something missing, CR should be cat-B rather than cat-F, and it’s too late to bring WID.  [HW] there is no new feature  [Docomo] in r3, only EN does not help much. In r2, is too long. Definition clause could be always cat-F/cat-D. proposes to keep definition only.  [MCC] only cat-F should be used.  [Nokia] proposes way forward.  [HW] comments  [Chair] requests to extend to next week.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_1<<  [Nokia] -r3 provided, which keeps original EN, removes related changes, and adds a new one ‘EN on definition for user consent enforcement point is ffs’ in clause V.3. Only change kept is the editorial update.  [Nokia] -r4 provided, which keeps original EN (since not common understanding on shall/may) and removes related changes; -r4 goes back to original proposal to have clause V.1.3 to introduce user consent enforcement.  [Ericsson] requires changes to R4; asks to put Ericsson in Source; Propose a small language correction in V.1.3 “data subject to user consent” } “data that is subject to user consent” Motivation: “data subject” has legal meaning, it is easy to misread the text.  [Nokia] -r5 provided, including Ericsson’s comments. Regarding same trust domain, since we are not in the roaming case, I believe we are safe in this respect, Rong. We will need to update in R18, if the new SID scope allows for roaming.  [Huawei]: Suggest to remove the unclear part to generalize the definition.  [NTT DOCOMO]: disagree with removal of this sentence.  >>CC\_8<<  [Docomo] presents status, prefers r4.  [HW] does not agree with 3rd sentence.  [Docomo] proposes revision on 3rd sentence.  [HW] comments the case does not cover roaming which is the reason Docomo raise concern, so no need to say that.  [Docomo] clarifies  [Chair] requests to set EN now and refine the sentence later..  >>CC\_8<<  [NTT DOCOMO]: at the request of the original author, I uploaded -r6 implementing the agreement of the conference call.  [Huawei]: disagree the editor’s note.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_2<<  [Docomo] presents status  [HW] still has concerns.  [Docomo] emphasizes working agreement made yesterday already.  [HW] clarifies  [Chair] proposes to note and bring it back next meeting  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_2<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220385 | Formatting and alignment corrections | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR | [Nokia] : {I uploaded -r1, which is removing those changes that are duplicated in S3-220178. Thus, both docs can be treated without overlap}  [Nokia] : {minutes should show -r1 approved }  [Nokia] : {minutes should show -r1 approved } | agreed | R1 |
| 4.15 | Security aspects of enablers for Network Automation (eNA) for the 5G system (5GS) (Rel-17) | S3‑220191 | Refer to User Consent Requirements for eNA | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR | MCC commented that dependency with the other CR needed to be pointed out on the cover page, in the “other comments” field. The CR needed to be revised to remove the comment on the text.  [Huawei]: Uploaded r1 to follow MCC’s comments.  MCC provided some small comments on revision 1.  [Huawei]: provide r2 to follow MCC comments. | approved | R2 |
| 4.16 | Security aspects of the 5GMSG Service (Rel-17) | S3‑220265 | Removal of EN in 5GMSG security | China Mobile | CR | [Samsung]: Disagrees with this proposal.  [CMCC]: considers the additional mechanism in S3-220290 is not needed thus the EN could be deleted as proposed by 220265 | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220290 | Resolving EN on authorization in MSGin5G | Samsung | CR | [Qualcomm]: proposes to not pursue.  [CMCC]: proposes not to pursue.  [Samsung]: Requests clarification  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: Requests clarification about the MSGin5G UE ID and UE service ID.  [Samsung]: Requests clarification  [Qualcomm]: provides requested clarification  [CMCC]: provides clarification  [Samsung]: Provides justification  [Qualcomm]: questions Samsung suggested procedure.  [Samsung]: Provides clarification  [Qualcomm]: responds to Samsung.  [Samsung]: Asks Clarification  [MSI]: Cannot agree and asks for clarification.  [Samsung]: Identity management sever here 'SEAL Identity Management Server' not the one from MC.  [MSI]: Don't believe SEAL is mandatory therefore the SEAL IdM server solution may not be viable.  [Samsung]: Provides r1. If SEAL is supported the procedure applies and if not I believe UE service ID is not authorized.  [MSI]: MSI proposes clarifying text.  [Samsung]: Provides r2. As UE service ID and MSGin5G UE ID are very specific to MSGin5G, it needs to be specified as part of MSG and referring to 33.434 will not be enough.  [MSI]: MSI cannot agree to defining SEAL access tokens in 33.501.  [CMCC]: can’t agree with r2.  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: Disagree to introduce IdM and support to use AKMA only as specified in 0265.  [Samsung]: Provides r3.  [CMCC]: Requests changes to r3.  [Samsung]: Provides r4.  [CMCC]: r4 is ok.  [Qualcomm]: in principle ok with r4 but requires updates to the cover page  [Huawei, HiSilicon]: fine with r4  [Samsung]: Provides r5. Updated the cover page as suggested by Qualcomm.  [Qualcomm]: ok with r5.  [MSI]: MSI is ok with r5 IF the configuration manager is NOT the SEAL configuration manager. Please confirm.  [CMCC]: provides clarification  [MSI]: Unfortunately, MSI cannot agree to r5.  [CMCC]: provides clarification. | left for email approval | R5 |
|  |  | S3‑220299 | Discussion on Authorization of MSGin5G Client | Samsung | discussion | [Qualcomm]: proposes to note.  [Samsung]: Requests clarification on the Qualcomm's comment as Samsung's understanding is different.  [CMCC]: proposes to note. | noted |  |
| 4.17 | Enhanced security for Phase 2 network slicing (Rel-17) | S3‑220013 | LS for feedback on CT6 | C6-210358 | LS in | >>CC\_1<<  [Thales] presents  >>CC\_1<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220114 | CR for AF Authorization for accessing network slice quota-usage information | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR | [Xiaomi] : provides some comments  [Huawei] : r1 provided according to Xiaomi’s comments.  [Xiaomi] : requests for further clarification.  MCC commented that the CR was not valid as the whole new clause should appear with revision marks. They also pointed out some issues on the cover page: current version of TS 33.501 (it’s 17.4.2), clauses affected should be “16.x(new)”, and reminded that eventually changes on changes would have to be removed as well as the revision marks on the cover page. Another reminder was to write “1” on the revision field of the cover page.  [Huawei] : response to Xiaomi.  [Huawei] : will be modified as suggested by MCC once revisions are agreed.  [Huawei] : response to Xiaomi.  [Xiaomi] : provides some comments.  [Huawei] : further response to Xiaomi.  [Xiaomi] : requests for revision.  [Nokia] : suggest to postpone the decision after at least preliminary agreement made for 414.  [Huawei] : provide r1 as suggested by Xiaomi.  [Huawei] : provides clarification and r1 as suggested by Nokia  [Nokia] : fine to r2.  [Huawei] : the latest version should be r2, as corrected by Nokia.  [Huawei] : fine with either r2 or r3.  [Ericsson]: Does nto agree with some changes in r2 or r3.  [Ericsson]: Asks for clarifications to the original contribution.  [Huawei]: response to Ericsson.  [Huawei]: additional response to Ericsson.  [Ericsson]: Asks for clarifications.  [Ericsson]: Explains and asks for clarifications.  [Huawei]: response to Ericsson.  [Huawei]: Response to Ericsson.  [Xiaomi]: requests for clarification.  [Ericsson]: requests for clarification.  [Huawei]: response to Xiaomi.  [Huawei]: further response to Ericsson.  [Nokia]: change proposal for discussion.  [Huawei]: response to Nokia  [Nokia]: response to Huawei.  [Nokia]: r4 provided as suggested by Nokia.  [Ericsson]: Does not agree to r4. Proposes changes.  [Huawei]: Response to Ericsson and provide r5.  [Ericsson]: is fine with r5.  [Xiaomi]: provides r6.  [Ericsson]: is fine with r6.  [Nokia]: comments for r6.  [Huawei]: provide r7 based on r6+Nokia comment.  [Ericsson]: is fine with r7.  [Xiaomi]: is fine with r7. | agreed | R7 |
|  |  | S3‑220414 | Discussion about the NEF-AF trust model for solution #1 in TR 33.874 | Ericsson | discussion | [Deutsche Telekom] : Our position is, whatever AF uses a NEF should be treated as 'untrusted'.  [Xiaomi] : provides some comments.  [Huawei] : support the proposals in principle, with comments.  [Huawei] : provide comments to DT’s view.  [Deutsche Telekom] : thanks the explanation and corrects position.  [Ericsson]: provides clarifications.  [CMCC]: provides comments.  [Deutsche Telekom] : answers to the raised question on way forward.  [Nokia] : comments.  [Huawei] : Provide clarification or comments.  [Ericsson]: Provides r1 and clarifications  [Huawei]: Fine with the clarification and r1.  [Nokia] : fine to r1.  [Deutsche Telekom] : fine with -r1  [CMCC] : r1 is fine.  [Xiaomi] : r1 is OK. | endorsed | R1 |
| 4.18 | New work item proposals for Rel-18 | S3‑220059 | New WID on Authentication enhancements in 5GS | JSRPC Kryptonite | WID new | [Nokia] : Question raised for clarification, unclear objective.  [Kryptonite]: provides clarifications.  [Interdigital]: Requests clarification and changes.  >>CC\_6<<  [Chair] due to time limitation, if supporters are less than 4 for the SID/WID, currently will not be discussed on the call. It could be discussed through email.  [JSRPC] less supporter  [Chair] no discussion on the call  >>CC\_6<<  [Kryptonite]: provides clarifications.  [Interdigital]: Requests clarification and changes.  MCC agreed with Nokia that it was unclear whether this was a Work Item (normative) or a study item (continuation of the work from Rel-17). They also agreed with Interdigital that the objectives needed to be more specific and reworded if this was intended to be a study (e.g. language like “investigate”, “ potential solutions”, “recommendations”, etc).  [Ericsson]: Requests for clarifications.  MCC clarified that editor’s notes should not be part of a finished study (or TR). If these editor’s notes needed to be addressed the study shouldn’t have finished; it should have been continued in the next release. CRs at this stage would not be allowed since the study ended without any outstanding issues described in the cover sheet when sent for approval.  [Ericsson]: Asks for clarifications.  MCC clarified the purpose of the editor’s notes.  [Thales] : proposes to note the contribution.  [Nokia] : proposes to note the contribution.  [Qualcomm]: proposes the contribution should be noted  [Kryptonite]: Provides clarifications. Propose to continue the discussion on the next meeting. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220105 | Discussion on new wid on akma push function | ZTE Corporation | discussion | [Qualcomm]: proposes to note. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220106 | New WID on AKMA push function | ZTE Corporation | WID new | [Interdigital]: Requests clarification and changes.  [ZTE]: provides clarifications.  >>CC\_6<<  [ZTE] less supporter  [Chair] no discussion on the call  >>CC\_6<<  [Qualcomm]: proposes to note.  [ZTE]: provides response and ask some questions.  [Qualcomm]: provides the requested response.  [ZTE]: provides clarifications.  [Nokia]: Propose to note the study.  [Qualcomm]: further questions the provided clarification. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220118 | Rel-18 study for network slicing security | Huawei, HiSilicon | SID revised | >>CC\_6<<  [HW] less supporter  [Chair] no discussion on the call  >>CC\_6<<  MCC commented that the study couldn’t change acronym or title. The objectives needed to be reworded since the study couldn’t impact Rel-17 anymore. Since the study was shifted to Rel-18 the objectives needed to address Rel-18 issues, so MCC suggested to remove mentioning Releases in the objectives and stick to the specific security issues to be addressed.  Telecom Italia do not support this proposal.  [Ericsson] : revision needed, otherwise can be noted  [Huawei] : r1 provided according to comments raised by MCC, Telecom Italia and Ericsson.  [Ericsson] : revision needed, otherwise can be noted  [Qualcomm]: don’t agree that the study should be extended to Rel-18  [Huawei]: response to Qualcomm and Ericsson, provide r2  [Qualcomm]: re-iterates concern | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220127 | Proposal about considerations to introduce security capability center function | China Mobile | discussion | [Interdigital]: Requests clarification.  [Huawei]: Thanks for the discussion paper, but we would like to request some clarification.  [CMCC] provides clarification.  >>CC\_6<<  [CMCC] less supporter  [Chair] no discussion on the call  >>CC\_6<<  [Ericsson]: Proposes to consider that the new security function could be an O&M function instead of a Network Function in the SBA.  [CMCC] provides clarification  [Nokia]: requests clarifications on the new function  [CMCC] provides clarification.  [Ericsson]: Proposes update to the Detailed proposal  [CMCC] accepts comments and provides r1  [Huawei]: Propose not to endorse and note.  [CMCC] provides clarification and asks for clarification of comments.  [Ericsson]: r1 is fine | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220128 | Discussion on blockchain based approach for cross-domain certificate management in 3GPP system | China Mobile | discussion | [Huawei]: proposes to note since and move the discussion to the thread of the SID proposal 0129 | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220129 | New SID on blockchain based approach for cross-domain certification management in 3GPP system | China Mobile | SID new | >>CC\_6<<  [CMCC] less supporter  [Chair] no discussion on the call  >>CC\_6<<  [Huawei]: propose to postpone  [CMCC]: agree to postpone | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220130 | New SID on security aspects of enablers for Network Automation for 5G - phase 3 | China Mobile, ZTE, Ericsson, Apple, China Unicom, CAICT, China Telecom, Cablelabs, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, CATT | SID new | [Nokia] : Provides revision r1.  [Samsung] : Supports this SID proposal and fine with r1. Please add Samsung in the list of supporting companies.  >>CC\_6<<  [CMCC] more than 10 supporters already, presents  [IDCC] support, would like to be supporting company  [QC] not too much progress in SA2, should SA3 wait?  [CMCC] clarifies  [Docomo] agrees with QC, do not need to start now, needs more input.  [HW] delay starting will increase pressure to finish work in the end, no harm to start work now.  [IDCC] supports the comment not to lock step based on email  >>CC\_6<<  [China mobile] : Provide r2 with supporting companies added.  [Huawei]: don’t agree r2, propose to delete the bullet3.  [China mobile]: either of r2 and Huawei’s proposal is ok for us.  [Nokia]: agrees with r2 and objects Huawei proposal  [Nokia]: agrees with r2 and objects Huawei proposal  [China mobile]: propose to make way forward and provide r3.  [Huawei]: Thanks CMCC’s effort, as one of the supporting companies, we are fine with the original version and r3, not fine with r2.  [Nokia]: supports r3 | agreed | R3 |
|  |  | S3‑220132 | Discussion on Personal IoT Networks Security Aspects | vivo | discussion |  | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220133 | New SID on Personal IoT Networks Security Aspects | vivo, Apple, ZTE, Xiaomi, CATT, OPPO, China Unicom, China Telecom, CableLabs, InterDigital | SID new | [LGE] : supports this SID proposal. Please add LGE in the list of supporting IMs.  [vivo] : provides r1 to add LGE in the list of supporting IMs.  [Thales] : asks questions for clarification and disagrees to have objective related to remote provisioning.  >>CC\_6<<  [Vivo] more than 10 supporters, presents  [Thales] comments on authentication elements, do not understand the requirement. Management provisiong is not meaning. Need more clarification and revision.  [Vivo] clarifies, the requirement has specified by SA1  [Thales] comments further.  [Lenovo] support and would like to be supporting company.  >>CC\_6<<  [vivo] : replies and provides r2.  [Nokia] : supports study and asks to add Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell to the list of supporting members.  [vivo] : provides r3 to add Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell to the list of supporting members.  [Philips] supports this study. Can you please add Philips,  MCC asked to move the work items in clause 2.2 to clause 2.3.  [vivo] provides r4 to add Lenovo, Motorola mobility, and Philips as supporting IM  [vivo]: move the work items in clause 2.2 to clause 2.3 in r4.  [Thales] : provide comments.  [Huawei] : needs clarification before approval.  [vivo] : provides r5 and clarifies.  [Qualcomm]: propose to postpone.  [Thales] : disagree with r5 and provide comments.  [Philips] disagrees with Thales and provides clarification  [vivo] : clarifies  [Thales] : provide answers.  [Huawei] : still needs clarification.  [Thales] : answer to Philipps.  [vivo]: SA2 has done some work and postpone the work on SA3 will delay the whole study.  [vivo] : clarifies to Thales  [vivo] : clarifies to Huawei  [Philips]: responds to Thales  [vivo] : provides r6  [Qualcomm]: Contribution requires changes before it can be approved  [vivo]: provides r07 according to Qualcomm’s comments  [Huawei]: disagree with r7. The objectives are still not clear.  [vivo]: clarifies to Huawei and provides r8.  [Qualcomm]: Still propose to note this contribution  [Thales] : disagrees with r8 and provides comments.  [Ericsson] : propose to note this contribution  [vivo]: ask Qualcomm to stay “postponed” instead of “note”  [Qualcomm]: ok with ‘postpone’ – our positionis the SID needs more refining before it is ready to accept  [Ericsson] : propose to note this contribution  [vivo] : propose Ericsson to comments earlier so that we have time to refine it instead of commenting last minutes with note proposal  [Ericsson] : provides clarification | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220136 | 5GFBS- new WID on 5GFBS | Apple, US National Security Agency, AT&T, Deutsche Telekom, Ericsson, Huawei, Hisilicon, CableLabs, Intel, InterDigital, Johns Hopkins University APL, NIST, Xiaomi, OPPO | WID new | >>CC\_6<<  [Apple] can note this way as no conclusion in last week.  >>CC\_6<<  [Qualcomm]: this contribution should be noted as already mentioned by Apple during the conference call. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220166 | New SID on security enhancements for 5G multicast-broadcast services Phase 2 | Huawei, HiSilicon | SID new | [LGE] : supports this SID proposal. Please add LGE in the list of supporting IMs.  [Apple] : Supports this SID proposal. Please add Apple in the list of supporting IMs.  [Xiaomi]: Supports this SID proposal. Please add Xiaomi in the list of supporting IMs.  >>CC\_6<<  [HW] has 10 supporters, presents.  [ZTE] supports,  [QC] has concerns on objective 1 and 3.  [Ericsson] has comments on objective 1, 2. objective 3 may need rewording.  [HW] clarifies.  >>CC\_6<<  [Huawei]: provided r1. 6 companies are added to the list of supporting IMs.  [Ericsson] : proposal to clarify objectives  [Nokia]: supports this SID proposal. Please add Nokia to the list of supporting IMs.  [Huawei]: provided r2.  [Ericsson]: r2 ok  [MITRE]: MITRE supports r2  [Huawei]: provided r3. The list of supporting IMs is updated.  [Qualcomm]: propose to postpone  [Philips]: supports this SI.  [Huawei]: provided r4 and add Philips to the list of supporting companies.  [Qualcomm]: propose to note this document in this meeting | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220167 | Discussion on security enhancements for 5GC LoCation Services Phase 3 | Huawei, HiSilicon | discussion | >>CC\_6<<  [HW] discussion paper, no supporter  [Chair] no discussion on the call  >>CC\_6<<  [Qualcomm]: proposes to note  [Ericsson]: comments  [Huawei]: provides clarification. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220168 | New SID on Enhancement of User Consent for 3GPP Services | Huawei, HiSilicon | SID new | >>CC\_6<<  [HW] more than 10 supporter, presents.  [Docomo] comments, different case means very different issues, so proposes to keep issue separately by having separate SIDS for different features.  [QC] comment  [CableLabs] prefers to have a single study for all User Consent aspects.  >>CC\_6<<  [Ericsson]: Requests for changes.  MCC suggested to add related Work Items in clause 2.3.  [Apple]: kindly requests for clarifications.  [NTT DOCOMO]: Maintain that the solutions for the individual use cases should be treated in separate SIDs. For some, UE impact will be inevitable, for others not. Please separate the SID accordingly.  [CableLabs]: support this study and it should not split.  [Qualcomm]: request clarifications  [Huawei]: Thanks for all the comments. Please find r1 following some suggestions proposed by Ericsson and MCC, and add two more supporting companies.  Moreover, please find the following clarification.  [Apple]: Thanks for Huawei’s effort. Providing R2 keeping all the changes in R1, and only adding 2 NOTEs to clarify the relationship with regulation and the potential privacy in the subsequent procedure after user consent collection. The NOTEs content is similar with R17 UC3S SID (SP-200885)  [NTT DOCOMO]: requires revisions  [Huawei]: Provide r3 as a way forward.  [Qualcomm]: provides further comments/questions  [Huawei]: provide r4 to addtionally address Qualcomm’s concern.  [Huawei]: provide r4 to addtionally address Qualcomm’s concern.  [NTT DOCOMO]: disagree with r4  [Samsung]: disagree with r4  [Huawei]: Request the concrete modification proposal from NTT DoCoMo, remove the SNNAAP in r4. Provide updated objectives.  [CableLabs]: disagree with r4  [Nokia]: asks for more time and requests to postpone SID approval to next meeting  [NTT DOCOMO]: proposes rewording  [Qualcomm]: ok with r4 with general rewording of objectives NTT DOCOMO to spell out the use cases/scope instead of keeping it open ended; objects if this SID impacts ME or includes “dynamic user consent”  [CableLabs]: disagree with r4.  [Huawei]: For sake of progress, we are OK to update the objectives as NTT DoCoMo requested and upload as r5.  [Samsung]: Samsung objects to r5 and asking Qualcomm to provide technical reason to object dynamic user consent in R-18.  [Qualcomm]: responds to Samsung  [Nokia]: asks for more time and requests to postpone SID approval to next meeting  [NTT DOCOMO]: ok with -r5 objectives, but keep only first two paragraphs in the justification.  [Huawei]: Reply to Nokia’s comments.  [Qualcomm]: fine with r5. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220169 | New WID for SCAS work to introduce R-17 features on existing functions | Huawei, HiSilicon | WID new | >>CC\_6<<  [HW] more supporter, presents  [QC] comments on gNB, esp. for split gNB.  [Ericsson] asks whether separate WID is needed for split gNB case?  [HW] clarifies  [Chair] asks what would be the target output, new TS or CRs to existing TSs?  [HW] clarifies, CRs to existing TSs to cover Rel-17 features.  >>CC\_6<<  [Qualcomm]: proposed a way forward for handling overlap between this S3-220169 and S3-220322  [Huawei]: Fine with Qualcomm’s way forward. Agree on that now it’s indeed very important and proper time point to start the corresponding SCAS work. | Agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220170 | New SID on Home network triggerred authenticaiton | Huawei, HiSilicon | SID new | [Huawei] : Provides revision r1.  [Deutsche Telekom] : supports this study, asks minor clarification  [Huawei] : Answer to Deutsche Telekom, and r2 is provided by adding two more supporting companies.  [Huawei] : r3 is provided by adding two more supporting companies.  [Samsung] : Requires revision before approval. Provides r4.  [Qualcomm]: objects if the SID impacts ME; requires revision  [Huawei] : r5 is provided to address comments from Qualcomm and Samsung.  [LGE] : simple editorial correction required.  [Huawei] : r6 is provided to address the editorial.  >>CC\_6<<  [HW] 8 supporter, presents status  [IDCC] support the UE being mandatory, should set ME impact as yes.  [QC] comments.  [Docomo] agrees ME should not be affected  [Ericsson] comments on use cases, and backward capability.  [DT] UE impact should be marked.  [NEC] want to make UE as “don’t know”.  [HW] support to set as “don’t know”.  [CableLabs] proposes to set as “don’t know”  >>CC\_6<<  [Ericsson]: Provides some comments and proposals.  [Deutsche Telekom] : supports to the proposed rewording, except the part on UE impact  [Huawei]: r7 is provided addressing Ericsson’s comment.  [Nokia] : supports the study.  [Huawei] : provide r8 in which a way forward on ME impact is provided and 3 more supporting companies are added.  [Intel] : Agree to r8 and please add Intel as supporting company.  [Qualcomm]: requires revision  [Huawei]: answer to Qualcomm  [Qualcomm]: responds to Huawei. Maintains objection to the SID if the study impacts ME.  [Huawei]: r9 is provided without UE impact.  [NTT DOCOMO] supports this SID.  [Huawei]: r10 is provided. NTT DOCOMO is added to the supporting list  [Qualcomm]: ok in principle with r10; requests minor revision  [Samsung] : Fine with r10 and supports this SID.  [Huawei]: Provide r12 with the proposed change from Qualcomm, and add two more supporting companies.  [Ericsson]: Ok with r12. Please add Ericsson in the list of supporting companies.  [Huawei]:r14 is provided. Two more editorials are corrected based on offline discussion. One more supporting company is added.  [Ericsson]: Clarification requested.  [Huawei]: answer to Ericsson.  [Ericsson]: Respond to Huawei.  [Huawei]: provide r15 to address Ericsson’s concern.  [Ericsson]: is fine with R15. | agreed | R15 |
|  |  | S3‑220206 | New SID on Security Aspects of Enhancement for Proximity Based Services in 5GS Phase 2 | CATT, China Unicom, Interdigital | SID new | [Samsung] : Supports this SID proposal. Please add Samsung in the list of supporting companies.  [China Telecom] : Supports this SID proposal. Please add China Telecom in the list of supporting companies.  [Ericsson] : We support this SID proposal. Please add Ericsson in the list of supporting companies.  [Philips] supports this SID. Can you please add Philips to the list of supporting companies,  >>CC\_6<<  [CATT] 13 supporter and more in email, presents  [Nokia] would like to support this study in general, but needs clarification  [CATT] clarifies  [CATT] asks concrete revision proposal from Nokia  >>CC\_6<<  [MITRE]: MITRE supports this SID  [CATT]: Provide r1. Add Samsung, China Telecom, Ericsson, Philips, MITRE as supporting companies.  [Qualcomm]: support this SID.  [CATT]: Provide r2. Add Qualcomm as supporting company.  [Nokia]: support this SID with some comments.  [CATT]: Provide r3. Add Nokia as supporting company.  [Nokia]: R3 is fine. | agreed | R3 |
|  |  | S3‑220228 | R18 SID on Security Enhancement of support for Edge Computing | Huawei, HiSilicon | SID new | [Telecom Italia] : Telecom Italia supports this study.  [Ericsson] : the proposal requires some updates  [Huawei] : uploads r1 with supporting companies, and provides clarification to Ericsson.  [CMCC] : supports the SID, please add China Mobile to the IM list.  [CableLabs] : supports this study  >>CC\_6<<  [HW] 6 supporter, presents  [ZTE] supports and would like to be supporting company, asks question for clarification.  [HW] clarifies  [Ericsson] comments  [IDCC] supports and would like to be supporting company.  >>CC\_6<<  [Huawei] : uploads r2 with new supporting companies. Thanks.  [Nokia]: supports this study, and proposes some minor remarks in the justification.  [Huawei] : uploads r3 with new minor changes proposed by NOKIA, and new supporting company.  [Ericsson] : proposes some updates  [Huawei] : updates r4 by rephasing the formulation in the justification according to Ericsson’s comments.  [Qualcomm]: propose to postpone.  [China Telecom] : supports this study  [Huawei] : Reponse to Qualcomm, and upload r5 with new supporting companies.  [Huawei] : Thanks for the confirmation. Upload r6 with the minor change according to Ericsson’s comments.  [Apple]: kindly request changes before approval.  [Huawei] : R7 is uploaded by removing the EEC-AC, and adding the following two new objectives in general, i.e.  \* KIs from R17 which don’t have enough time to proceed, e.g. supporting AKMA and/or GBA.  \* Any further security requirements which need to be studied based upon the ongoing SA2 and SA6 Phase 2 work  [Apple]: kindly request for clarification with additional changes before approval.  [Huawei] : provides r8 to address Apple’s concern.  [Ericsson] : fine with r8  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_2<<  [HW] presents status.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_2<<  [Xiaomi]: supports the SID, please add Xiaomi to the IM list  [Huawei]: Thanks Xiaomi for the supporting. Please Adrian check if you are fine with r8. Thanks.  [Qualcomm]: OK with r8 | agreed | R8 |
|  |  | S3‑220252 | New SID on security aspects of enhanced support of Non-Public Networks phase 2 | Ericsson, CableLabs, InterDigital, Intel, Xiaomi, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, ZTE | SID new | [Samsung] : Uploads r1. Propose to include the study on CP based remote provisioning as part of Rel-18 NPN SID.  [CMCC] : supports the SID, fine with either the original version or r1.  [Thales] : Fine with initial version, objects r1.  [Samsung] : Disagrees with Thales's comment. Provides clarification.  >>CC\_6<<  [Ericsson] presents  [Thales] disagreement revision proposed by Samsung  [Samsung] clarifies  [Nokia] agrees with Thales, doesn’t like revision version  [Docomo] comments.  >>CC\_6<<  [Ericsson]: provides r2  [Nokia]: Nokia supports the opinion of Thales and objects r1 and r2.  [Thales]: also object r2.  [Qualcomm]: also objects including remote provisioning in the SID.  [Ericsson]: provides r3  [Nokia]: Nokia is fine to accept R3  [LGE]: supports this SID(r3), please add LGE in the supporting IMs  [Thales]: is fine with r3.  [Ericsson]: provides r4, which is r3 with one supporting company added  [Samsung]: can live with r4.  [Philips]: supports this study  [Ericsson]: provides r5, which is r4 with one supporting company added  [Lenovo]: Lenovo, Motorola Mobility would like to support this study.  [Ericsson]: provides r6, which is r5 with supporting companies added  [Qualcomm]: proposes to note the SID proposal for this meeting  [Nokia]: Disagrees with reason for noting.  [Qualcomm]: responds to Nokia  [Nokia]: responds to Qualcomm  [Nokia]: responds to Qualcomm | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220262 | New SID on enhancement of AKMA | China Mobile | SID new | >>CC\_6<<  [CMCC] less supporter  [Chair] no discussion on the call  >>CC\_6<<  [Ericsson]: Provides comments.  [ZTE]: supports this SID and provides comments.  [Qualcomm]: provides comments; needs revision.  [CMCC]: provides r1.  [Huawei]:Support r1.  [CMCC]: provides r2.  [Nokia]: Support the study and provide r2 adding Nokia as a supporting company  [LGE]: supports this SID proposal, please add LGE in the supporting IMs  [CMCC]: provides r4 adding more supporting companies.  [Qualcomm]: ok with r4 and co-signs  [Thales] : propose change.  [Lenovo]: we are fine with r4 and Thales proposal and would like to co-sign with Lenovo and Motorola Mobility  [Samsung]: Supports this SID. Fine with r4 + Thales proposal.  [Ericsson]: can support this SID. Please remove the questionmark for Ericsson in the list of supporters.  [Verizon]: r4 looks good. Kindly add Verizon to the list of supporting companies.  [Ericsson]: can support this SID. Please remove the questionmark for Ericsson in the list of supporters.  [CMCC]: provides r5 with supporting companies added, changes made as requested by Thales.  [Apple]: Supports.  [OPPO]: OPPO supports this study. Please add OPPO in the supporting IMs. Thank you.  [CMCC]: provides r6 adding supporting companies.  [Xiaomi]: supports the SID, please add Xiaomi to the IM list | agreed | R6 |
|  |  | S3‑220263 | New WID on SCAS for AAnF | China Mobile | WID new | [CMCC]: Provides r1 with supporting companies added and editorial corrections.  >>CC\_6<<  [CMCC] 4 supporter, presents  [Ericsson] asks whether it can be merged into the other WID or want to keep it separately.  [CMCC] prefers separetely.  [Nokia] prefers to be merged, and comments on AUSF  [HW] proposes to keep separetely based on what we have done in R17.  >>CC\_6<<  [CMCC]: Provides r2 adding supporting companies. | agreed | R2 |
|  |  | S3‑220281 | New SID on Security Aspects of Ranging Based Services and Sidelink Positioning | Xiaomi Technology | SID new | [Xiaomi]: provides revision r1  >>CC\_6<<  [Xiao] 14 supporter, presents  >>CC\_6<<  [Qualcomm]: propose to postpone this new SID.  [Xiaomi]: provides clarification on the comment  [Philips] supports Xiaomi to not postpone this SID  [Interdigital] supports Xiaomi and Philips to approve this SID  Also, there is a need to coordinate the study of privacy between this proposed Study and the existing Privacy study in TR 33.870. Kindly place an appropriate sentence in the SID.  [Nokia]: Supports this SID.  [Xiaomi]: provides r2  [Qualcomm]: propose to note this SID in this meeting.  [Xiaomi]: provides clarification for NOT noting the SID | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220282 | New SID on Security Aspects of Satellite Access | Xiaomi Technology | SID new | >>CC\_6<<  [Xiaomi] less supporter  [Chair] no discussion on the call  >>CC\_6<<  [Huawei]: Request clarification before it’s acceptable.  [Qualcomm]: propose to postpone.  [Xiaomi]: responds to the comments and provides r1 | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220297 | New SID on 5G User plane security enhancements | Samsung | SID new | [Samsung] : Provides r1. Updates to list of supporting companies.  >>CC\_6<<  [Samsung] 7 supporter, presents  [HW] has concern on 2nd objective, disaggregated BS was discussed multiple times, but recently concluded with no agreement..  [Ericsson] has concern on 1st bullet related user id privacy, doesn’t support  [Samsung] clarifies to Ericsson, no impact on user id privacy..  [Docomo] comments it needs different bearer, does not agree this approach.  [CableLabs] support this, operators need flexible mechanisms o deploy UPIP..  [QC] comments.  [Samsung] clarifies.  [Mavenir] asks questions, enforcement from the network or the UE.  [Samsung] clarifies  >>CC\_6<<  MCC suggested a simpler acronym: FS\_eUPSEC  [Mavenir] : Clarification that requires a contribution update.  [Samsung]: Provides r2, based on the comments received during the Conf Call.  [NTT DOCOMO]: still doesn't see the necessity for this study  [Ericsson]: we don’t see the necessity for this study either  [Nokia]: We support this study  [Samsung] : Provides clarification  [NTT DOCOMO]: maintain this study is not necessary.  [Samsung] : Provides clarification  [Qualcomm]: Proposes to postpone this SID at this meeting  [Samsung]: Asks question for clarification to Qualcomm  [Qualcomm]: Provides response.  [CableLabs]: Provided comments to Qualcomm and NTT Docomo.  [Mavenir]: provides prospective and request clarification.  [CableLabs]: provides comments to Mavenir.  [Samsung]: provides clarification to Mavenir.  [Mavenir]: a follow up with Samsung .  [Intel]: Supports the SID for DRB level granularity  [Mavenir]: Conditionally support. require change .  [Qualcomm]: Proposes to note this contribution  [Samsung]: provides clarification to Mavenir.  [Mavenir]: Respond and propose modification to Samsung proposed text.  [Deutsche Telekom] : strongly supports the proposed text modification  [Samsung] : Provides r3.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_2<<  [Samsung] requests to find a way forward as many supporting companies to consider the issue is feasible.  [CableLabs] r3 is available  [Docomo] comments to bring back next time.  [Mavenir] clarifies  [DT] proposes to bring it back next meeting.  [Nokia] comments it should be studied  [Samsung] replies to Docomo  [Ericsson] supports.  [Apple] comments to study to get benefit. support  [Docomo] comments all clarification doesn’t address his concern.  [CableLabs] clarifies  [Samsung] agrees with comments from Ericsson, and proposes way forward to Docomo  [Docomo] does not consider it needs to study.  [QC] UPIP solution is already agreed, negative to more study.  [DT] proposes to split the study between the two main objectives.  [HW] wrap up session should not used for technical details like this.  [Chair] asks Samsung to bring it next meeting along with discussion paper for justification..  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_2<<  [Mavenir]: agrees with r3. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220300 | R18 SID on Standardising Automated Certificate Management in SBA | Nokia Germany | SID revised | [Nokia]: Provides r1 with a new list of supporting companies.  [Huawei]: requests clarifications.  [Ericsson] : requires some updates and clarification.  [Nokia]: provides required clarifications on virtualization impact, third bullet and inter PLMN scope.  [Nokia]: provides -r2 including one more supporter of the study and updates, and clarifications  [Huawei]: propose to remove the objective related to virtualization and NF management  [Verizon] : Kindly add Verizon as a supporting company to the SID  >>CC\_6<<  [Nokia] 9 supporter, presents  [HW] doesn’t agree with other objective, that is not correct baseline.  [CableLabs] clarifies.  [HW] still doesn’t agree revised objective and asks to use correct baseline.  >>CC\_6<<  [Nokia]: provides -r3, adding Verizon as supporting company, and provides clarifications to Huawei concerns on the scope.  [Verizon] : Minor clarifications.  [Nokia]: provides -r4 and clarifications to Verizon.  [CMCC]: requests clarifications.  [Huawei]: propose to remove the virtualization aspect.  [Nokia]: provides further clarification  [Ericsson] : r4 is ok with a minor revision  [Huawei]: as one of the supporting companies to the original SID disagrees with current revision  [Nokia]: provides r5, addressing the concerns of Huawei and last proposal of Ericsson. Baseline has been corrected.  [Huawei]: is fine with r5  [Deutsche Telekom] : ok with -r5  [Ericsson] : ok with -r5 | agreed | R5 |
|  |  | S3‑220321 | Discussion on SCAS for gNB | Qualcomm Incorporated, Deutsche Telekom AG, AT&T | discussion |  | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220322 | New WID on Updates to gNB SCAS including split gNBs | Qualcomm Incorporated, Deutsche Telekom AG, AT&T | WID new | >>CC\_6<<  [QC] 4 supporter, presents  [HW] comments, doesn’t agree to modify current gNB SCAS, proposes to make independent SCAS for CU and DU units.  [Ericsson] comments not copying current gNB SCAS for split gNB shouldn’t be the answer.  [QC] many requirements the test cases should be same as normal gNB, and other new. Some should be referred to normal gNB  >>CC\_6<<  MCC proposed to align the acronym with the rest of SCAS WIDs: SCAS\_5G\_gNB  [Huawei]: requires changes before agreement and proposes to treat this as a separate SCAS WID pertaining to separate network products as this would be more in accordance to how we conduct the SCAS development work  [Huawei]: requires changes before agreement and proposes to treat this as a separate SCAS WID pertaining to separate network products as this would be more in accordance to how we conduct the SCAS development work  [Qualcomm]: Have uploaded r1  [Huawei]: is fine with r1.  [Ericsson]: 4 new SCAS specs for gNB,  [Deutsche Telekom] : fine with -r1  [Qualcomm]: OK with DT’s proposal for one CU specification  [Ericsson]: proposal - only 1 new SCAS specs for split gNB  [Qualcomm]: Uploaded an r2 with just one new specification  [Deutsche Telekom] : agrees to -r2  [Ericsson]: r2 is ok  [Huawei]: fine with r2 | agreed | R2 |
|  |  | S3‑220363 | Study on Security aspects for 5WWC Phase 2 | Nokia Solutions & Networks (I) | SID new | [Nokia] : Provides r1  >>CC\_6<<  [Nokia] 2 supporter  [Chair] no discussion on the call  >>CC\_6<<  [Lenovo] : Provides r2.  [Qualcomm]: propose to postpone.  [Thales] : provides comments and propose to postpone.  [CableLabs] : need not postpone since SA2 study is progressing fast.  [Nokia] : wants to start the study since SA2 work has been started and also agrees with the proposal from Lenovo r2 | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220382 | Discussion on applying URSP rules for Authentic Applications | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | discussion | [Qualcomm]: proposes to note. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220405 | New Study on applying URSP rules for Authentic Applications (FS\_UAutA) | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | SID new | [Deutsche Telekom] : DT supports this study  [Lenovo] : Provides revision r1.  [NTT DOCOMO]: request clarification regarding relationship to other specification groups, as well as clarification on hardware dependencies.  [Lenovo]: provides clarifications.  [NTT DOCOMO]: asks more questions  [Interdigital]: Requests clarification.  [Lenovo]: provides clarification to NTT DOCOMO and Interdigital.  >>CC\_6<<  [Lenovo] presents  [Docomo] doesn’t understand  [IDCC] comments  [CableLabs] is good to discuss the issue, should down scope.  [Lenovo] clarifies.  >>CC\_6<<  [CATT] : CATT supports this study and can be one of the supporting companies.  [Lenovo]: provides revision r2.  [NTT DOCOMO] objective is still unclear. Further revisions are required  [Interdigital] Objectives need clarifications and changes.  [Qualcomm]: request clarification  [Lenovo]: provides clarification to NTT DOCOMO, Interdigital and Qualcomm  [Ericsson]: asks for further clarification  [NTT DOCOMO] more comments  [Verizon]: Kindly add Verizon as a supporting company. Some clarifications needed.  [Lenovo]: Provides more clarification and a revision r3  [Interdigital]: Asks for additional clarification, stating that “identification” alone is not sufficient and authentication is needed to remedy application id spoofing.  [Lenovo]: Provides more clarification to Interdigital  [Interdigital]: Changes are needed to better convey the anticipated objectives.  [Lenovo]: new revision r4 covering Interdigital’s comments is available  [NTT DOCOMO]: objectives still unclear  [Lenovo]: provides clarification to NTT DOCOMO  [NTT DOCOMO]: this study doesn't need to be done in SA3.  [Lenovo]: provides clarification to NTT DOCOMO  [Qualcomm]: proposes to note  [Lenovo]: provides clarification to Qualcomm | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220410 | New SID on the security aspects of Artificial Intelligence (AI)/Machine Learning (ML) for the NR Air Interface and NG-RAN | Ericsson | SID new | [Ericsson]: Provides r1 with a new supporting company.  [Ericsson]: Provides r2 with a new supporting company.  [Ericsson]: Provides r3 with a new supporting company.  [Ericsson]: Provides r4 with new supporting companies.  [Apple]: Supports this SID.  [Philips]: Supports this SID.  [Ericsson]: Provides r5 with new supporting companies.  [Verizon] : Verizon supports the SID  [Ericsson]: Provides r6 a new supporting company.  >>CC\_6<<  [Ericsson] 9 supporter, presents  [HW] suggests to remove RAN1 related material.  [CableLabs] supports and asks questions about SA2 work.  [Ericsson] clarifies that is different as this focus on RAN work, and SA2 is about core network work.  >>CC\_6<<  [Interdigital]: Supports this SID.  [Ericsson]: Provides r7 a new supporting company.  [Huawei]: Request changes before it’s agreeable.  [Thales] : propose change.  [Huawei]: Provides r8 with an update of the supporters.  [Interdigital]: Requests to indicate inter-dependency with the existing Rel-18 privacy study in TR 33.870  \* in Objectives and  \* in the Table “Impacted existing TS/TR” from Section 5.  .  [Qualcomm]: proposes to postpone.  [Ericsson]: Propose to continue the discussion.  [Huawei]: Request clarification and prefer to postpone.  [Interdigital]: Prefers to approve the SID at this meeting to be able to finish the Study on time.  [Huawei]: disagree IDCC’s reply.  [Qualcomm]: comments further  [Ericsson]: Provides r9 and some clarifications.  [Qualcomm]: proposes to note | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220422 | AIML Security and Privacy SID | Chengdu OPPO Mobile Com. corp. | SID new | >>CC\_6<<  [Oppo] 6 supporter, presents  [Docomo] asks difference with previos  [Oppo] clarifies previous one focus on RAN side, this one is core network side  [CMCC] supports and asks questions.  [IDCC] comments on privacy. If this is remove then can support  [Apple] supports but has comments on 2nd bullet.  >>CC\_6<<  [China mobile] : Supports this study and we are ok with the current version.  [OPPO] : Provides r1 with additional supporting companies and revision based on comments.  [Qualcomm]: propose to postpone.  [Ericsson] : ask for clarification in impact section  [Nokia] : Support the study and opposing to merge with RAN Study and ask clarification on objective 2  MCC commented that the SA1 study in section 2.2 should be moved to the table in section 2.3.  [OPPO] Provides r2 based on feedback received.  [Huawei]: Request further changes before it’s acceptable.  [OPPO]: Request clarification from Huawei and propose changes.  [Huawei]: fine with the NOTE, disagree with objective1 in the current form.  [Qualcomm]: comments further  [OPPO]: provides r3 and reply comments to Qualcomm  [Qualcomm]: proposes to note  [Nokia]: provides r4 with company(Nokia) name correction | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220426 | Study on Zero Trust Security | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Interdigital, Verizon, Cablelabs, Mavenir, Johns Hopkins University APL, LG Electronics, Telefonica | SID new | [Lenovo] : Provides r1  [MSI] : Provides comments  [Lenovo] : Provides Clarifications.  Will provide r2.  [Lenovo] : Provided r2.  R2 address comments from Motorola Solutions, Inc.  Updates the Source and Supporting IM names.  [MSI] : Accepts r2, thank you!  >>CC\_6<<  [Lenovo] presents  [Docomo] would like to suport, but comments, CN is important, but why ME?  [HW] comments  [CMCC] doesn’t like to mention any reference.  [CableLabs] clarifies  [Lenovo] clarifies.  >>CC\_6<<  [Huawei]: disagrees with provided justification and requires more clarifications before this can be agreed  [Apple] : kindly request some clarification.  [Nokia]: provides r3, proposing an update in the objectives of the study  [Intel]: Request modification on the objectives in r3. Add Intel as supporting company.  [Mavenir]: request Nokia clarification.  [Interdigital]: Agrees with Mavenir. There is no security reason to limit the scope to 5GC.  [Lenovo]: provided r4, to address comments from Nokia, Huawei, Docomo, CMCC and Apple.  Updates specific to comments clarified.  [Lenovo]: provided r5, to address Intel’s comment and updated supporting company list.  [Mavenir]: provides r6.  [Lenovo]: Accepts r6.  [CMCC] is fine with r6 but minor comment  [Qualcomm]: revision required before approval (ME and AN impact should be marked as No).  [Lenovo]: provided r7 and clarifies.  [Huawei]: Still disagrees with current content in r7 and hence proposes to postpone this in order to further refine the justification and the objectives.  [Lenovo]: Provides clarification to Huawei.  R8 is provided.  [Mavenir]: Responds to Huawei and request Huawei further response.  [Huawei]: responds to Mavenir  [Thales] : provide comments.  [NTT DOCOMO]: comments and a proposal  [Lenovo]: Provided clarification to Huawei.  R8 is available.  [Ericsson]: Ask to be put as IM and propose some changes.  [Lenovo]: Provides r10 to incorporate Ericsson’s feedback and updated the IM.  [Qualcomm]: object this contribution unless the ME impact is marked as “no”.  [CableLabs]: ok with r10.  [Lenovo]: Provides r11 to include Rakuten Mobile Inc and China Telecom as the Supporter and in the IM name.  As the ME impact is not marked as ‘yes’ and it is only marked as ‘don’t know’, we do not accept the justification of Qualcomm to object this document.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_2<<  [Lenovo] presents status  [HW] clarifies only want to postpone rather than object with technical reason.  [QC] keeps objection as ME impact is not “no” as ME is always not trusted.  [Mavenir] comments 24 supports than 2 opposing, why postpone.  [Chair] clarifies 3GPP working is by consensus.  [Docomo] proposes way forward, to incorporate this work into SBA.  [CableLabs] clarifies  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_2<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220427 | Discussion to Study on Zero Trust Security | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | discussion |  | noted |  |
| 4.19 | Other work areas (no release restrictions) | S3‑220061 | Align GUTI allocation to best practices of unpredictable identifier generation. | Deutsche Telekom AG | CR | [Deutsche Telekom] : -r1 is available  [Ericsson] : Ericsson proposes r2.  [Huawei] : Requires clarifications.  [Deutsche Telekom] : clarifies  [Deutsche Telekom] : DT proposes -r3.  [Ericsson] : Does not agree with r3.  [Deutsche Telekom] : DT proposes -r4 (reverts the changes of -r3).  [Huawei] : fine with r4.  [Qualcomm] : indicates some coversheet issues  [Deutsche Telekom] : proposes -r5, that adresses QC findings  [Qualcomm] : OK with r5  [Ericsson] : Proposes r6.  [Deutsche Telekom] : thanks for the re-wording and agrees to -r6.  [Huawei] : agrees to -r6.  [Qualcomm] : OK with r6 | Agreed | r6 |
|  |  | S3‑220064 | OAuth2.0 misalignmnet | Mavenir | CR |  | withdrawn |  |
|  |  | S3‑220065 | OAuth2.0 misalignmnet | Mavenir | CR |  | withdrawn |  |
|  |  | S3‑220066 | Clarification when the responder SEPP establish a second N32-C connection | Mavenir | CR | [Nokia] : supports this CR with one more clarification. The new N32-c connection is only established when needed; the word “now” in step 5 is creating further confusion and is therefore deleted in -r1  [Mavenir]: I am fine with r1. Thanks for the update and co-signing the contribution.  [Ericsson] : proposes updates to r1  [Mavenir]: In principle, Mavenir would agree. However, please see details below.  [Ericsson] : agrees with Mavenir’s proposed new formulation  [Mavenir] : provides r2 with implementation of proposed text.  [Ericsson] : r2 is fine  [Nokia] : r2 is fine | agreed | r2 |
|  |  | S3‑220067 | Clarification when the responder SEPP establish a second N32-C connection | Mavenir | CR | [Nokia] : mirror of 0066. Nokia supports 0066 and its mirror in 0067 with one more clarification as uploaded in 0066-r1.  Once 0066 is finalized, 0067 can be updated. Please comment in 0066 thread till it is finalized.  [Nokia] : {mirror doc, comments to be addressed in 0066, but update of mirror in line with 0066 needed – after finalization of discussion}  [Mavenir] : provides r1 which is mirror of draft\_S3-220066-r2. | agreed | r1 |
|  |  | S3‑220069 | [33.180] R16 Clarification requested by ETSI Plugtest | Motorola Solutions Danmark A/S | CR |  | agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220070 | [33.180] R17 Clarification requested by ETSI Plugtest (mirror) | Motorola Solutions Danmark A/S | CR |  | agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220071 | [33.180] R18 Clarification requested by ETSI Plugtest (mirror) | Motorola Solutions Danmark A/S | CR | MCC commented that the mirror for Rel-18 was not necessary since TS 33.180 didn’t have a rel-18 version yet. MCC added that the WID code for the package should be MCXSec since this is the Rel-16 WID.  MSI agrees with MCC's comments. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220075 | GUTI allocation discussion paper | Deutsche Telekom AG | discussion |  | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220082 | Integrity check during context transfer scenario 2 | NEC Telecom MODUS Ltd. | CR | >>CC\_2<<  [NEC] presents  [HW] comments, doesn’t think problem exist it was rejected earlier.  [Nokia] similar comments as HW.  [Ericsson] comments changes shouldn’t be in the current clause.  [NEC] clarifies  >>CC\_2<<  [Huawei]: Clarify is needed before approval.  Kundan(NEC) clarifies Huawei question.  [Ericsson] : asking questions  Kundan(NEC) clarifies further to He (Huawei).  [Ericsson] : providing further comments  Kundan(NEC) responds to Ericsson.  [Ericsson]responds to NEC  Huawei: we think we have different understanding on the clause 6,4,2,1 and 6.4.2.2. Huawei propose to clarify the clause first, and hear other people’s view.  [NEC]responds to Ericsson and tries to clarify Ericsson questions.  Kundan (NEC) provides revision r01 based on He comment.  Kundan (NEC) provides revision r02 based on further discussion with He to make the thing more generic.  [Ericsson] propose to note this document and continue discussion in next SA3 meeting  [NEC] disagrees with Ericsson that it violates the spec. This paragraph tells the UE is registered to the two different PLMNs at the same time while in the scenario in the CR UE is registered to the one PLMN only. so your objection is wrong. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220083 | Editor note removal from Annex S | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR | [Nokia] : -r1 is available.  [Huawei] : -r1 is fine.  MCC commented that the CR number on the cover page was wrong (it should be 1262), the WID code should be NSWO\_5G and the category F.  [Nokia] : -r2 is available.  [AT&T] Correct CR references and make clarification in “Reason for Change” section.  [Samsung]: Samsung supports this contribution. Provides r3 with editorial corrections.  [Nokia]: Fine with r3 but a minor comment.  [AT&T]: AT&T supports r3. | agreed | r3 |
|  |  | S3‑220084 | Verification of NSSAIs for preventing slice attack | CableLabs | CR | [Ericsson] : proposes r1  >>CC\_2<<  [Ericsson] presents  [Docomo] comments “e.g” is confusing, need clarification  [Ericsson] clarifies  [Nokia] comments  [HW] comments that additional modification to introduce slicing information into token are needed.  [Nokia] does not like to introduce certificate, to keep flexibility  [Chair] keeps email discussion  [CableLabs] clarifies about certificate  >>CC\_2<<  [Xiaomi] : requests for clarification.  [Deutsche Telekom] : DT supports the -r1  [Huawei] : request clarification.  [Ericsson] : clarifies  [CableLabs] : provided comments.  [CableLabs] : provided R2.  [Ericsson] : r2 is not agreeable, provides r3  [CableLabs] : accept r3  [Huawei] : propose r2, not agree with r3.  [Ericsson] : asks Huawei to consider agreeing to r3  [Nokia] : also not okay with inclusion of NSSAI in certificate, maybe best to keep 0084-r3 as DraftCR from this meeting,  [Huawei] : Prefer to keep it as a draftCR.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_1<<  [CableLabs] asks how to convert to draft CR  [MCC] clarifies.  [Nokia] comments  [HW] asks question.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_1<<  [Huawei] : Prefer to keep it as a draftCR.  [Huawei] : Prefer to keep it as a draftCR. | Convert to draft CR | R3 |
|  |  | S3‑220107 | Delete EN on defining EIA7 in clause 6.6.4.3 | ZTE Corporation | CR | [Vodafone] : Requests clarification on when the corresponding update to TS 24.501 was made  [ZTE]: provides clarification.  [Vodafone]: thanks ZTE for the reply and is OK with the CR. Also suggests some independent clarifications. | Agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220109 | Verification of NSSAIs for preventing slice attack | CableLabs | CR | [Nokia] : can be noted for this meeting, since mirror of 0084 and there is a request to keep 0084 as draft CR for this meeting. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220117 | Serving network name in NSSAA | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR | [Ericsson] : Proposal to note.  [Huawei] : Response to Ericsson.  [Nokia] : Proposal to send LS to SA2 first. Please see Nokia’s comments below.  [Huawei] : Response to Nokia.  [Ericsson] : LS not needed  >>CC\_4<<  [HW] presents the status and would like to send LS  [Ericsson] comments it has been discussion a long time. Sending LS has no benefit. Proposes not send LS.  [HW] clarifies  [Chair] suggests to revise CR based on SA2.  [Ericsson] comments it is for R-16 which is frozen.  >>CC\_4<<  [Huawei] : request Ericsson to change position.  [Nokia] : Suggest further discussion. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220145 | CR - 33501 - Clarification on Fast re-authentication | Apple | CR | [Ericsson] : clarification needed  [Nokia] : object this contribution  [Apple] : clarifies that the current 33501 text indicates there are still cases for supporting fast re-authentication in F.2.  [LGE] : provides comments  [Lenovo] : provides reference and comments.  MCC commented that the changes were not editorial; hence the category should be changed to F. They also added that the clauses affected field on the cover page was wrong.  [Apple]: Upload r1 only including MCC comments.  [Apple]: Provide comments on revision.  [Qualcomm] : does not see the need for this contribution  [Ericsson] : Supports Qualcomm and propose not to pursue the contribution  [Apple] : request more clarification from QC, wonders the current description still needs refining. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220156 | Clarification and corrections to NSWO SBI Interface methods | Intel | CR | [Nokia] : -r1 is available.  [Huawei] : -r1 is fine.  [Intel] : -r1 is fine.  [Samsung]: Samsung supports this contribution. We are fine with r1.  [Ericsson]: Ericsson proposes to note this contribution and gives clarification why.  [Lenovo]: Lenovo supports this contribution and is fine with revision r1.  >>CC\_2<<  [Intel] presents  [Nokia] supports, comments, supports to reuse  [Lenovo] supports.  [Ericsson] comments  [Nokia] replies.  [HW] supports  [CableLabs] supports  [Ericsson] comments  [Thales] supports Ericsson’s proposal rather than this.  [Samsung] questions to Ericsson  [Ericsson] replies  [HW] has same comment as Samsung.  [QC] : need to consider the issue Ericsson raising.  >>CC\_2<<  [Ericsson]: Asks supporting companies to respond to raised concerns.  [Huawei]: replies to comments and reiterates support for r1  [Ericsson]: Provides clarifications and asks further questions.  [Lenovo]: asks further questions.  [Ericsson]: Provides clarifications.  [Ericsson]: Clarifies that this proposal which has security issues and proposes to note this contribution.  [Samsung]: Provides clarification.  [Ericsson]: Responds to Samsung.  [Lenovo]: Question to Ericsson on the attack impact.  [Intel]: Does not agree with Ericsson Attack and request clarification  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_1<<  [In CC\_4, working assumption is made, to make 156 as baseline]  [Chair] it would be marked as agreed. .Decisions made using hand raising will be reported to plenary.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_1<< | agreed | R1 |
|  |  | S3‑220171 | Delete Editor's Note in NSWO | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR | [Nokia] : -r1 is available.  [Huawei] : -r1 is fine.  Tdoc number is missing from the header. “TS” should not be with the spec number 33.501. What does the proposed change affect, UICC, ME, Radio Access Network, Core Network, Re-word the note: “.is not addressed in the present document”.  [Samsung]: Samsung supports this contribution. Provides r2 with editorial corrections in NOTE and updates CR cover page.  [Qualcomm]: object to turning the last EN into a NOTE as there are proposals in this meeting to address this EN.  >>CC\_2<<  [HW] gives brief introduction  [QC] comments  [Lenovo] questions why to touch roaming aspect, that is not covered in study.  [Nokia] supports QC.  [AT&T] supports 337  [HW] clarifies, that is too late to introduce roaming security. Asks questions to Ericsson’s solution.  [Chair] asks whether can merge contributions or not.  [QC] supports to merge.  [Chair] : use 337 as baseline for merging.  >>CC\_2<< | merged | 156 |
|  |  | S3‑220174 | Report UP IP Security Result | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR | [Ericsson] : Propose to note this contribution.  [Huawei]: is fine with noting this for now based on outcome of discussion related to the LS 220039 | Not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220178 | Clean up for TR 33.867 | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR |  | agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220202 | EAP ID Request in NSSAA procedure | Ericsson | discussion | [Nokia] : Disagree with the proposal. The contribution and the corresponding CRs should be noted.  [Ericsson] : response  [Nokia] : Response.  [Huawei] : Response to Ericsson’s comments. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220204 | EAP ID Request in NSSAA Procedure (Rel-16) | Ericsson | CR |  | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220207 | EAP ID Request in NSSAA Procedure (Rel-17) | Ericsson | CR | [Huawei] : This contribution should be noted with reasons provided under the thread 0202. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220212 | LS on EAP ID Request in NSSAA Procedure | Ericsson | LS out | [Huawei] : propose to note this contribution. The reasons are provided in the thread 0202. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220214 | New WID on Security Aspects of Minimization of Service Interruption (MINT) | LG Electronics Inc. | WID new | [Thales] : proposes change.  [LGE] : asks a question to Thales for clarification  [Thales] : fine with initial version.  [Thales] : fine with initial version. | agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220222 | Rel-17 SUPI Privacy for SNPN | Ericsson | CR | [Thales] : disagree with the CR and propose not to pursue.  [Ericsson] : Responds to Thales and requests clarification  [Lenovo] : Should not be pursued.  [Thales] : answers Ericsson question. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220223 | Rel-16 SUPI Privacy for SNPN | Ericsson | CR | [Thales] : disagree with the CR and propose not to pursue.  [Ericsson] : Responds to Thales and requests clarification  [Lenovo] : Should not be pursued.  [Thales] : answers Ericsson question. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220224 | Rel-17 security aspects on MINT feature | LG Electronics Inc. | CR | >>CC\_2<<  [LGE] needs to wait LS reply from SA2, so propose to postpone to next week.  [Chair] goes into week 2  >>CC\_2<<  [LGE]: shares background and SA2 decision.  [Huawei]: requests clarification.  [LGE]: provides clarification to Huawei and asks for suggestion.  [Huawei]: fine with the clarification. | agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220227 | Editorial correction on clause 11.1.3 and 11.1.4 in TS 33.501 | LG Electronics Inc. | CR | [Huawei]: asks for a clarification on why this is only introduced to Rel-17 since the changes are editorial.  [LGE]: responses to Huawei’s question  MCC commented that the WID code should have been TEI17 as DUMMY is reserved for CRs included in WIDs to be approved in SA. They also noted that changing authorization with authentication was not an editorial change, so the category should be F.  [LGE]: proposes to note this contribution in this meeting and asks a question to MCC  MCC answered LG’s questions on how to handle the mirrors.  [LGE]: withdraws the previous proposal to note this contribution and provides r1 based on MCC’s guidance  [Huawei]: comments that revision is not available and asks to clarify the changes with respect to the original document before this can be agreed  [LGE]: responses to Huawei  [HW] commented on coversheet (notes captured by VC)  [LGE]: responses to Huawei | Agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220448 | Editorial correction on clause 11.1.3 and 11.1.4 in TS 33.501 –R15 | LG Electronics Inc. | CR | [LGE] mirror of 227 | Agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220449 | Editorial correction on clause 11.1.3 and 11.1.4 in TS 33.501 –R16 | LG Electronics Inc. | CR | [LGE] mirror of 227 | Agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220229 | Resolving the EN on the authorization between SCPs | Huawei, HiSilicon, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, Samsung | CR | [Nokia] : {we can support this CR with an additional clarification, since the reference is too specific otherwise}  [Mavenir]: Clarification is required before approval.  The text is not clear and confusing.  What is the scenario which enables one SCP to send an access token request on behalf of another SCP.  May be the intention is different than what the text is saying; this clarification is required.  Thanks!  [Huawei] : Provide the clarification  [Ericsson] : comments  [Mavenir]: Mavenir is fine with the most simple option. Option B.  @Christine: This way we get things approved quickly  [Nokia] : comments  [Mavenir]: Propose an update to the proposed paragraph.  [Ericsson] : comments on Mavenir’s and Nokia’s proposed updates  [Mavenir] : respond to Ericsson comments.  [Nokia] : -r1 uploaded, implementing Nokia proposal (but without mentioning sender, since clause is about “between SCPs”).  [Ericsson] : disagrees with r1  [Huawei] : Propose to use Option B.  [Huawei] : propose R2 with option B only.  [Nokia] : note the contribution, since no consensus seems possible. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220233 | Clarification on IV usage on N32-f protection-R15 | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR | [Mavenir]: Why Huawei believes that making this fundamental changes for Rel-15/Rel-16 is necessary,  This While there is no security issue other than fixing a bad implementation,  Looking for your answer before I make my final opinion.  [Mavenir]: did not get any clarification on the asked question,  Just a reminder.  [Huawei] : providing Huawei answers.  [Ericsson] : CR and its mirrors should be not pursued  [Huawei] : provide clarification to Ericsson.  [Mavenir] : providing feedback and request Huawei response.  [Huawei] : Provides the reply to Mavenir.  [Nokia] : objects  [Mavenir]: Provides the reply to Huawei and looking for other companies response(s).  [Ericsson] : replies to Huawei  [Nokia] : note for this meeting and allow companies to check before next meeting.  [Huawei] : agree to note in this meeting. Asking companies to do the offline checking to avoid the potential issue on the SEPP when the roaming is implemented in the worldwide. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220234 | Clarification on IV usage on N32-f protection-R16 | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR | [Nokia] : note for this meeting and allow companies to check before next meeting. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220235 | Clarification on IV usage on N32-f protection-R17 | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR | [Nokia] : note for this meeting and allow companies to check before next meeting. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220236 | Clarification on origination of the Rel17 SCAS test cases in AMF | Huawei, Hisilicon | CR | [Ericsson] : Comment  [Huawei] : How about add the Note under the pre-condition,  [Ericsson] : Reply  [Huawei] : Please find r1 in the draft folder. Thanks.  [Ericsson] : r1 is ok | agreed | r1 |
|  |  | S3‑220241 | Clarification on the format of callback URI in the NF certificate profile | Ericsson | CR | [Nokia] : asks for clarification, only agrees on the change with urn:uuid so far  [Ericsson] : clarifies, provides r1 with only URN format correction  [Nokia] : fine with -r1 | agreed | r1 |
|  |  | S3‑220242 | Clarification on the format of callback URI in the NF certificate profile | Ericsson | CR | [Nokia] : CR cannot be agreed, since mirror and pending on 241  [Ericsson] : provides r1, mirror of 241-r1  [Nokia] : fine with -r1 | agreed | r1 |
|  |  | S3‑220243 | Clarification on the certificate profile for SCP and SEPP | Ericsson, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | draftCR | [NTT DOCOMO]: depends on S3-220241. Needs to have updated coversheet to  show this. Gives proposal to update.  [Ericsson] : proposes way forward to resolve the dependency with S3-220241  [Nokia] : CR cannot be agreed, since mirror and pending on 241  [Ericsson] : asks Nokia to withdraw objection, since it is not a mirror of 241 but a draft-CR approved last meeting  [Nokia] : made mistake, withdraws. agree on -r1, which should integrate approved 244-r2  [Ericsson] : r1 available, implements 244-r1. Should be converted into CR.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_1<<  [Ericsson] proposes to convert to CR  [Nokia] keeps as draft CR  [Ericsson] this should be CR.  [HW] comments to keep draft CR and bring CR next meeting  [Docomo] proposes to keep as draft CR and next meeting to bring CR  [HW] proposes not to convert to CR this meeting.  [Chair]: treats this as draft CR this meeting.  [Ericsson] asks whether needs to announce draft CR will be converted to CR.  [HW] clarifies  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_1<< | agreed | r1 |
|  |  | S3‑220244 | Multiple PLMN-IDs in the SEPP interconnect certificate profile | Ericsson | other | >>CC\_2<<  [Ericsson] gives brief introduction  >>CC\_2<<  [Mavenir]: provides r1 with minor editorial but critical to be captured.  An additional Question:  Why we chose to use “dNSName subjectAltName” in specific,  Is this inline with GSMA for example,  Why not using the 'gsma' namespace - https://www.iana.org/assignments/urn-namespaces/urn-namespaces.xhtml {https://www.iana.org/assignments/urn-namespaces/urn-namespaces.xhtml} ,  Thanks.  [Ericsson] : replies and asks for clarification  [Ericsson] : r1 is fine  [Nokia] : fine with r1, Nokia supports. | agreed | r1 |
|  |  | S3‑220245 | SEPP to include and verify the source PLMN-ID | Ericsson | draftCR | >>CC\_2<<  >>CC\_2<<  [Nokia] : suggest to implement -r8 of 246 into draftCR, but keep draftCR as living CR till next meeting  [Nokia] : can be approved as 245-r1 draftCR after implementing -246-r9  [Mavenir] : Please add Mavenir as a cosigner before final upload. | approved | r1 |
|  |  | S3‑220246 | Resolving Editor's Notes in "SEPP to include and verify the source PLMN-ID" | Ericsson | other | [Mavenir] : Mavenir support this contribution but we propose editorial changes, draft\_S3-220246\_r1 uploaded.  All the changes are editorial and should not cause any problem.  I know we spent lots of time discussing and drafting some this text but after things Seattle we need to make sure that the text is clear and no room for ambiguity as much as possible.  One minor issue: I am not comfortable with the notion of having a default PLMN ID with any qualification. ☹  [Ericsson] : provides r3  >>CC\_2<<  [Ericsson] gives brief introduction  [IDCC] (in chat) will read r3 and provide comments.  [Docomo] comments how SEPP know which PLMN ID should be used. The discussion has a lot of things not concluded.  [Chair] asks the issue is in scope of SA3 or GSMA?  [Docomo] it triggers from GSMA, but involve SA3 now.  [HW] agrees with Docomo in general.  >>CC\_2<<  [Nokia] : {provides r4}  [Mavenir]: Somehow, there is r4 on the server. Mavenir agrees with r4 with condition below.  However, no one has addressed my concern about the default PLMN-ID  Do we need to have any qualification to this default PLMN-ID or just leave it very generic and very HL.  There must be some conditions for this default PLMN-ID, otherwise, it sounds it does not make sense.  We are instructing the receiving SEPP to drop the message if the PLMN-ID does not belong to the receiving SEPP and all of a sudden we allow the sending SEPP to include a default PLMN ID that is not qualified nor defined,  That should not be the case.  I hope we can close on this before the deadline. I want this contribution to be agreed but we should address this part first.  [Huawei] : request clarification on the default PLMN ID and multiple PLMN ID.  [NTT DOCOMO]: This solution needs work by CT4, so an LS to CT4 is required.  [Mavenir]: completely share the same concerns and we should hold on this and send an LS to CT4. More details below.  [Ericsson] : provides r5  [NTT DOCOMO]: propose an editor's note  [Ericsson] : provides r6 with the Editor’s Note proposed by NTT DOCOMO  [Mavenir]: disagree with r6 new clause for the requirement on NFs. Mavenir provides r7.  [Ericsson] : disagrees with r7, provides r8 for the case that r6 is not agreeable, prefers r6  [Nokia] : propose to digest this topic for one more meeting cycle. suggest to use -r8 as baseline for next meeting, i.e. implement it in draft CR 245.  [NTT DOCOMO]: needs further work.  [Ericsson] : provides r9  [NTT DOCOMO]: more comments  [Ericsson] : provides r10  [Mavenir] : r9 is fine. Could you please add Mavenir as a cosigner before uploading the final version.  [Mavenir] : r9 is fine. Could you please add Mavenir as a cosigner before uploading the final version. | approved | R10 |
|  |  | S3‑220247 | Further alignment with TS 29.573 to clarify that N32-c is short-lived | Ericsson | CR | >>CC\_2<<  [Ericsson] it should be merged into 392.  >>CC\_2<<  [Nokia] : {merge content into 392 to become joint Nokia/Ericsson contribution since both address the same topic but 392 starts from R15 onwards; draft\_S3-220392\_r1 has been uploaded, please comment at 392 thread}  [Ericsson]: agrees to merge S3-220247 in S3-220393  [Nokia] : provides clarification on doc merges, 247 is to be merged into 393 (cat A), similarly 248 into 394 (cat A), content of 247 also be part of 392-r6 (cat F) | merged | 393 |
|  |  | S3‑220248 | Further alignment with TS 29.573 to clarify that N32-c is short-lived | Ericsson | CR | [Nokia] : {248 is the mirror of 247, this tdoc can be noted or marked as merged as well, because 247 has been merged into 392 to become a joint Nokia/Ericsson contribution; draft\_S3-220392\_r2 has been uploaded, please comment at 392 thread}  [Ericsson]: should be marked as merged into S3-220394 | merged | 394 |
|  |  | S3‑220249 | Editorials suggested by Edithelp | Ericsson | CR |  | agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220250 | Removing Editor's Note on PNi-NPN security aspects | Ericsson | CR |  | agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220251 | Removing Editor's Note on PNi-NPN security aspects | Ericsson | CR |  | agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220258 | Rel-15 - Updating reference to RFC 9048 (EAP-AKA | Ericsson | CR |  | agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220259 | Rel-16 - Updating reference to RFC 9048 (EAP-AKA | Ericsson | CR |  | agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220260 | Rel-17 - Updating reference to RFC 9048 (EAP-AKA | Ericsson | CR |  | agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220261 | Discussion on the SBA service operations to support NSWO authentication | Ericsson, Thales | discussion | >>CC\_2<<  [Ericsson] presents  >>CC\_2<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220266 | Update of NSWO authentication procedure and SBA service operations | Ericsson, Thales | CR | >>CC\_2<<  [Ericsson] presents  >>CC\_2<<  [Nokia] : Proposes to note this contribution.  [Ericsson] : Disagrees with noting the contribution. Clarifies that no technical problems and especially no secure issues have been found in this proposal.  [Nokia] : proposes to still note this contribution.  [Ericsson] : Asks for further clarification.  >>CC\_4<<  [Nokia] presents current status.  (related to 156,  266 is using new service, and 156 is using existing service)  [Ericsson] clarifies why to introduce new services.  [Intel] comments it is not a valid attack.  [Lenovo] doesn’t think it is valid attack.  [HW] shares same view as Intel and Lenovo.  [Ericsson] clarifies.  ===Show of hands====  Supporting new services (266): Thales, Ericsson  Supporting existing services (156): Intel, Samsung, Lenovo, Huawei, Nokia  [Chair]: 156 will be the baseline for further discussion since majority supports it.  [Thales] comments that more time is needed.  [HW] clarifies that issue was discussed in the last meeting also, so not a new topic..  **[Ericsson] requests to mark down that decision is not agreed by Ericsson.**  **[**Chair] reminds that this is the last meeting for Rel-17, and request everyone to agree with majority view. We need to make progress. If the issue need to be re-opened, please present it in the plenary.  >>CC\_4<< | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220267 | Resolve Editor Note related to co-existence of EPS NSWO | Ericsson | CR | [Qualcomm]: propose to merge this into S3-220336 and continue the discussion in the thread for S3-220336  >>CC\_2<<  [Ericsson] presents  [QC] comments already on email.  [Ericsson] clarifies.  [QC] doesn’t convinced with Ericsson’s comment.  [Chair] continue discussion, and prefer to merge  [QC] proposes to keep discussion under 0336 and try to merge.  [Ericsson] comments  >>CC\_2<<  [Ericsson]: Asks clarifying questions.  [Qualcomm]: clarifies.  [Ericsson]: Agrees to close this thread and continue the discussion of merging tdocs 267 and 336 in the thread for 336. | merge | 336 |
|  |  | S3‑220268 | Roaming for 5G NSWO | Ericsson | CR | [Qualcomm]: propose to merge this into S3-220337 and continue the discussion in the thread for S3-220337  >>CC\_2<<  [Ericsson] presents  >>CC\_2<< | merge | 337 |
|  |  | S3‑220283 | Usage of AN ID for NSWO authentication | Ericsson | CR |  | agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220284 | Alternative solution for NSWO authentication | Ericsson | CR | [Nokia] : Request for clarification.  [Ericsson] : Provides clarifications to Nokia.  [Nokia] : Proposes to note this contribution.  [Ericsson] : Provides clarification why the threat is valid.  >>CC\_2<<  [Ericsson] presents  >>CC\_2<< | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220291 | Authorization between MCData message store and MCData Server | Samsung | CR | [MSI]: MSI cannot agree. Proposed solution does not fit with MC architecture.  [Samsung]: Provides clarification.  [Nokia]: Provides general comments related to MCData-7 and MCData-8 reference points.  [MSI]: MSI provides a compromise.  [Samsung] : Provides comments and further clarifications  [Nokia]: provides further comments for discussion.  [MSI]: more discussion.  [Nokia]: clarifies own position.  [Ericsson] : prefers MSI’s proposal  [MSI] : MSI agrees to optional access lists and MCData-8 out of scope.  [Nokia] : supports MSI and Ericsson proposal and also agrees to optional access lists and MCData-8 out of scope.  [Samsung]: Provides r1. For the sake of progress and to have a solution in TS 33.180 we are fine to have compromised proposal suggested by MSI.  [MSI] : Some proposed clarifications to r1.  [NOKIA] : Supports suggested clarifications from MSI on r1.  [Samsung] : Provides r2.  [MSI] : Comments on r2.  [Samsung] : Provides clarification on r2.  [MSI] : Response to Samsung.  [Samsung] : Responds to MSI.  [Nokia] : Disagrees with r2.  [Samsung] : Provides r3, based on MSI's proposal.  [MSI] : Thanks Samsung and accepts r3.  [Ericsson] : r3 is ok and proposes some editorial corrections  [Samsung] : Thanks for accepting r3. Will incorporate suggested editorials in final version.  [Nokia] : Accepts r3. | agreed | r3 |
|  |  | S3‑220295 | Clarification to IAB in EN-DC architecture | Samsung | CR |  | agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220298 | Updates to NF profile for inter-slice access control | Samsung | CR | MCC commented that it was not possible to have a CR based on conclusions of a Study. A normative WID was needed in order to implement these conclusions. They added that TEIx cat-B CRs were strongly discouraged in SA.  They also added that the clauses affected field needed to be filled in the cover page.  >>CC\_2<<  [Samsung] presents.  [CableLabs] comments it depends on the previous CR discussed (0084). It should be agreed only after 0084 is agreed.  [Ericsson] comments  [Samsung] clarifies  [HW] comments  [Chair] : continue email discussion  >>CC\_2<<  [Samsung] : Provides r1 with updates in cover page as per MCC comment.  [Ericsson] : should be not pursued (original and r1)  [Samsung] : Provides comments. And asks if r1 is fine.  [Samsung] : Provides comments. And asks if r1 is fine.  [Ericsson] : let’s continue the discussion in the FS\_eSBA\_SEC study | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220303 | UP IP: No support for UP IP in LTE-LTE Dual Connectivity in Rel-17 | Ericsson | CR | MCC pointed out some issues on the cover page. MCC also clarified that notes could not be renumbered. They added that the new note in Annex E could not be located there since it was creating a hanging paragraph.  [Ericsson] : r1 is updated to Draft folder correcting the issues mentioned below.  MCC commented on revision 1.  [Ericsson] : r2 is updated to Draft folder correcting the issues mentioned below. | agreed | r2 |
|  |  | S3‑220316 | Using MACS as a freshness parameter in the calculation of AK\* | Qualcomm Incorporated, Thales | CR | >>CC\_2<<  [QC] presents  [Chair] continue discussion.  >>CC\_2<< | agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220320 | Adding text on preferring AKMA keys to GBA Digest | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR | MCC asked for which specification was this CR created. The document was reserved for TS 33.535 but the cover page read TS 33.222. If this was intended for TS 33.222 the CR needed to be not pursued and a new tdoc number and CR number should be taken.  [Qualcomm]: The document is for TS 33.535 so will provide a revision to correct this  [Thales] : proposes to add a NOTE.  [Qualcomm]: provides an r1  [Thales] : Thales is fine with r1. | agreed | R1 |
|  |  | S3‑220323 | Correcting the update to the support of GEA algorithms in Rel-11 | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR |  | agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220334 | Correct NAS uplink COUNT for KgNB/KeNB derivation | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR | >>CC\_2<<  [QC] presents  [HW] asks question for clarification about mirror.  [Chair] asks reason why not implemented in R15.  >>CC\_2<<  [CMCC] comments on necessity to update R15 specs.  [Qualcomm]: provide an answer  [CMCC] is ok for the clarification. | agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220336 | Co-existence with EPS NSWO | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR | >>CC\_2<<  [QC] presents  >>CC\_2<<  [Qualcomm]: provides r1 (merger of S3-220336 and S3-220267).  [Ericsson]: Asks clarifying questions.  [Qualcomm]: provides requested clarifications  [Ericsson]: is fine with r1 and provides some observations  [Qualcomm]: responds to the observation | agreed | r1 |
|  |  | S3‑220337 | 5G NSWO roaming aspects | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR | [Nokia]: We support this contribution.  [Ericsson]: Asks for clarification.  >>CC\_2<<  [QC] presents  >>CC\_2<<  [CableLabs]: provided comments and ask for clarification and changes.  [Qualcomm]: provides clarifications to Ericsson and Cable Labs  [Huawei]: proposes to change the cat of the CR to B and send an LS to CT group to inform and confirm our common view that this does not have stage 3 impact.  [Lenovo]: supports Huawei proposal of informing CT groups that no stage 3 impact is expected.  [CableLabs]: provided R1.  [Qualcomm]: responds to the comments & requests clarification on r1  [CableLabs]: provided clarification on r1  [Huawei]: provides a first version of the corresponding LS to stage 3 groups.  [Ericsson]: Asks clarifications on Opt1 and does not see a need for Opt4.  [Nokia]: -r2 available for review.  [CableLabs]: fine with -r2.  [Nokia]: -r2 available for review.  [Qualcomm]: provides r3  [CableLabs]: not fine with r3.  [Qualcomm]: provides r4; ok with r3/r4  [CableLabs]: ok with r4  [Nokia]: fine with r4 revision  [Ericsson]: provides r5 version  [Qualcomm]: fine with r5  [Nokia]: fine with r5  [CableLabs]: fine with r5  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_1<<  [Ericsson] comments on cat-B, consider stage-3 impact  [HW] clarifies cat-B doesn’t mean stage-3 impact.  [MCC] clarifies, it still has time to provide cat-B contribution  [Ericsson] that is not cat-B currently.  [Chair] requests to change cat-F to cat-B.  [CableLabs] asks how to do if there is stage-3 work.  [HW] clarifies.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_1<< | agreed | r5 |
|  |  | S3-220446 | LS on 5G NSWO roaming aspects | Huawei | LS out | >>CC\_4<<  [Chair] Since this is initiated today, it could be extended to next week.  >>CC\_4<<  [Huawei]: kick starts the discussion on the LS related to the 5G NSWO aspects  [Nokia]: Fine with proposed r1 but minor comment.  [Qualcomm]: fine with r1  [Ericsson]: Proposes an addition.  [Nokia]: Provides r2.  [Lenovo]: fine with r2.  [Qualcomm]: also fine with r2  [Huawei]: comments that changes are needed and provides r3  [Ericsson]: fine with r3  [Nokia]: fine with r3  [Qualcomm]: also fine with r3  [Lenovo]: also fine with r3  [CableLabs]: fine with r3 | approved | R3 |
|  |  | S3‑220341 | Updating SEAL-S security | Ericsson | CR |  | agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220342 | Updating SEAL-UU security | Ericsson | CR |  | agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220343 | Profiling ACE in SEAL | Ericsson | CR | MSI asks for access token clarification.  [Ericsson] : provides explanation  MCC commented that this CR was not a correction, so the category should be changed to B.  MSI appreciates the token explanation and will withdraw our objection.  MSI appreciates the token explanation and will withdraw our objection. | agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220344 | Revisiting security of SEAL interfaces | Ericsson | discussion |  | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220345 | Correcting the implementation of approved S3-214431 to SEAL TS 33.434 | Ericsson | CR | MSI asks that text 'a direct HTTP connection' be added to clause 5.1.1.3.  [Ericsson] : provides explanation  [Ericsson] : provides r1  [MSI] : Accepts r1 with minor editorial comments.  [Ericsson] : thanks and will made the minor editorial comments while uploading the revised version to the portal. | agreed | r1 |
|  |  | S3‑220347 | Rel-16 CAPIF usage for SEAL-S | Ericsson | CR | MSI asks that text 'a direct HTTP connection' be added to the proposed text.  [Ericsson] : provides r1  [MSI] : accepts r1  [Ericsson] : thanks and will update Rev from '-' to '1' while uploading the revised versions to the portal. | agreed | r1 |
|  |  | S3‑220348 | Rel-17 CAPIF usage for SEAL-S | Ericsson | CR |  | agreed | R1 |
|  |  | S3‑220349 | Rel-16 Correcting SEAL-UU security | Ericsson | CR | MSI asks that deleted text 'a direct HTTP connection' be reinstated.  [Ericsson] : provides explanation  [MSI] : Maintains their position  [Ericsson] :  [Ericsson] : provides r1  [MSI] : accepts r1  [Ericsson] : thanks and will update Rev from '-' to '1' while uploading the revised version to the portal. | agreed | r1 |
|  |  | S3‑220350 | Rel-17 Correcting SEAL-UU security | Ericsson | CR |  | agreed | R1 |
|  |  | S3‑220368 | SBA service operations for Prose L3 U2N security CP solution | Ericsson | CR | MCC pointed out some issues on the cover page and a missing reference.  MCC pointed out some issues on the cover page and a missing reference. | agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220388 | Reference to symmetric channel delay clause | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR |  | agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220392 | Clarification on separate handling of N32-c and N32-f | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR | [Nokia] : { draft\_S3-220392\_r1 uploaded. We propose to use this doc as baseline, merging into 392 the content from Ericsson S3-210247/248. It is up for discussion if N32-f clarification should apply from Rel15 onward. It is argued to be useful to avoid backward compatibility issues. 392/394 will be created once the content in 392 is agreed.  please comment/discuss in this thread, also for R16/R17}  [Nokia] : { resent with correct tdoc numbers: draft\_S3-220392\_r2 uploaded. We propose to use this doc as baseline, merging into 392 the content from Ericsson S3-220247/248. It is up for discussion if N32-f clarification should apply from Rel15 onward. It is argued to be useful to avoid backward compatibility issues. S3-220392/394 will be created once the content in 392 is agreed.  please comment/discuss in this thread, also for R16/R17}  [Huawei] : Disagree with the proposal.  [Ericsson] : explains why changes are necessary for both security reasons and for compatibility with frozen stage-3 specifications  >>CC\_2<<  [Ericsson] presents  [Huawei] comments CT4 should be align with SA3.  [Docomo] usually to make alignment on stage-3, not stage-2.  [Ericsson] agrees with Docomo  [Docomo] if no consensus, send LS to SA/CT plenary and decide there.  [Chair] prefers to get conclusion in SA3.  [Chair] asks whether it is acceptable for HW to align with CT.  [Huawei] does not like that proposal.  [Nokia] comments  [CMCC] proposes to show hand  [VF] comments  [Nokia] comments SA3 is not consistance itself.  [Huawei] comments reusing TLS has benefits.  [Chair] proposes to continue offline and discuss tomorrow, and show of hands if needed.  >>CC\_2<<  MCC commented that the cat-F and its mirrors must have the same WID code on the cover page. There was also misalignment between what was reserved (5G\_eSBA) and what was uploaded (TEIx). They also pointed out a mistake in the CR number of tdoc 393.  [Huawei] : provides responses and further comments  [China mobile] : need some clarification, propose to discuss further which method is better.  [Ericsson] : clarifies  [Huawei] : clarifies and tries to propose a way forward  [Ericsson] : Good to find a way forward, but r3 is not clear and requires updates.  [Huawei] : Responds to Ericsson.  [Nokia] : Object the proposed addition by Huawei.  [Huawei] : asks for clarification.  [Nokia] : responds  [Huawei] : responds  [Nokia] : responds, objects -r3, has uploaded -r4 (=cleaned -r2) which several companies agree on, and asks HW to provide a concrete proposal for alignment with CT4 based on -r4  [Ericsson] : disagrees with r3, supports r4  [Huawei] : disagrees with r4  [Nokia] : asks Huawei to provide proposal for update and to discuss in SA3 call today  [Huawei] : responds to Nokia.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_1<<  [Chair] asks whether to postpone to week 2  [Nokia] no need to postpone, HW’s request may be fulfilled with additional NOTE.  [HW] has already given compromise, want to use r3, but Nokia doesn’t like r3.  [Nokia] clarifies.  [Ericsson] : needs further discussion, extending to next week is great.  [HW] proposes to extends to next week.  [Nokia] is not ok to extend to next week.  [CMCC] prefers to extend to next week.  [CableLabs] shares some view with Nokia, consider to extend to next week as best way to mitigate concern from HW.  [Chair] requests to extend to week 2.  [HW] asks whether Nokia can accept HW’s position. If not accepted, no need to extend and proposes to discuss next meeting.  [Nokia] comments.  [HW] clarifies.  [Ericsson] proposes to solve it in this meeting, proposes to have offline discussion/confcall and possible show of hand if needed.  [Chair]: extends to next week, no official discussion during weekend, but please continue offline discussions.  [Ericsson] 247/248, 392/393/394 should accompany  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_1<<  [Mavenir] : request clarification from Huawei. (assuming this contribution is carried over to week2)  [Huawei] : provides clarification.  [Ericsson]: asks Huawei for further clarification  [Huawei]: replies to Ericsson  [Verizon] : Objects to pre-configuration. Please clarify exactly what is being pre-configured.  [China mobile]: Propose to make way forward.  [Ericsson]: replies to Huawei and China Mobile  [Deutsche Telekom] : supports the proposal to keep these connections independent of each other and provides -r5  [Mavenir] : Support r5 and kindly asks Nokia to add Mavenir as a cosigner.  [Nokia]: Nokia requests to resolve the misalignment issue for N32 [S3-220392], and is necessary by show of hands.  [Huawei]: Huawei kindly requests for another meeting cycle as these are big changes since Rel-15, we need more time to check.  >>CC\_8<<  [Ericsson] presents status, currently is r6  [HW] suggests to postpone.  [Nokia] comments the issue is not new.  [Mavenir] considers it is not a big change.  [Chair] request HW to accept majority opinion raised.  [HW] still objects.  ---show of hands---  Supporter: DT, Lenovo, Ericsson, Docomo, CableLabs, NCSC, Mavenir, Nokia (8 companies)  Not support: HW, CMCC (2 companies).  **[Chair] requests to set 392 as working assumption, and mark HW objects.**  ---show of hands---  >>CC\_8<<  [Ericsson]: informs that r6 has been uploaded, which is r5 with additional cosigners  [Deutsche Telekom] : agrees to -r6, asks editorial  [Huawei] : sustained objection for 2 reasons: 1/ no security reason to change a deeply frozen spec from R-15, and 2/ downgrade the efficiency of reusing TLS mechanism approved since R-15 | agreed with sustained objection | R6 |
|  |  | S3‑220393 | Clarification on separate handling of N32-c and N32-f | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR | [Nokia] : {mirror of 392, please comment at 392 thread} | agreed with sustained objection | R1 |
|  |  | S3‑220394 | Clarification on separate handling of N32-c and N32-f | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR | [Nokia] : {mirror of 392, please comment at 392 thread} | agreed with sustained objection | R1 |
|  |  | S3‑220395 | draftCR NRF deployment was S3-214534 | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, Ericsson | draftCR |  | approved |  |
|  |  | S3‑220396 | NRF deployments | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR | [Ericsson] : provides r1  MCC reminded the authors to clean up the CR and pointed out an error on the cover page.  [Mavenir]: objects to r1 as it is proposed.  Mavenir will provide r2 and upload to the server when ready.  [Mavenir]: provides r2.  It is clarification and removing text that is not needed or necessary for the meaning.  [Huawei]: supports r2 and would like to co-sign.  [Ericsson] : asks Mavenir and Huawei for clarification regarding r2  [NTT DOCOMO]: need some more time to check.  [Mavenir]: provides r3. Added Mavenir, Huawei, and HiSilicon as cosigners.  [Mavenir]: provided r3. Please check it as the latest. Thanks.  [Ericsson] : r3 requires update  [Mavenir]: looking for your proposed changes for the last paragraph.  [Ericsson] : proposes r4  [Mavenir]: In principle agrees with r4 but it has an unintentional typo error, I believe. Mavenir correct the error and provide r5.  [Ericsson] : In principle agrees with r5, but proposes to resolve the typo slightly differently in r6.  [Mavenir] : responds to Ericsson.  [Ericsson] : replies to Mavenir  [Mavenir] : agrees with r6.  [Nokia] : provides -r7 and asks why specific slice part was removed.  [Ericsson] : explains why slice specific part was removed  [NTT DOCOMO]: ask for clarification  [Huawei]: pvovides r8 to align with CT4  [Mavenir]: provides r9. The only change I added the word “target” to the NRF where the request is forwarded to (in couple of places). This is to make it clear and eliminate confusion. Nothing else was changed from r8.  [Mavenir]: trying to answer the clarification.  [Ericsson] : provides r10  [Nokia] : propose to keep content of -r10 as draft CR / working status, since we run out of time, I will upload -r11 clean later today.  [Mavenir] : -r10 is fine.  [Nokia] : -r11 is the clean version of -r10, can be approved as draft CR | convert to draft CR | r11 |
|  |  | S3‑220397 | SEPP reference | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR |  | agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220398 | Reference to N5CW and key derivation correction | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR | [Ericsson] : revision needed  [Qualcomm] : provides comments  [Nokia] : revision -r1 uploaded  [Nokia] : revision -r2 uploaded, editorial change, capitalizing the key name.  [Ericsson] : r3 provided  [Qualcomm] : r3 is OK from changes perspective but needs cover sheet changes  [Nokia] : r4 uploaded, updating cover sheet  [Ericsson] : r4 OK  [Qualcomm] : r4 OK | agreed | r4 |
|  |  | S3‑220399 | Reference to N5CW and key derivation correction | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR | [Ericsson] : revision needed  [Qualcomm] : provides comments  MCC pointed out a mistake on the cover page.  [Nokia] : revision -r1 will be created with final outcome, since 399 is mirror of 398.  [Nokia] : revision -r1 (not yet created since mirror) can be approved with content as in 399-r4. | agreed | r1 |
|  |  | S3‑220400 | Using existing authentication services for NSWO | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR | [Nokia] : Proposed to merge to S3-220156. This email thread can be closed. | merge | 156 |
|  |  | S3‑220401 | Editorial corrections to Annex F of IMS | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR |  | agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220402 | Clarification on unspecified expiration of AV in 5G AKA | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR | [Ericsson] : revision proposed (r1)  [Huawei] : Requires further clarification before it's acceptable.  [Nokia] : provides explanation .  [Nokia] : providing -r2, cleaning up the changes over changes from ERI proposal & updating to remove 2x “error” from “error reason” because the response message is success with the authentication failure indication.  [Huawei] : not convinced by the arguments  [Ericsson] : cannot accept r2, prefer r1  propose to note for this meeting and come back after further investigation. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220403 | Clarification on unspecified expiration of AV in 5G AKA | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR | [Ericsson] : revision needed  [Nokia] : mirror doc, can be noted, since 402 is noted | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220404 | Clarification on unspecified expiration of AV in 5G AKA | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR | [Ericsson] : revision needed  [Nokia] : mirror doc, can be noted, since 402 is noted | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220411 | Update of references for the GBA related UDM service operations | Ericsson | CR |  | agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220413 | Rel-17 Clarification of the Registration Request handling for the direct AMF re-allocation | Ericsson | CR | [Huawei] : supports the contribution and provides r1.  >>CC\_2<<  [Ericsson] provides r2 and presents  [HW] would like to check and discuss further in email.  [Ericsson] clarifies. >>CC\_2<<  [Ericsson] : Provides r2 and explains about Rel-17 CR. Proposes a way forward.  [Huawei] : r2 is fine with Huawei.  [Ericsson] : Provides proposal for handling the CR and related LS to SA2 (S3-220412)  [Huawei] : supports Ericsson’s proposal.  >>CC\_3<<  [Ericsson] presents r2  >>CC\_3<< | agreed | r2 |
|  |  | S3‑220423 | Deletion of the usage of NGAP PATH SWITCH REQUEST ACKNOWLEDGE message for AS rekeying during Xn-Handover | NTT DOCOMO INC. | CR | >>CC\_2<<  [Docomo] presents  [Ericsson] asks question for clarification, is there corresponding contribution in RAN3?  [Docomo] clarifies  [VF] asks question for clarification  [Docomo] clarifies  [HW] is it only alignment?  [Docomo] clarifies  [HW] comments, previous discussion does not reach consensus.  [Chair] asks for clarification, is the CR introducing new behavior?  [Docomo] clarifies, that is not the intention.  [Nokia] comments, that changes can be captured in a better way.  [Docomo] clarifies that open for simplifying CR.  [Chair] continue discussion over email  >>CC\_2<<  [ZTE] : Requests some clarifications.  [Ericsson] : Ask question for clarification.  [Nokia]: R1 is now available for review.  [Ericsson]: we are fine with r1.  [NTT DOCOMO]: fine with r1. Thank you very much.  [NTT DOCOMO]: there is no LS  [ZTE]: supports r1.  >>CC\_5<<  Has revised as 500 for 423r1  >>CC\_5<<  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_2<<  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_2<< | agreed | R1 |
|  |  | S3-220499 | Reply LS on MINT functionality for Disaster Roaming | SA2 | LS in | [LGE]: proposes to reply, and provides draft\_S3-220499-r1 as a draft reply.  >>CC\_5<<  [Chair] presents status.  >>CC\_5<<  >>CC\_7<<  [LGE] presents status  [Chair] requests delegates to check r1  >>CC\_7<<  [Ericsson]: In general ok with the LS. Proposes some changes.  [LGE]: declares r2 based on Ericsson comment  [Ericsson]: is fine with r2. | Replied to | R2 |
| 5 | Studies areas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.1 | Study on 5G security enhancement against false base stations | S3‑220110 | LS out on authenticity and replay protection of system information | CableLabs | LS out | [Philips] Supports LS out once small updates are done.  >>CC\_3<<  [CableLabs] presents  >>CC\_3<<  [Apple] : Apple supports this LS.  [Qualcomm]: Qualcomm propose to note this contribution  [CableLabs]: Provided R1 and comments to Qualcomm.  [Huawei] : supports the LS and provides r2.  [Deutsche Telekom] : asks clarification for -r2  [Huawei] : provides clarification.  [Philips] Supports LS out once small updates are done.  [Deutsche Telekom] : thanks for the clarification  [CableLabs] : agree with R2.  [Ericsson] : reference to solution #27 should be removed from the action section in r2.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_1<<  QC is objecting.  [CableLabs] the objection is not technical, ask QC to reconsider position.  [Chair] continue discussion, this is Rel-18 no hurry needed.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_1<<  [Deutsche Telekom] : fine with -r3 | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220111 | Update to solution #25 | Huawei, HiSilicon | pCR | [Ericsson] : Ericsson does not agree with the pCR.  [Qualcomm]: requests revision before approval  [Huawei]: Response to Qualcomm and provide r1.  [Huawei] : Response to Ericsson and provide r1.  [Ericsson] : comments  [Huawei] : r2 provided.  [Ericsson] : objection stays as we don't agree with neither r1 nor r2.  [Huawei] : response to Ericsson. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220112 | Evaluation of solution #4 | Huawei, HiSilicon | pCR | [Ericsson] : Ericsson supports and proposes an editorial change.  [Qualcomm]: propose to note this document  [Huawei]: response to qualcomm  [Apple]: request clarification on QC’s comments. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220113 | Conclusion for KI#3 | Huawei, HiSilicon | pCR | [Ericsson] : Ericsson supports.  [Apple] : Apple supports.  [Qualcomm]: do not agree with the conclusion and propose to note this document. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220134 | 5GFBS-Conclusion for solution#17 | Apple | pCR | [Ericsson] : Ericsson strongly supports the conclusion.  [Deutsche Telekom] : DT supports the conlusion to use solution #17 as the basis of normative work.  [Philips] Supports conclusions. Requests small clarification.  [Qualcomm]: disagree with the conclusion and propose to note this document  [Huawei] : supports the conclusion.  [Philips] Supports conclusions. Requests small clarification.  [Ericsson]: seems to a wrong thread.  [Ericsson] : comments.  >>CC\_4<<  >>CC\_4<<  [Apple]: request more clarification on the QC’s comments | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220135 | 5GFBS- Draft LS to RAN plenary on the conlcusion of solution#17 | Apple | pCR | [Ericsson] : Ericsson supports the draft.  [Deutsche Telekom] : DT supports this draft LS to RAN plenary.  >>CC\_3<<  [Apple] presents  [HW] support in general, the text description solution does not needed, needs to update LS, proposes to postpone to next week.  [QC] disagrees with this draft LS out.  [Nokia] comments.  [Ericsson] should send out LS.  [Apple] is ok to make text refine, and replies to QC.  [Docomo] asks question.  [Apple] clarifies.  [CableLabs] supports the conclusion and support to send out LS.  >>CC\_3<<  [Qualcomm]: disagree with the LS and propose to note this document.  >>CC\_4<<  [Apple] presents status  [QC] comments it is not urgent, its for Rel18.  [Chair] Suggest to postpone the discussion to next SA3, LS for Rel-18.  >>CC\_4<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220192 | addressing the editor's notes in sol#27 | Huawei, HiSilicon, CableLabs | pCR | [Philips] Clarifications required to be accepted.  [Qualcomm]: requests clarification and revision before approval  [Huawei]: provides clarification and r1.  [Philips] Clarifications required to be accepted.  [Philips] Provides input. Asks for small update.  [Huawei]: provides r2 addressing the comment from Philips. | approved | R2 |
|  |  | S3‑220305 | Addressing the editor | CableLabs | pCR | [Qualcomm]: requests revision before approval  [CableLabs]: provided comments to Qualcomm.  [Qualcomm]: stays our position (keep the EN)  [CableLabs]: respond to Qualcomm's question. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220306 | Addressing the editor | CableLabs | pCR | [Qualcomm]: requests clarification and revision before approval  [CableLabs]: Provided comments to Qualcomm. | approved |  |
|  |  | S3‑220307 | Addressing the editor | CableLabs | pCR | [Qualcomm]: requests clarification before approval  [CableLabs]: Provided clarification to Qualcomm | approved |  |
|  |  | S3‑220308 | Addressing the editor | CableLabs | pCR | [Philips] Clarifications required to be accepted.  [Qualcomm]: requests clarification and revision before approval  [Philips] Clarifications required to be accepted. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220309 | Addressing the editor | CableLabs | pCR | [Philips] Clarifications suggested.  [Qualcomm]: requests clarification and revision before approval  [Philips] Clarifications suggested. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220310 | Addressing the editor | CableLabs | pCR | [Deutsche Telekom] : asks further clarification  [Philips] Clarifications required to be accepted.  [Qualcomm]: requests clarification and revision before approval  [Philips] Clarifications required to be accepted.  [CableLabs]: provided -r1.  [Deutsche Telekom] : is ok with -r1  [Philips] : requests addition to remove the first EN.  [Deutsche Telekom] : comments and asks clarification  [Philips]: provides answers.  [Deutsche Telekom] : agrees to way forward  [Qualcomm]: requests revision before approval (r1 is not ok) | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220353 | New Solution: Shared key based MIB/SIBs protection with enhanced protection against replay/MitM attacks | Philips International B.V. | pCR | [Ericsson] : Ericsson does not support.  [Ericsson] : Philips provides answers. Requests Ericsson to support the contribution.  [Philips] : Philips provides answers. Requests Ericsson to support the contribution.  [Huawei] : provides comments.  [Philips] : provides answers.  [Ericsson] : provides comments.  [Philips] Provides answers.  [Qualcomm]: requests further revision  [Philips] Provides revision r2. Disagrees with full removal of conclusions and proposes way forward.  [Huawei] : suggests to note the contribution for this meeting. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220364 | Key Issue for Secure RRC connection setup procedure | Nokia Corporation | pCR |  | withdrawn |  |
|  |  | S3‑220406 | Detection of MitM attacks with secret paging | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | pCR | [Qualcomm]: disagrees with the solution.  [Ericsson] : Ericsson does not support. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220437 | Key Issue for Secure RRC connection setup procedure | Nokia Corporation | pCR | [Huawei] : propose to postpone or note.  [Qualcomm]: propose to note this document | noted |  |
| 5.2 | Study on Security Impacts of Virtualisation | S3‑220062 | New Solution: Confidentiality, and Integrity Protection for Container Images | MITRE Corporation | pCR | [Nokia]: asks for clarification.  [MITRE]: provides clarification.  [Huawei]: propose to note as we consider this out of scope for 2 reasons: 1/ not in scope of KI requirements, and 2/ not in scope of 3GPP but rather ETSI NFV SEC.  [BT plc]: Strongly disagrees with Huawei scoping comments. ISG NFV provides capabilities to support secure VNFs. However the security architecture of VNFs and their internal security requirements (eg securing of key driven by 3GPP requirements) are out of scope of ISG NFV and NFVI. Solution is therefore in scope of TR 33.848.  [NTAC] Supports BT position  [NCSC] Also supports BT position  [NOKIA]: Asks for EN.  [Huawei]: Requires further clarification before it's acceptable  [BT Plc]: Replies to Huawei. Further comments inline.  [MITRE]: provides r1 with EN in evaluation.  [ZTE]: requires some modification before approval, and provides r2.  [Nokia]: accepts and appreciates r1.  [Huawei]: Objection | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220077 | Updates to Terminology for Solution #5 | Johns Hopkins University APL, US National Security Agency | pCR |  | approved |  |
|  |  | S3‑220078 | Updates to Solution #5 | Johns Hopkins University APL, US National Security Agency, CISA ECD, InterDigital | pCR | [Nokia]: accepts updates to Solution#5 and provides comments.  [Huawei]: agree with Nokia’s comments and require additional revisions  [Ericsson]: Proposes to add EN  [Ericsson]: Proposes to add EN with ffs  [Nokia] Provides further comments.  [Bt Plc]: Disagrees with Huawei comments on NF profile linkage to VNF attestation. The fact that a VNF attests does not mean it is the correct VNF for the requested purpose.  [JHU]: Agrees with Ericsson’s EN. EN already exists in clause 6.6.4  [JHU]: Replies to Huawei. Agrees with BT Plc.  [JHU]: Replies to Nokia’s comments  [Ericsson]: EN is ok  [Nokia]: clarifies that Nokia does not object to the contribution.  [Huawei]: proposes ENs to make progress.  [JHU]: Replies to Huawei. Provides r1.  [Huawei]: requests revision before approval  [JHU]: provides revision 2.  [Huawei]: accept r2 | approved | R2 |
| 5.3 | Study on authentication enhancements in 5GS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.4 | Study on Security Aspects of Enhancement of Support for Edge Computing in 5GC | S3‑220139 | MEC - TR - Conclusion for KI#1 and KI#2. | Apple | CR | [Qualcomm] : propose to Note, as agreed to discuss the content of TR contributions will be discussed in the agenda 4.10 | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220140 | MEC - TR - Authentication between EEC and ECS based on TLS-PSK | Apple | CR | [Huawei] : propose to Note, as agreed duiring the call that content of 140/141/142 will be discussed in the agenda 4.10  [Apple] : Agree to discuss in agenda 4.10. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220141 | MEC - TR - Modification and Evaluation for solution#28 | Apple | CR | [Huawei] : propose to Note, as agreed duiring the call that content of 140/141/142 will be discussed in the agenda 4.10  [Apple] : Agree to discuss in agenda 4.10. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220142 | MEC - TR - Conclusion for key isolation issue | Apple | CR | [Huawei] : propose to Note, as agreed during the call that content of 140/141/142 will be discussed in the agenda 4.10  [Apple] : Agree to discuss in agenda 4.10. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220230 | Clean up for TR 33.839 | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR |  | agreed |  |
| 5.5 | Study on Security Aspects of Enhancement for Proximity Based Services in 5GS | S3‑220054 | LS to 3GPP on Identification of source PLMN-ID in SBA | GSMA | LS in | >>CC\_5<<  [Docomo] presents and has related draft CR, proposes to postpone and to wait for the draft CR complete  >>CC\_5<<  [Ericsson]: proposes to postpone the LS | postponed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220081 | Conclusion for NSSAA support with L3 U2N | InterDigital Finland Oy | CR | [Interdigital] : seconds LG (Dongjoo’s) points and stress that support for NSSAA was reported to SA#93e as one of the contentious issues and not concluded.  >>CC\_3<<  [IDCC] presents.  [LGE] supports and asks Ericsson to check  [Ericsson] still objects.  [LGE] comments  [QC] doesn’t think NSSAA relevant with L3 U2N  [IDCC] challenges there is no technical issue  [QC] comments  >>CC\_3<<  >>CC\_4<<  Rapporteur requests show of hands to make progress.  [Chair] asks who is opposing? May be a formal show of hands can be avoided.  [Ericsson] opposes this.  [QC] opposes this.  [IDCC] comments  [QC] it is ok without N3IWF  [QC] comments it is no need to have new feature.  [Chair] asks way forward, only 2 companies objecting.  [HW] new solution is not needed with N3IWF, so no need to consider this case.  [Ericsson] asks to have its objection noted in the meeting minutes and report.  >>CC\_4<<  [Qualcomm]: require revision before approval.  [Interdigital]: reiterates that support for NSSAA by L3 Relay is incomplete if not supported without N3IWF  [Philips]: supports Interdigital and friends' view that remote UE gaining unauthorized access to a slice is an issue to solve, also for the non-N3IWF deployment. | Not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220159 | Discussion on Secondary Authentication and NSSAA for Remote UE over L3 U2N relay without using N3IWF | LG Electronics Inc., InterDigital, Xiaomi, Verizon Wireless, Samsung | discussion | [Qualcomm]: propose to note this document | Noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220160 | Conclusion for Secondary Authentication support with L3 U2N Relay | LG Electronics Inc., InterDigital | CR | [Ericsson] : Ericsson propose to note the contribution.  [LGE] : asks a clarification question to Ericsson  [Interdigital] : seconds LG (Dongjoo’s) points and stress that support for secondary authentication was reported to SA#93e as one of the contentious issues and not concluded.  >>CC\_3<<  [LGE] presents  [IDCC] it is not same as 0081.  [QC] still has concern.  [LGE] replies and asks show of hands.  >>CC\_3<<  >>CC\_4<<  Show of hands  [Chair] asks possible way forward before show hands  [Ericsson] does not support.  [Chair] asks whether a compromise possible since secondary authentication for UE is not totally new.  [QC] didn’t oppose the feature, but has comment.  [Chair] asks whether it is ok to be optional for QC.  [QC] is ok with optional  [Ericsson] is still not ok if it is optional.  [CATT] has concern on TS completion in next week.  [Ericsson] insists to have consensus before contribution approval.  [Chair] **it is noted that only Ericsson oppose this and suggest to solve the concern in plenary. The content could be seen as agreed and could be incorporate into draft TR.**  [QC] it seems TS contribution is not same as this contribution.  [Chair] Please discuss the TS contribution next week.  [VF] comments that VF SoR feature in many meetings, but work progressed irrespective of the objection.  [QC] wants to know how many companies supports this.  [Chair]; Requests show of hands supporting the contribution.  Supporting companies: Lenovo, IDCC, Xiaomi, Apple, Philips, Samsung, LGE, Nokia.  [Ericsson] asks to have its objection noted in the report..  >>CC\_4<<  [Qualcomm]: require revision before acceptable. Otherwise, we object to the conclusion.  [LGE]: provides r1 reflecting Qualcomm’s comment.  [Qualcomm]: provide r2  [LGE]: is fine with r2.  [Interdigital] : OK with r2 | agreed | R2 |
|  |  | S3‑220329 | Additional conclusion of KI #17 | Qualcomm Incorporated, CATT, InterDigital, Ericsson | CR | [LGE] : revision and clarification required  [Xiaomi]: has similar concerns as LG’s and proposes changes  [Qualcomm]: provides answers and comments  [Xiaomi]: provides clarification and asks further questions for clarification  [LGE]: responds to Qualcomm and provides further comments over Xiaomi comments  >>CC\_3<<  [QC] introduces status.  [LGE] is fine to add a NOTE  [Xiaomi] is fine to make NOTE but has another comment for user plane  >>CC\_3<<  [Qualcomm]: provide r2  [LGE]: fine with r2  [Xiaomi]: provides r3  >>CC\_4<<  [CATT] presents the key argument (last bullet)  [QC] comments the last bullet is not needed as other bullet covered this.  [Xiaomi] clarifies why this is needed.  [HW] comments last bullet should contain more details if it needs to be kept.  [Chair] asks whether last bullet could be merged into 2nd bullet.  [HW] is fine with Chair’s proposal.  >>CC\_4<<  [Qualcomm]: disagree with r3 and propose to agree on r2  [CATT]: Fine with r2 | agreed | R2 |
|  |  | S3‑220330 | Update of conclusion for KI#5 | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR | [Philips] proposes to use S3-220440 as a basis for discussion  [Huawei]: Clarify is needed before approval. Integrity protection shall be added into the conclusion.  >>CC\_3<<  [QC] presents.  [HW] wants to add integrity protection to privacy requirement  [Chair] asks concrete proposal  [HW] proposes revised wording.  [QC] does not agree with HW’s proposal, privacy is separate from integrity protection.  [HW]: it is not enough to protect privacy by only confidentiality protection, integrity protection still needed.  [QC]: although SUCI can be tampered, does not impact privacy.  >>CC\_3<<  [Huawei]: this contribution can be approved.  [Philips]: proposes some changes in r1  [Qualcomm]: does not agree with r1.  [Philips] provides comments  [Qualcomm]: provides further clarification. | agreed |  |
|  |  | S3‑220331 | Conclusion for KI#16 | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR | [Xiaomi]: revision is needed before approval  >>CC\_3<<  [QC] presents  [Philips] comments  [Chair] asks concrete proposal  [Philips] provides proposal  [Xiaomi]: already commented in email, want to revise. Currently it is only apply when N3IWF is used.  >>CC\_3<<  [Philips]: revision is needed before approval  [Qualcomm]: provides clarification.  [Xiaomi]: provides more comments and r1  [Philips] provides r2  [Qualcomm]: is ok with r1, but not r2.  [Xiaomi]: fine with both r1 and r2  [Ericsson]: we are ok with r1, but not r2.  [Philips] can only agree r2.  [Qualcomm]: stays our position (only r1 is ok), and provides further clarification. | Not purused |  |
|  |  | S3‑220355 | Updates Key Issue #1 | Philips International B.V. | CR | [Qualcomm]: disagrees with the conclusion.  >>CC\_4<<  [Philips] presents  >>CC\_4<< | Not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220356 | Updates Solution #43 | Philips International B.V. | CR | [Qualcomm]: requests revision before approval  [Philips]: provides answer and proposes way forward: keep both NOTE and text to not lose work (last meeting). Philips is ok to remove any incorrect text if Qualcomm indicates which text is not correct.  [Qualcomm]: requests further revision.  [Philips]: provides revision r2.  [Qualcomm]: requests further revision.  [Philips] provides input.  [Qualcomm]: is fine with R3. | agreed | R3 |
|  |  | S3‑220358 | Resolve EN in solution #44 | Ericsson | CR | [Interdigital] : revision required. The NOTE converted from EN does not address the PRUK desynch issue.  [Ericsson] : disagrees with the proposed updates  [Interdigital]: OK to note this contribution. Concerned about ENs converted to NOTEs without discussion following Edithelp review of the TR 33.847.  [Interdigital]: OK to note this contribution. Concerned about ENs converted to NOTEs without discussion following Edithelp review of the TR 33.847.  [Philips] Agrees it strange that EditHelp changed the Editor's notes into notes or sometimes even removed them without discussion. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220359 | Conclusion for user plane solutions for KI#3, KI#4, KI#9 | Ericsson | CR | [Interdigital] : revision required. Propose to add a NOTE to address the PRUK desynch issue during normative work.  >>CC\_3<<  [Ericsson] presents  [IDCC] comments provided via email. Proposes to add a NOTE  [QC] does not think the NOTE is relevant with this TR  [IDCC] clarifies.  [QC] doesn’t think there is issue. Don’t know why need a NOTE  >>CC\_3<<  [Ericsson] : disagrees with the proposed updates  [Interdigital] : insists on the NOTE.  [Thales] : asks question to InterDigital regarding editor’s note  [Interdigital] : replies to (Mireille) Thales question about missing EN in sol#44.  [Qualcomm]: provide a comment  [Thales] : do not understand the need for the proposed NOTE.  [Ericsson] : reply to Interdigital.  [Interdigital] : replies to (Monica) Ericsson.  [Ericssonl] : disagrees with the proposed note  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_1<<  [CATT] proposes status.  [IDCC] clarifies that is no additional text, but pending issue.  [Ericsson] clarifies motivation.  [CATT] proposes way forward.  [Chair] does not prefer this way forward.  [IDCC] objects without NOTE  [Ericsson] clarifies that is already defined in TS but not concluded in TR.  [CATT] proposes another way forward  [Ericsson] asks confirmation to IDCC that not to block GBA push in TS as clarified.  [IDCC] confirms no intention to block.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_1<< | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220379 | TR 33.847 | MITRE Corporation | CR | [Xiaomi]: revision is required before approval  [Qualcomm]: require revision before approval  [MITRE]: Provides clarification and r1  [Xiaomi]: responds to the comments and provides r2  [Philips] Asks a question and provides input.  >>CC\_4<<  [MITRE] presents  [Ericsson] comments on relay discovery  [CATT] asks how to proceed if related contribution could not be approved in next week  [MITRE] clarifies  [Chair] suggests to keep it open and extends to next week.  [CATT] clarifies TR must be closed this week, is there any related doc if the conclusion is approved.  [Philips] clarifies there is corresponding contribution for discussion in next week.  [MSI] comments on concern for public safety.  [MITRE] clarifies  [MSI] doesn’t consider public safety is in scope of this study, proposes to define public safety security in mission critical topic.  >>CC\_4<<  [Qualcomm]: require revision before approval  [MITRE]: Provides r4  [Xiaomi]: provides r5  [Philips]: We agree with r4.  [Qualcomm]: propose to remove the entire 2nd change section from this contribution before approval  [Ericsson]: we also propose to remove the entire 2nd change section from this contribution before approval i.e. the change to clause 7.3 should be removed from the contribution  [Ericsson]: asks further questions before we can accept this contribution  [MITRE]: Provides r6 and clarification  [Ericsson]: Provides comments to r6  [MITRE]: Provides r7  [Ericsson]: fine with r7  [Xiaomi]: not fine with r7 and provides r8  [MITRE]: not fine with r8. | not pursued |  |
|  |  | S3‑220439 | TR 33.847 - Discussion on KI#5 conclusions | Philips International B.V. | discussion |  | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220440 | TR 33.847 - Update to conclusions of KI#5 | Philips International B.V. | CR | [Philips] proposes to use S3-220440 as a basis for discussion on KI#5, and provides revision r1 to reflect the wording of S3-220330.  [Qualcomm]: only agrees with the first paragraph of the proposed conclusion. We don’t agree with the second paragraph and NOTE 1.  [Philips]: responds to Qualcomm's comments  [Ericsson]: we support QC’s comments and we can only agree with the first paragraph of the proposed conclusion. We don’t agree with the second paragraph and NOTE 1.  [Ericsson]: provides a correction to our previous comments. When referring to solution #42 we actually mean #32.  [Philips]: responds to Ericsson  [LGE]: supports the conclusion in r2 proposed by Philips  >>CC\_4<<  [Philips] presents  [IDCC] supports r2  [QC] agrees 1st paragraph but does not agree 2nd paragraph  [LGE] doesn’t support QC’s comments and provides way forwards.  [QC] doesn’t agree the way forward.  [LGE] clarifies  [Philips] agrees with LGE  >>CC\_4<<  [Interdigital]: supports r2 from Philips  [Qualcomm]: stays our position.  [Philips]: requests clarification  [Qualcomm]: provides clarification.  [Philips]: responds to comments  [Qualcomm]: provides further clarification.  [LGE]: provides comments. | not pursued |  |
| 5.6 | Study on Security Aspects of Enhancements for 5G Multicast-Broadcast Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.7 | Study on security aspects of the 5GMSG Service | S3‑220264 | Editorial changes to TR 33.862 | China Mobile | CR |  | agreed |  |
| 5.8 | Study on security aspects of enablers for Network Automation (eNA) for the 5G system (5GS) Phase 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.9 | Study on the security of AMF re-allocation | S3‑220412 | LS on full Registration Request upon AMF re-allocation | Ericsson | LS out | [Huawei] : supports the contribution and provides r1.  [Lenovo] : Have comments on initial contribution, but can accept r1.  [Qualcomm]: Have comments on r1.  [Ericsson]: Provides r2.  >>CC\_3<<  [Ericsson] presents r2, request to treat 4.19 doc 413 together.  [QC] comments the statement is too complex, just state simple.  [Ericsson] clarifies  [Lenovo] comments to keep the sentence as a note.  [HW] prefers to remove last part.  [CMCC] proposes to remove last part.  >>CC\_3<<  [Ericsson]: Provides r3.  [Huawei] : fine with r1.  [Lenovo]: fine with r3.  [Ericsson]: Provides r5.  [Qualcomm] : OK with r5  >>CC\_4<<  [Ericsson] presents status  **[Chair] puts into next challenge deadline.**  >>CC\_4<<  [Lenovo] : r5 is okay.  [Ericsson]: Provides r6. Text is added to indicate that there is an agreed attached CR in the LS.  [Qualcomm]: OK with r6  [Lenovo]: r6 is okay. | approved | R6 |
| 5.10 | Study on Security for NR Integrated Access and Backhaul | S3‑220296 | Coversheet for TS 33.824 | Samsung | TS or TR cover |  | approved |  |
| 5.11 | Study on enhanced Security Aspects of the 5G Service Based Architecture | S3‑220287 | Evaluation and Conclusion for Key Issue#9 | Samsung | pCR | [Huawei] :Require revision.  [Ericsson] : requires revisions  [Samsung] : Provides r1 and clarification.  [Ericsson] : disagrees with r1, provides r2  [Nokia] : fine with r2  [Ericsson] : disagrees with r1, provides r2  [Samsung] : provides r4  [Ericsson] : r4 is fine  [Nokia] : r4 is fine | approved | R4 |
|  |  | S3‑220389 | New KI on N32 security in Roaming Hub scenarios | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | pCR | [Ericsson] : generally agrees with adding the Key Issue, but revision of the text is needed  [Nokia] : -r1 was uploaded on Wednesday, in line with Ericsson comments  [Ericsson] : provides r2  [Ericsson] : fine with r2 | approved | R2 |
|  |  | S3‑220390 | Resolution EN authorization method negotiation per KI7-Sol9 | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | pCR | [Huawei] : The changes are not necessary. Propose to note.  [Nokia] : provides clarification  [Huawei] : provides clarification  [Nokia] : Huawei states ”there is not mandatory requirement of Oauth in the PLMN from security point of view. Oauth is an optional feature.”  Nokia responds with a citation from 33.501, clause 13.4.1.0  ”The authorization framework described in clause 13.4.1 allows NF Service Producers to authorize the requests from NF Service requestors. … The authorization framework described in clause 13.4.1 is mandatory to support for NRF and NF.” | Noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220391 | New sol. for KI7 on authorization mechanism negotiation | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | pCR | [Huawei] :Require clarification.  [Nokia] : provides proposal.  [Huawei] : provides response to NOKIA.  [Nokia] : asks for clarification.  [Ericsson] : replies to Huawei  [Ericsson] : replies to Huawei  [Huawei] : propose to not. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220409 | Resolution EN on NF Set per KI6-Sol7 | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | pCR |  | approved |  |
|  |  | S3‑220438 | New KI for Authentication of PLMNs over IPX | CableLabs | pCR | [Ericsson] : should be noted if not clarified  [CableLabs] : provided clarification.  [Ericsson] : replies to CableLabs  [CableLabs] : replies to Ericsson.  [Ericsson] : Proposes to continue discussion next meeting. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3-220512 | Draft TR 33.875 | Nokia | Draft TR | [Nokia] : TR 33.875 implements the approved tdocs. Please review draft\_S3-220512.zip | approved |  |
| 5.12 | Study on enhanced security for network slicing Phase 2 | S3‑220115 | conclusion for KI#1 | Huawei, HiSilicon | pCR | [Ericsson]: Requests clarifications. The conclusion is ok but It is not clear how the proposed requirement can be fulfilled or verified from an implementation point of view.  [Qualcomm]: Needs modification and proposed conclusion in unclear  [Xiaomi]: requests for clarification.  [Huawei]: provide clarification for comments made.  [Ericsson]: Asks for clarifications.  [Huawei]: Response to Ericsson.  [Ericsson]: Proposes a way forward.  [Huawei]: Provide r1.  [Xiaomi]: is ok with r1.  [Ericsson]: is fine with r1.  [Qualcomm]: is OK with r1 | approved | R1 |
|  |  | S3‑220116 | updates to KI#2 | Huawei, HiSilicon | pCR | [Ericsson]: Requests for clarifications about how to handle changes to KI#2. Provides comments for this contribution.  [Huawei]: Response to Ericsson’s comments.  [Xiaomi]: provides 116 r2  [Huawei]: prefer 116r1 and response to Xiaomi’s comments.  [Xiaomi]: provides r3.  [Huawei]: provide r4.  [Qualcomm]: asks a question for understanding  [Ericsson]: Proposes to remove security threats.  [Xiaomi]: provides r5 for the sake of progress.  [Huawei]: Response to Qualcomm.  [Huawei]: Response to Ericsson.  [Huawei]: disagree with r5.  [Xiaomi]: provides r6 for progress.  [Ericsson]: is fine with r6.  [Huawei]: prefer r4, no objection to r6.  [Qualcomm]: r6 is OK | approved | R6 |
|  |  | S3‑220199 | eNS2: Key Issue #2 update | Xiaomi Communications | pCR |  | withdrawn |  |
|  |  | S3‑220200 | eNS2: Key Issue #2 update | Xiaomi Communications | pCR | [Huawei] : request revisions as suggested in the email.  [Xiaomi] : provides r1  [Ericsson]: Requests for clarifications about handling the changes to KI#2 and using the correct baseline for revisions.  [Ericsson]: Provides comments for this contribution.  [Xiaomi] : provides r2  [Nokia] : comments on r2. Please see comments below.  [Huawei] : provide comments to r2.  [Nokia] : merge suggestion. If we use 116 as baseline, please consider the comments made on 220200.  [Huawei] : merged 200 into 116 and provided 116r1.  [Huawei] : The thread is closed and further discussions are in the thread for 116. | merged | 116 |
|  |  | S3‑220226 | eNS2\_Solution #1Update | Xiaomi Communications | pCR | [Huawei] : request clarification.  [Xiaomi] : provides clarification.  [Huawei] : response to Xiaomi.  [Xiaomi] : provides r1.  [Huawei] : fine with r1. | approved | R1 |
|  |  | S3-220487 | draft TR33874 for eNS2 | Huawei | Draft TR | Draft TR is available for email approval |  |  |
| 5.13 | Study on non-seamless WLAN Offload in 5GS using 3GPP credentials | S3‑220021 | Reply LS on proposed NSWO architecture | S2-2107859 | LS in |  | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220042 | Addressing several issue from MCC and EditHelp for TR 33.811 | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR |  | agreed |  |
| 5.14 | Study on privacy of identifiers over radio access | S3‑220044 | TR 33.870 - Skeleton | InterDigital, Inc. | draft TR | [Huawei]: comments that the solution template includes a title that maybe should be removed.  >>CC\_3<<  [IDCC] presents. Comments from HW can be fixed after approval as editor.  [HW] prefers to revise it asap.  [IDCC] is ok to revise r1 to incorporate comments.  >>CC\_3<<  [Interdigital]: R1 that addresses editorial comments raised by HW is in the Drafts folder.  [Huawei]: fine with r1 | approved | R1 |
|  |  | S3‑220055 | TR 33.870 - Scope | InterDigital, Inc. | pCR | [Xiaomi]: asks questions for clarification  >>CC\_3<<  [IDCC] presents.  [Xiaomi] asks question on countermeasure in 3rd sentences.  [IDCC] clarifies.  [Verizon] comments.  >>CC\_3<<  [Interdigital]: Provides S3 220055-r1. R1 has changes agreed on Wednesday’s call.  [Xiaomi]: provides r2  [Interdigital]: Agrees with r2. | approved | R2 |
|  |  | S3‑220057 | TR 33.870 | InterDigital, Inc. | pCR | [NCSC]: suggests this is merged into S3-220073  [Ericsson] : Proposes to merge with S3-220073 and take S3-220073 as the baseline. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220058 | TR 33.870 - References | InterDigital, Inc. | pCR | [Huawei]: comments that references are introduced upon first occurrence alongside the changes where they are needed.  [Ericsson] : Request for clarification.  [Interdigital] : Provides clarification to Ericsson re. references.  MCC has a macro that is used to detect unused references. IMO, it is better to list more at this stage than to miss one.  [Qualcomm]: propose to note.  >>CC\_3<<  [IDCC] presents  [HW] comments  [MCC] clarifies  [QC] comments.  >>CC\_3<< | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220060 | TR 33.870 - Abbreviations | InterDigital, Inc. | pCR | [Huawei]: comments that abbreviations are introduced upon first occurrence alongside the changes where they are needed.  [Ericsson] : Request for clarification.  [Interdigital] : Provides clarification to Ericsson re. references.  MCC has a macro that is used to detect unused abbreviations. IMO, it is better to list more at this stage than to miss one. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220068 | TR 33.870 | InterDigital, Inc. | pCR | [Huawei]: requires a revision and especially the removal of the content in the last column since this is bypassing the work and the discussion we need to do when developing the key issues.  [Ericsson] : Request for changes.  [Interdigital] : Intending to provide changes.  This makes sense. I am removing the“Possible privacy attack description” column in R1 that is coming up shortly.  [Interdigital]: Provides R1 with suggested changes.  “Possible privacy attack description” column in R1 is removed.  [Qualcomm]: do not agree with r1 and proposes that the contribution should be noted  [Interdigital]: provides arguments for reassessment and asks to reconsider.  [NCSC]: also provides arguments for inclusion  [Ericsson]: Support’s NCSC’s argument for the inclusion of the Annex.  >>CC\_3<<  [IDCC] presents r1  [HW] comments SUPI is not exposed over the air, proposes to remove SUPI  [Verizon] comments to change SUPI/SUCI to non-encrypted/encrypted IMSI.  [QC] questions why need this detailed list of ids now.  [Docomo] comments it is useful to have the list of ids.  [NCSC] comments that the list is useful  [Verizon] comments that a guidance on the validity of identifiers would be useful  [Docomo] comments  >>CC\_3<<  [Interdigital]: Provides R2 based on comments received during W1-Wednesday SA3 call..  [CableLabs]: supports R2.  [NCSC]: also supports r2.  [ZTE]: ask for clarification before approved.  [Interdigital]: Provides clarification and offers a way forward.  [ZTE]: Reply to Interdigital.  [Interdigital]: Provides R3 per email agreement for the way forward.  [ZTE]: OK with R3  [Huawei]: requires some changes for consistency.  [Xiaomi]: requires for revision.  [Interdigital]: Asks for an appropriate pCR for adding ENSI in the Annex.  Any other opinions before I change the title?  [Xiaomi]: is ok for the suggestion of preparing parameter-related pCR for the next meeting.  [Interdigital]: asks for the proposed text to avoid back-and-forth exchanges  [Qualcomm]: proposes way of making r3 agreeable to Qualcomm  [Interdigital]: Uploads R5 with MCC/MNC row removed per HW and QC proposal.  [Interdigital]: Makes changes according to the proposed way forward except for adding back “Informative” in the Annex title.  Note that during the Wednesday call, it was agreed to strike “informative” from the annex title since this is a TR and everything in it is informative.  Changes are reflected in R5 in the Inbox.  [Qualcomm]: R5 OK | approved | R5 |
|  |  | S3‑220073 | New key issue on SUPI length disclosed by SUCI | Ericsson LM | pCR | [NCSC]: suggests this contribution is used as the baseline for this Key Issue  [Thales] : propose to update the requirement.  [Xiaomi]: further revision is needed  [NCSC]: further revision is needed.  [Ericsson]: Provides r2.  [Huawei]: requires changes in particular to the requirement which is too solution specific.  >>CC\_3<<  [IDCC] presents  [CableLabs] comments  [Ericsson]: potential security requirement is problem specific not solution based.  [HW] doesn’t agree with this requirement and comment on threats and detailed description.  [Apple] requirements needs to be revised.  [QC] doesn’t like this key issue at all.  >>CC\_3<<  [Qualcomm]: object to the KI  [Verizon] does not agree with QC (notes captured by VC)  [CableLabs]: support the KI.  [Interdigital]: Points out the need to study the Key Issue and invites QC to study their proposed solution in the framework of the Privacy Study rather than over the SA3 mailing list while bypassing the Study process.  • As Tao pointed out, we seem to all agree that there is a privacy threat. Studying such issues is exactly why this Study was created.  • Anand seems to propose one potential solution (i.e., “…MNO can simply choose/assign usernames of fixed length (e.g., 64 chars) for their subscribers.“) for this issue. I would like to invite Anand/QC to bring it in as one of the solutions for this KI to be evaluated on its merit.  • Let’s follow a regular SA3 Study process and avoid premature evaluation on the SA3 exploder while the KI is being discussed.  [OPPO]: support the KI but requests that the potential security requirement be reworded to be non-solution specific.  [Qualcomm]: requests clarification from Verizon  [Verizon] replies to QC (notes captured by VC)  [QC] is not convinced with KI. (notes captured by VC)  [Verizon] replies to QC (notes captured by VC)  [QC] replies (notes captured by VC)  [Ericsson] : Accepts Thales’ formulation of the potential security requirement. Provides rebuttal to QC's objection and explains why the KI is practical, not only academic. Proposes the KI to be accepted.  [Verizon]: support the KI. We need the KI to better understand the problem, determine risk/impact and find a solution(s).  [Ericsson] : Provides r3 with modified potential security requirement as proposed by Thales.  [Xiaomi]: fine with r3 | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220108 | New KI privacy protection of SUCI | China Southern Power Grid Co., Ltd, ZTE Corporation | other | [NCSC]: suggests this is merged into S3-220073  [Ericsson] : Proposes to merge with S3-220073 and take S3-220073 as the baseline.  [Interdigital] : Provides R1 with merged 108, 73, and 57.  The general information is paired down.  The threats are written in a more concise format.  The requirement from #73 is slightly modified while preserving its targeted approach.  Note that the References part of the PCR is not touched by the merger in R1. I plan to merge References from #73 into #58. | noted |  |
|  |  | S3-220517 | Draft TR 33.870 | Interdigital | Draft TR | [Interdigital] : TR 33.870 implements the approved tdocs. Please review draft\_S3-220517 |  |  |
| 5.15 | Study on Standardising Automated Certificate Management in SBA | S3‑220237 | New Key issue on automated certificate management for SBA NF | Huawei, Hisilicon | pCR | [Ericsson]: clarification/update is necessary before approval  [Huawei] : provides r1.  [Nokia]: proposes to postpone the key issue to next meeting adding more precise content | noted |  |
|  |  | S3‑220339 | Scope for Automated Certificate Management in SBA TR | Nokia Germany | pCR | [Ericsson]: update is necessary before approval  [Nokia]: provides r1, proposal accepted.  [Ericsson]: r1 is ok | approved | R1 |
|  |  | S3‑220354 | Introduction for Automated Certificate Management in SBA TR | Nokia Germany | pCR | [Ericsson]: update/clarification is necessary before approval  [Nokia]: provides r1  [Ericsson]: r1 is ok | approved | R1 |
|  |  | S3‑220381 | Skeleton for Automated Certificate Management in SBA TR | Nokia Germany | pCR |  | approved |  |
|  |  | S3-220504 | Draft TR 33.876 v0.1.0 | Nokia | Draft TR | Nokia provide r1 in draft folder for email approval  Since no comments were received, the draft TR is approved. | approved | R1 |
| 6 | CVD and research |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Any Other Business |  |  |  |  | >>CC\_wrap\_up\_1<<  Discussion on SA3#107Bis meeting in Bath, GB.  SA3 May meeting is missing in calendar.  [Nokia] ready to follow the 3GPP meeting guidelines.  [CableLabs] asks whether the meeting is hybrid or just pure F2F/e-meeting.  [Chair] not hybrid  [HW] comments on 106-e-bis necessity. Do we really need 106-e-bis as R18 has not too much work at this time.  [Chair] clarifies, meeting names we can decide, but location has been paid, SA3 need to make use of it.  [CMCC] proposes to have e-meeting before Sept.  [QC] prefers F2F in Bath.  [Docomo] shares same view with HW how many meeting we need, and really willing to attend F2F meeting in Bath.  [Thales] prefers F2F in Bath.  [Mavenir] comments to CMCC’s argument.  [LGE] prefers online meeting, not be able to attend F2F meeting  [US NSA] prefers F2F meeting.  [CableLabs] asks whether socail distance can be kept.  [MSI] supports F2F meeting.  [Interdigital] raises concern about travelling.  [JHU] supports F2F meeting.  [HW] shows difficulty to attend F2F meeting.  [Apple] asks whether 107/107e is e-meeting.  [Chair] clarifies it starts after June plenary meeting.  [VF] introduces logistics background about Bath meeting.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_1<< |  |  |
|  |  | S3-220525 | Calendar |  |  | >>CC\_wrap\_up\_2<<  [HW] comments 106 ad hoc is not good date  [Thales] propose to remove one meeting.  [Docomo] also proposes to remove one meeting  [HW] suggest to remove 106ad hoc and keep 107e  [MSI] calendar shows one week, proposes to extend one meeting for two weeks or keeps two meetings for each one week.  [IDCC] remove May meeting.  [Apple] proposes to merge 106 adhoc and 107e at week 16+17.  [Ericsson] prefers to keep 2 meetings in both April and May instead of extending May meeting.  [Chair] may not need to have 2 week meeting.  [AT&T] comments not to move the dates.  ------show of hands-------  Prefer meeting in April: IDCC, Docomo, MSI, DT, Thales, Philips, Verizon  Prefer Meeting in May: Apple, LGE, Huawei, Lenovo, CableLabs, China Telecom, Xiaomi, QC, Ericsson, Vivo  -----show of hands------  [CATT] asks about the date from CT  [Chair] has no idea about the date  [CMCC] proposes to have meeting on week 17  [Chair] that is not good as dates are determined earlier.  [Chair] based on show hands, there will be no April meeting. Whether May meeting needs to extend should depend on the work load.  [Ericsson] May meeting has impact to Turkey holiday, propose to move one week earlier  [Chair] it is not possible to move the calendar  [Thales] prefers not to change date.  >>CC\_wrap\_up\_2<< |  |  |