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# 1 Introduction

This paper provides summary of discussions at RAN3#120 on:

**CB: # SONMDT4\_SNPN**

**- Finalize the stage3 CRs**

**- Other open issues, if any**

(moderator - Nok)

Please provide your comments by Thursday the 25th at 18.00 Korean time.

A draft NGAP TP is uploaded based on the following agreements from online discussion:

* + **Set the range of maxnoofCAGforMDT to 256**
  + **Add separate SNPN Cell Based MDT and SNPN TAI Based MDT area scope**
  + **No need to introduce user consent of SNPN over interfaces.**

# 2 For the Chairman’s Notes

[To be completed]

Proposal 1: Add multi-SNPN MDT area scope.

Proposal 2: No need for PLMN-wide area scope.

# 3 Discussion

## 3.1 Open issue: Introduce SNPN wide IE?

Is it needed to introduce SNPN wide IE (choice alternative)?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Answer  (yes/no) | Comment |
| Nokia | No | No need to add SNPN-wide choice alternative, but see proposals for multi-SNPN area scope in section 3.2. |
| Huawei | Yes | If there is no SNPN wide choice alternative, we then at least need the NID list option for SNPN? |
| ZTE | Yes | Same view as HW |
| CATT | Yes but not clearly | Is this for multiple SNPN or register SNPN?  If for register SNPN, we think PLMN wide is needed, and the SNPN information is get from the UE access procedure.  If for multiple SNPN, we should define SNPN list in somewhere, and then we can say SNPN wide. If no SNPN list (like the PLMN list in user consent), how shall we interpret the SNPN wide? |

Moderator: It seems that SNPN-wide choice is not needed if multi-SNPN area scope is supported.

## 3.2 Other open issues

Do you see other open issues?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Nokia | We would like to remind about the following two proposals from our paper 2588:  **Proposal 3: Introduce support of multi-SNPN area scope for MDT in Rel-18.**  **Proposal 4: Incorporate the multi-SNPN area scope directly in the Area Scope configuration**  If companies can agree we will update the NGAP TP accordingly based on 2588 (with some IE name correction). |
| Huawei | We are positive to proposal 3 and 4. |
| ZTE | 1: Remove the EN of "Editor's note 1: The text in the Semantics Descriptions may be revisited if needed".  2:During the previous RAN3 meeting, Most companies agreed to send an LS to RAN2 to inform the progress of MDT support in NPN in RAN3, if SNPN solution is adopt. we hope the LS can be sent in this meeting. The draft LS to RAN2 is provided in R3-233190.  3: TP to MDT stage 2 (37.320) is missing and can be found in R3-233190. |
| CATT | Still not sure we will support multiple SNPN in this version? Is this the common understanding?  And for the PNI-NPN,  **in case of PNI-NPN area scope is not present, whether how to interpret the old area scope choices when it set as cell base, TA based, TAI based, and PLMN wide**  **-only represents the PN area, i.e, only including non-CAG cells**  **-can represent both PN and NPN area, i.e, including both non-CAG cells and CAG cells. If the latter is preferred, whether further clarification is needed to avoid misunderstanding.**  We need to have a common understanding and end the discussion about PNI-NPN. |

Moderator:

Multi-SNPN area scope: Moderator believes inter-SNPN mobility is part of Rel-18 WI. Two companies support. Will tentatively include multi-SNPN area scope in the TP.

Stage 2: only stage 3 TPs are within the scope of this CB.

PNI-NPN: scope of this CB is limited to SNPN.

LS to RAN2 depends on whether PNI-NPN is stable?

# 4 Conclusion, Recommendations [if needed]

If needed

# 5 References

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
|  |  |