|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
| 2 | Meeting Reports | S3‑220002 | Report from SA3#105e | MCC | report | >>CC\_1<<[Chair] presents>>CC\_1<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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 contributions431 are corresponding draft LS out>>CC\_5<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220011 | LS on Disaster Roaming Enabled Indication | C1-217427 | LS in | [LGE] : This LS should be noted | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220014 | Reply LS on RAN2 agreements for MUSIM | R2-2111329 | LS in | >>CC\_5<<[VC] presents[Chair] noted**1st challenge deadline**>>CC\_5<< | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220015 | LS on RAN2 agreements for paging with service indication | R2-2111330 | LS in | >>CC\_5<<[Chair] noted**1st challenge deadline**>>CC\_5<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220028 | LS Reply on QoE report handling at QoE pause | S5- 216417 | LS in | >>CC\_5<<[Chair] noted**1st challenge dealine**>>CC\_5<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220038 | LS on opens issues for NB-IoT and eMTC support for NTN | R3-221406 | LS in | >>CC\_5<<[VC] presents269 is corresponding draft LS reply[Chair] : continue discussion>>CC\_5<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220040 | TCG progress - report from TCG rapporteur | InterDigital, Inc. | other | >>CC\_5<<[IDCC] presents**1st challenge deadline**>>CC\_5<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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] presents143/190/272/428/271 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220049 | LS on security concerns for UE providing Location Information for NB-IoT | R2-2201958 | LS in | >>CC\_5<<[Ericsson] presents273, 144 and 425 are corresponding reply contributions[Xiaomi] will hold the pen>>CC\_5<< | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220050 | LS on RAN3 impacts for non-SDT handling | R2-2201977 | LS in |  | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220085 | Reply LS on Security for Small Data Transmission | ZTE Corporation | LS out | [Intel]: Discussion will be in S3-220152 Closing thread. | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220144 | NTN - Reply LS on NTN specific user consent (R2-2201958) | Apple | LS out | >>CC\_5<<[Apple] has similar view >>CC\_5<< | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220151 | Discussion on Security Issues with SDT | Intel | discussion | >>CC\_1<<[Intel] presents. Fine with way forward in offline call.>>CC\_1<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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 | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220165 | Reply LS on Multicast paging with TMGI | Huawei, HiSilicon | LS out | >>CC\_5<<[HW] presents>>CC\_5<< | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220189 | Reply LS | Huawei, HiSilicon | LS out |  | withdrawn |  |
|  |  | S3‑220190 | Reply LS on user consent for NTN | Huawei, HiSilicon | LS out |  | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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 | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220271 | Reply LS on NTN specific User Consent | Xiaomi Technology | LS out |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220272 | Proposal for NTN Specific User Consent | Xiaomi Technology | discussion |  | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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] confirmsIt will be sent out after the call.>>CC\_5<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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 | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220377 | Discussion on LS on Security for Small Data Transmission | Nokia Corporation | discussion | >>CC\_1<<[Nokia] presents>>CC\_1<< | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220380 | Reply LS on Security for Small Data Transmission | Nokia Corporation | LS out |  | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220416 | CR to 33.501 to protect CPSOR-CMCI information only (alternative to S3-220415) | NTT DOCOMO INC. | CR |  | available |  |
|  |  | 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 | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220424 | Discussion on RAN 3 | VODAFONE | discussion | >>CC\_1<<[VF] presents>>CC\_1<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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 | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220431 | draft-Reply LS on new parameters for SOR | NTT DOCOMO INC. | LS out | >>CC\_5<<[Docomo] presents>>CC\_5<< | available |  |
| 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. | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220150 | Revise generic network product to support management function | Nokia Germany | CR | [Huawei]: proposes to integrate this into the living document | available |  |
|  |  | 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 | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220172 | MnF SCAS Skeleton | Huawei, HiSilicon | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220173 | MnF SCAS Scope | Huawei, HiSilicon | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220186 | Living document for MnF SCAS: draftCR to TR 33.926 | Huawei, HiSilicon | draftCR |  | available |  |
| 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 |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220122 | proposal to add skeleton of TR33.936 Security Assurance Methodology (SECAM) for 3GPP virtualized network products | China Mobile | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | 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 |  | available |  |
|  |  | 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 |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220125 | proposal to add scope of TS33.527 Security Assurance Specification (SCAS) for 3GPP virtualized network products | China Mobile | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220126 | proposal to add skeleton of TS33.527 Security Assurance Specification (SCAS) for 3GPP virtualized network products | China Mobile | pCR |  | available |  |
| 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 |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220088 | Add function description about AAnF in 4.2.1 | ZTE Corporation | CR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220089 | Clarification on the NF consumer in 6.6.1 | ZTE Corporation | CR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220090 | Clarification on UDM manage AKMA subscription data in 4.2.5 | ZTE Corporation | CR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220285 | Clarification on AKMA Application key retrieval | Samsung, ZTE | CR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220286 | New AAnF application key get service without SUPI | Samsung, Verizon | CR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220301 | Clarification on indication to UE when KAF is expired | LG Electronics France | CR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220304 | Clean up for TS 33.535 | LG Electronics France | CR |  | available |  |
| 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 |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220318 | Adding a Note about the new Ua security protocol identifier for TLS 1.3 | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220319 | Adding a new Ua security protocol identifier for TLS 1.3 | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220407 | Adding Reference to RFC 7235 in TS 33.203 | Ericsson | CR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220408 | LS on eCryptPr | Ericsson | LS out |  | available |  |
| 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 replyQC will hold the pen>>CC\_5<< | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220091 | Resolve the EN in 5MBS | ZTE Corporation | CR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220092 | Clean up for 5MBS | ZTE Corporation | CR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220162 | Resolution of authorization issue | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220163 | update to User-plane procedure for MBS security | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220164 | Corrections and clarifications in the security mechanisms for MBS | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220184 | Secondary authentication for MBS sessions | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220225 | Clarification on AS security aspect in 5MBS | LG Electronics Inc. | CR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220292 | PDCP COUNT check for MRB | Samsung | CR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220293 | MBS capability exchange and delivery method | Samsung | CR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220294 | Security indication in MBS security context | Samsung | CR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220332 | pCR to the draft CR: EN resolution | Qualcomm Incorporated | other |  | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
| 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 | available |  |
|  |  | 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) | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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 | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220035 | Reply LS on IMEI for Non-Public Networks/Private Networks without using USIM | GSMA | LS in | [Ericsson] : proposes to note the LS | available |  |
|  |  | 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) | available |  |
|  |  | 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 | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | 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 | available |  |
|  |  | 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 | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220219 | Removing Editor | Ericsson | CR | [Lenovo] : Objects to the contribution.[Ericsson]: Provides revision (r1) and clarifications | available |  |
|  |  | 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 | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | 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 | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220240 | SN name verification in eNPN | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR | [Qualcomm]: proposes to not pursue[Huawei]: responds to Qualcomm[Ericsson] : proposes to not pursue | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220255 | Removing Editor | Ericsson | CR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220256 | Removing Editor | Ericsson | CR | [Ericsson] : can be merged in S3-220335[Ericsson] : can be not pursued instead of merged into S3-220335 | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | 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 | available |  |
|  |  | 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 | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | 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 |  |  |
| 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.>>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<< | 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\_rx |
|  |  | 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\_rx |
|  |  | 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\_rx |
|  |  | 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 updateAs 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 updateAll 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\_rx |
|  |  | 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\_rx |
|  |  | 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 1Deleting “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.Change2Deleting “The UE shall support AKMA and GBA features”Change3Adding “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 | Extended to week 2 |  |
|  |  | 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 | Extended to week 2 |  |
| 4.11 | TLS protocols profiles for AKMA (Rel-17) | S3‑220095 | Add description about error case in annex B | ZTE Corporation | CR |  | available |  |
| 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 |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220076 | Update to UUAA-MM procedure | InterDigital Finland Oy | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220119 | security between UAS-NF and USS | Huawei, HiSilicon | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220120 | remove EN in 5.2.1.5 UUAA revocation | Huawei, HiSilicon | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220181 | Resolve EN about USS Identifier | Huawei, HiSilicon | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220311 | Protection of UAS NF to USS interface | Qualcomm Incorporated | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220312 | Additional of further 5G pairing cases | Qualcomm Incorporated | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220313 | Adding details of UUAA procedure in 4G | Qualcomm Incorporated | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220314 | Details of pairing in EPS | Qualcomm Incorporated | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220429 | Update to Clause 5.2.1.1 General | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220430 | Resolving EN for UUAA re-authentication | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220432 | Resolving EN for UUAA Revocation | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220433 | Resolving EN for UAS data security | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220434 | UUAA and Pairing Alignment update to 33.256 | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | pCR |  | available |  |
| 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<< | withdrawn |  |
|  |  | S3‑220072 | Provisioning and refresh of 5G ProSe long-term credentials | KPN N.V. | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220074 | Discussion paper on provisioning and refresh of 5G ProSe long-term credentials | KPN N.V. | discussion |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220079 | Update to U2N Security procedure over User Plane when using GBA Push | InterDigital Finland Oy | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220080 | NSSAA for Remote UE with L3 U2N relay without N3IWF | InterDigital Finland Oy | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220096 | Add a clause about key hierarchy for user plane | ZTE Corporation | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220097 | Add an EN in clause 6.3.3.2.2 | ZTE Corporation | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220098 | Add some abbrevations for Prose | ZTE Corporation | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220099 | Clarficaiton on PKMF act as AKMA AF in clause 6.3.3.2.2 | ZTE Corporation | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220100 | Clarification on AUSF instance store in UDM | ZTE Corporation | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220101 | Clean up the step 10-14 in clause 6.3.3.3.2 | ZTE Corporation | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220102 | CR to 33.501 about AUSF instance store in UDM | ZTE Corporation | CR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220103 | Update the PC5 key hierarchy over control plane | ZTE Corporation | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220104 | Update the step 2-5 in clause 6.3.3.3.2 | ZTE Corporation | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220131 | Address the EN on the UE-to-Network Relay security procedure over control plane | OPPO | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220147 | Remove the EN on privacy of PRUK ID | ZTE Corporation | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220161 | Procedure for secondary authentication without N3IWF | LG Electronics Inc., InterDigital | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220179 | Clarification the security policy used during restricted discovery | Huawei, HiSilicon | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220180 | Security procedures for L2 UE-to-Network relay | Huawei, HiSilicon | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220182 | Resolving the ENs on authentication procedure in control plane security procedure | Huawei, HiSilicon | pCR | OPPO proposes to NOTE this contribution. | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220183 | Resolving the EN on the usage of 5GPRUK ID | Huawei, HiSilicon | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220185 | Clarification on procedures for PC5 establishment in UE-to-Network relay scenario | Huawei, HiSilicon | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220198 | Procedure for secondary re-authentication and revocation of Remote UE over L3 U2N Relay without N3IWF | LG Electronics Inc., InterDigital | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220208 | pCR to TS33.503 Clause 3 Definitions of terms and abbreviations | CATT | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220209 | pCR to TS33.503 Clause 4.2 Add new reference point between PKMF and UDM | CATT | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | 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 | available |  |
|  |  | 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 | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220213 | pCR to TS33.503 Consistent term usage | CATT | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220274 | 33.503: Corrections for Network Domain Security | Xiaomi Technology | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | 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 | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220276 | 33.503: Proposed Changes in Model A Discovery | Xiaomi Technology | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220277 | 33.503: Proposed Changes in Model B Discovery | Xiaomi Technology | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220278 | 33.503: PC5 Security Policy Privisioned by PKMF | Xiaomi Technology | pCR | [China Telecom] There is a clarification about the S3-220278. | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220279 | 33.503: PC5 Security Policy Handling during CP-based Security Procedure | Xiaomi Technology | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220280 | 33.503: PC5 Security Policy for L2 U2N Relay | Xiaomi Technology | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | 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] clarifiesQ4:[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:Q1.1ZTE,IDCC:yesEricsson 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. | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220324 | CR on PRUK ID format | Qualcomm Incorporated | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220325 | Discussion on potential security mechanisms for protecting ProSe Disocovery message | Qualcomm Incorporated | discussion |  | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220327 | CR to ProSe TS | Qualcomm Incorporated | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220328 | CR to ProSe TS | Qualcomm Incorporated | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220360 | Clarification Source Authenticity | Philips International B.V. | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220362 | Protection of longer discovery messages (more efficient) | Philips International B.V. | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220365 | Resolving EN in user plane solution for UE-to-network relay | Ericsson | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220366 | Discussion on the SBA services to support Prose authentication | Ericsson | discussion |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220367 | SBA service operations for Prose CP based solution for L3 U2N security | Ericsson | pCR | OPPO proposes to NOTE this contribution. | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220369 | Definitation of functional entity PKMF | Ericsson | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220370 | PC5 security policies in User plane solution for ProSe UE-to-network relay | Ericsson | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220371 | Prose Anchor Function to handle PRUK and PRUK ID | Ericsson | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220372 | Authentication flow over PC5 for Prose CP based solution for L3 U2N security | Ericsson | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220373 | Update for Security Procedure of Communication with 5G ProSe Layer-2 UE-to-Network Relay | Ericsson | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220374 | Correction of the reference for 5G ProSe Layer-3 UE-to-Network Relay Disocvery | Ericsson | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220375 | Removal of PRUK ID in CP based solution | Ericsson | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220376 | ProSe: New service operations in the user plane solution for ProSe UE-to-network relay | Ericsson | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | 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 | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220441 | Integrity protection for UE-to-NW relays | Philips International B.V. | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220442 | Long term identifier updates for UE-to-NW relays | Philips International B.V. | pCR |  | available |  |
| 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. | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220041 | LS on User consent Updating | R3-221210 | LS in |  | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | 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 statusR7 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. | available |  |
|  |  | 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 | available |  |
|  |  | 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 | available |  |
|  |  | 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 | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | 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} | available |  |
| 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 |  | available |  |
| 4.16 | Security aspects of the 5GMSG Service (Rel-17) | S3‑220265 | Removal of EN in 5GMSG security | China Mobile | CR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220290 | Resolving EN on authorization in MSGin5G | Samsung | CR |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220299 | Discussion on Authorization of MSGin5G Client | Samsung | discussion |  | available |  |
| 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220114 | CR for AF Authorization for accessing network slice quota-usage information | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR | [Xiaomi] : provides some comments | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
| 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. | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220105 | Discussion on new wid on akma push function | ZTE Corporation | discussion |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220106 | New WID on AKMA push function | ZTE Corporation | WID new |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220118 | Rel-18 study for network slicing security | Huawei, HiSilicon | SID revised |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220127 | Proposal about considerations to introduce security capability center function | China Mobile | discussion |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220128 | Discussion on blockchain based approach for cross-domain certificate management in 3GPP system | China Mobile | discussion |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220129 | New SID on blockchain based approach for cross-domain certification management in 3GPP system | China Mobile | SID new |  | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220132 | Discussion on Personal IoT Networks Security Aspects | vivo | discussion |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220133 | New SID on Personal IoT Networks Security Aspects | vivo, Apple, ZTE, Xiaomi, CATT, OPPO, China Unicom, China Telecom, CableLabs, InterDigital | SID new |  | available |  |
|  |  | 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 |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220166 | New SID on security enhancements for 5G multicast-broadcast services Phase 2 | Huawei, HiSilicon | SID new |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220167 | Discussion on security enhancements for 5GC LoCation Services Phase 3 | Huawei, HiSilicon | discussion |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220168 | New SID on Enhancement of User Consent for 3GPP Services | Huawei, HiSilicon | SID new |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220169 | New WID for SCAS work to introduce R-17 features on existing functions | Huawei, HiSilicon | WID new |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220170 | New SID on Home network triggerred authenticaiton | Huawei, HiSilicon | SID new |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220206 | New SID on Security Aspects of Enhancement for Proximity Based Services in 5GS Phase 2 | CATT, China Unicom, Interdigital | SID new |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220228 | R18 SID on Security Enhancement of support for Edge Computing | Huawei, HiSilicon | SID new |  | available |  |
|  |  | 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 |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220262 | New SID on enhancement of AKMA | China Mobile | SID new |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220263 | New WID on SCAS for AAnF | China Mobile | WID new |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220281 | New SID on Security Aspects of Ranging Based Services and Sidelink Positioning | Xiaomi Technology | SID new | [Xiaomi]: provides revision r1 | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220282 | New SID on Security Aspects of Satellite Access | Xiaomi Technology | SID new |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220297 | New SID on 5G User plane security enhancements | Samsung | SID new | [Samsung] : Provides r1. Updates to list of supporting companies. | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220300 | R18 SID on Standardising Automated Certificate Management in SBA | Nokia Germany | SID revised |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220321 | Discussion on SCAS for gNB | Qualcomm Incorporated, Deutsche Telekom AG, AT&T | discussion |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220322 | New WID on Updates to gNB SCAS including split gNBs | Qualcomm Incorporated, Deutsche Telekom AG, AT&T | WID new |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220363 | Study on Security aspects for 5WWC Phase 2 | Nokia Solutions & Networks (I) | SID new | [Nokia] : Provides r1 | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220382 | Discussion on applying URSP rules for Authentic Applications | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | discussion |  | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | 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 |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220422 | AIML Security and Privacy SID | Chengdu OPPO Mobile Com. corp. | SID new |  | available |  |
|  |  | 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 | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220427 | Discussion to Study on Zero Trust Security | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | discussion |  | available |  |
| 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(QC check) | 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 questionsKundan(NEC) clarifies further to He (Huawei).[Ericsson] : providing further commentsKundan(NEC) responds to Ericsson.[Ericsson]responds to NECHuawei: 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?(HW check) | 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. | 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 |  |
|  |  | 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\_rx |
|  |  | 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 |  | Extented to week 2 |  |
|  |  | 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. | Extented to week 2 |  |
|  |  | 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 questionMCC 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 MCCMCC 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 toshow 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-IDDo 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. | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | merged  | 392\_rx |
|  |  | 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} | merged  | 392\_rx |
|  |  | 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, EricssonSupporting 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\_rx |
|  |  | 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\_rx |
|  |  | 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 |  | agreed | 　 |
|  |  | 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 | extended to week 2 |  |
|  |  | 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 explanationMCC 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?(need revision) |  |
|  |  | 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 |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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} | available |  |
|  |  | 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} | available |  |
|  |  | 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 r1MCC 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 commentsMCC 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\_rx |
|  |  | 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 r1propose 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< |  |  |
| 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 | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | 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 | available |  |
|  |  | 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<< | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220306 | Addressing the editor | CableLabs | pCR | [Qualcomm]: requests clarification and revision before approval[CableLabs]: Provided comments to Qualcomm. | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220307 | Addressing the editor | CableLabs | pCR | [Qualcomm]: requests clarification before approval[CableLabs]: Provided clarification to Qualcomm | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220309 | Addressing the editor | CableLabs | pCR | [Philips] Clarifications suggested.[Qualcomm]: requests clarification and revision before approval[Philips] Clarifications suggested. | available |  |
|  |  | 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) | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | 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 | available |  |
| 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 | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220077 | Updates to Terminology for Solution #5 | Johns Hopkins University APL, US National Security Agency | pCR |  | available |  |
|  |  | 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 | available |  |
| 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 | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220230 | Clean up for TR 33.839 | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR |  | available |  |
| 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<< | noted |  |
|  |  | 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(only Ericsson objected) | 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(only Xiaomi objected) | 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 purused |  |
|  |  | 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 |  | available |  |
| 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. | available |  |
| 5.10 | Study on Security for NR Integrated Access and Backhaul | S3‑220296 | Coversheet for TS 33.824 | Samsung | TS or TR cover |  | available |  |
| 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. | available |  |
|  |  | 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 |  |
| 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 | available |  |
|  |  | 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 | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
|  |  | 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. | available |  |
| 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 |  | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220042 | Addressing several issue from MCC and EditHelp for TR 33.811 | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR |  | available |  |
| 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 |  |
| 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 | available |  |
|  |  | 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 | available |  |
|  |  | 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 | available |  |
|  |  | S3‑220381 | Skeleton for Automated Certificate Management in SBA TR | Nokia Germany | pCR |  | available |  |
| 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<< |  |  |