**3GPP TSG CT WG1 Meeting#122** ***C1-200***

**Electronic meeting, 20-28 February 2020**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Meeting documents by agenda item  Meeting: Meeting #122-e  Electronic meeting  20 - 28 February 20 20  **All indicated time s are CET** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cyan background means allocated but not available. | | | | | Yellow background means available but not yet treated document. | Green background means this document was agreed at a revious meeting in this plenary cycle. | | | | White background means that the document has been handled in the meeting and a decision has been made. |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Additional Colour coding for Tdocs in the 1st row | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Late Papers | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Easy and uncontroversial papers – can be presented within 2 minutes | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Papers for common sessions | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Low Priority | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |
| Agenda item | Agenda item title | | Tdoc | Title | | | Source | Spec | Result | |
|  | Opening & welcome | | Tdoc | Title | | | Source | Spec | Result | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | | **IPR Policy** Reminder to Individual Members and the persons making the technical proposals about their obligations under their respective Organizational Partners IPR Policy:  I draw your attention to your obligations under the 3GPP Partner Organizations' IPR policies. Every Individual Member organization is obliged to declare to the Partner Organization or Organizations of which it is a member any IPR owned by the Individual Member or any other organization which is or is likely to become essential to the work of 3GPP. | | | | | | | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | | **Antitrust & Competition** I also draw your attention to the fact that 3GPP activities are subject to all applicable antitrust and competition laws and that compliance with said laws is therefore required of any participant of this TSG/WG meeting including the Chairman and Vice Chairman. In case of question I recommend that you contact your legal counsel.  The leadership shall conduct the present meeting with impartiality and in the interests of 3GPP.  Furthermore, I would like to remind you that timely submission of work items in advance of TSG/WG meetings is important to allow for full and fair consideration of such matters. | | | | | | | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | | **Usage if WiFi**  During 3GPP meetings, IT support staff have noticed an increasing amount of RF pollution from private, ad hoc, wireless networks (Wi-Fi Direct, hot-spots hosted on mobile phones, …), and this gives rise to reduced throughput capability of the 3GPP WLAN. I would like to remind delegates to disable all such non-3GPP Wi-Fi networks while they are in the meeting rooms or adjacent areas. This will allow the quality of connection to the 3GPP Wi-Fi network which delegates have a right to expect. | | | | | | | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | | **Statement Regarding Engagement with Companies Added to the**  **U.S. Export Administration Regulations (EAR) Entity List in 3GPP Activities**  1. Public Information is Not Subject to EAR  3GPP is an open platform where all contributions (including technology protected or not by patent) made by the different Individual Members under the membership of each respective Organizational Partner are publicly available. Indeed, contributions by all and any Individual Members are uploaded to a public file server when received and then the documents are effectively in the public domain.  In addition, since membership of email distribution lists is open to all, documents and emails distributed by that means are considered to be publicly available.  As a result, information contained in 3GPP contributions, documents, and emails distributed at 3GPP meetings or by 3GPP email distribution lists, because it is made available to the public without restrictions upon its further dissemination, is not subject to the export restrictions of the EAR.  Meeting minutes are maintained for 3GPP meetings. Such meeting minutes for 3GPP meetings are made available to the public without restrictions upon its further dissemination. As a result, information, including information conveyed orally, contained in 3GPP meetings is not subject to the export restriction of the EAR; this would include information conveyed during side meetings that may occur during the main meetings, if these meetings are open to any participants and the results of all said meetings are publicly available without restrictions upon their further dissemination.  2. Non-Public Information  Non-public information refers to the information not contained or not intended to be contained in 3GPP contributions, documents or emails. Such non-public information may be disclosed during informal meetings, exchanges, discussions or any form of other communication outside the 3GPP meetings and email distribution lists, and may be subject to the EAR.  3. Other Information  Certain encryption software controlled under the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR), even if publicly available, may still be subject to US export controls other than the EAR.  4. Conduct of Meetings  The situation should be considered as "business as usual" during all the meetings called by 3GPP.  5. Responsibility of Individual Members  It should be remembered that contributions, meetings, exchanges, discussions or any form of other communication in or outside the 3GPP meetings are of the accountability, integrity and the responsibility of each Individual Member. In addition, Individual Members remain responsible for ensuring their compliance with all applicable export control regulations, including but not limited to EAR.  Individual Members with questions regarding the impact of laws and regulations on their participation in 3GPP should contact their companies’ legal counsels. | | | | | | | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | | Please remember:  - to perform the electronic registration before end-of-meeting  - to wear your badge | | | | | | | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Agenda & Reports | | Tdoc | Title | | | Source | Doctype | Result & comments | |
|  |  | | C1-200275 | 3GPP TSG CT1#122 – agenda after Tdoc allocation deadline | | | CT1 chairman | agenda | Revision of C1-200200 | |
|  |  | | C1-200201 | 3GPP TSG CT1#122 – agenda after Tdoc allocation deadline | | | CT1 chairman | agenda |  | |
|  |  | | C1-200202 | 3GPP TSG CT1#122 – agenda with proposed LS-actions | | | CT1 chairman | agenda |  | |
|  |  | | C1-200203 | 3GPP TSG CT1#122 – agenda at start of meeting | | | CT1 chairman | agenda |  | |
|  |  | | C1-200204 | 3GPP TSG CT1#122 – agenda Thursday (27th Feb) evening | | | CT1 chairman | agenda |  | |
|  |  | | C1-200205 | 3GPP TSG CT1#122 – agenda at end of meeting | | | CT1 chairman | agenda |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-200307](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200307.zip) | draft C1-121 meeting report | | | MCC | report | Noted | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  | Highest number shown in the xxxx | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | | **Agenda**  1 Opening  2 Agenda and Reports  3 work organization  4 incoming LS Rel-16  **Rel-16:**  16.1.x Work items (4)  16.2.3 SAES16 (all aspects) (0) only revisions of CRs agreed in CT1#121bis-e and disc papers supporting LSs  16.2.4 5GProtoc16 (all aspects) (5) only revisions of CRs agreed in CT1#121bis-e and disc papers supporting LSs  16.2.21 Rel-16 non-IMS issues (0) only revisions of CRs agreed in CT1#121bis-e and disc papers supporting LSs  **Agenda Items from 16.2**  16.2.2 SINE\_5G (4)  16.2.5 ATSSS (28)  16.2.6 eNS (51)  16.2.7.x vertical-LAN (79)  16.2.8 5G\_CIoT (44)  16.2.9 5WWC (25)  16.2.11 5G\_eLCS (2)  16.2.14 RACS (16)  16.2.15 5G\_SRVCC (2)  16.2.16 xBDT (0)  16.2.17 IAB-CT (0)  16.2.18 5GS\_OTAF (0)  16.2.19 5G\_URLLC (2)  16.2.20 SEAL (51)  16.2.1 ePWS (5)  16.2.10 PARLOS (7)  16.2.12 V2XAPP (13)  16.2.13 eV2XARC (35)  **Agenda Items from 16.3**  16.3.1 MCCI\_CT (7)  16.3.2 MCProtoc16 (5)  16.3.5 MCSMI\_CT (0)  16.3.6 eMCDATA2 (19)  16.3.10 MONASTERY2 (8)  16.3.12 enh2MCPTT-CT (9)  16.3.3 MuD (15)  16.3.4 IMSProtoc16 (3)  16.3.7 E2E\_DELAY (0)  16.3.8 VBCLTE (0)  16.3.11 eIMS5G\_SBA (1)  16.3.13 eIMSVideo (8)  16.3.14 IMS/MC TEI16 (3)  18 outgoing LS Rel-16 | | | | | | | |
|  |  | |  | | | | | | | |
|  | Work organisation | | Tdoc | Title | | | Source | To / CC | Result & comments | |
|  | Meeting schedule | |  |  | | | | | | |
|  |  | |  | CT1 and CT plenary meeting dates. | | | | | | |
|  |  | |  | Date | | | Meeting | | Venue | |
|  |  | |  | *13 – 17 January* | | | [*CT1-Potential Ad-Hoc*](https://portal.etsi.org/webapp/MeetingCalendar/MeetingDetails.asp?m_id=36254) | | *cancelled* | |
|  |  | |  | 16 – 22 January | | | CT1#121bis-e | | Electronic Meeting | |
|  |  | |  | *24 – 28 February* | | | *CT1#122* | | *cancelled* | |
|  |  | |  | 20 – 28 February | | | CT1#122-e | | Electronic Meeting | |
|  |  | |  | 16 – 17 March 2020 | | | CT plenary #87 | | Jeju, Korea | |
|  |  | |  | 20 – 24 April | | | CT1#123 | | Dubrovnik, Croatia | |
|  |  | |  | 25 – 29 May | | | CT1#124 | | Dalian, China | |
|  |  | |  | 15 – 16 June 2020 | | | CT plenary #88 | | Malmö, Sweden | |
|  |  | |  | 13 – 17 July | | | [CT1-Potential Ad-Hoc](https://portal.etsi.org/webapp/MeetingCalendar/MeetingDetails.asp?m_id=36254) | | TBD | |
|  |  | |  | 24 – 28 August | | | CT1#125 | | US | |
|  |  | |  | 14 – 15 September 2020 | | | CT plenary #89 | | Funchal, Madeira | |
|  |  | |  | 12 – 16 October | | | CT1#126 | | India | |
|  |  | |  | 16 – 20 November | | | CT1#127 | | US | |
|  |  | |  | 7 – 8 December 2020 | | | CT plenary #90 | | NAF | |
|  |  | |  | 25 – 29 January 2021 | | | CT1#127bis | | tbd | |
|  |  | |  | 01- 05 March 2021 | | | CT1#128 | | tbd | |
|  |  | |  | 22 – 23 March 2021 | | | CT plenary #91 | | US | |
|  |  | |  | 19 – 23 April 2021 | | | CT1#129 | | tbd | |
|  |  | |  | 24 – 28 May 2021 | | | CT1#130 | | tbd | |
|  |  | |  | 14 – 15 June 2021 | | | CT plenary #91 | | Japan | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  | |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  | |  | |
|  | Work Plan and other adm. issues | | Tdoc | Title | | | Source | Spec / doctype | Result & comments | |
|  |  | | [C1-200306](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200306.zip) | work plan | | | MCC | Work Plan | Proposed Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-200312](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200312.zip) | CT1#122-e Electronic Meeting – Process and Scope | | | CT1 chairman | other | Proposed Noted | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Input Liaison statements | | Tdoc | Title | | | Source | To / CC | Result & comments | |
|  |  | | [C1-200206](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200206.zip) | LS on usage of IMSI during 3GPP based authentication (C4-195574) | | | CT4 | Cc | Proposed Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-200207](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200207.zip) | LS on user identity when 5G-AKA or EAP AKA’ is used for SNPN (C6-190468) | | | CT6 | To | Proposed Noted  SA3 reply in C1-200255 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200208](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200208.zip) | LS on Proposal to transfer the study on service-based support for SMS in 5GC to CT WGs (CP-193301) | | | TSG CT | Cc | Postponed  LS pertains to Rel-17 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200209](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200209.zip) | Reply LS to Transfer the study on service-based support for SMS in 5GC to CT WGs (SP-191362) | | | TSG SA | Cc | Postponed  LS pertains to Rel-17 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200210](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200210.zip) | Response to 3GPP S2-1910806 and S2-1912767 on Line ID (LIAISE-353) | | | Broadband Forum | To | Proposed Noted  SA2 has already handled the incoming LS | |
|  |  | | [C1-200211](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200211.zip) | General Status of Work (LIAISE-363à | | | Broadband Forum | To | Proposed tbd  Reply needed  Proposed LS out in C1-200309 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200212](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200212.zip) | LS on Testing and Certification of 3GPP Mission Critical features A GCF-TCCA Joint Approach to Develop and Manage MC Certification ( | | | TCCA | Cc | Proposed Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-200213](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200213.zip) | Reply LS on QoE Measurement Collection (R2-1916328) | | | RAN2 | Cc | Proposed Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-200214](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200214.zip) | Reply LS on NID structure and length (R2-1916344) | | | RAN2 | Cc | Proposed Noted  Related CR in C1-200334 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200215](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200215.zip) | CMAS/ETWS and emergency services for SNPNs (R2-1916345) | | | RAN2 | Cc | Proposed Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-200216](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200216.zip) | Reply LS on Sending CAG ID in NAS layer (R2-1916349) | | | RAN2 | Cc | Proposed Noted  Related DP in C1-200335 and CR in C1-200337 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200217](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200217.zip) | Reply LS on Mobile-terminated Early Data Transmission (R2-1916368) | | | RAN2 | To | Proposed tbd  Proposed LS out in C1-200707  CR in C1-200368 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200218](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200218.zip) | Reply LS on assistance indication for WUS (R2-1916440) | | | RAN2 | To | Proposed Noted  Seems no reply needed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200219](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200219.zip) | Reply LS on PC5S and PC5 RRC unicast message protection (R2-1916461) | | | RAN2 | Cc | Proposed Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-200220](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200220.zip) | LS on dependencies on AS design for mobility management aspects of NTN in 5GS (R2-1916470) | | | RAN2 | Cc | Proposed Noted  C1-200220 from RAN2 and C1-200269 from RAN3 are both replies to the same LS from SA2 (S2-1910786) | |
|  |  | | [C1-200221](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200221.zip) | LS on RRC establishment cause value in EPS voice fallback from NR to E-UTRAN (R2-1916530) | | | RAN2 | To | Proposed Posptoned  TEI16, potentially changes to 24.301 needed  Proposed LS out in C1-200710, LS out postponed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200222](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200222.zip) | LS on inter-RAT HO from SA to EN-DC (R2-1916600) | | | RAN2 | Cc | Proposed Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-200223](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200223.zip) | LS on LS on system level design assumptions for satellite in 5GS (R2-1916620) | | | RAN2 | Cc | Proposed Noted  C1-200223 from RAN2 and C1-200269 from RAN3 are both replies to the same LS from SA2  (S2-1910787) | |
|  |  | | [C1-200224](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200224.zip) | Reply LS on extended NAS timers for CE in 5GS (R2-1916623) | | | RAN2 | To | Proposed tbd  Proposed LS out in C1-200717  Related CRs in C1-200383 - C1-200384 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200225](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200225.zip) | Reply LS on Sending CAG ID in NAS layer (R3-197591) | | | RAN3 | Cc | Proposed Noted  Related DP in C1-200335 and CR in C1-200337 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200226](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200226.zip) | LS on Concurrent Broadcasting for CMAS (R3-197749) | | | RAN3 | To | Postponed  LS pertains to Rel-15  Proposed LS out in C1-200764 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200227](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200227.zip) | Reply LS on UAC for NB-IOT (S1-193592) | | | SA1 | Cc | Proposed Noted  Is related at least to CRs in C1-200397, C1-200421, C1-200677 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200228](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200228.zip) | Reply LS on enhanced access control for IMS signalling (S1-193595) | | | SA1 | To | Proposed Noted  No action in the LS | |
|  |  | | [C1-200229](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200229.zip) | Reply LS on NSI requirements (S1-193596) | | | SA1 | Cc | Proposed Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-200230](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200230.zip) | Reply LS on LS on PC5S and PC5 RRC unicast message protection (S2-1912002) | | | SA2 | Cc | Proposed Noted  Related CR in C1-200349 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200231](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200231.zip) | Reply LS on Enquiries on eV2XARC (S2-1912018) | | | SA2 | To | Proposed Noted  Related pCR in C1-200391  Related CR in C1-200349 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200232](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200232.zip) | Reply LS on SUCI computation from an NSI (S2-1912417) | | | SA2 | To | Proposed Noted  Are CRs available to this meeting? | |
|  |  | | [C1-200233](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200233.zip) | LS on PLMN selection solutions for satellite access (S2-1912551) | | | SA2 | To | Postponed  LS pertains to Rel-17 (FS\_5GSAT\_ARCH) although header of the LS incorrectly indicates Rel-16 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200234](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200234.zip) | Reply LS on applicability of the notification procedure in SNPNs (S2-1912601) | | | SA2 | To | Proposed tbd  Proposed LS out in C1-200718  Related CRs in C1-200504, C1-200505, C1-200333 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200235](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200235.zip) | LS on support of Control Plane CIoT 5GS Optimisation (S2-1912609) | | | SA2 | To | Proposed Noted  Are CRs available to this meeting? | |
|  |  | | [C1-200236](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200236.zip) | Reply LS on sending CAG ID during resume procedure (S2-1912731) | | | SA2 | To | Proposed Noted  No action for CT1 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200237](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200237.zip) | Reply LS on Rel-16 NB-IoT enhancements (S2-1912763) | | | SA2 | To | Proposed tbd  Reply Needed  Proposed LS out in C1-200499  Proposed LS out in C1-200416  Discussion paper in C1-200498  DP in C1-200417 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200238](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200238.zip) | Reply LS on clarification on the requirement for steering of roaming (S2-1912764) | | | SA2 | To | Proposed Postponed  CRs in CT1 likely needed, agenda item not in scope of this meeting | |
|  |  | | [C1-200239](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200239.zip) | LS on the support for ECN in 5GS (S2-1912765) | | | SA2 | Cc | Proposed Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-200240](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200240.zip) | Reply LS on "set of configuration parameters" in the precedence of the V2X configuration parameters (S2-2000970) | | | SA2 | To | Proposed Noted  Related CR in C1-200525 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200241](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200241.zip) | Reply LS on PC5 unicast and groupcast security protection (S2-2000971) | | | SA2 | To | Proposed Noted  Related CR in C1-200349 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200242](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200242.zip) | Reply LS on Response LS on SL RLM/RLF (S2-2000973) | | | SA2 | To | Proposed Noted  Related CR in C1-200350 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200243](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200243.zip) | Reply LS on configured NSSAI handling (S2-2001110) | | | SA2 | To | Proposed tbd  Proposed LS out in C1-200718  No action for CT1 identified | |
|  |  | | [C1-200244](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200244.zip) | Reply LS on Dual-registration requirements for EHPLMNs (S2-2001130) | | | SA2 | To | Proposed Postponed  CT1 CRs seem needed, potentially a reply LS | |
|  |  | | [C1-200245](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200245.zip) | LS on MA PDU establishment when the VPLMN does not support ATSSS (S2-2001148) | | | SA2 | To | Proposed Noted  Are CRs available to this meeting? | |
|  |  | | [C1-200246](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200246.zip) | Reply LS on gPTP message delivery to DS-TT (S2-2001150) | | | SA2 | To | Proposed Noted  Related CR in C1-200339 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200247](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200247.zip) | Reply LS on 5G-S-TMSI Truncation Procedure (S2-2001248) | | | SA2 | To | Proposed Noted  C1-200500 (discussion paper) and C1-200501 (related CR) | |
|  |  | | [C1-200248](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200248.zip) | Reply LS on congestion during RLOS access (S2-2001335) | | | SA2 | To | Proposed Noted  No action seems required | |
|  |  | | [C1-200249](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200249.zip) | LS on Non-UE N2 Message Services Operations (S2-2001340) | | | SA2 | To | Proposed tbd  Proposed LS out in C1-200721 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200250](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200250.zip) | Reply LS on CMAS/ETWS and emergency services for SNPNs (S2-2001400) | | | SA2 | Cc | Proposed Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-200251](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200251.zip) | Reply LS on assistance indication for WUS (S2-2001578) | | | SA2 | To | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-200252](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200252.zip) | LS on Sending CAG ID (S2-2001616) | | | SA2 | To | Proposed tbd  Reply Needed  Proposed LS out in C1-200310  Related CRs in C1-200311, C1-200467, C1-200337 (seem to contain the same solution)  Related DP in C1-200335 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200253](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200253.zip) | LS on PC5S and PC5 RRC unicast message protection (S3-193802) | | | SA3 | To | Proposed Noted  Proposed LS out in C1-200545  Related CR in C1-200349 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200254](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200254.zip) | Reply LS to LS on usage of IMSI during 3GPP based authentication (S3-194454) | | | SA3 | Cc | Proposed Noted  Reply from SA3 to CT4 (C1-200206) | |
|  |  | | [C1-200255](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200255.zip) | Reply LS on SUCI computation from an NSI (S3-194455) | | | SA3 | To | Proposed tbd  Reply Needed  Proposed LS out in C1-200395 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200256](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200256.zip) | Reply LS to SA2 on 5G-S-TMSI Truncation Procedure (S3-194482) | | | SA3 | Cc | Proposed Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-200257](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200257.zip) | Reply LS on SUCI computation from an NSI (S3-194548) | | | SA3 | To | Proposed Noted  Are CRs available to this meeting? | |
|  |  | | [C1-200258](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200258.zip) | Reply LS on Sending CAG ID in NAS layer (S3-194559) | | | SA3 | Cc | Proposed Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-200259](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200259.zip) | Reply LS on IANA assigned values for mission critical (S3-194603) | | | SA3 | To | Proposed Postponed  Reply LS is needed, not provided to the meeting, SA6 meets in May, i.e. after next CT1 meeting | |
|  |  | | [C1-200260](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200260.zip) | LS to CT1 on 3rd ETSI MCX Remote Plugtest (S3-194611) | | | SA3 | To | Proposed Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-200261](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200261.zip) | LS on Reply on QoE Measurement Collection (S5-197543) | | | SA5 | Cc | Proposed Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-200262](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200262.zip) | Reply LS on how the IWF obtains key material for interworking group and private communications (S6-192194) | | | SA6 | To | Proposed Noted  Are CRs available to this meeting? | |
|  |  | | [C1-200263](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200263.zip) | Reply LS (S6-192023) on clarifications regarding SEAL services (S6-192318) | | | SA6 | Cc | Proposed Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-200264](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200264.zip) | Reply LS on Unicast resource management with SIP core (S6-200163) | | | SA6 | To | Proposed Noted  related CR iC1-200616 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200265](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200265.zip) | LS on API additions to SEAL and V2XAPP (S6-200270) | | | SA6 | To | Proposed Noted  No CT1 CRs seem available to this meeting, commented that none are needed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200266](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200266.zip) | Reply LS on Enquiries for supporting vertical applications (S6-200337) | | | SA6 | To | Proposed Noted  Related CRs in C1-200562, C1-200563, C1-200554,C1-200552, C1-200553, C1-200608 and C1-200610 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200267](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200267.zip) | Reply LS on clarifications regarding V2XAPP services (S6-192385) | | | SA6 | Cc | Proposed Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-200268](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200268.zip) | LS on missing cause code mapping (C3-195374) | | | CT3 | Cc | Proposed Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-200269](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200269.zip) | Reply LS on LS on dependencies on AS design for mobility management aspects of NTN in 5GS / LS on system level design assumptions for satellite in 5GS (R3-197699) | | | RAN3 | Cc | Proposed Noted  C1-200220 from RAN2 and C1-200269 from RAN3 are both replies to the same LS from SA2 (S2-1910786)  C1-200223 from RAN2 and C1-200269 from RAN3 are both replies to the same LS from SA2  (S2-1910787) | |
|  |  | | [C1-200270](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200270.zip) | Reply on QoE Measurement Collection (S4-200241) | | | SA4 | To | Proposed Postponed  Reply LS is needed, not provided to the meeting | |
|  |  | | [C1-200271](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200271.zip) | Reply LS on Support for ECN in 5GS (S4-200298) | | | SA4 | Cc | Proposed Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-200272](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200272.zip) | LS on GSMA NG.116 Attribute Area of service and impact on PLMN selection (S2-2001726) | | | SA2 | To | Postponed  LS pertains to Rel-17 (FS\_eNS\_Ph2 ) | |
|  |  | | [C1-200273](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200273.zip) | Questions on onboarding requirements (S2-2001729) | | | SA2 | Cc | Postponed  LS pertains to Rel-17 (FS\_eNPN) | |
|  |  | | [C1-200274](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200274.zip) | Reply LS on assistance indication for WUS (S2-2001732) | | | SA2 | To | Proposed Postponed  SA2 asks CT WG1 group to take the above answers into account and update their specifications accordingly, if required. Any CRs for WUS in EPC were treated under SAES in previous meeting | |
|  |  | | [C1-200319](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200319.zip) | Specification of NAS COUNT for 5G (FSAG Doc 78\_002) | | | GSMA FSAG | To | Proposed Postponed  CRs to 24.501 may be needed  Reply LS may be needed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200356](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200356.zip) | General status of WWC work (LIAISE-376) | | | Broadband Forum | To | Proposed Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-200777](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_122e/Docs/C1-200777.zip) | LS on Questions on onboarding requirements (S1-201087) | | | [C1-200777](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_122e/Docs/C1-200777.zip) | Cc | Postponed  LS pertains to Rel-17 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200776](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_122e/Docs/C1-200776.zip) | Reply LS on manual CAG selection (S1-201084) | | | [C1-200776](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_122e/Docs/C1-200776.zip) | To | Proposed Noted  Providing answers, | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | void | |  |  | | |  |  | Release 5 is closed | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | void | |  |  | | |  |  | Release 6 is closed | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | void | |  |  | | |  |  | Release 7 is closed | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 8  work items | | Tdoc | **NOT PART OF THIS MEETING** | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 9  work items | | Tdoc | **NOT PART OF THIS MEETING** | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 10  work items | | Tdoc | **NOT PART OF THIS MEETING** | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 11  work items | | Tdoc | **NOT PART OF THIS MEETING** | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 12  work items | | Tdoc | **NOT PART OF THIS MEETING** | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 13  work items | | Tdoc | **NOT PART OF THIS MEETING** | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 14  work items | | Tdoc | **NOT PART OF THIS MEETING** | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 15  work items | | Tdoc | **NOT PART OF THIS MEETING** | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 16  work items | | Tdoc | Title | | | Source | Tdoc info | Result & comments | |
|  | Tdocs on Work Items | |  |  | | |  |  | Papers related to Rel-16 Work Items | |
|  | Work Item Descriptions | |  | Peter - Main | | |  |  | New and revised Work Item Descritpions | |
|  |  | | [C1-200296](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200296.zip) | Stage-3 5GS NAS protocol development | | | Ericsson / Ivo | WID revised Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of CP-183087 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200348](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200348.zip) | Revised WID on CT aspects of optimisations on UE radio capability signalling | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | WID revised Rel-16 | Current Status Endorsed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200423](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200423.zip) | Revised WID on CT aspects of Cellular IoT support and evolution for the 5G System | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Amer | WID revised Rel-16 | Current status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200472](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200472.zip) | Revised WID on Multi-device and multi-identity | | | Ericsson /Jörgen | WID revised Rel-16 | Current status Agreed | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | CRs and Discussion Documents related to new or revised Work Items | |  | Peter - Main | | |  |  | CRs and Disc papers related to new Work Items | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Status of other Work Items | |  | Peter - Main | | |  |  | Status information on other relevant Rel-16 Work Items | |
|  |  | | [C1-200422](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200422.zip) | 5G\_CIoT WI workplan | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Amer | Work Plan Rel-16 | Noted | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 16 documents for information | |  | Peter - Main | | |  |  | Miscellaneous documents provided for information | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | WIs for common and SAE/5G | |  |  | | |  |  | WIs mainly targeted for common sessions or the SAE/5G breakout | |
|  | ePWS | |  | Lena – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects of enhancements of Public Warning System  TR 23.735 is sent to CT#85 for approval | |
|  |  | | [C1-200444](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200444.zip) | CR 23.041#0210 Example of Unicode based symbols as the language independent contents mapping to disasters in NOTE | | | SyncTechno Inc. | CR 0210 23.041 Rel-16 | **Current status: Postponed**  Ivo, Thursday, 9:28  each unicode character required to be supported as a language-independent content needs to be listed in a normative text (not in a NOTE). Until this is done, editor's notes in 9.1.3.4.2 and 9.1.3.5.2 are valid and cannot be removed. I suggest to introduce a table with rows containing an event/disaster semantic and related unicode character code (if known, or TBD if not known) + an editor's note related to those TBDs.  Peter, Friday, 9:54  In clause 8.3 there are 2 functionalities (2 bullets) and 444 proposes to add an example in the note under bullet 1.  Bullet 1) starts with this sentence:  1)            UEs with user interface which support the ePWS language-independent content functionality and which are not                 capable of displaying text-based warning messages should be capable of displaying the language-independent .....  and I propose to remove the words in red, because this requires the UE to have a user interface, while this is not necessary. The UE needs to have a display to display the unicode character, and that is already stated further down the sentence. Secondly, I think the purple word not is missing from the original text and should be added.  Bullet 2); I propose to add the text in red and remove the text in purple  2)   UEs with no user interface which support the ePWS disaster characteristics functionality should be capable of identifying the characteristics of a disaster derived from the message identifier of a received warning message in order to take appropriate action.  Without this text in red it is unclear what the purpose is of a UE identifying characteristics of a disaster.  Secondly, I don't think it is relevant whether the UE has a user interface or not. Let's not include such a restriction.  Peter, Wednesday, 11:44  I think you have missed one of my comments in the middle of all the discussions.  Bullet 3) is the only bullet that deals with ePWS devices with no user interface:  3) UEs with no user interface which support the ePWS disaster characteristics functionality should be capable of identifying the characteristics of a disaster derived from the message identifier of a received warning message.  This sentence only states what the UE should do, but it is unclear why that is. Hence I proposed to add a few words (in red) at the end: "..... received warning message, in order to take appropriate action.  Hyounhee, Wednesday, 11:48  Feedback on the comments:  First, regarding adding the description on Unicode Symbol as the normative text (Ivo’s comment),  I don’t agree with you.  It should be described as a NOTE, not a normative text because it is to help device manufacturers get 3GPP guidance on how to handle them in case regulatory bodies of countries where their devices are sold do not have any regulation on that issue yet.  And I double-checked with the expert on Unicode symbols to identify which Unicode numbers represent some disasters important from the perspective of public warning.  Due to too many Unicode numbers, it was like looking for a needle in a haystack.  So rather than adding some Unicode numbers mapping to some of disasters based on my searching Unicode symbol, I selected a way of sending a liaison out to ISO in charge of Unicode standardization because they are the expert on them and can provide an recommended approach to be taken by 3GPP CT1 to address this issue.  In addition, if any normative texts need to be added to address this issue, then, I think that the clause 6.2.3 of TS 23.038 is a right place to add them instead of the clauses of TS 23.041.  So… I  would like to suggest to approve C1-200444 to replace existing Editor’s notes by the new Editor’s note and the addition of new sentences in NOTE at this meeting and wait until the ISO sends the reply liaison  to 3GPP. Then, depending on the recommendation from ISO, it will be revised.  Second, regarding Peter’s comment on the first bullet in the clause 8.3,  I think Peter confused something on the first bullet.  The first bullet is applied to legacy type of handsets with ePWS functionality to address the language issue for foreigners who do not know local language used in warning message. So it is right to have “with user interface” and it is right not to have “not”.  I hope all of your comments are clarified above.  I still keep the first version on this CR, i.e. C1-200444 for the approval at this meeting.  Peter, Wednesday, 12:06  My only comment that remains on 444 (and 443), is to add a few words at the end of bullet 3). See my last 2 emails. All other comments from my side were withdrawn after the discussion with Ivo last week  Ivo, Wednesday, 17:54  In order to have a testable solution, we need a normative text identifying what "the language-independent content mapped to an event or a disaster (e.g. character such as Unicode based pictogram mapping to a disaster) that is part of user information contained in the content of a warning message" is. A NOTE will not do the job.  I have no preferences whether to document this in 23.041 or in some other TS, but the Editor's note below cannot be removed until it is documented in a TS.  Editor’s note [WI: ePWS, CR#202]:         FFS on what character(s) such as Unicode based pictogram(s) are the language-independent content mapped to an event or a disaster.  So, C1-200444 is not OK.  Peter, Thursday, 11:56  The "clauses affected" on the cover sheet only has 8.3 in it, there are a few missing: 9.1.3.4.2 and 9.1.3.5.2.  There is also a typo in "consequences if not approved": Missiong  Hyounhee, Thursday, 14:55  C1-200444 is postponed. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200446](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200446.zip) | Workplan for ePWS-CT aspects | | | SyncTechno Inc. | Work Plan Rel-16 | **Noted**  **Current status: Noted** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200765](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200765.zip) | handling of ePWS message | | | Samsung /Grace | CR 0211 23.041 Rel-16 | **Current status: Postponed**  The CR seems to be related to incoming LS in C1-200226. The incoming LS pertains to Rel-15, and is not part of work item ePWS.  Lena, Tuesday, 7:19  The contents of the CR are not related to ePWS. In our view they fall under TEI16. So we request the CR to be postponed to the April meeting.  Grace, Thursday, 10:52  I postpone this CR. | |
|  |  | | C1-200769 | discussion for concurrent broadcast for CMAS | | | Samsung R&D Institute UK | discussion 23.041 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-200770 | discussion for concurrent broadcast for CMAS | | | Samsung R&D Institute UK | discussion 23.041 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-200771 | discussion for concurrent broadcast for CMAS | | | Samsung /Grace | discussion 23.041 Rel-16 | Postponed  Document was LATE | |
|  |  | | [C1-200891](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200891.zip) | CR 23.041#0209 Support of a stored language-independent content referenced by a warning message | | | SyncTechno Inc. | CR 0209 23.041 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200443  -------------------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 10:22  1st sentence uses "mapping" while 2nd sentence uses "referencing".  2)  UEs with user interface which support the ePWS language-independent content functionality and which are incapable of displaying text-based warning messages should be capable of mapping message identifiers of received warning messages to language-independent contents stored in those UEs. Such UEs should be capable of referencing a stored language-independent content to be displayed by those UEs when a warning message is received.   Are those supposed to be the same functionality? If so, then the same term should be used. E.g. 2nd sentence can be changed as follows: "When a warning message is received, such a UE should be capable of displaying of a language-independent content stored in the UE mapped from message identifier of the received warning message."  If those are not supposed to the same functionality, then the 2nd sentence was not concluded in 23.735 subclause 6.4.3.  Peter, Thursday, 11:15  This is the new proposed text:  "2) UEs with user interface which support the ePWS language-independent content functionality and which are incapable of displaying text-based warning messages should be capable of mapping message identifiers of received warning messages to language-independent contents stored in those UEs. Such UEs should be capable of referencing a stored language-independent content to be displayed by those UEs when a warning message is received."  The words "with user interface" seem to be unnecessary. The device only needs to display language-independent content and that is mentioned in the second sentence. I think the words "with user interface" add a requirement that serves no purpose. I would remove those words.  Cristina, Monday, 1:59  We agree on this local storage and mapping feature, but the words “should be” is unacceptable. Considering some simple devices which just sound alarm after receiving any waring message, this feature may be too heavy to support. “can be” or “may be” are preferred.  Hyounhee, Wednesday, 9:33  I have uploaded a draft revision to the drafts folder.  Feedback on the comments:  Regarding the issue on “referencing” or “mapping” (Ivo & Peter’s comment),  Ivo is right. It should be “mapping”. I was confused between the first paragraph and the second paragraph in the clause 6.4.2 of TR 23.735.  Regarding the issue on “should be” or “ can be or may be” (Cristina’s comment),  This proposal is not for simple devices you considered as it was described in the clause 6.4 of TR 23.735.  The existing PWS messages can not include big size of contents suitable for devices such as AR devices or hologram devices that are incapable of text-based warning message.  In addition, it is assumed that 5G devices will be used to help disabled persons experience lots of things. So if a proper content stored in such devices dedicated to persons with specific disability can be displayed, then such disabled persons can understand what happened when a warning message is received in such devices.  And TR 23.735 request it as “shall” as follows.  UEs with ePWS functionality incapable of displaying-text-based warning messages shall be capable of mapping message identifiers of received warning messages to contents stored in UEs with ePWS functionality.  Considering any potential issues that we can not identify in such future 5G devices, I selected “should” instead of “shall”.  If Cristian worrys about mis-interpretation on proposed sentences different from what is specified in TR 23.735, I think NOTE can be added to clarify that this sentence is not applied for UEs with user interface and with very limited memory that can not include any stored language-independent content. However, what I intended to do with this paragraph is that any content stored in such UEs can be useful to the user of such devices to recognize that something dangerous is happening.  Cristina, Wednesday, 11:17  An note to exclude limited capability UE is suggested. Besides, I have no further comment.  Ivo, Wednesday, 11:34  The draft revision partly addresses the comment I raised previously.  I have to say, the sentence "Such UEs should be capable of mapping a stored language-independent content to be displayed by those UEs when a warning message is received." is very difficult to understand.  I assume expectation is that the UE should map the message id to the stored language-independent content and then display the stored language-independent content.  However, I cannot really read it in the sentence.  Proposal: "When a warning message is received, such a UE should be capable of displaying of a language-independent content stored in the UE mapped from message identifier of the received warning message."  Hyounhee, Wednesday, 14:16  A draft revision is available. Changes:   * Took onboard Ivo’s rewording * Added NOTE requested by Cristina   Hyounhee, Wednesday, 14:23  To Peter: Bullet 3) does not exist in C1-200444 but exists in C1-200443 because bullet 2) is added to deal with a stored content.  So, I will add what you suggested, i.e. “in order to take appropriate action” at the end of bullet 3) in C1-200443.  Ivo, Wednesday, 17:14  Latest draft is nearly ok. Comments:  - there are two NOTEs in subclause 8.3 so they need to be numbered (with hard space between "NOTE" and the number)  - there are two full stops at the end of "received warning message.."  - style of the NOTE should be "NO" (rather than "NO + Left:  1 cm, Hanging:  1,5 cm" as now)  Hyounhee, Thursday, 6:00  I took all of Ivo’s comments onboard in a further draft revision.  Cristina, Thursday, 6:04  Proposes to reword the note as there might be limitations other than memory size  Hyounhee, Thursday, 6:04  Agrees with Cristina’s comment, will take it onboard in final version.  Lena, Thursday, 6:32  Proposes rewording “if they are not possible to store” to “if they are not capable of storing” in the note.  Hyounhee, Thursday, 7:05  I took onboard Lena’s comments in a draft revision.  Lena, Thursday, 7:23  I am ok with the draft revision.  Cristina, Thursday, 7:26  I am ok with the draft revision.  Ivo, Thursday, 9:02  I am ok with the draft revision.  Peter, Thursday, 11:45  I am ok with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | [C1-201033](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-201033.zip) | CR 23.041#0208 Addition of message identifiers for UEs with no user interface | | | SyncTechno Inc. | CR 0208 23.041 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200890  Ivo, Thursday, 15:06  C1-201033 is OK.  Peter, 15:25  The consequence of this editor's note for the Warning Type is that we still need to complete the feature and need an exception to do that in the next meeting if we want to complete it within release 16.  I have no objection against that.  ----------------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-200442  Ivo, Thursday, 13:09  C1-200890 still contain the issue by which semantics of different message IDs are overlapping and is NOT OK.  Peter, Thursday, 13:41  The Warning Type IE is mandatory for ETWS, regardless of what the UE is going to do with it. Hence, specifying a range of Message IDs for ETWS and not addressing the Warning Type will lead to an unimplementable ePWS feature. I don't believe SA1 would specify warning types. This is a stage 2 issue.  So, as 442 stands now, the ETWS part is unimplementable and we shouldn't do that close to the freeze of the release 16. We either   1. remove the list of ETWS message identifiers from 442 or 2. we add an editor's note in 9.3.24 stating that the Warning Type for ePWS will be allocated later, or 3. we allocate 1 new value for ePWS if we want to finish the WI in release 16   Ivo, Thursday, 13:59  My preference is Peter’s option 2) above. Not much discussion on 3) and I do not agree with 1).  Another option is to postpone the CR, add "specification of the message Identifiers for warning messages dedicated to UEs with no user interface and with ePWS functionality" in ePWS exception sheet and work on the CR offline to Apr 2020 CT1 meeting.  Peter, Thursday, 14:00  To Hyounhee: do you anticipate there is going to be a real deployment of ePWS with ETWS-like broadcast? Do we really need ePWS with ETWS? I'm only asking; I'm not against it if there is a use case for it.  You didn't address this concern.  Hyounhee, Thursday, 14:02  A draft revision was uploaded:  Regarding Ivo’s comment,  I don’t like the new term “non-ETWS” but it seems to be best way to differentiate two cases to prevent such potential confusion on semantics though I don’t see any confusion.  I added “non-ETWS”.  Regarding Peter’s comment,  I also thought that table you pointed in TS 23.041 while I assumed it is in TS 22.268. You are right. It can be addressed in TS 23.041.  I allocated one Warning Type for UEs with no user interface and with ePWS functionality in that clause you pointed out.  Peter, Thursday, 14:20  You forgot to add the new section to the "clauses affected" on the cover sheet. I'm happy with the change, but Ivo may not be; your and his mail crossed. Furthermore, I'm still not sure ePWS with ETWS serves a real use case (see other mail from a bit earlier).  Hyounhee, Thursday, 14:27  Initially I described the sentence to allocate a new number of Warning Type in the revised version as I mentioned below.  But I am also uncomfortable to do it without checking it in details with relevant stakeholders. So I added an Editor’s note instead.  -------------------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 9:16  - ePWS WID (CP-191155) states "This work item will not introduce new functionality for US WEA and Japan ETWS." but this CR defines new message IDs for ETWS and CMAS and 23.041 states "CMAS (aka WEA)". Thus, the proposed new message IDs should be limited to KPAS and EU-Alert only.  - furthermore, if CMAS and ETWS are anyway in scope, then to follow the existing 23.041 convention, there should be two sets of message ids - one set for ETWS (in the range 4357 - 4369) and one set for non-ETWS PWS (in the range proposed in the CR).  Peter, Thursday, 11:00  1) I don't completely agree with Ivo's comment: Neither KPAS, nor EU-Alert have requirements for an ePWS service. The new message IDs should not apply to KPAS or EU-Alert. Simply removing the "CMAS/ETWS" will do (so this remains: "CBS Message Identifier for warning message dedicated to UEs with no user interface and with ePWS functionality regardless of the type of disasters and characteristics of a disaster.")  2) My remarks:  - The RAN Node needs to make a choice between broadcasting as an ETWS-like service (SIB10 or SIB11 in E-UTRAN) or as a CMAS-like service (SIB12 in E-UTRAN). At this moment it is not specified which choice the RAN node should make and what this choice should be based on. Since the message contains no text, and the receiving device will use the message ID instead, I assume that it will be an ETWS-like service.  - The text in red above says there is no user interface, but all entries for the new message IDs have a sentence "(Not) Settable by MMI". This is confusing; there is no MMI says the text in red. Since we are talking about devices, I would simply remove that sentence.  Ivo, Thursday, 11:13:  1) Peter’s proposed wording ("CBS Message Identifier for warning message dedicated to UEs with no user interface and with ePWS functionality regardless of the type of disasters and characteristics of a disaster.") would still make the new message IDs applicable for ETWS and CMAS, which is against the scope of the WID. So, such wording is NOT OK.  2) I agree that RAN Node needs to make a choice between broadcasting as an ETWS-like service (SIB10 or SIB11 in E-UTRAN) or as a CMAS-like service (SIB12 in E-UTRAN). At this moment it is not specified which choice the RAN node should make and what this choice should be based on.  However, specifying the message identifiers for ETWS is against the WID.  Peter, Thursday, 11:57  To Ivo: I'm not sure there is a confusion. There are 65535 possible message IDs and only the range 4370-4399 applies to CMAS and 4351-4359 applies to ETWS. That leaves 65495 message IDs that don't belong to either.  But, I don't have a strong objection against adding your words.  We need to specify whether the CBC will populate the Warning Type IE (which will result in an ETWS-like broadcast) or not use this IE (which will result in CMAS-like broadcast). However, there are no Warning Type values allocated for ePWS.  Lena, Tuesday, 7:03  I agree with Ivo’s comments.  Additionally, I have the following other comments:   * What is meant by “regardless of the type of disasters and characteristics of a disaster” exactly? * There are several new message identifiers which are marked as “for UEs with no user interface” but then there are also marked as “Settable by MMI”. How can there be an MMI if there is no user interface? * “when a volcano occurs” -> “when a volcanic eruption occurs”   Hyounhee, Wednesday, 6:58  I have uploaded a revision in the drafts folder.  Feedback on the comments:  Regarding the issue on the exclusion of US and Japan case (Ivo’s comment)  Ivo made the confusion by missing “US” and “Japan” in front of CMAS and ETWS.  I would like to remind you that WID ePWS-CT aspect has the sentence as follows.  This work item will not introduce new functionality for US WEA and Japan ETWS.  In addition, the clause 9 of TS 22.268 (clause for ePWS requirements) has the sentence as follows.  Requirements specified in the clause 9 do not apply for US WEA and Japan ETWS.  In other words, CMAS is not same as US WEA though Ivo pointed out the expression CMAS (aka WEA). Such expression should be revised as US CMAS (aka WEA). ETWS is also not same as Japan ETWS.  However, I added the sentence “This message identifier is not applicable to US WEA and Japan ETWS” because anyway such sentences may be deleted later if US and Japan governments decide to have ePWS functionality.  I haven’t heard from two governments that they didn’t want it when I double-checked it with them so I want Ericsson to be responsible for keeping the sentence “This message identifier is not applicable to US WEA and Japan ETWS” in TS 23.041.  Anyway, it will be identified after some activities in AWG, UNDRR etc. continuously.  And, 4401 – 6399 are message identifiers reversed for PWS range in future versions. ETWS is also one of PWS.  As I strongly explained at the last meeting, the same message identifiers for UEs with no user interface need to be defined for both CMAS and ETWS from the perspective of device manufacturer.  Regarding the issue on broadcasting as ETWS-like or CMAS-like, (Peter’s comment)  I would like to remind all of you that ePWS functionality is specified based on existing PWS network architecture without any change.  It means that if the legacy PWS network architecture is based on ETWS, then warning message for UEs with no user interface and with ePWS functionality need to be broadcast as legacy warning message, ETWS-like message. Same as CMAS.  Regarding the issue on the meaning of “regardless of the type of disasters and characteristics of a disaster”, (Lena’s comment)  I saw Lena’s point. That expression is too much vague. I revised it as follows as what I intended to mean.   * For disasters to be decided to be notified by authorities   Regarding the issue on MMI (Lena’s comment)  I was confused about this point when I drafted it. I deleted it.  Hyounhee, Wednesday, 7:13  One thing to be mentioned: As the Editor of AWG work item related to PWS, I plan to provide the summary of 3GPP ePWS works during upcoming AWG meeting.  I need to provide the clarification on why “This message identifier is not applicable to US WEA and Japan ETWS” for new message identifiers.” In the draft of AWG Report if CT1#122e meeting decide to keep that sentence in the agreed CR in the end.  So I would like you to take into account such potential activities because I may need to indicate what company requests to add such sentence when the representative of US/Japan governments asks me the reason in AWG etc. meetings.  Peter, Wednesday, 11:05  I still have an issue with starting the sentence with "CMAS/ETWS" (CMAS/ETWS CBS Message Identifier for warning message dedicated to UEs with no user interface and with ePWS functionality for disasters to be decided to be notified by authorities)  It says that the Message IDs are for CMAS and ETWS, but are not applicable in the US and in Japan. Does this mean that ePWS devices cannot be sold in the US or Japan? Its confusing.  My understanding is that by introducing ePWS, we shall not affect the current CMAS and ETWS services as they are used in the US and in Japan. Whatever is out there today shall not require any modification because of ePWS.  The solution seems very simple to me: we call the new service "ePWS". Hence we should not confuse anyone by adding the words "CMAS/ETWS" in the beginning of the sentence.  Furthermore, you added some text upon request from Lena. The words that you chose imply that ePWS can only be used by authorities. 3GPP shouldn't care who uses it and should not restrict the use to certain persons or certain groups. If the original words were vague, then simply leave them out.  The result would be like this:  CBS Message Identifier for warning message dedicated to UEs with no user interface and with ePWS functionality.  We've defined elsewhere in the TS what ePWS functionality is.  Ivo, Wednesday, 11: 28  I raised the following comments:  - ePWS WID (CP-191155) states "*This work item will not introduce new functionality for US WEA and Japan ETWS.*" but this CR defines new message IDs for ETWS and CMAS and 23.041 states "*CMAS (aka WEA)*". Thus, the proposed new message IDs should be limited to KPAS and EU-Alert only.  - furthermore, if CMAS and ETWS are anyway in scope, then to follow the existing 23.041 convention, there should be two sets of message ids - one set for ETWS (in the range 4357 - 4369) and one set for non-ETWS PWS (in the range proposed in the CR).  The draft revision addresses my 1st comment.  The draft revision does not address my 2nd comment.  Hyounhee, Wednesday, 12:35  An updated draft revision is available.  Feedback on the comments:  I like Peter’s suggestion, i.e. deleting CMAS/ETWS as these new message identifiers are for UEs with ePWS functionality. Thanks, Peter for good suggestion.  Accordingly, I deleted the last sentence from each message identifier as well because I think such sentence is enough to be kept in Stage 1 TS 22.268 though I assume that it may be deleted in TS 22.268 someday according to discussions in AWG meetings etc. because that sentence was not requested by government organizations but by two companies at that time during SA1 meeting.  I want 3GPP specifications to be kept as neutral as much as possible. Then, I don’t need to provide such clarification on why such sentence was added in 3GPP CT1 technical specifications during any AWG meetings etc.  Regarding Ivo’s comment on his second comment, i.e. two sets of message ids,  I do not agree with Ivo’s interpretation, i.e. 4401 – 6399 are reserved message identifiers for CMAS only.  As I already clarified, it is described in TS 23.041 that 4401 – 6399 are intended as PWS range in future versions of the present document.  It was not described as “CMAS range”.  In addition, TS 22.268 used “General PWS Requirements” that are applied for both CMAS based warning and ETWS based warning. With such legacy usage on “PWS” terminology, it shall be interpreted that 44001 – 6399 are possible to be used for both CMAS and ETWS as well.  So, I still think the C1-200442\_r2 addresses your second comment as well.  Ivo, Wednesday, 12:58  Today:  - a message with ETWS message ID is sent by RAN using ETWS specific broadcast; and  - a message with non-ETWS message ID is sent by RAN using non-ETWS (i.e. CMAS) specific broadcast.  Assuming that ePWS can be used both in countries which use the ETWS specific broadcast and in countries which use non-ETWS (CMAS) specific broadcast, we should have two sets of message IDs.  So, C1-200442\_r2 is NOT OK.  Peter, Wednesday, 13:36  What Ivo wrote is not necessarily always true. There exist RAN Node implementations that do not look at the Message ID to distinguish between CMAS and ETWS. Have a look at C1-200226, the LS from RAN3 which is postponed to the next meeting.  There are implementations that look at the presence of the Concurrent Warning Message Indicator IE. If this indicator is present, then it is CMAS, otherwise it is ETWS. The reason for this choice is that the Message ID is supposed to be transparent for the RAN Node and the Concurrent Warning Message Indicator is not, this indicator is intended to be used by the RAN Node and is not sent to the UE.  Having said that, there are indeed implementations that do look at the Message ID as you indicate in your comment below.  However, we should first discuss if we want to use ETWS-like broadcast for ePWS devices with no user interface and CMAS-like broadcast for ePWS devices that have a user interface, but cannot display the full text of a warning message. If that is the case, then we need 2 sets of Message IDs.  Furthermore, if we decide we need a set of Message IDs for ETWS-like broadcast then we also need to discuss the need for an ePWS specific value for the Warning Type IE, because without that we cannot use the ETWS Primary Notification.  Hyounhee, Wednesday, 13:50  I uploaded revised version (file name: C1-200443\_r3.doc) in “Drafts” folder of “Inbox’ folder.  Thank you for providing the clarification on the current RAN network procedure. I missed that point.  Now I fully understood why Ivo proposed two sets of message identifiers.  If only single set of message identifiers are specified, it seem to need to introduce the new network procedure from the perspective of RAN networks in order to decide what SI needs to be used to broadcast a warning message.  It is not acceptable to have any network change by Rel-16 ePWS work so I think two sets of message identifiers are only solution without any RAN network change as you suggested even though device manufacturers need to take care of two sets of message identifiers.  I think this approach is much less painful at this point because it is required for new type of devices, not for legacy devices while keeping the legacy network architecture without any network change for such new type of devices.  However, I will address this ETWS case during AWG meetings to see whether there is a good way to have the single set of MIs for PWS, i.e. both ETWS and CMAS because in practical service scenario, I don’t think that 3GPP networks need to deal with both ETWS and CMAS at the same time once they are deployed in places in any country.  It may take long time until the conclusion is made out of 3GPP meetings. So I took Ivo’s suggestion.  Peter, Wednesday, 14:03  There are more complications.  A new ETWS message replaces ongoing broadcast; in ETWS there is no concurrent broadcast. This implies that in networks where a mix is used of ETWS and CMAS, that the next ETWS message cancels all ongoing ETWS and CMAS broadcast and this includes all ongoing warning message broadcast to citizens (the current CMAS/EU-Alert/KPAS service). I'm pretty sure that this is not what we want.  We never specified how ETWS and CMAS can work together in a single network.  Therefore, in countries that have a PWS for citizens (like Korea with KPAS), we can't add ePWS in such networks with ETWS-like broadcast, unless we seriously modify the specifications to make it possible to broadcast ETWS Primary Notifications concurrently with CMAS messages.  If we don't want that, then the only solution is to broadcast ePWS messages as CMAS-like messages; concurrently with any other CMAS messages. This implies a few things:  - we don't need 2 sets of Message IDs and we don't need an ePWS specific value for the Warning Type IE;  - in CMAS the Warning Message Content IE is mandatory (see TS 36.331 on SystemInformationType 12). For devices that have no user interface, this IE is useless but since it is mandatory, it will have to be populated with 82 octets of (useless) padding characters. I think we should add a note somewhere to clarify this.  Peter, Wednesday, 14:25  Latest draft uses message id range “4368 to 4359”! 4359 is the upper limit for the ETWS range and 4368 is way above it. There was only room for 3 new Message IDs, not for 11 new ones.  Secondly, you didn't modify the second column with values in hex  Ivo, Wednesday, 17:10  C1-200442\_r3.docx addresses my 2nd comment.  However, somehow changes for my 1st comment were lost in C1-200442\_r3. Can we please add text "This message identifier is not applicable to US WEA and Japan ETWS." in the message ID definitions?  About the message id range, Can't we use the message IDs in the 4360-4369 range?  Hyounhee, Thursday, 5:32  Thanks Ivo for pointing out the mistake, I fixed it in a further draft revision. In addition, considering Ivo’s request on adding not applicable for US and Japan, I also changed my mind.  I added “Not applicable for US WEA” for new MIs specified for CMAS case and “Not applicable for Japan ETWS” for new MIs specified for ETWS case because it might be useful to make relevant stakeholders easily recognize this issue during AWG meetings etc that are out of 3GPP.  About Peter’s comments:  I am very unhappy about his continuously repeated comments he made during CT1 meeting in August 2018 when his pCR was not selected as recommendable solution in the conclusion of TR 23.735. You should bring a new study item and work item in order to propose your new ideas.  I fail to understand why he assumed that CMAS and ETWS are running in the single network in the real deployment scenario.  ePWS is operated over the legacy PWS network systems without any change and I don’t think legacy network architecture assumes that both CMAS and ETWS are running by the single network at the same time in the same place when they are deployed in real markets.  Ivo, Thursday, 9:03  Given that message IDs from 4412 to 4422 are marked "ETWS ....", the message IDs from 4401 to 4411 need to be marked "CMAS ...."  Hyounhee, Thursday, 9:27  I didn’t add “CMAS” because there might  be someone else that interpreted it as US WEA as you did. In 3GPP specifications, CMAS term seems to be described in general to be applied for US WEA, EU-Alert, KPAS and others over CMAS by countries. Also CMAS term seems to be described to mean US WEA as you first pointed out that part.So, with the expression “Not applicable for US WEA”, I think those new MIs are for CMAS based messages, not ETWS based messages. I prefer proposed expression as the new ePWS functionality if it is not sensitive to you.  Peter, Thursday, 12:08  In the latest draft revision, a range of Message IDs (4412-4422) was added for ETWS type messages.  For ETWS the Warning-Type iE can be set to earthquake, tsunami, earthquake and tsunami, test, and other. Please explain how ETWS is going to be used in ePWS for example for a volcanic eruption; which value of Warning-Type shall be selected?  Ivo, Thursday, 12:19  About Hyounhee’s “I prefer proposed expression as the new ePWS functionality if it is not sensitive to you.”, this is NOT OK as it encompasses ETWS. What about the message IDs from 4401 to 4411 being marked as "Non-ETWS ...."?  Hyounhee, Thursday, 12:32  To Peter: I don’t assume using the existing Warning Type for UEs with no user interface as you do. I think it should be discussed in SA1 first to define a new Warning Type for UEs with no user interface in order not to give any impact on legacy ETWS procedure in TS 22.268 as new MIs are defined for UEs with no user interface.  So if you explicitly want something at this meeting, I can draft a Liaison to SA1 to request SA1 to deal with this issue in TS 22.268. Without that liaison, I will submit a CR to address this issue in next SA1 meeting.  Ivo, Thursday, 13:08  I would like to repeat that the latest version of the draft revision is NOT OK since semantics of different message IDs are overlapping as e.g. 4401 encompasses 4412.  I propose that semantics of message IDs in range of 4401 to 4411 are changed so that it is clear that they are NOT applicable for ETWS. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | SINE\_5G | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | Signalling Improvements for Network Efficiency in 5GS | |
|  |  | | [C1-200513](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200513.zip) | Work plan for SINE\_5G | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  Revision of C1-198222 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200514](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200514.zip) | No retry in 4G for PDU session type related 5GSM causes | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1943 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status AGreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200547](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200547.zip) | Correction on UE retry restriction on EPLMN | | | China Telecom, Huawei, HiSilicon | CR 1944 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status AGreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200768](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200768.zip) | handling of PDU session authentication | | | Samsung/Grace | CR 2026 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Lena, Thursday, 09:05  In 4.9.3, a note should be added stating “The term "non-3GPP access" used in "SNPN is selected over non-3GPP access " is used to express access to SNPN services via a PLMN.”  Ivo, Thursday, 09:45  the text should either be a NOTE or should be reformulated to be a normative requirement on the UE.  Amer, Friday, 20:04  The proposed new text is not needed, because the NW and the UE behavior is defined  in sc. 6.4.1.4.1:  Lin, Monday, 08:07  As the UE cannot distinguish this case from other cases in which #29 can be used, I second what Ivo proposed, to have a NOTE to remind that in this case, retry is not allowed.  Lin, Thu  Waiting for the rev | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | SAES16 WIs | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | Stage-3 SAE protocol pevelopment for Rel-16 | |
|  | SAES16 | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | General Stage-3 SAE protocol development  **Only revision of agreed CRs from the ad-hoc meeting and DISC paper supporting LS possible** | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200120 | Correcting reference to 5GSM procedures | | | Ericsson / Mikael | CR 1858 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200123 | +CGEV amendment for indicating IP address/type change | | | MediaTek Inc. / JJ | CR 0681 27.007 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200091 | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | SAES16-CSFB | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | Stage-3 SAE protocol development related to Circuit Switched Fall Back | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | SAES16-non3GPP | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | Stage-3 SAE protocol development related to non-3GPP access | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 5GProtoc16 WIs | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | Stage-3 5GS NAS protocol development for Rel-16 | |
|  | 5GProtoc16 | |  |  | | |  |  | General Stage-3 5GS NAS protocol development  Only revision of agreed CRs from the ad-hoc meeting and DISC paper supporting LS possible | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200023 | Correction for AUTHENTICATION REJECT handling | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 1785 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200032 | Correct “ANSDP” | | | Intel | CR 1793 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200037 | Correction to RAT's that can be scanned after E-UTRAN disable due to no voice service | | | Samsung/Anikethan | CR 0482 23.122 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200043 | Emergency service missing condition for performing registration update | | | Intel / Thomas | CR 0483 23.122 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200044 | Listing of 5GMM parameters for EMM cause #12 handling | | | HiSilicon, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 3315 24.301 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200047 | Declare syntactical error when both MFBR uplink and MFBR downlink equal zero | | | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR 1804 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200059 | Correction on NAS transparent container for 5G-4G interworking | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1811 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200062 | Trigger for stopping timer T3511 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1813 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200063 | Correction on T3502 for deactivated value | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1814 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200066 | EMM cause #22 for resetting registration attempt counter | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 3322 24.301 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200067 | Consistent use of additional 5G security information IE | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1816 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200069 | Correction on N26 interface indicator | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 3323 24.301 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200070 | Correction on reference of TS 36.304 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1818 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200072 | Inclusion of 5GSM cause in PDU session release request | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1820 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200073 | PDU session establishment reject with 5GSM #29 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1821 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200079 | Acknowledgement of UCU procedure | | | vivo / Yanchao | CR 1826 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200100 | Correction in handling of persistent PDU session during the mobility registration update | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 1842 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200099 | Procedures for an ETWS/CMAS-capable UE in NG-RAN | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0205 23.041 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200101 | NAS signalling spelling correction | | | Ericsson / Mikael | CR 1843 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200105 | Correction to IEI values | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | CR 1846 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200107 | Correction to UCU procedure abnormal cases on NW side for a new TAI list | | | Ericsson /kaj | CR 1848 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200113 | Correction to the Mapped NSSAI IE | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | CR 1854 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200118 | Correction to AT+CLADN string type | | | MediaTek Inc. / Marko | CR 0682 27.007 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200124 | S-NSSAI value associated with the BO timer applied for all PLMNs | | | MediaTek Inc., Qualcomm Incorporated, Huawei, HiSilicon / JJ | CR 1839 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200096 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200127 | Correcting styles | | | BlackBerry UK Ltd. | CR 3313 24.301 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200014  **This is now a TEI16 change** | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200129 | Abnormal case for service request procedure | | | ZTE | CR 1797 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200038 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200131 | S-NSSAI as a mandatory parameter for interworking with 5GS | | | MediaTek Inc. / JJ | CR 1836 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200093 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200137 | Service Request for PS Data Off | | | ZTE | CR 1799 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200040 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200139 | Usage of SoR-AF function | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell /Jennifer | CR 0486 23.122 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200081 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200140 | Update bullet index to include all NAS transport cases | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell /Jennifer | CR 1827 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200082 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200141 | Correction to 5GMM cause IE | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | CR 1847 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200106 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200145 | Correction to the retransmission timer for the network slice-specific EAP message reliable transport procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | CR 1852 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200111 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200147 | Handling of unsupported SSC mode | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | CR 1794 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200033  Author indicated a revision for Sophia meeting to fix some unlcarity | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200148 | Matching of SSC mode for association between an application and an existing PDU session | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | CR 0069 24.526 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200034 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200151 | Clarification of forbidden PLMN list | | | vivo | CR 0484 23.122 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200053 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200154 | Correction to sending of EPS NAS message container in Registration Request message | | | Samsung/Anikethan | CR 1789 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200028 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200155 | Editorial correction of an input parameter for 5G NAS message integrity protection | | | Samsung/Anikethan | CR 1786 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200025 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200156 | Inclusion of PDU session reactivation result error cause IE | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1810 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200056 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200157 | Deletion of the rejected NSSAI for the current registration area | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1812 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200061 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200158 | 5GMM cause #22 for resetting registration attempt counter | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1815 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200065  Author indicated a revision for Sophia to fix a minor aspect | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200159 | Inclusion of 5GSM cause in PDU session modification request | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1819 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200071 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200160 | Correction on QoS rule/QoS flow synchronization | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1822 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-20000074  MCC is asked to fix the missing semicolon between “session” and “and” as shown below  the SMF decides to continue to use the previous configuration of the PDU session and | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200166 | UE handling of invalid QoS flow description | | | MediaTek Inc. / JJ | CR 1835 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200092 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200167 | UE handling of multiple QoS errors in EPS | | | MediaTek Inc., Qualcomm Incorporated, Ericsson / JJ | CR 1838 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200095 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200168 | Optional IE description for release assistance indication IE | | | MediaTek Inc. / JJ | CR 1837 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200094 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200171 | Correction on NAS COUNT handling for intra-N1 handover | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1824 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200077 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200172 | Correction on Uplink data status IE coding | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1825 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200078  Lin, Monday, 16:01 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200175 | Correction on payload container of type SMS | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 1828 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200083 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200177 | Correcting reference to NAS transparent container IE during S1 mode to N1 mode in 5GMM-CONNECTED mode | | | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR 1805 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200049 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200181 | Corrections on 5GMM cause #91 "DNN not supported or not subscribed in the slice" | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 1834 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200090 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200187 | Handling multiple QoS errors during a PDU session establishment procedure | | | Qualcomm Incorporated, MediaTek Inc. / Amer | CR 1807 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200051 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200190 | Correction on N26 interface indicator | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1817 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200068 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200191 | Abnormal case for UL NAS TRANSPORT | | | ZTE | CR 1800 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200041 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200192 | Mapped EPS bearer contexts deletion | | | ZTE | CR 1798 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200130  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1ah-200039 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200196 | Corrections on UE-initiated NAS transport procedure initiation | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 1829 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200176  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1ah-200084 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200201 | Abnormal case handling for 5GMM cause value #90 along with a PDU SESSION MODIFICATION REQUEST message | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 1840 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200097 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200203 | Service area restrictons, condition for UE out of allowed tracking area list and RA is missing | | | Ericsson /kaj | CR 1853 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  There was a late request for a revision, some editorial  Revision of C1ah-200170  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1ah-200112 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200205 | Reject non-emergency PDU session request attempt while registered for emergency services | | | Ericsson /kaj | CR 1845 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200104  **There was a reservation to raise concerns to this CR in February i.e., to not sending it for CT plenary for approval. Potential issues:**   * **make the reason for change (scenario) clearer so implementers would understand the scenario when they need to implement this.** * **to (re-)consider updating the proposal by using a reject cause different than #90 to the UE.** | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200208 | Correcting unimplementable condition regarding N26 interworking support detection | | | BlackBerry UK Ltd., Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 1781 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200183  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1ah-200086 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200211 | Maintain Selected EPS NAS security algorithms during N1 mode to N1 mode handover | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Cristina | CR 1784 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200197  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1ah-200019 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200212 | Correction to handling of a PDU session for emergency service at SOR | | | MediaTek Inc. / Marko | CR 0488 23.122 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200204  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1ah-200202  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1ah-200169  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1ah-200116 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200332](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200332.zip) | Handling of unsupported SSC mode | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | CR 1794 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status AGreed  Revision of C1ah-200147 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200515](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200515.zip) | Deletion of the rejected NSSAI for the current registration area | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1812 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status AGreed  Revision of C1ah-200157 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200620](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200620.zip) | Dual-registration requirements for EHPLMNs | | | Intel, Qualcomm Incorporated / Vivek | CR 1974 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  NEW CR for this WID, out of scope of the meeting | |
|  |  | | [C1-200680](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200680.zip) | Reject non-emergency PDU session request attempt while registered for emergency services | | | Ericsson /kaj | CR 1845 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status AGreed  Revision of C1ah-200205  Lena, Thursday, 09:03  It does not seem justified to add the possibility for the AMF to reject a non-emergency PDU session establishment request from an emergency-registered UE with cause “congestion”. In this case, the reject is not due to congestion, it is due to the fact that the UE is emergency-registered  Sung, Saturday, 05:50  Supports the Cr  Lena, Monday, 00:46  Thanks for Additional Info, FINE with the CR  Kaj, Monday, 10:50  All ok | |
|  |  | | [C1-200719](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200719.zip) | Corrections in specifying reasons for errors | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 1834 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status AGreed  Revision of C1ah-200181 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200631](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200631.zip) | S-NSSAI as a mandatory parameter to support interworking with 5GS | | | MediaTek Inc., Ericsson / JJ | CR 1836 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status AGreed  Revision of C1ah-200131 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200678](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200678.zip) | Service area restrictions, case missing for when UE is out of allowed tracking area list and RA | | | Ericsson /kaj | CR 1853 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200203  Moved from 16.2.8 | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 5GProtoc16-non3GPP | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | Stage-3 5GS NAS protocol development related to non-3GPP access | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | ATSSS | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects of Access Traffic Steering, Switch and Splitting support in 5G system  Is TS 24.193 sufficiently stable to be sent to CT#87-e for approval? | |
|  |  | | C1-200301 | MA PDU session is not supported | | | Motorola Mobility, Lenovo | CR 1862 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Revision of C1-200004 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200313](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200313.zip) | Comparison of solutions for performance measurement function (PMF) protocol | | | Ericsson / Ivo | discussion Rel-16 | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-200314](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200314.zip) | Performance management function protocol | | | Ericsson / Ivo | pCR 24.193 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-200110  Alternative to C1-200655  Peter, Monday, 19:46  I have not seen much of discussion on the protocol for ATSSS Performance Measurement Function Protocols where we have competing CRs in C1-200655 (Apple) and C1-200314 (Ericsson).  f the situation does not change (e.g. one company withdrawing), then we will postpone both CRs out of the meeting and try resolving this in the next meeting.  Krisztian, Monday, 19:57  Agrees with Peter  Krisztian, Tue, 20:32  The technical voting on the solution for Performance Measurement Function Protocol (PMFP) scheduled for CT1#122 was cancelled because CT1#122 face-to-face meeting was cancelled and converted into CT1#122-e electronic meeting. The situation since CT1#121 has not changed, i.e. C1-200314 and C1-200655 are alternative proposals and CT1 should re-schedule the technical voting for CT1#123. **Hence, I am proposing to postpone C1-200314**. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200404](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200404.zip) | Minor Correction to ATSSS container IE desciption | | | China Mobile | CR 1903 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200456](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200456.zip) | Discussion on handling of clause 5.2 of TS 24.193 | | | ZTE / Joy | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  Related to CRs in C1-200457, C1-200458 and C1-200459, describes two alternatives  Atle, Thursday, 17:13  This topic has a knock on effect on other CRs to this meeting, thus I think that we must attempt conclusion on where to specify this as soon as possible.  Generally speaking, if we can justify to specify a new feature in a TS of 25 pages versus a TS of 625 pages, the smaller TS is as I see it preferable.  Looking at the current version of TS 24.193, it looks like we can justify this text in TS 24.193. I do not think the clauses in question look misplaced.  Consequently I **am in favor of keeping these subclauses in TS 24.193 and only remove the EN in TS 24.193 clause 5.2**.  Roozbeh, Thursday, 17:24  Seconds Atle, keep in 24.193  Roozbeh, Thursday, 18:21  **Suppot to keep text in 24.193**  Joy, Friday, 04.51  Can go either way, but Christian and Jennifer preferred 24.501 approach, as asked for feedback  Lazaros, Monday, 00:02  Nokia prefers to move text to 24.501  Joy, Monday, 09:55  ZTE soupports moving to 24.501  Atle, Monday, 16:15  Concerned about shifting this to 501  Roozbeh, Monday, 22:26  Keep text in 24.193  Krisztain, Tuesday, 00:40  Keept text in 24.193  Joay, Tuesday, 02:42  Explaining while moving text to 24.501 is possible  Chen, Tuesday, 14:55  Keep this in 24.193  NO to alternative 1  Joy, Tuesay, 16:11  Acknowledging email from Chen  JJ, Thu, 04:55  Our preference is alternative 1 (moving it to 24.501). | |
|  |  | | [C1-200457](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200457.zip) | Move the content of clause 5.2 out of TS 24.193 | | | ZTE / Joy | pCR 24.193 Rel-16 | Postponed  Based on authors request  Alternative 1 described in C1-200456  Atle, Thursday, 17:14  See my comments to [16.2.5\_C1-200456]  I think this text is useful in TS 24.193 and **I do not agree with this CR.**  **Christian, Saturday, 15:38**  **Supports this, text needs to go to 24.501**  add both Huawei and HSilicon as co-signers of any revision of C1-200457 and C1-200458 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200458](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200458.zip) | Introduction of multi-access PDU connectivity service | | | ZTE / Joy | CR 1920 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Based on authors request  Alternative 1 described in C1-200456  Atle, Thursday, 17:14  See my comments to [16.2.5\_C1-200456]  I think this text is useful in TS 24.193 and **I do not agree with this CR.**  **Christian, Saturday, 15:38**  **Supports this, text needs to go to 24.501**  add both Huawei and HSilicon as co-signers of any revision of C1-200457 and C1-200458 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200459](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200459.zip) | Remove editor's notes | | | ZTE / Joy | pCR 24.193 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Alternative 2 described in C1-200456  Partially overlapping with C1-200413  Atle, Thursday, 17:15  I support removing the Editor’s Note in 5.2, as I think this text is useful in TS 24.193  For the Editor’s Note in 5.2.4, this EN is also removed by C1-200413  Krisztian, Friday, 07:18  Supports this CR  Cristian, Saturday, 15:45  we are against agreeing C1-200459  Roozbeh, Thursday, 18:21  [16.2.5, C1-200456, C1-200457, C1-200458]Z  prefer to keep the clauses in 24.193. No need to move them. With that I think the related CRs can be withdrawn. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200461](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200461.zip) | Clarification on multi-homing and UL-CL funtionalities in MA PDU Session | | | ZTE / Joy | pCR 24.193 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200630](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200630.zip) | Correction of "a different PLMN" | | | MediaTek Inc. / JJ | pCR 24.193 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200655](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200655.zip) | ATSSS Performance Measurement Function Protocols and Procedures | | | Apple, Deutsche Telekom, Charter Communications | pCR 24.193 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-199051  Alternative to C1-200314  Ivo, Thursday, 09:48  refers to IETF draft-ietf-ippm-stamp-option-tlv-03 which does not exist. Thus, the solution cannot be reviewed.  Krisztian, Friday, 17:58  is available at: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-ippm-stamp-option-tlv-03>  Peter, Monday, 19:46  I have not seen much of discussion on the protocol for ATSSS Performance Measurement Function Protocols where we have competing CRs in C1-200655 (Apple) and C1-200314 (Ericsson).  f the situation does not change (e.g. one company withdrawing), then we will postpone both CRs out of the meeting and try resolving this in the next meeting.  Krisztian, Monday, 19:57  Agrees with Peter  Ivo, Tue, 23:52  TDoc submission deadline was 17th Feb 2020.  Start of meeting was 20th Feb 2020.  draft-ietf-ippm-stamp-option-tlv-03 was made available only on 21st Feb 2020.  Given that draft-ietf-ippm-stamp-option-tlv-03 contains major part of the solution of C1-200655, unavailability of draft-ietf-ippm-stamp-option-tlv-03 at submission deadline implies that the solution cannot be reviewed at the time set for TDoc review, i.e. between the TDoc submission deadline and the start of meeting.  **Thus, I request that C1-200655 is postponed.** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200747](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200747.zip) | service request for multiple access PDU session | | | Samsung /Grace | pCR 24.193 Rel-16 | Postponed  Based on request from authro  Roozbeh, Thursday, 18:50  why is it important that the UE must be registered in different PLMNs and why this cannot be generic? If it can be generic then to me this is covered by bullet a and b  Lazaros, Friday, 23.08  We do **not see the need for the CR**. As described in "4.22.7 Adding / Re-activating / De-activating User-Plane Resources of TS 23.502 re-activation is always the same.  SangMin, 01:08  don’t understand what “confirm the same PDU session ID activated on the other access” means, and why this is required.  So in bullet y), 1) seems not needed. | |
|  |  | | C1-200760 | ATSSS 5GSM capability indication | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2024 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  LATE | |
|  |  | | [C1-200789](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update1\C1-200789.zip) | Clarification on link-specific address/prefix | | | ZTE / Joy | pCR 24.193 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200460  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Roozbeh, Thursday, 18:21  Wants text to stay in 24.193  Krisztian, Friday, 07:29  Some rewording of a NOTE  Joy, Sunday, 16:49  Ok with Krisztian suggestin  Krisztian, Sunday, 21:16  There was problems with the email subject, fine now with Joy’s reply | |
|  |  | | [C1-200807](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update1\C1-200807.zip) | MA-PDU session activation in Restricted Service Area | | | InterDigital / Atle | pCR 24.193 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-20799  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200317  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200112  Mikael, Thursday, 13:23  CR seems to introduce a new term: “MA-PDU session establishment procedure”. Could we either add a definition, or maybe better, reword to e.g.:  “PDU session establishment procedure for an MA PDU session  Atle, Thursday, 16:00  Agrees that something needs to be done, provides some options  Mikael, Thursday, 16:48  Would it make sense to align with wordigin in 24.501  Roozbeh, Thursday, 17:04  This to me is not specific to ATSSS. It seems to belong perhaps to 24.501 or 24.502. Moreover, the wording seems to be stage 2ish.  Roozbeh, Thursday, 18:14  Repeats some comments  Atle, Thusrday, 18:14  Acks Mikae  Krisztian, Friday 06:56  Also vote for "UE-requested PDU session establishment procedure for MA PDU session”.  Roozbeh, Friday, 07:42  Moreover the content of the CR seems to be against what the highlighted text in yellow says. The CR proposes that the UE may initiate a PDU session in non-3GPP access vs. this stage two does not allow that and only allow the UE to act upon notification.  Is there any other related concept in stage 2 which I have missed?  Atle, Friday, 08:37  Don’t agree that this is stage-2 wording, gives examples, asks for concrete proposal from Roozebeh  Roozbeh, Fridday, 21:02  Some comments/ …**should be first resolved in either SA2 or 24.502 or 24.501**. Note that I am not against to have something like that in the ATSSS, but I do not understand why it should be structured and prioritized as you are proposing.  Just a question if this was brought up in SA2 before? I asked my “people” but they didn’t recall.  Atle, Monday, 13:51  Announcing that this will be revised to 799, all comments taken on board  Atle, Monday, 13;51  Atle, Mopnday, 13:52  Explaining the reationale to Roozbeh, hope this addresses the concern  Mikael, Monday, 14:19  Is Fine  Atle, Monday, 14:30  Acknowledging to Mikael that there are some nits, however, would like that 24.193 rapporteur takes them on board  Mikael, Monday, 14:48  Fine if Joy can do this  Atle, Monday, 15:09  Indicate the rev is 807  Joy, Monday, 16:08  Will correct all the spelling problems in the spec  Roozbeh, Monday, 19:25  Still asking questions  Can the UE in the same circumstance establish a single access PDU session?  2- Can the UE in the same circumstance establish a single access PDU session and also allows the network to upgrade it to MA PDU session?  If not, then I am wondering why? If yes, then the first bullet is not specific to ATSSS and should be in TS 24.501 or TS 24.502.  Please share your opinion  Atle, Monday 21:33  Explaining to Roozebeh, why this is ATSSS  Roozbeh, Tuesday, 03:44  Some explanation, . I have no comment on you latest revision. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200927](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update2\C1-200927.zip) | ATSSS PCO parameters for 5G-RG | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 3211 24.008 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200286  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  CR#3211 has a dependency on agreement of pCR in [C1-200287](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200287.zip) or any of its revisions  Joy, Thursday, 09:43  CR lacks "MA PDU request" in PCO as specifined in 4.12.3.2 of 23.316:  Atle, Thursday,20:55  Cover page, issue with the two octet logic  Roozbeh, Thursday, 18:03  Issues with clause numbering and reference between 286<>287  Ivo, Friday, 10:14  Explains that the numbering and that 286 can fail in plenary if 287 does not get agreed to Roozbeh  Ivo, Fridy, 11:25  Eplains the two octets to atle  Ivo, Friday, 11:35  Explains to Joy, solution limits the amount of ATSSS information in 24.008 and provides the maximum information in 24.193.  Roozbeh, Saturday, 02:18  Fine as such, asking whether CR cover page can be used to hint at linke  Ivo, Monday, 08:58  Dependencies will be sorted out via chairman notes  Atle, Monday, 14:05  Can live with Ivo’s explanation, isn isnot the showstopper  Joy, Tuesday, 10:53  CR fine, just needs 3bit instead of 2  Roozbeh, Tuesday, 16:26  Looks ok | |
|  |  | | [C1-200928](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update2\C1-200928.zip) | Contents of ATSSS PCO parameters for 5G-RG | | | Ericsson / Ivo | pCR 24.193 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Krisztian is fine  Rae is fine, email Friday  Revision of C1-200287  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Joy, Thursday, 09:42  The definition of ATSSS request PCO parameter in 6.1.x.2 needs to be update according to 5.32.6 of 23.501.  The UE ATSSS capability includes:  1) ATSSS-LL functionality with any steering mode  2) MPTCP functionality with any steering mode and ATSSS-LL functionality with only Active-Standby steering mode  3) MPTCP functionality with any steering mode and ATSSS-LL functionality with any steering mode  The definition can consider to follow the way made in C1-200565 from Apple.  Rae, Thursday, 10:00  ATSSS request IE itself overlaps with the “MA request type”bit because if UE wants to request the PDN connection to be one leg of MA PDU session, ATSSS request IE will be used, vice versa.  “MA request type”bit seems unnecessary.  Roozbeh, Thursday, 18:04  Long list of comments on the proposal  Atle, Thursday, 20:50  Logice with two octests not optimal as described in “The ATSSS response with the length of two octets PCO parameter container contents are coded as shown in figure 6.1.x.3-1 and table 6.1.x.3-1.”  Ivo, Friday, 10:00  To Atle .Does this address the comment or would you like me to change the PCO parameter name?  Ivo, Friday, 10:51  Anwers Roozebhe, is this fine??  Ivo, Friday, 10:52  To joy, will align with the agreed way forward for C1-200565  Ivo, Friday, 12:02  Answers Rae, proposes way forward, does it work for Rae?  Roozbeh, Satursday, 06:15  Asking some clarification on the usage of R-bit  Rae, Monday, 02:23  In my understanding, the “MA PDU request”indication in PCO mentioned in SA2 spec can correspond to the ATSSS request PCO parameter without the “MA request type”bit.  If UE wants to establish PDN connection as a leg of MA PDU session, no matter as the first or the second leg, UE will provide ATSSS request PCO parameter in the PCO IE, if not, UE will provide.  Joy, Monday, 08:38  Further suggestions on how the CR should look like  Ivo, Monday, 09:13  1) in this solution, coding of the ATSSS request PCO parameter in PCO IE depends on values of other IEs present in PDN CONNECTIVITY REQUEST. This is not a good design.  2) this solution is not easily extendable to indicate additional MA PDU session related actions, as the coding of the PCO parameter depends on other IEs present in PDN CONNECTIVITY REQUEST and they might be the same for those MA PDU session related actions.  If CT1 has preference for such design, I can update the CR but IMO, it is suboptimal solution.  Atle, Monday, 14:08  If all other are fine with param-names as is, I’m fine aswell  Ivo, Tuesday, 10:27  Updated the CR, rev06 available in drafts, this is according Joy’s proposal  Krisztian, TUed, 20:15  Indicating some changes in his 565  Ivo, Tue, 22:46  To Krisztian and Joy  New rev Main changes on top of those indicated below:  - ATSSS capability indications aligned with revision of C1-200565, with exception of value 000 which is "reserved" instead of "ATSSS not supported". (Reason: 5G-RG supporting ATSSS request PCO parameter supports ATSSS). Also not-assigned values are considered as "reserved".  Roozbeh, Wed, 00:23  Fine with it  Ivo, Wed, 09:01  Ivo provides a new rev  Joy, Wed, 10:46  Fine with rev3 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200929](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update2\C1-200929.zip) | Procedures for establishment of a PDN connection in EPS as a user-plane resource of a MA PDU session | | | Ericsson / Ivo | pCR 24.193 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200288  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Joy, Thursday, 10:06  5.2.x, 1) and 2) under bullet c): need to update ATSSS capability with steering mode according to 5.32.6 of 23.501.  Roozbeh, Thursday, 18:06  Not a strong opinion except The text should say an MA PDU session and not a MA PDU session.  Atle, Thursday,20:30  5G-RG only, would it be useful to also identify this from the title of the new subclauses  Ivo, Tuesday, 10:28  Provides a rev  Roozbeh, Tuesday, 16:29  Fine with the draft  Krisztian, Tue20:13  Latest rev looks good | |
|  |  | | [C1-200930](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update2\C1-200930.zip) | PDU session ID usage when the UE is a 5G-RG and requests establishment of a PDN connection in EPS as a user-plane resource of a MA PDU session | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 3326 24.301 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200289  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Roozbeh, Thursday, 18:06  Not a strong opinion except The text should say an MA PDU session and not a MA PDU session.  Ivo, Monday, 08:29  Rev in drafts folder, any comments | |
|  |  | | [C1-200939](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update2\C1-200939.zip) | MA PDU session and one set of QoS parameters | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 1896 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Atle is fine  Revision of C1-200396  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Atle, Thursday, 21:03  Problems with how requirements are written, wants some rephrasing  Ivo, Friday, 09:14  Provides some suggestion on rephrasing  Atle, Friday, 09:58  Fine with the rewording wants a NW mentioned  Ivo, Monday, 08:17  please see a draft revision of C1-200396 in drafts, Changes:  - it is clarified that the UE accepts modification or deletion received via either access.  Any comments? | |
|  |  | | [C1-201000](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200406.zip) | Minor Correction to Traffic descriptor component type identifier of ATSSS rules | | | China Mobile | pCR 24.193 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Lazaros is fine  Revision of C1-200406  Roozbeh, Thu  OK  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Roozbeh, Thursday, 18:17  This is not one-to one mapping with the table in 24.526. Connection capability needs to be reasoned. I do not think there is any need for it for the ATSSS.  Xu, Friday, 03:57  Asks two questions from Roozbeh  Roozbeh, Friday, 19:43  So all I can say that mapping is not one-to one and as long as I am aware the connection capabilities are applicable for URSP but not for ATSSS, unless you can provide a reason why it should be there  Xu, Saturday, 15:01  Defending the case replying to Roozbeh  Roozbeh, Sunday, 00:27  , I do not think you can justify the need for connection capabilities for ATSSS as to avoid having separate lists in PCF for URSP and ATSSS (If that is what you meant in your mail). As I pointed out in my previous mail, you need to educate SA2 or CT1 why the connection capability is needed for ATSSS. If you have a reason for that then you need to describe it in a discussion paper or cover page as in SA2 or CT1. I am not trying to make this difficult. I simply do not see any motivation in your CR for it, except mapping to URSP list which is not a valid reason , IMHO.  Xu, Sunday, 06.50  Still discussing with Roozbeh  Lazraros, Sunday, 16:52  reference to 24.526 has to be preserved  Connection capabilities were discussed within CT1 and considered not applicable to ATSSS  Joy, Sunday, 17:37  Existing wording with ref to 24.526 brings confusion  Some proposal for reworded text  Roozbeh, Sunday, 23:31  To Joy, proposal may imply that the traffic descriptor is different in TS 24.193 than from TS 24.526, which is not true  Some potential way forward described  Xu, Tuesday, 03:11  Thanks to Lazaros, think a bit further about the CR  Xu, Wed, 06:07  Joy Roozbeh, Lazaros, all comms taken on board, new rev provided  Roozbeh, Thu, 19:48  Provides a modification of the rev, if that is agreed, then Moto co-signs  Xu, Thu, 04:31  Took all on board, mot as co-signer | |
|  |  | | [C1-201008](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update4\C1-201008.zip) | ATSSS Non-MPTCP traffic support | | | Apple | CR 1948 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Roozbeh, Thursday, 22:35  hinting at a need for small change, will let it go  Krisztian will do this  Revision of C1-200870  New rev, joy suggestion taken on board  Mikael, Thu, 14:57  On 1008  We now use all bits of octet 3, so this could also be corrected:  “All other bits in octet 4 to 15 are spare and shall be coded as zero, if the respective octet is included in the information element.”  If you have time and want to revise, please also add Ericsson as co-signer.  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200565  Joy, Wed, 10:28  Still comments  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  C1-200299 and C1-200565 are competing  Mikael, Thursday, 12:39  I think it makes sense to limit the setting of ATSSS support indication as proposed in Motorola CR (C1-200299): “If the UE requests to establish a new MA PDU session or if the UE requests to establish a new PDU session and the UE allows the network to upgrade the requested PDU session to an MA PDU session”  I propose to use one parameter with sufficient codepoints to cover the needed indication alternatives, rather than 3 individual one bit indications. With proposed separate indications there will be several invalid setting combinations that need to be evaluated and handled whereas a combined parameter limits such cases. Maybe a two bit parameter is sufficient?  Roozbeh, Thursday, 18:31  Comments via attachement  Krisztian, Friday, 05:52  Agrees with comments from Mikael, rev in the drafts folder  Rae, Friday, 07:35  Comments questions on the revision, go with existing 2 bits  Krisztian, Friday, 07:50  Asking Rae to check the rev in the drafts box  Mikael, Friday, 10:52  Rev5 almost fine, some minor comment  Roozbeh, Friday, 22:13  Some changes requested for the start of the change in subclause 6.4.2.2 and then delete the paragraph coming after the changes  Wants to see a condition (is in the rev, )  Supports Mikael  Krisztian, Sunday, 21:59  Provides new rev in drafts, asking whether this is good  Lazaros, Sunday, 23:56  Additional suggestions  Krisztian, Sunday, 00:35  New rev, asking Lazaros whether this is fin  Joy, Tuesday, 10:21  Two bits is not enough for future extensions  Krisztian, Tue, 20:08  Extended to 3bits, provides rev  Krisztien, Tue, 20:20  To Ivo, new rev  Ivo, TUed, 22:32  for ATSSS-ST field, it should be clear whether the not-assigned values are to be treated as "reserved" or as "spare". My expectation is "reserved".  Mikael, Tue, 23:02  Only a very minor fix: multiple bit parameters are specified as “(octet 3, bits 4 to 6)”  Joy, Wed. 04:33  Now asking for 4bit | |
|  |  | | [C1-201009](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update4\C1-201009.zip) | ATSSS Non-MPTCP traffic support | | | Apple | pCR 24.193 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200871  Fixes all Roozbeh comments, Moto as cosigner  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200567  Roozbeh, Wed, 20:20  Minor comment, wants to co-sign  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Roozbeh, Thursday, 18:31  Coments on cover page  Krisztian, Sunday, 23:58  Fine with comments, fixed them, changed some bullets | |
|  |  | | [C1-201014](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update4\C1-201014.zip) | Correction of release of user-plane resources | | | MediaTek Inc. / JJ | pCR 24.193 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200629  --------------------------------------------------------  Roozbeh, Thursday, 18:37  Edits  JJ, Frieday, 04.43  Fine with Roozbeh comment  SangMin, Monday, 01:27  Similar concerns as expressed for C1-200628 are also applied to this pCR.  We need to distinguish two cases: release of the PDU session and release of the user plane resources (for the PDU session).  According to the stage 2, it is clear that the PDU session release procedure actually \***release**\* the PDU session, and when it is MA PDU, it will release the PDU session for all access or over a single access. And if the user plane resources have to be released for MA PDU session (for one or both accesses), it shall be done via the CN-initiated deactivation of UP connection procedure (not NAS procedure).  So in your pCR, you seems to mix both cases.  JJ, Monday, 08:14  Explains to SangMin  .. this pCR is proposed to distinguish the two cases, i.e.,  release of the PDU session and release of the user plane resource.  FYI, the access type IE is included in PDU SESSION RELEASE COMMAND (in TS 24.501 CR#01500) for the second case.  Your comments and suggestions are welcome, thanks a lot.  SangMin, Wed, 03:49  Some suggested rewording  Other than that, we are fine with this pCR.  JJ, Wed, 12:43  Provides a rev, asking SangMin and Roozbeh whether this is fine  Joy, Wed, 14:25  Still comments on the rev  Lazaros, Wed, 20:07  Does not agree with the latest rev  SangMin, Thu04:02  Does not agree with Lazaros  JJ, Thu, 04:32  Further explanation to Laza  Lazaros, Thus, 11:15  To jj, sangmin, agrees with the text | |
|  |  | | [C1-200988](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update4\C1-200988.zip) | Removing editor's note | | | Motorola Mobility, Lenovo | pCR 24.193 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200413  -----------------------------  Partially overlapping with C1-200459  Atle, Thursday, 17:15  Note that this Editor’s Note also is removed by C1-200459.  Roozbeh, Thursday, 18:23  No issue to remove the editor’s note. Just remove one of them so it does not collide with C1-200413.  Joy, Sunday, 16:45  Asking to see what the outcome of 0459 is before any revision is done because of overlap  Roozbeh, Wed, 21:05  Providing a rev, updated cover page  Joy, Thu, 02:14  Requests to merge the overlapping part in ZTE's C1-200459 to your p-CR  Roozbeh, Thu, 02:28  Providing rev, fine with Joy’s request  Joy, Thu,, 02:55  Fine with the rev | |
|  |  | | [C1-200989](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200299.zip) | 5GSM capabilities for MA PDU session | | | Motorola Mobility, Lenovo | CR 1860 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Rae is fine, Fri, 10:15  Revision of C1-200299  C1-200299 and C1-200565 are competing  Joy, Thursday, 09:41  Understands background, however, there are issues, proposes to merge this CR in C1-200565  Roozbeh, Thursday, 22:59  That is a good point. I will incorporate the changes and share with Apple to see if they agree to merge the CR.  Second part of 299 will be kept and not merged with Apple Cr  Krisztian, Friday, 04:52  Fine to merge part of 299 into his CR  Rae, Friday, 10:39  Fine with the coding, procedure text for interworking to be moved  Roozbeh, Wed, 01:08  Providing rev that shows the parts that are not merged | |
|  |  | | [C1-201012](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update4\C1-201012.zip) | Considering allowed NSSAI when establishing MA PDU session | | | MediaTek Inc., ZTE / JJ | CR 1976 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200627  ----------------------------------------  Mikael, Thursday, 13:29  change ”is allowed to” to “may”  JJ, Friday, 04:54  Fine with comment form Mikael  Lazaros, Friday, 23:08  Could you please elaborate on your intention with this CR? ……. Prefers previous version  JJ, Monday, 04:11  Answers to Lazaros, is this fine?  JJ, Wed, 09:25  Provides the rev, asking asking Mikael and Lazaros whther this is ok  Lazaros, Wed, 19:30  Ok with the revision  JJ, Thu, 09:45  A new minor rev to make synch the doc with 629 | |
|  |  | | [C1-201013](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update4\C1-201013.zip) | UE Handling upon receipt of PDU session release command | | | MediaTek Inc. / JJ | CR 1977 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Open questions  Atle can can agree it, but needs some confirmation from SangMin and JJ  Revision of C1-200628  Lazaros, Friday, 23:09  Commenting  1) In 6.3.3.1 ”if the PDU session is an MA PDU session” to be added  2)” and the UE shall create a PDU SESSION RELEASE COMPLETE message” to be added.  3) Editorials in b)  is->are not available, shall further process  JJ, Monday, 04:12  Will take comments from Lazaros on board  SangMin, 01:21  We need to distinguish two cases: release of the PDU session and release of the user plane resources (for the PDU session).  But the Cr mixes the case.  JJ, Monday, 07;25  Explains the case to SangMin, pls confirm this addresses the concerns  SanMin, Tuesday, 10:50  Concrete proposal for rewording  JJ, Wed, 11:23  Proives a rev, asking for comemnts  Joy, Wed, 15:49  Requests a change  Lazaros, Wed, 20:33  Additional comments  SangMin, Thu04:02  Does not agree with Lazaros  JJ,. Thu, 07:47  Providing a rev  SangMin, Thu 08:42  Looks fine, but wants some terminology changes  Joy, thu, 10:33  To SangMin  As clause 5.2 is expected to move to 24.501 with a CR in next meeting, the terminology can be fixed in that CR.  I will co-work with you all to make sure all the terminology fixed when prepaing that CR before the meeting.  As for this one, the editor's note is not so necessary.  Lazaros,Thu, 11:02  FINE with the rev  SanMin, Thu, 11:26  Fine with the rev  JJ, Thu, 11:37  Has taken all comms on board, provides a revision | |
|  |  | | C1-201044 | MA PDU session is not supported | | | Motorola Mobility, Lenovo | CR 1862 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Document was provided on time!!!  Joy, Friday: FINE  Rae, Friday, FINE  Revision of C1-200990  Revision of C1-200303  Joy, Thursday, 16:59  One question for clarification:  The UE has an MA PDU session established over 3GPP access and then moves to a different PLMN.  In this case, Does the UE need to initiate to release the MA PDU session if the UE learns that this network does not support ATSSS during the mobility registration procedure?  One comment:  In 6.4.1.2, "If the UE is registered to a network supporting ATSSS" is better than "If the network supports ATSSS". Why not use the same wording in the beginning of the three paragraphs?  Roozbeh, Thursday, 17:21  Regarding your question: This is more based on registration area; meaning if the UE changes the registration area and need to re-register, the UE shall release the related PDU sessions and act appropriately when establishing the new PDU session. Meaning the UE shall not establish any MA PDU session if it does not receive any indicator from the network supporting MA PDU session.  Regarding your comment; that is fine with me  Krisztian, Friday, 06:30  Provding some comments  Rae, Friday, 07:45  Why to mandate UE to provide whether network supports ATSSS to the upper layers, especially in the case that UE only supports ATS-LL  Roozbeh, Friday, 21:39  To Krisztian  bullet 1) no to the wording  bullet 2) ok  bullet 3) some concerns  Roozbeh, Friday, 22:00  Explains to Rae, why he has chosen, existing wording in 24.501  Rae, Monday 03:00  Even upper layer(application layer) does not know whether the network supports ATSSS and triggers 5GSM to establish MA PDU session, the 5GSM can still stop sending the signaling. This not sending behaviors at 5GSM are already included in the same CR.  Roozbeh, Monday, 23:03  To rae, The CR is for the case when the registration area sends an indicator on the NAS layer to the UE, that the ATSSS has supports. The UE when receiving this, will forward it to the upper layer. Now the upper layer does not initiate any MA PDU session since the  registration area does not support the MA PDU session.  Rae, TUesay, 04:50  Agrees with most of the changes, requests an additional change in the CR  Joy, Tuesday, 07:52  In the end, SA2 agreed Ericsson's solution which defining ATSSS indication provided by the AMF during the registration procedures. The reason why this solution won is because it based on the assumption that support of ATSSS is homogeneous in a PLMN. With this assumption, this solution is the most easy and clear way  Roozbeh, Tue, 18.08  Does not agree with Joy, conclusion we at Motorola cannot agree to this note from the SA2 report.  I am happy to draft an LS to SA2 to get clarification on this if that is a way forward.  Roozbeh, Tue, 20:57  To Rae, arguing why this is needed  Mikael, Tue, 22:47  Support Roozbeh, need the sentence “In a UE with the capability for ATSSS, the network support for ATSSS shall be provided to the upper layers.”  Sentence is challenged by Rae  Roozbeh, Wed, 06:03  Latest rev  Rae, Wed, 06:30  Stil has questions to Roozbeh  Rae, Wed, 06:49  More questions to Roozbeh  Joy, Wed 07:26  Proosaing an EN, no LS to SA2  Roozbeh, Wed, 19:52  Confirming Rae’s understanding  Roozbeh, Wed, 20:02  Answering more questions from Rae  Rai, Thu, 05:45  Not really clear, OK to wait for SA2?  Roozbehm, Thu, 07:09  Further explaining to Rae  Krisztian, thus08:48  Apple to co-sign  Joy, THusd, 09:45  Asks for an EN | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | eNS | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects on enhancement of network slicing | |
|  |  | | [C1-200393](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200393.zip) | Adding NSSAA result indication into Network slicing indication IE of the CONFIGURATION UPDATE COMMAND message | | | China Telecommunications | CR 1894 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Frederic, Thusday, 18:47  Editorials, cover page  Shzehn Friday, 11.15  Will revise once more coments are there  Ricky, Friday, 12:14  Challenges the need  The **CR needs to be rejected, not needed**  Kaj, Friday, 17:35  more or less the same view as Ricky.  The **CR should not be agreed**  **Vijay(Apple), Monday, 04:26**  **do not see a necessity for this change**. The result of NSAAA would be communicated appropriately via the Allowed and Rejected NSSAI in CONFIGURATION UPDATE COMMAND. Thus, there is no extra benefit of having an additional indicator added in Network Slicing Indication.  Sung, Monday, 19:33  Agrees with Ricky, Fei, Vijay, **not needed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200394](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200394.zip) | Adding NSSAA failed or revoked to 5GSM and 5GMM cause IE | | | China Telecommunications | CR 1895 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Frederic, Thursday, 18:53  Cover page  Xu, Friday, 03:21  Asks for clarificaitonon defining new cause  Shuzeh, Friday, 11:39  Sees new 5GMM cause as needed, what would be alternative  Fei, Friday, 11:40  #62 could be sufficient  If a new cause is introduced, UE behaviour needs to be specified  Ani, Friday, 12:08  Agrees with Fei, #62 is sufficient  Xu, Friday, 15:35  Sees now the idea of the CR, still some questions  Sung, Sunday, 21:56  Introduction of new 5GMM and 5GSM cause values is not justified, what would it bring  Roozbeh, Monday, 20:23  Cause value #62 should cover the 5GMM case  For 5GSM case,  please see the Cr in C1-200415 if it covers your purpose. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200401](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200401.zip) | Definition of Rejected NSSAI due to the failed and revorked NSSAA | | | vivo / Yanchao | CR 1901 24.501 Rel-16 | Merged in C1-200352 and its revsions  Mail from Yanchao, Saturday, 07:19  Covered by C1-200352. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200354](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200354.zip) | Correcting condition for Network Slice-Specific Authentication and Authorization | | | Samsung Electronics Polska / Ricky | CR 1890 24.501 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-200697 and its revisions  Covered by C1-200697  Ricky, Thursday, 15:39  **Fine to merge this CRinto 697** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200405](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200405.zip) | Updating requirements and descriptions of NS for NSSAA | | | China Mobile | CR 1904 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  The revision was not Provided  See also C1-200352  Fei, Wed, 07:59  Revision is required as this overlaps with 352  CR seems to have formatting issues  Xu, Wed, 15:56  Provides a rev  Xu, Thus, 02:28  Takes all comments on board, Fei, is this fine?  Fei, Thu, 09:31  There are still some overlaps with the revision of 0683. **I suggested the** **changes in the subclause 4.6.2.2 are reverted**.  The format of the CR are still strange in my PC.  @Frederic, whether the format of CR looks OK in your PC.  Xu, thu, 12:24  Provides a rev, avoids the overlap | |
|  |  | | [C1-200407](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200407.zip) | Clarification of T35xx timer during Network slice-specific authentication and authorization procedure | | | LG Electronics / Sunhee Kim | CR 1905 24.501 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-2007901 and its revisions  Covered by C1-200432  Sunhee, Tuesday, 10:19  Fine to merge into rev of 791 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200415](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200415.zip) | Network-requested PDU session release due no longer available S-NSSAI | | | Motorola Mobility, Lenovo, China Mobile | CR 1906 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  See also C1-200395, 0704, 0695  Three different proposals in C1-200704,0695 and C1-200415  Atle, Friday, 07:50  Not clear why the existing code point is not enough, why a new cause code is needed  Ani, Fridy, 12.15  Same conern as with 704  5GSM cause would not be needed due to the following reasons:  Roozbeh, Saturday, 00:04  To Atle, reason for need the cause value in 5GSM is that the  PDU session is already established and the SMF releases the PDU session. Looking at 5GSM cause value, we could not find one we could use and therefore a new one was proposed  Lin, Monday, 11:16  Agrees with Ani, IMHO, the locally release could work well without providing any cause value as I do not see any existing cause value is appropriate for this case.  Atle, Monday, 15:15  Not yet convinced  I agree that some SM-cause must be communicated to the UE as the cause is a mandatory IE, but in my view, an important point is to secure that a slice that is not any longer appropriate to use must be moved to the rejected NSSAI. This is done by the “Rejected NSSAI”.  Is this done in a separate CR to this meeting, or is the intention to only convey to the UE a SM-cause and don’t use the “rejected NSSAI”?  Roozbeh, Monday, 20:20  To atle, see your point and I can incorporate your comment if you believe there is a need for it in this CR. I have not submitted any other CR than this otherwise  **Sung, Monday, 20:46**  agree that performing a local release on both sides should work. I would like to draft an LS to SA2 cc-ing CT4 for stage 2-stage 3 synchronization.  LS number??  Atle, Monday, 21:06  how we can handle tearing down of a context with the cause-values provided by SM and additionally taking into account the cause-codes in rejected NSSAI as needed. As I see it, your CR is currently covering the 1st part. **Some statements on the 2nd aspect would be good**.  Roozbeh, Monday, 22:37  To Atle, however, not addressing the 21:06 email  On the second thought, wasn’t your comment already covered with last meeting’s CR that the NAS MM signaling will convey the rejected NSSAI with the appropriate cause value (e.g. due to NSSAA failure or revocation)? IF that is the case so nothing else needs to be done. This CR is for a general 5GSM cause value for unavailable slice.  Fei, Tuesday, 03:42  Agrees with whate Ani said  Kaj, Tuesday, 08:09  Now a number of companies propose, related to NSSAA to use local release at the UE and the NW which is not aligned with stage 2.  **I don’t see why we should have different handlingsfor similar case depending on NSSAA or not.**  Andto my understanding it is not possible to change legacy NW slicing aswill break backward compatible.  Ani, Tuesday, 11:36  Considering these, it looks right for the UE and the SMF to simply release the PDU sessions locally based on the updated allowed/rejected NSSAI.  Tsuyoshi, Tuesday, 13:05  UE to be able to understand the cause of release (req from SA2)  If an LS out, then ask “why” instead of saying “we don’t need it”  Network needs to release RAN resources anyway  Sung, Tue, 18:59  Refers to prefivous discussion, I think that C1-**200704, 0695, 0415 need to be rejected**.  Tsuyoshi, Wed, 00:57  With the facts above, it is not entirely correct to make a decision based on the feature for Rel15 Rejected NSSAI. **In sum, we shall not agree on any CR unless it is clarified in SA2.**  Sung, Wed, 02:20  Does not agree with some of Tsuyoshis arguments  Fei, Wed, 03:21  To Tsuyhosh  It only specifiied that the AMF indicated the appropriate cause value to the SMF. This does not mean that the SMF needs the signalling to the UE.  Even the 5GSM signalling is needed to the UE, then the appropriate cause value does not mean new cause value.  SA2 will not determine which cause value is used for this case.  Lin, Wed, 10:06  **No new work for this**  **Roozbeh, Wed, 20:59**  **Providing new rev**  **Sung, Wed, 21:06**  **Explaining to Roozbeh the request for postponing this CR**  **Roozbeh, Wed, 21:33**  **Explaining why the CR should go forward**  **Roozbeh, Wed, 21:48**  **Fine if the CRs 704, 695, 415 get postponed**  **Sung, Wed, 21:54**  **Still discussing**  **Roozbe, Wed, 22:25**  **Disc goes on and more**  **Fei, Thu, 02:13**  **Even the new cause value is defined over the N11 interface, we (CT1) should also discuss whether a new 5GSM cause is required to the UE.**  **Roozbeh, Thu, 0224**  **Ongoing**  **Ani, Thu, 04:17**  **Further discussion** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200428](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200428.zip) | Work Plan for eNS in CT1 | | | ZTE | Work Plan Rel-16 | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-200494](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200494.zip) | Prevention of indefinite wait for completion of the network slice-specific authentication and authorization procedure | | | InterDigital / Atle | CR 1929 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Based on email from the author  See also C1-200429.  Fei,Friday,  Indicating that comments on 429 apply on 494 as well  Fei, Friday, 1032  Clarifiyin gin NOTE is fine for Fei  Sung, Monay, 19:13  Note is fine  Peter, Wed, 13:24  Clarifying that there is a need to update this CR | |
|  |  | | [C1-200509](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200509.zip) | Requested NSSAI creation from configured NSSAI excluding pending NSSA | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1939 24.501 Rel-16 | Not pursued  See also C1-200724  Mahmoud, Friday, 20:42  Our view is aligned with what is proposed in C1-200724 but it requires other updates, updates are all given  Sung, Monday, 21:28  My view is also more aligned with C1-200724 than C1-200509  Lin, Tuesday, 05:30  Acknowledges that the scenarios are very complex and the a DISC paper might be needed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200510](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200510.zip) | Remove mobility restriction after NSSAA | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1940 24.501 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-200602 and its revsions  See also C1-200602  Lin, Friday, 03:40  Wants to merge 510 into 602 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200512](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200512.zip) | Consistent name for NSSAA | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1942 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200572](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200572.zip) | EPS selection when the UE is deregistered due to NSSAA failure | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 1950 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Based on email of author  Fei, Thursday, 09:43  Understands motivation, However I do not think the change is required  Sunhee, Friday, 09:05  Therefore, I think that It is not recommended to specify only one case.  Also, I think it is technically unnecessary.  Sung, Saturday, 05:10  Same as Fei  Kundan, Monday, 07:37  Wants to understand, where the case would already be covered (from Fei)  Fei, Monday, 07:54  Explains to Kundan  Kundan, Monday, 08:09  To Sunhee  In general, when the UE receives any cause value in a NAS message, the EPS behaviour is also specified. Here in the cause code handling nothing has specified. We should give indication to the implementer that the UE may select E-UTRAN to connect to EPS as the UE may have EPS service.  Kundan, Wed, 12:04  Explaining to Fei why this is needed, and some rewording  Kundan, Wed, 14:03  Provides a rev, would need review  Sung, Wed, 17:42  It does not any value and only brings confugsion.  Fei, Thu, 02:55  I do not see any need | |
|  |  | | [C1-200574](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200574.zip) | Handling of NSSAA at non suppoting AMF | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 1951 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Fei, Thursday, 09:58  As commented during the last meeting, **this should be resolved in the CT4 spec**.  If the AMF does not support the eNS, then the UDM shall not send the corresponding S-NSSAI to the AMF. This is also clarified in the 23.501.  Kaj, Thursday, 10:26  If the AMF does not support NSSAA then no related NSSAA at all will be performed.  In addition, the UDM shall not send S-NSSAIs subject to NSSAA to non-NSSAA-supporting AMF according to 23.501.  Kundan, Thursday, 11:04  Replies to Kaj  Kaj, Thursday, 11.15  Clarifies a question from Tsuyoshi, not shown in my inbox  Kundan, Thursday, 11:18  Replies to Fei  Kaj, THursdy, 11:20  Not convinced by Kundan’s reply, sees an update of AMF-UDM interface needed -> but that is CT4  Sunhhe, Friday, 09:45  I would like to understand what scenario can be happened.  Could you clarify the scenario mentioned in this CR ?  Sung, Sunday, 02:28  Same view as Kaj  Kundan, Monday, 06:57  Explaining the case, If other delegates have similar understanding as me the then I withdraw the CR.  Tsuyoshi, Monday, 08:16  For my clarification, one is saying that UDM can not handle such issue because it does not know whether or not the AMF support NSSAA. And another is saying AMF can not handle such issue because non NSSAA capable AMF has no clue about it.  Is my understanding correct that we have an issue but this is not under CT1's responsibility?  Sung, Monday, 21:54  but the issue occurs because a network deployer does not pay enough attention for the warning that is in the spec | |
|  |  | | [C1-200575](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200575.zip) | PDN connection establishment and NSSAA | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 1952 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Fei, Thursday, 10:06  The CR requires the UE to remember the S-NSSAIs in the pending NSSAI even when the UE receives the allowed NSSAI to replace the pending NSSAI. **I did not see any requirement on this**.  Additionally, the stage 2 requirement is only about the SMF/PGW behaviour and the PGW can reject the PDN connection establishment procedure in the S1 mode**. There is no requirement on the UE side for this issue.**  **Sung, Saturday, 05:14**  Agrees with Fei, furthermore, how is the association between DNN and S-NSSAI stored in the UE? Do you mean URSP? Is it used by the UE is S1 mode?  Kundan, Monday, 12:23  Answers to Fei and Sung  Sung, Monday, 22:29  Asking for more clarifity, is there any text that URSP can be used in EPS. Second, even if URSP can be used in EPS, this idea should impact 24.526, not 24.501.  Fei, Tuesday, 02:56  I am still NOT convinced that the CR is needed. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200576](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200576.zip) | NSSAA revocation function | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 1953 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200577](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200577.zip) | Intersystem selection procedure when all allowed S-NSSAI are subject to NSSAA | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 1954 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Fei, Thursday, 10:08  CR requires the UE to remember the S-NSSAIs in the pending NSSAI even when the UE receives the allowed NSSAI to replace the pending NSSAI. I did not see any requirement on this.  After the UE received the allowed NSSAI, then UE does not know which S-NSSAI is subjected to the NSSAA procedure.  **Therefore the CR is not needed**  **Sung, Saturday, 05:34**  **Agrees with Fei, Not just for NSSAA, there are other cases in which no PDU session can be continued in S1 mode, e.g. all PDU sessions are related to DNN or IPv6 multi-homing. Even for those cases, we have not specified any specific UE behavior like this.** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200582](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200582.zip) | Correction UE behaviour when the UE recives the pending NSSAI | | | SHARP | CR 1958 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200584](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200584.zip) | Correction related the rejected NSSAI | | | SHARP | CR 1960 24.501 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-200462 and its revisions  Yanchao indicated this is fine  Yoko, Wed, 08:29  I’d like to marge C1-200584 into C1-200462. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200601](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200601.zip) | Discussion on eNS | | | BEIJING SAMSUNG TELECOM R&D | discussion | Noted  Lin, Friday, 02:40  Comments for all the proposals, | |
|  |  | | [C1-200604](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200604.zip) | Re-initiation of NSSAA for a registered UE | | | BEIJING SAMSUNG TELECOM R&D | CR 1972 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Based on request of author, THU  Fei, Thursday, 10:15  not happy to add the Editor' note for this issue at the current stage. If some work is required for the impact on the 5GSM procedure in the next meeting, then CAT F can be used for the essential correction.  Tsuyoshi, Thursday, 10:56  CR comes from discussion paper C1-200601(Proposal 4). And looking at "To avoid this unnecessary signalling, these S-NSSAIs can be indicated as pending NSSAI and sent to the UE with the Configuration Update Command message." in the discussion paper, we share the same view as Mahmoud. And, C1-200694 (NEC) is proposing a solution  Mahmoud, Thursday, 17:53  Regarding the EN in my CR, I can revise the CR as indicated in the discussion paper i.e. send a pending NSSAI to the UE containing the S-NSSAIs for which NSSAA is to be re-initiated.  I understand NEC (Tsuyoshi) has a similar proposal which I am also fine to purse if the necessary changes are captured.  Happy to merge with Tsuyoshi if some changes are made  Lin, Friday, 02:40  Believes CT1 can proceed without EN and provides a proposal  Mahmoud, Friday, 04:21  I am fine with the proposal of using the pending NSSAI and therefore the UE will not send any 5GSM request for any of the S-NSSAIs in the pending NSSAI.  However, thinking more about it, I believe the only exception to this would be that the UE should be allowed to release the PDU session if triggered by the UE. The release should be allowed since: a) if NSSAA succeeds, the UE will be allowed to send a request to release, or b) if NSSAA fails, the session will anyways be released by the network.  Please let me know your comments on this and we can avoid the EN and perhaps move forward with NEC’s paper. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200605](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200605.zip) | Additional triggers for deletion of pending S-NSSAI | | | Samsung/Anikethan | CR 1973 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200689](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200689.zip) | No default S-NSSAI | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 1988 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Lin, Friday, 06:27  Providing 3 comments  Ani, Fridacy, 14:51  Two comments  Sung, Monday, 19:49  This is not a change for eNS, rather 5GProtoc16, asking to postpone | |
|  |  | | [C1-200690](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200690.zip) | Missing NSSAI storage for rejected NSSAI due to the failed or revoked network slice-specific authentication and authorization | | | NEC | CR 1989 24.501 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-200352 and its revisions  Covered by C1-200352  Tsuyohsi, Friday, 09:26  Fine to merge into revision of 352 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200691](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200691.zip) | Updating NSSAI status in AMF | | | NEC | CR 1990 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Roozbeh, Friday, 20:07  Seems related to 694, Is this proposal needed? IMO, as the S-NSSAI is currently allowed, the AMF can keep it allowed until the NSSAA procedure is completed and then decide whether to 1) keep as allowed or 2) reject it.  Tsuyoshi, Monday, 09:40  Question to Roozbeh, Things which is not clear to me is what would be the expected behavior in NW side (AMF/SMF) if a UE requests a PDU session establishment with a S-NSSAI that AMF invokes the NSSAA?  Lin, Monday, 10:42  Based on below SA2 text in 23.501, only the final result (success or failed) will be included in the NSSAA status stored at the AMF, so for the revoking of NSSAA, the AMF needs not to do so.  Tsuyoshi, Monday, 11:11  Reacting to LIN, Rationale for this CR is that NW can react on any request from the UE for the S-NSSAI(pending) appropriately.  Sung, Monday, 22:25  hard to understand what is the difference between scenarios covered by 0691 and 0694. Do you mean that even if 0694 is not agreed, there is a reason to discuss 0691  Roozbeh, Tuesday, 00:19  maintain my position. Please see my other mail which should be realted to this -> position was negative  Tsuyoshi, Wed, 01:46  To sung, Yes. They are decoupled.  To our understanding, if not by AAA server, it is only the AMF can maintain the status of NSSAA for specific S-NSSAI in the system.  The AMF requires the status of NSSAA for specific S-NSSA because for re-NSSAA, it is defined that AMF uses an S-NSSAI from allowed NSSAI. If we don't maintain "pending" status in AMF and keep it as "allowed" even if the re-NSSAA is ongoing, there may be such implementation that AMF wrongly uses the S-NSSAI.  Sung, Wed, 02:125  I see. How the AMF handles and stores should be left up to implementation because there is no multi-vendor operability issue. **So now I disagree with the CR.**  Lin, Wed, 09:38  Explaining that this can be achieved via provide a updated rejected NSSAI to include the invoked S-NSSAI(s) to the UE via UCU, which was already covered by our CR C1-200511.  Tsuyoshie, Wed, 10:19  Explaining to Lin the rational  Sung, Wed, 17:40  Arguing with Tsuyoshi  Tsuyhoshi, Thu, 01:24  Arguing with Sung  Sung, Thu, 13:12  Keeps his position, there willnot be a conclusion | |
|  |  | | [C1-200692](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200692.zip) | AMF updates the UE NSSAI storage after network slice-specific authentication and authorization is completed | | | NEC | CR 1991 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200693](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200693.zip) | NSSAI status in AMF | | | NEC | CR 1992 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Roozbeh, Friday, 20:10  Proposal seems fine, some rewording needed  Tsuyoshi, Monday, 09:05  Provides rev in drafts folder, is this fine for Roozbeh?  Lin, Monday, 10:52   1. The 1st change given in sub 4.6.1 was covered by LGE’s CR C1-200352 and hence better to take it out.” 2. For allowed NSSAI,  rejected NSSAI and pending NSSAI, as they are allocated by the AMF, so I believe they will be naturally stored as UE’s context in the AMF. That is to say, without you proposed changes, these three NSSAI will be stored at the AMF until, e.g. it needs to be updated, or UE switch-off, or enter deregistered state.   Tsujoyhi, Monday, 11:09  First comment aligned  About 2nd comment, so I feel that we have the same understanding that those three NSSAIs are maintained in the AMF. For clarification it is good to explain how they are stored in the first place because the TS already captures the requirement that AMF manages(moving from pending status to allowed status or rejected status) the status of NSSAI.  How do you think about update ver as follows?  Sung, Monday, 22:17  **We don’t see a need to specify** that AMF stores pending NSSAI in the UE 5GMM context. There are many parameters that are created by the AMF and provided to the UE and it is true that some of the parameters are stored in the AMF. However, unless you make change to all those parameters, this CR only brings confusion.  Roozbeh, Monday, 00:09  Editorial comments  Tsuyoshi, Wed, 01:43  Pending NSSAI management in AMF is already captured in TS24.501. For additional clarification, we believe it is good to clarify how in the first place the AMF do that.  Sung, Wed, 02:24  I disagree from the perspective of consistency. It bring confusion towards other existing parameters. AMF implementors are not only handling this parameter.  Lin, Wed, 09:44  So I think the CR is correct but is not needed.  Tsuyohsi, Wed, 10:07  Thinks this is needed  Kaj, Wed, 10:23  Same view as Lin**, not needed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200694](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200694.zip) | NSSAI storage at UE – pending NSSAI | | | NEC | CR 1993 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  See also 0511, 0683  Lin, Friday, 04:28  NOT so convinced that the AMF needs to include the pending NSSAI in CONFIGURATION UPDATE COMMAND message.  Tsuyoshi, Friday, 05:10  Explains to Lin his rationale for the Cr  Mahmoud, Friday, 05:49  Same view as Tsuyoshi  Sunhee, Friday, 08:37  Some questions form Tsuyoshi  Tsuyoshi, Friday, 09:21  Explains to Sunhee his rationale for the Cr  Kaj, Friday, 12:56  share the same view as others that pending NSSAI in UCU command is not needed and should not be there.  Nothing is missing in the current spec as te EN gets deleted by 00683  Roozbeh, Friday, 19:52  We are  not sure about the benefit of this proposal…..Unless you have some work in SA2 to backup you proposal what we suggest is if an S-NSSAI is currently “allowed”, keep it as “allowed” until the NSSAA procedure runs and only if the NSSAA fails, then change the status from “allowed” to “rejected”.  Sunhee, Monday, 10:09  Explains his position asks for clarification from Tsuyoshi, If it is right, I will withdraw my comments.  Tsuyhoshi, Monday, 10:37  To Sunhee, Indeed. S-NSSAI#B is the foreseen scenario used as reasoning in reason for change.  Tsuyoshi, Monday. 13:46  Explaining to Roozbeh why the CR is needed  Sung, Monday, 17:52  issue was discussed previously and the current specification reflects the agreement that the UE is allowed to initiate 5GSM procedures for such an S-NSSAI  Mahmoud, Monday, 18:07  Supports the CR, …. To Sung: I don’t see an advantage to allow signalling (for setting up of new PDU sessions for which S-NSSAI is subject to re-NSSAA) that may end up requiring more signalling to release these sessions if the associated S-NSSAIs fail NSSAA.  Sung, Monday, 18:24  Summarizes the issue, **still against the proposal**  Kaj, Monday, 23:03  Explanation … **Given this I don’t see such optimization motivated**.  Fei, Tuesday, 02:52  **Shares Kaj view, i.e. negative**  Sunhee, Wed, 07:09  **Asking question on the proposal**  **Fei, Wed, 07:15**  Clarifies to Sunhee, only for config update command  Sunhee, Wed, 07:27  Acks Fei  Kaj, Wed, 10:12  Some answers to SUnhee | |
|  |  | | [C1-200695](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200695.zip) | Release of PDU sessions due to revocation from AAA server or re-auth failure | | | NEC | CR 1994 24.501 Rel-16 | Not pursued  Email form Tsuyoshi, Wed, 10:46  See also C1-200415 & 0704  Three different proposals in C1-200704,0695 and C1-200415  Ani, Friday, 12:28  Our comment wrt this CR would be the same as that given for C1-200394, C1-200415, C1-200704.  **We think there is no need to have a specific 5GSM cause**  Roozbeh, Friday, 20:19  do not believe that there is any need for two Cause values for this case so **we object to this CR**. The CR which should go forward is C1-200415  Kaj, Sunday, 23:46  Slightly different understanding regarding related stage-2, **don’t see that additional causes are needed** with the PDU session release message  Tsuyoshi, Monday, 02:14  Some explanation to Kaj, and Roozbeh ….  #After all,  SA2 defines two separate call flow for revocation and authentication failure in TS23.502. And consequently, they define the 5GSM cause requirement that we need an appropriate 5GSM cause for authentication failure related PDU session release (4.2.9.2 Network Slice-Specific Authentication and Authorization ) and an appropriate 5GSM cause for revocation related PDU session release ( 4.2.9.4 AAA Server triggered Slice-Specific Authorization Revocation ).  **Tsuyoshi, Monday 14:37**  **To ani, explaining why the CR is needed**  **Sung, Monday, 20:46**  agree that performing a local release on both sides should work. I would like to draft an LS to SA2 cc-ing CT4 for stage 2-stage 3 synchronization.  LS number??  Roozbeh, Monday, 23:37  Explaining his position on 695  Fei, Tuesday, 03:42  Agrees with whate Ani said  Kaj, Tuesday, 08:09  Now a number of companies propose, related to NSSAA to use local release at the UE and the NW which is not aligned with stage 2.  **I don’t see why we should have different handlingsfor similar case depending on NSSAA or not.**  Andto my understanding it is not possible to change legacy NW slicing aswill break backward compatible.  Ani, Tuesday, 11:36  Considering these, it looks right for the UE and the SMF to simply release the PDU sessions locally based on the updated allowed/rejected NSSAI  Tsuyoshi, Tuesday, 13:05  UE to be able to understand the cause of release (req from SA2)  If an LS out, then ask “why” instead of saying “we don’t need it”  Network needs to release RAN resources anyway  **Ani, Tuesday, 14:16**  opinion is that a 5GSM cause would not really matter since at the application layer there is more specific and granular cause available, i.e. local policy  Sung, Tue, 18:59  Refers to prefivous discussion, I think that C1-**200704, 0695, 0415 need to be rejected**  Tsuyoshi, Wed, 00:57  With the facts above, it is not entirely correct to make a decision based on the feature for Rel15 Rejected NSSAI. **In sum, we shall not agree on any CR unless it is clarified in SA2.**  **Tsuyoshi, Wed, 01:46**  Yes that could be one of the options for implementation. But as indicated in different mail, our stance is aligned with SA2 requirement (to define "appropriate cause").  Sung, Wed, 02:20  Does not agree with some of Tsuyoshis arguements  **Sung, Wed, 02:30**  The appropriate cause does not have to be new. And I believe that we will never be able to conclude on what “appropriate” means.  Fei, Wed, 03:21  To Tsuyhosh  It only specifiied that the AMF indicated the appropriate cause value to the SMF. This does not mean that the SMF needs the signalling to the UE.  Even the 5GSM signalling is needed to the UE, then the appropriate cause value does not mean new cause value.  SA2 will not determine which cause value is used for this case.  **Lin, Wed, 10:06**  **No new work for this** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200696](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200696.zip) | Clarification on the S-NSSAI not subject to NSSAA included in allowed NSSAI | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 1995 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200698](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200698.zip) | Additional conditions to the presence in the subscribed S-NSSAIs | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 1997 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200702](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200702.zip) | Definition of pending NSSAI | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 1999 24.501 Rel-16 | Merged into 0352 and its revisions  Sung, Monday, 14:43  Fine to merge  Covered by C1-200352. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200704](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200704.zip) | Release of a PDU session due to failure/revocation in NSSAA | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2001 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  See also C1-200415 & 0695  Three different proposals in C1-200704,0695 and   C1-200415  Kaj, Thursday, 10:44  SMF given the current 3GPP specifications is not aware of that the AMF initiated the PDU session release due to revocation or failure of network slice-specific authentication and authorization.  Given this, the **current proposal cannot be agreed.**  statement “*Upon receipt of the 5GSM cause value #29 "user authentication or authorization failed" in the 5GSM cause IE of the PDU SESSION RELEASE COMMAND message, the UE shall release the PDU session.”* seems not needed as it is covered by 6.3.3.3  Lin, Friday, 08:44  Detailed comments  Ani, Friday, 12:03  Fundamental concern wrt the PDU session release part where any SMF signalling towards UE will be redundant.  Roozbeh, Friday, 20:27  3 concerns, contradicts SA2, contradicts 415, wrong cause value  Fei, Tuesday, 03:42  Agrees with whate Ani said  Kaj, Tuesday, 08:09  Now a number of companies propose, related to NSSAA to use local release at the UE and the NW which is not aligned with stage 2.  **I don’t see why we should have different handlingsfor similar case depending on NSSAA or not.**  Andto my understanding it is not possible to change legacy NW slicing aswill break backward compatible.  Tsuyoshi, Tuesday, 13:05  UE to be able to understand the cause of release (req from SA2)  If an LS out, then ask “why” instead of saying “we don’t need it”  Network needs to release RAN resources anyway  Tsuyoshi, Tuesday, 13:05  UE to be able to understand the cause of release (req from SA2)  If an LS out, then ask “why” instead of saying “we don’t need it”  Network needs to release RAN resources anyway  Sung, Tuesday, 15:06  From Fei, Which text from UCU?  Ani, Tuesday, 16;59  We are ok with the contents of the CR.  But we think the LS would not be needed since this does not add any new procedure but rather makes use of an existing procedure in CT1 scope. That said, we are ok to go by whatever is the general consensus wrt the need to send out the LS.  Sung, Tuesday, 17:45  The LS is to indicate that the stage 2 agreement is not aligned with our decision here. Let us see what other companies say.  Sung, Tue, 18:59  Refers to prefivous discussion, I think that C1-**200704, 0695, 0415 need to be rejected**  Tsuyoshi, Wed, 00:57  With the facts above, it is not entirely correct to make a decision based on the feature for Rel15 Rejected NSSAI. **In sum, we shall not agree on any CR unless it is clarified in SA2.**  Sung, Wed, 02:20  Does not agree with some of Tsuyoshis arguements  Fei, Wed, 03:21  To Tsuyhosh  It only specifiied that the AMF indicated the appropriate cause value to the SMF. This does not mean that the SMF needs the signalling to the UE.  Even the 5GSM signalling is needed to the UE, then the appropriate cause value does not mean new cause value.  SA2 will not determine which cause value is used for this case.  Fei, Wed, 03:343  My comment was to add {the similar text in subclause 4.6.3} to the configuration update procedure.  Then the change in the subclause 4.6.3 is not needed.  The comment is applied only to the draft shared by Sung.  Lin, Wed, 10:06  **No new work needed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200724](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200724.zip) | Request S-NSSAI pending the NW slice-specific authentication and authorization | | | Ericsson /kaj | CR 2004 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Based on email from the author  See also C1-200509  Lin, Friday, 04:42  SA2 rquirement is broken, not aligned with some SA2 text, prefers C1-200509  Roozbeh, Friday, 20:32  Fine with the content, wants to see condition at beginning of sentence  Andrew, Friday, 20:35  What is meant with “intends to”  Mahmoud, Friday, 20:42  Our view is aligned with what is proposed in C1-200724 but it requires other updates, updates are all given  Roozbeh, Friay, 21:16  Wording can be improved  Sung, Monday, 21:28  My view is also more aligned with C1-200724 than C1-200509  Lin, Tuesday, 05:30  Acknowledges that the scenarios are very complex and the a DISC paper might be needed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200778](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update1\C1-200778.zip) | Removal of the use of Service area list IE during NSSAA | | | BEIJING SAMSUNG TELECOM R&D | CR 1971 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status agreed  Kai is fine  Fei is fine  Revision of C1-200602  Kaj, Thu, 10:13  For the proposal to mimic the service area restriction there seems to be some parts missing, i.e. the enforcement in the network.  That needs to be covered by the CR.  Mahmoud, Thu,  What is the enforcement on the network side?  Please indicate the current enforcement in 24.501 so that I can take it on board. I have not seen an enforcement on the network side in 24.501.  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Related to DP C1-200601  See also C1-200510.  Lin, Friday, 02:40  Asks for some rewording, wants his 510 to be merged into this one.  Mahmoud, Friday, 03:50  Ok with Lins proposal, some clarification  Lin, Friday, 04:18  Fine  Fei, Friday, 06:36  Fine with alternative in 602, and send an ls to SA2  Kaj, Friday, 15:46  Does not see that a), b), d) are needed  Mahmoud, Monday, 12:45  Explains to Kaj why things are needed  Asking for comments on 778 to make progress  Lin, Tuesday, 01;56  Agreeing with Mahmoud, rev looks good to him  Fei, Tuesday, 02:17  was in the subclause 4.6.2.4, some wording should be added.  Mahmoud, Tuesday, 05:22  Huawei, Hisilicon added as co-signer  Mahmoud, Tuesday, 05:23  Acks Fei’s request | |
|  |  | | C1-200790 | tPending NSSAI update for the configured NSSAI in the CUC message | | | ZTE | CR 1914 24.501 Rel-16 | Current status Agreed  Kaj is fine  Sung is fine  Revision of C1-200431  Lin, Wed, 06:10  Fine  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Kaj, Thursday, 10:17  not yet fully convinced of the proposal, reasons are provided  Summary of changes does not match the changes  Sung, Sunday, 02:24  Our view is that update in configured NSSAI does not directly impact pending NSSAI. Change in configured NSSAI can result in renewal of allowed NSSAI and when allowed NSSAI is renewed, pending NSSAI will be updated as well. So we can simply remove both bullet 5) and the EN  Lin, Monday, 04:13  To Sung and Kaj, Just removing the pending NSSAI works for me.  Lin, Monday, 07:24   1. I have the same comments as Sung, it is a valid case that there is overlapped S-NSSAI(s) between C-SNSSAI and P-NSSAI temporarilly. So just remvoe the 5th existing bullet and the EN is enough. 2. If going to above 1, then cover page needs to be updated. 3. Should be categary F CR.   Fei, Mondy 08:16  Rev in drafts folder, all taken on board | |
|  |  | | C1-200791 | Cleanup for NSSAA message and coding | | | ZTE | CR 1915 24.501 Rel-16 | Current status Agreed  Revision of C1-200432  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  See also C1-200392.  Also covers the changes in C1-200407  Lin, Monday, 07:41  I have a concern on defining a new HPLMN S-NSSAI IE format.  Fei, Monday, 07:49  As indicated to Sunhee, I am fine to go with the proposal in 0392.  Maybe you can check the 0392 discussion.  Fei, Monday, 08:21  New rev in drafts folder, overlap with 392 has been removed, asking Sunhee whether it is fine to merge 407 into revision of 432  Lin, Wed, 09:23  Pls untick UE  Fei; Wed, 09:36  Message IEI is update, i.e. UE is impacte | |
|  |  | | C1-200794 | UE behaviour for other causes in the rejected NSSAI during deregistration procedure | | | ZTE | CR 1913 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200430  Fei,Wed, 03:57  Providing a rev, asking for review  Lin, Wed, 06:08  Fine  Kaj, Wed, 16:30  FINE  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Kaj, Thursday, 09:40  Almost fine, however, Maybe better the UE just ignores S-NSSAIs associated with "S-NSSAI not available in the current registration area" as it does not make sense that the network sends the reject cause for this use case.  Fei, Friday, 03:32  To kaj, as you are now OK with the proposal in the C1-200433, I assume that  you would be also OK with this similar proposal in the deregistration procedure  Sunhee, Friday, 10:12  Change seem not related to eNS, rather 5GProtoc  Fei, Friday, 10:26  Explains CR addresses the UE behaviour regarding the cause #62. In the past few meetings, this cause was handled in the eNS WI. Maybe you can check the agreed CR e.g. C1-196971 in CT1#120 meeting  Lin, Monday, 06:34  Provides detailed comments to Fei  Fei, Monday, 08:13  All comments taken on board, rev in drafts folder | |
|  |  | | C1-200795 | Rejected NSSAI during the initial registration procedure | | | ZTE | CR 1916 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200433  Kaj, Wed, 16:25  FINE  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Kaj, Thursday, 09:41  To my understanding when the UE is deregistered over an access then the TAI list is invalid.  Given this I don’t see why the UE shall remove the S-NSSAI from allowed NSSAI as the UE will not have a TAI list available during initial registration i.e. the UE is not aware about any registration area. But of course, because no TAI list and at least no rejected NSSAI for RA the UE could also request S-NSSAIs from configured NSSAI if available.  The UE could just ignore S-NSSAIs associated with "S-NSSAI not available in the current registration area" as it does not make sense that the network sends the reject cause for this use case.  Fei, Thursday, 12:13  Explains why the situation can occur and something is needed to avoid the deadlock  Kaj, Thursday, 21:10  Acks the explanation from Fei, OK with the CR  Yoko, Friday, 06:11  Commenting that In this case, the UE should be able to use S-NSSAI-A as requested NSSAI in the registration request messgae in new RA.  Fei, Friday, 07:34  Explains to Yoko the rationale  Yoko, Friday, 09:16  Fine with Fei explanation, new questions  Fei, Monday, 04:19  Explains to Yoko why there is no need to add extras  Lin, Monday, 06:21  agree that current ingoring handling is not so good and better to not go this way.  However, provides an alternativ  Yoko, Tuesday, 06:08  Not agreeing with Fei  Fei, Tuesday, 06:57  Does not see the argument from Yoko,  Kaj, Tuesday, 18:26  Almost fine, some chnages on the cover page  Fei, Wed, 03:55  To Kaj, all comments taken on board in the rev  Yoko, Wed, 06:07  Fine with the revision  Lin, Wed, 09:26  FINE | |
|  |  | | [C1-200796](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update1\C1-200796.zip) | Alignment of error codes with 3GPP TS 24.501 | | | InterDigital / Atle | CR 0683 27.007 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  **Revision of C1-200320**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Has to be shifted to 16.2.2**  Revision of C1-200315  Sunhee, Friday, 10:04  the TS27.007 error code names should be change to the same error code name described in TS24.501.  Atle, Friday, 10:29  Will fix this  Atle, Monday, 10:27  This is rvised to 796 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200797](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update1\C1-200797.zip) | Cleanups of the Pending NSSAI | | | InterDigital / Atle | CR 1869 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200318  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200113  Lin, Friday, 09:51  Some minor comment  Atle, Frida, Friday, 09:52  Will take Lin comment on board  Ricky, Friday, 11:39  Wording needs improvement  Atle, Monday, 11:01  All comments taken on board, rev is 797  Sung, Monday, 22:44  I am reluctant to the use of rejected S-NSSAI, which is not defined even though the TS is contaminated with the term. If you want to use it, I request for you to define it in section 3.1.  Lin, Wed, 05:00  To Sung, there are other terms that are used without definition use “rejected S-NSSAI” is fine as it just refers a single S-NSSAI included in a rejected NSSAI.  Sung, Wed, 05:48  Accepts that the spec is contaminated with some undefined terms, can live with it | |
| 17 |  | | C1-200830 | Clarification on HPLMN S-NSSAI | | | LG Electronics / Sunhee Kim | CR 1893 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status agreed  Kaj accepted via email  Revision of C1-200392  Sunhee, Wed, 04:22  Explaining to Kay why “*in the S-NSSAI(s)*”?”  Lin, Wed, 06:05  FIne  Sung, Wed, 16:53  Fine, there are two editorials in the NOTE 5  Sunhee, Thu, 15:19  Comments form Sung addressed  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  See also C1-200432.  Different proposals.  Fei, Thursday, 09:31  CR has some overlaps with CR in the 0432.  In this CR, it is proposed to re-use S-NSSAI IE.  In 0432, a new IE is proposed.  I have no strong preference. However, if re-using the existing IE, then I think it is better to add a table note in the S-NSSAI IE subclause. Then there is no need to touch the description in the subclause 5.4.7.1.  Sunhee, Thursday, 13:04  Fine with comment from Fei,, revises accordingly  Lin, Friday 03:16  Fine with Sunhee proposal, will remove any overlap in revision of C1-200432  Lind, Friday, 09:43  Comment on the rev in the drafts folder  Sung, Sunday, 00:12  It is not entirely clear to me how the CRs (0392 and 0432) will evolve. Thus, let me make my comment based on the current versions.  **This CR (0392) is not needed** because in subclauses 5.4.7.2.1, 5.4.7.2.2, and 5.4.7.3.1, it is clarified that the S-NSSAI IE includes the HPLMN S-NSSAI.  Sunhee, Monday, 00:48  To sung  Could I ask what is your exact opinion ?   1. The intention of CR is wrong. (already HPMN S-NSSAI definition is clear) 2. The intention of CR is correct but way to CR evolve is wrong   Fei and I think HPLMN S-NSSAI definition is not clear, so we think CR changes are needed, (even though the way to CR evolve is not correct).  Lin, Monday, 10:29  I would prefer to re-use the existing IE format but would be fine to add a table NOTE in the Table 9.11.2.8.1, e.g. as below. Note that it is not only for NSSAA but also for the case that when the UE is accessing its HPLMN, provides text for the NOTE  Ricky, Monday, 13:43  Fine in general, similar concern as Sung, a rev of 392 is needed if this should go foreard  Sung, Monday, 22:37  Anyways, now it became clear that a revision of 0392 will clarify something in the coding part, I can live with it.  Sunhee, Tuesday, 09:09  Confirms there is noverlap anymore to Sung  SUnhee, Tuesday, 09:40  Informs that the is a rev2  Kaj, Tuesday, 16:01  Question for clarificaitokn | |
| 5 |  | | C1-200898 | ENs resolution for revoked or failed NSSAA | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1941 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200511  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  See also C1-200683, C1-200694 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200868](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200399.zip) | Update to registration procedure due to eNS | | | vivo / Yanchao | CR 1899 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200399  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Kaj, Thursday, 11:08  problems to identify a scenario that motivates the proposal.  …….Given this, an AMF that receives a S-NSSAI in requested NSSAI that has the status “not-authorized” have to initiate a re-NSSAA procedure following the registration accept message (with the S-NSSAI in the pending NSSAI).  Yanchao, Thursday, 12:31  Explains to Kaj, why the CR is correct  Kaj, Thursday, 21:29  Agrees with some of Yanchao’s explanation, more questions  I’m not yet fully convinced but we are closer.  Yanchao, Friday, 05:13  Explains rational, Kaj, are you OK?  Sunge, Monday, 18:13  **I do not think that** **the stage 2 requirement** on the UE context in AMF including the result of the NSSAA **justifies changes in this CR**  **Yanchao, Tuesday, 09:39**  **Explaining to Sunge why the CR is justified**  Fei, Tuesday, 10:23  Motiviation is fine, but wants to see rewording  Tsuyoshi, Tuesday, 13:30  Does not want to take Fei’s proposal on board  Kaj, Tuesday, 15:40  Intension goes in right direction, but there need to be more changes  Yanchao, Tuesay, 15:58  Offers “optionally” to kaj  Kaj, Tuesday; 17:12  Optionally works, CR is fine  Sung, Tuesday, 17:45  “Optionally” works  Fei, Wed, 03:34  fine | |
|  |  | | C1-200922 | Name of the rejected NSSAI cause values | | | vivo | CR 1921 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200462  Yanchao, thu, 03:54  Added sharp as cosigner  Yoki, Thu  FINE | |
|  |  | | C1-200883 | Correction related the rejected NSSAI due to the failed or revoked NSSAA | | | SHARP | CR 1955 24.501 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-201055  Revision of C1-200579  Lin, wed, 09:30  this revision overlaps with 683  suggests to merge it with 683  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  See also C1-200352.  YOki, Tuesday, 09:39  Rev in the folder, takes out overlap with 00352  Yoko, Wed, 07:14  NEC is now co-signer  Fei, Wed, 07:50  Changes the revision from Yoko  Yoki, Thu  Has taken Fei on board | |
|  |  | | [C1-200960](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update4\C1-200960.zip) | Emergency PDU session handling after NSSAA failure | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2000 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200703  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lin, Friday, 08:14  Fine with the CR , prefer to change to “when the UE has an emergency PDU session established  Fei, Friday, 08:36  "the UE is establishing a PDU session for emergency services." shall not be removed. And it would be fine to change it to "the UE is establishing an emergency PDU session"  Sung, Monday, 19:29  Provides rev in drafts  Fei, Tuesday, 04:16  To sung, looks good  Lin, Wed, 09:56  Fine | |
|  |  | | C1-201049 | Subscribed S-NSSAI marked as default and NSSAA | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 1996 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200958  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200697  Sung, Thu 15:13  Two ENs are included  Mahmoud, Thu, 15:39  If timer permits, ,then proposal for EN change  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Covers the change in C1-200354  Ricky, Thursday, 15:38  Comments on how the CR can be improved, is fine that his CR in 354 gets merged into a revision of this one.  Lin, Friday, 07:55  Detailed comments  Sung, Monday, 19:08  Providing rev in drafts, reflects the comments, has Samsung  Ricky, Tuesday, 11:15  Mostly OK, one issue requires an Editor’s Note  Sung, Tuesday, 17:14  To Ricky, not agreeing that the aspect he raised relates to eNS  URSP should be secured if the UE is not using default ones.  Ricky, Wed, 13:27  Still open question not agreeing with Sung  Sung, Wed, 16:38  To Ricky, if this is a problem then it is one from Rel-15  Mahmoud, Thu, 06:50  Now for Rel-16 with NSSAA, if the AMF selects a default slice that is subject to NSSAA, how can the session be established…? Or will it…?  Sung, Thu, 07:00  TO Mahmoud  If the allowed NSSAI does not include any default ones and the UE does not include anything for the establishment of a PDU session, could you explain how the AMF select an S-NSSAI for the PDU session?  And before we dig this, don’t you agree that this is not related to the scope of the CR? In the first place, I don’t understand why Ricky is asking me to add an EN for the NAS transport procedure that I did not meant to cover.  Lin, Thu, 07:23  FINE with the latest revision  Mahmoud, Thu07:39  Explaining why Ricky concern needs to be addressed  Sung, Thu, 13:00  Arguing with Mahmoud  Mahmoud, thu, 13:20  Don’t agree with Sung  Sung, Thu, 13:41  Still arguing | |
|  |  | | C1-201051 | Deleting Editors note regarding indefinite wait at the UE for NSSAA completion | | | ZTE | CR 1912 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Atle asked for timeout  Revision of C1-200998  Fei, Thu, 15:27  Does not fully agree with atle, anyway provides this revision  Atle??  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200429  Atle thursda,  is asking for more words  Fei, Tursay, 13:26  Offering a rev  Atle, Thu, 14:17  However, I don’t find existing behavior in 24.501 that covers all of this, and would have expected some (most likely normative) statements in 24.501. I think that such text is needed, and I am not keen to remove the editors notes until we have this text in 24.5021 in place.  Fei, Thu, 14:32  Answering to Atle, reason for change is changed  Atle, Thu 15:06  I would really appreciate if **we could take a timeout work on this until the next meeting and get it correct. Given that we are reaching the end-of-r16, I’d like to keep the Editor’s Note in 24.501 until we have fully corrected t**his outstanding topic.  I’m not debating use of NW-timer(s), but I’d like to:   1. Understand that the CT4.mechanism covers all failure / unsuccessful cases 2. See what needs to be documented in 24.501 for the AMF and the UE   \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  See also C1-200494.  Different proposals.  Related to the outgoing LS in C1-200434  Atle, Friday, 08:03  Deleting EN without solution not acceptable, 494 provides a solution  Fei, Friday, 08:31  am not convinced that the timer in the UE is needed. Since when the NSSAA procedure is completed, the AMF will inform the result to the UE either in the allowed NSSAI or the rejected NSSAI.  Then the UE will remove the pending NSSAI. Based on this, the EN can be easily removed. There is no addtional work required in CT1.  Lin, Friday, 10:14  Want a network solution, potentially a NOTE could do  Fei, Friday, 1032  NOTE is fine for Fei  Sung, Monay, 19:13  Note is fine  Fei, Wed, 11:27  Provides a rev  Lin, thu, 05:10  Revision is fine | |
|  |  | | C1-201036 | MA PDU session is not supported | | | Motorola Mobility France S.A.S | pCR 24.193 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  NEEDS TO BE SHIFTED TO 16:2.5 ATSSS  Revision of C1-200992  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200414  Atle, Thu, 15:05  Would you be able to change the “may” to “can” in the 1st section?  -------------------------------------------------------------  Atle, Thursday, 21:06  introductory clause like 4.1 to be informative  Roozbeh, Thursday, 21:16  Hints at cases with mandatory text in introductory clauses of other specs, no better place for it  Krisztian, Friday, 07:09  Cover page to go away, and suggestions  Roozbeh, Friday, 21:53  Accepts some of the comments, but not all  Roozbeh, Saturday, 23.51  Will use pCR template  Krisztian, Sunday, 21:11  the wording "any PDU session related to the ATSSS” potentially confuses the reader in an Introduction section, so it’s better to just reference 24.501 for the complete description.  Lazaros, Sunday, 23:01  We do not see the need for this CR as is, since  1) most of the information mentioned exists already in 23.501  2) the purpose of section 4 was to be informative  More explanation  PRoviddes a shortened version that would be acceptable in drafts  Roozbeh, Sunday, 23::11  To Krisztian, provides a compromise, how about  If the UE does not receive the indication for the ATSSS capability from the AMF, the UE shall not initiate   1. an MA PDU session; or 2. a single access (SA) PDU session which can be upgraded by the network.   Roozbeh, Wed, 05:33  Taking Lazarous on board, rev is provided  Lazaros, Thu, 01:10  Minor comms, wants to co-sign  Roozbeh, Thus, 01:22  To LazarosTaken on board, new rev  Krisztian, Thus, 08:28  All fine, Apple co-signs | |
|  |  | | C1-201042 | Handling of S-NSSAIs in the pending NSSAI | | | LG Electronics / Sunhee | CR 1889 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200813  Revision of C1-200352  SangMin, Thu, 11:18  Providing a rev of 813, askig Sung whether he can live with it  Tsuyoshi, can you live with it  Tsuyoshi, thu, 11:21  Can live with it  Fei, Thu, 11:29  Requesting a change  Kaj, Thu, 12:51  There is still an overlap with 683, provides a way forward  Sung, Thu, 13.19  Has a suggestion for rewording  Roozbeh, Thu, 14:25  If possible, wants to co-sign  SangMin, Thu, 15:02  Overlap with Kaj was missed, yet another rev  SangMin, Thu15:09  Phrased in the proposal from Sung  Sung, Thu 15:13  This works  Lin, Thu, 15:14  Prefers Fei text  Kaj, Thu, 15:31  Fine with the proposal  Sung, Thu, 15:36  Latest rev looks good  Atle, Thu, 15:39  Interdigital OK  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Tsuyhoshi, Tuesday, 05:58  Pls add NEC as co-signer  Sunhee, Monday06:13  Reacting to latest comments form Sung, they are taken on board  Yoko, Tuesday, 06:37  Fine with the rev, pls add Sharp  Yanchao, Tuesday, 08:09  Some minor modifications to the rev  Sung, Tuesday, 16:37  The e-mail thread “[16.2.6\_C1-200694]” reveals that there are some companies who do not want to send pending NSSAI whenever re-auth is initiated.  Lin, Wed, 05:11  Not all his proposals are reflected,  Sunhee, Wed, 06:47  Will add china mobile as co-signer  Sunhee, Wed, 07:09  Acks to Sung that there is some coordination to 694, will be done  Sunhee, Wed, 07:49  Addressing Lins comments  Tsuyohi, Wed 08:09  352 does not relate to 694  Sung, Wed, 17:15  Explaining to Tsyuo  Sung, Wed,  “is initiated for one or more S-NSSAIs, these S-NSSAI(s) will be included in the pending NSSAI. When the network slice-specific authentication and authorization procedure”, i.e. to not include them.  Tsuyoshi, Thu, 01:16  My proposal is "is determined to invoke for one or more S-NSSAIs," instead of "is initiated for one or more S-NSSAIs, ".  Sung, thu, 03.11  The CR has many valuable parts, does not objct to it  Tsuyoshi, Thu, 03:50  Some further disc with sung, no problem with the CR  Lin, Thu, 09:45  Some explanation with Sung  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  See also C1-200318 & 0405 & 0579  Covers the change in C1-200702.  Covers the change in C1-200401.  Covers the change in C1-200690  Sunhee, Thursday, 12:42  Offers an attempt to merge from the above mentioned CRs what is possible to merge. The related revision is their in the inbox/drafts  Tsuyoshi, Thursday, 13:50  Tsuyoshi confirms that 690 is correctly included in in the rev from Sunhee, but wants to see how this evolves  Kaj, Thursday, 14:02  There is an additional overlap with C1-200683  Atle, Thursday, 15:22  Ok to take out overlaps of 318, want to co-sign 352  Sunhee, Frday, 07:11  Acks Atle, new rev in drafts folder  Yoko, Friday, 09:08  Fine to ake out thing sfrom 579  Lin, Friday, 09:43  Some comments  Ani, Friday, 14:18  Issue with the definition of *Rejected NSSAI due to the failed or revoked network slice-specific authentication and authorization*  Yanchao, Saturday, 07:20  I would like to second Lin’s comment of using a shorter name for “rejected NSSAI due to the failed or revoked network slice-specific authentication and authorization” as “rejected NSSAI due to the failed or revoked NSSAA”.  Sunhaee, Monday, 08:39  Vivo is added to latest rev in the drafts folder  Sunhaee, Monday, 08:46  Lin and Yanchao comments fixed.  Sunhaee, Monday, 09:20  Ani comments taken on board, further commenting  Lin, Monday, 0352  Further comments on the rev  Xu, Monday, 11:18  Wants to co-sign, will remove overlap from 405  Sung, Monday, 23:01  Providing comments, requesting that outcome of 694 disc needs to be taken into account | |
|  |  | | C1-201055 | NW slice authentication and authorization failure and revocation | | | Ericsson /kaj | CR 1533 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Tsuyoshi is fine, Friday, 01:22  Amo is fine, Friday, 07:43  Revision of C1-200683  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-198772  Partly overlaps with C1-200511  Tsuyoshi, Friday, 02:29  Asks to undo deletion of EN, to avoid overlap with CT1-200694  Lin, Friday, 04:11  Detailed comments in INBOX, if they are taken on board, then Lin wants to co-sign  Ani, Friday, 14:39  *PLMN and rejected NSSAI due to the failed or revoked network slice-specific authentication and authorization shall be deleted.*  This change is not needed since it is already allowed by local policy for these slices to be re-used.  Providing the UE an allowed NSSAI would not be needed. Just providing the UE with the rejected NSSAI is sufficient. There is already text to remove an S-NSSAI from allowed NSSAI if it is in the received rejected NSSAI.  Kaj, Monday, 17:28  Fine with all of Lin’s ussgestions, wants to know whether to delete the EN three times  Kaj, Monay, 17:49  Replying to Ani, explaining, that this is start from scratch, and want to keep AMF acting correctly  Sung, Monday, 23:10  Believes that revision of C1-200704 covers this already  Ani, Tuesday, 12:58  Thinks some local policy handling is required  Lin, Wed, 10:18  Waiting for the rev  Tsuyoshi, Thu, 01:07  EN needs to stay, otherwise can not agree the CR  Lin, Thu, 0500  Looks good, some very minor comments  Ani, 08:58  But I still stick to my comment that it is not necessary to delete “rejected NSSAI for the failed or revoked NSSAA” every time the UE moves to DEREGISTERED.  Samsung can not agree on that part  Kaj, Thu, 09:08  Will take Lin suggestion on board  Lin, Thu, 09:14  Difficult to understand Ani argument  Ani, Thu, 09:26  Eplains to Lin  Fei, Thu, 09:27  EN can be removed to Tsuyoshi  Kaj, Thu, 09:40  Can revoke removal of the NOTE, if this makes Tsuyoshi agreeing  Fei, Thu, 09:52  Requests the following NOTE:   Whether t  he UE deletes the rejected NSSAA for the failed or revoked NSSAA  when the UE is in 5GMM-DEREGISTERED is implementation specific.  To be added  Ani, Thu, 10:50  “Local policy” can be any of these triggers including DEREGISTERED and is implementation specific. It is an open statement. Hence this NOTE would be redundant. Right?  Hence the suggestion that we just remove that part of the change which asks for deletion of these NSSAI when moving to DEREGISTERED. I am ok with the other changes in the CR.  Kaj, Thu, 11:16  For the progress I am fine to revert the change from the CR without adding a note.  Tsuyoshi, thu, 11:36  Wants to see the EN staying in the spec | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Vertical\_LAN | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects of 5GS enhanced support of vertical and LAN services  TS 24.534 has been withdrawn  Is TS 24.535 sufficiently stable to be sent to CT#87-e for approval  Is TS 24.519 sufficiently stable to be sent to CT#87-e for approval? | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  | Stand-alone NPN | |
|  |  | | C1-200767 | Work plan for CT aspects of Vertical\_LAN | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | discussion Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Tdoc was not provided  Revision of C1-200762 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200587](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200587.zip) | Correlation of SNPN entry stored in ME and USIM | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 1963 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Lena, Thursday, 09:05  we prefer the alternative in C1-200686 which leaves USIM selection up to UE implementation in Rel-16 | |
|  |  | | C1-200591 | Modification of the allowed CAG list | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 1965 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Document was LATE | |
|  |  | | [C1-200599](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200599.zip) | Handlig of PLMN specific NID | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 1969 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Lena, Thursday, 09:03  terminology proposed by this CR is not aligned with that in CT4 spec TS 23.003, current wording in 24.501 fine as is, CR is not needed  Ivo, Thursday, 10:37  not clear what "PLMN defined unique SNPN identity" is, CR might not be needed  Sung, Tuesday, 17:53  Support comments form Ivo, Lena | |
|  |  | | [C1-200333](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200333.zip) | Removal of Editor’s note on the use of the NOTIFICATION message in SNPNs | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | CR 1882 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200334](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200334.zip) | Updating length of NID | | | Qualcomm Incorporated, Ericsson, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell / Lena | CR 0115 24.502 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200470](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200470.zip) | Clarification of the rejected NSSAI cause value | | | vivo | CR 1926 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200505](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200505.zip) | 5GMM cause #72 not used in SNPN | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1936 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Based on request of author, Thurs 09:35  Lena, Thursday, 09:05  change is also covered in C1-200739  Ivo, Thursday, 16:39  **5GMM cause #72 "Non-3GPP access to 5GCN not allowed" can be used to inform the UE that the access to SNPN** via PLMN is not possible (while access to SNPN via 3GPP access is possible)  Lin, Saturday, 09:16  To Ivo Explaining why new cause is needed  Lin, Saturday, 09:20  To Lena  I tend to say it is not the case that “the same change is also covered in C1-200739”.  Actually C1-200739 is going to a totally opposite direction than my CR. So it is not the case that the change of my CR was covered by C1-200739. I will provide my comments on 200739 in a separate email.  Marko, Monday, 07:27  Rel-16 UE shall not attempt directly to SNPN over non-3GPP access.  Nokia's CR in C1-200739 propose the cause would be useful in case the UE attempts indirect access over non-3GPP.  So, **I think cause#72 is potentially useful and should not be removed from SNPN use**.  Ivo, Monday, 12:41  access to SNPN via PLMN is seen as non-3GPP access since NWu is used and NAS handling for non-3GPP access applies.    **Thus, IMO, #72 can be used when the UE attempts to access SNPN via PLMN**.  Lin, Tuesday, 04:00  To Ivo and Marko  Not against the idea, however, different proposal -> Hence, to make the UE handling simpler and future proof, we need a new cause value for accessing SNPN via PLMN is not allowed in R16, while reserve #72 for future release in which accessing SNPN directly via non-3GPP access (e.g. WiFi) is not allowed.  Sung, Tuesday, 05:28  Does not agree with Lin  Lin, Tuesday, 16:34  Does not agree with Sung, provides explanation for the CR  Sung Tuesday, 17:01  Not agreeing with Lin  Ivo, Tue, 19:47  Not agreeing with Lin  Lin, Wed, 04:41  To sung  That is why I said to reuse #72 for accessing SNPN via PLMN is not a future proof way forward.  Sung, Wed, 04:51  TO Lin  Both solutions require clarification on #72 anyways. So I see no big issue of futureproof-ness.  Lin, Wed, 10:30  To me your below proposal sounds a little strange that the NW use a different cause for ‘real’ non-3GPP access but re-used the #72 for a pseudonymous non-3GPP access. It is also not consistent between PLMN and SNPN.  Ivo, Wed, 12:05  Explaingin based on 24.501 why #72 is appropriate  Sung, Wed. 14:40  Anyways, introduction of a new 5GMM cause value is not well-justified.  Lin, thu, 03:58  **ASKS THAT THIS GETS POSTPONED** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200506](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200506.zip) | Correction on term “non-3GPP access” used in SNPN | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1937 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200600](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200600.zip) | Handling of LADN infotmation when the UE operating in SNPN access mode | | | SHARP | CR 1970 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Based on request from the author  SangMin, Thursday, 12:18  I understand the intent of this CR. However, I’m not sure if SA2 has discussed on whether LADN is applicable to SNPN. As per current specs and agreed CRs in Jan SA2 meeting, I can’t find any stage 2 requirement on this scenario. Moreover, both LADN and NPN are introduced to support (geographically) localized services. So I’m wondering if there’s any use cases that apply both redundant technologies at the same time.  Yudai, Fridy, 11:25  agree with you that SA2 has not discussed on whether LADN is applicable to SNPN.  If there are no scenario that LADN and SNPN are applied at same time, I think it should be specified in CT1 spec that the LADN information shall not be provided to the UE if the UE is operating SNPN mode in order to avoid a misunderstanding.  SangMin, Monday, 07:15  For either cases whether LADN is applicable to SNPN or not, we need clear guidance from the stage 2, since this is not just a protocol issue but more likely to be a high-level requirements issue.  **At this moment, we don’t see any clear stage 2 requirement for your CR, so we would like to propose to postpone this CR in this meeting**. Rather, it may be good to ask SA2 about the applicability of LADN within SNPN.  Sung, Tue, 20:13  Does not agree with SangMin  SangMin, Wed, 07:12  As I said, I’m okay to ask SA2 on this aspect**, but not okay to define some functionality without stage 2 analysis and requirements**  Sung, 07:13  To SangMin, disagrees with the argument on granularity  Yudai, Wed, 07:46  Wants to know whether an LS is needed, his view is that SA2 does not specify relation between LADN and SNPN, LADN can be used even if the UE selects SNPN.  SangMin, Wed, 10:07  . This is stage 2 area and CT1 cannot assume that “LADN is applicable in SNPN since stage 2 didn’t clearly prohibit it”.  Thanks.  Sunge, Wed, 14:34  Requests SangMin to work on an LS | |
|  |  | | [C1-200686](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200686.zip) | UE identifier for SNPN | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, Qualcomm Incorporated, Vodafone, Charter Communications, NTT DOCOMO, Ericsson | CR 0498 23.122 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Ly-Thanh is fine, sent email to chairman  Ly-Thanh, Friday, 10:59  he CR is missing to address the case where the USIM may be used to authenticate to several different SNPNs that differ by their NID part and more explanation .  Lena, Monday, 00:59  I don’t understand why the NID information would be needed in the USIM: the NID is stored in the ME in the list of subscriber data and this is sufficient (there is no need for the ME to “populate” this list, it is provisioned to the ME). Hence I don’t the note is needed, and I also do not think the CT6 CR is needed.  Kundan, Tuesday, 09:49  Current form of the CR is incorrect, as SUPI of IMSI type always has to use 5G AKA and EAP AKA  Sung, Tue, 21:01  To Kundan, I agree with the comments from Lena.  Kundan, authentication method is chosen by the network.  So if the network uses AKA, the text basically says that there is no need to search SUPI in the ME. The SUPI can exist in the ME even in this case, but it is not used. You misinterpreted the CR.  Lena, Wed, 01:26  Credentials means identifier + keys, not just the keys. So when 5G AKA or EAP-AKA’ are used in an SNPN, then there is no identifier (whether it is an NSI or an IMSI) stored in the ME for the SNPN. **Hence the current text in the CR is correct**. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200740](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200740.zip) | T3245 in an SNPN | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2014 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Vishnu, Friday 15:03  CR 1803 was not agreed in the last meeting. Without CR 1803, the proposed changes in C1-200740 looks out of place. So we propose to postpone this CR. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200742](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200742.zip) | Handling of 5GMM cause values #62 in an SNPN | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2016 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Ivo, Thursday, 16:47  - CR adds "an entry of the "list of subscriber data" with the SNPN identity of the current SNPN is updated" in a few places in 24.50. However, such addition would be applicable in many other places, including 5GSM congestion control statements. Will the rest of the TS be fixed too?  Sung, Tue, 19:31  As the title of the CR says, for now I would like to focus on the new cause value introduced in the last quarter. However, as a rapporteur, let me bring a cleanup CR for the next meeting, if seen needed.  Ivo, Tue, 21:44  If you confirm that you will prepare such cleanup CR for the next meeting, I am OK with C1-200742.  Sung, Tue, 21:45  Will bring the CR | |
|  |  | | [C1-200834](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update1\C1-200834.zip) | Clarification of forbidden TAI lists for SNPN | | | vivo | CR 1923 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200464  Ivo, Wed, 11:59  Fine  Marko, Wed, 13:01  Fine  Vishnu, Wec, 15:19  fine  yanchao, thu03:34  some more discussion about future crs  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thursday, 11:14  handling of 5GMM cause #12 should modify "5GS forbidden tracking areas for regional provision of service" (rather than "5GS forbidden tracking areas for roaming")  Yanchao, Monday, 10:26  Provides rev in drats, any further comments?  Ivo, Monday, 12:33  Rev look good, wants to co-sign  Vishnu, Monday, 12:50  Looks good, one minor issue on cover sheet, wants to co-sign  Yanchao, Tuesday, 08:39  Fine, takes Huawei and HiSilicon on board  Ericsson as well  Yanchao, wed, 07:14  Hinting at the rev, all included | |
|  |  | | C1-200896 | Correction on 5GMM cause #74/#75 for no touching non-3GPP access | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1935 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200504  Lin, Thu, 03:44  Hinting at the rev  Sung, Thu, 03:46  FINE  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thursday, 16:36  - the removed text is applicable:                  - when the UE accesses an SNPN via PLMN and receives #74. If #74 is in a integrity protected 5GMM message, the UE should perform the actions both for the 3GPP access and the non-3GPP access (i.e. access to an SNPN via PLMN); or                  - when the UE accesses an SNPN via 3GPP access and receives #74. If #74 is in a integrity protected 5GMM message, the UE should perform the actions both for the 3GPP access and the non-3GPP access (i.e. access to an SNPN via PLMN).  Lin, Saturday, 15:05  Defending the CR, **another key point is: if a UE can already access the SNPN directly, why it has to access the same SNPN via PLMN indrectly? I cannot see such use case actually.**  Ivo, Monday, 12:36  Not agreeing with Lin, would like to preserver functionality as in baseline  Lin, Tuesday, 03:38  Explaining to Ivo the background, please check whether you are fine or not  SangMin, TUesay, 08:04  Agrees with Lin  Sung, Tue, 20:54  **I disagree with changes** that are currently proposed by the CR. If you want to revise the CR, then you can add a note similar to the existing ones (examples below) instead of removing the existing text.  Ivo, Tue, 21:41  Shares Sung concern, has given more comments in thread on 505  Lin, Wed, 06:23  To Sung, you misunderstood the case, please check again  Lin, wed, 06:24  To Ivo you misunderstood the case, please check again  Sung, Wed, 06:30  To lin, Did NOT misunderstood the case  Lin, Wed, 09:20  Totally reworded. New rev, Sung to review  Ivo, Wed, 14:02  Ivo fine with the rev, there are “the the”  Wants to co-sign  Sung, Wed, 14:11  Fine, wants to co-sign | |
|  |  | | C1-200897 | Correction on term “shared network” definition for SNPN | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 0497 23.122 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200507  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lena, Thursday, 09:05  C1-200507: “E-UTRA connected to EPC” should be just “E-UTRAN”.  Lin, Monday, 04:33  Fine with Lena’s comment, provides rev in drafts folder  Lena, Monady, 23:05  Fine with the revision from Lin  Sung, W | |
|  |  | | [C1-200847](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update1\C1-200847.zip) | List of SNPNs for which the N1 mode capability was disabled | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0502 23.122 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  SangMin: Fri, 03:01 is not blocking this, can accept the CR  Revision of C1-200736  Sung Thu, 03:26  Gives some explanation  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thursday, 11:55  - the last bullet should be performed also when the SNPN's entry in "list of subscriber data" is updated.  SangMin, Friday, 06:12  Similar concern as expressed for C1-200738 will be also applied to this documents as below:  Clearly, SNPN is not supported by EPC. Since the UE in SNPN access mode will only search for 5GS, disabling N1 does not make sense. Thus, managing list of “N1 mode not allowed" SNPN just creates unnecessary burden.  Sung, Tue, 19:07  Provides revision, to Ivo  SangMin concern addressed in 738 discussion  Ivo, Tue, 19:57  Ok, ericsson to co-sign  Sung, Tue, 22:57  Ericsson is added | |
|  |  | | [C1-200849](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update1\C1-200849.zip) | Validity of the USIM for an SNPN and for a specific access type | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2015 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200741  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thursday, 11:58  wording ("USIM as invalid for the current SNPN and for 3GPP access") should be aligned with the one (i.e. "USIM as invalid for 5GS services via 3GPP access") used when the UE does not operate in the SNPN access mode. E.g. (i.e. "USIM as invalid for the current SNPN via 3GPP access")  Sung, Tue, 19:10  To Ivo, fixed, see rev  Ivo, Tue, 19:59  Looks OK. Can you please add Ericsson as cosigner? Thank you.  Sung, tue 23:01  Ericsson is added | |
|  |  | | [C1-200851](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update1\C1-200851.zip) | SNN coding | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2018 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200850  Ivo, Wed, 12:07  OK  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200744  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thursday, 12.11  Some suggestions on how to revise, they are also available in a rev in the INBOX, if agreeabel then Ericsson wants to co-sign  Sung, Tue, 19:15  Fixed  Ivo, Tue, 20:09  Some speces in the coding missing  Sung, Tue, 23:08  fixed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200921](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update2\C1-200921.zip) | No mandate to support default configured NSSAI or network slicing indication | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2017 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200743  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lena, Thursday, 09:05  fine with the CR in principle, but in the last change, “the UE operating in SNPN access mode may not support default configured NSSAI or network slicing indication” should be “the default configured NSSAI and the network slicing indication are not supported in SNPNs” instead, since the network will not send them  Sung, Tuesday, 06:22  Provides, rev, inline with Lena’s comment  Lena, Wed, 05:21  Still some issues with the wording  Sung, Wed, 05:37  Addressing Lena comment  Lena, Wed, 05:55  Ok  Sung, Wed ,  Uploaded | |
|  |  | | [C1-200942](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update2\C1-200942.zip) | Clarify that access to RLOS is not supported in SNPN | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 0494 23.122 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200469  Ivo, Wed, 18:23  OK  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  NEEDS TO BE SHIFTED TO PARLOS AGENDA ITEM  Ivo, Thursday, 11:50  - the CR is misleading. Access to RLOS is not supported in N1 mode, regardless whether the MS is operating in SNPN access mode or not. It would be more appropriate to state "An MS operating in N1 mode never attempts to to access RLOS."  Vishnu, Tuesday, 10:55  Suggests to add a Note, asking Ivo whether this is correct  Ivo, Tuesday, 14:53  Not ok with Vishnu’s suggestion  Vishnu, Tuesday, 15:;44  Fine with explanation from Ivo, updates the rev accordingly  Ivo, Tue, 19:30  OK, Ericsson wants to co-sign  Sung, Tue, 21:27  Wid to be changed to PARLOS  Vishnu, Wed, 09:16  Provides update, this is now PARLOS, any comments?  Sung, Wed, 14:11  FINE | |
|  |  | | [C1-200943](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update2\C1-200943.zip) | Correction to Limited service state for SNPN | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 0492 23.122 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200466  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lena, Thursday, 09:03  fine with the intent of the CR, but “and the UE does not have any valid entry in the "list of subscriber data”” in “For the item b, if the MS operates in SNPN access mode and the UE does not have any valid entry in the "list of subscriber data"” should be deleted since it is already covered by “For the item b”  Vishnu, Monday, 09:38  Comments from Lena taken on board, rev in the drafts folder  Lena, Monday, 23:22  Fine with rev from Vishnu | |
|  |  | | [C1-200999](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update4\C1-200999.zip) | UE receives CAG information in SNPN access mode | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Cristina | CR 1946 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200551  Lena, thu  FINE  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lena, Thursday, 09:03  Overall ok with the intent of the CR but there are some editorial issues as the new text does not read well:  Cristina, Friday, 03:49  Ok with proposal from Lena, will provide revsion | |
|  |  | | [C1-200964](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update4\C1-200964.zip) | Display of the human readable name of an SNPN | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0503 23.122 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200746  Ivo, Thu, 09:40  FINE  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lena, Thursday, 09:05  CR assumes that a human readable network name will be configured at the ME, not broadcast in SIB. However the input I got from my RAN2 colleagues is that whether the human readable network name is broadcast in SIB was still FFS as of the end of the Reno November meeting  Ivo, Thursday, 16:48  Not clear where the HRNN is from  Sung, Tue, 18:18  My intent was to say that an SNPN displayed to the user can be associated with an HRNN. But I agree that the way that I described is misleading. How about:  The MS indicates to the user one or more SNPNs, which are available and each of them is identified by an SNPN identity in an entry of the "list of subscriber data" in the ME. Additionally, for each of the indicated SNPNs, the MS may optionally display a human readable name for the SNPN (see 3GPP TS 38.331 [65]).  Lena, Tue, 18:59  Fine  Ivo, Tue, 20:19  does 38.331 already contain specification of the human readable name?    If not, please remove "(see 3GPP TS 38.331 [65])" and add an editor's note stating e.g. "it is FFS how the human readable name is obtained".  Sung, wed, 14:50  Providing rev  Ivo, Wed, 18:34  Nearly ok, minor mod in the EN  Sung, Wed, 18:50  Fixed the editorial in the EN  Lena, Thu, 01:36  Fine with the changes, clauses affected to be fixed  Sung, Thu, 03:14  Acks to Lena | |
|  |  | | C1-201010 | Update SNPN key differences | | | Intel / Thomas | CR 1985 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Revision not provided  Revision of C1-200923  Ericsson added as co-signer  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200836  Vishnu is fine Wed, 16:02  Ivo, Wed, 18:24  Fine but wants to co-sign  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200681  Ivo, Tue, 19:51  “are” -> “is” , rest is fine  Lena, Wed, 0527  Same comments as Ivo, rest is fine  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lena, Thusday, 09:05  Some editorials  Vishnu, Thursday, 15:36  fine with this CR. Just one comment that the change in bullet d) is not needed  Ivo, Thursday, 16:41  Some editorials  Thomas, Tuesda, 17:28  Taking all comments on board, provides a revision which is 836 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200965](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update4\C1-200965.zip) | 5GMM cause value #74 in an SNPN with a globally-unique SNPN identity | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2019 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200745  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thursday, 12:13  Work item missing on cover page, ericsson wants to co-sign  Sung, Tue, 19:18  fixed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200970](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update4\C1-200970.zip) | Correction in UE ehaviour upon receipt of 5GMM cause value #74 or #75 via a non-integrity protected NAS message | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2010 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Based on request of the author  Revision of C1-200735  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thursday, 1644  No aligned with 23.122  - if preference is to change 23.122 along the proposed 24.501 change, then why is T3247 set to a shorter value for #74 (as in "15 minutes and 30 minutes for 5GMM cause value #74") than for other 5GMM causes?  Lin, Saturday, 10:46  1. The intention of the CR to align with the same handling for 5GMM #11 is not fully correct as what current specified UE handling for 5GMM #11 the CR want to align is only for VPLMN but SNPN currently does not support roaming. So the current text in 24.501 is correct which is aligned with the current specified UE handling for 5GMM #11 for HPLMN.  2. It seems what needs to be updated is in TS 23.122 to remove the 2nd bullet as shown in the cover page.  Sung, Tue, 20:06  Defending the proposal  Lena, Tue, 22:03  We support the changes in C1-200735, but we agree with Ivo’s comment that the text in TS 23.122 needs to be aligned.  Sung, Tue, 22:31  If agreeable to evveryon, then Sung wants a new CR against 23.122, provides wording  Lin, Tue, 03:30  Detiailed comments  Sung, Wed, 04:42  Provides a rev of the 24.501 CR addressing all of Lin’s comment  Lena, Wed, 05:40  Providing updates to the text for the 23.122 CR  Peter, Wed, 09:22,  Clarified that it is too late for a new CR  Ivo, Wed, 09:44  Wants to see **both crs in same meeting, wants 735 to be postponed**  Sunge, Wed, 14:27  Ivo,I don’t understand why you are OK with the #11 VPLMN text and not OK with the #74/75 text. My understanding one should equally be OK or not OK for both  Ivo, Wed, 18:30  We need to have entire solution on the table, both for 23.122 and 24.501.  Sung, Wed, 19:07  Now sees Ivo’s case, still wants to do the 24:501 CR now, 23.122 next meeting  Ivo, Thu, 09:39  I am actually NOT convinced that the UE should act on a single non-integrity protected rejection. **Seems too easily misusable by attackers.**  **Let's have entire solution on the table in Apr 2020 CT1 meeting and decide there**. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200971](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update4\C1-200971.zip) | #72 applicable and #31 not applicable in an SNPN | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2013 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Yanchao is fine, Friday, 02:43  Revision of C1-200739  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lin, Saturday, 09:37  Providing three comments  Lena, Saturday, 19:20  we support making cause #31 not applicable to SNPNs in Rel-16.  For #72, we would prefer to make it not applicable to SNPNs since SA2 indicated in C1-200234 that “Access to SNPN over Trusted non-3GPP access and Wireline access are not supported in Rel-16. Regarding whether access to SNPN via Untrusted non-3GPP access is supported in Rel-16, SA2 could not reach a consensus  With this I am fine to make it clear in our spec that CIOT is not supported in SNPN in R16.  Then I just recalled that during the discussion on a set of CR related to adding new UAC category type for SNPN, it has added below EN in the revision of C1-200677. If now we all agree that CIOT is not supported for SNPN, then below EN is not needed and nothing needs to be done for SNPN for UAC for exception data.  “Editor's note [WI: Vertical\_LAN, CR#1938]: It needs to be verified if NB-IoT (MO exception data) is also applicable for SNPN.”  For #72, if I got your below comments correctly, you do support our CR C1-200505 proposal, right?  Sung, Tuesday, 05:30  To Lena, The use of #72 in an SNPN is not for non-3GPP access in the context of untrusted/trusted non-3GPP access or Wireline access. It is about restricting access to SNPN services via a PLMN.  Ivo, Tuesday, 15:09  Agrees with Sung, wants to co-sign  Lena, Tuesday, 15:20  Fine with the CR  Yanchao, Tuesday, 15:46  Wants some update in subclause A.2  Sung, Tue, 21:21  Provides a rev, asking for review  Lin, Wed, 04:57  I still see to reuse #72 for accesses SNPN services via a PLMN is not a future proof way.  Sung, Wed, 05:01  Provides a rev to Lin, asking for review  Lin, Thu,  Some proposal  Sung, Thu, 04:42  Agrees with Lin, provides rev in 971  Lin, Thu, 09:41  FINE with the latest rev | |
|  |  | | C1-201032 | Introduction of SNPN-specific N1 mode attempt counters | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2011 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Lin NOT in this meeting, 06:24  Yanchao: clarified no comments open  Revision of C1-200737  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lin, Saturday, 10:53  1. The reason for change “However, similar to the PLMN, dedicated counters for SNPN-specific N1 mode attempt should be introduced” is not correct, as for PLMN it has different RATs (G/U/L/NGRAN) but for SNPN so far it only has one RAT (NG-RAN). So you cannot just copy the same logic from PLMN to SNPN here.  2. Then, the proposed changes are not needed and to use the existing SNPN-specific attempt counter is enough which is only applied to N1 mode only, i.e. added “SNPN-specific N1 mode attempt counter” = existing “SNPN-specific attempt counter”  Marko, Monday, 08:13  Wondering why to add new counters for "N1 mode" while there is already existing ones for SNPN over 3GPP access and non-3GPP access... Looks like new ones are unnecessary duplicates. If necessary, would addition of “N1 mode” in the name of existing ones fix the (possible) issue?  Sung, Tue, 20:23  To Marko, So last year I proposed to prohibit the use of #27 in an SNPN because it will bring the basically same effect as #75 as there is no other RAT. But people wanted to allow #27. Why did CT1 decided to allow #27 then?  Currently it is only NG-RAN, but in the future 6G radio access network can be an available RAT for an SNPN. Then, we need to distinguish N1 mode prohibition from SNPN prohibition.  SNPN-specific attempt counters are for managing forbidden SNPNs list and SNPN-specific N1 mode attempt counters are for managing list of SNPNs for which N1 mode cap is disabled.  Then, question back to you: do you want the UE to add the SNPN ID to the forbidden SNPN list if #27 is received rather than the list of SNPNs for which N1 mode cap is disabled? See a relevant discussion in terms of C1-200736.  Lin, Wed, 03:44  To Sung  Then we can add it in 6G as we now added N1 mode in 5G, not in 4G.  #27 is used in SNPN is due to RAT restriction.  #75 is used in SNPN due to subscription restriction.  Sung, Wed, 04:26  Asking Lin  Upon receipt of #27:  should the SNPN be added to a list of SNPNs for which N1 mode capability is disabled or  should the SNPN be added to temporarily forbidden SNPN list or  should the SNPN be added to permanently forbidden SNPN list?  Marko, Wed, 13:37  Has a different proposal for the counter names  Sung, Wed, 14:33  Asking questions from Marko  Lin, Thu, 10:35  Wants to see this changed  Sung, Thu, 14:04  Now it is a single EN, asking lin to check | |
|  |  | | C1-201031 | N1 mode capability disabling and re-enabling for SNPN | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2012 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  SangMin: Fri, 03:00: LGE will not block if they are the only one.  Lin: can accept it, although it has an editorial  Revision of C1-200969  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200738  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  SangMin, Thursday, 12:59  Clearly, SNPN is not supported by EPC. So where does it go after “disabling **N1 mode capability** for a registered SNPN”? there’s no other choice for the UE but staying in DEREGISTERED state for N1 mode. The described behavior seems to be SNPN re-selection, but seems not related to the **disabling N1 mode capability mechanism**.  Lin, Saturday, 14:05  Some comments  Sung, Tue, 18:10  Provides a rev addressing  Lin, Wed, 03:46  I think to add that NOTE in sub 4.9.3, cannot fly because the disabled/enable N1 mode capability for non-3GPP access in this subclause can only refer the non-3GPP access capability (e.g. WiFi)  For access to SNPN services via a PLMN, at the UE side, its access capability is still 3GPP access, so what disabled/enabled UE's N1 mode capability for SNPN can only be 3GPP access, i.e. in sub 4.9.2.  So sub 4.9.3 need not to be touched, otherwise, it will create confusing.  Sung, We, 05:07  Has a proposal to Lin, what do you think  SangMin, Wed, 09:48  What I said previously was that the original purpose of the disabling “specific access mode” capability functionality was to select other access mode \***within**\* the PLMN. As you specified in the thread for 0737, if we had alternative access within the SNPN e.g. 6G, this “disabling” feature is definitely required. But we only have one choice for SNPN as of Rel-16, i.e. N1 mode.  The UE behavior is technically correct, e.g. enter deregistered state and select another SNPN, but as I said, I’m not sure whether this behavior needs to be introduced as part of “disabling N1 mode for SNPN” functionality.  Alternative way is that add the same behavior under the UE behaviors for reception of 5GMM cause #27. I guess this is somewhat related to the discussion on 0737. We don’t have strong preference on how to handle the SNPN list for which N1 mode is not allowed, e.g. using one of the existing forbidden SNPN list or using UE implementation specific way  Sung, Wed, 14:37  I don’t understand why it should be UE-implementation-specific when we can copy the PLMN behavior. Is there any specific reason why LGE wants the deviation?  SangMin, 04:19  Commenting As I explained, this is not exactly desired behavior for “disabling specific access mode” functionality  Lin, thu, 09:55  Proposal for an update to NOTE  Sung, Thu, 13;52  Lin, done | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  | Public network integrated NPN | |
|  |  | | [C1-200316](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200316.zip) | CAG Information in Registration Reject | | | InterDigital / Atle | CR 1868 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Based on email form author  Revision of C1-200111  Lena, Thursday 09:05  Enabling sending of the CAG information list in a Registration Reject message is dangerous since the Registration Reject message can be sent non-integrity protected, so this could allow a fake network to modify the CAG provisioning at the UE. Moreover, it seems unnecessary since the network could also let the UE successfully register and then update the CAG provisioning info at the UE.  Atle, Friday, 08:14  Explaind his rationale  Lena, Sunday, 00:10  Further commenting on Atle’s reply, not agreeing  Kundan, Monday, 07:59  support the CR it make sense for the following scenarios. Of course the CAG information IE should be sent integrity protected otherwise the  message will be ignored as the UE does for 5GMM Cause #25 and 76.  Lena, Monday, 23:12  Challenging Kundans argument  SangMin, Tuesday, 05:50  We share the concerns expressed by Qualcomm. Providing critical information via “Reject” message is not a good idea.  Sung, 07:00  Wants to see a SA2 CR first  Kundan, 07:30  Disagree with Sung, SangMin  Atle, Wed, 13:02  I echo Kundans comment that stage-3 must be able to do this kind of minors with or without SA2s ability to document such scenarios in stage-2.  **Having said  that, I also understand that we need consensus for an agreement, and will need to continue on this topic in the next meeting unless resistance disappear.**  Ivo, thu, 09:09  I support the idea in C1-200316.  JJ, Thu, 10:14  I agree with Sung that **SA2 shall agree this first**, and now it looks like the corresponding SA2 CR will most likely be postponed.  Kundan, Thu, 11:11  Agrees with Ivo | |
|  |  | | [C1-200335](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200335.zip) | Signalling of CAG-ID | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | discussion Rel-16 | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-200336](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200336.zip) | Clarification to manual CAG selection | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | CR 0489 23.122 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200337](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200337.zip) | Removal of the requirement for NAS to pass the selected CAG-ID to the lower layers | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | CR 1883 24.501 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-200311 and its revisions  Ivo, Thursday, 12:15  - same changes as C1-200311. Given that C1-200311 has more cosigners, it is proposed that C1-200337 is merged into C1-200311  Lena, Friday, 04:57  Fine to merge the CR into 0311 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200398](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200398.zip) | “CAG information list” preventing selection of any available and allowable PLMN | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 1898 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200403](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200403.zip) | Clarification on CAG selection | | | Intel / Thomas | CR 0490 23.122 Rel-16 | Merged into in C1-200336  Indicated by Thomas on Wed, 13:xx  Lena, THursdy, 09:05  This CR conflicts with the changes in C1-200336. Both CRs try to address the fact that as per SA2’s input in LS C1-200252, the UE will be allowed to register on a cell if at least one of the CAG-IDs broadcast by the cell is in the UE’s allowed list. C1-200336 assumes that there is one selected CAG-ID at the UE (which one is up to UE implementation in automatic CAG selection mode) while C1-200403 assumes that the UE considers all CAG-IDs broadcast by the cell as selected CAG-IDs, which seems to bring unnecessary complexity.  Vishnu, Thursday, 15:50  We are fine with the CR. But we don’t think the changes in 4.4.3.1.2  Ban, Monday, 14:15  Prefers 336 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200451](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200451.zip) | Discussion on limited service on CAG cell | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Vishnu | discussion 23.122 Rel-16 | Noted  Lena, Thursday, 09:05  SA2 has already agreed a CR in [S2-2001693](ftp://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_sa/WG2_Arch/TSGS2_136AH_Incheon/Docs/S2-2001693.zip) by which Rel-16 UEs that are not CAG capable can camp on a CAG cell in limited service state. The SA2 CR also assumes that legacy UEs (Rel-15 or older) cannot camp on CAG cells in limited service state. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200465](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200465.zip) | Deletion of all CAG IDs of a CAG cell for 5GMM cause #76 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 1924 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200467](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200467.zip) | Removal of the indication of CAG-ID for N1 NAS signalling connection | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 1925 24.501 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-200311 and its revisions  Lena, Thursday, 09:03  fine with the change in C1-200467 but the same change is covered by C1-200337 and C1-200311  Ivo, Thursday, 0958  same changes as C1-200311. Given that C1-200311 has more cosigners, it is proposed that C1-200467 is merged into C1-200311  Vishnu, Thursday, 12:10  **Fine to merge this into C1-200311** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200471](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200471.zip) | Removal of term CAG access control | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 1927 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200508](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200508.zip) | Reset the registration attempt counter for #76 in service reject | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1938 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200516](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200516.zip) | Updates for Manual CAG selection | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 1554 24.501 Rel-16 | Merged into revision of C1-200701 and its revision  Based on email from authorThu, 11.17  Revision of C1-198992  Seem to conflict with C1-200701  Lena, Thursday, 09:06  the CR overlaps with C1-200701 which seems more complete**. I would prefer to progress C1-200701**.  Ivo, Thursday, 12:22  - for registration after manual CAG selection, C1-200516 addresses a part of one case only (the marked part of case-1 below) while C1-200701 addresses both cases (case-1 and case-2 below). **IMO, C1-200701 should be progressed as it is more complete**. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200517](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200517.zip) | Configuration for the presentation of CAG cells for manual CAG selection | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 0471 23.122 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-201039 and its revision  Revision of C1-199010  Lena, Thursday, 09:05   * The CR overlaps with C1-200700 * there should be a condition in new bullet 2) saying “the CAG-ID is not included in the "Allowed CAG list" of the entry”   Ivo, Thursday, 16:57  The best way to provide the information is an indication in SIB - either HRNN or a new bit.                  However, C1-200517 proposes "there exists an entry with the PLMN ID of the PLMN in the "CAG information list" and the CAG cell is allowed to be presented to the user by the PLMN" which does not fit  Ban, Thursday, 23:48  Overlaps with 700  Challenges the text and provides a new proposal  Vishnu, Friday, 10:24  The issue that I see is that, now that the manual CAG indicator is broadcasted, all the CAG ids of the neighboring PLMNs ( even for the ones to which the HPLMN does not have any roaming agreements) will be presented to the user.     Those PLMNs could have set the “manual CAG indicator” for the subscribers with whom they have roaming agreements. Is that an acceptable behavior ?  Ivo, Friday, 15:53  Explanation to Vishnu  C1-200517 overlaps with C1-200700 and a merge is needed  Ban, Monday, 13:36  Fine with most of Vishnu’s explanation, asking whether there is a merge of 517 and 700  Lena, Monday 17:00  We think that your proposal below goes too much into user interface specification and that this should be left to UE implementation. So we would prefer not to add these additional indications to the user.  Sung, Tuesday, 04:06  On Issue 2, it seems that 0468 is progressing. Thus, we can use 0468 for addressing Issue 2.  On Issue 1, I would like to volunteer to hold the pen, i.e. let us progress with 0700.  With that proposal, 517merged in 700 and 586 in 486  Kundan, Tuesday, 12:38  Samsung does not support manual broadcasting indicator. It should be configured based on the agreement between roaming partners and by default the UE shows the CAG ID for the PLMN for which no configuration exists  Sung, Wed, 07:30  To Kundan, Then, how can the RPLMN control it? Please note that CAG configuration is updated by HPLMN only. Do you mean that a VPLMN needs to contact HPLMN whenever there is any change in the manual CAG selection policy for a PNI-NPN hosted by the VPLMN?  Kundan, Wed, 09:52  Does not agree with Sung  Ban, Wed, 10:22  Kundan, I do not agree that this should be configured based on the agreement between roaming partners.  This can be dynamic and it is impossible to keep track across all roaming partners in the world.. and imagine how much efforts it will cost operators to do so!!  Kundan, Wed, 10:59  Does not agree with ban  Ivo, Wed, 11:53  To kundan, Stage-1 requirements expect control by the RPLMN. It can be achieved either by using HRNN as in 731 or by a new bit in SIB.  Lena, Thu, 01:20  We agree that an indicator in SIB is the easiest way to achieve control by the RPLMN. We have a preference for using a new bit in SIB rather than using the HRNN. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200578](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200578.zip) | Discussion on requirement of sending CAG ID by UE | | | Samsung/Kundan | discussion 24.501 Rel-16 | Noted  Lena, THusday, 09:05  Proposal 1 not acceptable  Proposal 2 not needed  Vishnu, Thursday, 14:00  Fail to see the problem  No need for this CR  Kundan, Monday, 13:32  Replies to Lena and Vishnu  Vishnu, Monday, 14:39  Does not agree with Kundan | |
|  |  | | [C1-200581](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200581.zip) | Handling of manual CAG selection procedure | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 1957 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  See confcall  Lena, Thursday, 09:05  this CR is not needed because the UE does not need to send its manually selected CAG ID to the network (see comments on C1-200578)  Ivo, Thursday, 16:32  - no need of the CAG selection Type bit in the 5GS update type  - the AMF should send the entire CAG information list, if updated in the network, as in C1-200338 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200586](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200586.zip) | CAG only UE and Manual PLMN selection | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 1962 24.501 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-200468 and its revisions  Lena, Thursday, 09:05  CR overlaps with C1-200468, prefers to progress **C1-200468** as it updates the details of the manual CAG selection procedure rather than the high-level overview of CAG selection.  Ivo, Thursday, 11:00  Proposal give detailed text in general section, not appropriate. Such text needs to go to text into subclause 4.4.3.1.2, as in **C1-200468**  Sung, Wed, 07:30  To Kundan, Then, how can the RPLMN control it? Please note that CAG configuration is updated by HPLMN only. Do you mean that a VPLMN needs to contact HPLMN whenever there is any change in the manual CAG selection policy for a PNI-NPN hosted by the VPLMN?  Kundan, Wed, 09:52  Does not agree with SUng  Ban, Wed, 10:22  Kundan, I do not agree that this should be configured based on the agreement between roaming partners.  This can be dynamic and it is impossible to keep track across all roaming partners in the world.. and imagine how much efforts it will cost operators to do so!!  Kundan, Wed, 10:59  Does not agree with Ban  Ivo, Wed, 11:53  To kundan, Stage-1 requirements expect control by the RPLMN. It can be achieved either by using HRNN as in 731 or by a new bit in SIB.  Lena, Thu, 01:20  We agree that an indicator in SIB is the easiest way to achieve control by the RPLMN. We have a preference for using a new bit in SIB rather than using the HRNN. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200589](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200589.zip) | Handling of a CAG UE at non supporting AMF | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 1964 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Based on request from Kundan, Tuesday, 12:19  Lena, Thursday, 09:05  **this CR does not make sense** as it requires an AMF which does NOT support CAG to reject the UE if “the UE’s subscription contains an "indication that the UE is only allowed to access 5GS via CAG cells"”, which effectively means an AMF which does NOT support CAG is expected to somehow understand the "indication that the UE is only allowed to access 5GS via CAG cells" . The CR should be rejected  Ivo, THursdy, 11:06  - the document is corrupted - when opening the document, Word states "Word found unreadable content in C1-200589.docx. Do you want to recover the contents of this document? If you trust the source of this document, click Yes"  - the document requires that AMF NOT supporting a feature to perform some action related to the feature . **This is not OK.** Furthermore, Rel-15 AMFs will not do so either.  Vishnu, Thursday, 12:50  Same understanding as Lena, **CR is not OK**  **Kundan, Tuesday, 09:09**  Thinks the CR is needed, and wants to send an LS  Ban, Tuesday, 09:59  Use case does not make sense, NO NEED TO SEND AN LS  Kundan, Tuesday, 10:15  Asking questions from Ban ….  Lena, Wed, 01:36  There is no need to send an LS to SA2, 23.501 contains relevant statements | |
|  |  | | [C1-200688](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200688.zip) | CAG information towards the lower layers for paging | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 1567 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-196737 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200728](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200728.zip) | Rejection of non-emergency PDU session establishment with 5GMM cause #76 | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2007 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Based on author’s request Wed, 19:19  Lena, Thursday, 09:06  **proposed addition does not yield any benefit**, since the MM layer does nothing with the info that the message was not forwarded to the SMF due to CAG access restrictions. So a more generic cause value (like routing failure) can be used instead.  Ivo, Thursday, 12:38  the scenario addressed in the **CR does not seem to be possible** as if the UE is non-emergency registered and attempts to camp on:  Vishnu, Thursday, 14:53  question on the scenario itself, as how it is possible -> **CR is not needed**  **Sung, Tuesday, 06:12**  To Vishnu,  CAG information list is updated, but before the AMF initiates UCU, the AMF receives UL NAS TRANSPORT message including an SM request. Then, the AMF should reject the request rather than forwarding the 5GSM message. It would not happen often and that is why it is an abnormal case.  Ivo, Tue, 20:47  **This seems to be rather rare race condition.**  **Wouldn't it be more appropriate to silently discard the received 5GSM message** and perform UCU? This would trigger the UE to select a new cell and then the 5GSM procedure can continue, upon 5GSM timer expiration.  Also, this would work for any type of payload, not just 5GSM.  Sung, Tue, 21:33  To Ivo, No information is delivered towards the 5GSM sublayer and the 5GSM procedure will be retried. That should be avoided.    Sung, Wed, 06:13  To Ivo, this is not a race condition only,  **Ivo, Wed., 13: 12**  **Does not agree with Sung**  **Sung, Wed, 15:00**  **Ongoing.**  **Ivo, Wed, 19:07**  **Not agreeing with Sung** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200730](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200730.zip) | Determination of CAG cell | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0500 23.122 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200731](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200731.zip) | Discussion to manual CAG selection | | | Ericsson / Ivo | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  Lena, Thursday,09:06  **not a good way forward to re-use** the HRNN as indication of whether the CAG ID can be displayed to the user if the CAG ID is not in the UE’s allowed CAG list. The HRNN was defined with a different purpose. And the proposed solution would prevent an operator who does not want to allow the user to select a CAG ID not in the UE’s allowed CAG list from broadcasting an HRNN.  Similar comments apply to the related CRs in C1-200732 and C1-200733. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200732](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200732.zip) | Manual CAG selection | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 0501 23.122 Rel-16 | Postponed  Based on request of author  Lena, Thursday, 09:06  See 0731  Vishnu, Thursday, 16:15  using the HRNN is NOT a good way forward due to the below reasons  **not OK with the CR**  Sung, Wed, 06:42  Asking Ivo, whether he wants to pursue this one?? To sung this is confusing | |
|  |  | | [C1-200733](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200733.zip) | Manual CAG selection – providing HRNN | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 2009 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Based on email of author  Lena, Thursday, 09:06  See 0731  Vishnu, Thursday, 16:15  using the HRNN is NOT a good way forward due to the below reasons  **not OK with the CR** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200932](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update2\C1-200932.zip) | CAG information list storage | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 1879 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200291  Vishnu, Thu, 09:17  This looks fine  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Rae, Thursday, 09:45  In principle agrees with the CR, however,  For “- CAG information list, if the UE supports CAG”in Annex C.1, if UE disables and re-enable CAG, the CAG information list will be deleted.  But actually this CAG information list can still be used in this case.  So the condition here seems unnecessary.  Vishnu, THurday, 1642  Fine in principle, wants some changes, wants to co-sign  Ivo, Friday, 08:39  Detailes respons to Rae and Vishnu, wants to keep some conditions, but is open if people insist on change  Vishan, Friday, 11:00  Minor comments, fine to go either way,  Ivo, Friday, 15:36  Provides a rev in the draft box, still waits for response from Rae  Rae, Monday, 02:46  To Ivo, If the list is deleted just because the UE toggles between CAG enabled and not CAG enabled (and back to CAG enabled), then UE will have no CAG list when CAG enabled is turned back ON. **That would be worse** than if the list is not up to date.  Ivo, Monday, 09:56  Takes Rae comment on board and provides rev  Rae, Monday, 10:05  Oppo wants to co-sign  Vishnu, Monday, 11:08  We are fine with this version. A minor comment to add "" around CAG Information list  Lena, Monday, 23:01  not ok with removing the condition “if the UE supports CAG”. The UE cannot be mandated to store information for a feature which the UE does not support.  Rae, Monday, 06:07  Lena, I agree with what you said.  But I think the network will not configure the CAG info list to UE if UE does not support CAG.  Additionally, if UE does not support CAG, UE will not understand this parameter, so naturally will not store this parameter?  Lena, Wed, 01:15  So the requirement on the UE must be condition to UE support for CAG.  Rae, Wed, 06:00  Still asks questions  Lena, Wed, 06:10  To Rae, for the concern we need a next CR, still for this one we need the condition  Rae, Wed, 06:11  Then I am FINE  Ivo, Wed, 08:19  Ivo provides rev, all comments addressed  Chen, wed, 10:15  Still insists on Oppo position, . But if majority in CT1 do not want to go with our proposal, we can live with that.  Let's wait a few years and see what happens.  Lena, Thu, 01:10  Fine | |
|  |  | | [C1-200937](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update2\C1-200937.zip) | CAG-ID not provided to lower layers during NAS signalling connection establishment | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 1880 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200311  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Friday, 08:51  Provides revision, additional co-signers.  Lena, Saturday, 22:36  Fine with the revision | |
|  |  | | C1-2000985 | Including CAG information list in REGISTRATION ACCEPT message | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | CR 1884 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200840  Revision of C1-200338  Lena, Wed, 01:02  Highlighting to Vishnu on revision number  Sung, Wed, 07:32  Asking for a SA2 paper that was previously mentioned  Lena, Thu, 02:32  The SA2 papers were submitted, they are CR 2135 to TS 23.501 (S2-2001846) and CR 2091 to TS 23.502 (S2-2001876). I have revised C1-200840 into C1-200985 to add the linkage. The revision has been uploaded.  Sung, Thu, 02:37  Fine  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Vishnu, Friday, 15:28  Fine with the CR, requests some changes  Lena, Saturday, 23:05  All commens from Vishnu taken on board, hints at rev in drafts folder  Vishna, Monday, 11:01      Thank you for the revision and taking the comments on board.      We are fine with it. A minor comment to add “stored in the UE” as below.  Lena, Monday, 23:30  Fine with Vishnu’s suggestion, providing rev in drafts folder  Vishnu, Tuesday, 10:33  Fine with the rev from lena | |
|  |  | | [C1-201020](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update4\C1-201020.zip) | Presentation of PLMN with non-CAG cells for manual selection | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 0493 23.122 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200924  Vishnu, thu, 12:41      I would like to kindly inform you that there is no objection to C1-200468 ( revised to C1-200924 and now to C1-201020 (forgot to add Samsung as co-signing company **due to the merge of C1-200586**)) . The ongoing discussion is not relevant to this CR.        Please find the Tdoc below  Revision of C1-200468  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thursday, 10:50  Issues listed, a potential revision from Ivo in the inbox/drafts. If updates are are taken on board, Ericsson wants to co-sign  Sung, Tuesday, 04:06  On Issue 2, it seems that 0468 is progressing. Thus, we can use 0468 for addressing Issue 2.  On Issue 1, I would like to volunteer to hold the pen, i.e. let us progress with 0700.  With that proposal, 517merged in 700 and 586 in 486  Vishnu, Tuesday, 11:09  Takes all comments on board, provides rev  Kundan, Tuesday, 12:38  Samsung does not support manual broadcasting indicator. It should be configured based on the agreement between roaming partners and by default the UE shows the CAG ID for the PLMN for which no configuration exists.  Ivo, Tuesday, 14:43  Fine with the rev provided by Vishnu  Sung, Wed, 07:23  Wants to co-sign  Sung, Wed, 07:30  To Kundan, Then, how can the RPLMN control it? Please note that CAG configuration is updated by HPLMN only. Do you mean that a VPLMN needs to contact HPLMN whenever there is any change in the manual CAG selection policy for a PNI-NPN hosted by the VPLMN?  Kundan, Wed, 09:52  Does not agree with Sung  Ban, Wed, 10:22  Kundan, I do not agree that this should be configured based on the agreement between roaming partners.  This can be dynamic and it is impossible to keep track across all roaming partners in the world.. and imagine how much efforts it will cost operators to do so!!  Kundan, Wed, 10:59  Do not agree with Ban  Ivo, Wed, 11:53  To kundan, Stage-1 requirements expect control by the RPLMN. It can be achieved either by using HRNN as in 731 or by a new bit in SIB.  Lena, Thu, 01:20  We agree that an indicator in SIB is the easiest way to achieve control by the RPLMN. We have a preference for using a new bit in SIB rather than using the HRNN. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200973](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update4\C1-200973.zip) | Triggering mobility registration update due to manual CAG selection | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 1998 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200701  Seem to conflict with C1-200516  Ivo, Thursday, 12:25  - "or" needs to be removed from the bullet y.  - I prefer C1-200701 above competing C1-200516, as C1-200701 is more complete.  - Ericsson would like to cosign.  Kundan, Tuesday, 11:46  Wants to co-sign  Sung, Wed, 07:27  Provides the rev  Ivo, Wed, 09:19  FINE | |
|  |  | | [C1-201001](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200549.zip) | Clarification on Public Network Integrated NPN in TS 24.501 | | | China Telecom | CR 1945 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200549  Ivo, Thursday, 10:55  OK to use PNI-NPN in general. However, we should be consistent in its usage. I.e. also the 1st occurence in 4.14.3 should state PNI-NPN and title of 4.14.3 should be updated too.  Michele, Tuesday, 16:14  To Ivo, first comment ok, second comment not  Ivo, Tue, 19:25  Nearly ok, one more typo  Michele, Wed, 13:36  To Ivo, corrected  Ivo, Wed, 18:20  OK | |
|  |  | | C1-201023 | Limited service state on CAG cell | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 0491 23.122 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Lena is fine  Sung is fine  Revision of C1-200452  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lena, Thursday, 09:05  Since the SA2 agreement on non-CAG capable UEs being able to camp on a CAG cell in limited service state is only for Rel-16 UEs (see [S2-2001693](ftp://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_sa/WG2_Arch/TSGS2_136AH_Incheon/Docs/S2-2001693.zip)), the second bullet added should be made specific to “MS not supporting CAG, but supporting this release of the specification”.  Ivo, Thursday, 16:07  - 3.5 i) - this is captured in 3.5 a) already  - 3.5 j) - whether a UE not supporting CAG can make an emergency registration on a CAG cell depends on broadcast information provided in AS layer. According to my information, RAN2 expects that the CAG cell will indicate "cellreservedForOtherUse" which might prevent a UE not supporting CAG from camping on the CAG cell. We believe that CT1 should wait for RAN2 decision on whether a UE not supporting CAG can make an emergency registration on a CAG cell.  Vishnu, Friday, 10:57  Explains his case to Ivo  Ivo, Friday, 15:29  Bullet I can be accepted, needs some more work  Bullet II wait for Ran2  Vishnu, Tuesday, 16:40  Provides a draft, asking whether Ivo to review/take explanation into account  Ivo, Tue, 19:20  Accepts some but not all, on some aspects we need to wait for RAN2 , use EN  Sung, Wd, 02:44  Acks Ivo, takes out the bulle that depends on RAN2  Vishn, Wed, 14:48  Provides new rev, asking Ivo, Sung  Ivo, Wed, 18:14  Asking for additional changes  Vishnu, Thu, 10:41  All comments taken on board new REVISION  Ivo, Thu, 11:39  FINE with latest revision  Kundan, Thu, 11:58  This looks fine  Vishn, Thu, 13:44  Some words, new tdoc number | |
|  |  | | [C1-201052](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update4\C1-200972.zip) | Manual CAG selection | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0499 23.122 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Kundan wants this to be postponed, Friday, 09:21  Rev of C1-201039  Sung, Thu, 15:26  En as requested by lena  Lena, Thu, 15:50  Fine  Rev of C1-201037  ---------------------------  Revision of C1-200972  Lena on 1039, the EN needs to be changed  Revision of C1-200700  Ivo, Thursday, 17:05  - a) 2) ii) does not capture the case  of "CAG information list" NOT containing an entry for the PLMN and  - a) 2) ii) "the PLMN allows a user to manually select the CAG-ID" - proposal to reformulate to state "CAG cell broadcasting the CAG-ID for the PLMN also broadcasts that the PLMN allows a user to manually select the CAG-ID"  - a)  new paragraph - no need of "an indication that the CAG-ID is allowed" to the user. Instead, those PLMN/CAG-ID combinations should be presented first.  - b) new paragraphs - no need of "indication that the MS is only allowed to access the PLMN via CAG cells" to the user. Instead, those PLMNs should be presented last.  - no need of NOTE 1  Ban, Thursday, 23:48  Overlaps with 700  Challenges the text and provides a new proposal  Vishnu, Friday, 10:42  In principle fine, still comments, see 517  Sung, Tuesday, 04:06  On Issue 2, it seems that 0468 is progressing. Thus, we can use 0468 for addressing Issue 2.  On Issue 1, I would like to volunteer to hold the pen, i.e. let us progress with 0700.  With that proposal, 517merged in 700 and 586 in 486  Sung, Tuesday, 04:40  Provides a rev taking Ivo’s comment on board  Sung, Tuesday, 05:20  Provides a new rev  Kundan, Tuesday, 12:38  Samsung does not support manual broadcasting indicator. It should be configured based on the agreement between roaming partners and by default the UE shows the CAG ID for the PLMN for which no configuration exists  Ban, Tuesday, 17:46  In general the conditions in the CR are OK, but a bit complex, has a proposal to modify  Ivo, Tue, 20:30  Supports Ban, needs to be reworded  Sung, Tue, 22:46  Revised according to Ban and Ivo comments  Lena, Wed, 05:18  We cannot accept the mandatory requirement on the UE to present the list of {PLMN/access technology combination, CAG-ID, HRNN} in a specific order. There are no stage 1 or stage 2 requirements defining this tier 1 and tier 2 type of combination which you introduced in the CR. Moreover, this is going too much into user interface implementation details. We could accept a note making a recommendation about the ordering  Sung, Wed, 06:05  Now a NOTE  Lena, Wed, 06:16  Rev is OK  Sung, Wed, 07:30  To Kundan, Then, how can the RPLMN control it? Please note that CAG configuration is updated by HPLMN only. Do you mean that a VPLMN needs to contact HPLMN whenever there is any change in the manual CAG selection policy for a PNI-NPN hosted by the VPLMN?  Vishnu, Wed, 09:31  Still comments  Kundan, Wed, 09:52  Does not agree with SUng  Ban, Wed, 10:14  Commenting  Ban, Wed, 10:22  Kundan, I do not agree that this should be configured based on the agreement between roaming partners.  This can be dynamic and it is impossible to keep track across all roaming partners in the world.. and imagine how much efforts it will cost operators to do so!!  Kundan, Wed, 10:59  Does not agree with Ban  Ivo, Wed, 11:53  To kundan, Stage-1 requirements expect control by the RPLMN. It can be achieved either by using HRNN as in 731 or by a new bit in SIB.  Ivo, Wed, 13:05  Wants to so-sign, all fine  **Kundan, Wed, 13:50**  **I have expressed my comments over broadcasting by SIB whether the manual CAG selection is allowed or not. IMO, we need F2F discussion to handle this case. It has dependency on RAN2.**  Sung, Wed. 16:30  New rev  Ivo, Wed, 18:53  Requesting more changes  Sung, Wed, 19:06  Gives new revision  Lena, Thu, 01:20  We agree that an indicator in SIB is the easiest way to achieve control by the RPLMN. We have a preference for using a new bit in SIB rather than using the HRNN.  Lena, 02:04  I support this version rather than replacing bullet a) 2) ii) entirely with an editor's note. Our view is that an indication in SIB is the most straightforward way to achieve the SA1 requirement.  Ban, Thu, 08:56  Not happy with how NOTE 0 is written  Vishnu, Thu, 09:36  Agrees, the NOTE needs to be reworded  Sung, Thu, 13:37  Still arguing with Ban and Vishnu  Vishnu, Thu14:17    If this cannot be concluded now, I will prefer  to remove the Note completely and keep the normative text so that the CR is not blocked.  Sung, Thu, 14:27  Asks to check 1039  Ivo, Thu, 14:35  FINE with 1039  Ban ,Thu; 14:36  Can live with this  Vishnu, Thus, 14:52  Fine with 1039  Lena, Thu, 15:17  The EN must be changed or deleted | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  | Time sensitive communication | |
|  |  | | [C1-200330](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200330.zip) | Support for traffic forwarding | | | Intel, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | other Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200331](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200331.zip) | Additional LLDP parameters | | | Intel / Thomas | other Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200339](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200339.zip) | Update of text on time synchronization | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | CR 1885 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200493](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200493.zip) | Definition alignment for UE-DS-TT residence time | | | vivo | CR 1928 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200566](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200566.zip) | Correction on port management message direction | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Cristina | pCR 24.519 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-200411  Lena, Thursday, 09:05   * “UE-initiated” should be changed to “DS-TT-initiated” * The same change is covered in C1-200411   Cristina, Friday, 05:11  Will consider to merge with 411 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200570](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200570.zip) | Add PSFP parameters | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Cristina | pCR 24.519 Rel-16 | Merged, into C1-200329 and its revs  Lena, Thursday, 09:05  the changes in this CR overlap with those in C1-200329, preference for the encoding proposed in C1-200329.  Cristina, Friday, 09:11  Explains her encoding based on IEEE  Ivo, Tue,21:02  Updated CR is nearly OK.  One more mod needed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200573](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200573.zip) | Exchange port management information container through N4 Session Level Reporting procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Cristina | pCR 24.519 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Lena, Thursday, 09:05  don’t think N4 session level procedures between the SMF and the UPF are in the scope of TS 24.519, so this CR should be rejected  Cristina, Friday, 10:23  Explain why Protocol aspect between NW-TT and TSN AF is in the scope of 24.519.  Lena, Monday, 01:29  Fine with explanation, CR is fine | |
|  |  | | [C1-200687](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200687.zip) | Port management IE format and length updates | | | Intel / Thomas | other Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200706](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200706.zip) | Resolving editor’s notes on reliable transmission | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | pCR 24.519 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200708](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200708.zip) | Duplicated Ethernet port parameters in case of validation and generation of LLDP frames processed centrally at NW-TT | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | pCR 24.519 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200734](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200734.zip) | Clarification on calculation of the residence time spent within the 5G system | | | Intel / Thomas | pCR 24.535 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200832](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update1\C1-200832.zip) | Port management corrections | | | Intel / Thomas | other Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200411  This includes 0411, Huawei as co-source, offline Cristina indicated this is fine  Lena, Wed, 05:30  OK  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lena, Thursday, 09:06   * last change is also covered in Huawei’s C1-200566 * in subclause 8.5.1, “UE-initiated” should be “DS-TT-initiated“   Cristina, Friday, 05:13  OK to merge 566 and 411 | |
|  |  | | C1-200835 | Support for per-stream filtering and policing | | | Intel / Thomas | other Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Document not provided  Revision of C1-200329  Cristina, Wed, 02:15  Reporting “PSFPSupportedListMax” does solve compatibility issue. But note that “PSFPSupportedListMax” is not in current supported PSFP parameter list. Hence the following revision may need to be considered:  Option1: add one parameter more – “PSFPSupportedListMax”;  Option2: follow up IEEE’s design, using “4 octets” as the length of “PSFPAdminControlListLength”.  As I mentioned in former email, C1-200570 also proposes the similar content. If the above revision suggestion can be taken, we would like to merge C1-200570 into C1-200329 and co-authoring.  Thomas, Wed, 15:05  Fine to take 329 on board  Cristina, Thus, 07:28  Fine  Ivo, Thursday, 25.02.  Thomas takes the comments from Ivo on board  0835 is revised  Ivo, Thu 10:56  OK with the revision, wants to co-sign  Now hua and eri co-signe  Ivo, thu, 14:24  FINE  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thursday, 12:50  - 9.xz - it should be stated that this is a type 6 IE  - Figure 9.xz.2 - in order to enable adding additiona parameters to the table, the Figure 9.xz.2 should start with length field  - pCR should be against 24.519  Ivo, Thursday, 12:58  More detailed comments  Cristina, Friday, 09:11  Explains her encoding based on IEEE  Thomas, Monday, 15:39  Explains his view  Therefore there is no need to have more than 2 octets for coding of PSFPAdminControlListLength  Cristina, Tuesday, 05:03  but I’m worried about that such misalignment design with IEEE (in which 4 octets is required) may lead to compatibility issues. Sooner or later we have to face this problem.  Thomas, Tuesday, 10:20  To Cristina, thinks this is not a problem  Thomas, Tuesday, 16:12  To Ivo, has taken almost all comments on board, two are not considered  Rev available | |
|  |  | | [C1-200997](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update3\C1-200997.zip) | Correction for the wrongly implemented CR1963r1 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Cristina | CR 1949 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200571  Lena, Thursday, 09:06  in the CR coversheet, the CR # of the CR that was wrongly implemented is not correct, it should be CR 1693 instead of CR 1963  Crisitna, Friday, 07:39  Fine with comment from lena  Sung, Wed, 19:49  a hard space between 24. and 519 should be removed.  Cristina, Thu, 03:34  Providing a rev, this has both comments addressed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200993](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update4\C1-200993.zip) | Establish PDU session to transfer port management information containers | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Cristina | CR 1947 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200855  Cristina, Thu, 02:11  Taken all comments from Lena and Ivo on board  Lena, Thu, 02:22  This versio is fine  Ivo, Thu, 09:12  Fine  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200564  Ivo, Wed, 11:50  In general ok wants to co-sign, still issues  - the CR is not based on the correct baseline - there is not "[general part to check if already covered]" in 24.501. This text should be present in the CR.  - there should be no changes indicated in the cover sheet  Ivo, Wed, 18:18  Correcting  general, Ericsson is OK with C1-200855.zip and would like to cosign.  However, there are the following minor issues:  - the CR is not based on the correct baseline - there is not "[general part to check if already covered]" in 24.501. This text should NOT be present in the CR.  - there should be no changes indicated in the cover sheet  Lena, Thu, 01:19  Same comment as Ivo, plus the new NOTE 3 does not read well. To be consistent with existing wording in the same subclause, I suggest:  NOTE 3:     Only SSC mode 1 is supported for a PDU session which is for TSC.  CRs in C1-200685, C1-200290, C1-200564 conflict  Lena, Thursday, 09:03  CR is not needed, requirement for PDU sessions always on already covered, requirement for UE to request SSC mode 1 is not justified  Ivo, Thurssday, 15:55  no need to add normative text on inclusion of Always-on PDU session requested IE in the bullet list starting with “If the UE requests to establish a PDU session of “Ethernet” PDU session type and the UE supports transfer of port management information containers, the UE shall:” as this is already captured in “If the UE requests to establish a new PDU session as an always-on PDU session (e.g. because the PDU session is for TSC), the UE shall include the Always-on PDU session requested IE and set the value of the IE to “Always-on PDU session requested" in the PDU SESSION ESTABLISHMENT REQUEST message."  Cristina, Friday, 04:58  Partly agrees with Lena, disagrees on SSC mode things  Cristian, Friday, 04:59  Fine with Ivo comment  Lena, Friday, 05:03  At the most, a note could be added in stage 3 stating something like “Only SSC mode 1 is supported for TSC PDU sessions”.  Yanchao, Friday, 08:26   1. SA2 requirement “the TSC service supported PDU session should be the always-on PDU session” has already been covered by the following text copied from clause 6.4.1 of 3GPP TS 24.501:   Cristina, Friday, 10:31  Delete “always-on PDU session” from proposed bullet list in new version  Cristina, Friday 10:32  Takes out ssc mode  Sung, Tue, 19:40  Asking when the update is available  Cristina, Wed, 02:38  Rev is available, explaining the mods | |
|  |  | | C1-201035 | Handling of a UE with an emergency PDU session in terms of CAG | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2008 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Agreed  Ivo FINE  Revision of C1-200975  Proposal from Ban is accepted  Ban ; thu, 14:44  FINE  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  REvsion of C1-200729  Lena, Thursday, 09:06   * The text on AMF not performing CAG access control needs to be changed to AMF not checking CAG restrictions to align with the terminology changes proposed in C1-200471 * Typo: “the UE does not pass CAG access control is not a pass”   Ivo, Thursday, 12:44  Technical comment on 5.4.4.2, 5.6.1.4.1 is no readable  Lin, Saturday, 10:39  7 comments as to what needs to be improved in the Cr  Sung, Wed, 05:34  Provides a rev, taking Ivo and Lin on board  Ban, Wed, 09:41  Few comments  Sung, Wed, 15:51  Takes comments from Ban on board, provides a rev  Ban Wed, 16:15  New comes  Sung, Wed, 16:43  Taking some of the coms on board, new rev, waiting for Ban  Ban, Thu, 09:52  New proposal  Îvo, Thu, 0958  Nearly ok, still some comments | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 5G\_CioT | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects of Cellular IoT support and evolution for the 5G System | |
|  |  | | [C1-200298](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200298.zip) | Update of Reading coverage enhancement status +CRCES for Connection to 5G Core Network | | | BlackBerry UK Limited | CR 0684 27.007 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200116 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200383](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200383.zip) | Resolve Editor´s Notes on NB-N1 mode extended NAS timers for CE | | | Ericsson / Mikael | CR 1891 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200384](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200384.zip) | Resolve Editor´s Notes on WB-N1 mode extended NAS timers for CE | | | Ericsson / Mikael | CR 1892 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200397](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200397.zip) | “MO exception data” access category | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 1897 24.501 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-200677 and its revisions  C1-200397, C1-200421 and C1-200677 overlap, all related to incoming LS in C1-200227  Fei, Thursday, 10:21  Both CRs (421, 397)have proposed to support the ""MO exception data" in the SNPN. I am not sure whether the NB-N1 mode will be supported in the SNPN.  Ivo, Thursday, 16:17  unaware of any statement which excludes SNPN in NB-N1 mode. If that's correct, then someone might deploy SNPN in NB-N1 mode and the standard should be prepared for it.  Ban, Thursday, 22:19  agree with Ivo that there is no restriction so far to exclude NB-N1 mode for SNPN.  Please note that C1-200677 provides the same solution  Amer, Friday, 00:07  Agrees with Fei, . I prefer to not do this unnecessary work. At the very least, an EN should be added saying that “The support for CP CIoT in SNPN is to be verified”.  Ivo, Friday, 09:21  Ok to merge this in 677 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200417](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200417.zip) | Support for UE specific DRX for NB-S1 mode | | | Qualcomm Incorporated, Ericsson / Amer | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  C1-200355, C1-200417, C1-200498 overlapping, All related to the incoming LS in C1-200237  Lin, Friday, 11:36  principle the whole content of this paper is confusing as it does not distinguish the discussion between EPS and 5GS while the existing DRX NAS negotiation is totoally different between EPS and 5GS.  Lin, Sunday,  Further comment, option 2 does not work, has NBC issue  Mikael, Sunday, 22:36  thinks you have misunderstood alt2. At least my understanding of alt2 is different than what you describe …  In my understanding, one of the main points of different understanding is that you believe the legacy MME will provide a requested UE specific DRX to the eNB also at NB access whereas our interpretation is that the legacy MME only provides the requested UE specific DRX value to the eNB in WB. I guess we need to come to a common understanding on this, or agree on a solution that satisfies both options.  Lin, Tuesday, 07:52  Arguing based on incoming SA2 LS  Mikael, Tuesday, 10:49  Agreeing with some of Lin on issue 1), however, issue 2) is a RAN3 aspect | |
|  |  | | [C1-200420](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200420.zip) | 5GSM congestion timers apply to data transfer over control plane | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Amer | CR 1908 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Kaj, Thursday, 14:19  In EPS, T3396 does not prevent sending of ESM DATA TRANSPORT message according to 6.5.1.4.2 and 6.5.3.4.2 in 24.301.  Thus,  in 5GS, T3396, T3584 and T3585 should not prevent transfer of user data using control plane CIoT 5GS optimization.  For this purpose, timer T3448 applies.  Yanchao, Friday, 10:26  Supports Kaj  Lin, Sunday, 09:30  1. Wrong CR template, e.g. the background yellow color is missing.  2. The ME box should be ticked in the cover page.  3. The date format is wrong in the cover page  4. The release no. is wrong in the cover page.  5. For the change part, prefer to use "neither A nor B nor C", not “neither A, B, nor C”.  Mahmoud, Wed, 22:45  Are there any stage-2 reqs in support of this CR | |
|  |  | | [C1-200421](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200421.zip) | Definition of a new access category for MO exception data | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Amer | CR 1909 24.501 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-200677 and its revisions  C1-200397, C1-200421 and C1-200677 overlap, all related to incoming LS in C1-200227  Fei, Thursday, 10:21  Both CRs (421, 397) have proposed to support the ""MO exception data" in the SNPN. I am not sure whether the NB-N1 mode will be supported in the SNPN.  Ivo, Thursday, 14:19  exception data reporting is not a regulatory service, and thus "Access attempt for MO exceptional data" should be done after "Access attempt for operator-defined access category", as in C1-200397.  Ivo, Thursday, 16:18  unaware of any statement which excludes SNPN in NB-N1 mode. If that's correct, then someone might deploy SNPN in NB-N1 mode and the standard should be prepared for it.  Ban, Thursday, 22:19  agree with Ivo that there is no restriction so far to exclude NB-N1 mode for SNPN.  Please note that C1-200677 provides the same solution  Ban, Thursday, 22:20  Services related to regulation should come first, before the Operator-defined access category.  Emergency call is regulatory requirement, where Exception data is not. Also, there is no way to prevent IoT UEs from using mo exception data, that may impact the traffic and make it uncontrollable. Therefore conceptually, operator-defined category should come first.  If you agree on this comment, then we can work on merging the 3 contributions:  C1-200421, C1-200397 and C1-200677.  Amer, Friday, 00:07  Agrees with Fei, . I prefer to not do this unnecessary work. At the very least, an EN should be added saying that “The support for CP CIoT in SNPN is to be verified”.  Amer, Friday, 00:11  I am OK with moving the new row below ODAC. However, as I explained in the other thread about C1-200421, there is no support for CP CIoT in SNPN, so the related subclause should be removed  Lin, Sunday, 07:19  We believe CP CIOT can be supported by SNPN via NB-IoT/eMTC connected to SNPN 5GCN. At least we did not see any clear spec text in both SA2/CT1 to exclude it, so by default, I can be supported. But we could live with to add an EN to capture this without touching SNPN as the timebeing.  It seems C1-200421 and C1-200397 will be merged into the revision of C1-200677, I do support this way  Ban, Monday, 12:30  Provides a rev of 677 in the drafts folder, is this fine for all, i.e. can 421, be merged  Amer, Monday, 19:52  We are OK with merging C1-200421 into C1-200677-r1 and we would like to co-sign the CR  Amer, Tuesday, 00:48  Still want to keep the en | |
|  |  | | [C1-200424](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200424.zip) | Update of +CNMPSD for NR | | | BlackBerry UK Ltd. | CR 0685 27.007 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200496](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200496.zip) | Ciphering and deciphering handling of CPSR message | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1930 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200498](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200498.zip) | NAS evaluation on options for UE specific DRX for NB-IoT | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  C1-200355, C1-200417, C1-200498 overlapping, All related to the incoming LS in C1-200237  Amer, Friday, 01:13  Disagrees with proposal 1 and proposal 2, proposal 3 out of scope | |
|  |  | | [C1-200500](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200500.zip) | Discussion on truncated 5G-S-TMSI over NAS | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | discussion Rel-16 | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-200502](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200502.zip) | AMF behavior on stop T3448 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1933 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200588](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200588.zip) | Ambiguity in the suspend indication from lower layers to the NAS | | | Samsung/Mahmoud | discussion 24.501 Rel-16 | Noted  Amer, Friday, 01:28  any breakdown in the meaning of the suspend indication that would be introduced in the specs would be untestable, provides an alternative  Mahmoud, Friday, 02:10  I would like to point out that the text you propose below is for the case when the pending procedure is registration request or service request procedure.  The CR also covers the case that the pending procedure is an UL NAS TRANSPORT for sending data which is a different paragraph, and just adding “Control Plane Service Request” there does not suffice.  Mikael, Friday, 08:48  paper is relevant and when looking at NAS specification the same lower layer indication seems to trigger two different behaviors. It should be clarified by RAN2 how these cases are distinguished so therefore  I support sending an LS to request clarification, but I would prefer to leave it open for RAN to explain or resolve without CT1 pointing at any specific required action.  Mahmoud, Friday, 16:37  Explains to Amer, ok to reword the LS  Behrouz, Friday, 19:45  it is absolutely clear that there are two possible actions for the UE to take for the exact same indication form the lower layers. Hence, we too are of the understanding that something has to be done to resolve this issue.  We would like to, therefore, support sending an LS to RAN2.  Mahmoud, Friday, 21:35  ….In other words, the UE can implement this distinction in any way it wants. The proposal about different naming is just to remove the confusion in the specs.  At any rate, sending an LS along the lines of what Mikael suggested is fine. No need to hint any (untestable) solutions.  Rae, Monday, 10:14  Based on the discussion paper, I also think the issue does exist.  Also it is better that keep CT1 spec and RAN2 spec align for the indication between NAS layer and RRC layer.  So I support what Mikael suggested, i.e. sending an LS to RAN2 to let RAN2 clarify. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200593](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200593.zip) | Service area restrictions for UEs using CIoT 5GS optimization | | | Samsung/Mahmoud | CR 1967 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Amer, Friday, 01:42  are there any stage 2 requirements to support this stage 3 CR?  Mahmoud, Friday, 02:01  have not seen any requirement stating that service area restriction is not applicable for UEs that use CIoT 5GS optimization, and the current service area restriction have not considered such UEs  Kaj, Friday, 11:36  Almost fine, but what is the motivation for "*or a DL NAS TRANSPORT message with the Payload container type IE to set to "CIoT user data container" has been received"* ?  To me the NW should not send a DL CIoT user data container in the first place when the UE is in non-allowed area.  Mahmoud, Friday, 17:45  Explains the motivation to Kaj  Amer, Friday, 21:11  I was not able to find any stage 2 requirements for allowing the UE to:   * send exception data inside a non-allowed area.; or * initiate UL NAS transport procedure to transport CIoT user data container upon receipt of a DL NAS TRANSPORT msg with CIoT user data container inside a non-allowed area.   Are there such requirements?  Mahmoud, Friday, 22:42  There are no such reqs, but we need to consider these UEs…… if you have other suggestions for this then please provide them. However, it is clear that something needs to be done for UEs that use CIoT 5GS optimization that are in restricted service area.  Mahmoud, Saturday, 23:44  Further clarifies his comments and answers to Kaj  Lin, Sunday, 10:23  Fine in general, detailed comments via drafts folder  Mahmoud, Monday 05:24  One comment no problem to take into account, **your comment about network not sending CIoT user data to the UE while in a restricted area, I am not sure about that.** As mentioned to Kaj in another email, the restriction in SA2 is about 5GSM signalling. Noting that SMS is not prohibited in the DL, it is not evident to me that CIoT user data cannot be sent by the network. I am of the opinion that the network can choose to do so if it wants.  Please provide further thoughts on this  Amer, Monday, 19:08  My position is that this rationale should be discussed and **agreed in stage 2 first before we can agree to your CR in stage** *3*.  Mahmoud, Monay, 19:54  To Amer, asking for any suggestions for improvement. Yet, you seem to question the entire concept.  If this is the case, then we need to send an LS to SA2 to ask about guidance on the applicability of service area restriction to UEs that use CIoT 5GS optimization. I will draft and share one.  Amer, Monday, 00:10  On the LS, I am OK with asking SA2, if everyone else is OK too, about the exception to the service restriction for exception data, proposal to exempt UL data transfer to send an application layer ACK, I don’t agree with that question  Lin, Tuesday, 10:54  Limit the scope of the TR, and maybe we can not touch DL in this meeting and then discuss it separately in the next meeting  Amer, Tuesday, 16:36  Wants to see a draft CR showing the remaining aspects before providing comments  Mahmoud, Tue 19:54  Providing the draft-v1  Amer, Tue, 23.59  Looking at 23.501, it seems that the same applies to 23.501, i.e. the reason that 24.501 has not considered these aspects is that stage 2 has not considered them either. My SA2 colleague confirms that this seems to be a gap that needs to be closed in SA2, since 5G CIoT is a Rel-16 work item and service area restrictions had been defined in Rel-15. **So this needs to addressed by SA2 first**. In this particular case, since you are drafting an LS on service area restrictions out of this meeting, you could maybe add this aspect to the draft LS. Another option is to submit a CR to close the gap to SA2 directly.  Mahmoud, Wed, 18:42  Fine with sending the LS  Lin, Thu, 08:02  Looks fine | |
|  |  | | [C1-200594](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200594.zip) | Adding reference to TS 24.501 for exception data reporting | | | Samsung/Mahmoud | CR 0047 24.368 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-200773 and its revisions  Ban, Tuesday, 12:54  Wants this to be merged into 773  Mahmoud, Tuesday, 16:31  Fine with the merge | |
|  |  | | [C1-200618](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200618.zip) | Value range of UE specific DRX in NB-S1 mode | | | Vodafone GmbH | CR 3212 24.008 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Amer: Thursday, 19:55 requests to postpone this Cr  Amer, Friday, 01:47  Believes CR is inmature, CT1 should first agree on a complete stage 3 solution for signaling of UE specific DRX parameters for NB-S1 mode, - There is a related ongoing discussion in RAN2 on the value range of UE specific DRX parameters for NB-S1 mode  Lin, Sunday, 09:11  believe the original motivation of RAN to support this feature is to shorten down the paging latency as currently NB UE can only use eDRX for paging.  So if we want to define the value range, then we would prefer to have the value range as {320ms, 640ms, 1.28s, 2.56s, 5.12s, 10.24s}  We also believe that the UE specific DRX value and the cell specific DRX value are two different concepts and there is no requirements they have to use the same value range | |
|  |  | | [C1-200666](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200666.zip) | Service gap control timer corrections | | | Ericsson /kaj | CR 3335 24.301 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200675](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200675.zip) | CIoT user data container in CPSR message not forwarded | | | Ericsson /kaj | CR 1743 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Based on email form Kaj, 14:50  Revision of C1-198950  Amerd, Friday, 01:54  the CR doesn’t have any UE impact. If that is correct, the ME box in the cover sheet should be unchecked  Lin, Sunday, 07:51  Alll in all, we do not like the CR direction and would prefer to go another direction, i.e. the NW rejects  Kaj, Tuesday, 08:33  Only agrees with the second of Lin’s comments, not with the first one  Lin, wed, 02:47  It sounds not a good logic that you provide a failed cause in a Accept message, IMO.  Not convinced | |
|  |  | | [C1-200682](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200682.zip) | MO exception data for NB-IoT in 5G | | | DOCOMO Communications Lab., Ericsson | CR 1986 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  CR was withdrawn as it used a CR number requested for 24.501 instead of 24.368 | |
|  |  | | C1-20782 | 5G-GUTI reallocation after resume from 5GMM-IDLE mode with suspend indication due to paging | | | Samsung/Mahmoud | CR 1959 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Revision of C1-200583  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Fei, Thursday, 11:55  motivation of the CR is fine. However one more condition should be added to clarify that this is only applied for the MT access resume cause.  Now the CR looks that even the resume procedure is triggered by the mo-signalling or mo data, the 5G-GUTI allocation is also required during the lifetime of the NAS signalling connection.  Mahmoud, Thursday, 16:25  Provides an answer to Fei  Fei, Friday, 02:54  Fine with Mahmoud comment, provides a proposed wording  Mahmoud, Friday, 03:38  Ok with the wording form Fei, will provide a revision  Mahmoud, Friday, 19:17  Announces revision  Kaji, Sunday, 22:28  **Explaining security aspects … given this I do not see that the proposed change is needed.**  **Mahmoud, Monday, 14:22**  **Explaining to Kaj that there are security issues that need to be resolved**  **Kaj, Monday, 22:36**  **To Mahmoud**  Note that there is no 5G-GUTI re-allocation requirement in stage 2 for the MO service request which could happen over and over again from 5GMM-IDLE to 5GMM-CONNECTED without a 5G-GUTI re-allocation in between.  SA3 did not see the lack of 5G-GUTI re-allocation at MO service request as a security issue.  The same reasoning applies for paging with resume response case  Mahmoud, Monday, 23:25  Not agreeing with kaj,  Again, I have clarified that paging with same 5G-S-TMSI twice should not be possible with the current SA3 requirement. And I also demonstrated that there is a case (as explained by our CR) where this breaks.  **At this point, we should ask SA3 for guidance on this important security matter.**  **I therefore will draft an LS to SA3 on this and let them tell us what the requirement is**.  **Kaj, Tuesday, 08:19**  The current TS 33.501 is clear about when 5G-GUTI reallocation shall take place and resume response to paging request is not one of the triggers.  According to our SA3 colleagues this is intentionally.  **If Samsung wants to also have paging with resume response as a trigger, then this should be handled in SA3 via regular CR and not via a LS from CT1.** | |
|  |  | | C1-20783 | Adding an editor’s note for suspend indication due to user plane CIoT 5GS optimization | | | Samsung/Mahmoud | CR 1961 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200585  Lin, Tuesday, 12:11  fine  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Amer, Friday, 01:32  disagree with the editor’s note. Resolving the EN would amount to designing the API between AS and NAS, which would be untestable, provides an alternative  Mikael, Friday, 08:59  Something needs to be done in 24.501, an EN would be good, provides some text  Mahmoud, Friday, 19:46  Fine with mikael’s suggestion, announces a revision  Amer, Friday, 23:53  Suggests to only to an EN  ditor’s Note: Clarification is needed to differentiate the suspend indication due to the use of user plane CIoT 5GS optimization from a suspend indication due to the RRC entering the RRC inactive state  Mahmoud, Saturday, 00:33  Different wording for the En  Amer, Saturday, 01:00  Fine with the EN  Mikael, Saturday, 10:26  Fine  Lin, Sunday, 10:15  Fine, use CAT F  Mahmoud, Tuesday, 00:29  Update available ack  Amer, Tuesday, 00:51  783 looks ok | |
|  |  | | [C1-200786](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200626.zip) | Indication of change in the use of enhanced coverage | | | BEIJING SAMSUNG TELECOM R&D | CR 1975 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Mikael, Friday, 1047  Provides some comments on 786, comparing to the agreed SA2  Revision of C1-200626  Amer, Monday, 18:38  Looking for 786  Mikael, Wed, 15:58  **Anyway, the discussion is ongoing in SA2, and as I already stated, we do not think CT1 should proceed with this CR unless there is an SA2 agreed CR to align to. Lets see how quickly SA2 can come to a conclusion**.  Mahmoud, Wed, 20:19  Explaining to Mikael the rationale, and that ther is a dependency on the cover sheet  Mahmoud, Wed, 20:34  To amer, hinting at the rev  Amer, Wed, 21.26  No need for two way handshake, reg request without data is bad protocol design  Fine to let SA2 have first say  Mahmoud, Thu, 04:42  Explaining to Amer  Amer, Thu, 11:24  , the proper way to move forward is to postpone the stage 3 CR and move the discussion to SA2. This is also what others suggested below.  Mahmoud, Thu, 07;32  Wants to pursue, dependany on the cover sheet is covered  Lin, THU, 07:50  Supports Mahmoud  Fei, Thu, 08:50  Lined CR box to be ticked to yes  Mahmound, thu, 12:54  Ticks the CR box  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Amer, Friday, 01:48  are there any stage 2 requirements to support this stage 3 CR  Fei, Friday, 08:57  Wants to discuss stage-2 first  Mahmoud, Friday, 17:58  Highlights that there are stage-2 reqs, cover page explains the issue  Amer, Friday, 20:44  not debating the need for the indication but I **disagree that CT1 can introduce it without SA2 requirements**. The restriction on the use of EC is a system-wide feature and modifications to the related procedures need to be considered by SA2. They should confirm the need for the indication; if OK’ed, SA2 should decide what is the best procedure to use to provide it to the UE, how it fits in with the similar indications in the core NW, should other nodes be involved too (as Fei hinted  Mahmoud, Friday, 23:52  To Amer, CT1 can discuss this. There is a CR to SA2 emeeting, linkage will be provided on the cover sheet, based on that, asking for more comments  Amer, Saturday, 02:02  Thanks for SA2 info, asking one more question/suggestion  Mahmoud, Saturday, 02:49  That does not work. Sending a CUC message containing only the Configuration update indication IE with registration requested bit set is specifically used for the purpose of AMF relocation  Amer, Saturday, 04:00  Can’t see the limitation mentioned by Mahmoud in 24.501  Lin, Saturday, 08:41  support the CR to resolve this gap between the UE and the NW on using the extended NAS timer for UEs in CE mode B. some comment on the IE coding  Amer, Saturday, 12:20  Commenting, One way to make the new proposed indication useful would be to have it directly indicate to the UE whether the enhanced coverage is restricted or not without requesting registration. That would avoid the need to trigger the registration procedure  Mahmoud, Saturday, 21:31  I am sorry but your proposal changes the fundamental principle that features are requested by the UE via registration procedure and usage of a feature is indicated to be allowed by the network in the Reg. Accept message.  It is important for the UE to register and for the network to indicate whether or not EC is being used, and based on this negotiation the AMF can inform the SMF so that all the network entities are in synch.  This is how it has been and so we don’t like to deviate from this principle.  What is the issue with the UE registering again?  Mahmoud, Saturday, 21:31  To Amer, pls check section 5.3.1.1.  Mahmoud, Saturday, 21:32  Fine with Lin’s way forward, rev will be in 00786  Amer, Sunday, 04:06  Still not convinced  The issue with the UE re-registering, from the UE point of view, is:  - The REGISTRATION REQUEST message would carry zero useful information. Sending such messages is a bad protocol design.  - These are NB-IoT devices, which are supposed to have lean, (power-)efficient protocols.  Mikael, Sunday, 18:07  Agrees with much of what Amer is saying, long explanation  so therefore we believe the **discussion needs to be concluded in SA2 before an alignment in CT1 can be agreed.** At least we need to have the finally agreed SA2 CR available before we can agree a CR in CT1. We cannot at this time assume that the changes will be limited to what is captured in the SA2 CR as submitted  Fei, Monday, 02:08  I agree with what Amer said.  If the subcription changes to the restriction of the use, then there is no need for the UE to trigger the registration procedure. This is somehow like the SMS availability indication.  Yang, 09;48  Our inclination is to side with Mahmoud/Lin to have a prompt recover from the mismatch of the usage of enhanced coverage between the UE and the network.  Certainly, the solution needs to align with stage 2. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200792](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200435.zip) | UE behaviour when T3447 running | | | ZTE | CR 1917 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Lin, confirms Friday, 08:02  Revision of C1-200435  Lin, Tuesday, 10:12  Fine with the CR, some aspect open  Fei, Tuesday, 10:37  Clarifies that the aspect mentioned by Lin is already addressed  Kaj, Wed, 15:55  Coming in late  ….What I try to say is,  do we really need specify this new exception?  Fei, Thu, 03:15  Tries to explain to Kaj, hopes this addresses the concern  Kaj is fine  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Amer, Friday, 00:36  if T3447 is running than the UE cannot send any data for any service. So what is the rationale for the urgency to report change in PS data off status while T3447 is running?  Fei, Friday, 04:28  Answers the questions from Amer  Amer, Friday, 21:58  Thanks for the clarification.  Lin, Sunday, 14:57   1. normally the UE cannot modify an emergency PDU session and hence, it would be better to refer the error cases as specified in sub 6.4.1.3 and 6.3.2.3, e.g. yellow text added. 2. changed sub 5.4.5.2.6 is only for the connected mode, then how about the idle mode? When T3447 is running in the idle mode and the PS data off is changed, then whether the UE is still allowed to initiate the SR in order to send the PDU session modification? IMHO, it think so and hence the required change for the idle mode is also needed. 3. The “or” at the end of below text needs to be removed.   Fei, Monday, 08:26  Rev in drafts folder, all taken on board | |
|  |  | | [C1-200821](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update1\C1-200821.zip) | UAC updates for NB-IoT to include "MO exception data" | | | DOCOMO Communications Lab. | CR 1983 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200677  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  C1-200397, C1-200421 and C1-200677 overlap, all related to incoming LS in C1-200227  Amer, Friday, 01:56  As explained for C1-200421, there is no support for CP CIoT in SNPN, so the related subclause should be removed  Ivo, Friday, 14:14  OK to revert changes for SNPN, i.e. in Table 4.5.2A.2. However, I would like to see an editor's note, e.g. "The support for CP CIoT in SNPN is to be verified" under Table 4.5.2A.2.  Fei, Tuesday, 04:32  Fine with the rev from Ban | |
|  |  | | [C1-200831](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update1\C1-200831.zip) | Stop T3565 upon connection resumption | | | vivo / Yanchao | CR 1900 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200400  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Corrected agenda  Lin, Monday, 09:41  The CR is fine with some comments to improve it ….  Yanchao, Monday, 10:46  To Lin, comments taken on board, rev in drafts folder  Fei, Monday, 11:18  **Reference to 36.413 is not right**.  The correct reference should be 38.413. Otherwise it means that the AMF will support the S1 interface.  Although the NR does not support the CIoT, the eNodeB still needs to update to support N2 and N3 interface for the 5G\_CIoT.  Lin, Monday, 11:22  I am talking about E-UTRA connected to 5GCN, which is NGAP between eNB and AMF, not S1.  For E-UTRA connected to 5GCN, it was covered in 36.413, not in 38.413.  **Fei; Monday, 11:31**  **Does not agree with Lin on the reference**  **Amer, Monday, 20:47**  **Wanted to know whether agenda item is correct?**  **Fei, Tuesday, 03:18,**  **Agenda item is correct**  **Lin, Tuesday, 09:54**  **After checking, agrees with Fei** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200852](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update1\C1-200852.zip) | Stopping of T3513 after connection resume for user plane CIoT 5GS optimization | | | Samsung/Mahmoud | CR 1956 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200580  Mahmoud, Tue, 23:19  Only change was to make it CAT F  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lin, Sunday, 10:12  Fine,  Better to be category F CR.  Change part needs also to refer TS 36.413  Lin, Monday,09:43  Corrects his comments,on reference  Although email is a bit confusing:  Lin, Tuesday,  Corrects his comments, right ref is 38.413, which is used in the CR | |
|  |  | | C1-200859 | Recovery from fallback for UEs using CP CIoT optimization | | | Samsung/Mahmoud | CR 1966 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Open questions  Amer  Lin confirmed he is ok,  Mikael confirmed he is ok,  Revision of C1-200592  Amer, Wed, 21:01  Revises the text, still working on 859-rev  Mahmoud, Wed, 21:38  Fine with Amer proposals  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Amer, Friday, 01:42  OK with the rationale and the objective of the CR. We think that the same objective could be achieved with much less impact on the specification, provides an alternative  Kaj, Friday, 11:36  Almost find,  I’m almost fine with the CR except:   * for the last update, the NAS message container could be included if the UE wants to sync PDU session status (PDU session status IE). Maybe you could change to:   + *the* *UE shall send the CONTROL PLANE SERVICE REQUEST without including the Payload container IE and without including the CIoT small data container IE.*   Amer, Friday, 21:23  existing text says “If the UE has only uplink user data or SMS to be sent…” Doesn’t this cover it?  Mahmoud, Friday, 23:15  Explaining to Amer section 5.3.1.4: does not apply for UEs that use CIoT optimization further explanation, asking Amer to give comments specific per each section  Lin, Sunday, 09:41  We also agree with the intention of the CR and need to do something but the proposed changes are overdone as some cases will not happen for UE is using CP. Detailed comments via DRAFTS  Mahmoud, Monday, 05:02  Takes Lin’s proposal into account, provides new revisiokn and explains why. Lin is asked to confirm that this clarifies his comments  Lin, Tuesday, 10:42  Clarifies that the case needs to be more specific, i.e rewording for condition  Mikael, Tuesday, 14:42  I am fine in general with the intentions of the CR, but a couple of minor comments for now:  …..  Mahmoud, Wed, 04:11  Explaingin to Lin how the rev is addressing his comments, new number is 859, asking for comments  Explaing to Mikael that all comments are taken on board | |
|  |  | | C1-200893 | Enhancement on CPSR for CIoT CP data transport | | | Huawei, HiSilicon, Vodafone, ZTE, China Mobile, China Telecom, CATT/Lin | CR 1701 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Revision of C1-200495  Lin, Thu, 11:28  Some explanation to Vivek and Jennifer  Behourz, Thu, 15:15  Postion has not changed  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-198581  Mikael, Friday, 01:35  Compared to previous version of this CPSR optimization proposal, ngKSI and SN have been shortened and combined into one octet.  Shortening SN will result in security impact and decreasing the window for accepted NAS COUNT values at replay protection. This is not acceptable for us and the previous “normal” 8 bit SN needs to be used.  Shortening ngKSI will loose the TSC indication. We believe there are cases when this is needed and given that there is no actual saving in message size, assuming SN is reverted to 8 bits, we would prefer to also keep the “normal” ngKSI  Behrouz, Friday, 17:07  Supports Mikael, general position in regards to this topic has not changed. I don’t see any strong reason for defining a Non-Standard L3 message, creating an exceptional case and, hence, making the protocol more complex.  Vivek, Friday, 17:36  Our views have not changed on this topic as well, and we are \***not**\* in favor of further optimization of CPSR message by defining this as a non-standard L3 message.  Lin, Monday, 01:43  Fine with Mikael’s proposal, rev in drafts folder  Lin, Monday, 02:00  To behrouz, Vivek, The CPSR message is a NEW NAS message in 5GS and dedicatedly used for CP CIOT data transport, which is already a special NAS message. As we discussed/analyzed in the past, even to save one octet for this message over NAS, will save much more transport block and restrasmission over AS layer and finally will improve the CIoT device battery life and signaling efficienc  Looking whether Vivik Behrouz can live with the rev in drafts folder  Jennifer, Monday, February 24, 2020  Our position remains the same as well.  In 5G, there is no non-standard L3 NAS message, 5G Service request is designed as standard L3 NAS message. Introducing a new non-standard L3 NAS message would incur much development complexity and testing overhead. We are not convinced that there is need to introduce the CPSR message as a non-standard L3 NAS message.  Yang, Tuesday, 08:41  Accepts Mikaels comment, sconds what Lin said | |
|  |  | | C1-200894 | No SMS in payload container IE in CPSR message | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1934 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200503  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Kaj, Friday, 17:47  some sympathy with your proposal but I do not fully agree with the conclusion.  If the UE wants to both send SMS and e.g. synchronize PDU session status with the NW, then the Payload container IE must be used.  Lin, Monday, 04:28  Agrees with Kaj’s proposals, provides rev in drafts folder  Kaj, Monday, 09:44  Almost fine with the rev, more changes requested  Lin, Tuesday, 03:19  Takes Kaj comment on board, updates cover page as requested  Kaj, Wed, 14:56  FINE | |
|  |  | | C1-200895 | Truncated 5G-S-TMSI over NAS | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1932 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Yang is fine  Mikael, Thursday, 22:39  New questions, cover sheet not correct  Lin, Friday, 04:22  Big comment, can’t vbe addressed  Either we agree, knowing more to come  Or we postpone  Mikael 08:31, can live with it,  Amer, Friday, is fine 06:13  Fei, Friday, is fine  Revision of C1-200501  Lin, thu 03:37  Asking Mikael, Yang, Amer, Fei and Behrouz  Whether they are fine  Behrouz, Thu07:05  I am so sorry, but it seems that I totally missed this mail within the barrage of mails that I had on Monday morning. Hope it is not too late…  The reason **you need an IE of TLV** format is backward compatibility. If the NW sends this IE to a UE of earlier release of the protocol, then that UE does not recognize the IEI (the “T”) and, hence, will discard the entire IE. However, the UE needs to know how many octets this new IE contain.  Lin, Thu, 08:54  Agrees with Behrouz  Behrouz, thu, 15:00  OK  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Yang, Thursday, 11:36  Proposes usage of a Note, instead repeated text  Fei, Thursday, 11:38  The UE behaviour shall also be enhanced to indicate the UE will provide this info to the lower layer since the truncated S-TMSI is used over the RRC interface.  Mikael, Friday, 15:45  Whyi is PNB used  Does not think that normative requirement needed in NAS spec  Behrouz, Saturday, 20:27  new IE that you are introducing should be a Type 4 IE of TLV format and, hence, of Length = 3.  Lin, Monday, 04:07  Has taken almost all comments on board, rev in drafts folder, asks for confirmation  Fei, Monday, 10:32  Suggests some rewording in the rev  Amer, Monday, 19:22  It is untestable what the UE provides to the lower layer; namely: 5G-S-TMSI or the 5G-S-TMSI configuration. Whichever option we select in the specs is unenforceable through testing. So this should not be a requirement, but rather a note  Lin, Tuesday 03:16  Fine with Amer’s proposal, has a rev in drafts folder | |
|  |  | | C1-200915 | Correction to UL CIoT user data container not routable or not allowed to be routed | | | Ericsson /kaj | CR 1978 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200658  Lin, 11:14  FINE  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Amer, Friday, 01:50the CR doesn’t have any UE impact. If that is correct, the ME box in the cover sheet should be unchecked.  Lin, Sunday, 07:22  Based on existing text in sub 5.4.5.2.4, only cause #22 needs to be included to sent to the UE in your proposal.  Untick ME box  Kaj, Tuesday, 13:20  All comemnts accepted, reflected in a rev | |
|  |  | | [C1-200919](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update2\C1-200919.zip) | Service gap control, correction when to start service gap control timer in UE and NW | | | Ericsson /kaj | CR 1981 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200669  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lin, Sunday, 07:36  CR is fine but better to reword the "initial registration" to "registration procedure for initial registration" in the NOTE,  Kaj, Tuesday, 08:40  Acks Lin’s comment, will address it  Lin, Wed, 02:03  That is correct | |
|  |  | | [C1-200916](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update1\C1-200916.zip) | Clarification on the use of exception data reporting | | | DOCOMO Communications Lab. | CR 1984 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200679  Lin, Thu 1041  FINE  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lin, Sunday, 10:32  Fine, some rewording, via drafts  Ban, Sunday, 12:03  Fine with proposals from Lin, | |
|  |  | | [C1-200917](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update1\C1-200917.zip) | MO exception data for NB-IoT in 5G | | | DOCOMO Communications Lab., Ericsson | CR 0048 24.368 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200773  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  CR was originally provided as C1-200682, on time, new CR number was needed for 24.368 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200918](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update2\C1-200918.zip) | Clarification of control plane service request message options | | | Ericsson /kaj | CR 1982 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200672  Lin, Thu, 10:46  Doubl wording  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Mahmoud, Thursday, 20:36  Number of comments/questions  Lin, Sunday, 07:48  Some parts of the CR can go out, bullet d) to go in a NOTE  Kaj, Monday, 22:56  Responding to Mhamoud, Line, acknowledging the comments, providing a rev in drafts folder  Lin, Wed, 02:41  Asking for more changes on the rev  Kaj, Wed, 14:31  Taking all comms on board, rev in 918 | |
|  |  | | [C1-201021](file:///C:\\Users\\dems1ce9\\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\\3gpp\\cn1\\meetings\\122-e_electronic_0220\\docs\\update4\\C1-201021.zip) | Addition of MT-EDT support indication | | | Ericsson, Qualcomm Incorporated, OPPO / Mikael | CR 3332 24.301 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200892  Mikael, Thu, 10:31  Lin comments taken on board  Lin, Thu, 10:47  FINE  Revision of C1-200976  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200368  **NEEDS to be shifted to 16.2.21**  CR was originally allocated under 5G\_CIoT, however, needs to have TEI16, CIoT-CT as work item on the cover page. Pursued based on consensus.  Lin, Thu, 02:27  Fine, wants to see some minor mods  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Fei, Thursday, 10:18  Almost fine, some rewording requested  Mikael, Thursday, 11:01  Agrees with Fei, will fix it  Yanchao, Friday.10:59  Minor comment  Mikael, Friday, 10:55  Ok to yanchao  Lin, Sunday, 07:02  This is MT-EDT, not related to CIoT, rather SAES16 -> clarified that this means TEI16  cover page, RAN2 LS C1-200048 should be C1-200217.  Some parts of the new text very confusing  Mikael, Monday, 11:54  Can take the proosals form Lin on board, on work item, Mikael sees this as 5GCIoT, like in SA2  Amer, Monday, 00:15  this CR should be discussed under 5G\_CIoT and TEI16, since the corresponding stage 2 CR in [S2-1912322](ftp://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_sa/WG2_Arch/TSGS2_136_Reno/Docs/S2-1912322.zip) is also agreed under 5G\_CIoT WI  Let | |
|  |  | | [C1-200996](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200497.zip) | UE-requested user-plane resources release in NB-N1 mode | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1931 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Revision of [C1-200497](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200497.zip)  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  C1-200419 and C1-200497 overlap  Amer, Friday, 00:43  this proposed optimization does not provide a favorable cost-benefit tradeoff, existing solution not optimal, but works, prefer to not agree to this CR in Rel-16  Lin, Friday, 06:00  Coment form Amer to general, asks for more details  Fei, Friday, 08:45  I share the same view with Amer and the additional enhancement is not needed.  Lin, Friday 10:35  Explains benefit of the proposal  Fei, Friday, 10:42  Does not agree, questions why you are talking about the DL packets. If the UE has already two DRBs, how the AMF triggers the setup of the DRB.  Lin, Friday, 15:38  Explains his position with example  Kaj, Friday, 17:23  There is no stage-2, and that would be needed  Amer, Friday, 21:53  Fei and Kaj provided the details you requested from me. I second their comments and re-affirm my position that **this CR is not needed in Rel-16**  Fei, Friday, 02:35  actually this CR has introduced a UP to CP data transfer switch mechanism, which has no stage 2 requirement either.  Lin, Saturday, 14:22  Defends his case, explains other cases where there was no explicite stage-2 either  Lin, Saturday, 14:29  To Fei please do not confuse something! Defends his case  To Amer, Sunday, 15:15  You just provided a general comment “does not provide a favorable cost-benefit tradeoff” but what Kaj and Fei’s comments are related to stage 2 requirement for which I have clarified.  So I still did not get your specific technical comments.  Asking for a technical comment  Amer, Sunday, 19:01  - The existing stage 3 solution fulfills the stage 2 requirements of ensuring that not more than 2 PDU sessions have active user plane resources  - Based on the above, your proposal is an optimization. The implementation effort for this optimization outweighs the benefits, in my opinion, especially at this stage in the release:  -- It is simpler to implement the logic to release a PDU session beyond instead of a logic to handle the corner cases like the one you described below + a new NAS procedure. For most NB-IoT devices, I think the existing solution will be sufficient.  -- Augmenting the NAS protocol by adding new features to it for small gains goes against the objective of making simple and cheap IoT devices  - NAS protocol currently does not support a procedure for the UE to initiate a release of active UP resources of a PDU session. This would be a substantial addition to the NAS protocol that should be evaluated and OK'ed by SA2 first.  **Based on the above, my proposal is to submit this idea to SA2, and if agreed in SA2, work on it as a Rel-17 enhancement**  **Kaj, Sunday, 22:52**  this CR proposes a new procedure and as CT1 does not own the stage 2, the stage 2 responsible group should specify such procedure i.e. SA2.  **Lin, Monday, 02:25**  Answering to Amers commments  **Lin, Monday, 02:25**  Answering to Kaj comments, this is not a new procedure  **Fei, Monday, 02:50**  Does not agree with Lin, If the PDU session is not CP only PDU session and the network has indicate the support of N3 data transerfer and CP in the registration accept message, then when the UP resource of the PDU session is released, the UE can send the small data over CP for this PDU session. This is somehow considered as the UP to CP switch.  Lin, Monday, 04:41  Does not agree with Fei, explaining why  Amer, Monday, 19:43  It seems that we both agree that your proposal is an optimization to the current solution, which meets the requirements. We disagree on the need to implement this optimization. A I stated below, I think that the cases where your proposal will make a difference are rare and unlikely to occur, and as such are **not worthy of addressing by creating a new NAS signaling procedure at this stage in Rel-16.**  Kaj, Monday, 20:18  this is a new procedure, UE initiated user plane release procedure, create new mechanisms in NAS and CN to coop with a RAN limitation, makes no sense.  Lin, Tuesday, 03:01  Arguing with Kaj why the CR is needed and is not new  Ani, Wed, 10:37  Acks the use case, solution too complex, prefers something like in C1-198074  Chen, Wed, 15:22  To kaj, amer, ani  Does not agree with them  Wants to co-sign  Amer, wed, 21:45  Answering Chen, Amer holds his position  Lin, Thu, 03:32  To chen, Amer, Ani  Explaining why this is the way to go  Fei, Thu, 04:12  Wants to see stage-2 requirement first  Kaj, Thu, 09:55  Wants to see stage-2 first | |
|  |  | | [C1-201007](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200355.zip) | Applicability of UE specific DRX Parameter for NB-S1 mode Indicator | | | Vodafone GmbH | CR 3331 24.301 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Tdoc not available  Revision of C1-200355  C1-200355, C1-200417, C1-200498 overlapping, All related to the incoming LS in C1-200237  Amer, Friday, 00:32  Agree with the problem, don’t agree with the proposal, prefers Option 2 in [C1-200237](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_122e/Docs/C1-200237.zip)  Yang, Friday, 08:28  the CR in C1-200355 does re-use the same parameter negotiation scheme for UE specific DRX parameter negotiation in N1 mode.  Addition to UE indicating its specific DRX parameter by using the existing mechanism specified in TS24.301, as described on the cover sheet, in order to resolve the backwards compatibility issue, the UE needs to indicate it’s capability of supporting the UE specific DRX in NB-S1 mode in the UE network capability IE.  Can you please elaborate on your proposal as to how the negotiation will be done?  We are open to discuss alternatives to fix the backwards compatibility issue.  Mikael, Friday, 08:30  think CT1 should wait for SA2/RAN2 to progress further before deciding on the NAS solution as a decision on alt1 vs alt2 as indicated in incoming LS C1-200237 will impact the details of a NAS solution.  In my understanding, the proposal in C1-200355 may be a needed extension of alt1 to handle the described backwards compatibility issues, whereas if alt 2 is selected it is not needed.  Amer, Friday,  agree with Mikael’s proposal. To answer Yang’s question would prefer to copy the existing NAS procedure for negotiating eDRX parameter negotiation in 24.301, only the procedure for UE specific DRX parameters would involve two IEs, one for each mode/RAT.  Lin, Sunday, 09:05  Not agreeing with Amer, Option 1 has has no NBC problem, prefers 1 over option 2  Amer, Monday, 20:43  Asking how option 1 would address two described scenarios,  Yang, Tuesday, 07:37  Asking from Amer and Mikael details on their preference  Lin, TUesdy, 09:10  Explaining to Amer  Mikael, Tuesday,12:20  Correct, as of now our preference is to select alt2 as a baseline solution. Maybe we need to tweak the details of the solution but the main feature of alt2 to introduce a new NAS IE for NB-UE specific DRX value is what we prefer.  Your summary and comparison of alt2 vs your proposal is correct what I can see. We do not need a UE support indication in alt2 as use of the new IE indicates use of NB-UE specific DRX. The indication of negotiated NB-UE specific DRX value from MME to UE is sufficient for the supporting UE to differentiate supporting from non-supporting MME.  Amer, Tuesday, 16:41  Not agreeing with Lin  Amer, Tuesday, 17:16  To mikael, Yang, I agree with your views below. I prefer to not use the capability indications and use the DRX parameter IEs to negotiate Rel-16 NB-S1 mode DRX parameters. This also allows the MME to provide a different DRX parameter from the one that the UE requested.  Yang, Wed, 09:33  To Lin, Amer, Mikael, providing a rev, asking for comments  Mikael, Wed, 22:24  In line with our preferred solution so the principle of this CR is fine for us.  Comments:  The Requested NB-DRX value can be modified by the network and the “negotiated” value is signaled to the UE in the accept message. Procedure text of Attach and TAU does not reflect this modification.  The Requested WB-DRX cannot be changed by the network but just accepted and stored (legacy behavior). But SA2 still mentioned in their LS an accept being signaled back to the UE also for WB-DRX. Not sure if this will be pursued in stage2 so we need check SA2 on this.  The NB-DRX should also be provided at mobility from WB-EUTRA. I guess it should also be a “may” provide and not “shall” provide?  Yang, Thu, 07:51  Provides a rev, taking all comms from Mikael on board  Lin, Thu, 09:06  Now the CR totally changed the direction which is going to another **NEW** NAS alternative. It is neither option 2 in SA2 LS, nor we discussed option 2a nor option 2b in our discussion paper.  Today is the deadline and hence we have no time to analyze such **NEW** NAS alternative in detail, typically related to NBC issues.  As CT1 will intend to send an reply LS to SA2 and ask some questions to RAN/RAN3, for the safe way forward, I would suggest CT1 will not agree any CR action on this topic in this meeting, thanks.  Maoki, Thu, 11:43  Shares Lin view, do not agree in this meeting | |
|  |  | | [C1-201025](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update4\C1-201025.zip) | Removal of EN and additional abnormal case for cause #31 | | | Samsung/Anikethan | CR 1881 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Osamah: thu: 20:30, OK, there might be an interaction  Revision of C1-200862  Revision of C1-200328  Ani, Wed, 05:26  Providing this new rev, new approach  This requires confirmation from Osamah, Robert, Lin  Robert, Wed, 10:44  Generally ok, minor editorial  Osamah, Wed, 21:19  Question for clarification  Ani, thu, 03:45  Explaining to Osamah  Lin, Thu, 10:12  Ok with direction, however, requests some changes  Ani, Thu, 11:01  Did not take all of Lin on board, asking Lin would you be fin  Lin, Thu, 14:19  Fine now  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Osamah, Thursday, 23:10  Does not agree with the proposal, leaves a security hole in the spec, at least a NOTE would be needed  Arni, Friday, 11:42  Long explanation for the CR  But I am also ok with your suggestion that we add a note saying that it can be implementation whether any additional actions need to be taken in cases of receiving non-integrity protected reject.  Would you be ok with that?  And my comments are the same for 200351 as well.  Osamah,  Replies to Arni,  If anything goes forward, then it has to be  may” or “should” and then follow that with implementation note/option to allow UE to abort and do that proprietary solution.  If the REGISTRATION REJECT message with 5GMM cause #31 was received without integrity protection, then the UE shall discard the message  Message needs to be integrity protected  Lin, Sunday, 10:09  Commenting,  IMHO, in our spec, we just need to specify that the UE will discard the NIP reject message with #31 and for all other required additional UE handling, it is up to per different UE vendor’s implementation. No need to have a NOTE to capture this as whenever something unspecified in the standard, the vendor could/will have some proprietary mechanism if they believe needed.  **All in all, we do support this CR.**  Some small comments as below and also apply to 24.301 CR:  1. “ 5GMM cause #31 when received by a UE that has not indicated support for CIoT optimizations or when received by a UE over non-3GPP access is considered an abnormal case and the behaviour of the UE is specified in subclause 5.5.1.2.7. ” better to be reworded as:  "5GMM cause #31 received by a UE that has not indicated support for CIoT 5GS optimizations or received by a UE over non-3GPP access is considered as an abnormal case and the behaviour of the UE is specified in subclause 5.5.1.2.7. "   1. "Clauses affected:" in the cover page is missing.   Osamah, Sunday, 17:19  Answering Lin  Does not agree on common understanding from Lin  Why NAS spec do not want to inform lower layer that the eLTE cell is fake? Again we did this for cause #11 from HPLMN but here we decided to ignore that attack and hope the attacker will go away by +240 sec. This looks like inconsistency in NAS spec  We are of the opinion of choosing either option a) or b) and specify it in NAS. I went for adding optional text to be more flexible  Ani, Monday, 12:22  Can live with a NOTE; provides some text, asking Osamah whether this is fine  Osamah, Monday, 15:08  The NOTE will not help, as it is ruled out by existing mandatory text  Nobody is answering my question. Why downgrade attack with cause #31 coming from fake cell needs to be handled different than other cause code (#11,#14, ..etc) that we know come from fake cell (being added to F-TAI and no real action related to cause code is effective) and we handle them in DoS section?!!!  Lin, Tuesday, 09:48  Does not really like the CR but can live with it .  Ani, Tuesday, 11:29  Explaining to Osamah why a NOTE is all we can achieve  Robert, Tuesday, 16:16  Supports the very first email from Osamah  …  I’m not convinced that it is a good idea to leave all additional UE actions (besides discarding the Reject message) up to UE implementation.  But in the past this topic was alway **driven by some operators, so maybe they have a view on this**? | |
|  |  | | [C1-201026](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update4\C1-201026.zip) | Removal of EN and additional abnormal case for cause #31 | | | Samsung/Anikethan | CR 3330 24.301 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Osamah: fri, 20:30 OK  Revision of C1-200861  Revision of C1-200351  Ani, Wed, 05:26  Providing this new rev, new approach  This requires confirmation from Osamah, Robert, Lin  Robert, Wed, 10:44  Generally ok, minor editorial  Ani, Wed, 11:43  Acks Robert’s comment  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Osamah, Thursday, 23:10  Does not agree with the proposal, leaves a security hole in the spec, at least a NOTE would be needed  Arni, Friday, 11:42  Long explanation for the CR  But I am also ok with your suggestion that we add a note saying that it can be implementation whether any additional actions need to be taken in cases of receiving non-integrity protected reject.  Would you be ok with that?  And my comments are the same for 200351 as well.  Osamah, Tue, 23:07  I checked with my SA3 colleagues. There is not any requirement for MME to run authentication when redirecting CIoT devices from 4G to 5G using cause #31. Currently, this kind of redirection is not security concern as it is not downgrade attack and 5G is much better in security than 4G. In other word, there is not any text or living CR in SA3 to prevent legit MME to send that cause code non-integrity protected. I think the text in TS 24.301 was not accurate to mandate to discard that NAS message. | |
|  |  | | C1-201038 | PDU session status with control plane service request message | | | Ericsson /KAJ | CR 1980 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200914  Lin, Thus, 15:30  Double “which”, “which”  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200663  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Amer, Friday, 01:53  first change is incorrect. The correct statement is already in sc. 8.2.30.6. So I propose to remove the first change. After the removal, the ME box on the cover sheet should be unchecked  Fei, Friday, 09:02  the second change should be included in the subclause 5.6.1.4.2.  Lin, Sunday, 07:35  CR is fine, some detailed comments, in drafts folder  Kaj, Tuesday, 09:27  Does not agree with all comments, will update the proposal  Fei, Tuesday, 09:44  I would be fine if you also make the alignment for the UE not using the ciot subclauses.  Lin, Tuesday, 11:08  Fine with parts, however, second change needs to be clearer  Kaj, Wed, 13:22  Latest comments form Lin on board | |
|  |  | | C1-201050 | Support for the signalling of the capability for receiving WUS assistance information | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Amer | CR 1907 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Lin is fine, email Friday 07:39, asking for a CR to next meeting  Revision of C1-200812  Amer,thu, 15:28  Takes Lin suggestion on board  Lin, Thu, 15:37  Still sees text that is not agreeable  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200418  Lin, Thu, 14:50  Even based on SA2 agreed 23.501 CR, the condition in your CT1 CR is not fully correct.  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Yanchao, Friday, 10:13  AMF<>MME change needed  Mikael, Friday, 11:02  don’t use ”doesn’t”, use “does not”. 4 places.  Fei, Friday, 11:33  Indicate stage-2 cr on cover page dependency  If and only if rewording  Amer, Friday, 22:28  Takes all comments received on board  Mahmoud, Friday, 23:03  What does “active emergency PDU session” mean exactly? I have not seen this term in the spec.  Amer, Saturday, 00:49  Same active” condition as the stage 2 CR, but will clarify this further  Fei, Saturday, 02:25  believe that "active' can be removed.  Lin, Sunday, 09:20  In prinviple fine, some comments via drafts folder  Amer, Tuesday, 01:55  Regarding the comment to remove the condition on not having any emergency sessions: the reply LS from SA2 that you quoted confirms the condition and so does the stage 2 text. So can you clarify your request to remove the condition on not having any emergency sessions?  Lin, Tuesday, 10:07  Please reword condition  Amer, Tue, 18:47  Provides rev3 to Lin | |
|  |  | | C1-201034 | Single downlink data only indication and release of NAS signalling connection | | | Ericsson /kaj | CR 1979 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200661  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Mahmoud, Thursday, 19:10  Request changes to conditions  Amer, Friday, 01:51  No UE impact, untick ME  Lin, Sunday, 07:27  In principle the CR is fine but I some proposal under.  <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_122e/Inbox/Drafts/C1-200661-single-dl-data-only-indication-and-signalling%20connection-release-v01-Lin.docx>  Kaj, Tuesday, 11:15  Some of the proposals taken on board, requesting aconcrete proposal form Mahmoud on some aspects  Mahmoud, Thu, 14:17  Fine  Lin fine with 1034 | |
|  |  | | [C1-201054](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update6\C1-201054.zip) | Handling of user-plane resources for NB-IoT UEs having at least two PDU sessions | | | Qualcomm Incorporated, Ericsson / Amer | CR 1672 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Yanchao editorial comment against earlier version, chairman checked, corredted  Lin, Friday, 05:09, there are editorials, but can live with it  John-Luc, Thu, 20:52: editorials  Peter clarified on the list that we go forward with the CR. Amer will bring a CR to fix the editorials in the next meeint  Revision of C1-200853  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200419  Kaj, Wed, 15:42  Why is ericsson removed  Refe from Gerneral section to normative  section does not work  Amer, Wed, 21:56  Acks Kaj  Lin, Thu, 15:10  Not all comments are addressed  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-198585  C1-200419 and C1-200497 overlap  Fei, Friday, 08:15  Couple of comments, proposals  Yanchao, Friday, 10:25  Hints at # that needs to be deleted  Amer, Friday, 22:28  Comments will be taken on board  Lin, Sunday, 09:26  Some detailed comments via drafts folder  Amer, Wed, 01:14  Providing rev, Lin to check | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 5WWC | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects on wireless and wireline convergence for the 5G system architecture | |
|  |  | | [C1-200276](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200276.zip) | Secondary authentication and W-AGF acting on behalf of FN-RG | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 1689 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agred  Revision of C1-198161 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200277](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200277.zip) | EAP-5G handling and transport of NAS messages for wireline access | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 0110 24.502 Rel-16 | Current Status Agred  Revision of C1-198159 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200278](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200278.zip) | SUCI used by W-AGF acting on behalf of FN-RG | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 1870 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agred  Conflict with C1-200754 in subclause 5.3.2  Lazaros, Thu, 14:42  In C1-200978 (revision of C1-200754) the part on W-AGF acting on behalf of an RG has been removed as it is correctly handled by C1-200278, i.e. no more conflict of the two CRs | |
|  |  | | [C1-200279](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200279.zip) | Resolving editor's note on W-AGF acting on behalf of FN-RG not using the "null integrity protection algorithm" 5G-IA0 | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 1871 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agred | |
|  |  | | [C1-200280](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200280.zip) | Resolving editor's note on service area restrictions in case of FN-BRG | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 1872 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agred | |
|  |  | | [C1-200281](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200281.zip) | Resolving editor's note in forbidden wireline access area | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 1873 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agred | |
|  |  | | [C1-200282](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200282.zip) | Wireline 5G access network and wireline 5G access | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 1874 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agred | |
| doe |  | | [C1-200284](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200284.zip) | Alignment for stop of enforcement of mobility restrictions in 5G-RG and W-AGF acting on behalf of FN-CRG | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 1876 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agred | |
|  |  | | [C1-200302](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200302.zip) | Removal of editor's notes for N5CW device | | | Motorola Mobility, Lenovo | CR 0112 24.502 Rel-16 | Current Status Postpomned  Revision of C1-200005  Ivo, Monday, 16:07  - the editor's note in 7.3A.4.2 cannot be removed since subclause 28.7 of 3GPP TS 23.003 [8] is not sufficient clear on the NAI to be used. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200304](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200304.zip) | Removal of an editor's note | | | Motorola Mobility, Lenovo, BlackBerry UK Ltd. | CR 0113 24.502 Rel-16 | Current Status Agred  Revision of C1-200006 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200454](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200454.zip) | ACS information via DHCP | | | ZTE / Joy | CR 1919 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agred | |
|  |  | | [C1-200455](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200455.zip) | LADN service does not apply for RG connected to 5GC via wireline access | | | ZTE / Joy | CR 0070 24.526 Rel-16 | Current Status Agred | |
|  |  | | [C1-200518](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200518.zip) | Work plan for the CT1 part of 5WWC | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | discussion Rel-16 | Current Status Agred | |
|  |  | | [C1-200757](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200757.zip) | Corrections on N5CW support | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2022 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agred | |
|  |  | | C1-200758 | Supporting IPTV NAS impacts | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2023 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  LATE | |
|  |  | | C1-200759 | Supporting IPTV via wireline access | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0117 24.502 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  LATE | |
|  |  | | [C1-200784](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update1\C1-200784.zip) | Removal of editor notes | | | BlackBery UK Ltd. Motorola Mobility, Lenovo | CR 0114 24.502 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-20781  Ivo,  the NAI is to be used in 5GS so a subclause in 23.003 clause 28 would be needed.  Ivo, wed, 11:04  One more hint on SA3 requ  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200297  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200114  Ivo, Thursday, 14:22  a particular 23.003 subclause should be referenced  John-Luc, Friday, 16:03  Agrees with Ivo, will provide a revision | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-200925](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update2\C1-200925.zip) | PEI clean up | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 1875 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agred  Revision of C1-200283  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Roozbeh, Thursday, 19:19  IMEISV on cover page to be aligned with 5.3.2  Ivo, Friday, 09:40  Does not undertand the comment, explains backgournd, any guidance?  Roozbeh, Saturday, 02:15  I was more referring to that 5G-RG does not contain either IMEI or IMEISV.  If you think the reader should know that IMEISV is derived from IMEI and removing the IMEISV from the above as an obvious thing, that is fine. But I have some concerns that is the case.  Ivo, Monday, 14:24  To Roozbeh, it is not clear which changes are required, asking for a concrete proposal  Ivo, Tuesday 09:51  Provides a rev in drats, asks whether there are any comments  Roozbeh, Tuesday, 16;28  Fine with the draft from Ivo  Christian, Tue, 21:40  The CR is necessary indeed to remove current inconsistencies in the specification and also align with stage 2 (TS 23.316).  The latest draft revision is fine and we, Huawei and HiSilicon would like to co-sign the CR.  Ivo, Wed, 08:07  Will take Huawei on board | |
|  |  | | [C1-200926](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update2\C1-200926.zip) | Introduction of GCI and GLI | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 1877 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agred  Revision of C1-200285  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Roozbeh, Thursday, 19:23  C1-200285 and C1-200761 are colliding  Ivo, Friday, 08:11  Does not understand the comment, as 285 and761 are CRs on different TSs  Christian, Saturday, 16:55  Supports the CR, has two comments, with that would want to co-sign  Ivo, Monday, 08:51  Provides a rev in the drafts folder and asks whether this is sufficient  Lazaros, Monday, 10:26  There is a typo  Christian, Tue, 21:24  The revision of the CR on the Drafts folder (i.e., C1-20iala-was-C1-200285-v01.doc) is fine by me. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200945](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update3\C1-200945.zip) | Enabling mobility with (emergency) sessions/connections between the (trusted) non-3GPP access network connected to the 5GCN and the E-UTRAN | | | BlackBerry UK Ltd. | CR 1910 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agred  Revision of C1-200837  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200780  Roozbeh, Tue, 20:08  7 new comments, apply to 837  JLB, Tue, 21:08  Answering to Roozehs comments  Ivo, Tue, 22:27  - "**Non-3GPP access (network):** In this specification, the non-3GPP access (network) connects to the 5GC(N), unless otherwise qualified." - those are two separate definitions. Not sure why we need brackets in "5GC(N)".  - "N3AN (non-3GPP access network)" -> not sure why we need the brackets  - I see no need of NOTE 2 in 4.8.2.3.2  JLB, Tue, 22:53  Commenting to Ivo  Roozbeh, Wed, 00:01  What TS is using this abbreviation. 24.502 is using it but not 24.501.  I think this is extremely confusing to add and subtract (network) in your abbreviation to identify which one is 5G and which one is EPS. I would like to avoid it. I am sure that many would think the same if they simply read your CR so I still think you should remove the definition and the abbreviation and leave the wording as they used to be.  Roozbe, Wed, 00:13  cannot agree to it. I do not think we need any N3AN def or abbreviation and should be left out from this CR.  JLB, Wed, 00:14  To roozhbeh, this is not right understanding.  JLB; Wed, 00:26  Modifies some in the wording, a V3 will be on the server shortly  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200426  John-Luc, Tuesday, 16:58  Indicating a new revision to address a concern from Roozbeh, did not find this on the lsit  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thursday, 14:32  - 4.8.2.3.2 2nd part - see no need of ordering of UE-requested PDU session establishment procedures when performing interworking of PDN connections in EPS to PDU sessions in N1 mode, as the UE can initiate several UE-requested PDU session establishment procedures in one UL NAS TRANSPORT request.  - 6.4.1.2 - no need to add  "connected to 5GC" to "non-3GPP access"  as then we would need to put it everywhere.  John-Luc, Friday, 16:15  Agrees with some comments, provides a way forward | |
|  |  | | C1-200978 | Registration of N5GC devices via wireline access | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell,Charter Communications | CR 2020 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200754  Ivo, Thu 10:12  All comments addressed  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Conflict with C1-200278 in subclause 5.3.2  Ivo, Thursday, 14:37  Many detailed comments  Lazaros, Wed, 13:30  Providing a rev, asking Ivo to review  Ivo, Wed, 19:54  Nearly ok, this is type 2 IE  Larzaro, Thu, 01:02  New rev | |
|  |  | | C1-200979 | Support of authentication and registration of N5GC devices via wireline access | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell,Charter Communications | CR 0116 24.502 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200755  Ivo, Thu, 10:22  The rev to cable labs spec needs to be made specific  Lazaros, Thu, 13:53  Now ref is specific  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thursday, 14:46  Number of detailed reqes, - unclear how the W-AGF receives the EAP-request and where it sends the EAP-responses - likely a 24.501 CR is needed.  Lazaros, Wed, 13:49  Providing a rev, asking Ivo to confirm  Ivo, Wed, 20:25  Requesting more changes  Lararos, Thu, 00.53  Ack Ivo, new rev | |
|  |  | | C1-200980 | Corrections on EUI-64 as PEI | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2021 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Stauts Agreed  Revision of C1-200756  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thursday, 14:48  summary of change, part 1) is confusing  - EUI-64 is already part of the mobile identity IE.  Lazaros, Tue, 19:47  Summary of change modified to address Ivo concern  Ivo, Tue, 21:18  OK | |
|  |  | | C1-200981 | SUPI and SUCI for legacy wireline access | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0118 24.502 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200761  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thursday, 14;49  Missing comma  Roozbeh, Thursday, 19:23  C1-200285 and C1-200761 are colliding  Ivo, Friday, 08:11  Does not understand the comment, as 285 and761 are CRs on different TSs  Roozbeh, Friday, 20:35  Withdraws his comment  Christian, Saturday, 16:55  support the CR but we have the following comments:   1. the CR indicates that the GCI or the GLI always takes the form of a NAI as defined in TS 23.003 but current version of this spec does not shows that. I see several CRs in CT4 attempting to do so, and therefore can you please add linkage to the necessary CT4 CRs?   We that change Huawei and HiSilicon would like to co-sign the CR  Lazaros, Wed, 13:58  Provides a rev, all comments are addressed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200984](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update4\C1-200984.zip) | Additional QoS Information in an untrusted non-3GPP network | | | Motorola Mobility, Lenovo | CR 0111 24.502 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200300  Ivo, Thursday, 14:23  Many detailed comments on the sections  Roozebeh, Friday, 07:20  Provides answers in a revision  Ivo, Monday, 13:29  Requests additional changes  Roozbeh, Tuesday, 06:31  Provides the revision  Ivo, Tuesday 09:09  Does not like the rev from Roozbeh  Roozbeh, Tuesday, 16:16  Provides new revision  Ivo, TUed, 21:29  All comments are addressed    Roozbeh, Thu, 01:17  Provides rev, Ericsson added | |
|  |  | | [C1-200991](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update4\C1-200991.zip) | PDU session handling for N5CW device | | | Motorola Mobility, Lenovo | CR 1641 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Editorial problem will be fixed by MCC  Revision of C1-200305  John-Luc, Thu, 15:51  There is a carriage return at the end or bullet b) that is not shown in change marks in 4.7.X.  Please use change marks.  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200007  Ivo, Monday, 16:14  details on TWAN and TWAP are out of scope of 24.501, as they do not send NAS messages. It is sufficient to refer to TWIF only, as TWIF sends NAS messages.  Roozbeh, Tuesday, 06:27  Provides the re  Roozbeh, Tuesday, 16:21  New rev, now has Ericsson as co-signer, requested by Ivo  Christian, Tue, 21:36  This CR is needed and we support the latest version we found on the Drafts folders. Can you please add Huawei and HiSilicon as co-signers?  Roozbeh, Wed, 00:06  Provides new rev  Ivo, Thu, 09:59  OK | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | PARLOS | |  | Lena – Breakout | | |  |  | CT aspects of System enhancements for Provision of Access to Restricted Local Operator Services by Unauthenticated UEs | |
|  |  | | [C1-200480](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200480.zip) | Manual network selection procedure for access to RLOS | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell /Jennifer | CR 0496 23.122 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | C1-200763 | De-registration before initial registration for RLOS and Emergency | | | MediaTek / Marko | CR 2025 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-200793](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200793.zip) | Factoring in T3346 during access to RLOS | | | Samsung R&D Institute India | CR 3327 24.301 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200322  ---------------------------------------------------------- | |
|  |  | | [C1-200814](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200814.zip) | Support of restriction on access to RLOS | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell /Jennifer | CR 3333 24.301 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200476  --------------------------------------------------------  Lena, Thursday, 9:06  Editorial comments:   * the MCC of the serving PLMN network name” should be “the MCC of the serving PLMN” * “For UE with USIM” should be “if the UE has a valid USIM”   Ricky, Thursday, 12:48  “the UE shall verify that the MCC of the serving PLMN network name is present in the list of RLOS allowed MCCs configured in the UE” should be “the UE shall verify that the MCC of the serving PLMN network name is present in the list of RLOS allowed MCCs configured in the ME” given that the white list is maintained on the ME according to the SA3 requirement.  Ivo, Thursday, 14:54  In "the MCC of the serving PLMN network name", what is "serving PLMN network name"? Is it the same as "the MCC of the PLMN ID of the serving PLMN"? If so, then I prefer the updated term.  Jennifer, Monday, 5:06  I am fine with Lena and Ivo’s suggested rewording and will incorporate them in the revision.  About Rickys’ suggested rewording, I believe UE is more appropriate here. Relying on manufacturer to provision device for security control will not work well. RLOS services are normally country specific, for example, there are FCC regulations in the U.S. related to offering of such services, but not every country has regulations requiring such deployment. Some countries may not have regulatory requirements, but a network can still choose to offer RLOS services (albeit not mandatory). A device manufactured by Samsung could be used by users in US or France. The home operator needs to have the ultimate control in order for the service to work well.  Jennifer, Monday, 7:01  A revision was uploaded to the drafts folder. Updates:  - changed "For UE with USIM” to “if the UE has a valid USIM"  - changed "the MCC of the serving PLMN network name” should be “the MCC of the PLMN ID of the serving PLMN"  Ivo, Monday, 13:34  I am ok with the draft revision. Please add Ericsson as co-signer.  Lena, Monday, 20:39  I am fine with the draft revision.  Jennifer, 5:54  Thanks for the support. Ericsson is added as cosigner.  The revision to be uploaded (C1-200814) is in draft folder. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200817](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200817.zip) | Authentication and security handling for RLOS | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell /Jennifer | CR 3334 24.301 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200479  ----------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 15:05  In 5.4.3.3: the UE has to be attached for RLOS, in order to be able to establish an RLOS PDN connection. This is different from emergency PDN connection which can be established even when the UE is non-emergency non-RLOS registered. If change is needed, it would be better to add "or is attached for access to RLOS".  Jennifer, Monday, 6:03  I am fine to change wording in subclause 5.4.3.3 to “or is attached for access to RLOS”. I will incorporate the change in the revision.  Jennifer, Monday, 6:58  A revision is available in the drafts folder. Updates: changed wording in subclause 5.4.3.3 to “or is attached for access to RLOS”.  Ivo, Monday, 13:48  The draft revision is nearly OK.  In 5.4.3.3, can you please consider adding "a UE that " as follows: "The UE shall accept a SECURITY MODE COMMAND message indicating the "null integrity protection algorithm" EIA0 as the selected NAS integrity algorithm only if the message is received for a UE that has a PDN connection for emergency bearer services established, or a UE that is attached for access to RLOS, or a UE that is establishing a PDN connection for emergency bearer services or a UE that is requesting attach for access to RLOS."  Reason: all the other sub-conditions contain "a UE that".  With such change, Ericsson would like to cosign.  Jennifer, Tuesday, 5:51  I have added the wording “a UE that” and also included Ericsson as cosigner.  The revision to be uploaded (C1-200817) is in draft folder.  Ivo, Tuesday, 21:22  Ok with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200986](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200986.zip) | Support of restriction on access to RLOS | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell /Jennifer | CR 0495 23.122 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200815  ---------------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-200477  Lena, Wednesday, 23:59 C1-200815 has not addressed the following comments I made on Monday:   * “the MCC part of the preferred PLMN” should be “the MCC part of the preferred PLMN ID” * “the MCC part of the PLMN” should be “the MCC part of the PLMN ID” * “according to RLOS allowed MCC list” should be “according to the RLOS allowed MCC list”   Jennifer, Thursday, 0:37  Lena’s comments have been incorporated in a draft revision of C1-200815.  Lena, Thursday, 0:45  Draft revision still has one occurrence of “If the MCC part of a PLMN is present in the RLOS allowed MCC list” that should be “If the MCC part of a PLMN ID is present in the RLOS allowed MCC list” (in new bullet b) of subclause 4.4.3.1.1).  Jennifer, Thursday, 0:52  This occurrence in subclause 4.4.3.1.1 has been fixed in a further draft revision.  Lena, Thursday, 1:19  The draft revision adddresses all my comments.  --------------------------------  Lena, Thursday, 9:07:  the added text about requesting user’s consent is not needed. CT1 has agreed an AT command which allows to set/unset user consent (see TS 27.007 subclause 8.80), so user consent does not need to be requested every time a PLMN is selected.  Ivo, Thursday, 14:59  Issue with the use of “allowable” in "If registration cannot be achieved because no PLMNs are available and allowable, and if no PLMN offering access to RLOS has been found, or none of the PLMNs offering access to RLOS is allowable according to RLOS allowed MCC list configured in the USIM (see 3GPP TS 31.102 [40]) or in the ME (see 3GPP TS 24.368 [50])” .  The term "allowable PLMN" is defined in 23.122 as below and has nothing to do with the RLOS allowed MCC list.  Jennifer, Monday, 5:09  To Ivo: Instead of using “allowable”, how about  changing to more explicit wording “is allowed to be accessed”, as in “none of the PLMNs offering access to RLOS is allowed to be accessed according to RLOS allowed MCC list”  Jennifer, Monday, 5:11  To Lena: I will remove the text about requesting user’s consent in the revision.  Anikethan, Monday, 5:57  About “either the UICC containing the USIM is not present on the MS, or the UICC containing the USIM is present on the MS and the MCC part of the IMSI in the USIM is present in the RLOS allowed MCC list configured in the USIM (see 3GPP TS 31.102 [40]) or in the ME (see 3GPP TS 24.368 [50]);”   * there is no RLOS allowed MCC list in the USIM, it is present only in the ME. * Also the intent of the sentence is unclear wrt “UICC containing USIM”   Same comments apply to other pieces of text added by the CR.  We think the text could be:  “there is no SIM in the MS or if the SIM is present in the MS and the MCC part of the IMSI in the SIM is present in the RLOS allowed MCC list configured in the ME (see 3GPP TS 24.368 [50]);”  Jennifer, Monday, 7:01  A revision is uploaded to the drafts folder. Updates:  - removed text about requesting user's consent;  - changed "allowable" to "is allowed to be accessed" to avoid mixed with existing terminology.  Ivo, Monday, 13:37  I am ok with the draft revision. Please add Ericsson as co-signer.  Lena, Monday, 20:29  I have the following further comments on the draft revision:   * “the MCC part of the preferred PLMN” should be “the MCC part of the preferred PLMN ID” * “the MCC part of the PLMN” should be “the MCC part of the PLMN ID” * “according to RLOS allowed MCC list” should be “according to the RLOS allowed MCC list”   Jennifer, Tuesday, 5:54  Thanks for the support. Ericsson is now added as cosigner.  The revision to be uploaded (C1-200815) is in draft folder.  Anikethan, Wednesday, 11: 50  This change of having the MCC list in the USIM is a new one and is not present anywhere else. Even 22.011 and 33.401 just mention ME.  Could you please add in the cover page additional details that this requirement is being introduced in the USIM via the current CR?  Jennifer, Wednesday, 18:20  To Anikethan: I have updated the cover sheet to clarify that the RLOS allowed MCC list is added as part of NAS Configuration file EFNASCONFIG configuration parameter in the USIM (corresponds to NAS Configuration MO in TS 24.368). The revision is in the drafts folder. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200987](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200987.zip) | NAS configuration on access to RLOS | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell /Jennifer | CR 0046 24.368 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200816  ---------------------------  Revision of C1-200478  Lena, Thursday, 0:10  C1-200816 does not take into account the following comments I sent on Monday:   * The text in subclause 5.10zg still talks about preferred PLMNs. “one or more RLOS preferred PLMNs” should be instead “one or more RLOS allowed MCCs” * “MCC” already includes the work “Code”, so “the MCC code” is redundant. I suggest replacing it by “the MCC value”   Jennifer, Thursday, 0:30  Lena’s comments have been incorporated in a draft revision of C1-200816.  Lena, Thursday, 0:42  The draft revision addresses my comments.  ----------------------------  Lena, Thursday, 9:07:  The DDF needs to be updated.  Ricky, Thursday, 12:34  1) “5.10zg /<X>/RLOSPreferredPLMNList/<X>” should be “5.10zg  /<X>/RLOSAllowedMCCList/<X>”  2) The SA3 requirement talks only about **preconfiguring** the white list either at the time of ME manufacturing or hardcoding with {310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316}. So is there a need for an MO parameter, if this is purely pre-configuration?  Ivo, Thursday, 15:02  - in 5.10zf last paragraph: it is not clear where is stage-1 or stage-2 requirement related to "the interior node <X> that holds the following MCC leaf values {310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316}. ". If there is such stage-1 or stage-2 requirement, then the requirement should be enforced in 23.122, without the need to configure the UE.  - same comment applies to last paragraph of 5.10zh.  Jennifer, Monday, 5:27  To Ricky: I will fix the title for 5.10zg in the revision.  Regarding the MO configuration, so far only in the US there are mandatory FCC requirements for accessing RLOS services, so these MCCs {310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316} must be allowed (in the allowed MCC list). For other countries, it would not be mandatory, but a network can still choose to offer RLOS services (therefore configuring more allowed MCCs in the Allowed MCC list).  Jennifer, Monday 5:30  To Ivo: These texts are not needed here and will be removed in the revision.  To Lena: I will update the DDF in the revision.  Jennifer, Monday, 7:01  A revision is available in the drafts folder. Updates:  - corrected title of subclause 5.10zg;  - removed detailed MCC allowed list for the US;  - added DDF.  Ivo, Monday, 13:41  I am ok with the draft revision. Please add Ericsson as co-signer.  Lena, Monday, 20:37  I have the following comments on the draft revision:   * The text in subclause 5.10zg still talks about preferred PLMNs. “one or more RLOS preferred PLMNs” should be instead “one or more RLOS allowed MCCs” * “MCC” already includes the work “Code”, so “the MCC code” is redundant. I suggest replacing it by “the MCC value”   Jennifer, Tuesday, 5:53  Ericsson is now added as cosigner.  The revision to be uploaded (C1-200816) is in draft folder. | |
|  |  | | [C1-201029](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-201029.zip) | Detach before RLOS and Emergency Attach | | | MediaTek / Marko | CR 3338 24.301 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200748  Marko: the only change from C1-200748 to C1-201029 is to add TEI16 on the coverpage as requested by Ricky  -----------------------------------------------------  Ricky, Thursday, 13:01  1) TEI16 needs to be added as WIC on the coversheet as the “may detach locally and initiate attach for emergency bearer services” is not a change related to RLOS  2) OK to add the clarification, but surely it is obvious that the UE will perform a local detach, as it is unable to perform the detach procedure by explicit signalling since the UE in these states is unable to perform the detach procedure (as stated in the cover sheet)  Marko, Friday, 8:22  The local detach is indeed obvious for emergency attach (it’s well-known), but for RLOS the UE behavior better to be written, and then to express that the same behavior is need in both, texts are aligned.  I’m fine to indicate also TEI16 in the cover page. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 5G\_eLCS (CT4) | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects of Enhancement to the 5GC LoCation Services  Is TS 24.571 sufficiently stable to be sent to CT#87-e for approval | |
|  |  | | [C1-200568](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200568.zip) | Adding UE initiated LCS service operations | | | CATT/Scott | pCR 24.571 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Lena, Sunday, 23.41  Long list of comments, errors  Mikael, Wed, 07:47  use ”signalling” and not ”signaling” (both in body text and figures) to align within TS and to other TSs (e.g. 24.501).  Clause heading: Can we use a better more descriptive cause heading than “EventReport”? E.g. “UE initiated event reporting procedure”? | |
|  |  | | [C1-200569](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200569.zip) | LCS messages and coding | | | CATT/Scott | pCR 24.571 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Lena, Sunday, 23:44  text in subclause 5.3.2.1 is not aligned with TS 23.273 clause 6.3.1 NOTE 9 which describes a case where there is no positioning session in the AMF. It needs to be modified as follows: | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | V2XAPP | |  | Lena – Breakout | | |  |  | CT aspects of V2XAPP  Is TS 24.486 sufficiently stable to be sent to CT#87-e for information and/or approval | |
|  |  | | [C1-200519](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200519.zip) | Work plan for the CT1 part of V2XAPP | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | discussion Rel-16 | **Current status: Noted** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200522](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200522.zip) | Latest reference version of draft TS 24.486 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | draft TS 24.486 Rel-16 | **Current status: Noted** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200530](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200530.zip) | V2X service discovery procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.486 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed.** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200532](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200532.zip) | V2X sevice continuity procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.486 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed.** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200533](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200533.zip) | General on provisioning of parameters | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.486 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed.** | |
|  |  | | C1-200534 | V2X USD provisioning | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.486 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-200535 | PC5 parameters provisioning | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.486 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-200622](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200622.zip) | Structure and data semantics for V2X service discovery procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.486 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed.** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200623](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200623.zip) | Structure and data semantics for V2X UE registration procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.486 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed.** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200624](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200624.zip) | Structure and data semantics for V2X UE de-registration procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.486 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed.** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200903](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200903.zip) | V2X message delivery procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.486 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed.**  Revision of C1-200529  ------------------------------------------------  Mikael, Tuesday, 11:50  The contents of the procedures seem to be for Location tracking and not for Message delivery procedure.  Christian, Tuesday, 19:03  I have revised C1-200529 to include the correct p-CR, see revision in the drafts folder.  Mikael, Wednesday, 13:32  Draft revision looks good except ”targer” should be “target” in 6.5.2.4  Christian, Wednesday, 16:42  I have corrected the typo in an updated draft revision.  Mikael, Thursday, 10:07  This version is fine for me. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200905](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200905.zip) | Structure and data semantics for application level location tracking procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.486 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200619  --------------------------------------------  Mikael, Tuesday, 11:51  The zip file seems to include the wrong TDoc, C1-200621 and not C1-200619.  Christian, Tuesday, 19:03  I have revised C1-200619 to include the correct p-CR, see revision in the drafts folder.  Mikael, Wednesday, 11:16  I uploaded draft-revision-of-C1-200619-v1+MW.doc to the drafts folder marking a couple of things unclear to me:   1. Don’t we need to add further description of <geographical-identifier>? 2. Mismatch of <location-tracking-info> vs <location-tracking>?   Christian, Wednesday, 12:36  An updated draft revision taking into account Mikael’s further comments is available. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200906](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200906.zip) | Structure and data semantics for V2X message delivery procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.486 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200621  ----------------------------------------  Mikael, Tuesday, 11:54  The contents seem to cover Location tracking procedure rather than Message delivery procedure.  Wording: “elemen” should be “element”  Christian, Tuesday, 19:03  I have revised C1-200621 to include the correct p-CR, i.e., which provides the structure and semantics of the V2X message delivery procedure. See revision in the drafts folder.  Mikael, Wednesday, 11:10  I made some corrections in draft-revision-of-C1-200621-v1+MW.doc in the drafts folder.  Main question is on:  a)   a <polygon-area> element shall include a <trigger-id> element; and  b)   an <ellipsoid-arc-area> element shall include a <trigger-id> element.  I don´t quite understand this <trigger-id> and how it matches the information in the semantics clause:  “an optional element specifying the area as a polygon specified in subclause…”  Christian, Wednesday, 12:36  An updated draft revision taking into account Mikael’s further comments is available. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200944](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200944.zip) | Application level location tracking procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.486 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200528  ---------------------------------------------  Mikael, Wednesday, 13:34  In 6.4.1:  “shall include a <geographical-identifier> element with a <geo-id> child element set to the identity of the geographical location to be subscribed.”  “location” (or possibly “area”?) needs to be added after “geographical”. 2 occurrences.  Christian, Wednesday, 16:42  I have produced a new version of the revision using “geographical area” as in other parts of the p-CR the same words are used, e.g., “shall store the received geographical area information”:  Mikael, Thursday, 10:07  This version is fine for me. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | eV2XARC | |  | Lena – Breakout | | |  |  | CT aspects of eV2XARC  Is TS 24.587 sufficiently stable to be sent to CT#87-e for approval?  Is TS 24.588 sufficiently stable to be sent to CT#87-e for approval? | |
|  |  | | C1-200321 | Precedence order between V2X configuration parameters | | | LG Electronics | pCR 24.587 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Revision of C1-198404 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200324](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200324.zip) | Direct link establishment procedure update based on SA3 LS | | | OPPO / Rae | pCR 24.587 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-200349 and its revisions.  Yanchao, Thursday, 12:46  In Table 7.3.2.1.1, the length of sequence number should be 1 octet  Ivo, Thursday, 15:07  - "if the result of the above check is yes" -> "If the request is accepted"  - it is not clear how the UE figures out whether "the security association with the initiating UE is successful". Maybe an editor's note is needed.  Rae, Friday, 11:05  I have taken Yanchao and Ivo’s comments in a draft revision available in the drafts folder.  Christian, Friday,15:52  We are supporters of the intent of the p-CR but we have got the following comments to the draft revision:   1. I do wonder; how many similar editor’s on security we want to add into TS 24.587? There are already many and even with most of them being very similar in wording. At least; can you please use the same text as the previous one in the specification, i.e., “Editor’s note:        This section needs to be revisited after SA3 have determined the full set of security requirements for unicast link establishment.”; 2. your proposal of deletion of the bullet item c under 6.1.2.2.3 is not correct to me as it is not aligned with TS 23.387 clause 6.3.3.1. Hence, can you please reverse your deletion?; and 3. I hope that the highlighted colour you use on the p-CR will be removed in the actual final revision (to be uploaded to the inbox/3GPP portal). As rapporteur, I do not want to deal with colourful text when implementing p-CRs as I believe that it is already enough with the usual template style corruption and editorials.   With those changes, Huawei and HiSilicon would like to co-sign the revision of the p-CR.  Ivo, Friday, 15:59  About Christian’s comment 1) above, IMO, the new editor's note below is needed - the normative text refers to security association which does not exist.  No strong view on Christian’s comments 2) and 3) above.  Rae, Monday, 3:34  To Christian:  For (1): no strong view;  For (2): I deleted the bullet c in 6.1.2.2.3 because now the IP address configuration IE is not included in DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT REQUEST message and is going to add the description after SA3 determines which message is used.  But if you cannot live with the deletion, how about change as the below in this meeting and I will update this bullet after SA3 requirements is stable:  c)         if the IP address configuration IE is received ~~included in the DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT REQUEST message~~, the target UE checks whether there is at least one common IP address configuration option supported by both the initiating UE and the target UE.  For (3): I will, don’t worry.  Christian, Tuesday, 21:07  The latest draft version and unfortunately does not consider our comments. Our point is that TS 23.287 in the clause 6.3.3.1 indicates that still there is need to consider the IP address configuration. I fail to see why this stage 2 requirement is removed. With that change, Huawei and HiSilicon would like to co-sign the revision of the p-CR.  Rae, Wednesday, 5:54  Now C1-200324 is merged to the revision of C1-200349 and I checked that what Christian commented has been covered in C1-200349. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200325](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200325.zip) | Remove the FFS on non-IP | | | OPPO / Rae | pCR 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200327](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200327.zip) | Keep alive procedure | | | OPPO / Rae | pCR 24.587 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-200350 and its revisions.  Lena, Friday, 7:53   * This pCR overlaps with C1-200350. We suggest merging C1-200327 into C1-200350. * Mention of radio link failure is out of scope of CT1 spec. It is sufficient to say that a trigger from the lower layers is received. Also we would prefer to keep these triggers UE implementation specific. * Inconsistent use of T5yyy and T500y * Title of figure in 6.1.2.X.2 is wrong * Sending of the Maximum inactivity period info is missing. It is useful to determine how to set the inactivity timer at the peer UE and minimize colliding keep-alive procedures. * Handling of a Keep-alive counter is missing. Such counter is useful to detect duplicate messages, it should be added to the procedure * “requesting UE” should be “initiating UE” * In 6.1.2.X.5.2, “the peer UE” should be “the target UE”   Rae, Friday, 10:07  I am ok to merge C1-200327 into C1-200350. If people think Maximum inactivity period and Keep-alive counter are useful, I am also OK to have them. Still a question for the Maximum inactivity period, what’s the relation between this period T5zzz and the T5xxx on the target UE side?  Christian, Friday, 16:23  We are supporters of adding this in TS 24.587 as your proposals are related to LS in C1-200242 so we eventually would like to co-sign the related p-CR. Merging of the proposals is fine by us but I wonder which direction is the merging taking.  In my analysis of the proposals in C1-200327 and C1-200350; C1-200350 (from Qualcomm) seems to be taken directly from the LTE ProSe keep-alive procedure, and therefore more complete whereas C1-200327 (from OPPO) is a lightweight version which seems simpler for implementations. In my view, we can make things a sort of better than in LTE ProSe. Can you please at least restrict the trigger of start or restart of the T5XXX within the V2X layer (to avoid cross-layer interaction)?  Lena, Monday, 0:55  To Christian: the SA2-agreed CR (S2-200972) does mention triggers from the lower layers several times. As a compromise, would it be acceptable to have the triggers from the lower layers optional?  Lena, Monday, 1:33  To Rae: the relationship between this period T5zzz and the T5xxx on the target UE sideis up to implementation but the target UE can use the Maximum inactivity period info to set T5xxx to a value slightly larger than T5zzzz, so as to minimize the number of keep-alive procedures initiated by the target UE. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200385](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200385.zip) | Adding abnormal case on the network side | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Ivo, Thursday, 15:12  In case REJECT is not delivered, the PCF should wait for retransmission of REQUEST. If the procedure is aborted, the PCF will need to handle any retransmitted REQUEST again.  Chen, Friday, 4:48  The abnormal case is dealt with as in other 3GPP specifications, see for instance TS 24.334 clause 7.2.9.2, TS 24.501 clause 5.4.2.6 and TS 24.501 clause 5.4.2.7.  On the other hand, there is a timer for UE for retransmission of REQUEST, but there is not a timer for PCF in case REJECT.  Ivo, Tuesday, 22:07  The cases quoted by Chen are different from the one discussed.  However, after some further thinking, I withdraw my comment. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200387](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200387.zip) | Correction for the list of V2X service identifier to PDU session parameters mapping rules over V2X Uu | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200389](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200389.zip) | Correction for the list of V2X service identifier to V2X E-UTRA frequency mapping rules over V2X PC5 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  CRs C1-200391, C1-200389, C1-200388, C1-200386 influence coding in CR C1-200292 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200391](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200391.zip) | Resolution of the editor's note on validity timer | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  C1-200391, C1-200389, C1-200388, C1-200386 influence coding in CR C1-200292  Lena, Friday, 7:58  This pCR seems to conflict with C1-200292 and C1-200293 which specify an expiration time (ie absolute UTC time) rather than a validity timer.  Chen, Friday, 8:29  The expiration time and the validity timer is the same thing. I’ve found that in stage 2 TS 23.287 uses validity timer, and the validity timer is first used in TS 24.587 and then the expiration time is added. Therefore, from my side, it should be aligned with stage 2 and early TS24.587. But it is OK to use “expiration time”. The word should be kept consistent.  Christian, Friday, 15:18  I kindly disagree. As per my comments to C1-200292 and others, in light of SA2 LS in C1-200231 and latest version of TS 23.387, CT1 need to be aligned with SA2 decisions and also keep consistency in our TS 24.587, and therefore we propose to replace the “expiration timer” wording by “validity timer” and remove the editor’s notes regarding this (see C1-200391). Hence, we would like that the specification uses a single wording and not two to refer to the very same thing, i.e., “validity timer”.  Ivo, Friday, 16:30  if "validity timer" is used in the V2X configuration, would the "validity timer" be an absolute UTC time as in 24.385 or a relative time?  Lena, Friday, 19:39  If the parameter is called “validity timer” then to be consistent it should be a relative time. Using a relative time over an absolute UTC time also has the advantage that you can set to the timer to a special value (0 or deactivated) so that it never expires (for operators who want the policy to be valid until it is updated).  Ivo, Monday, 10:57  if the validity time in the V2X configuration is a relative time, the UE would need to remember when the UE received the UE policy sections with the V2XP, right? The UE is not required to do so today.  Also, operator might want to configure its UEs so that the V2X configuration for PC5 stops being valid at more-or-less the same absolute time (not exactly, but e.g. end in the same day). Then, PCF would need to calculate the relative time based on when the PCF provides the V2XP to the UE.  It deserves proper thinking-through.  I put an editor's note on this issue in C1-200292.  Lena, Monday, 20:01  I am fine with having an Editor’s note on the encoding of the validity timer, and I am ok with C1-200391. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200520](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200520.zip) | Work plan for the CT1 part of eV2XARC | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | discussion Rel-16 | **Current status: Noted** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200521](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200521.zip) | Latest reference version of draft TS 24.587 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | draft TS 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current status: Noted** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200538](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200538.zip) | Introduction of “PC5 Unicast Link Identifier Update Procedure” | | | InterDigital Communications | pCR 24.587 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-200439 and its revisions.  Yanchao, Thursday, 13:49   1. According to S2-2000953, if the target UE has the privacy configuration, it will update its identifier after receiving the link id update request message 2. In clause 6.1.2.4.3, bullet f), g) and h) are not the IEs included in the link update accept message. These are the UE’s behaviours. Same as the bullet e) and f) in subclause 6.1.2.4.4. 3. The format of figure 6.1.2.4.2 is not right. 4. The number of the timers are not defined yet.   Lena, Friday, 8:21   * overlaps with C1-200439 * subclause 6.1.2.4 (and its subclauses) should be numbered 6.1.2.x instead * issues with style of bulleted lists in several subclauses (bullets ending with “.” Instead of “;” or ending with nothing, missing “and/or”) * New timer should be numbered T5xxx instead of T5002 * There seems to be an issue with the formatting of Figure 6.1.2.4.2 * In subclause 6.1.2.4.3, it is not explained how the target UE determines whether it can accept the request * Definition of the new messages introduced by this procedure is missing   Christian, Friday, 16:34  We support to add the PC5 Unicast link identifier update procedure so we eventually would like to co-sign the final p-CR.  However, we agree that C1-200538 and C1-200439 overlap and they are in fact very similar so they should be merged but both p-CRs have a number of issues to be corrected (as already indicated by Ivo and Lena so no need to repeat any of them plus some editorials, e.g., unnecessary capitalizations, ..). My question is which one of the p-CRs is going for revision? I have a preference for vivo’s p-CR as the basis.  Behrouz, Friday, 21:31  I will touch base with vivo and ask for a possible merger of the two pCRs. Meanwhile, please see some answers/comments to Lena’s comments:   * subclause 6.1.2.4 (and its subclauses) should be numbered 6.1.2.x instead -> BA: May I ask “why”? Subclause 6.1.2 is about Unicast mode communication over NR based PC5 and the other procedures (Link Establishment and Modification have already been presented in 6.1.2.2 and 6.1.2.3 respectively, so the next procedure should be 6.1.2.4] * New timer should be numbered T5xxx instead of T5002 -> BA: Since T5000 & T5001 were already defined, I only stepped up the Timer number. Is there any specific reason behind your request? * There seems to be an issue with the formatting of Figure 6.1.2.4.2-> BA: Yes, I know. I have an issue with Visio and have asked my colleagues for help!] * In subclause 6.1.2.4.3, it is not explained how the target UE determines whether it can accept the request-> BA: Ok, I will modify that part to resemble the other cases] * Definition of the new messages introduced by this procedure is missing-> BA: In fact, I was initially leaning toward defining the message. However, I noticed that the messages for the Modification procedure are also missing and decided, therefore, to wait…]   Behrouz, Monday, 6:49  I have asked Yanchao about merging our pCRs. I do not have any strong preference on which one of the two that should act as a basis. However, it seems that our (Interdigital’s) pCR covers a bit more than vivo’s, but as I said, we can go either way. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200595](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200595.zip) | Triggering service request procedure for V2X communication over PC5 interface | | | LG Electronics / SangMin | CR 1968 24.501 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200596](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200596.zip) | Discussion on multiple V2X services during the direct link establishment procedure | | | LG Electronics / SangMin | discussion Rel-16 | **Current status: Noted**  Yanchao, Thursday, 13:42  Vivo does not agree with Proposal 1 for the following reasons:   1. We see no strong reason from the real V2X services that have to support multiple V2X service during the PC5 link establishment procedure. 2. The current link modification procedure can add new V2X service to the existing PC5 link. 3. Inclusion of multiple V2X service identifier to the direct link establishment request will introduce lots complexity in the PC5 link establishment procedure:    1. If multiple V2X service are included in one link establishment request message, it needs to convey the relationship between V2X service and the PQFIs;    2. The link establishment accept message has to be extended to include the V2X service ID that target UE accepts; 4. According to the descriptions in TS23.287, if the UE has the interest on the announcing V2X service, it responds with a accept message. (This mean only one V2X service). If multiple V2X service are include, there is no SA2 requirement that the target UE are interested on all the V2X service or some of the V2X servicess. 5. If multiple V2X service are included in a establishment request message, the UE has to ensure that all the V2X service ID are linked to the same UE application layer ID.   SangMin, Monday, 8:39  I understand Yanchao’s observations / reasons for disagreeing the proposal 1. I have waited for other company’s view on this issue, but since not so much interests on this issue were identified…  So I assume that   1. for a direct link establishment procedure, only one V2X service is added to the PC5 link. 2. After that, if more V2X services are to be added, direct link modification procedure can do so.   If CT1 has such an understanding on the scenario, we are fine to withdraw or postpone relevant documents (0597 is related to proposals 1,2 and 3).  One additional question is that, is this principle also applied to the modification procedure, i.e. one direct link modification procedure only handles one V2X service including adding a new service and providing PC5 QoS flow descriptions for the V2X service?  If so, then we also don’t need any further update to PC5 QoS flow description IE as suggested in C1-200598 (or other way), but if a modification procedure can update more than one V2X services, still mapping between PQF description and V2X service needs to be considered.  Also if there are more companies interested in this issue, please provide your opinion. It would be appreciated.  Rae, Monday, 9:04  In my understanding, what LGE proposed is some optimization. As you said below, using a procedure for each V2X service at least can work.  Adding more than one V2X service make things more complex since both UEs should consider more scenarios then can make a decision.  Considering the late phase of this WI, my preference is to keep things simple.  Lena, Monday, 20:25   * Qualcomm’s view is that LGE’s proposal is aligned with the current SA2 requirements, so we support the proposal. Also note that it would be difficult to add this capability of supporting multiple V2X service identifiers in e.g. Rel-17 as the initiating UE would not know in advance if the target UE supports receiving multiple V2X service identifiers in the DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT REQUEST message. * Another comment is that the 1-1 mapping of V2X Service and PC5 QoS Flow (PFI) is only for non-IP based services (this is because for non-IP bases services, there is no port information to do the traffic differentiation). | |
|  |  | | [C1-200597](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200597.zip) | Multiple V2X service identifiers in DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT REQUEST message | | | LG Electronics / SangMin | pCR 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current status: Postponed**  Ivo, Thursday, 15:36  1) 6.1.2.2.2 "V2X service identifier(s)" -> "one or more V2X service identifier(s)"  2) 6.1.2.2.3 "it is interested in the V2X service(s) identified by the V2X service identifiers IE" - can you please clarify whether the target UE has to be interested in \*all of them\* or \*at least one of them\*. If \*at least one of them\*, then DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT ACCEPT should indicate which of the V2X service identifier(s) indicated in the DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT REQUEST are interesting for the target UE.  Chen, Monday, 3:55  Conflicts with C1-200326 on the V2X service identifier IE.  Ivo, Tuesday, 14:09  Ericsson is ok with either C1-200326 or C1-200597.  SangMin, Wednesday, 9:34  Ivo’s comment 1) is valid, I’ll fix it.  For comment 2) my understanding is the latter, “at least one of them”. If so, the V2X service identifiers IE should be added to the ACCEPT message as well. I’ll update accordingly.  Note that CT1 has not reached a consensus on whether multiple V2X service ids are included in a single message or not. So if we get agreement on the way forward, I’ll revise this pCR and update for your comments, or withdraw it.  Also Xiaoguang has notified the conflict with 0326, which we had discussed during the CC#2. As I said above, I’ll revise this pCR after we agree on the way forward. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200598](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200598.zip) | Association between V2X service id and PC5 QoS flow description | | | LG Electronics / SangMin | pCR 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Postponed**  Ivo, Thursday, 15:37  V2X services can be added to and removed from the PC5 unicast link. It is not clear how to identify the V2X service in such case, given that the coding refers solely to DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT REQUEST.  Chen, Friday, 10:24   * This pCR conflicts with C1-200326 which defines the V2X service identifier IE, especially the length; * This pCR Alt b) conflicts with C1-200440 in operation code. C1-200440 would delete the link modification operation code and the operation code octet may be deleted. * In alt b, there is a risk that 5 bits index is not enough for 4 octets V2X service identifier when a lot of V2X service identifiers are included.   SangMin, Tuesday, 8:57  To Ivo: so according to your opinion, the other alternative (alt a) using full V2X service ID itself seems simpler and better solution. Anyway, the life of this pCR depends on the multiple V2X service ID issue, so I would rather wait for the conclusion of that discussion, and then I’ll revise the paper or postpone it accordingly. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200603](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200603.zip) | Latest reference version of draft TS 24.588 | | | LG Electronics / SangMin | draft TS 24.588 Rel-16 | **Current status: Noted** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200632](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200632.zip) | PC5 unicast link keep-alive procedure – additions to C1-200350 | | | Apple | pCR 24.587 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-200350 and its revisions. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200652](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200652.zip) | Clean-up for TS 24.588 | | | LG Electronics / SangMin | pCR 24.588 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200820](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200820.zip) | Decoding on V2X service ID and application ID | | | OPPO / Rae | pCR 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  SangMin indicated on the list he can let this go forward, under the condition that we note the following in the chairman report  **The number of V2X service identifiers that can be included in a single message for the unicast mode communication over PC5 is not yet decided. CT1 will continue to work on this aspect in the following WG meetings**.  Are the proponents of C1-200597 ok to agree this pCR?  Revision of C1-200326  ---------------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 15:09  - V2X service identifier is PSID or ITS-AID, and the coding should point to ISO TS 17419 ITS-AID AssignedNumbers : <http://standards.iso.org/iso/ts/17419/TS17419%20Assigned%20Numbers/TS17419_ITS-AID_AssignedNumbers.pdf> similarly as done in V2X in EPS.  - V2X service identifier cannot be out-of-scope since it is used to distinguish different formattings of V2X messages  Lena, Friday, 7:50   * For the V2X service identifier, I would prefer to go with a fixed length of 4 octets since this field carries a PSID or ITS-AIDs of the V2X application * All messages in which the V2X service identifier and/or an Application layer ID are included need to be updated to reflect the new formats of the IEs   Rae, Friday, 10:48  I will take the comments on board, i.e change the format of V2X service identifier as the following to be TV with a length of 5 octets. I will also change the format of V2X service identifier IE in the DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT REQUEST message from “LV”to “V”of the revision of C1-200324.  Christian, Friday, 15:59  We support the intent of the p-CR and Rae revises the CR as indicated via email, please add Huawei and HiSilicon as co-signers of the revision of the p-CR.  Ivo, Friday, 16:01  Proposed revision is ok for me and Ericsson would like to co-sign.  However, please be aware that there is a conflicting CR in C1-200597. Either the revision of C1-200326 or the solution in C1-200597 would be OK with me.  SangMin, Tuesday, 3:05  We acknowledge that 0326 conflicts with 0597. In the discussion on the multiple V2X service identifiers issue in 0596, two companies support single V2X service per each request while one company support multiple V2X service per each request. (and it seems Ericsson is okay for both ways) We will follow the majority view, so please share your view on this to this thread or the thread on 0596.  Yanchao, Tuesday, 4:49  We prefer the solution in C1-200326 and it is aligned with what we have in our pCRs.  Ivo, Tuesday, 14:09  Ericsson is ok with either C1-200326 or C1-200597. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200824](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200824.zip) | PC5 unicast link release procedure | | | vivo | pCR 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200437  ---------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 15:15  - unnecessary capitalization in “PC5 Signalling Protocol procedures"  - in 6.1.2.X.3 + 6.1.2.X.4: why is the release of the PC5 unicast link after DIRECT LINK RELEASE ACCEPT optional?  Lena, Friday, 7:59   * In 6.1.2.X.2, “The initiating UE shall initiate the PC5 unicast link release procedure by generating” should be “In order to initiate the PC5 unicast link release procedure, the initiating UE shall create” to be aligned with existing procedures already in TS 24.587 * In 6.1.2.X.2, I don’t see a need to introduce a separate Release Reason IE. The PC5 signalling protocol cause value IE (introduced in C1-200390 and in C1-200349) can be used. So “with a Release Reason IE indicating one of the following cause values” should be “In this message, the UE shall include a PC5 signalling protocol cause value IE indicating one of the following cause values” * In 6.1.2.X.2, “Direct communication with the target UE is no longer allowed” should be “Direct communication with the target UE no longer allowed * In 6.1.2.X.2, “any more” should be “anymore” * In 6.1.2.X.3, “for this link” should be “for this PC5 unicast link” * In 6.1.2.X.4, “may release” should be “shall release”   Yanchao, Friday, 9:05  We are ok with most of Lena’s comments. For the 2nd comment, we are ok to use the PC5 signalling protocol cause value IE to convey the release reason information. However I am not sure how to proceed with this comment. As you said, there are two papers that define the same IE (C1-200390 and in C1-200349), so I just define the same IE in the revision of C1-200437 and use three values of this IE for the release reason that C1-200437 needed?  Lena, Saturday, 17:49  Yes, my proposal would be that Yanchoa defines the same IE (as that defined in C1-200390 and C1-00349) in the revision of C1-200437 and uses three values of this IE (e.g. ‘xxxxxxxx’, ‘yyyyyyyy’ and ‘zzzzzzzz’) for the release reasons that C1-200437 needed. Since TS 24.587 is not yet under change control, the TS rapporteur would then have to add the new IE only once in the TS, and allocate values for the code points defined in this IE by C1-200437, C1-200390 and C1-200349 when implementing the pCRs.  Is this ok with Christian?  Christian, Sunday, 15:55  Yes I am ok with Lena’s proposal.  Yanchao, Monday, 9:02  I am ok with Lena’s proposal.  Since we are defining the same IE in our papers (C1-200390 & in C1-200349& C1-200437), I think we better align on the wording. I have some comments for the purpose of the PC5 signalling protocol cause value IE:  “The purpose of the PC5 signaling protocol cause value information element is to indicate the error cause values used in the PC5 signalling protocol procedures.”  Since this IE is used to convey the release reason of PC5 link:  #x  Direct communication to target UE no longer needed;  #y  Direct communication with the target UE no longer allowed; or  #z  Direct connection is not available anymore.  I think the use of “error” cause values is not proper, because now some values are not about errors.  Inspired by the purpose of the 5GSM cause value “The purpose of the 5GSM cause information element is to indicate the reason why a 5GSM request is rejected.”, I propose to use this following wording:  “The purpose of the PC5 signalling protocol cause value information element is to indicate the reason why a PC5 signalling protocol procedure is rejected.”  Your feedback is appreciated.  Chen, Monday, 9:32  “The purpose of the PC5 signaling protocol cause value information element is to indicate the error cause values used in the PC5 signalling protocol procedures.”  is from ProSe PC5 standard TS 24.334 clause 12.5.1.7. And the release reason of C1-200437 is a new IE in TS 24.334 clause 12.5.1.8.  The release procedure in C1-200437 is not a REJECT procedure. I therefore don’t think your proposal is appropriate.  I’d prefer to add a new Release Reason IE as ProSe does for the release procedure in C1-200437  Yanchao, Monday, 11:24  I am ok with either new release reason IE or reuse of the PC5 signaling protocol cause value IE.  Hope to hear your opinion on this, so I can go with what most people prefers.  Note that the 5GSM cause value is also used in the PDU session release procedure.  Chen, Monday, 14:56  PC5 is for both ProSe and V2X, I therefore would prefer to be aligned with ProSe. But either is OK to me too.  Lena, Monday, 20:01  We have a preference for re-using the PC5 signalling protocol cause value, in the same way as the 5GSM cause value can be included in a PDU session release request (as pointed out by Yanchao).  To resolve the wording issue pointed out by Chen, I suggest defining the IE as follows:  “The purpose of the PC5 signaling protocol cause value information element is to indicate the ~~error~~ cause values used in the PC5 signalling protocol procedures.”  Chen, Tuesday, 2:09  I am fine wih Lena’s suggestion.  Yanchao, Tuesday, 12:14  CR was revised to C1-200824  Note that I have updated the wording to “The purpose of the PC5 signaling protocol cause value information element is to indicate the ~~error~~ cause value~~s~~ used in the PC5 signalling protocol procedures.”  Ivo, Tuesday, 14:37  The draft of C1-200824 addresses my comment. Ericsson would like to cos-sign.  Yanchao, Wednesday, 4:56  An updated draft revision is available. Changes:   * Added Ericsson as co-signer.   To Lena and Chen: note that there are use of the term “PC5-S cause” which need your opinion.  Lena, Wednesday, 5:55  Please note that in the latest draft revision of C1-200349, I am no longer defining the PC5 signaling protocol cause value IE, based on Ivo’s comments that he cannot accept message and IE definitions before SA3 has agreed contents into the V2X TS about the security procedures. So you will need to define the code point for “Protocol error, unspecified” in your pCR.  Regarding the name of the IE , I have no strong view, I am ok with either “PC5 signalling protocol cause” or “PC5-S cause” (but whatever you choose will not impact C1-200349 and its revisions as explained above).  Chen, Wednesday, 7:27  For the name of the IE, I’d prefer “PC5 signalling”. There are a lot of “PC5 signalling” in TS 24.587 and there is no abbreviation for  “PC5 signalling” in the clause 3.2 Abbreviations.  Ivo, Wednesday, 9:27  "PC5 signaling cause" is OK with me, as long as it is used consistently everywhere.  Yanchao, Wednesday, 12:10  An updated draft revision is available. Changes”   1. Add Ericsson as co-singer; 2. Use “PC5 signaling cause value”in the table and figure， based on Ivo’s 2nd comment; 3. Add "protocol error, unspecified"，based on Ivo’s 3rd comment;   Ivo, Wednesday, 14:54  The updated draft revision is nearly ok: the references to the figure and table in 8.4.x are incorrect.  Yanchao, Thursday, 3:29  Figure number and table number are all corrected in 8.4.x.1 in an updated draft revision. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200825](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200825.zip) | Encoding of direct link release messages and parameters | | | vivo | pCR 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200438  -------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 15:19  - remove unncessary capitalization in "Sequence Number" + "Release Reason" + "Release Reason Content"  - incorrect styles in 7.3.X.1, message type  - in Table 7.3.X.1.1, length of Release Reason should be 1 octet  - in Table 7.3.X.1.1  + Table 7.3.y.1, length of sequence number should be 1 octet  - Table 8.4.x.1 is inconsistent on length of Release Reason value  - Figure 8.4.x.1 is not aligned with Table 8.4.x.1 on fields in 2nd octet  Lena, Friday, 8:01   * I don’t see a need to introduce a separate Release Reason IE. The PC5 signalling protocol cause value IE (introduced in C1-200390 and in C1-200349) can be used. * The length of the Sequence number IE should be 1 octet   Yanchao, Tuesday, 12:14  CR was revised to C1-200825  Note that I have updated the wording to “The purpose of the PC5 signaling protocol cause value information element is to indicate the ~~error~~ cause value~~s~~ used in the PC5 signalling protocol procedures.”  Ivo, Tuesday, 14:37  Comments on draft of C1-200825:  - "PC5 signalling protocol cause" is rather long. Consider shortening to "PC5-S cause".  - Figure 8.4.j.1 is not aligned with Table 8.4.j.1 on field in 2nd octet  - Table 8.4.j.1 states: "Any other value received by the UE shall be treated as 0000 0011, "protocol error, unspecified".". However, Table 8.4.j.1 does not list 0000 0011, "protocol error, unspecified" in the list of possible values. I suggest this value is added to the list  Yanchao, Thursday, 3:29  Figure number and table number are all corrected in 8.4.x.1 in a draft revision.  Ivo, Thursday, 10:33  Revision looks ok. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200826](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200826.zip) | PC5 unicast link identifier update procedure | | | vivo | pCR 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200439  --------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 15:22  - 6.1.2.x.2 bullet a) is not an English sentence  - unnecessary capitalization in "the Security Information"  - in 6.1.2.x.3, 2nd paragraph should be normative  Lena, Friday, 8:11   * In subclause 6.1.2.x.3, it is not explained how the target UE determines whether it can accept the request * The definition of the new messages introduced by this procedure is missing   Christian, Friday, 16:34  We support to add the PC5 Unicast link identifier update procedure so we eventually would like to co-sign the final p-CR.  However, we agree that C1-200538 and C1-200439 overlap and they are in fact very similar so they should be merged but both p-CRs have a number of issues to be corrected (as already indicated by Ivo and Lena so no need to repeat any of them plus some editorials, e.g., unnecessary capitalizations, ..). My question is which one of the p-CRs is going for revision? I have a preference for vivo’s p-CR as the basis.  Yanchao, Monday, 10:20  A draft revision is available in the drafts folder. Updates:   * Some text is added to the beginning of 6.1.2.x.3 to address Lena’s comments. * The draft revision merge the 6.1.2.x.4 and 6.1.2.x.7.2 from interdigital’s paper in C1-200538. * There are some difference between C1-200538 and C1-200439, but we didn’t take it into the revision:   + According to the agreed paper S2-2000953, if the target UE has the privacy configuration, it will update its identifier after receiving the link id update request message, this is not captured in C1-200538   + In clause 6.1.2.4.3, bullet f), g) and h) are not the IEs included in the link update accept message. These are the UE’s behaviours. Same commets to the bullet e) and f) in subclause 6.1.2.4.4.   + C1-200538 has some requirement on cypher the new identifiers, such as ”The target UE shall cypher the new identifiers before transmitting the message” ,“The initiating UE shall cypher the new identifiers before transmitting the message. ”. We thought with the paper C1-200349 and its revision, which define the authentication and SMC procedure for PC5 link, all the PC5-signalling message sent with cipher and integrity protection after the establishment of security context for PC5 link. Not sure if SA3 has any specific cypher requirement for transmission of updated identifiers besides the cipher and integrity protection of PC5-S messages.   Ivo, Monday, 14:07  1) in creation of DIRECT LINK IDENTIFIER UPDATE ACCEPT in 6.1.2.x.3, would it be possible to use similar style as in creation of DIRECT LINK IDENTIFIER UPDATE REQUEST in 6.1.2.x.2? I.e.:  ---------------  If the target UE has the privacy configuration as specified in clause 5.2.3 and decides to change its identifier, the target UE shall create the DIRECT LINK IDENTIFIER UPDATE ACCEPT message. In this message, the target UE:  a)   shall include the target UE’s new layer 2 ID assigned by itself;  b)   shall include the new security information;  c)   may include the target UE’s new application layer ID received from upper layer; and  d)   may include the new IP address/prefix if IP communication is used.  ---------------  Reason: the structure above allows for "should" and "may", while the other structure does not.  2) bullets b) and c) in 6.1.2.x.4 seem to provide conflicting information - only one of the bullets should remain.  Upon receipt of the DIRECT LINK IDENTIFIER UPDATE ACCEPT message, the initiating UE shall stop timer Txxxx and respond with a DIRECT LINK IDENTIFIER UPDATE ACK message. In this message, the initiating UE:  a)   shall include the target UE’s new layer 2 ID, if received;  b)   shall include the target UE new Application Layer ID, if received;  c)   may include the target UE’s new application layer ID, if received; and  d)   may include the new IP address/prefix, if received.  With the changes above, Ericsson would like to cosign.  Yanchao, Wednesday, 4:34  An updated draft revision is available. Changes:   1. Take Ivo’s comments on board. 2. Add “ InterDigital Communications?, Huawei, HiSilicon, Ericsson” as co-source.   Yanchao, Wednesday, 12:43  Behrouz, are you ok with the latest draft revision?  Behrouz, Wednesday, 15:13  I am checking with my colleagues who follow V2X closely.  Yanchao, Thursday, 5:11  I have uploaded a draft revision which addresses comments received from Behrouz offline. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200844](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200844.zip) | Security establishment for PC5 unicast link | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | pCR 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200349  ----------------------------------------------  Rae, Thursday, 10:24  For the deletion of FFS on Non-IP, I think this part can be left to my C1-200325 since this CR covers security issues and has a lot of information already.  For the security procedures, I cannot find SA3 V2X TS. I agree that the security procedures in principle may be the same with what defined in EPS. But is it better to wait for SA3 TS?  Yanchao, Thursday, 13:09  1) The length of sequence number should be 1 octet.  2) Which UE can trigger the PC5 unicast link authentication procedure: the initiating UE, the target, or both?  3) Which UE can trigger the PC5 unicast link security mode control procedure: the initiating UE, the target, or both?  Ivo, Thursday, 15:10  It is too early to bring security in CT1 specs - no version of 33.536 exists yet and there are no security details available in 23.287 either.  Lena, Friday, 1:16  C1-200349 does not delete the Editor’s note on non-IP communication, so there is no conflict with C1-200325.  Regarding the security procedures, Qualcomm is submitting pCRs to the V2X TS in SA3 and the contents of C1-200349 are based on those pCRs (SA3 meets from March 2nd to March 6). We can either agree C1-200349 and update TS 24.587 in April to align with any updates made by SA3 at their March meeting, or we can postpone C1-200349 to the April meeting if people want to wait until the security procedures are in the V2X TS.  Lena, Friday, 1:34  I have fixed the length of the sequence number in Revision\_of\_C1-200349\_v1 which was uploaded to the drafts folder.  About Yanchao’s questions 2 & 3, the UE triggering the PC5 unicast link authentication procedure and the UE triggering the SMC is the target UE of the PC5 unicast link establishment procedure  Christian, Friday, 16:24  I have to agree with Lena that the proposals in C1-200349 are based on LSs in C1-200230, 231, 241, and possibly 253 so in my view as rapporteur I would like to have security aspects added to TS 24.587 for the PC5 unicast link establishment procedure and adding the (new) PC5 unicast link authentication procedure.  Having said that I understand that some companies want to ask for having more time as the p-CR proposal is based on current situation which may change in the upcoming SA3 meeting (I guess from the raised comments that things could change?).  In my personal view in light of the LSs and what SA3 have worked out, the new procedure is needed and should be added to TS 24.587. Furthermore, the Qualcomm proposal seems aligned with present situation. We could add editor’s notes to cover up for the case that SA3 decide to update or add some small details in the upcoming meeting.  Chen, Saturday, 7:49   1. This p-CR adds a PC5 unicast link authentication procedure and a PC5 unicast link security mode control procedure in the PC5 unicast link establishment procedure, but only the security mode control procedure was updated in the link establishment procedure. Therefore, the authentication procedure should be updated in the link establishment procedure too. And I suggest a new/replaced figure of the all procedures to make it clear enough. 2. There’s no clarification about the relationship of T5000 and T5aaa and T5bbb. In my understanding, T5aaa and T5bbb is in the T5000, and all of them would not last too long, because vehicles moves fast which means the surroundings are changed fast and there’s a shortage of PC5 resources untill now. Therefore, I concern about the procedure when the T5aaa and T5bbb expires. If the retransmission occurrs, there would be a high risk that the total time is beyond T5000 that would cause conflicts between the establishment procedure and the sub procedure. 3. Lack of procedures of the link establishment procedure in the case of the authentication procedure not accepted by the target UE and the security mode control procedure not accepted by the target UE and their related abnormal cases. 4. In 6.1.2.x.5, the cause value #y should be “authentication failure” instead of “Unspecified error”.   Yanchao, Saturday, 11:19  I have the following comments on the draft revision:   1. In 6.1.2.2.3, the new added bullet a) has style issue. 2. In 6.1.2.y.2, the highlighted condition “if the initiating UE does not share a known KNRP with the target UE” in bullet b is confusing, does the condition mean “if the KNRP ID is not included in the DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT REQUEST message”? 3. In 6.1.2.y.3,  there is a similar condition here, but the use of “target UE ”and “initiating UE” is on the contrary.   Rae, Monday, 9:17  1. C1-200324 is covered by C1-200349 so if the majority agrees C1-200349 as a way forward, C1-200324 can be merged to C1-200349.  2. I also submitted a LS out for SA3 LS C1-200253. If QC’s pCR finally survive, maybe the LS out should also be sent by QC since the contact person in SA3 LS is QC?  Ivo, Monday, 13:56  I still prefer to wait for SA3 to have some agreed stage-2 text on security details, before progressing security details in stage-3.  Lena, Tuesday, 5:21  An updated draft revision is available in the drafts folder. Answers to Chen’s comments:   1. -> I have added a reference to the authentication procedure in the link establishment procedure in v2 of the CR revision. Regarding a figure with all procedures, I don’t think this is needed in CT1 stage 3: for instance in TS 24.301 we do not have a figure showing e.g an attach procedure combined with an authentication procedure and a security mode control procedure. The figure showing how all procedures combine will be in the SA3 TS (TS 33.536) 2. -> Indeed T5000 should be set to a value larger than T5aaa and T5bbb. In v2 of the draft CR revision, I have added a note in the link establishment procedure stating “In order to ensure successful PC5 unicast link establishment procedure, T5000 should be set to a value larger than the sum of T5aaa and T5bbb”. Please let me know if this does not address your comment. 3. -> The subclause on the authentication procedure not accepted by the target UE already says “Upon receipt of the DIRECT LINK AUTHENTICATION REJECT message, the initiating UE shall stop timer T5aaa and abort the ongoing procedure that triggered the initiation of the PC5 unicast link authentication procedure.” Similarly the subclause on the security mode control procedure not accepted by the target UE says “Upon receipt of the DIRECT LINK SECURITY MODE REJECT message, the initiating UE shall stop timer T5bbb and abort the ongoing procedure that triggered the initiation of the PC5 unicast link security mode control procedure”. Similar statements are also in the abnormal case handling of each procedure. I have added statements about the behavior of the target UE sending the reject (which is the initiating UE of the PC5 unicast link establishment procedure) in v2 of the draft CR revision. If you think something is still missing, could you please specifically list the scenarios which are not covered? 4. -> Thanks for pointing this out, I have fixed this in v2 of the draft CR revision. I have also aligned the wording in the PC5 signalling protocol cause value IE definition as discussed on the other thread about C1-200347   Lena, Monday, 5:21  Answers to Yanchao’s comments:  1. -> thanks, I have fixed it in the updated draft revision  2. -> It means “if KNRP ID is not included in the DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT REQUEST message or the target UE does not have an existing KNRP for the KNRP ID included in DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT REQUEST message”. I have updated the wording accordingly in the updated draft revision  3. -> In this case it means “if the target UE did not include a KNRP ID in the DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT REQUEST message. I have updated the wording accordingly in the updated draft revision.  Lena, Tuesday, 5:48  Answers to Ivo’s comments:  In the updated draft revision, I have added the following Editor’s notes:   * In the general subclause of the PC5 unicast link authentication procedure:   Editor’s note:      The PC5 unicast link authentication procedure will need to be updated once SA3 has finalized the requirements in TS 33.356.   * In the general subclause of the PC5 unicast link security mode control procedure:   Editor’s note:      The PC5 unicast link security mode control procedure will need to be updated once SA3 has finalized the requirements in TS 33.356.  Is the pCR acceptable to you with these Editor’s notes?  Chen, Tuesday, 7:53  About Lena’s answers:   1. -> ok 2. -> partially OK. My additional point is the retransmission procedure when T5aaa and T5bbb expires will cause conflicts between the T5000 and the sum of T5aaa(s) and T5bbb(s) too. Based on TS 24.334 clause 10.4.5.6.1,there’s no retransmission procedure due to the short timers. Therefore, from my side, the retransmission procedure could be safely removed and just send the REJECT message 3. -> I suggest to merge the “DIRECT LINK AUTHENTICATION REJECT message” into the “DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT REJECT message”, which means if the initiating UE (which is the target UE of the PC5 unicast link establishment procedure) rejects, the initiating UE just send the DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT REJECT message with the cause value instead of DIRECT LINK AUTHENTICATION REJECT message so that the target UE (which is the initiating UE of the PC5 unicast link establishment procedure) will proceed the same procedure as PC5 unicast link establishment procedure describes. And that would deduce both the UE’s overhead.   Similar suggestion to the security mode control procedure and the related abnormal cases.  Based on the above suggestion and as shown in the last above reply of mine, we should use “if the PC5 unicast link security mode control procedure is triggered by a DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT REQUEST message”,  …, because the authentication procedure and the security mode control procedure may be not only to the PC5 unicast link establishment procedure.   1. -> ok.   Ivo, Tuesday, 21:29  IMO, this is still not acceptable - we cannot jump into stage-3 details on security before SA3 specifies stage-2 security architecture. All the details on security need to be removed from the CR. I do agree that we need PC5 unicast link authentication procedure and PC5 unicast link security mode control procedure, but we can only give general overview for them, without  mentioning any security details. Also, we do not know what messages will be required by SA3.  Lena, Wednesday, 5:08  Feedback on Chen’s comments:  Thanks for your further feedback and the additional info on the interaction between T5000 and T5aaa & T5bbb as well as the handling of the PC5 unicast link establishment procedure in case the authentication procedure is not accepted by the target UE or the security mode control procedure is not accepted by the target UE, it is very useful. I understand your points and I will take them into account when preparing a contribution to the April meeting, after SA3 has agreed the corresponding procedures.  For this meeting, since Ivo has indicated during this morning’s CT1 conference call that he prefers to wait for SA3 to make agreements, I have revised the pCR to remove the details about the PC5 unicast authentication procedure and the PC5 unicast link security mode control procedure, as well as remove the definition of the associated messages. See draft revision in the drafts folder.  Lena, Wednesday, 5:08  Feedback on Ivo’s comments:  In the interest of progress, I have revised the pCR to remove the details about the PC5 unicast authentication procedure and the PC5 unicast link security mode control procedure, as well as remove the definition of the associated messages. The updated draft revision is available in the drafts folder.  Ivo, Wednesday, 14:40  The updated draft revision goes in the right direction. Comments:  1) in 6.1.2.x.1  - the text refers to new KNRP  which is a security detailed to be decided by SA3.  - shouldn't the PC5 unicast link authentication procedure primarily ensure mutual authentication of the UEs establishing the PC5 unicast link?  2) in 6.1.2.y.1  - the text refers to "integrity protect and cipher" while SA3 LS C1-198441 referred solely to "protection".  - the text expects protection of user plane data, which was not mentioned in SA3 LS C1-198441.  I have provided a draft revision with proposal on how to address these comments. If the draft revision is acceptable, Ericsson would like to cosign.  Christian, Wednesday, 19:30  We believe that the PC5 unicast link authentication procedure and the PC5 unicast link security control mode procedure need to be part of the specification and the latest version distributed is fine by us. Can you please add Huawei and HiSilicon as co-signing companies to the revision of C1-200349?  Lena, Wednesday, 23:58  To Ivo: Your proposed edits are fine with me, I have taken them onboard in an updated revision and added Ericsson as co-signer.  Lena, Thursday, 0:10  To Christian: I have updated the draft revision to add Huawei and HiSilicon as co-signers.  Ivo, Thursday, 0:20  Draft revision looks ok. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200845](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200845.zip) | PC5 unicast link keep-alive procedure | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | pCR 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200350  ---------------------------------------------------  Yanchao, Thursday, 13:00  1) The length of sequence number IE should be 1 octet.  2) Can the keep-alive procedure be triggered by upper layers?  3) The stop of T5xxx in Figure 6.1.2.x.2 should be removed because the procedure can also be triggered when T5xxx expires  Lena, Friday, 1:28  I have fixed the sequence number length and also removed the start of timer T5xxx from the figure in Revision\_of\_C1-200350\_v1 which has been uploaded to the drafts folder.  For now I have not added any trigger from the upper layer because it is not mentioned in the SA2-agreed CR. Is there any stage 2 requirement for a trigger from upper layers?  Rae, Friday, 6:13  For the trigger of keepalive message, SA2 left this to CT1, described in the agreed S2-2000972. W.r.t. trigger from upper layer, this trigger is already included in the EPS ProSe. And I think it is reasonable to let upper layer to check whether link is alive if not receiving the report for a period.Since I also submit C1-200327 for keepalive procedure, maybe we can merge.  Krisztian, Friday, 8:16  We submitted C1-200632 with the aim to merge into the revision of C1-200350.  Christian, Friday, 16:23  We are supporters of adding this in TS 24.587 as your proposals are related to LS in C1-200242 so we eventually would like to co-sign the related p-CR. Merging of the proposals is fine by us but I wonder which direction is the merging taking.  In my analysis of the proposals in C1-200327 and C1-200350; C1-200350 (from Qualcomm) seems to be taken directly from the LTE ProSe keep-alive procedure, and therefore more complete whereas C1-200327 (from OPPO) is a lightweight version which seems simpler for implementations. In my view, we can make things a sort of better than in LTE ProSe. Can you please at least restrict the trigger of start or restart of the T5XXX within the V2X layer (to avoid cross-layer interaction)?  Lena, Monday, 0:55  To Christian: the SA2-agreed CR (S2-200972) does mention triggers from the lower layers several times. As a compromise, would it be acceptable to have the triggers from the lower layers optional?  Lena, Monday, 1:33  To Rae: the relationship between this period T5zzz and the T5xxx on the target UE sideis up to implementation but the target UE can use the Maximum inactivity period info to set T5xxx to a value slightly larger than T5zzzz, so as to minimize the number of keep-alive procedures initiated by the target UE.  Lena, Monday, 22:52  A draft merge of C1-200350, C1-200362 and C1-200327, co-signed by OPPO, is available in the drafts folder.  Lena, Tuesday, 6:13  An updated draft merge is available in the draft folder. Changes include:   * Confirming Apple as co-signer * Updating the stop condition for timer T5yyy to “Upon receiving a PC5 signalling message or PC5 user plane data”   Christian, Tuesday, 20:52  Thanks for considering our comments which are covered in the latest version. We would like to co-sign the p-CR.  Lena, Wednesday, 2:49  An updated revision is available in the drafts folder. Changes:   * Adding Huawei, HiSilicon as co-signers * Adding the stopping of T5xxx in Figure 6.1.2.x.2 (since the initiating UE stops T5xxx before sending the DIRECT LINK KEEPALIVE REQUEST message) | |
|  |  | | [C1-200899](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200899.zip) | Data transmission over PC5 unicast link | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200537  ---------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 15:29  - "The pair of layer-2 IDs shall be associated with a PC5 unicast link context." - which pair?  - 6.1.2.X - why is providing source layer-2 ID and destination layer-2 ID to lower layers optional? Shouldn't it be conditional or mandatory?  Christian, Wednesday, 12:07  I have uploaded a draft revision taking into account Ivo’s comments. About his 2nd question, agreed CR in S2-2000975 (at SA2 #136AH) which has made it optional.  Ivo, Wednesday, 15:16  The draft revision looks ok. Ericsson would like to co-sign.  Christian, Wednesday, 16:42  I have updated the draft revision to add Ericsson. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200900](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200900.zip) | Operations for broadcast mode and groupcast mode communication over PC5 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200536  ----------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 15:26  - broken styles of headlines  - wrong style of A) bullet list  - "Then, there can be two conditions:" seems strange  - "according to the mapping rules specified in subclause 5.2.3" - which mapping rules? There are several.  - what is meant by “build a new context for the destination layer-2 ID"?  - "set up a new PC5 QoS rule, the PC5 QoS rule contains:" and "a set of packet filters" - which packet filters?  - 6.1.3.2.4 - the bullet list starting with 3) should start with 1)  Christian, Wednesday, 11:50  A draft revision taking into account Ivo’s comments is available.  About his questions:   * what is meant by "build a new context for the destination layer-2 ID"? -> In the revision I used “to establish a new context”. Our point is that the service identifier only maps to one destination Layer-2 ID, but optionally V2X application requirements for the V2X services can be provided by the application layer. Note that different PC5 QoS Flow contexts might be established for the same destination Layer-2 ID and V2X application requirements can be provided or not by the application and these optional V2X application requirements might be different. Hence,  there can be a need to establish a context corresponding to the destination Layer-2 ID to manage **all** the PC5 QoS Flow contexts using the same destination Layer-2 ID but with different QoS parameters. * set up a new PC5 QoS rule, the PC5 QoS rule contains:" and "a set of packet filters" - which packet filters? -> That comes into picture because of stage, see TS 23.287 subclause 5.4.1.1.4. What is your proposal to cover the above stage 2 requirements? We could add a reference to TS 23.287 or an editor’s note indicating that the details are for further study   Ivo, Wednesday, 15:13  The draft revision goes into the right direction.  I agree that there is a packet filter. The issue is that the text does not state \*how\* the packet filter of the new PC5 QoS rule is constructed - is the packet filter supposed to be generated by V2X layer NAS or provided by upper layers? And if generated by the V2X layer, which of the packet filter types will be used and with which values? If it is not known at the moment, I suggest to add an editor's note stating e.g. exact content of the set of packet filters is FFS.  Minor issues: “as” in “proceed as” seems superfluous, and “to” is missing in from of “self-assign”.  The rest is ok. Ericsson would like to co-sign.  Christian, Wednesday, 16:42  At present it is not clear what the exact content of the packet filter(s) will be. I would need to have some time to make a proposal on this issue so I have added an editor’s note. I have also corrected the unnecessary “proceed as” as I agree that it we do not need those words.  I have produced a new revision to reflect all the above and added Ericsson.  Ivo, Wednesday, 20:37  This version is OK for me. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200907](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200907.zip) | Updates to the link modification procedure | | | vivo | pCR 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200827  ----------------------------------------  Revision of C1-200440  Lena, Friday, 8:16  It seems more robust to keep the link modification operation code. For 5G NAS, we do include the e.g. both the QoS rule identifier, and the rule operation code. This helps with error handling, for instance if one side asks the other side to delete a non-existing QoS rule.  Chen, Friday, 10:05   * In the last 3rd and 4th paragraph of Reason for change, “POFI” should be “PQFI”; * The case "remove existing PC5 QoS flow(s) in the existing PC5 unicast link" should be added in the DIRECT LINK MODIFICATION ACCEPT message; * In case of "remove an existing V2X service in the PC5 unicast link", the information should be added in the DIRECT LINK MODIFICATION ACCEPT message;   Yanchao, Saturday, 4:22  I will take the Chen’s first comment on board.  For the 2nd and 3rd comments, if I understand correctly, Chen wants me to add the removed V2X service ID or the removed PQFI to the DIRECT LINK MODIFICATION ACCEPT message. I think this is not needed, the DIRECT LINK MODIFICATION ACCEPT message itself could be the ACK for the removal of V2X service or PQF. That is the same as what we have done for the PDU session modification procedure in TS 24.501, wherein the network could remove some QoS flow by  the authorized QoS rules IE of the PDU SESSION MODIFICATION COMMAND message, and The UE respond with PDU SESSSION MODIFICATION COMPLETE message without indication of the removed QoS flows.  Chen, Saturday, 5:46  The pCR states:  If the DIRECT LINK MODIFICATION REQUEST message is to add a new V2X service, add new PC5 QoS flow(s) or modify any existing PC5 QoS flow(s) in the PC5 unicast link, the target UE shall include in the DIRECT LINK MODIFICATION ACCEPT message:  a)     the PQFI and the corresponding PC5 QoS parameters that the target UE accepts.  What if the DIRECT LINK MODIFICATION REQUEST message is to remove existing PC5 QoS flow(s) in the existing PC5 unicast link?  Your reply means the target UE will include in the DIRECT LINK MODIFICATION ACCEPT message ACK? Then what if only part of PC5 QoS flow(s) removal are accepted?  BTW, this specification has not specified the ACK in the DIRECT LINK MODIFICATION ACCEPT message  Yanchao, Saturday, 6:48  I didn’t intend to add an ACK in the DIRECT LINK MODIFICATION ACCEPT message. I am saying “the DIRECT LINK MODIFICATION ACCEPT message itself could be the ACK for the removal of V2X service or PQF”.  Regarding the question on why “the PQFI and the corresponding PC5 QoS parameters that the target UE accepts” is only added for case of ” add a new V2X service, add new PC5 QoS flow(s) or modify any existing PC5 QoS flow(s)”,not for case of ” remove existing PC5 QoS flow(s) in the existing PC5 unicast link”, my understanding is :   1. For the case of “add a new V2X service, add new PC5 QoS flow(s) or modify any existing PC5 QoS flow”: It is possible that the target UE didn’t accept some PCS5 QoS flow or QoS parameters that the initiating UE sent. 2. For the case of “remove existing PC5 QoS flow(s) in the existing PC5 unicast link”, when the imitating UE want to remove some V2X service or the PC5 QoS flow, the target UE  has no choice but to accept the release   Chen, Saturday, 8:17  I suggest to add clarification for the confusion. I provide some exceptional use cases about “when the initiating UE wants to remove some V2X service or the PC5 QoS flow, the target UE  has no choice but to accept the release”, which is based on the role equivalence of the initiating UE and the target UE. But in the practical situation, there are many higher-class vehicles, e.g., police vehicles, emergency vehicles, the head vehicle of the vehicle fleet, and so on.  Yanchao, Saturday, 8:40  I don’t understand Chens’ exceptional case.   For example, for the normal 3GPP service, when the UE want to release a PDU session, the network can only accept the release, no matter the PDU session is for emergency or not.  And there is no SA2 requirement that the target UE could reject the removal of a V2X service or a PQF.  I think what Chen proposed here is a new service requirement where the “higher-class vehicles” could reject the removal of a V2X service or a PQF, and which should be discussed in SA2 first.  Chen, Saturday, 9:23  The P-CR lacks the two cases, right? Yanchao’s point is that it’s common sense on the two cases in 3GPP, and there is no need to specify the two cases, right?  Yanchao, Saturday, 9:41  If Chen could show me that SA2 requirement that the target UE can reject the removal of a V2X service or PC5 QoS flow requested by the initiating UE, I will take his comment onboard.  Chen, Saturday, 10:45  My point is no matter what the SA2 requirement is, the procedures of the two cases should be specified, just because they are missing in the P-CR.  Yanchao, Saturday, 11:29  For the removal case, there is no need to add explicit ID in the DIRECT LINK MODIFICATION ACCEPT message because the target UE always accept the removal. That is the same as what we have done for the PDU session modification procedure. I can’t take Chen’s comments on board unless he provides a valid reason or solid SA2 requirements.  Chen, Monday, 3:02  I didn’t intend to add explicit ID. As you said, “remove an existing V2X service in the PC5 unicast link” is kept in the accept procedure in your P-CR, but “remove existing PC5 QoS flow(s) in the existing PC5 unicast link” is missing.  Yanchao, Monday, 7:54  I will add the description for “remove existing PC5 QoS flow(s) in the existing PC5 unicast link” in the subclause 6.1.2.3.3 and will share the draft later.  Yanchao, Monday, 10:56  A draft revision is now available in the drafts folder. The following changes are made:   1. Undelete the link modification operation code; 2. add the description for “remove existing PC5 QoS flow(s) in the existing PC5 unicast link” in the subclause 6.1.2.3.3   Lena, Monday, 20:45  I am fine with the draft revision.  Chen, Tuesday, 2:27  the link modification operation code was added 2 values. Could you please add them in subclause 8.4.5 of TS 24.587? Then I will be fine.  Yanchao, Tuesday, 4:56  I am confused by Chen’s comment. The link modification operation code IE is a new IE in the Direct link modification procedure, please see C1-200441 for Encoding of direct link modification messages and parameters. I am not sure how to add that in 8.4.5 for PC5 QoS flow descriptions.  Chen, Tuesday, 8:06  What I mean is that the operation code field is defined in 8.4.5 and needs to be updated.  Yanchao, Tuesday, 9:02  The Link modification operation code IE is a new IE, which is defined in C1-200441 now, not the “Operation code” field of the PC5 QoS flow description IE.  Chen, Tuesday, 9:12  Thanks Yanchao for the clarification, I am fine with the draft revision now.  Yanchao, Tuesday, 12:18  CR was revised to C1-200827  Christian, Tuesday, 19:34  Comments on the draft of C1-200827:  We are fine with the pCR and we would also like to co-sign it so can you please add both Huawei and HiSilicon?  Yanchao, Wednesday, 12:21  An updated draft revision is available, with Huawei and HiSilicon added as co-signers.  Christian, Wednesday, 12:36  The updated draft revision is fine with me. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200909](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200909.zip) | Encoding of direct link modification messages and parameters | | | vivo | pCR 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200828  ------------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-200441  Ivo, Thursday, 15:25  V2X service identifier can be a type 3 IE, with a total length of 5 octets in TV formatting (rather than type 4 IE with total length of 6 octets in TLV formatting).  Lena, Friday, 8:16  It seems more robust to keep the link modification operation code. For 5G NAS, we do include the e.g. both the QoS rule identifier, and the rule operation code. This helps with error handling, for instance if one side asks the other side to delete a non-existing QoS rule.  Chen, Monday, 3:20  TS 24.587 clause 8.4.5 states: “The PC5 QoS flow descriptions IE is a type 6 information element with a minimum length of 6 octets. The maximum length for the information element is 65538 octets.” Why is the length of PC5 QoS flow descriptions in the P-CR 3-253?  Yanchao, Monday, 7:55  I will fix the length issue and share the draft later.  Yanchao, Monday, 11:17  A draft revision is available in the drafts folder. The following change are made   1. Keep the link modification operation code 2. Correct the format of V2X service ID 3. Correct length of PC5 QoS flow descriptions   Ivo, Monday, 14:19  Comment on the draft revision:  1) is it necessary to \*always\* include V2X service identifier in DIRECT LINK MODIFICATION REQUEST ? If not, the IE should have IEI and be in TV or TLV format.  2) given the size of QoS flow descriptions IE, the format should be LV-E or TLV-E.  3) QoS flow descriptions is mandatory IE in DIRECT LINK MODIFICATION REQUEST  but it is indicated in TLV format. Why? Either it is mandatory and then the format should be LV**-E** or it is optional and then the format should be TLV**-E** format and IEI should be indicated (at least as TBD).  Yanchao, Tuesday, 4:45  We are We are ok to take Ivo’s first two comments on board.For the 3rd comment,  QoS flow descriptions IE  is an optional IE in Direct link modification request message, for example this IE is not included for the removal of a V2X service.  Now its format is TLV in Table 7.3.X.1.1, I will correct it to TLV**-E** as you suggested.  Yanchao, Tuesday, 12:20  CR was revised to C1-200828  Ivo, Tuesday, 14:41  Comments on draft of C1-200828:  Nearly ok: is it possible to indicate that IEIs need to be assigned to the optional IEs, by stating "TBD" in the IEI column. Ericsson woud like to co-sign.  Christian, Tuesday, 19:33  Comments on draft of C1-200828:  we are fine with the pCR. We would also like to co-sign it so can you please add both Huawei and HiSilicon?  Yanchao, Wednesday, 12:36  A draft revision is available. Changes:   * Ericsson, Huawei, HiSilicon added as co-signers * add TBD to IEI per Ivo’s comments   Christian, Wednesday, 16:42  The draft revision addresses my comments. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200933](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200933.zip) | UE policies for V2X communication over PC5 | | | Ericsson / Ivo | pCR 24.588 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200292  ---------------------------------------------  CRs C1-200391, C1-200389, C1-200388, C1-200386 influence coding in CR C1-200292  Christian, Friday, 15:06  We are supportive of completing the UE policies for V2X communication over PC5 but we have the following comments to improve the p-CR and allow interworking to EPS and compatibility:   1. as shown by our p-CR in C1-200286, there is need to correct the Configuration parameters for V2X communication over PC5 so that it is made optional the list of the V2X services authorized for ProSe Per-Packet Reliability (PPPR). Note that this list is used for configuration parameters for a V2X communication over PC5 in E-UTRA. The need of making the list optional aligns with TS 24.386 and allows inteworking to EPS; 2. we further believe that there is need to make optional the list of list of V2X service identifier to Tx profiles mapping rules and the list of V2X service identifier to V2X E-UTRA frequency mapping rules over V2X PC5 for similar reasons as per (1) (see p-CRs in C1-200388 and 389) ; and 3. in light of SA2 LS in C1-200231 and latest version of TS 23.387, CT1 need to be aligned with SA2 decisions and also keep consistency in our TS 24.587, and therefore we propose to replace the “expiration timer” wording by “validity timer” and remove the editor’s notes regarding this (see C1-200391). Hence, we would like that the revision of C1-200292 also uses “validity timer” wording.   With those changes, Huawei and HiSilicon would like to co-sign the p-CR.  Ivo, Monday, 10:49  A draft revision is available in the drafts folder. Main changes:  - additional cosigners added  - Expiration field became validity field. Semantic of the validity field is FFS since it is not clear whether to use relative time or absolute UTC time.  - V2X service identifier to Tx profiles mapping rules field is optional and its presence is controlled by the V2X service identifier to Tx profiles mapping rules indicator bit.  - V2X service identifier to V2X E-UTRA frequency mapping rule field is optional and its presence is controlled by V2X service identifier to V2X E-UTRA frequency mapping rule indicator bit.  - V2X services authorized for PPPR field is optional and its presence is controlled by V2X services authorized for PPPR indicator bit.  - V2X service identifier to V2X NR frequency mapping rule field is optional and its presence is controlled by V2X service identifier to V2X NR frequency mapping rule indicator bit.  - "figure 5.4.1.31" -> "figure 5.3.1.31"  - bit numberring added to figures where missing  - titles of figures and tables corrected  Ivo, Tuesday, 13:40  An updated revision is available in the drafts folder. Main changes:  - "validity" field renamed to "validity timer" field. Length of the validity timer is FFS (in addition to semantic of the validity field being FFS as indicated below). Same reason as below - it is not clear whether to use relative time or absolute UTC time.  - order of fields in Figure 5.3.1.1 swapped, to have the same ordering as in C1-200295 - i.e. the validity timer is first. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200934](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200934.zip) | Updates of configuration parameters for V2X communication over Uu | | | Ericsson / Ivo | pCR 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200293  ---------------------------------------------------  Rae, Thursday, 10:18  There is no stage-2 requirement for the authorization policy for Uu interface. In EPS the authorization policy for Uu is related to MBMS, but for eV2XARC there is no MBMS so there is no need for special authorization policy for V2X Uu.  Ivo, Tuesday, 13:40  A draft revision is available. Main changes: - "authorized" -> "configured" | |
|  |  | | [C1-200935](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200935.zip) | V2X communication over Uu | | | Ericsson / Ivo | pCR 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200294  ----------------------------------------------  Christian, Friday, 15:08  We support the intend of the p-CR as this allows interworking with EPS which we are also very interested in achieving but we would like to consider the following comments:   1. the “V2X message family” encoding is not fully aligned with V2X in EPS, i.e., TS 24.386. The value 0 and other values not defined by C1-200293 are “spare” while they are “reserved” in TS 24.386. We would like to know the rationale behind this diversion and whether you have analyzed the impact for interworking to EPS. We initially want to keep aligned with TS 24.386; 2. there is some minor issue in the proposal for clause 6.2.7 item b), quote: "b) with one or more UDP for downlink transport;". Can you please replace it by "with one or more UDP ports for downlink transport"; 3. the p-CR adds 5GSM layer requirements into TS 24.587 (i.e., for establishment of PDU session). This is not correct as establishment of the PDU session should be part of TS 24.501, i.e., 6.4.1.2 on “UE-requested PDU session establishment procedure initiation”. Your proposal unfortunately adds 5GSM-layer functionality into the V2X layer which is not acceptable as it in fact breaks the NAS architectural layering principles we have in CT1. We propose to have those parts of C1-200294 moved out and produce a CR to TS 24.501 instead; and 4. in light of SA2 LS in C1-200231 and latest version of TS 23.387, CT1 need to be aligned with SA2 decisions and also keep consistency in our TS 24.587, and therefore we propose to replace the “expiration timer” wording by “validity timer” and remove the editor’s notes regarding this (see C1-200391). Hence, we would like that the revision of C1-200294 also uses “validity timer” wording for the encoding rules of the IE.   With those changes, Huawei and HiSilicon would like to co-sign the p-CR.  Ivo, Friday, 16:25  Feedback on Christian’s comments:  (1) -> Copy&paste error. It will be changed to "reserved".  (2) -> It will be changed as proposed  (3) -> I assume you are referring to subclause 6.2.2 bullet:  2)   the UE shall establish a PDU session with the PDU session type, the SSC mode (if indicated in determined mapping rule), an S-NSSAI (if indicated in determined mapping rule) and a DNN (if indicated in determined mapping rule) indicated in the determined mapping rule, if such PDU session does not exist yet;  If so, would you be OK with replacement of this bullet with an editor's note stating e.g.:  Editor's note: documentation of establishment of a PDU session with the PDU session type, the SSC mode (if indicated in determined mapping rule), an S-NSSAI (if indicated in determined mapping rule) and a DNN (if indicated in determined mapping rule) indicated in the determined mapping rule, if such PDU session does not exist yet, is FFS.  (4) -> It will be changed as proposed.  Ivo, Monday, 11:41  A draft revision is available in the drafts folder. Changes:  - additional cosigners added  - "authorized" -> "configured"  - establishment of a PDU session for V2X communication over Uu is moved to editor's note  - expiration time -> validity time  - "with one or more UDP for downlink transport" -> "with one or more UDP ports for downlink transport"  - unassigned values of V2X message family are reserved  Christian, Tuesday, 21:19  We are fine with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200936](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200936.zip) | UE policies for V2X communication over Uu | | | Ericsson / Ivo | pCR 24.588 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200295  ----------------------------------------  Christian, Friday, 15:23  We are supporters of completing the UE policies for V2X communication over Uu but we have the following comment to improve the p-CR:   1. in light of SA2 LS in C1-200231 and latest version of TS 23.387, CT1 need to be aligned with SA2 decisions and also keep consistency in our TS 24.587, and therefore we propose to replace the “expiration timer” wording by “validity timer” and remove the editor’s notes regarding this (see C1-200391). Hence, we would like that the revision of C1-200295 also uses “validity timer” wording. If not, then we are now adding a new term “expiration”.   With that change, Huawei and HiSilicon would like to co-sign the p-CR.  Ivo, Monday, 12:00  A draft revision is available in the drafts folder. Main changes:  - additional cosigners added  - "expiration" -> "validity", with semantic being FFS, as it is not clear whether the validity time is relative or absolute UTC time  - "authorized PLMN info" -> "PLMN info" and "authorized V2X service info" -> "Authorized V2X service info", as Rea commented that there is no authorization policy in V2X over Uu in 5GS  Ivo, Tuesday, 13:40  An updated revision is available in the drafts folder. Main changes:  - "validity" field renamed to "validity timer" field. Length of the validity timer is FFS, in addition to the semantic of the validity field being FFS. Same reason as below - it is not clear whether to use relative time or absolute UTC time. | |
|  |  | | [C1-201015](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-201015.zip) | Correction for the list of the V2X services authorized for PPPR over V2X PC5 in E-UTRA | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200874  -------------------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-200386  CRs C1-200391, C1-200389, C1-200388, C1-200386 influence coding in CR C1-200292  Ivo, Monday, 12:21  We generally support the pCR. However, the pCR does not contain the entire subclause 5.2.3. Can you please update the pCR so that entire modified subclause is shown? With the change, Ericsson would like to cosign revision of C1-200386.  Chen, Monday, 14:50  A draft revision is available in the drafts folder. Changes:   * Ericsson as cosigner added; * Clause 5.2.3 complemented entirely with a minor change “**a**” to “**an**”;   Ivo, Tuesday, 14:21  The draft revision is nearly ok: clause 5.2.3 complemented entirely with a minor change “a” to “an”" seems to be done in both C1-200386 and C1-200388. It should be in one pCR only.  Chen, Tuesday, 14:41  I kept the change in C1-200386 and removed it from C1-200388.  Ivo, Tuesday, 21:38  Draft revision looks ok. | |
|  |  | | [C1-201016](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-201016.zip) | Correction for the list of V2X service identifier to Tx profiles mapping rules over V2X PC5 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200875  ---------------------------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-200388  CRs C1-200391, C1-200389, C1-200388, C1-200386 influence coding in CR C1-200292  Ivo, Monday, 12:21  We generally support the pCR. However, the pCR does not contain the entire subclause 5.2.3. Can you please update the pCR so that entire modified subclause is shown? With the change, Ericsson would like to cosign revision of C1-200388.  Chen, Monday, 14:50  A draft revision is available in the drafts folder. Changes:   * Ericsson as cosigner added; * Clause 5.2.3 complemented entirely with a minor change “**a**” to “**an**”;   Ivo, Tuesday, 14:21  The draft revision is nearly ok: clause 5.2.3 complemented entirely with a minor change “a” to “an”" seems to be done in both C1-200386 and C1-200388. It should be in one pCR only.  Chen, Tuesday, 14:41  I kept the change in C1-200386 and removed it from C1-200388.  Ivo, Tuesday, 21:38  Draft revision looks ok. | |
|  |  | | [C1-201017](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-201017.zip) | Resolution of the editor's note on details about PC5 unicast link establishment procedure not accepted by the target UE | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200876  ---------------------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-200390  Ivo, Thursday, 15:14  Table 8.4.x.1 is not aligned with Figure 8.4.x.1 on fields in 2nd octet.  Chen, Friday, 7:16  The table and the figure will be aligned and made in the same width in the last revision.  Lena, Friday, 7:56   * This pCR conflicts with C1-200349 which also introduces the PC5 signalling protocol cause value IE * An authentication failure would not be sent in the DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT REJECT message, it would be sent in the DIRECT LINK AUTHENTICATION REJECT message (see C1-200349) * “Link setup failure due to other errors” should be ”Protocol error, unspecified” to be consistent with the terminology in e.g. TS 24.501 * NOTE 1 in 6.1.2.2.5 should be just “NOTE” as there is only one note in this subclause * Rather than just using 4 bits in the octet for the PC5 signalling protocol cause value, it is more easily extensible to use the full octet and to make unused values spare (as done for e.g. the 5GMM cause value IE in TS 24.501)   Chen, Friday, 9:54   * Ok to merge definition of PC5 signalling protocol cause value IE with C1-200349 * Ok to update handing of authentication failure after C1-200349 is agreed * Ok to change “Link setup failure due to other errors” to ”Protocol error, unspecified” * Ok to change NOTE 1 in 6.1.2.2.5 to NOTE * About the encoding of the PC5 signallign protocol cause value, the spare values are already in C1-200390   Lena, Monday, 1:35  About the PC5 signalling protocol cause value, what I am proposing is to reuse the encoding of the 5GMM cause value IE, ie use the full octet, not just 4 bits out of it.  Chen, Monday, 2:22  To Lena: thanks for the clarification, I take it on board, but I will provide the revision including other comments after the IE-related p-CRs are agreed.  Chen, Wednesday, 4:40  A draft revision is available. Changes:   * The value numbering changed to “aaa”, ”bbb”, ”ccc”, ”ddd” * Security related cause value removed * “Link setup failure due to other errors” changed to ”Protocol error, unspecified” * “NOTE 1”  changed to “NOTE” * "PC5 signalling protocol cause value contents" changed to "PC5 signalling cause value” * “The purpose of the PC5 signaling protocol cause value information element is to indicate the ~~error~~ cause value~~s~~ used in the PC5 signalling protocol procedures” * “Table 8.4.x.1: PC5 signaling protocol cause value information element” aligned (use the full octet) * Wording: use ”signalling” and not ”signaling” (both in body text and figures) to align within TS and to other TSs (e.g. 24.501)   Ivo, Wednesday, 14:58  "PC5 Signalling Protocol cause value" -> "PC5 signalling protocol cause value"  Chen, Wednesday, 15:39  An updated draft revision is available. Changes:   * "PC5 Signalling Protocol cause value" -> "PC5 signalling protocol cause value" * Editorial changes in the NOTE   Ivo, Wednesday, 20:35  My comments were addressed.  Lena, Thursday, 0:41  The draft revision looks good for changes on changes.  Chen, Thursday, 0:57  I have removed changes on changes in a further draft revision.  Lena, Thursday, 2:19  Draft revision looks good. | |
|  |  | | [C1-201028](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-201028.zip) | Resolution of the editor's notes on precedence of V2X configuration parameters | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200525  ------------------------------------  Lena, Friday, 8:19  CT1’s question to SA2 was whether the UE could “mix and match“ configuration parameters received from different sources, or should only use parameters from one given source. SA2’s answer in C1-200240 is the latter, with the exception of the parameters received from a V2X application server over V1 which can be combined with parameters received from another source (the reason for this is that a V2X application server cannot send the authorization policy parameters over V1). However the modifications in the pCR do not make this fully clear. I suggest rewording the text in 5.2.2 to:  The V2X configuration parameters can be:  a)  pre-configured in the ME;  b)  configured in the USIM;  c)  provided as a V2XP using the UE policy delivery service as specified in annex D of 3GPP TS 24.501 [3]; or  d)  provided by a V2X application server via V1 reference point; or  e)  a combination of d) and either a), b), c) or d)  The UE shall use the V2X configuration parameters in the following order of decreasing precedence:   1. the V2X configuration parameters provided as a V2XP using the UE policy delivery service as specified in annex D of 3GPP TS 24.501 [3]; 2. the V2X configuration parameters provided by a V2X application server via V1 reference point   c)  the V2X configuration parameters configured in the USIM; and  d)  the V2X configuration parameters pre-configured in the ME.  Christian, Tuesday, 20:29  I have produced a draft revision which should take all of Lena’s comments into account.  Lena, Wednesday, 5:27  The draft revision addresses my comments. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | RACS (CT4 lead) | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects of optimizations on UE radio capability signaling | |
|  |  | | [C1-200340](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200340.zip) | RACS CT work plan | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | discussion Rel-16 | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-200341](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200341.zip) | Proposed way forward on remaining CT1 items for RACS | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | discussion Rel-16 | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-200343](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200343.zip) | Finalizing provisioning of manufacturer-assigned UE radio capability IDs at the UE | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | CR 0045 24.368 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200344](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200344.zip) | Removal of Editor’s note on applicability of RACS to SNPNs | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | CR 1886 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200345](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200345.zip) | Finalizing the encoding of the UE radio capability ID | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | CR 1887 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Delete the same Editor’s note as C1-200723, plus contains more changes | |
|  |  | | [C1-200463](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200463.zip) | Clarification of the cause of start of T3550 | | | vivo | CR 1922 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200720](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200720.zip) | UE behaviour upon receipt of a UE radio capability ID deletion indication | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2002 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200722](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200722.zip) | UE behaviour upon receipt of a UE radio capability ID deletion indication | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 3336 24.301 Rel-16 | Current Status Agered | |
|  |  | | [C1-200723](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200723.zip) | Format of the UE radio capability ID | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2003 24.501 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-200345 and its revisions  CR deletes an Editor’s note which is also deleted by C1-200345  Lena, Thursday, 09:03  Fin with the change but it is already covered in C1-200345, which covers more changes. I suggest merging C1-200723 into C1-200345.  Sung, Monday 14:55  Fine to merge this into 345 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200809](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update1\C1-200809.zip) | RACS not applicable for non-3GPP access | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2005 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200725  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Overlaps with C1-200402. Covers more required changes but missed the change to subclause 4.7.2 which is included in C1-200402.  Lena, Thursday, 09:03  fine with the CR except that changes in subclause 4.7.2 (as done in C1-200402) are missing.  Mikael, THursdy, 11:18  For the proposed changes, what is the justification to add “the procedure is for 3GPP access” for the RACS parameters? I cannot see that this has been done for other parameters applicable to 3GPP access only, so I think these additions are not needed.  Yanchao, Thursday, 12.17  As I mentioned in another email:  I think we should follow the same principle for capturing a specific feature not applicable for non-3GPP access, which is only capture that in general section, same as LADN, MICO, CIoT, UAC, DRX, service area restrictions and etc.  Therefore, all the detailed changes of “the procedure is for 3GPP access” in C1-200725 are not needed. We propose C1-200402 as way forward.  Lena, Friday, 05:25  As mentioned on the other thread about C1-200725, I can accept C1-200402 as the way forward if that is preferred by most companies.  Lena, Monday, 23:40  Fine with Sung’s way forward | |
|  |  | | [C1-200829](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update1\C1-200829.zip) | RACS not apply for non-3GPP access | | | vivo / Yanchao | CR 1902 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200402  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Overlaps with C1-200725 which covers more changes.  Lena, Thursday, 09:02  overlaps with the changes on C1-200725, which covers more changes. preference for progressing C1-200725  Yanchao, Thursday, 12:01  For those features that only apply to 3GPP access, such as: LADN, MICO, CIoT, UAC, DRX, service area restrictions and etc., we only mention that in the general sub clause 4.7.2.1, and no conditions are added for detailed behaviors.If we add the corresponding conditions for every detailed behaviors, the specification  would be too complex and redundant.  I think we should follow the same principle  for RACS not applicable to non-3GPP access, and only capture “RACS does not apply to Non-3GPP access” in the general section.  Therefore, all the detailed changes of “the procedure is for 3GPP access” in C1-200725 are not needed. We propose C1-200402 as way forward.  Lena, Friday, 05:25  If the majority view is to only make the change in 4.7.2, I can live with that and accept C1-200402 as the way forward.  Yanchao, Saturday, 09:32  Hints at revsion  Sung, Are you ok to merge C1-200725 into the revision of C1-200402? Hope to hear your reply. T  Lena, Saturday, 17:53  The draft revision looks good to me except that 4.16 is missing from the clauses affected in the coversheet.  Yanchao, Monday, 07:49  Will fix cover sheet  Sung, Monday, 14:39  Fine with the paper, still wants to keep some parts of 725, this is provided in a revision  Lena, Monday, 23:40  Fine with Sung’s way forward | |
|  |  | | C1-200841 | UE radio capability ID assignment via GUTI reallocation procedure | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | CR 3328 24.301 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200342  Lena, Wed, 00:55  New rev, has the mods from Mikael  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Mikael, Thursday, 11:51  that the deletion indication in GUTI reallocation command seems to be handled in the UE as a parameter to store (5.4.1.3):  “in WB-S1 mode, if the UE supports RACS, store the UE radio capability ID or UE radio capability ID deletion indication, if provided”  Whereas my understanding is that it is an indication that triggers UE action (delete Network-assigned RACS IDs) and there will be o storing of this indication.  Further I think that for the two new IEs, only one of then shall be provided in the message. We normally do not use Conditional IEs (even if that might be an option), but I think it would be good to express in inclusion criteria, or in some other way.  Lena, Friday, 05:42  Agrees with Mikael, rev1 in the drafts folder  Mikael, Saturday, 10:23  Fine with rev from Lena | |
|  |  | | C1-200842 | UE radio capability ID deletion upon Version ID change | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | CR 1888 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200346  Sung, Wed, 0054  looks good  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Sung, Monday, 17:22  Wants to add Nokia, Nokia, Shanghai Bell as co-source  Lena, Tuesday, 06:18  Acks to Sung | |
|  |  | | C1-200843 | UE radio capability ID deletion upon Version ID change | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | CR 3329 24.301 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Revision of C1-200347  Sung, Wed, 0054  looks good  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Sung, Monday, 17:22  Wants to add Nokia, Nokia, Shanghai Bell as co-source  Lena, Tuesday, 06:18  Acks to Sung | |
|  |  | | [C1-200966](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update4\C1-200966.zip) | UE radio capability information storage not needed for RACS | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2006 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Stauts Agreed  Yanchao, Fri, 02:51  Fine  Revision of C1-200726  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lena, Thursday, 09:03  CR coversheet states that there is no need for the AMF to store the UE radio capabilities when the UE supports RACS, but this does not seem correct  Mikael, Thursday, 11:26  In the updated paragraphs the possibility of no stored UE Radio capabilities is covered by “any”/”if any”, and there is no need to add a RACS dependency.  **I think this CR is not needed**.  Yanchao, THursady, 12:17  Same as Lena  Sung, Monday, 17:10  I disagree with comments from Lena, Yanchao, and Mikael. If the RACS feature is enabled for a UE, the AMF does not manage UE radio capability information per UE. What is managed per UE is UE radio capability ID. The mapping is not managed per UE, but it is managed for all the UEs served by the AMF.  Now, even if a specific UE sets the NG-RAN-RCU bit to "NG-RAN radio capability update needed", if the RACS is enabled, the AMF does not delete the UE radio capability information for the UE because there is no UE-specific UE radio capability information and, even though the AMF has the UE radio capability information matching the UE radio capability ID for the UE (the AMF must be possessing it based on the stage 2 requirement), the AMF should not delete the UE radio capability information because it can be used for other UEs.  Mikael, Tuesdday, 09:46  Some clarification might be needed, but sees the changed paragraph as correct  Sung, Wed, 02:18  Answering to Mikael  Sung, Wed, 19:38  Providing a rev  Mikeal, Wed, 21:16  Rev addresses resolves his concerns  Lena, Thu, 02:08  Fine | |
|  |  | | [C1-200968](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update4\C1-200968.zip) | UE radio capability information storage not needed for RACS | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 3337 24.301 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Yanchao indicated FINE in email with subject 726/727  Yanchao indicated on Friday 02:55 fine, Subject line was 726 and 727 that 966 is FINE. It is assumed that 727/968 is fine for Yanchao, it was the same comment  Revision of C1-200727  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lena, Thursday, 09:03  CR coversheet states that there is no need for the MME to store the UE radio capabilities when the UE supports RACS, but this does not seem correct  Mikael, Thursday, 11:26  In the updated paragraphs the possibility of no stored UE Radio capabilities is covered by “any”/”if any”, and there is no need to add a RACS dependency.  **I think this CR is not needed**.  Yanchao, THursady, 12:17  Same as Lena  Sung, Monday, 17:10  I disagree with comments from Lena, Yanchao, and Mikael. If the RACS feature is enabled for a UE, the AMF does not manage UE radio capability information per UE. What is managed per UE is UE radio capability ID. The mapping is not managed per UE, but it is managed for all the UEs served by the AMF.  Now, even if a specific UE sets the NG-RAN-RCU bit to "NG-RAN radio capability update needed", if the RACS is enabled, the AMF does not delete the UE radio capability information for the UE because there is no UE-specific UE radio capability information and, even though the AMF has the UE radio capability information matching the UE radio capability ID for the UE (the AMF must be possessing it based on the stage 2 requirement), the AMF should not delete the UE radio capability information because it can be used for other UEs.  Mikael, Tuesdday, 09:46  Some clarification might be needed, but sees the changed paragraph as correct  Sung, Wed, 02:18  Answering to Mikael  Sung, Wed, 19:38  Providing a rev  Mikeal, Wed, 21:16  Rev addresses resolves his concerns  Lena, Thu, 02:08  Fine | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 5G\_SRVCC (CT4 lead) | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects of single radio voice continuity from 5GS to 3G | |
|  |  | | C1-200811 | Use registration message to inform the network when the SRVCC information changes | | | BlackBerry UK Ltd. | CR 1911 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  John-Luc, Monday, 23.50  the proposed change was covered already by bullet g) in the 5.5.1.3.2”  Revision of C1-200427  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thursday, 15;48  - 5.5.1.2.2 - not needed, the 24.501 baseline text is correct  - 5.5.1.3.2 - not needed, 24.301 uses similar wording as in 24.501 baseline^  John-Luc, Friday, 00:43  CR aligns stage-3 with stage-2, seems that even 24.301 would need a CR  Lena, Satuday, 19:40   * We agree with Ivo that the change in 5.5.1.2.2 is not needed, as the existing text is aligned with the text used for other capabilities (“if the UE supports… “) * For the change in 5.5.1.3.2, we would prefer to add a separate registration trigger for a change in the indication of support for 5G-SRVCC from NG-RAN to UTRAN rather than modifying existing bullet v). Also, do you have a CR to TS 24.301 to add a similar TAU trigger?   Lin, Monday, 08:19  I would be better if you could share related stage 2 spec text for “Stage 2 defines that changing the service configuration on the UE can result in changing even the value of the 5GSRVCC capability bit.” in your reason for change.  I recalled that UE’s (v)SRVCC capability from L to G/U cannot be dynamically changed, so it would be better to know why now the capability from NR to U can be changed, Category should be F  Fei, Monday, 08:46  Agrees with Ivo, I agree that the service configuration can change the 5G-SRVCC bit, however it has been covered by the bullet g)  g) when the UE changes the 5GMM capability or the S1 UE network capability or both;  John-Luc, Monday, 17:53  Will revise the CR according to comments from lena  Ivo, Monday, 18:09  Concur with Fei, **the CR is not needed** | |
|  |  | | C1-200833 | PDU session release at the UE side | | | ZTE, China Unicom, Ericsson | CR 1918 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agred  Revision of C1-200436  Fei , Wed, 03:53  To lin, all comments taken on board  Lin, Thu, 02:44  Fine  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lin, Monday, 08:38  do support to do something in stage 3 to implement stage 2 requirement.  However, wants to see a different approach  Fei, Monday, 11:47  Fine with the proposal from Lin | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | xBDT (CT3 lead) | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects on 5GS Transfer of Policies for Background Data  100% | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | IAB-CT (CT4 lead) | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects of support for integrated access and backhaul (IAB)  CT1 no longer affected by this work item | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 5GS\_OTAF (CT4 lead) | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | 5GS Enhanced support of OTA mechanism for UICC configuration parameter update | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 5G\_URLLC (CT4 lead) | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects of CT Aspects of 5G URLLC | |
|  |  | | [C1-200931](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update2\C1-200931.zip) | Always-On PDU session and URLLC | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 1878 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agred  Revision of C1-200290  Sung, Wed, 18:48  Looks good  Lin, Thu, 02:36  Rev Looks good  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  CRs in **C1-200685**, C1-200290, C1-200564 conflict  Sung, Saturday, 04:31  **Subclause 6.3.2.2**  Currently incorrect change  **Subclause 6.4.1.3**  **Prefers C1-200685**  if you still want to make some changes on subclause 6.3.2.2, please revise your CR. But as long as subclause 6.4.1.3 is concerned, C1-200685 is a better choice in our view.  Lin, Monday, 08:51  I agree with what Sung commented, cases are different between modification and establishment. So better C1-200290 can be merged into C1-200685.  So I would prefer Sung’s CR C1-200685 and I have no comment on Sung’s CR.  Ivo, Monday, 17:41  Long explanation, If we can agree on changes in **Subclause 6.4.1.3**, I will remove **Subclause 6.4.1.3** from scope of C1-200290, merge this part into C1-200685, and focus C1-200290 solely on **Subclause 6.3.2.2.**  Sung, Monday, 21:07  Some comments on Ivo, also indicating a rev of 685 in drats  Ivo, Tuesday, 12:08  Updates the rev, OK? | |
|  |  | | [C1-200962](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update4\C1-200962.zip) | Setting the Always-on PDU session indication IE in the PDU SESSION ESTABLISHMENT ACCEPT message | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 1987 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agred  Revision of C1-200685  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  CRs in C1-200685, C1-200290, C1-200564 conflict  Ivo, Thursday, 15:51  C1-200685 contains similar changes as C1-200290. However, C1-200290 address an additional occurence. Would it be possible to **merge C1-200685 into C1-200290?**  Sung, Monday, 21:07  Some comments on Ivo, also indicating a rev of 685 in drats  Ban, Tuesday, 11:14  Wants to get rid of e.g.  Ivo, Tuesday, 12:08  Example seems right thing  Lin, Thu, 02:36  Rev Looks good | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | SEAL | |  | Lena – Breakout | | |  |  | CT aspects of Service Enabler Architecture Layer for Verticals  Is TS 24.544 sufficiently stable to be sent to CT#87-e for approval?  Is TS 24.545 sufficiently stable to be sent to CT#87-e for information and/or approval?  Is TS 24.546 sufficiently stable to be sent to CT#87-e for approval?  Is TS 24.547 sufficiently stable to be sent to CT#87-e for approval?  Is TS 24.548 sufficiently stable to be sent to CT#87-e for information and/or approval? | |
|  |  | | [C1-200450](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200450.zip) | Annex to describes the functionality expected from the HTTP entities | | | Samsung, Intel / Sapan | pCR 24.547 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200523](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200523.zip) | Latest reference version of draft TS 24.545 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | draft TS 24.545 Rel-16 | **Current status: Noted**  Sapan, Thursday, 13:55  In clause 7.6, the Editor’s note needs to be removed as the MIME type is already defined.  Christian, Tuesday, 20:04  I agree with Sapans’ comment. I will remove the EN as rapporteur of TS 24.545 when producing the next version of the TS. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200524](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200524.zip) | Latest reference version of draft TS 24.548 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | draft TS 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current status: Noted**  Sapan, Thursday, 13:52  Editorial comments:  1) In clause 7.5.2:  <request> is an optional element used to include the unicast resource management requested information.  should be changed to  The <request> element is an optional element used to include the unicast resource management requested information.    2) In clause 7.5.2:  <response> is an optional element used to include the unicast resource management response information.  should be changed to  The <response> element is an optional element used to include the unicast resource management response information.  Christian, Tuesday, 20:05  I agree with Sapan’s editorial comments. I will take those comments into account as rapporteur of TS 24.548 when producing the new version of the TS. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200526](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200526.zip) | Off-network procedures for SEAL location management | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.545 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200527](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200527.zip) | Off-network procedures for SEAL network resource management | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200552](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200552.zip) | Fetching location reporting configuration | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.545 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-200774 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200553](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200553.zip) | Structure and data semantics for fetching location reporting configuration | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.545 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-200775 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200555](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200555.zip) | Structure and data semantics for on-demand location reporting procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.545 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200556](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200556.zip) | Location reporting event-triggered configuration cancel procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.545 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200558](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200558.zip) | Structure and data semantics for location information subscription procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.545 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200560](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200560.zip) | Structure and data semantics for Event-triggered location information notification procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.545 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200607](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200607.zip) | Latest draft version of TS 24.547 ver 1.0.0 | | | Intel / Vivek | pCR 24.547 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200609](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200609.zip) | Updates to Client User Authentication Procedurey | | | Intel / Vivek | pCR 24.547 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed.**  The rapporteur will change the “.” Before the parameters into a “:” as the rapporteur when producing the next version of the TS.  Chen, Monday, 5:12   * “.” before the parameters should be “:”; * I haven’t found these parameters in TS 33.434 v0.1.0 as the p-CR states “*The SIM-C shall include the following parameters as specified in 3GPP TS 33.434*”, could you clarify further?   Chen, Tuesday, 8:57  According to the REFERENCES “OpenID Connect Core 1.0 incorporating errata set 1” and “draft-ietf-oauth-token-exchange”, the parameters added in both the client and the server procedure are not very matched with those specified in the references, e.g., my comments to C1-200613 before  Vivek, Tuesday, 12:42  These parameters are not yet in TS 33.343 but are proposed to be added in TS 33.434 at the SA3 March meeting. There is still another Editor note left at the beginning of each of the procedures in CT1 spec in TS 24.547 as follows:         Editor’s Note: This procedure may be updated once a more updated reference to 3GPP TS 33.434 is available  With the above Editor note in place once the SA3 spec is updated after their e-meeting, we can still take care of any updates to these procedures in CT1 specs based on outcome of SA3 e-meeting, if required in next cycle.  Chen, Thursday, 4:45  I’m OK with the Editor’s note. Then, please check and match the parameters to the REFERENCES (mandatory/optional).  Vivek, Thursday, 14:40  I have taken the below submitted SA3 contribution as the basis for updates to CT1 specification. Any further updates and alignments can be done after SA3 meeting, once an updated version of TS 33.434 is available, and there is already an Editor’s note for that in every procedure. Can we move forward with this arrangement?  Chen, Thursday, 14:49  I agree to go forward in this e-meeting though with some worries.  Minor suggestion:  “.” before the parameters should be “:”  Vivek, Thursday, 15:11  I will change the “.” into a “:” as the rapporteur when producing the next version of the TS. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200611](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200611.zip) | Updates to Server User Authentication Procedure | | | Intel / Vivek | pCR 24.547 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed.**  The rapporteur will change the “.” Before the parameters into a “:” as the rapporteur when producing the next version of the TS.  Chen, Tuesday, 8:57   * I haven’t found these parameters in TS 33.434 v0.1.0 as the p-CRs all state “*shall include the following parameters as specified in 3GPP TS 33.434*”, could you clarify further? * according to the REFERENCES “OpenID Connect Core 1.0 incorporating errata set 1” and “draft-ietf-oauth-token-exchange”, the parameters added in both the client and the server procedure are not very matched with those specified in the references, e.g., my comments to C1-200613 before   Vivek, Tuesday, 12:42  These parameters are not yet in TS 33.343 but are proposed to be added in TS 33.434 at the SA3 March meeting. There is still another Editor note left at the beginning of each of the procedures in CT1 spec in TS 24.547 as follows:         Editor’s Note: This procedure may be updated once a more updated reference to 3GPP TS 33.434 is available  With the above Editor note in place once the SA3 spec is updated after their e-meeting, we can still take care of any updates to these procedures in CT1 specs based on outcome of SA3 e-meeting, if required in next cycle.  Chen, Thursday, 4:45  I’m OK with the Editor’s note. Then, please check and match the parameters to the REFERENCES (mandatory/optional).  Vivek, Thursday, 14:40  I have taken the below submitted SA3 contribution as the basis for updates to CT1 specification. Any further updates and alignments can be done after SA3 meeting, once an updated version of TS 33.434 is available, and there is already an Editor’s note for that in every procedure. Can we move forward with this arrangement?  Chen, Thursday, 14:49  I agree to go forward in this e-meeting though with some worries.  Minor suggestion:  “.” before the parameters should be “:”  Vivek, Thursday, 15:11  I will change the “.” into a “:” as the rapporteur when producing the next version of the TS. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200612](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200612.zip) | Updates to Client Token Exchange Procedure | | | Intel / Vivek | pCR 24.547 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed.**  The rapporteur will change the “.” Before the parameters into a “:” as the rapporteur when producing the next version of the TS.  Chen, Tuesday, 8:57   * I haven’t found these parameters in TS 33.434 v0.1.0 as the p-CRs all state “*shall include the following parameters as specified in 3GPP TS 33.434*”, could you clarify further? * according to the REFERENCES “OpenID Connect Core 1.0 incorporating errata set 1” and “draft-ietf-oauth-token-exchange”, the parameters added in both the client and the server procedure are not very matched with those specified in the references, e.g., my comments to C1-200613 before   Vivek, Tuesday, 12:42  These parameters are not yet in TS 33.343 but are proposed to be added in TS 33.434 at the SA3 March meeting. There is still another Editor note left at the beginning of each of the procedures in CT1 spec in TS 24.547 as follows:         Editor’s Note: This procedure may be updated once a more updated reference to 3GPP TS 33.434 is available  With the above Editor note in place once the SA3 spec is updated after their e-meeting, we can still take care of any updates to these procedures in CT1 specs based on outcome of SA3 e-meeting, if required in next cycle.  Chen, Thursday, 4:45  I’m OK with the Editor’s note. Then, please check and match the parameters to the REFERENCES (mandatory/optional).  Vivek, Thursday, 14:40  I have taken the below submitted SA3 contribution as the basis for updates to CT1 specification. Any further updates and alignments can be done after SA3 meeting, once an updated version of TS 33.434 is available, and there is already an Editor’s note for that in every procedure. Can we move forward with this arrangement?  Chen, Thursday, 14:49  I agree to go forward in this e-meeting though with some worries.  Minor suggestion:  “.” before the parameters should be “:”  Vivek, Thursday, 15:11  I will change the “.” into a “:” as the rapporteur when producing the next version of the TS. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200615](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200615.zip) | Resolution of editor's note under clause 6.2.2.2.1 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed.** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200616](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200616.zip) | Resolution of editor's note under 6.2.2.2.3 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed.** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200634](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200634.zip) | XML schema for SEAL group document and update coding | | | Samsung / Sapan | pCR 24.544 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed.** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200635](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200635.zip) | Updating client side procedures based on XML schema | | | Samsung / Sapan | pCR 24.544 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed.** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200636](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200636.zip) | Location based group creation procedure | | | Samsung / Sapan | pCR 24.544 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed.**  See also: C1-200449 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200637](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200637.zip) | Parameters for group event subscription and notification | | | Samsung / Sapan | pCR 24.544 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed.** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200640](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200640.zip) | Removal of clause for security parameter | | | Samsung / Sapan | pCR 24.544 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed.** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200644](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200644.zip) | Update references | | | Samsung / Sapan | pCR 24.544 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed.** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200645](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200645.zip) | XML schema for VAL user profile document and update of coding | | | Samsung / Sapan | pCR 24.546 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed.** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200646](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200646.zip) | XML schema and coding for VAL UE configuration document | | | Samsung / Sapan | pCR 24.546 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed.** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200649](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200649.zip) | Parameters for configuration event subscription and notification | | | Samsung / Sapan | pCR 24.546 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed.** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200660](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200660.zip) | Latest draft version of TS 24.544 ver 1.0.0 | | | Samsung / Sapan | pCR 24.544 Rel-16 | **Current status: Noted** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200662](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200662.zip) | Latest draft version of TS 24.546 ver 1.0.0 | | | Samsung / Sapan | pCR 24.546 Rel-16 | **Current status: Noted** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200676](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200676.zip) | Workplan for SEAL | | | Samsung / Sapan | Work Plan | **Current status: Noted** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200808](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200808.zip) | Obtain list of users based on location | | | Samsung / Sapan | pCR 24.545 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200449  ------------------------------------------  Chen, Thursday, 14:19   1. In the client procedure, the identity of the querying client should be included; 2. In the server procedure, the SLM-S should first check if the client is authorized to query; 3. In order to query the list of users based on **given** geolocation area, the client shall send **an** HTTP POST request message   Sapan, Monday, 16:19  I have taken all of Chen’s comment onboard. A draft revision is available in the drafts folder.  Chen, Tuesday, 3:51  In order to keep aligned with other procedures of Location mgmt., I changed your p-CR, so please check the updated draft and see whether you are fine with this, thanks.  Sapan, Tuesday, 9:12  I agreed to almost all of Chen’s changes except one change - where he proposed to change "SEAL server" to "SGM-S". I would prefer to use "SEAL server" only as its generic and in future other SEAL server can also user location services.  Chen, Tuesday, 9:24  I am fine with the updated draft revision. Huawei would like to co-sign.  Sapan, Wednesday, 8:06  I have added Huawei and HiSilicon as co-signers and uploaded C1-200808. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200818](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200818.zip) | Off Network Procedures for Identity Management | | | Intel / Vivek | pCR 24.547 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200614  ----------------------------------------  Sapan, Monday, 6:07  Can you please reword as “The off-network procedures are out of scope of the present document in this release of the specification.” ?  This is to align all SEAL specification text regarding off-network procedures (as specified in C1-200526 from Huawei). I will be revising my contributions C1-200643 and C1-200651 – to align text to above wordings.  Vivek, Monday, 5:34  The missing words were added. C1-200614 revised to C1-200818 accordingly and uploaded.  Sapan, Tuesday, 10:20  I am fine with C1-200818. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200822](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200822.zip) | Removal of editor’s note for off-network | | | Samsung / Sapan | pCR 24.544 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200643  ---------------------------------------  Sapan, Monday, 6:07  I will revise this doc to align with the wording in C1-200526 from Huawei ie “The off-network procedures are out of scope of the present document in this release of the specification. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200823](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200823.zip) | Removal of editor’s note for off-network | | | Samsung / Sapan | pCR 24.546 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200651  -----------------------------------------  Sapan, Monday, 6:07  I will revise this doc to align with the wording in C1-200526 from Huawei ie “The off-network procedures are out of scope of the present document in this release of the specification. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200872](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200872.zip) | Procedure to notify configuration management event | | | Samsung / Sapan | pCR 24.546 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200648  -------------------------------------  Related to C1-200649  Chen, Tuesday, 10:21  I have some wording comments, see doc in draft folder.  Sapan, Wednesday, 8:36  I have accepted most of Chens’ comments and made minor corrections. The draft revision is available in the drafts folder.  Chen, Wednesday, 9:02  The draft revision looks ok.  Sapan, Wednesday, 9:51  Samsung and Huawei discussed about subscription and notification procedures which need to be defined in SEAL specifications. The summary of our discussion is as follows:    1)     SEAL specifications need to support both SIP based and HTTP based procedures for subscription and notification mechanism as described by stage 2.  2)     The Rel-16 SEAL specifications are targeted to be used by V2XAPP only. The V2X service as of now do not support SIP based REGISTER. So HTTP based procedures are necessary.  3)     For SIP based procedures – below issues need to be discussed and work upon:  a.      Usage of identity to be used in SIP messages  b.      Description of new event package  c.      Usage of ICSI values  d.      Usage of access-token  C1-200648 will thus be revised to add editor’s note to describe SIP based procedures.  Sapan, Wednesday, 11:37  A draft revision is available  Chen, Wednesday, 15:06  I am fine with the draft revision.  Sapan, Thursday, 11:32  I have updated the draft revision to include a separate clause for SIP based procedures.  Chen, Thursday, 11:40  I am ok with the updated draft revision. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200873](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200873.zip) | Management of configuration event subscription | | | Samsung / Sapan | pCR 24.546 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200647  ----------------------------------------  Related to C1-200649  Chen, Wednesday, 2:49  Before the word “HTTP” there should be an “an”/”the”, not missing or “a”  Sapan, Wednesday, 9:51  Samsung and Huawei discussed about subscription and notification procedures which need to be defined in SEAL specifications. The summary of our discussion is as follows:    1)     SEAL specifications need to support both SIP based and HTTP based procedures for subscription and notification mechanism as described by stage 2.  2)     The Rel-16 SEAL specifications are targeted to be used by V2XAPP only. The V2X service as of now do not support SIP based REGISTER. So HTTP based procedures are necessary.  3)     For SIP based procedures – below issues need to be discussed and work upon:  a.      Usage of identity to be used in SIP messages  b.      Description of new event package  c.      Usage of ICSI values  d.      Usage of access-token  C1-200647 will thus be revised to add editor’s note to describe SIP based procedures  Sapan, Wednesday, 11:15  I have taken into account Chen’s comment in the draft revision.  Chen, Wednesday, 15:06  I am fine with the draft revision.  Sapan, Thursday, 11:32  I have updated the draft revision to include a separate clause for SIP based procedures.  Chen, Thursday, 11:40  I am ok with the updated draft revision. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200878](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200878.zip) | Location information subscription procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.545 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200557  ----------------------------------------------  Sapan, Wednesday, 9:51  Samsung and Huawei discussed about subscription and notification procedures which need to be defined in SEAL specifications. The summary of our discussion is as follows:    1)     SEAL specifications need to support both SIP based and HTTP based procedures for subscription and notification mechanism as described by stage 2.  2)     The Rel-16 SEAL specifications are targeted to be used by V2XAPP only. The V2X service as of now do not support SIP based REGISTER. So HTTP based procedures are necessary.  3)     For SIP based procedures – below issues need to be discussed and work upon:  a.      Usage of identity to be used in SIP messages  b.      Description of new event package  c.      Usage of ICSI values  d.      Usage of access-token  C1-200557 will thus be revised to add HTTP based procedure and notes for SIP based procedure.  Chen, Wednesday, 9:58  A draft revision is available.  Sapan, Thursday, 8:08  Ok with the revision except for editorial comments:  1) Change marks in "Reason for change".  2) You have combined both (SIP and HTTP) procedures in clause 6.2.6.1. My suggestion would be to break this clause into 2 clauses - one for SIP based and another for HTTP based.  Chen, Thursday, 9:32  I took onboard Sapan’s comments in an updated draft revision. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200879](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200879.zip) | Event-triggered location information notification procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.545 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200559  ------------------------------------------  Sapan, Wednesday, 9:51  Samsung and Huawei discussed about subscription and notification procedures which need to be defined in SEAL specifications. The summary of our discussion is as follows:    1)     SEAL specifications need to support both SIP based and HTTP based procedures for subscription and notification mechanism as described by stage 2.  2)     The Rel-16 SEAL specifications are targeted to be used by V2XAPP only. The V2X service as of now do not support SIP based REGISTER. So HTTP based procedures are necessary.  3)     For SIP based procedures – below issues need to be discussed and work upon:  a.      Usage of identity to be used in SIP messages  b.      Description of new event package  c.      Usage of ICSI values  d.      Usage of access-token  C1-200559 will thus be revised to add HTTP based procedure and notes for SIP based procedure.  Chen, Wednesday, 9:58  A draft revision is available.  Chen, Thursday, 9:32  I took onboard Sapan’s comments in an updated draft revision. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200881](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200881.zip) | MBMS bearer announcement over MBMS bearer procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200562  ------------------------------------------  Sapan, Wednesday, 9:51  Samsung and Huawei discussed about subscription and notification procedures which need to be defined in SEAL specifications. The summary of our discussion is as follows:    1)     SEAL specifications need to support both SIP based and HTTP based procedures for subscription and notification mechanism as described by stage 2.  2)     The Rel-16 SEAL specifications are targeted to be used by V2XAPP only. The V2X service as of now do not support SIP based REGISTER. So HTTP based procedures are necessary.  3)     For SIP based procedures – below issues need to be discussed and work upon:  a.      Usage of identity to be used in SIP messages  b.      Description of new event package  c.      Usage of ICSI values  d.      Usage of access-token  C1-200562 will thus be revised to add HTTP based procedure and notes for SIP based procedure.  Chen, Wednesday, 9:58  A draft revision is available.  Chen, Thursday, 9:32  I took onboard Sapan’s comments in an updated draft revision. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200882](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200882.zip) | MBMS bearer quality detection procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200563  ---------------------------------------  Sapan, Wednesday, 9:51  Samsung and Huawei discussed about subscription and notification procedures which need to be defined in SEAL specifications. The summary of our discussion is as follows:    1)     SEAL specifications need to support both SIP based and HTTP based procedures for subscription and notification mechanism as described by stage 2.  2)     The Rel-16 SEAL specifications are targeted to be used by V2XAPP only. The V2X service as of now do not support SIP based REGISTER. So HTTP based procedures are necessary.  3)     For SIP based procedures – below issues need to be discussed and work upon:  a.      Usage of identity to be used in SIP messages  b.      Description of new event package  c.      Usage of ICSI values  d.      Usage of access-token  C1-200563 will thus be revised to add HTTP based procedure and notes for SIP based procedure.  Chen, Wednesday, 9:58  A draft revision is available.  Chen, Thursday, 9:32  I took onboard Sapan’s comments in an updated draft revision. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200884](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200884.zip) | Group member leave procedure | | | Samsung / Sapan | pCR 24.544 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200642  -----------------------------------  Chen, Wednesday, 2:49  Before the word “HTTP” there should be an “an”/”the”, not missing or “a”  Sapan, Wednesday, 11:15  I have taken Chen’s comment into account in the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200885](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200885.zip) | Group announcement and join procedure | | | Samsung / Sapan | pCR 24.544 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200641  -------------------------------------  Chen, Wednesday, 2:49  Before the word “HTTP” there should be an “an”/”the”, not missing or “a”  Sapan, Wednesday, 11:15  I have taken Chen’s comments into account in the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200887](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200887.zip) | Procedures for management of group events subscription | | | Samsung / Sapan | pCR 24.544 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200638  ------------------------------------------  Related to C1-200637  Sapan, Wednesday, 9:51  Samsung and Huawei discussed about subscription and notification procedures which need to be defined in SEAL specifications. The summary of our discussion is as follows:    1)     SEAL specifications need to support both SIP based and HTTP based procedures for subscription and notification mechanism as described by stage 2.  2)     The Rel-16 SEAL specifications are targeted to be used by V2XAPP only. The V2X service as of now do not support SIP based REGISTER. So HTTP based procedures are necessary.  3)     For SIP based procedures – below issues need to be discussed and work upon:  a.      Usage of identity to be used in SIP messages  b.      Description of new event package  c.      Usage of ICSI values  d.      Usage of access-token  C1-200638 will thus be revised to add editor’s note to describe SIP based procedures  Sapan, Wednesday, 11:37  A draft revision is available  Chen, Wednesday, 15:06  I am fine with the draft revision.  Sapan, Thursday, 11:32  I have updated the draft revision to include a separate clause for SIP based procedures.  Chen, Thursday, 11:40  I am ok with the updated draft revision. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200888](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200888.zip) | Procedures to notify group events | | | Samsung / Sapan | pCR 24.544 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200639  ----------------------------------  Related to C1-200637  Sapan, Wednesday, 9:51  Samsung and Huawei discussed about subscription and notification procedures which need to be defined in SEAL specifications. The summary of our discussion is as follows:    1)     SEAL specifications need to support both SIP based and HTTP based procedures for subscription and notification mechanism as described by stage 2.  2)     The Rel-16 SEAL specifications are targeted to be used by V2XAPP only. The V2X service as of now do not support SIP based REGISTER. So HTTP based procedures are necessary.  3)     For SIP based procedures – below issues need to be discussed and work upon:  a.      Usage of identity to be used in SIP messages  b.      Description of new event package  c.      Usage of ICSI values  d.      Usage of access-token  C1-200639 will thus be revised to add editor’s note to describe SIP based procedures  Sapan, Wednesday, 11:37  A draft revision is available  Chen, Wednesday, 15:06  I am fine with the draft revision.  Sapan, Thursday, 11:32  I have updated the draft revision to include a separate clause for SIP based procedures.  Chen, Thursday, 11:40  I am ok with the updated draft revision. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200901](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200901.zip) | Update to Event-triggered location reporting procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.545 Rel-16 | **Current statis: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200774  ---------------------------------  Revision of C1-200608  Sapan, Thursday, 14:45  1)    In clause 6.2.2.1, step a), reference to clause 6.2.2.2 needs to be modified to clause 6.2.2.2*.2*.  2)    In clause 6.2.2.2.1:              b) shall set X-3GPP-Intended-Identity header to the VAL user identity requesting for location reporting configuration.          Should be changed to             b) shall include an Authorization header field with the "Bearer" authentication scheme set to an access token of the "bearer" token type as specified in IETF RFC 6750 [r6750].  3)    In clause 6.2.2.3.1,              B) a <triggering-criteria> child element which indicate a specified location trigger criteria to send the location report; and          should be changed to              B) a <triggering-criteria> child element specifying the triggers for the SLM-C to request a location report as specified in clause 7; and  4)    In clause 6.2.2.3.1, not able to understand below step - can you please reword it?              3) shall include the <trigger-id> attribute where defined for the sub-elements defining the trigger criterion; and  Christian, Friday, 17:42  Feedback on Sapan’s comments:  1) -> It is going to be correcting by a revision.  2) -> We kindly disagree. Please, note that the HTTP message cannot contain a MIME body which provides an <identity> element, and therefore a “X-3GPP-Intended-Identity header” needs to be used instead. Additionally, not that TS 24.546 includes “shall set X-3GPP-Intended-Identity header to the VAL user identity.”  3) -> It is going to be correcting by a revision.  4) -> We kindly disagree. This same wording is already in MCPTT specs, see for instance TS 24.379.  Sapan, Monday, 8:10  Feedback on Christian’s comments:  2) -> The VAL user's identity is already encoded within access-token (of type "Bearer") shared by Identity Management Server (SIL-S). The purpose for SIM-S to provide “Bearer” type access-token is that any SEAL client can share the access-token to SEAL server to request service. The SEAL server will validate the access-token present in Authorization header field with “Bearer” scheme type. Similar authentication mechanism is used in MCX specification too - for example: 3GPP TS 24.484 – clause A.2.1 – In step#1) CMC-1 adds Authorization header and in step#2) CMS authorized the user using access-token present in Authorization header. I have already provided contribution (**C1-200650**) **to correct procedures of TS 24.546** (as you have already pointed out below).  4) -> Ok.  Christian, Tuesday, 20:08  For 2), we believe that we should follow the identity procedure as defined by TS 24.546. By the way, it seems that Sapan’s p-CR in C1-200650 also follows the way we propose.  Christian, Wednesday, 12:56  A draft revision is available taking into account Sapan’s comments agreed during the email exchange.  Sapan, Wednesday, 13:32  I am fine with all changes in the draft revision except usage of X-3GPP-Intended-Identity header. I still believe that as per user authentication and authorization framework defined in SA3 - the client needs to send access-token in Authorization header field with the "Bearer" authentication scheme. The similar discussion is already concluded in another email thread - (Subject: Re: (2) [16.2.20\_C1-200650]).    I would like to go ahead with your proposed revised draft for now. We can have offline discussions and based on that if changes are required to be made then we can take it up in next meeting.  Christian, Wednesday,15:51  We both have raised good points about our different point of views on this controversial issue but we need to agree that it is up to SA3 to make a decision.  I am well aware of your discussion with Chen on your p-CR C1-200650 as Chen and myself do coordinate. To both of us you are questioning the usage of the X-3GPP-Intended-Identity header when it is in fact already in the SEAL TSs and to us still feasible while in your documents you argue that this is wrong and needs to be replaced. We have indicated that we are fine to accept your p-CRs proposal on this issue so we are fine to go as you propose, i.e., all different p-CRs are kept as proposed on the issue.  But please we should have a sort of consistent set of CT1 SEAL TSs as a result of this e-meeting, and therefore we should identify that this controversial issue exists in all proposals. Hence, I would propose to add a similar editor’s note in all TSs, i.e., the revision of Huawei’s C1-200774 but also Samsung’s C1-200633 and C1-200650. The editor’s note should capture in my specification the need to check the usage of the X-3GPP-Intended-Identity header based on security requirements (TS 33.434) and in your p-CRs the need to check the usage of access-token in Authorization header field with the "Bearer" authentication scheme based on also security requirements. Mainly, as the proposal you point out (in S3-200166) is not agreed yet (so not part of TS 33.434).  I believe that capturing the issue by editor’s note in the TSs helps in concluding in it in a consistent way in all SEAL CT1 TSs in future meeting, and ensuring that as soon as security requirements are sorted out, all TSs will be aligned.  Christian, Wednesday, 16:56  I have added the Editor’s note in an updated draft revision.  Sapan, Thursday, 6:05  I agree that its SA3's decision to provide user authentication and authorization framework.  I also agree to Huawei’s proposed way forward of adding Editor's notes in both Huawei and Samsung's contributions. I checked your draft revision and I am fine with the changes now. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200902](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200902.zip) | Update to structure and data semantics for event-triggered location reporting procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.545 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200775  ------------------------------  Revision of C1-200610  Sapan, Thursday, 15:36  The structure in clause 7.3 and the data semantics in clause 7.5 are not matching.  the triggering criteria should be optional only. Can you please change clause 7.3 from “shall” to “may”? Same comment applies to the <triggering-criteria> element of <report> element also (which is already existing text).  Christian, Friday, 17:17  I believe that you misread current TS 24.545, and therefore C1-200775.  Please, note that current TS 24.545 already describes the same structure and semantics which is in fact correct and follows the MCPTT specification way of doing it. Hence, there is no conflict between 7.3 and 7.5 as both clauses are aligned.  For example the <triggering-criteria> element “shall” include a <cell-change>, <tracking-area-change> **or** <plmn-change> element (one of them). Now, when **a** <cell-change> element **is in fact** **included** so the “shall include” means “**if** the element is included then” (i.e., optional element) one more element follows. In other words, the “shall include” above means the element may or not be included, so again it is optional.  Christian, Wednesday, 12:58  A draft revision taking into account Sapan’s comments agreed during the email exchange is available. The revision just correct a number of editorials (unnecessary “or”, extra blank spaces, etc).  Sapan, Wednesday, 13:33  I am fine with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200904](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200904.zip) | General on unicast resource management | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200617  --------------------------------------  Sapan, Monday, 9:50  1) In clause 6.2.2.1 – points a), b) and c) are repeated again after second paragraph.  2) Second paragraph needs to be reworded:  The VAL client can request the VAL server to provide unicast resources (see clause 6.2.2), to modify or to release unicast resources (see clause 6.2.3) or to perform network resource adaptation (see clause 6.2.4).  3) Can you please recheck the clause number referenced? – In above line - Clause 6.2.3 is for multicast resource management, and there is no clause 6.2.4. Did you mean to refer clause 6.2.2.2, 6.2.2.3 and 6.2.2.4 ?  4) Please provide stage#3 references instead of stage#2 reference (23.286). Also, reference number [7] is for RFC 3428 and not for TS 23.286.  5) Please provide stage#3 CT4 reference instead of stage#2 references (23.203 and 23.503). Also, reference numbers [18] and [19] doesn’t exists.  Christian, Tuesday, 20:02  I have produced a draft revision which should take all of Sapan’s comments into account. | |
|  |  | | [C1-201003](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-201003.zip) | Updates to Server Token Exchange Procedure | | | Intel / Vivek | pCR 24.547 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200819  -------------------------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-200613  Chen, Thursday, 4:42   * The issued\_token\_type(REQUIRED) should be added too. * An editor’s note that based on SA3 requirements should be added as there are not these parameters in TS33.434 by now.   Vivek, Thursday, 5:26  The submitted SA3 contributions I used as basis don’t have issued\_token\_type. But the IETF draft does indeed mention issued\_token\_type in clause 2.2.1. So, I can add issued\_token\_type for now and we can align later based on how things develop in SA3.  As for Editor’s Note regarding alignment with SA3, there is already something at beginning of procedure to that effect and you seem to be ok with that, as you indicated in other thread.  Chen, Thursday, 5:31  I’m fine with the issued\_token\_type added as another parameter.  ----------------------------------------------------  Chen, Monday, 10:24  I’m confused on the parameters according to draft-ietf-oauth-token-exchange[8]. draft-ietf-oauth-token-exchange clause 2.2.1 states successful response includes:   * access\_token(REQUIRED) * issued\_token\_type(REQUIRED) * token\_type(REQUIRED) * expires\_in(RECOMMENDED) * scope(OPTIONAL) * refresh\_token(OPTIONAL)   but the p-CR propose 5 mandatory parameters:   * access\_token; * token\_type; * expires\_in; * id\_token; and * refresh\_token.   Vivek, Monday, 5:30  You are correct.  I have removed these two parameters in revision.  Chen, Tuesday, 8:57   * I haven’t found these parameters in TS 33.434 v0.1.0 as the p-CRs all state “*shall include the following parameters as specified in 3GPP TS 33.434*”, could you clarify further? * according to the REFERENCES “OpenID Connect Core 1.0 incorporating errata set 1” and “draft-ietf-oauth-token-exchange”, the parameters added in both the client and the server procedure are not very matched with those specified in the references, e.g., my comments to C1-200613 before   Vivek, Tuesday, 12:42  These parameters are not yet in TS 33.343 but are proposed to be added in TS 33.434 at the SA3 March meeting. There is still another Editor note left at the beginning of each of the procedures in CT1 spec in TS 24.547 as follows:         Editor’s Note: This procedure may be updated once a more updated reference to 3GPP TS 33.434 is available  With the above Editor note in place once the SA3 spec is updated after their e-meeting, we can still take care of any updates to these procedures in CT1 specs based on outcome of SA3 e-meeting, if required in next cycle. | |
|  |  | | [C1-201004](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-201004.zip) | Adding access token in proper header of HTTP request from client | | | Samsung / Sapan | pCR 24.544 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200633 | |
|  |  | | [C1-201005](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-201005.zip) | Corrections in procedures | | | Samsung / Sapan | pCR 24.546 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200650  ---------------------------------------  Chen, Tuesday, 9:42  My suggestion is not to replace the X-3GPP-Intended-Identity with an Authorization header field with the "Bearer" authentication scheme, because   1. In my understanding, The VAL user's identity is NOT encoded within access-token (of type "Bearer") shared by Identity Management Server (SIL-S). 2. The VAL user ID is needed in the HTTP request message and the X-3GPP-Intended-Identity is simple and convenient enough to indicate the VAL user identity. Therefore, from my side, there’s no need to change this.   Sapan, Tuesday, 12:14  We kindly disagree that we need to use X-3GPP-Intended-Identity header to share user's identity.  - The user authentication and authorization framework is generally defined by SA3 (TS 33.434). We need to follow the process defined in SA3.  - I may have used wrong word "encoded" - but as per SA3 group, access token conveys user's identity to server. The client shall send access-token to server so that server can validate access-token and determine user's identity from access-token.  - See also SA3 contribution (S3-200166)  - You may also want to check TS 33.180 - how the usage of access token is defined.  - As per SA3 defined framework - we need to use HTTP Authorization header with access-token of type "Bearer".  Chen, Tuesday, 13:13  My confusion is:   1. Why cannot the X-3GPP-Intended-Identity header be used? 2. User identity is not VAL user identity. What if a VAL user has many VAL service?(i.e. a user identity with multi VAL user identities); 3. Identity management is different from other SEAL management procedures on authentication, because TS23.434 states “The VAL user presents the user identity to the identity management server during a user authentication transaction, to provide the identity management client a means for VAL service authentication.”   Moreover, in your example in TS 24.484, I checked and found that though an Authorization header field with the "Bearer" authentication scheme is included, the VAL user identity is also included in the MIME body.  On the other hand, there’s no clear word on these issues (besides as you said The user authentication and authorization framework is generally defined by SA3 (TS 33.434) in TS 33.434, and S3-200166 has not been agreed by now. We therefore suggest to keep the current situation (i.e. X-3GPP-Intended-Identity header used in all SEAL specifications by now) and postpone this related issues to wait for SA3 to have some agreed text on security details.  Sapan, Tuesday, 13:39  Feedback on Chen’s comments:  1. -> I am not a security expert but as per my understanding we should not send VAL user's identity in plain form in X-3GPP-Intended-Identity header. And so, SIM-S includes VAL user's identity within access-token and make it opaque. When SEAL client sends access-token to SEAL server, the SEAL server can validate the access-token and determine the VAL user's identity  2. -> I agree - User identity is not VAL user identity. The access-token contains VAL user's identity only  3. -> See 2.  The SA3 working group is responsible for security. Based on the situation we are in currently, best way forward is to proceed with proposed changes. If any corrections are needed then we can take it up based on SA3 contribution agreement. I hope we can proceed with the contribution.  Chen, Tuesday, 15:29  Thanks Sapan for the feedback, I am fine with the pCR now. | |
|  |  | | [C1-201018](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200877.zip) | On-demand location reporting procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.545 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200877  -----------------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-200554  Sapan, Monday, 5:48  1) In clause 6.2.3.1 – change “subclause” to “clause”  2) In clause 6.2.3.1 – clause number is changed now. 6.2.2.2 should be change to 6.2.2.2.2.  3) In clause 6.2.3.1 – Need to remove step “ b) shall reset the minimum-report-interval timer if the location report is sent". This is because in step a), procedure of clause 6.2.2.2.2 will be followed which already takes care of resetting and restarting minimum-interval-report timer.  Chen, Monday: 8:11  All of Sapan’s comments are taken onboard in a revision uploaded to the drafts folder.  Sapan, Monday, 16:47  I am fine with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | [C1-201019](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-201019.zip) | On-demand usage of location information procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.545 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-200880  ---------------------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-200561  Sapan, Monday, 5:39  1) In clause 6.2.8.1 – First paragraph should be of normal style.  2) Clause 6.2.3.2 => should be numbered as 6.2.8.2.  3) In clause 6.2.3.2 (or new number 6.2.8.2) – steps starts from c). And auto-numbering is enabled. Kindly remove auto-numbering and provide proper step numbers.  4) Clause 6.2.8.1 – “may share the information” – seems incomplete. Kindly reword it to add details – to whom to share the information?  Chen, Monday, 7:41  All of Sapan’s comments are taken on board.  3) -> all the auto-numbering are replaced.  4) -> “may share the information to a group or to another VAL user or VAL UE” as described in TS23.434 clause 9.3.9.  A draft revision for is uploaded to the drafts folder.  Sapan, Monda, 16:34  I am fine with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Other Rel-16 non-IMS issues | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | Other Rel-16 non-IMS topics  **Only revision of agreed CRs from the ad-hoc meeting and DISC paper supporting LS** | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200024 | Correction for misalignment of 23.041 with 23.007 and 23.527 | | | Ericsson, one2many / Ivo | CR 0204 23.041 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200064 | Correction on T3402 for deactivated value | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 3321 24.301 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200186 | Correcting reference | | | BlackBerry UK Ltd. | CR 0128 24.007 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200136  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1ah-200134  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1ah-200010 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200207 | Correcting active flag and signalling active flag wording | | | BlackBerry UK Ltd. | CR 3314 24.301 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200193  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1ah-200185  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1ah-200128  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1ah-200015 | |
|  |  | | C1ah-200209 | Correct UE behavior when maximum number of active EPS bearer contexts is reached and the upper layers request more DRBs | | | BlackBerry UK Limited | CR 3317 24.301 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1ah-200184  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1ah-200125  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1ah-200052 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200308](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200308.zip) | Removal of Duplicate Service Operation Details | | | Cisco Systems Belgium | CR 0207 23.041 Rel-16 | Postponed  New CR under TEI16, out of scope for this meeting | |
|  |  | | [C1-200606](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200606.zip) | Considerations for AML over SMS in roaming scenarios | | | Apple | discussion Rel-16 | Postponed  New input DISC on TEI16, out of scope of this meeting | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | WIs for IMS | |  | Joergen – Breakout | | |  |  |  | |
|  | MCCI\_CT | |  |  | | |  |  | Mission Critical Communication Interworking with Land Mobile Radio Systems  Is TS 29.582 sufficiently stable to be sent to CT#87-e for approval? | |
|  |  | | [C1-200369](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200369.zip) | Remove editor's note – clause 4.1 | | | FirstNet / Mike | pCR 29.582 Rel-16 | Current status agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200370](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200370.zip) | Remove editor's note – clause 4.2.2 | | | FirstNet / Mike | pCR 29.582 Rel-16 | Current status agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200371](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200371.zip) | Remove editor's note – clause 6.3.2.1 | | | FirstNet / Mike | pCR 29.582 Rel-16 | Current status agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200912](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200912.zip) | Non-3GPP Message for Data interworking | | | Sepura, Hytera Communications Corp. | pCR 29.582 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  **Revision of C1-200366**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen (Friday 14:47):**  A few comments:  The new annex Y is to a large extent a copy of 24.282 annex D. Why not just reference annex D and specify the extensions?  X.1.1 bullet 6): Is this going to MC service users? Or is it going to a user homed in the IWF?  **Kit (Friday 15:14):**  Mike has also raised the first point.    There is no change to the body text to the XML schema from 24.282 .   The only change to the detail of the 24.282 annex D text is in the semantics & extension sections of the usage of AnyExt to carry the Interworking Security Data Message.  I wasn’t sure from the Reno discussion as to whether this was do-able. Happy to simplify by referring to the existing 24.282 schema    A resulting question – do we actually need an IANA registration if we can refer to 24.282, re-use the XML schema and only change the  semantics & extension description    X.1.1 bullet 6) – this is a message generated by the IWF towards MC service users.   [In reality, IWF will be triggered to generate it by some unspecified Key Management activity on the LMR side] | |
|  |  | | [C1-200913](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200913.zip) | SDS media plane message handling by IWF | | | Sepura, Hytera Communications Corp. | pCR 29.582 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  **Revision of C1-200367**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen (Friday 14:50):**  In 9.2.3 it is stated that SDS over media plane is not supported. So what do we need clause 16 for? If we need it, isn't it better to just state "no media plane procedures specified"?  **Kit (Friday 15:03):**  That would be OK.  As François, I think, pointed out in Reno, there will be an eventual need to support it for the reasons given in the introduction, so I believe that leaving clause 16 in as a placeholder is useful.    Clause 16 could just become "no media plane procedures specified in the present document.", with no 16.1 etc. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200946](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200946.zip) | Remove editor's note – clause 6.6.2 | | | FirstNet / Mike | pCR 29.582 Rel-16 | **Current status agreed**  **Revision of C1-200372**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen (Friday 14:59):**  Why not remove "in the present document"? I think it only confuses the reader, as we don't talk about the document but about the IWF.  **Mike (Friday 16:59):**  Good comment. I will remove those words in a revision. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200948](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200948.zip) | Remove editor's note – clause 8.3.2.8 | | | FirstNet / Mike | pCR 29.582 Rel-16 | **Current status agreed**  **Revision of C1-200373**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen (Friday 14:59):**  "Not supported" is not a response code I know about, which response code is intended?  **Mike (Friday 17:04):**  The simplest solution is just deletion of the EN and not include a new NOTE.  Would that be acceptable? | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | MCProtoc16 | |  | Joergen – Breakout | | |  |  | Protocol enhancements for Mission Critical Services for Rel-16 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200357](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200357.zip) | Correcting SIP related terminology | | | Ericsson / Nevenka | CR 0543 24.379 Rel-16 | **Current status agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200358](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200358.zip) | Correcting SIP related terminology | | | Ericsson / Nevenka | CR 0089 24.281 Rel-16 | **Current status agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200359](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200359.zip) | Correcting SIP related terminology | | | Ericsson / Nevenka | CR 0099 24.282 Rel-16 | **Current status agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200805](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200805.zip) | Corrections to TDC2 and TDC3 timer handling | | | Samsung | CR 0116 24.282 Rel-16 | **Current status agreed**  **Revision of C1-200715**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen (Monday 11:29):**  Is this CR related to eMCData2, or should do you need to change to MCProtoc16?  **Kiran (Monday 16:07):**  No issues, we can change to MCProtoc16.  Please note that - I took the new revision (tDoc no: C1-200805) with change in WI code from eMCData2 to MCProtoc16. I will upload the revision by tomorrow. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200838](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200838.zip) | FEC encoding by the BM-SC | | | ENENSYS | CR 0068 24.581 Rel-16 | **Current status agreed**  **Revision of C1-200709**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Sapan (Thursday 15:50):**In TS 24.581 - clause 4.2.3.3.1 already contains the similar text which has been proposed in this contribution: "The participating MCVideo function can apply forward error correction to the media packets before transmitting them over MBMS, or it can ask the BM-SC to apply forward error correction application as described in 3GPP TS 23.280 [12]." Not able to understand why we need to mention similar text again in clause 10.4.1?  **Mike (Thursday 18:25):**  I agree with Sapan. Based on his comment below, perhaps a revision of this CR could simply delete the note.  **Christophe (Monday 17:11)**  Thanks Sapan, Mike for pointing that out.    I will submit the suggested revision (just delete the note) if there is no additional comments. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200952](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200952.zip) | Check for controlling function identity in 10.1.1.3.1.1 | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0547 24.379 Rel-16 | **Current status agreed**  **Revision of C1-200377**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen (Monday 14:10):**  I think the WI should be MCProtoc16 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200954](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200954.zip) | Correct clause reference in 11.1.1.3.1.2 | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0549 24.379 Rel-16 | **Current status agreed**  **Revision of C1-200379**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen (Monday 14:10 and 14:31):**I think the WI should be MCProtoc16  Aside from the previously mentioned WI issue, I think even for this kind of changes F is better than D as Cat.  **Mike (Monday 22:22):**  Agree – cat F used.  WID changed to MCProtoc16 per other correspondence. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200955](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200955.zip) | Correct reference in 8.3.2.6 | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0100 24.282 Rel-16 | **Current status agreed**  Revision of C1-200381 | |
|  |  | | [C1-201006](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-201006.zip) | Update on Plugtest Reported Issues | | | FirstNet / Mike | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  Revision of C1-200382  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | MuD | |  | Joergen – Breakout | | |  |  | Multi-device and multi-identity  Is TS 24.174 sufficiently stable to be sent to CT#87-e for approval?  Is Ts 24.175 management object sufficiently stable to be sent to CT#87-e for approval? | |
|  |  | | [C1-200360](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200360.zip) | Update of OMA references | | | Ericsson / Nevenka | pCR 24.174 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-200361](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200361.zip) | Adding interactions with "Multi-Device" and "Multi-Identity" services | | | Ericsson / Nevenka | CR 0188 24.604 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-200362](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200362.zip) | Adding interactions with "Multi-Device" and "Multi-Identity" services | | | Ericsson / Nevenka | CR 0028 24.605 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-200363](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200363.zip) | Adding interactions with "Multi-Device" and "Multi-Identity" services | | | Ericsson / Nevenka | CR 0075 24.615 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-200364](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200364.zip) | Adding interactions with "Multi-Device" and "Multi-Identity" services | | | Ericsson / Nevenka | CR 0039 24.629 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-200653](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200653.zip) | Clarifications of identity definitions and activation procedures | | | Ericsson /Jörgen | pCR 24.174 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-200654](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200654.zip) | Call log handling, Additional-Identity | | | Ericsson /Jörgen | pCR 24.174 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-200656](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200656.zip) | Conf indication completion | | | Ericsson /Jörgen | pCR 24.174 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-200657](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200657.zip) | Management object correction, MuD | | | Ericsson /Jörgen | pCR 24.175 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-200664](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200664.zip) | MO for MuD and MiD correction | | | Orange / Mariusz | pCR 24.175 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-200665](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200665.zip) | MuD MiD and CAT interactions | | | Orange / Mariusz | pCR 24.174 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-200667](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200667.zip) | MuD MiD and CRS interactions | | | Orange / Mariusz | pCR 24.174 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-200668](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200668.zip) | CAT interactsions with MuD and MiD | | | Orange / Mariusz | CR 0118 24.182 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-200670](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200670.zip) | CRS interactsions with MuD and MiD | | | Orange / Mariusz | CR 0061 24.183 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-200360](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200360.zip) | Update of OMA references | | | Ericsson / Nevenka | pCR 24.174 Rel-16 | **Current status agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200361](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200361.zip) | Adding interactions with "Multi-Device" and "Multi-Identity" services | | | Ericsson / Nevenka | CR 0188 24.604 Rel-16 | **Current status agreed**  Bill acknowledged after discussion with Nevenka Thursday. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200362](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200362.zip) | Adding interactions with "Multi-Device" and "Multi-Identity" services | | | Ericsson / Nevenka | CR 0028 24.605 Rel-16 | **Current status agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200364](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200364.zip) | Adding interactions with "Multi-Device" and "Multi-Identity" services | | | Ericsson / Nevenka | CR 0039 24.629 Rel-16 | **Current status agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200654](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200654.zip) | Call log handling, Additional-Identity | | | Ericsson /Jörgen | pCR 24.174 Rel-16 | **Current status agreed**  **Mariusz (Thursday 12:53):**  So just to confirm that I’m ok with C1-200654.  **Mariusz (Tuesday 16:48):**  In 4.5.3.1 for user A and in 4.5.3.6 for user B respectively, we see this sentences proposed to be added:  If the served user in the "**From/To**" field is an identity not registered by the UE, the UE shall deduce that the call was originated using the Additional-Identity header field.  So a question for clarification, if my understanding of the intention of this pCR is correct:   * There are two devices of users A1 and A1 in multi-device case sharing the registered identity A, * So there is a call log for this identity A, and both A1 and A2 are subscribed to this call log. * If any of them (let’s say A1) is allowed to use identity C for a call (so in Additional-Identity header field), the AS-A will add the entry in the call log of identity A, but in which it will put in the “From” filed the identity C instead of A. * After, the call log for identity A is synchronized among A1 and A2 * Respectively in the user B side…   So by the end, on both A1 and A2, it will be possible to see the call log entry for an outgoing call made with identity C (even if again the identity C is not being registered. Is this understanding correct and following the intention leading to the proposed changes in this pCR? | |
|  |  | | [C1-200656](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200656.zip) | Conf indication completion | | | Ericsson /Jörgen | pCR 24.174 Rel-16 | **Current status agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200810](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200810.zip) | Adding interactions with "Multi-Device" and "Multi-Identity" services | | | Ericsson / Nevenka | CR 0075 24.615 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  **Revision of C1-200363**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Mariusz (Friday 15:59):**  Since a term of user B is needed without defining it here, a reference to 24.174 is needed to be added.  **Nevenka (Monday 11:41):**  I would like to clarify that this CR refers to user B as defined in TS 24.615, clause 3.1:  ***User B:*** *User B is the user who reacts to the communication waiting at subscriber B. User B is the served user for the communication waiting service.*  And not to user B as defined in 24.174.  **Mariusz (Monday 14:17):**  ou’re right, I didn’t noticed that. Then I’m ok with this CR.  **Upendra (Monday 14:31):**  The cover page should select the proposed change affects for UE also as it is terminal based call waiting using UDUB. If there is a revision please do the changes.  **Nevenka (Monday 19:07)** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200947](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200947.zip) | MuD MiD and CAT interactions | | | Orange / Mariusz | pCR 24.174 Rel-16 | **Current status agreed**  **Revision of C1-200665**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen (Friday 15:44):**  This follows the general principle that the services are handled by the AS serving the borrowed identity, but is this reasonable in this case? At least for the originating network, I think that user A owns its user interface. So if user A has a setting that its own CAT overrides the CAT of the terminating side then this will override any CAT. For CDIV it is an operator option to select which to play. So essentially I think that for user B there is no impact.  So for originating side no impact is better to state.  In any case the MiD/MuD does not need to do anything for CAT to work, so I think "no impact" is correct. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200950](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200950.zip) | MuD MiD and CRS interactions | | | Orange / Mariusz | pCR 24.174 Rel-16 | **Current status agreed**  **Revision of C1-200667**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen (Friday 16:08):**  Similar comments as for CAT. I think user B owns it interface and then the easiest is that the same settings as for CDIV apply, see 24.183 4.6.7.1 (which I suspect has an error "also not"-->"also").  So my preference is to state in 24.174 that there is no impact, and in 24.183 have similar text as for CDIV. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200951](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200951.zip) | CAT interactsions with MuD and MiD | | | Orange / Mariusz | CR 0118 24.182 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  Revision of C1-200668 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200953](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200953.zip) | CRS interactsions with MuD and MiD | | | Orange / Mariusz | CR 0061 24.183 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  Revision of C1-200670 | |
|  |  | | C1-200961 | Management object correction, MuD | | | Ericsson /Jörgen | pCR 24.175 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-201011  **Revision of C1-200657**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen (Friday 15:34):**  This pCR clashes with Orange C1-200664. It is also incomplete as clause 5 needs to be included to reflect the changes in the figure.  **Mariusz (Tuesday 15:03):**  Anyway, regarding the C1-200657 itself, I believe that “?”  are not needed in both leafs “SharedIdentity” and “DelegatedIdentity”.  The occurrence “One” should be enough in these cases, because there is “\*” in the nodes “<X> \*”, meaning “ZeroOrMore”. So if any of these is not needed, the node at the <X> level will simply not exist.  And also it seems that there are some corrections in Annex A needed, since In both “<X>\*” nodes   * the Description and DFTitle should be aligned (parameters vs. settings consequently)   Occurrence should be “ZeroOrMore” not “OneOrMore” | |
|  |  | | [C1-201030](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-201030.zip) | MO for MuD and MiD correction | | | Orange / Mariusz | pCR 24.175 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  **Revision of C1-201011**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Revision of C1-200664**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen (Friday 15:37):**  As stated in previous mail, this pCR collides with 0657. My comments on this one:  I don't think "Activated" should be part of an MO. This parameter is something the user is able to change, and there is no way to do that using the MO. So I prefer keeping this object to inform the UE that there are identities it can use.  I am not convinced that Call log URI can be used for the shared identity without a change in the call log for authenticating and authorizing the user. It will require changes to the call log function to enable it to be reached from someone else than the native identity it is serving. My view is that you can only access the call log using your native identity, but you receive information related to the identities use, clarified in C1-100654.  **Mariusz (Tuesday 14:45):**  Regarding the „Activated” leaf, I’m ok to not include it in both the cases of Shared Identity and Delegated User, and to have it up to the configuration.  The draft revision doc is available in draft folder here:  <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_122e/Inbox/Drafts/C-200xxx_C1-200664%20MO%20for%20MuD%20and%20MiD%20correction.doc>  The document describes a case where an identity Virtual A can be registered by several UEs. That is the need for having a URI so these call logs can be synchronized.  **Jörgen (Tuesday 17:34):**  I thought that we at some point concluded that the UE does not keep two different registrations? At least we removed them from the now removed annex. I wanted to keep multi-device and multi-identity trees somewhat separated in case there are different extensions in the future.  I will do updates of my contribution and then we can discuss further. I suspect that it is not easy to use different identities than the native identity to reach the call log. So the outstanding question there is if anything is needed to be able to access a call log from another identity. | |
|  |  | | [C1-201046](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-201046.zip) | Clarifications of identity definitions and activation procedures | | | Ericsson /Jörgen | pCR 24.174 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  Mariusz confirmed Thursday 15:39  **Revision of C1-200959**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Revision of C1-200653**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Mariusz (Friday 16:19):**  It seems a bit not clear to have it like this, that “Identity C can be an external alternative identity, a virtual identity or a non-native identity.”.  Whereas in definition of non-native identity we have “The non-native identity may be an alternative identity, external alternative identity or a virtual identity.”.  One thing is that identities C and D can be as well alternative identity.  The definitions of identities C and D are in fact similar to the definition of non-native identity, and to me identities C and D are the subset of non-native identities of users A and B, with the differentiator that these are not registered by user.  An alternative proposal could be to just say that:  **identity C:** identity C is a non-native identity that can be used by user A and is not registered by user A  and respectively for identity D?  Moreover, 2nd change of pCR to clause 4.5.2 is not indicated in cover page.  A proposal for extending the text as follows:  The user of MiD service decides which of its identities are active and can be used for incoming and outgoing calls by changing the "Activated" attribute in the <Shared-identity> or <Delagated-user> elements in the service configuration data. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | IMSProtoc16 | |  | Joergen – Breakout | | |  |  | IMS Stage-3 IETF Protocol Alignment for Rel-16 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200659](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200659.zip) | Correction of P-Associated-URI handling | | | Ericsson /Jörgen | CR 6412 24.229 Rel-16 | **Current status agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200684](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200684.zip) | UAC for MO-IMS registration related signalling EN resolution | | | NTT DOCOMO INC. | CR 6413 24.229 Rel-16 | Postponed  Out of scope for this meeting. Please use 5GProtoc16. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200963](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200963.zip) | Location information; mid-call access change | | | Ericsson, Deutsche Telekom /Jörgen | CR 6411 24.229 Rel-16 | **Current status questioned**  **Sung,**  **Mariusz is fine**  **Yue is fine**  **Hiroshi is fine**  **Revision of C1-200625**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Yue (Wed 18:31 (too early) confirmed Friday):**  1. Is the latest location information contained in the PANI header field of the MESSAGE request?  2. If there is another AS (acting as B2BUA) triggered before the AS expected to receive the MESSAGE, then the P-CSCF and the concerned AS may see different ICID, in that case how does the AS correlate the MESSAGE and the ongoing session?  **Sung (Thursday 17:31):**  Please let me ask some questions on the paper:   1. Is there a related stage 2 requirement? 2. On the procedure, would the MESSAGE be sent only to one AS or to multiple ASes? 3. Our understanding is that VPLMN change would not be reported via Rx. So, is the use case related to S8HR mentioned in the cover sheet valid? 4. What do you think about including PVNI header field in the MESSAGE request? 5. On the frequency of the MESSAGE transmission, can this flood the network? 6. Would change to WLAN be covered?   **Mariusz (Friday 15:26):**  In addition:   1. What exactly should be understood “determines that the UE has changed location”? It seems not fully clear based on what P-CSCF determines that. 2. Why not to refer exactly to the new clause 5.2.x in the sentence added in clause 4.1; 3. Second dot not needed in 7.9A.X:   Examples of typical use: A network entity indicating support for mid-call updates. A downstream network entity performs the update..  **Hiroshi (Monday 03:54):**   * May I ask clarification on the use case, is it intended to provide different retails charging depending on each access and per RAT type?   + As Mariusz pointed out in his first bullet, determination based on location change as described clause 5.2.x could be misleading. * Just to understand the condition of the support, if retail charging is influenced based on this new indicator, is it the assumption that operators have to upgrade all P-CSCF, or unexpected charging may occur?   **Jörgen response sent Wednesday 19:20** | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | MCSMI\_CT | |  | Joergen – Breakout | | |  |  | Mission Critical system migration and interconnection | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | eMCData2 | |  | Joergen – Breakout | | |  |  | CT aspects of Enhancements to Functional architecture and information flows for Mission Critical Data | |
|  |  | | C1-200766 | File distribution over MBMS - signalling control | | | ENENSYS | CR 0093 24.282 Rel-16 | Postponed  Document was LATE  Revision of C1-198542 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200798](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200798.zip) | Key download procedrue for MCData | | | Samsung / Sapan | CR 0102 24.282 Rel-16 | **Current status agreed**  **Revision of C1-200447**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Mike (Thu 20:15):**  There is a small editorial fix needed for C1-200447 (inherited from TS 24.379 and needing to eventually be fixed there also): 7.3.7       Sending a CSK key download message If confidentiality protection is enabled as specified in subclause 6.5.2.3.1, and if the participating MCData function received a Client Server Key (CSK) within a SIP REGISTER request for service authorisation or SIP PUBLISH request for service authorisation, the participating MCData function may decide to update the CSK. In this case, the participating MCData function shall perform a key download procedure for the CSK. The participating MCData function:  1)  shall generate ~~ana~~ SIP MESSAGE request in accordance with 3GPP TS 24.229 [5] and IETF RFC 3428 [6];  **Val (Sunday 23:42):**  1) Of the 3 references to RFC 4567 in section 7.2.5, two have the reference id [45] and one has the wrong ref id [47].  2) RFC 3428 and RFC 3481 have the same reference id [6]. At least one of them must be wrong/  3) An occurrence of "an SIP", should be "a SIP"  4) There is a somewhat awkward mention of "a third-party SIP REGISTER". It is unclear if it is the SIP REGISTER received for service authorization and mentioned earlier. (what if the SIP PUBLISH is received instead?).  **Jörgen (Monday 10:06):**  In addition to Val's editorials:  4.7: 24.379 uses "end-to-end" with hyphen. No capital letters is needed. At least I use this kind of string for searching, so I hope we can keep them consistent.  7.3.7: "and" missing (don't copy errors from 24.379).  7.2.5: "and" missing between bullets i) and ii), and between bullets 1) and 2).  I agree that the "a third-party SIP REGISTER" sounds strange. Maybe "the third-party SIP REGISTER" is better.  **Sapan (Monday 10:57):**  A new revision has been taken (new tdoc number: ***C1-200798***).    The draft revised document (after taking care of all comments) is also available in below link:  <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_122e/Inbox/Drafts/C1-200798_was_0447_MCData_Key_Download_draft_v1.zip> | |
|  |  | | [C1-200800](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200800.zip) | Move the stored object to destination folder | | | Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd | CR 0113 24.282 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  Revision of C1-200705 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200801](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200801.zip) | Included absolute URI associated with the media storage function of MCData content server | | | Samsung | CR 0066 24.483 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  Revision of C1-200712 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200802](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200802.zip) | Included absolute URI associated with the media storage function of MCData content server | | | Samsung | CR 0135 24.484 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  Revision of C1-200713  **Jörgen (Monday 10:56):**  An editorial: First change, move the "and" from g)iii) to h).  This schema change seems not backwards compatible as the new element will not be understood by old equipment. Further, the schema is not aligned with the coding as the new element does not contain an <entry> element. I think both comments can be resolved by using the anyExt element.  **Kiran (Monday 15:51):**  Agreed and happy to include in the revision. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200803](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200803.zip) | Accessing the absolute URI associated with the media storage function | | | Samsung | CR 0115 24.282 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  Mike confirmed Wednesday 17:48  Revision of C1-200714  **Jörgen (Monday 10:56):**  A question on this CR. If a release-16 UE is in a rel-15 network, will it then be configured with the Content Server URI? If not, doesn't it need to be able to support the discovery process? So a condition would be needed that the discover function is used if it cannot find the MO.  **Kiran (Monday 12:55):**  As per our understanding, In any deployments the server should be able to serve the clients which are less than or equivalent to the server version. Below mentioned deployment scenario is not expected to happen.  **Mike (Monday 14:45):**  The text “MCDataContentServerURI> element, of the MCPTT user profile document” should not have a comma after “element”.  It appears twice.  **Mike (Monday 14:59):**  If a Rel-15 client expects to find the content server as part of the MCData server, then an MCData server that it serving both Rel-15 and Rel-16 clients would need to be configured with the content server as somehow an integral part of the MCData server – otherwise, I don’t see how a Rel-15 client could manage to find the content server. And if the content server is truly external to the MCData server (and it needs to be possible), then there is no guarantee that the MCData server will know where the content server for a particular client is.  Specifically, consider a mutual aid case where the MCData client is coming from another domain and is attached to a group that is in the visited domain. That visited MCData server cannot be expected to know where the user’s content server is. Moreover, there is no guarantee that the visited MCData server will be capable of handling both Rel-15 and Rel-16 clients.  So, whatever mechanism is used, it needs to be backward compatible.  **Kiran (Tuesday 08:45, 09:04):**  Agree on all the comments and I shall incorporate the changes in new revision (tdoc: C1-200803).  The MCData server shall be backward compatible, means it supports both the discovery procedure and pre-configuration.  The Rel-16 onwards client shall use the pre-configuration, as the discovery of the content server will yield the same address always and which is known to the client via pre-configuration upfront.  The Rel-15 and below clients follows the discovery procedure to determine the content server. As the pre-configuration is applicable from Rel-16 onwards.  The content server is always known to the MCData server for the serving users and the content server is local to the users.  Could you please provide more insight on below comment.  “Specifically, consider a mutual aid case where the MCData client is coming from another domain and is attached to a group that is in the visited domain. That visited MCData server cannot be expected to know where the user’s content server is. Moreover, there is no guarantee that the visited MCData server will be capable of handling both Rel-15 and Rel-16 clients.” | |
|  |  | | [C1-200804](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200804.zip) | Upload the objects to the MCData message store | | | Samsung, AT&T | CR 0114 24.282 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  Revision of C1-200711 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200806](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200806.zip) | The pre-establshed session modification for MCData | | | Samsung | CR 0117 24.282 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  **Revision of C1-200716**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen (Monday 11:36):**  The summary of change indicates editor's notes are removed. I don't see any removed ENs. Please either remove the statement or introduce the subclauses containing the ENs in the contribution. Since you need a revision the word "implementation" has a strange spelling on cover page.  The heading levels are incorrect (you use the levels from 24.379). and the first heading is 8.3.4, not 18.3.4.  Kiran (Monday 16:10):  I took the new revision (tDoc no: C1-200806) with review changes incorporated.  **Kiran (Tuesday 08:43):**  Agree on all the comments and I shall incorporate the changes in new revision (tdoc: C1-200806). | |
|  |  | | [C1-200846](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200846.zip) | Retrieval of stored object | | | AT&T, Samsung | CR 0103 24.282 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  Revision of C1-200544  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200448 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200848](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200848.zip) | Add Message Store Client subclause | | | AT&T, Samsung | CR 0107 24.282 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  **Revision of C1-200531**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Val (Monday 7:46):**  For each of 0531, 0539-0544, 0548, 0550, 0705, 0711, 0714:  1) For back tracebility to Stage 2, on the front page, under either Reason for Change or Summary of Change, please indicate the sections in 23.282 (e.g. 7.13.3.1.x or 7.5.2.1.x) which represents the Stage 2 for each of the CRs  2) Search each CR for "clarification;" and if found, replace with "clarifications:" where appropriate (i.e. add a "s" and change the semicolon to colon).  In 0540, search for "is be" and replace with "is to be"  In 0711, there are list items 1), 2) and 4). What happened to 3) ?  In 0714, there are at least 4 occurrences of "MCPTT". Should they be "MCData"?  **Val (Tuesday 01:07):**  **Change title "X.X General" to "X.1 General" and add an Editor's node stating that text will be added in that section.**  **Change title "X.X MCData message store functions and client procedures" to "X.2 MCData message store functions and client procedures"** | |
|  |  | | [C1-200856](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200856.zip) | Delete Stored Object(s) in MCData message store | | | AT&T, Samsung | CR 0106 24.282 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  Revision of C1-200475  **Mike( Thu 19:16):**  I believe that the set of CRs on the Message Store procedures in Agenda Item 16.3.6 need some work before acceptance.  I have privately sent a previous version of this list of concerns to the authors before the start of this e-meeting.  I hope that all of us who are concerned with MCData can assist in either determining that these concerns are not valid, or find ways to improve the CRs in this agenda item to resolve them.   * There are no checks to make sure that the source files/folders are permitted to the MCData client. * There are no checks to make sure that the destination folder is permitted to the MCData client. * The stage 2 indicates that the MCData server can also place content into the Message Store. There will be a need to carry the MCData ID on the PUT request to the Message Store Function – that is not currently evident.   + As a corollary, if the Message Store Function needs to return an error to the MCData server, the MCData server procedures must be able to handle those errors. * Based on the above, there is also a question of the destination of any content inserted into the Message Store by the MCData server – it would seem that a default location(s) should be specified. If the MCData server attempts to use a different location, permission for storing into that location should be checked relative to the MCData ID. * It can be foreseen that the MCData server could be storing content into the Message Store that is both “sent to” and “sent by” the MCData user. This would imply the need to require that content sent by a different MCData user appear in only a specified “inbox” type of folder, with a record of the MCData user that sent it and a timestamp.   + This implies further that the MCData server must be able to indicate the MCData ID of the sender, as well as the MCData ID of the MCData user that will “own” that content once it is stored.   + It would also seem reasonable that an SDS message that the user sends and indicates a copy should be saved would be stored by the MCData server in a “sent” type of folder as a default.   In addition, there are a number of editorial issues that we can sort out, once these more important questions are answered.  I also may not have caught all of the technical issues (or may have some misunderstandings of some of these). Your technical review of these CRs is needed – and once we have reached conclusions on changes to be made, we need to be ready to assist the authors, so that appropriate revisions of these CRs can be agreed by the end of this e-meeting.  **Shahram (Thu 22:41):**  Looking at your list below, I wonder if your listed concerns are mainly around the interactions between MCData Server and MCData Store (MCDATA-8) whereas all the uploaded CRs (e.g. C1-200544) are about interactions between a message store client and the MCData Store (MCDATA-7).  Please see TS 23.282, Subclause 7.13 “Operations on MCData message store” for the operations which the uploaded CRs are trying to cover. For example: C1-200544 is addressing TS 23.282 operations “MCData retrieve a stored object request” & response as specified in Subclauses 7.13.3.1.1 & 7.13.3.1.2 respectively.  Regarding authorization concern – In order to allow the message store client access the end-user’s message store area (e.g. source or destination folders/files), the message store client would need to obtain in advance, the end-user’s consent which would then need to be present as an OAuth access token in the authorization header of the HTTP request (as stated in Note 1 in the CRs).  Regarding MCData ID-  The end-user’s identity (MCData ID) is also included in the OAuth access token and also the end-user’s identity (i.e. called {boxId} in OMA NMS) is part of the HTTP RequestURI in referenced OMA NMS spec. So, every RESTful operation invoked by the message store client onto a user’s message store area (over MCDATA-7), contains the identity of the end-user and the consent of the end-user (owning the given message store area).  I hope the above clarification is of help in crossing out some (hopefully most) of your listed concerns.  Lastly, in future meetings we intend to bring in CRs which will address the MCData Server to the MCData Store (MCDATA-8) interactions.  **Mike (Thu 00:19):**  It is my hope that the MCData-7 (client to message store function) and MCData-8 (MCData server to MSF) interfaces are the same protocol. The same HTTP PUT/GET/POST/DELETE/… will be seen by the MSF. When the HTTP message arrives from the MCData server, the MSF should know that it is communicating with the MCData server and will retrieve some information about who the actual client is, the client whose message store is the target for the PUT.  If you believe that the MCData-7 and MCData-8 interfaces are different, then it means that Short Data Service (SDS) messages cannot be stored in Rel-16 by the MCData server. The client will have to receive them and then send them to the MSF on its own – a waste of network resources as each such message traverses the radio an extra time. It also means that SDS messages that arrive while the user is unregistered to the MCData server will have to be queued in some other location than the MSF.  My comments assume a common protocol that can be used by both the client and the MCData server to communicate – in a client role – with the MSF. If you believe in that model, then my comments and concerns apply. If you believe in some other model, please let me know what it is.  **Shahram (Fri =2:53**MCData-8 & MCData-7 interfaces reuse the same OMA RESTful API. However, the Operations over MCData-8 would be limited to “POST ../objects” for depositing objects into MCData store vs all sorts of objects/folder operations supported over MCData-7.  Operations over MCData-8 i/f would be authorized by OAuth “client-credential” flow which ensures that MCData server is authenticated/identified and has the authority to make message deposits into the MCData message store for **any end-user** (i.e. OAuth access token used by MCData server has a scope value allowing access to the entire MCData message store). On the other hand, the end-user is identified to the MCData message store through the requestURI’s {boxId} parameter which is sent by the MCData server over “POST ../objects” operation towards the MCData message store. See example below where {boxId}= <tel:+19585550100> (i.e. MCData ID) identifying a particular user’s message box for depositing a message.  POST /exampleAPI/nms/v1/MCDataStore/tel%3A%2B19585550100/objects  **Jörgen (Fri 14:42):**  I have a few editorials that can be considered in a future revision:  General comment: At least some statements that the message store client uses HTTP over TLS don't need to be repeated, so I think some information can go into a general section for message store. Maybe some text could be added to 0531 and removed from all other contributions?  Good to mark the Editor's Notes with WI and CR#.  Looks like the sentence after the first EN is incorrectly formatted, should be "Normal" style.  "a HTTP" appears twice.  Curly quotes should be changed to straight quotes.  I think "as describe" should be "as described".  **Shahram:**  Thanks for your comments.  Good idea to put the repeated statements from the CRs into the general section of TDoc 0531 only once. The CR revisions will take care of your comments. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200858](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200858.zip) | Update Object(s) in MCData message store | | | AT&T, Samsung | CR 0105 24.282 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  Revision of [C1-200550](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200550.zip)  Revision of C1-200474 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200860](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200860.zip) | Search for Objects in MCData message store | | | AT&T, Samsung | CR 0104 24.282 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  Revision of [C1-200548](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200548.zip)  Revision of C1-200473 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200863](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200863.zip) | Copy stored object(s) and-or folder(s) | | | AT&T, Samsung | CR 0108 24.282 Rel-16 | Current status question  Francois to confirm  **Revision of C1-200539**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Francois (Fri 10:51):**  I have the following additional comments on this CR, and most apply similarly to all similar CRs:     * The first paragraph and NOTE for both the Client and the Server clauses are generic for all procedures and should be put in a General clause rather than being repeated in the exact same way in each clause (all message store procedures CRs). * Second paragraph is missing some words after “using” (To copy object(s) and/or folder(s) to a destination folder in message store **using**, the message store client…) * NOTE 2 should be in active form rather than passive form. And why is it in a NOTE and not part of the previous paragraph that states what shall be done by the client when the response is received ? Is that part optional ?   Also in NOTE 2, reference to 5.2.3.13 of the OMA spec (which the type definition for TargetSourceRef if I am not mistaken) does not seem to be needed, it may be implied by 5.4.4 clause of the OMA spec but not on its own. Also 5.4.4 just gives the high level view of the procedure, and I don’t see what other processing it implies, that the client, or the server should follow. If it is a better refenrece than 6.18.x, then why not use this one (5.4.4) | |
|  |  | | [C1-200864](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200864.zip) | Creating new folder | | | AT&T, Samsung | CR 0109 24.282 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  Revision of [C1-200540](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200540.zip) | |
|  |  | | [C1-200866](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200866.zip) | Delete folder | | | AT&T, Samsung | CR 0110 24.282 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  Revision of [C1-200541](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200541.zip) | |
|  |  | | [C1-200867](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200867.zip) | Move object(s) and folder(s) | | | AT&T, Samsung | CR 0111 24.282 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  Revision of [C1-200542](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200542.zip) | |
|  |  | | [C1-200869](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200869.zip) | Search for Folders in MCData message store | | | AT&T, Samsung | CR 0112 24.282 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  Revision of [C1-200543](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200543.zip) | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | E2E\_DELAY (CT4) | |  | Joergen – Breakout | | |  |  | CT Aspects of Media Handling for RAN Delay Budget Reporting in MTSI  100% | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | VBCLTE (CT3 lead) | |  | Joergen – Breakout | | |  |  | Volume Based Charging Aspects for VoLTE CT | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | ISAT-MO-WITHDRAW | |  | Joergen – Breakout | | |  |  | Withdrawal of TS 24.323 from Rel-11, Rel-12, Rel-13  No CRs needed, listed for the sake of completeness  100% | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | MONASTERY2 | |  | Joergen – Breakout | | |  |  | Mobile Communication System for Railways Phase 2 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200409](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200409.zip) | Automatic group affiliation and deaffiliation based on location or functional alias | | | Kontron Transportation, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0064 24.483 Rel-16 | **Current status agreed**  **Jörgen (Mon12:04):**  Can you just explain what are the criteria for setting the status parameter to "optional" or "required"?  **Peter B (Mon 16:26):**  Provided list of leaves with details of which are mandatory or not. This list indicates that a revision may be needed.  Revision of C1-198847  **Jörgen (Monday 20:44)**  Child leaves can be required for an optional parent if parent does not make sense without its children, see OMA-TS-DM\_TND-V1\_3-20160524-A  **Peter (Tuesday 11:42) and Jörgen (Tuesday 14:01)** seem to be in agreement. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200410](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200410.zip) | Automatic group affiliation and deaffiliation based on location or functional alias | | | Kontron TransportationS, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0541 24.379 Rel-16 | **Current status agreed**  Revision of C1-198803 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200749](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200749.zip) | Work plan for the CT1 part of MONASTERY2 | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | discussion Rel-16 | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-200750](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200750.zip) | Analysis of options for FA resolution | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | discussion Rel-16 | **Noted**  **Francois (Friday 11:33):**  I have the following comment on the discussion paper about Functional Alias resolution for call routing:    I believe that It can only be resolved on demand. How would a server know it will need information for a given alias ? Even if once it has received the information, it is cached locally, the on demand resolution is needed in first place. And then it  is enough. Caching the information locally would just require processing for storing and updating the information, with possibly any future use of that information (nothing guaranties that the same FA will ever be used again in the future).    Moreover, FA resolution is needed for first to answer call which is not time critical (because there is no risk to loose the beginning of the conversation as it is the case for a chat group call set up for instance), so taking few ms  to resolve the FA is not an issue. If needed implementation can improve the process  beyond the standard (with appropriate IT set up)    So I suggest that a solution that fetches the FA data when needed (SUBSCRIBE with Expires=0)  is the best thing to do. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200752](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200752.zip) | Update service configuration to support limiting the number of authorized clients per MCPTT user | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0136 24.484 Rel-16 | Postponed  Document was LATE | |
|  |  | | [C1-200886](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200886.zip) | Automatic group affiliation and deaffiliation based on location or functional alias | | | Kontron Transportation, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0132 24.484 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  **Revision of** [**C1-200408**](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200408.zip)  **Jörgen (Mon11:46)**  Mix of editorial and other comments:  8.3.2.1: "and" needed to connect e)i) and e)ii) and to connect f) and g) (the "and" you deleted but not reintroduced.  Please remove the space before ">" in new elements. I am happy if you also fix the existing such errors.  The XML schema is not valid (not even well formed), some end tags for complexType and sequence don't match.  Hard spaces missing after subclause and in references.  The Data Semantics change does not match the XML schema. For example, the <ListOfLocationCriteria> name is different from <xs:element name="LocationCriteriaList", and Speed is not part of EnterSpecificArea, but has to be under an anyExt. Please check.  Revision of C1-198846  **Peter (Tuesday 11:33):**  thanks for your comments, I have included all of them, and uploaded a draft draft-C1-20xxxx-was-200408.zip in the draft folder. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200982](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200982.zip) | Support of functional alias in first-to-answer calls | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0551 24.379 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  **Revision of C1-200751**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Francois (Friday 11:53):**   * In 11.1.1.2.1.1 in step 10, how can IDs and FAs be distinguished should be indicated here. It is only described in step 15 so the reader here wonders how ID and FA are distinguished. A NOTE can be added for instance, not to modify the steps ordering. * The word “calling” in <calling functional alias> is ambiguous, as usually it refers to the calling party, not to the called party (even if here it is the action of calling, not the state of being the caller) Better wording would help (e.g. something like <FA addressing> ?) * In 11.1.1.4.1 – Step 3a applies only to First to answer call. And in that case there shall be one INVITE for each MCPTT ID who has activated the called functional alias. The proposed wording is misleading as it looks like an expand/copy of the list of all targeted MCPTT ID in one outgoing INVITE, and not in individual INVITEs. To be consistent with Step 4, the proposed step 3a should rather be a Step 4a, that copies each MCPTT ID associated with the FA to the request-uri of on SIP INVITE (multiple outgoing INVITEs) * In 11.1.1.4.1, the NOTE 2 after Step 3a (-> 4a) ?) should rather be an Editor’s Note. The procedure will not work without that being specified. * In F.1.3. SEMANTIC, the <calling functional alias> is only compatible with First to answer call and default value is “false”.. Add a paragraph to indicate that if omitted, it means that IDs are used (like the statements about broadcast, emergency-ind, etc…) | |
|  |  | | [C1-201022](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-201022.zip) | IP Connectivity | | | Kontron Transportation | CR 0101 24.282 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  **Revision of C1-200412**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Francois (Friday 11:25):**  I have the following comments on the CR introducing IP connectivity procedures :  In 2.1.1 - I think resources shall be allocated (non GBR resources, but with its own priority and parameters so that it does not interfere with SIP signalling  on the default bearer)  = > Port shall not be zero   * Media plane procedures shall be added, which are essentially forwarding after whatever check is needed (size, time,…) so in 20.3.1 / processing the 200 OK step 9, the routing or transmission control are needed => SHALL interact (and 20.3.2 step 8, 20.4.1 step 1 and 20.4.2 step 9) * An editor’s note shall also be added in 24.582 to indicate that media plane procedures for IP connectivity shall be added and are FFS.   I think that without its own bearer parameters and without the hop by hop routing and  control procedures, the feature does not deliver what it is aimed for.  **Jörgen (Monday 12:04):**  In addition a number of comments from me:  4.1: Why IP Data, not just only Data?  a IP->an IP.  hard space after clause  Please do not use capital letters for Participating and Controlling in text.  20.1.1: "wants to" is stranged for a client. decides to?  Please do not use "it" in normative statements, better to state explicitly which entity is required to perform the action..  offer/anser is somewhat unclear. Better to state offer or answer as applicable.  The note is missing "It" in the beginning?  20.1.2: To me this is hard to read. Isn't it better to separate the participating function actions and the controlling function actions? It has to be clear which function performs the action.  20.2.1: First sentence lacks a subject. Possibly "the MCData client" is missing before the shall.  Why is 480 used? The text "transmission failed" is not consistent with the cause "480". Failure-Cause in 24.229 has a media bearer lost indication.  20.2.2: Some formatting issues, a B2 that should be B1<TAB>at end of 1) and a B1 that should be Normal after bullet 10). | |
|  |  | | [C1-201056](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-201056.zip) | Update service authorization procedures to support limiting the number of authorized clients per MCPTT user | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0552 24.379 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  **Revision of C1-200983**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Revision of C1-200753**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen (Mon 13:44):**  I think the text in bullet 2a is strange. You start with checking if the number of simultaneous authorizations is equal to and element, and then "has been reached" is coming which looks strange to me. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | eIMS5G\_SBA | |  | Joergen – Breakout | | |  |  | CT aspects of SBA interactions between IMS and 5GC | |
|  |  | | [C1-200353](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200353.zip) | No impact from SBA on main body | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, Ericsson | CR 6408 24.229 Rel-16 | Postponed  Based on request from author  Yue to confirm  **Yue (Wed 18:23, confirmed Fri 02:22 this is for the meeting**): IMO, the main body of 24.229 needs some update:  EXAMPLE 1:  "If the S-CSCF receives a Diameter result code of DIAMETER\_UNABLE\_TO\_COMPLY as defined in 3GPP TS 29.228 [14], the S-CSCF supports S-CSCF restoration procedures, and the Request-URI of the request does not match an emergency service URN, i.e. a service URN with a top-level service type of "sos" as specified in RFC 5031 [69], then the S-CSCF shall...."  what is the equivalent condition when N70 interface is used?  EXAMPLE 2:  When defining extension to Reason header field, we have  protocol /= "EMM" / "ESM" / "S1AP-RNL" / "S1AP-TL" / "S1AP-NAS" / "S1AP-MISC" /  "S1AP-PROT" / "DIAMETER" / "IKEV2" / "RELEASE\_CAUSE" / "FAILURE\_CAUSE"  If my understanding is correct, the "DIAMETER" is used when certain Diameter cause value is mapped into some SIP cause value, then how about HTTP?  **Peter L (Friday 13:11):**  On comment 1:  this is likely one of those cases where 24.229 went too much into DIAMETER details and now we are stuck. IMHO, the following text  in the annex covers what is needed  “While the main body of the present document only describes usage of Diameter Rx and Cx and Sh reference points, the usage of the equivalent SBA services is a valid option.”  **Yue response (Friday 14:26):**  This text does not provide detailed enough information. There is description on N70 is equivalent to Cx interface, however I still don't know what is the equivalent HTTP error (maybe plus application error) to DIAMETER\_UNABLE\_TO\_COMPLY in this specific case.  **Peter L response to above (Friday 16:32):**  let me check the progress of the N70 and see whether I can address your concern.  On comment2:  this is about the values that are provided to P-CSCF from Rx, defined in  29.274 subclause 8.103. It is actually to indicate errors that happened on the access network protocol. IIRC, then DIAMETER is used in some WLAN case. I would assume that N5 supports the same values as Rx, and assume that there is no impact on P-CSCF, N5 would report DIAMETER for the same use cases as if there is Rx.  I am not aware that we need HTTP.  **Yue response (Friday 14:26):**  Well, I may need education. I am not aware that N5 interface can report DIAMETER casue code, could you please indicate me where it is specified?  **Peter L response to above (Friday 16:32):**  the DIAMETER cause code is used for some trusted wlan /TWAN case. In case this use case is supported by 5GC, then N5 needs to support reporting it, if the use case is not supported, then there is no need for it | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | enh2MCPTT-CT | |  | Joergen – Breakout | | |  |  | Enhancements for Mission Critical Push-to-Talk CT aspects | |
|  |  | | [C1-200375](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200375.zip) | Ambiguity of location information in 6.3.2.1.4 | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0545 24.379 Rel-16 | **Withdrawn**  **Jörgen (Monday 14:10):**  Is the new note needed, I think it is clear from the context.  I think the WI should be MCProtoc16 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200376](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200376.zip) | Calling party location | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0546 24.379 Rel-16 | **Withdrawn**  **Jörgen (Monday 14:10):**  Why is bullet 14) deleted? I didn't see this in the reasons for change. Should there be a condition instead in the bullet? Otherwise the reason for change or summary of changes can say somthing.  In the bullet 15) where new text is added. Isn't the new text a new separate bullet?  I think this document is not this WI. Reason for change indicates it is essential, and then it is out of scope for this meeting, or if not essential it is IMSProtoc16. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200956](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200956.zip) | Check for groups that are already regrouped | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0548 24.379 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  Confirmed Wednesday 10:50 by Francois  Revision of C1-200378  **Francois (Fri 12:12):**   * Step 2 indicates that the NCF shall determine if the constituent group has already been regrouped. Stage 2 has identified that “regrouped” is a dynamic data of the group. Should steps be added in the regrouping procedure at (non-)controling server to store that information ?   If a group has been regrouped, then it does not only affect this procedure, but also the call set up procedures (at CF) to prevent a call set up on a (constituent) group that has been regrouped, as per stage 2 procedures. And if it is a chat group, does it mean that the session shall be torn down ? | |
|  |  | | [C1-200949](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200949.zip) | Affiliation in a regroup | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0544 24.379 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  Francois is fine  **Revision of** [**C1-200374**](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200374.zip)  **Francois (Fri 12:05):**  I have the following comments on the CR on affiliation to a constituent group :     * Clause 16.2.4.3 should be referenced from the controlling procedure that manages affiliation to the group (9.x.x). In that procedure 9.x.x procedure, it should be checked if the group is regrouped from the dynamic data associated to the group (to be added as per comment to C1-200378). * + Step 1 : why a “separate” list ? * Clause 16.3.2.4 Step 3, there should be at least a NOTE to indicate that if the user has already been notified (as per the data stored in step 4), then the notification can be omitted, to avoid a quadratic effect when multiple users are affiliating one by one to a group that has been regrouped (n individual affiliations would imply n(n+1)/2 notifications – could lead to very large number)   De-affiliation should also be considered ?  **Jörgen (Mon 13:49):**  First change, hard space needed after clause, and this is 24.379 so clausesubclause.. Should 4) state group regroup both times? I don't find the procedures referenced in 4). Which 9.2 procedures are referenced. Need to be more specific. I don't think the note is needed, but the procedure that the stored parameters are used need to be specified. As it stands it seems optional to store the paraemters but then optional to use that information.  There are spaces between NOTE and ":" which should be removed.  16.2.4.3: text says "preconfigured regroup", while heading says "preconfigured group". Heading in 16.2.2.4 says "regroup",, while 16.2.4.3 says "group regroup".  Bullet 7): Remove "for this participating MCPTT function as".  Bullet 8): Create how? Which element does it take?  16.3.2.4: Undelete "and" after 3)g). Same comment as above on 9.2 procedures.  **Mike (Monday 18:27):**  @ François:  Since referencing 16.2.4.3 from the controlling procedure would not, as far as I can see, affect the outcome of the procedure, I believe that we can leave the addition of that reference to a later meeting.  Regarding the use of “separate” – I have deleted that word in the revision I am preparing.  Modifications also as commented by Jörgen.  Regarding the PF using stored information to avoid notification to a client that is already aware of the user regroup, I have modified step 3 to:  3)  for each MCPTT ID contained in the <users-for-regroup> element of the application/vnd.3gpp.mcptt-regroup+xml MIME body, if the terminating participating MCPTT function is aware from stored information that the MCPTT client has not previously been notified of the creation of the user regroup:  **Jörgen (Monday 21:55):**  OK with the changes. Minor correction agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200977](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200977.zip) | Missing client procedures for preconfigured regroup | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0550 24.379 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  Revision of C1-200957  Revision of C1-200380  **Francois (Fri 12:25):**  I use this contribution as a reference to express comments related to the regrouping procedures in general, as I think some some pieces of puzzle are missing to deliver a fully actionable specification :   * What if the regrouped group is a chat group ? When is the join done, and which entity triggers the session set up ? * How are users aware of the template group ? Are template groups (identified as such by a parameter in the group document as per stage 2) defined with a list of users, that would trigger the mechanism for distributing the information (group would be listed in the user profiles and client would get the group document of the template at each users’ UE) ? That group document is needed at the Clients to get the key to be used by the regrouped group (this was the reason for changing the procedure) * Or are those groups declared without any member, and then what is the mechanism for making potential users aware of that template group (and of the group key…) ? * As per current procedures, the CF is checking the group document of the target group at call set up. But for the Regroup there is no group document created. Should that step be added in the procedures 16.2.3.1 ? What members are declared for that regroup? New document should be a copy of the template document + some special parameters ? Or shall the test be reworded to say that it does not apply to a regroup (but how does the CF knows that it is a regroup if there is no group document ?) * Even if it is stated that uniqueness of the (temporary) regroup ID is done at the originating client, it could be good to have a test in the servers that there is no conflict (e.g. at the controlling server when creating the group document if so) * Media plane procedures shall be added to reject a PTT request on a constituent group and send back a notification (as per stage 2, where the group call request is a PTT request if the group is a chat group) * Maybe we should add editor’s notes in different places of 24.379 and 24.380  not to let people believe that the feature is fully available. * This is something that could be done as CRs to the Plenary if needed. * Sorry for bringing those considerations late in the process, but better late than never, in order to have good quality specifications. * **Mike (Friday 16:45):**   These are all good questions. We probably need to begin working toward an understanding and CRs for the April CT1 meeting.  If any of your comments affect directly the CRs in this e-meeting, could you please point them out and offer suggested changes?  **Francois (Monday 10:00):**  No there is no direct impact to the CRs proposed for this e-meeting;  Proposed changes are OK for me, I just wanted to express my opinion that more changes are needed and that the specification as it will be after this e-meeting does not work.  If we think this is something that should be shown in the specification, then we will need additional CRS to include editor’s note in several places, what could be done as a contribution for the plenary.  **Jörgen (Monday 10:09):**  If you want editor's notes in the contributions, it is better to add them now rather than providing company contributions to plenary.  **Francois (Monday 10:53):**  Mike will address at least one the below comment in a revision of another CR (the absence of group document for a Regroup).  Thinking twice, a NOTE in this terminating client procedure, and in the originating client procedure, indicating what is the expected client behavior (considering itself as affiliated with the regroup, replace call to the constituent group by call to the regroup, join now if the regroup is a chat group) could simply resolve the question about the regroup being a chat group. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | eIMSVideo | |  | Joergen – Breakout | | |  |  | Video enhancement of IMS CAT/CRS/announcement services | |
|  |  | | [C1-200481](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200481.zip) | Work plan for eIMSVideo | | | Huawei,China Telecom,China Unicom,HiSilicon /Hongxia | discussion Rel-16 | Noted | |
|  |  | | C1-200487 | Work plan for eIMSVideo | | | Huawei,China Telecom,China Unicom,HiSilicon /Hongxia | discussion Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-200488 | Use precondition only for CAT when network disables precondition | | | Huawei,China Telecom,China Unicom,HiSilicon /Hongxia | CR 0116 24.182 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-200489 | Use precondition for CAT when originating UE and network both support precondtion | | | Huawei,China Telecom,China Unicom,HiSilicon /Hongxia | CR 0117 24.182 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-200490 | Use precondition for CRS when network disables precondition | | | Huawei,China Telecom,China Unicom,HiSilicon /Hongxia | CR 0059 24.183 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-200491 | Use precondition for CRS when terminating UE supports or requires precondition | | | Huawei,China Telecom,China Unicom,HiSilicon /Hongxia | CR 0060 24.183 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-200492 | Providing video announcement at the same time with audio conversation | | | Huawei,China Telecom,China Unicom,HiSilicon /Hongxia | CR 0073 24.628 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-200787](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200787.zip) | Use precondition only for CAT when network disables precondition | | | Huawei,China Telecom,China Unicom,HiSilicon /Hongxia | CR 0114 24.182 Rel-16 | Postponed  **Revision of C1-200482**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen (Friday 16:36):**  The header field needs to be defined in 24.229, provided that we go that way. Also the profile tables need to be updated. Somewhere the inclusion of the header field needs to be specified. 24.229 I believe, but it depends on where this is to be performed.  [Hongxia]: Yeah, it’s better to define the header in 24.229. I will do this when we can make sure this header is needed  We have not in 3GPP specified anywhere how the network disables the use of preconditions, but it seems assumed that this is performed by the P-CSCF or S-CSCF, is this correct? This is somewhat problematic as it means that the P/S-CSCF needs not remove precondition option tag in subsequent requests and responses. So then these nodes need to understand part of the service logic. It may be better to modify the Supported header and the SDP in an AS. I think this point requires further discussion.  [Hongxia]:  In GSMA IR.65, it specified: “As stated in GSMA PRD IR.92 [28], the network has the option of disabling SIP preconditions. This means that any network involved in the interconnection or roaming path has that option. In that case, the considered network shall disable SIP preconditions by removing both the precondition option-tag from the SIP Supported header and the related SDP media attributes.”  No doubt  “any network” includes “P-CSCF”, and in practical , we really identified some networks disable the precondition by P-CSCF. And considering the relative position of P-CSCF in IMS, P-CSCF is the most possible entity which can disable precondition.  So I took the P-CSCF for example in the signalling flow part, you know , the call flow is informative. More , because I do not want to make the call flow too complex, so I  put P-CSCF and S-CSCF together on the call flow.  If the P-CSCF allows precondition for CAT,  it may identify the CAT related request or response by only detecting whether the SDP includes “g.3gpp.cat” , its complexity is similar with detecting the “precondition” in the Supported header.  And it’s not possible to use precondition for CAT if we only modify the Supported header and the SDP in an AS.  If the network disabled precondition totally , the AS has no way to use precondition for CAT.  By removing the SDP and replacing that with a header field you break in principle the information chain that the preconditions mechanism relies on, i.e. the AS cannot know the status of the UE.  [Hongxia]: Sorry, I do not understand “removing the SDP” you mentioned, I did not say removing the SDP. I just mean the network removes “precondition”  option-tag from the SDP (as specified in GSMA IR.65),  and insert a new header field. As specified in my new NOTE, the network element insert the new header when it removes the  “precondition”  option-tag from Supported header. It imply that the network insert the new header only when the originating UE supports precondition. The changed INVITE request will be sent from the network element to AS.  So that the AS can know that the originating UE supports precondition and the network allows precondition only for CAT, when the AS detecting there is the new header in the INVITE request.  To me it seems to be a simpler solution to just configure the AS to include the precondition option tag and SDP parameters when it adds the video media line. If the UE understands preconditions it will use it. If the UE does not it will be ignored.  [Hongxia]: As mentioned above, if the network disabled precondition totally , the AS has no way to use precondition for CAT,  because the “precondition” option-tag in any request/response will be removed by network.  A question for the UE vendors: Is the UE able to use preconditions in the UPDATE if the network did not respond with preconditions in the reliable 183? If so I still don't think the header field is needed.  [Hongxia]: Sorry, I want to give the information I have.  We identified some UEs support.  But I think whether the header field is needed, when the network disables precondition, is not decided by the precondition capability of UE. The bottleneck is the network.  **Hongxia/Helen (Friday 20:52):**  **\*\*Comments pasted in the above\*\***  **Hiroshi (Monday 02:21):**  Regarding the new “Precondition-Enable header” that needs to be supported/included by P-CSCF, S-CSCF, (or any other?), I think it is better to avoid specifying only the AS behavior (in TS 24.182) where we are not clear on how the header will be provided, so I would appreciate if both are considered together.  So would the CR to TS 24.229 be part of this meeting’s CR?  **Hongxia/Helen (Monday 04:25):**  I think you prefer that I define the actions of both P-CSCF and AS , so that the things around the new header is  more clear.  I think it’s a good idea. @Jorgen, may I add the sub clause 4.5.5.x for  actions  of P-CSCF or other IMS entities in 24.182?  GSMA IR.65 specifies that the entity which disables SIP preconditions removes both the precondition option-tag from the SIP Supported header and the related SDP media attributes.  GSMA does not specify which entity, so can be P-CSCF or other entity.  Take P-CSCF for example, if P-CSCF is set that it can supports precondition only for CAT, after it receives the initial INVITE request, the actions of P-CSCF and other entity include:   1. P-CSCF will removes “precondition” option-tag from the Supported header as IR.65, and it needs to  insert the new header , then it forwards the INVITE request towards CAT AS. 2. The other entities between the P-CSCF and the AS need not do anything to the new header. 3. The AS send an UPDATE request using precondition towards originating UE , “g.3gpp.cat” is included in the SDP offer. 4. The other entities between the P-CSCF and the AS forwards the UPDATE request towards the P-CSCF. 5. P-CSCF receives the UPDATE request, and it  founds there is “g.3gpp.cat” in the SDP offer, so it will not removes the precondition related parameters in the UPDATE request.   You can see the above highlighted actions need to be supported by P-CSCF or other potential entity if they support preconditions only for CAT but not for general communication.  **Hiroshi (Monday 05:28):**  Yes, if it is going to be P-CSCF that takes care of inserting the new header, then I would prefer that we define it as such in the spec.  I do not prefer to leave the ambiguity of which entity can insert the header, even if multiple entities can potentially delete the support of (general) precondition.  It seems you have P-CSCF as the assumption  **Hongxia/Helen (Monday 04:25):**  I think P-CSCF is the most possible entity, until now,  we Huawei only found P-CSCF disables precondition in some operators’ network.  If we can make sure only P-CSCF can disables precondition or we 3GPP only allow P-CSCF to disable precondition, I would like to replace “the network element” with “P-CSCF”.  It’s good if GSMA IR.65 can specify clearly which entity can disables precondition.  **Yoshihiro (Monday 15:38):**  I think the CSCFs does not remove the option-tag. 3GPP TS 24.229 clause 5.1.5A specifies "Precondition disabling policy". IMS networks use the Precondition\_disabling\_policy MO (specified in 3GPP TS 24.167, 3GPP TS 31.102, 3GPP TS 31.103) to disabling precondition mechanism. So my understanding is that, if the IMS network disables precondition mechanism, the UE turns off the capability.  **Hongxia/Helen (Monday 16:30):**  based on my understanding of 24.229/24.267/IR.92, I think the precondition\_disabling\_policy is only used for the UE to disable precondition. However whether the UE disables precondition is not the scenario we discussed. And I cannot find the network entity may use precondition\_disabling\_policy to disable precondition.  In practical, the scenario "P-CSCF disables precondition by removing precondition option tag" and "UE support and does not disable preconditon" really exist.  IR.65 also talks about network based disabling of preconditions. How do you understand the "network" in IR65?  **Jörgen (Tuesday 13:00):**  GSMA IR.65 focuses on network and interconnect. To avoid ambiguity they specified that both the precondition tag in the supported header and the SDP parameters related to precondition. They cannot specify how this is done or in which node without support from 3GPP. So either we do it as part of the protocol or it goes to SA2 if we think this is architecture.  IR.92 has a statement that how to disable preconditions in the network is out of scope. They have a configuration option to configure the UEs. That is an alternative to have a node remove these parameters. But that relies on UE support and you only configure your own subscribers.  The P-CSCF is service agnostic and hence we have not specified any service specific actions. In particular P-CSCF actions are out of scope for any of the service specifications. So all P-CSCF changes go into 24.229. So P-CSCF subclauses are out of scope of 24.182.  From Ericsson's perspective, the P-CSCF is not the best place to disable preconditions. There are too many service specific actions for the general precondition handling. We prefer having all that logic in an AS. And in your solution I am not happy that the P-CSCF does not remove parameters because of specific services.  For the preconditions handling, I don't see a need to inform the AS what the network supports. The AS is part of the network and the AS can have configuration parameters to know if the network supports preconditions for a particular service. For the node disabling the preconditions there is no real difference. That node will need to allow these precondition messages irrespective if a header was introduced or not. So this means that the AS can based on configuration use preconditions for these video lines. | |
|  |  | | [C1-200788](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200788.zip) | Use precondition for CRS when network disables precondition | | | Huawei,China Telecom,China Unicom,HiSilicon /Hongxia | CR 0057 24.183 Rel-16 | Postponed.  Revision of C1-200484  **Hiroshi (Monday 2:29):**  I have similar comment/question that I expressed for C1-200482 (one for CAT) on this CR as well, i.e. the clarification on the condition of which IMS entity and on the condition of the new header needs to be included.  **Jörgen (Monday 15:53):**  If the UE receives a request without precondition in the Supported header field it is no point for the UE to indicate that this is supported in the response, so I think that point has a UE impact. In responses the server part uses Require to indicate it wants to use preconditions. So I don't think the network will see any Supported: preconditions.  As for the CAT, I don't think we need the header field. The CRS AS can be configured to use preconditions for adding a media line. The network needs to allow that, as for the case with the header field. If the UE does not support preconditions it will ignore this information.  **Hongxia/Helen (Tuesday 09:53):**  For the Supported header you commented,  in 24.229, there is no description that the UE cannot reply a 18x response with “Supported:precondition”  when the INIVTE request does not use precondition.  So I think it’s possible and not disallowed by 24.229 .  Yeah, the AS may add a media line at any time, but if the AS always send an request which cannot be supported by the network or UE, it will be a treat to the stability of the call procedure, and many ineffective request will be exist, so  the solution without the new header is not an safety and efficiency solution. It’s best that the AS use precondition to send the UPDATE request when the AS can make sure the network and the UE both support precondition.  You know the new header has two meanings: one is tell the AS that the network supports precondition, the other is to tell the AS that the UE supports precondition.  **Upendra (Wednesday 15:39):**  As mentioned in my comments for C1-200485- In step-4, if MT UE receives INVITE without preconditions, the MT UE will disbale preconditions. At step-20, UPDATE procedure is modifying the preconditions after 18x message, MT UE behvaior is to reject or per UE implementation.  Theis behavior should be defined in 24.229 similar to section 5.1.4.A2 for session modification request, after 2xx, UE will reject the UPDATE with 420 (Bad Extension) | |
|  |  | | [C1-201045](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-201045.zip) | Use precondition for CAT when originating UE and network both support precondtion | | | Huawei,China Telecom,China Unicom,HiSilicon /Hongxia | CR 0115 24.182 Rel-16 | Current status Question  Jörgen to confirm  Revision of C1-200908  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200483  **Jörgen (Monday 15:27):**  The use case is easy as the AS can do almost whatever. I don't think we need a call flow as the other call flow for adding video is very similar. Basically the UPDATE offer works regardless of what is used on the base call. But for preconditions I think the Require header is needed. Would be good to say something about what the SDP parameters should contain.  I think that the precondition should be mentioned in the context of adding the video media line. The exact text might be dependent on how we handle the non-supported case.  I don't think that you need to mention the SDP content parameter in the context of preconditions. That should already be there in the description of adding the video stream.  **Hongxia/Helen (Tuesday 10:51):**  Ok, I can remove the call flow from this CR.  Did you suggest the AS includes Require:precondition in the UPDATE request? I don’t think Require shall be added, use Supported:precondition is enough.  And you suggested to specify that the SDP parameters should contain…… . what information do you suggest to add ?  You also suggested that the precondition should be mentioned in the context of adding the video media line,  and you say “g.3gpp.cat” needn’t be added because it already there in the description of adding video stream, but I can’t find “the context of adding the video media line” or “the description of adding video stream” you mentioned in current spec. Could you help me find it? Thanks!  I think all existed “g.3gpp.cat” is not duplicate with this CR. | |
|  |  | | [C1-201047](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-201047.zip) | Use precondition for CRS when terminating UE supports or requires precondition | | | Huawei,China Telecom,China Unicom,HiSilicon /Hongxia | CR 0058 24.183 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  Upendra is fine  Revision of C1-200911  Revision of C1-200485  **Jörgen (Monday 16:23):**  Is this CR needed? If the UE uses precondition it works as normal. As before, I don't think a UE responds with preconditions in the Supported header field if the UE does not receive such header field. And then the response would be in the Require header field. Small update to some of the many existing call flows could be possible.  And gateway model does not exist for CRS. There can only be one dialog on the receiving side so the wording "gateway model" should not be in 24.183.  **Hongxia/Helen (Tuesday 10:25):**  Same response with 200484: For the Supported header you commented,  in 24.229, there is no description that the UE cannot reply a 18x response with “Supported:precondition”  when the INIVTE request does not use precondition.  So I think it’s possible and not disallowed by 24.229 .  About the call flow, you know no call flow exists for the CRS using gateway model. So we has nowhere to do small update you mentioned.  Sorry, I don’t understand why you say “gateway model does not exist for CRS, There can only be one dialog on the receiving side so the wording "gateway model" should not be in 24.183.”, there is already “UE Actions for gateway model” and “AS Actions for Gateway model” for CRS in 24.183. I will appreciate if  you say on this comment more clearly. | |
|  |  | | [C1-201048](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-201048.zip) | Providing video announcement at the same time with audio conversation | | | Huawei,China Telecom,China Unicom,HiSilicon /Hongxia | CR 0072 24.628 Rel-16 | Current status question  Jörgen and Yoshihiro to confirm  Revision of C1-200910  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200486  **Jörgen (Monday 16:39):**  This somehow redefines the term announcement, a totally parallel media stream is not really an announcement. I expect announcement to be something short and specific. Maybe we can find a better term?  4.2.3: I guess the intention is to add a media stream during session set-up? "at the same time" is very unclear to me. But the text possibly needs something more to say that this new stream is using a different media type.  4.7.2.9.1: This is subclause is about announcement during an established connection, and that means after 200 (OK), so this function should be somewhere else. And I think this needs to be formulated differently. I think it could be sufficient to state that the AS can add a media stream with a type different than any existing media types following the offer/answer mechansim.  A.2: The call flows should not be added. Second call flow is wrong as re-INVITE cannot be sent before the INVITE transaction is finished. There is a difference in user experience between UPDATE and re-INVITE and that is that if re-INVITE is used the user is usually given a chance to reject the offer. If UPDATE is used there is no such chance.  **Hongxia/Helen (Tuesday 08:33):**Why the announcement cannot be played parallel with the conversation? Why you doubt it’s not really an announcement only by when it is used?   I do not think it's a good idea to give the announcement more business level limitation. How short and specific the  announcement is business level things.  And I did not mean the announcement must be played to all over the conversation. I also did not mean only a long announcement can be played parallel with the conversation.  4.2.3:Not only different media type. You know from audio conversation to video conversation , it’s a case of different media type.  But Here, the audio conversation media is between UEs, but the added video announcement media is from the AS/MRF to the UE.  Anyhow, I will think how to change this part to avoid using “at the same time”  4.7.2.9.1:announcement during an established connection” means announcement is played during announcement during an established connection. It does not say we cannot prepare to play before the connection is established. As my proposal , announcement is also played during an established connection and is not played before the connection is established. “AS can add a media stream with a type different than any existing media types” is not enough. If current CR text is right, I think there is no need to change to another saying. It’s better to check which place is not right or reasonable.  A.2: Thanks for point out the error in the second call flow and the explanation on re-INVITE and UPDATE.  But I cannot understand why do you object any call flow? What’s rule of adding call flows?  If I did not give call flow here, I guess maybe you think the text is not clear. Although the call flow is not necessary, I think the call flow is helpful for understanding the normative text accurately.  At least, I think the first call flow is needed. | |
|  |  | | [C1-201057](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-201057.zip) | Condition of providing video announcement | | | China Telecom,Huawei, China Unicom, HiSilicon | CR 0074 24.628 Rel-16 | Current status question  Jörgen, Yoshihiro and to confirm  Upendra is fine  Revision of C1-200995  Revision of C1-200546  **Jörgen (Monday 16:39):**  I don't think we should state negative requirements like this. So better to say something that "the AS shall only provide video announcement (or some better term) if...  As the first sentence in 4.7.2.9 state that procedures apply to both originating and terminating UE only one paragraph is needed. Then I think you can use the term "served UE". I assume the conditions are that SDP is not in the negotiated SDP and there is a video media feature tag present.  Unrelated to the subject of your CR, it would be good if you add a heading 4.7.2.9.0 General. You don't need to, but the current text is a hanging paragraph.  **Michelle Li (Tuesday 16:52)**  Only one paragraph is complex. Positive requirement will be used. Heading for General will be added.  **Upendra (Wednesday 13:13):**  The changes submit in this CR – C1-200546 contradicts with C1-200486, section A.2.x where video announcements are added for only audio in SDP on both originating and terminating UEs.  AS only needs to check video feature-tag from MO/MT UEs, no need to check video content in SDP offer/answer.  **Michelle Li (Wednesday 15:06):**  Some old UE maybe have no video feature-tag but still have video capability,  which we should take them into account. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Other Rel-16 IMS & MC issues | |  | Joergen – Breakout | | |  |  | Other Rel-16 IMS topics | |
|  |  | | [C1-200365](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200365.zip) | SDP profile update to support FLUS | | | Ericsson / Nevenka | CR 6409 24.229 Rel-16 | Current status agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-200772](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200772.zip) | Correction in IMS\_Registration\_handling policy about how UE should deregister | | | MediaTek Inc. | CR 6404  24.229 Rel-16 | Postponed  Document was late | |
|  |  | | [C1-200779](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200779.zip) | Correct reference | | | BlackBerry UK Ltd. | CR 6410 24.229 Rel-16 | Current status agreed  Revision of C1-200425  Work item has changed to TEI16  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thursday, 17:10  the CR fixes errors created in Rel-15. The CR does not seem be related to 5WWC. The CR should have been submitted for 5GS\_Ph1-CT or 5GProtoc16, which are out of scope of the e-meeting, or for IMS TEI16.  John-Luc, Friday, 16:08  Agrees that this is not 5WWC, would go for IMS TEI16 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200940](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200940.zip) | Discussion on SRVCC from E-UTRAN to GERAN/UTRAN when IMS voice call is initiated in 5GS | | | Ericsson / Ivo | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  Revision of C1-200940  See comments on 674 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200941](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2002Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-200941.zip) | SRVCC from E-UTRAN to GERAN/UTRAN when IMS voice call is initiated in 5GS | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 1298 24.237 Rel-16 | Current status question  John-Luc, Christian, Robert to confirm  Revision of C1-200674  **Christian (Monday 16:04):**  There are discussions ongoing during the SA2 e-meeting on this topic of how to handle SRVCC from 5GS to EPS, and we would like to propose to postpone the CT1 discussion till the architectural discussion is settled in SA2. However, we are fine to discuss during this e-meeting the details of the CT1 proposal as proposed by Ericsson to collect comments.  **Ivo (Monday 16:24):**  I am unaware of any discussions ongoing during the SA2 e-meeting on this topic of how to handle SRVCC from 5GS to EPS.  can you please point me to any SA2 TDocs? Thank you.  **Christian (Monday 16:33):**  Please, check at least S2-2001973, S2-2001974 from us. The SA2 CRs from us do not focus on the IMS part but the general signalling part but anyhow there is need to analyze the impacts of each other if agreed, and anyhow it is recommended from my side that we wait for stage 2 (SA2) first so we, CT1, are on the safe side.  **Ivo (Monday 17:12):**  S2-2001973 and S2-2001974 seem to describe how the MME communicates with eNode during inter-system change from N1 mode to S1 mode.  C1-200673 and C1-200674 describe how the ATCF is informed by SCC AS about possible PS to CS SRVCC, when the UE is in 5GS.  Can you please clarify linkage of those discussions?  **Christian (Monday 17:33):**  You have the answer to your questions in my emails  **Robert (Monday 14:43):**  1) We are not in favour of leaving it up to “network implementation” to find out whether a UE is supporting SRVCC or not.  In our view, both networks and UEs would benefit from clear criteria. - Just imagine that we find out that for our UEs in certain networks SRVCC does not work in the scenario under discussion, but in other networks it is working perfectly well.  Should we then argue with the network vendor that he has chosen the wrong network-specific implementation?  So we would prefer to have a list of clear criteria.  (I also don’t think that the scenario under discussion should be considered a ‘rare corner case’. This may be the case for some networks; but in others it could be a quite common case:  if an EPS network is using SRVCC today, it will probably continue doing so after NR has been deployed. If then the network or the UE does not support VoNR, there will be many cases of EPS fallback - where the UE initiates the signalling for the IMS call via NR before it is handed over to EPS. And for any such call, if there is a subsequent SRVCC handover to 2G/3G, we will run into the issue.)  2) I have a question regarding the proposed NOTE 2 in subclause 6.3.2:  >  NOTE 2:  A UE supporting the PS to CS SRVCC is an SC UE. Presence of the g.3gpp.accesstype media feature tag in a Contact header field of the SIP REGISTER request that created the binding indicates that the UE is an SC UE.  Apparently, here the intention is to give such a criterion in the form of note, but are you sure that the 2nd sentence is correct?  In my view it should rather read:  > A UE that is an SC UE includes the g.3gpp.accesstype media feature tag in a Contact header field of the SIP REGISTER request. which is basically a repetition of the requirement in 6.2.2, General:  > The SC UE shall include the g.3gpp.accesstype media feature tag as described in clause B.3 of 3GPP TS 24.292 [4] in the Contact header field of the SIP REGISTER request.  The g.3gpp.accesstype media feature tag is defined in TS 24.292, annex B.3, and according to 24.292, subclause 6.2, it primarily indicates that “ICS is enabled for the UE”.  (Especially, if in a SIP REGISTER request it is combined with a g.3gpp.ics media feature tag set to “principal” as shown in the signalling flows in 24.237, annex A.3.)  3) It is our understanding that you want to collect comments, but that a final decision between the proposal in C1-200674 and the proposal in C1ah-200012 (or some third proposal) will be taken at a meeting where both proposals can be tabled and discussed at the same meeting.  **John-Luc (Monday 21:23):**  BlackBerry requests that C1-200674 is postponed. As pointed out, a competing (and complete) solution exists which could not be submitted to this meeting.  A detailed comment:  It is unclear what the purpose is of the new NOTE 2. According to 5.2 in 24.237, an SC UE can, dependent on the desired functionality, implement only one of the following 24.237 procedures: procedures in subclauses 6A.2, subclause 7.2, subclause 8.2, subclause 9.2, subclause 10.2, subclause 11.2, subclause 12.2, subclause 13.2 or subclause 20.1.  This means:   * An SC UE could be a UE that supports receiving some operator policy via OMA Device Management (3GPP TS 24.216) only, i.e. no SRVCC. * An SC UE could be a UE that supports PS-PS access transfer only. * An SC UE could even be using ICS.   Neither has to support SRVCC!  Thus, instead of “the SCC AS determines using *implementation specific* means that the PS to CS SRVCC is possible” the SCC AS has no way of determining whether PS to CS SRVCC is possible for any UE.  As a consequence the operator has to either assume all UEs support PS to CS SRVCC or none of them do. I.e. the operator supporting SRVCC needs to increase capacity in order to anchor all sessions in the SCC AS/ATCF/ATGW.  For any operator that depends on the UE PS to CS SRVCC capability, this is an incompatible change.  While the HSS will provide a correct “UE PS to CS SRVCC capability” value for UEs that have attached via EPS, when the same UE initially registers via 5GS, the “UE PS to CS SRVCC capability” value provided by the HSS will be incorrect.  When the same UE subsequently transfers from 5GS to EPS, the SCC AS isn’t triggered to check with the HSS whether the “UE PS to CS SRVCC capability” value has changed at the HSS (due to the UE having performed TAU with the EPS).  Hence, SRVCC will continue to fail for these operators and UEs.  The proposal essentially makes things “implementation-specific” and adds an obscure NOTE. And it doesn’t work.  **Ivo (Monday 21:46):**  A UE supporting SRVCC needs to both register and establish an IMS voice call. I.e. the UE needs to perform 24.237 6.2 and 7.2 and 8.2, in addition to 12.2. 24.237 6.2 states:  -----------------  The SC UE shall include the g.3gpp.accesstype media feature tag as described in clause B.3 of 3GPP TS 24.292 [4] in the Contact header field of the SIP REGISTER request.  -----------------  This is also reconfirmed in GSMA IR.92 which states:  -----------------  If the UE is a Session Continuity UE (SC-UE) (e.g. due to support of SR-VCC as described in Annex A.3), then the UE must include the g.3gpp.accesstype media feature tag as specified in section 6.2.2 of Release 11 of 3GPP TS 24.237 [16].  -----------------  I.e. SRVCC UE includes the g.3gpp.accesstype media feature tag in REGISTER request.  In C1-200674, when the g.3gpp.accesstype media feature tag is included in REGISTER request, SCC AS can provides SRVCC information to ATCF.  **In this solution, ATGW will get SRVCC information for every SRVCC UE and this ensures that SRVCC handover will be performed correctly. This solution works with Rel-15 5GS network (both in VPLMN and HPLMN), with Rel-15 UEs, and with Rel-15 ATGW.**  There might be other possible solution ensuring the above and that's why the CR states "implementation specific means that the PS to CS SRVCC is possible", with the above given as one possible solution.  Regarding whether other UEs can provide the g.3gpp.accesstype media feature tag in REGISTER request too. In theory, this is possible and the DISC paper stated so. In reality, we are not aware of deployments of such UEs. If such UE is anyway deployed, the services will continue being used as normally, the only effect is anchoring of the call in ATGW. Anchoring of unnecessary call in ATGW is a small cost in comparison to your solution which precludes SRVCC handover from E-UTRA to GERAN/UTRAN of a IMS voice call which was originally established by Rel-15 UE in Rel-15 5GS network and then moved to EPS using inter-system change from N1 mode to S1.  **Robert (Tuesday 10:22):**  1)  >  In C1-200674, when the g.3gpp.accesstype media feature tag is included in REGISTER request, SCC AS can provides SRVCC information to ATCF.  If that is the intention, can we please have this stated in a more normative way, as a requirement?  2)  > Regarding whether other UEs can provide the g.3gpp.accesstype media feature tag in REGISTER request too. In theory, this is possible and the DISC paper stated so. In reality, we are not aware of deployments of such UEs.  The DISC paper contains the same - wrong - claim that 'every UE sending a g.3gpp.accesstype media feature tag is an SC UE':  <snip>  The implementation specific means can consist of e.g. the SCC AS using UE's SRVCC capability received previously and stored in the SCC AS or the SCC AS analyzing IMS signalling sent by the UE. In the latter, the SCC AS can decide that SRVCC is possible e.g. if the g.3gpp.accesstype media feature tag is included in the Contact header field of the REGISTER request, as g.3gpp.accesstype media feature tag indicates that the UE is an SC UE and a UE supporting PS to CS SRVCC is an SC UE.  NOTE:    All SC UEs are a super set of all UEs supporting PS to CS SRVCC. I.e. a UE supporting PS to CS SRVCC is an SC UE but not all SC UEs support PS to CS SRVCC. E.g. an SC UE that does not support PS to CS SRVCC and supports PS to CS DRVCC or inter-UE-transfer can exist. If the SCC AS provides the SRVCC information to the ATCF for such a UE, IMS voice calls of such UE would be anchored in an ATGW unnecessarily.  <snap>  So can we please have the Note in the CR corrected? - Even if - for the time being - there is no implementation of an ISC UE which is not also an SC UE, in my view your statement is confusing the reader. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 17  work items | | Tdoc | **NOT PART OF THIS MEETING** | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Output Liaison Statements | | Tdoc | Title | | | Prepared by | To/CC | Result & comment | |
|  |  | | [C1-200309](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200309.zip) | Reply LS on General Status of Work | | | Ericsson / Ivo | LS out Rel-16 | Current Status Approved | |
|  |  | | [C1-200434](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200434.zip) | LS on secure that a UE does not wait indefinitely for completion of NSSAA procedure | | | ZTE | LS out Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Lin, Thu, 05:12  If we will go to the direction as indicated in the revision of C1-200429 <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_122e/Inbox/Drafts/C1-2008xx_was0429_EN1.docx>, Then it seems the outgoing LS C1-200434 to SA2 is not needed, or?  Lin, Thu, 08:20  Confirms he does NOT want to send the LS | |
|  |  | | [C1-200545](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200545.zip) | Reply LS on PC5S and PC5 RRC unicast message protection | | | OPPO / Rae | LS out Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Peter, Wed, 17:15  Explains that expectation from confcall is that this LS is withdrawn, | |
|  |  | | [C1-200710](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200710.zip) | Reply LS on RRC establishment cause value in EPS voice fallback from NR to E-UTRAN | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | LS out Rel-16 | Postponed  Osamah, Friday, 02:07  Had TEI16 CR3316 in previous e-meeting to address action related to incoming LS in LS R2-1916530/C1-200221. postponed the CR until next CT1 meeting where incoming LS can be discussed. Now this CT1 e-meeting excludes TEI16 CR therefore we did not submit any revised CR related to this incoming LS. No revised CR. any discussion related to outgoing reply LS should be postponed as well  Sung, Monday, 16:53  Wants the LS to be postponed to next meeting | |
|  |  | | [C1-200717](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200717.zip) | Reply LS on extended NAS timers for CE in 5GS | | | Ericsson / Mikael | LS out Rel-16 | Current Status Approved | |
|  |  | | [C1-200718](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200718.zip) | Reply LS on configured NSSAI handling | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | LS out Rel-16 | Current Status Approved | |
|  |  | | [C1-200764](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200764.zip) | reply LS for concurrent broadcast for CMAS | | | Samsung /Grace | LS out Rel-16 | Postponed  The related incoming LS in C1-200226 is Rel-15 and hence not in scope of this meeting. Consequently any Reply LS is not in scope of the meeting either (although header of this LS lists Rel-16) | |
|  |  | | [C1-200323](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200323.zip) | Response to LS on Non-UE N2 Message Services Operations | | | Cisco Systems Belgium | LS out Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Moved from 16.2.21 | |
|  |  | | [C1-200453](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200453.zip) | LS on limited service state for CAG cell | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | LS out Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Moved from 16.2.7.1  Lena, Thursday, 09:03  Why is this needed, SA2 already agreed a related CR in see [S2-2001693](ftp://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_sa/WG2_Arch/TSGS2_136AH_Incheon/Docs/S2-2001693.zip)  Ivo, Thursday, 16:12  whether a UE not supporting CAG can camp on an acceptable CAG cell depends on broadcast information provided in AS layer. According to my information, RAN2 expects that the CAG cell will indicate "cellreservedForOtherUse" which might prevent a UE not supporting CAG from camping on the acceptable CAG cell. We believe that CT1 should wait for RAN2 decision on whether a UE not supporting CAG can camp on an acceptable CAG cell  Lena, Friday, 04:37   * SA2 agreed [S2-2001693](ftp://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_sa/WG2_Arch/TSGS2_136AH_Incheon/Docs/S2-2001693.zip) by which Rel-16 UEs not supporting CAG can camp on a CAG cell in limited service state to get emergency services * RAN2 has not yet decided on whether/how Rel-15 UEs can camp on a CAG cell in limited service state to get emergency services   for Rel-15 UEs, we need to wait for RAN2. For Rel-16 UEs, we can align TS 23.122 with the SA2 agreement and there is no need to send any LS to SA2  Vishnu, Friday, 13:54  Agrees with Lena, withdraws the LS  Vishnu, Friday, 14:17  Ivo, As I am not aware of such RAN2 discussion, can you please share further information on this, like any Tdoc numbers etc?  Ivo, Friday, 15.11  Some explanation, Ericson prefers to wait for RAN2 for Rel-16 | |
|  |  | | C1-200671 | Response to LS on Sending CAG ID | | | Samsung/Kundan | LS out Rel-16 | Merged into 310  Moved from 16.7.1  LATE | |
|  |  | | C1-200839 | LS on service area restriction for CIoT 5GS optimization | | | Samsung/Mahmoud | LS out Rel-16 | Current Status Approved  Amer, Wed, 00:40  think we should ask SA2 to take another look at the service area restrictions as it applies to the UE using CIoT optimizations. So I propose to send a simpler but broader question in the attached revision.  Mahmoud, Wed, 22:14  Accepting Amers comments  Linm, thu 15:42  Fine  Kaj, Thursday, 15:54  fine | |
|  |  | | [C1-200889](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update1\C1-200889.zip) | Reply LS on Non-UE N2 Message Services Operations | | | Ericsson / Mikael | LS out Rel-16 | Current Status Approved  Revision of C1-200721  PeterS, Wed, 10:16  This looks fine  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Christian, Thursday, 15:03  Supports sending an LS   * Rel-16, need to use a correct work item * Proposes rewording, shorter   Mikael, Friday, 12.23  Fine with rewording, uploaded a rev to the drafts folder  PeterS, Friday, 12:25  Minore editorial on the new proposal  Christian, Tuesday, 21:19  Rev looks fine | |
|  |  | | C1-200865 | Reply LS on Rel-16 NB-IoT enhancements | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | LS out Rel-16 | Merged into 1024  Revision of C1-200499  Mikael, Wed, 14:23  Providing commens  Yang, Wed, 15:23  Given the fact that we must ensure backwards compatible by all means, I support Mikael to remove the text related to “backward compatible” in the LS.  Lin, Wed, 15:44  All comments taken on board  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  C1-200416 and C1-200499 compete  Lin, TUesdy, 08:19  Provides a proposal in the drafts folder  Wants to hold the poen | |
|  |  | | C1-200854 | LS on UE specific DRX for NB-S1 mode | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Amer | LS out Rel-16 | Merged into 1024  Revision of C1-200416  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Moved from 16.2.8  C1-200416 and C1-200499 compete  Lin, TUesdy, 08:19  Provides a proposal in the drafts folder  Wants to hold the poen  Amer, Wed, 01:55  Provides a rev of 416  Mikael, Wed, 12:55  In principle looks good  Some edits  Amer, Wed, 19:29  All comments taken on board | |
|  |  | | [C1-200938](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update2\C1-200938.zip) | Reply LS on SUCI computation from an NSI | | | Ericsson / Ivo | LS out Rel-16 | Current Status Approved  Revision of C1-200395  Wed, 16:11  ivo commenting, not to happy with Sung’s comment but can live with it  Sung, Wed, 17:11  This looks good  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lena, Friday, 08:28  Asks to change  “CT1 does not see advantages in specification of a SUPI of the NSI SUPI type containing an NSI derived from an IMSI”  to  “CT1 does not see the need for a SUPI of the NSI SUPI type containing an NSI derived from an IMSI in Rel-16”  Ivo, Monday, 08:24  Provides revision, according comment from Lena, is in drafts folder  Sung, Monday, 07:41  Asking for a rev, I don’t see any need for the last paragraph, that is:  Ivo, Wed, | |
|  |  | | [C1-200967](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update4\C1-200967.zip) | LS on 5G-GUTI reallocation after paging of a UE in 5GMM-IDLE mode with suspend indication | | | Mahmoud | LS out Rel-16 | Current Status Open Questions  Kaj to confirm  Chairman checked 967, it is a full copy of  New  Lin, Thu, 07:54  LS is fine  Kaj, Thu, 11:06  Ericsson does not agree on a CR, HOWEVER; they can live with an LS  a revision is given  Mahmoud, Thus, 12:56  OK with Kaj rewording | |
|  |  | | C1-200994 | LS on the applicability of LADN in an SNPN | | | LGE | LS out Rel-16 | Current Status Approved | |
|  |  | | C1-201002 | LS on the use of service area restriction for NSSAA | | | Mahmoud | LS out Rel-16 | Current Status Approved  New  Lin, Thu, 07:27  LS is fine | |
|  |  | | C1-201024 | LS on UE specific DRX for NB-S1 mode | | | Mikael | LS out | Current Status APproved | |
|  |  | | [C1-201027](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update4\C1-201027.zip) | Reply LS on sending CAG ID | | | Ericsson / Ivo | LS out Rel-16 | Current Status APproved  Kundan is fine  Revision of C1-200310  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Kundan, Thu, 06:04  In general ok, asking to take out SA2 and some modified text  Ivo, Thu, 10:41  Wants the text as is, however, if Samsung wants a rev, then he can do this  Kundan, PLEAS CONFIRM  Kundan wants a rev  Ivo Thu11:15  Provides a rev  Kundan, Thu, 11:09  Arguin on his case | |
|  |  | | C1-201040 | LS on suspend indication to the NAS | | | Samsung/Mahmoud | LS out Rel-16 | Current Status Approved  Revision of C1-200785  LS is fine for Lin  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200590  Amer, Tuesday, 01:14  draft LS describes the ambiguity related to the interpretation of the suspend indication that stems from the text in CT1 specs and asks RAN2 for a solution. This comes across to me as asking RAN2 to help us clean our own backyard. Is there a text in RAN2 specs that can be used to explain the ambiguity? We should draft the discussion and the question to RAN2 around it  The issue is not the text in CT1 specification. The issue is with the same suspend indication from the RRC spec that is being sent to the NAS for two different reasons/events.  Do you have an alternative proposal that you can kindly suggest?  Amer, Wednesday, 00:24  My suggestion is to re-formulate the question to show how it relates to RAN2, e.g. point to the text in the RAN2 spec defining the suspend indication to the upper layers and explain where the ambiguity is.  Mahmoiud, Wed, , 23:40  Prvoding a rev  Amer, Thu, 00:59  Modifying the rev  Lin, Thu, 06:18  LS looks good  Mahmoud, Thu ,14;34  Accepts Amer  Amer, Friday, 01:34  Base don comments to C1-200588 and C1-200585, believes the LS is not needed  Mahmoud, Friday, 22:52  Announces revision | |
|  |  | | C1-201053 | LS on manual CAG selection | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | LS out Rel-16 | Current Status Open questions  Kundan to confirm  Revision of C1-201041  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200974  Sung, Thu, 14:41  Now it contains a CR, is this fine for Kundan  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200699  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lena, Friday, 08:31  LS needs to be more to the point,  Vishnu, Saturday, 15:20  support Lena’s suggestion to be more specific with the broadcasted SIM indicator in the LS.  Sung, Wed, 18:29  Provides rev  Lena, Thu, 05:36  Fine  Kundan, Thu, 06:10  **Samsung does not see the requirement of sending this LS to RAN2**. As RAN2 is already in CC list of the LS S1-201084. If RAN2 see anything is needed then they will respond.  Lena, Thu, 06:19  Supports the LS, this is needed, otherwise the feature might not make it in RAN2  Sung, Thu, 06:36  Asking Kundan to rethink his position  Kundan, Thu, 06:37  Explaining RAN2 gets anyway the SA1 LS  Sung, Thu, 06:38  Explaining that it is CT1 owning the stage-2  Kundan, Thu, 06:37  Kundan still keeps his position  LS is redundant  Vishnu, thu, 09:13  supports sending the LS  Ivo Supports sendiong the LS  Kundan, Thu, 13:08  DOES NOT AGREE with the highlighted line | |
|  |  | | [C1-201043](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\update6\C1-201043.zip) | [Draft] LS on Unicode symbol numbers representing disasters | | | SyncTechno Inc. | LS out Rel-16 | Current Status Approved  Revision of C1-200920  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200445  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Moved from 16.2.1  Ivo, Thursday, 09:44  LS is to open, please remove “e.g.” , “etc”  Annex A is confusing since it also refers to UEs with no user interfaces which use new message IDs rather than Unicode characters  Hyounheem, THur, 06:16  Agreeing with Ivo  Providing rev2  Ivo is fine with REV2 | |
|  |  | | [C1-201061](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\122-e_electronic_0220\docs\C1-200707.zip) | Reply LS on Mobile-terminated Early Data Transmission | | | Ericsson / Mikael | LS out Rel-16 | Current Status Approved  Revision of C1-200707  Created on Friday, needed to include the related CR.  If the CR fails this does not get aprroved | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Late and misplaced documents | | Tdoc | Title  Prioritization of documents within this category will be done during the meeting.  Some tdocs are left in the main agenda item, although they are late (e.g. papers reporting IETF progress, which are usually more up to date the later they are submitted) | | | Source | Tdoc info | Result & comments  Late documents and documents which were submitted with erroneous or incomplete information | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | A.O.B. | | Tdoc | Title | | | Source | Tdoc info | Result & comments | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Closing  Friday  by 16:00 at the latest | |  | Did you mark your attendance to this meeting? | | |  |  | Any meeting document which is not mentioned in this report or with no recorded decision shall be interpreted as "reserved", i.e. not defined and shall be ignored if received | |
|  |  | |  | **Last upload of revisions:**  **Thursday 27th February 2020 16:00 CET**  **Last comments:**  **Friday 28th February 2020 16:00 CET**  **Chairman Report of the meeting:**  **Monday 2nd March 2020** | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |