**3GPP TSG CT WG1 Meeting#125-e** **C1-204505**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
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|  | | Additional Colour coding for Tdocs in the 1st row | | | | | | | | |
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| 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. | | | | | | | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  | | | | | | | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
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|  |  | | C1-204500 | 3GPP TSG CT1#125-e – agenda for Tdoc allocation | | | CT1 chairman | agenda | Noted | |
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|  |  | | C1-204504 | 3GPP TSG CT1#125-e – agenda Thursday (27 August) evening | | | CT1 chairman | agenda | Noted | |
|  |  | | C1-204505 | 3GPP TSG CT1#125-e – agenda at end of meeting | | | CT1 chairman | agenda |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-204506](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204506.zip) | draft C1-124e meeting report | | | MCC | report | approved | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  | Hightest number C1-205xxx | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
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|  |  | |  | | | | | | | |
|  | 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-e | | Electronic Meeting | |
|  |  | |  | *20 – 24 April* | | | *CT1#123* | | *cancelled* | |
|  |  | |  | 16 – 24 April | | | CT1#123-e | | Electronic Meeting | |
|  |  | |  | *25 – 29 May* | | | *CT1#124* | | *cancelled* | |
|  |  | |  | 02 – 10 June | | | CT1#124-e | | Electronic Meeting | |
|  |  | |  | 29 June – 1 July. 2020 | | | CT plenary #88-e | | Electronic Meeting | |
|  |  | |  | *13 – 17 July* | | | [*CT1-Potential Ad-Hoc*](https://portal.etsi.org/webapp/MeetingCalendar/MeetingDetails.asp?m_id=36254) | | *cancelled* | |
|  |  | |  | *24 – 28 August* | | | *CT1#125* | | *cancelled* | |
|  |  | |  | 20 – 28 August | | | CT1#125-e | | Electronic Meeting | |
|  |  | |  | 14 – 16 September 2020 | | | CT plenary #89e | | Electronic Meeting | |
|  |  | |  | 12 – 16 October | | | CT1#126 | | *F2F cancelled* | |
|  |  | |  | 16 – 20 November | | | CT1#127 | | *F2F cancelled* | |
|  |  | |  | 7 – 8 December 2020 | | | CT plenary #90e | | Electronic Meeting | |
|  |  | |  | 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 #92 | | Japan | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  | |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  | |  | |
|  | Work Plan and other adm. issues | | Tdoc | Title | | | Source | Spec / doctype | Result & comments | |
|  |  | | [C1-204507](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204507.zip) | work plan | | | MCC | Work Plan | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-204508](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204508.zip) | CT1#125-e Electronic Meeting – Process and Scope | | | CT1 chairman | other | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-204509](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204509.zip) | Decision making– electronic show of hands | | | CT1 chairman | other | Noted | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Input Liaison statements | | Tdoc | Title | | | Source | To / CC | Result & comments | |
|  |  | | [C1-204565](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204565.zip) | LS on Key Management procedure in SEAL (C3-203588) | | | CT3 | Cc | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-204567](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204567.zip) | Reply LS on PAP/CHAP and other point-to-point protocols usage in 5GS (C3-203609) | | | CT3 | To | Noted  See also C1-204647 | |
|  |  | | [C1-204569](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204569.zip) | LS on 5G SoR integrity protection mechanism (C4-203367) | | | CT4 | Cc | Noted  Marius, Thu, 10:11  Hints at two CRs in SA3 | |
|  |  | | [C1-204571](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204571.zip) | LS on human-readable network name (HRNN) (CP-201361) | | | TSG CT | Cc | Noted  Related CRs in C1-204599, C1-204600, C1-204601 | |
|  |  | | [C1-204572](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204572.zip) | Reply LS on QoE Measurement Collection (R2-2005778) | | | RAN2 | Cc | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-204575](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204575.zip) | Reply LS on assistance indication for WUS (R2-2005939) | | | RAN2 | Cc | Noted  See also C1-204614 | |
|  |  | | [C1-204576](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204576.zip) | LS on RAN2 NR V2X cell (re-)selection related agreements (R2-2005975) | | | RAN2 | To | Noted  Do we have CRs? | |
|  |  | | [C1-204613](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204613.zip) | LS on the re-keying procedure for NR SL (R2-2005978) | | | RAN2 | To | Noted  Draft LS out in C1-205068  Proposed CRs in C1-205061, C1-205003, C1-204810 | |
|  |  | | [C1-204614](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204614.zip) | Reply LS on assistance indication for WUS (R3-204175) | | | RAN3 | Cc | Noted  See also C1-204575 | |
|  |  | | [C1-204615](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204615.zip) | Reply LS on manual CAG ID selection and granularity of UAC parameters for PNI-NPNs (S2-2004335) | | | SA2 | Cc | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-204620](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204620.zip) | Reply LS on service area restriction for CIoT 5GS optimization (S2-2004440) | | | SA2 | To | Noted  Related CR agreed in last meeting in C1-204156, corrections are proposed in this meeting in C1-204604 and C1-204767. | |
|  |  | | [C1-204621](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204621.zip) | Reply LS on early UE capability retrieval for eMTC (S2-2004446) | | | SA2 | To | Noted  Pending RAN2 response  Related CR in C1-204672 | |
|  |  | | [C1-204622](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204622.zip) | Reply LS on manipulation of CAG Information element by a VPLMN (S2-2004453) | | | SA2 | To | Noted  C1-204582, C1-204869, C1-204921 | |
|  |  | | [C1-204623](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204623.zip) | Reply LS on protection of allowed CAG list against MITM Attack (S2-2004455) | | | SA2 | To | Noted  Related CR in C1-204582 | |
|  |  | | [C1-204624](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204624.zip) | Reply LS on IAB supporting in NPN deployment (S2-2004469) | | | SA2 | Cc | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-204634](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204634.zip) | Reply LS on NSSAAF in slice specific authentication (S2-2004476) | | | SA2 | To | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-204635](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204635.zip) | Reply LS on the applicability of LADN in an SNPN (S2-2004478) | | | SA2 | To | Noted  Related CR in C1-204906 | |
|  |  | | [C1-204647](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204647.zip) | Reply PAP/CHAP and other point-to-point protocols usage in 5GS (S2-2004481) | | | SA2 | To | Noted  Related CRs in C1-204537, C1-204538  Related DISC in C1-204937  Related work item in C1-204738  See also LS in C1-204567 | |
|  |  | | [C1-204648](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204648.zip) | LS on SA WG2 assumptions from conclusion of study on architecture aspects for using satellite access in 5G (S2-2004688) | | | SA2 | To | Noted  Related Rel-17 WID proposal in C1-204671, related discussion paper in C1-204670 | |
|  |  | | [C1-204649](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204649.zip) | LS on AT Commands for Bit Rate Recommendation (S4-200880) | | | SA4 | To | Noted  Related CR in C1-204658  Do we have draft LS out | |
|  |  | | [C1-2045510650](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204650.zip) | LS on Media Feature Tag for IMS Data Channel (S4-200908) | | | SA4 | To | Noted  Draft LS out in C1-204866  CR in C1-204856 | |
|  |  | | [C1-204651](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204651.zip) | LS Reply on QoE Measurement Collection (S4-200962) | | | SA4 | Cc | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-204652](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204652.zip) | Reply LS to Reply LS on support for eCall over NR (S5-203369) | | | SA5 | Cc | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-204653](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204653.zip) | Reply LS on location reporting triggers (S6-201259) | | | SA6 | To | Noted  Changes to TS 24.545 will be required | |
|  |  | | [C1-204654](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204654.zip) | LS on mandatory support of full rate user plane integrity protection for 5G (SP-200617) | | | TSG SA | To | Noted  Related CRs in C1-204533, C1-204534, C1-205171,C1-205173  Related Disc in C1-205181  Draft LS out in C1-204659 | |
|  |  | | [C1-204655](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204655.zip) | Completion of WT-456 and WT-470 (LIAISE-411) | | | Broadband Forum | To | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-204657](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204657.zip) | LS Reply on QoS mapping procedure (C3-203662) | | | CT3 | Cc | Noted | |
|  |  | | [**C1-205215**](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_125e/Docs/C1-205215.zip) | Reply LS on mandatory support of full rate user plane integrity protection for 5G (R3-205653) | | | RAN3 | To | Postponed | |
|  |  | | C1-205469 | Reply LS on early UE capability retrieval for eMTC (S2-2004446/R2-2006166) | | | RAN2 | Cc | Postponed | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | void | |  |  | | |  |  | Release 5 is closed | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | void | |  |  | | |  |  | Release 6 is closed | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | void | |  |  | | |  |  | Release 7 is closed | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 8  work items | | Tdoc | Title | | | Source | Tdoc info | Result & comments | |
|  | Rel-8 IMS Work Items and issues:  MRFC  MRFC\_TS  UUSIW  PktCbl-Intw  PktCbl-Deploy  PktCbl-Sec  NBA  OAM8-Trace  Overlap  PRIOR  IMS\_RP  PNM  IMSProtoc2  IMS\_Corp  ICSRA  IMS-Cont  MAINT\_R1  MAINT\_R2  REDOC\_TIS-C1  REDOC\_3GPP2  CCBS-CCNR CW-IMS  FA  CAT-SS  TEI8 (IMS related issues)  + all other IMS related issues | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | All WIs completed  AS – MRFC protocol (This covers both the study item and the work item)  User – User Signalling interworking  Packetcable - Protocol enhancements  Packetcable - Regulatory requirements  Packetcable - Security requirements  NASS Bundled Authentication  Service level tracing in IMS  CT1 aspects of overlap signaling  Multimedia priority service  IMS restoration procedures  Personal Network Management (stage 2 and 3)  IP Multimedia Core Network Subsystem - IMS Stage3 Protocol Evolution for Rel-8  IMS corporate network access  IMS centralized service control  IMS Service Continuity  TISPAN R1 and R2 maintenance  3GPP and 3GPP2 re-documentation  IMS supplementary services:  Call Completion on Busy Subscriber (CCBS) / Call Completion on Non-Reachable (CCNR) in IMS Communication Waiting in IMS  Flexible alerting in IMS  Customized alerting tone in IMS | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Rel-8 non-IMS Work Items and issues:  SAES  SAES-CSFB  SAES-SRVCC  HomeNB-LTE HomeNB-3G  ETWS  PPACR-CT1  EData  IWLANNSP  EVA  IWLAN\_Mob  TEI8 (non-IMS)  + all other non-IMS issues | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | All WIs completed  SAE issues  CS-Fallback  SRVCC  CSG, HomeeNB and HomeNB  Earthquake and tsunami warning systems  Paging Permission with Access Control  Data transfer during an emergency call  WLAN Network Selection Principles  Enhancements for VGCS applications  Mobility between 3GPP-WLAN Interworking and 3GPP Systems | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 9  work items | | Tdoc | Title | | | Source | Tdoc info | Result & comments | |
|  | Rel-9 IMS Work Items and issues:  Work Items:  CRS  eCAT-SS  eMMTel-CC  IMSProtoc3  IMS\_SCC-SPI  IMS\_SCC-ICS  IMS\_SCC-ICS\_I1  EMC2  MEDIASEC\_CORE  PAN\_EPNM  IMS\_EMER\_GPRS\_EPS  IMS\_EMER\_GPRS\_EPS-SRVCC  TEI9 (IMS related)  + all other Rel-9 IMS issues | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | All WIs completed  IMS Supplementary services  IMS Customized Ringing Signal Service  Enhancements of IMS Customized Alerting Tone (CAT) Service  Enhancements for Completion of Communications Supplementary service  IMS Stage-3 IETF Protocol Alignment  IMS Service Continuity Enhancements: Service, Policy, Interactions, and Inter UE Transfer  Enhancements to IMS Centralized Services  IMS Centralized Services support via I1 interface  Definition of Ml interface for Control Plane LCS  IMS Media Plane Security  Support of Personal Area Networks and Enhancements to Personal Network Management  Emergency Call Enhancements for IP& PS Based Calls – stage 3 IMS part  SRVCC support for IMS Emergency Calls | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Rel-9 non-IMS Work Items and issues:  IMS\_EMER\_GPRS\_EPS (non-IMS)  SSAC  VAS4SMS  PWS-St3  eANDSF  MUPSAP  LCS\_EPS-CPS  EHNB-CT1  TEI9 (non-IMS issues)  + all other Rel-9 non-IMS issues | |  | Peter - Main | | |  |  | All WIs completed  Support for IMS Emergency Calls over GPRS and EPS  Service Specific Access Control Requirements  Value-Added Services for Short Message Service  Public Warning System (PWS)  ANDSF while roaming  Multiple PDN Connection to the Same APN for PMIP-based Interfaces  Multiple PDN Connection to the Same APN for PMIP-based Interfaces  Control Plane LCS in the EPC  EHNB-issues for Rel-9 | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 10  work items | | Tdoc | Title | | | Source | Tdoc info | Result & comments | |
|  | Rel-10 IMS Work Items and issues:  Work Items:  IMS\_SC\_eIDT  CCNL  eAoC  OMR  IESE  eSRVCC  aSRVCC  AT\_IMS  IMSProtoc4  + all other Rel-10 IMS issues | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | All WIs completed  IMS Inter-UE Transfer enhancements  Call Completion on Not Logged-in  AoC enhancements  Optimal Media Routing  IMS Emergency Session Enhancements  SRVCC enhancements  SRVCC in alerting phase  AT Commands for IMS-configuration  IMS Stage-3 IETF Protocol Alignment | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Rel-10 non-IMS Work Items and issues:  Work Items:  ECSRA\_LAA-CN  eMPS-CN  NIMTC  AT\_UICC  SMOG-St3  IFOM-CT  LIPA  SIPTO  MAPCON-St3  TIGHTER  MOCN-GERAN  + all other Rel-10 non-IMS issues | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | All WIs completed  Enabling Coder Selection and Rate Adaptation for UTRAN and E-UTRAN for Load Adaptive Applications, CN impacts  Enhancements for Multimedia Priority Service  Network Improvements for Machine Type Communications  AT Commands for USAT  S2b Mobility based on GTP  IP Flow Mobility and WLAN offload  Local IP Access  Selected IP Traffic Offload  Multi Access PDN Connectivity  Tightened Link Level Performance Requirements for Single Antenna MS  Support of Multi-Operator Core Network by GERAN | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 11  work items | | Tdoc | Title | | | Source | Tdoc info | Result & comments | |
|  | Rel-11 IMS Work Items and issues:  Work Items:  USSI  IOI\_IMS\_CH  RLI  IPXS  VINE-CT  MRB  GINI  RAVEL-CT  IOC  IODB  GBA-ext-St3  NWK-PL2IMS-CT  MMTel\_T.38\_FAX  vSRVCC-CT  rSRVCC-CT  ATURI  IMSProtoc5  + all other Rel-11 IMS issues | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | All WIs completed  USSD Simulation Service  IMS Interconnection Charging Enhancements for transit scenarios in multi operator environments  CT1 aspects of RLI  Advanced Interconnection of Services  Supp. 3G Voice Interworking w. Enterprise IP-PBX  Inclusion of Media Resource Broker  Support of RFC 6140 in IMS  Roaming Architecture for VoIMS w Local Breakout  IMS Overload Control  Operator Determined Barring  GBA Extension for re-use of SIP Digest credentials  Network Provided Location Information for IMS  Enhanced T.38 FAX support  SRVCC for 3G-CS  SRVCC from UTRAN/GERAN to E-UTRAN/HSPA  AT Commands for URI Support  IMS Stage-3 IETF Protocol Alignment | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Rel-11 non-IMS Work Items and issues:  Work Items:  RT\_VGCS\_Red  SIMTC  SIMTC-CS  SIMTC-RAN\_OC  SIMTC-Reach  SIMTC-Sig  SIMTC-CN\_Pow  SIMTC-PS\_Only  BBAI  BBAI-BBI  BBAI-BBII  BBAI-BBIII  Full\_MOCN-GERAN  RT\_ERGSM  DIDA  SAMOG\_WLAN- CN  eNR\_EPC  PROTOC\_SMS\_SGs  SAES2  SAES2-CSFB  + all other Rel-11 non-IMS issues | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | All WIs completed  GCSMSC and GCR Redundancy for VGCS/VBS  System Improvements to Machine-Type Communications   * CS aspects for CT groups * Extended Access Barring for UTRAN and E-UTRAN for CT groups * Reachability Aspects * Signalling Optimizations * "CN-based" and power considerations   BroadBand Forum Accesses Interworking -  Building Block I, II and III  Full Support of Multi-Operator Core Network  Introduction of ER-GSM band for GSM-R  Data identification in ANDSF  Mobility based on GTP & PMIPv6 for WLAN access to EPC  enhanced Nodes Restoration for EPC  Enhancement of the Protocols for SMS over SGs  SAE Protocol Development | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 12  work items | | Tdoc | Title | | | Source | Tdoc info | Result & comments | |
|  | Rel-12 IMS Work Items and issues:  bSRVCC  SMSMI-CT  TURAN-CT  IMS\_TELEP  eDRVCC  EMC\_PC  IMS\_RegCon-CT  BusTI-CT  UP6665  eIODB  IMS\_WebRTC  IMS\_Corp2  NNI\_RS  USSD\_MS  USSI-NET  RFC7044  FS\_NNI\_RS  eMEDIASEC-CT  IMS\_SSFDD  CVO-CT  SIS\_CT  FS\_REVOLTE\_IMS  NETLOC\_TWAN\_CT  ALTC  PCSCF\_RES  EVS\_codec-CT  IMSProtoc6  TEI12 (IMS related issues)  + all other Rel-12 IMS related issues | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | All WIs completed  Single Radio Voice Call Continuity (SRVCC) before ringing  SMS submit and delivery without MSISDN in IMS  Tunnelling of UE Services over Restrictive Access Networks  IMS-based Telepresence (Stage 3)  Dual-Radio VCC (DRVCC) enhancements  IMS Emergency PSAP Callback  CT aspects of IMS registration control  CT Aspects of IMS Business Trunking for IP-PBX in Static Mode of Operation  Updating IMS to conform to RFC 6665  Enhancements to IMS Operator Determined Barring  Web Real Time Communication (WebRTC) Access to IMS  Transfer of ETSI business trunking specifications  Indication of NNI Routeing scenarios in SIP requests  USSD method selection - stage-3  Network Initiated USSD Simulation Services in IMS  SI: Evaluation and introduction of RFC 7044 (History-Info)  Indication of NNI Routeing scenarios in SIP requests  CT aspects of Extended IMS media plane security  IM-SSF Application Server Service Data Descriptions  CT Aspects of Coordination of Video Orientation  CT Aspects of Signalling of Image Size  Technical Aspects on Roaming End to End scenarios with VoLTE IMS and other networks  CT aspects of Network Provided Location Information for IMS Trusted WLAN Access Network  Support of ALT-C attribute  P-CSCF restoration enhancements  CT Impacts of Codec for Enhanced Voice Services  IMS Stage-3 IETF Protocol Alignment | |
|  |  | | C1-205470 | Removal of Capability indication by P-CSCF feature | | | Deutsche Telekom / Michael | CR 6425 24.229 Rel-12 | Postponed  Not uploaded Thu 17:54.  Revision of C1-204512  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  This set of CRs remove the dependency to draft-jesske-sipcore-sip-tree-cap-indicators. This is the only reference according to the tool. | |
|  |  | | C1-205471 | Removal of Capability indication by P-CSCF feature | | | Deutsche Telekom / Michael | CR 6426 24.229 Rel-13 | Postponed  Not uploaded Thu 17:54.  **Revision of C1-204513**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen Thu 11:17**: Some comments  **Roland Thu 15:58**: Ack  Bill, Roland, Jörgen Mon 06:36-12:08:  Discussion on app-subtype Feature-Capability indicator.  Bill Tue 0852: Fine with the CR  Jörgen, Thu, 1952  fine | |
|  |  | | C1-205472 | Removal of Capability indication by P-CSCF feature | | | Deutsche Telekom / Michael | CR 6427 24.229 Rel-14 | Postponed  Not uploaded Thu 17:54.  Revision of C1-204514 | |
|  |  | | C1-205473 | Removal of Capability indication by P-CSCF feature | | | Deutsche Telekom / Michael | CR 6428 24.229 Rel-15 | Postponed  Not uploaded Thu 17:54.  Revision of C1-204515 | |
|  |  | | C1-205474 | Removal of Capability indication by P-CSCF feature | | | Deutsche Telekom / Michael | CR 6429 24.229 Rel-16 | Postponed  Not uploaded Thu 17:54.  Revision of C1-204516 | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Rel-12 non-IMS Work Items and issues:  LIMONET-LIPA  REP-WMD  MTCe-UEPCOP-CT  ProSe-CT  SINE  SCM\_LTE-CT  UTRA\_LTE\_WLAN\_interw-CT  OPIIS-CT  eSaMOG\_St3  WORM-CT  WLAN\_NS-CT  LIMONET-SIPTO  Dia\_SGSN\_SMS  GCSE\_LTE-CT  MSRD\_VAMOS (GERAN)  DMCG (GERAN)  NewToN (GERAN)  SAES3  SAES3-CSFB  SAES3-non3GPP  TEI12 (non-IMS)  + all other Rel-12 non-IMS issues | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | All WIs completed  Core Network aspects of LIPA Mobility  Reporting Enhancements in Warning Message Delivery  UE Power Consumption Optimizations, stage 3  CT aspects of Proximity-based Services  Signalling Improvements for Network Efficiency  CT aspects of Smart Congestion Mitigation in E-UTRAN  CT aspects of WLAN/3GPP Radio Interworking  Operator Policies for IP Interface Selection  Enhanced S2a Mobility Over Trusted WLAN access to EPC for Stage 3  Optimized Offloading to WLAN in 3GPP RAT mobility  CT aspects of WLAN network selection for 3GPP terminals  Core Network aspects of SIPTO at the local network  Diameter based interface between SGSN and SMS central functions  CT aspects of Group Communication System Enablers for LTE  CT1 introduction of MS capability support for MS supporting MSRD for VAMOS  CT part: Downlink Multi Carrier GERAN  CT1 part of New Training Sequence Codes (TSC) for GERAN  general Stage-3 SAE Protocol Development  Stage-3 SAE Protocol Development related to Circuit Switched Fall Back  Stage-3 SAE Protocol Development related to non-3GPP access | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 13  work items | | Tdoc | Title | | | Source | Tdoc info | Result & comments | |
|  | Rel-13 Mision Critical Work Items and issues:  MCPTT-CT MPTT-Prof | |  | Jörgen – Breakout on MC | | |  |  | All WIs completed  Mission Critical Push-To-Talk over LTE   * MCPTT call control protocol * MCPTT floor control protocol   Mission Critical general work   * Group management * Identity management * Management Object (MO) * Configuration management   IMS Profile to support Mission Critical Push To Talk over LTE | |
|  |  | | [C1-204802](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204802.zip) | Adding port number value | | | Ericsson / Nevenka | CR 0633 24.379 Rel-13 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204822](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204822.zip) | Corrections to timers-events of On-Network Floor Control procedures | | | Samsung | CR 0250 24.380 Rel-17 | Rejected  CR not needed, there is no Rel-17 version of 24.380 | |
|  |  | | [C1-204827](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204827.zip) | Missing floor indicator in On-Network Floor Control procedures | | | Samsung | CR 0255 24.380 Rel-17 | Rejected  CR not needed, there is no Rel-17 version of 24.380 | |
|  |  | | C1-204828 | Resolve race condition between multiple clients during in-permission state simultaneously | | | Samsung | CR 0256 24.380 Rel-13 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-204829 | Resolve race condition between multiple clients during in-permission state simultaneously | | | Samsung | CR 0257 24.380 Rel-14 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-204830 | Resolve race condition between multiple clients during in-permission state simultaneously | | | Samsung | CR 0258 24.380 Rel-15 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-204831 | Corrections to timers-events of On-Network Floor Control procedures | | | Samsung | CR 0259 24.380 Rel-13 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-204832 | Corrections to timers-events of On-Network Floor Control procedures | | | Samsung | CR 0260 24.380 Rel-14 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-204833 | Corrections to timers-events of On-Network Floor Control procedures | | | Samsung | CR 0261 24.380 Rel-15 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-204834 | Corrections to timers-events of On-Network Floor Control procedures | | | Samsung | CR 0262 24.380 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-204835 | Corrections to timers-events of On-Network Floor Control procedures | | | Samsung | CR 0263 24.380 Rel-17 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-204836 | Missing floor indicator in On-Network Floor Control procedures | | | Samsung | CR 0264 24.380 Rel-13 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-204837 | Missing floor indicator in On-Network Floor Control procedures | | | Samsung | CR 0265 24.380 Rel-14 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-204838 | Missing floor indicator in On-Network Floor Control procedures | | | Samsung | CR 0266 24.380 Rel-15 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-204839 | Missing floor indicator in On-Network Floor Control procedures | | | Samsung | CR 0267 24.380 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-204840 | Missing floor indicator in On-Network Floor Control procedures | | | Samsung | CR 0268 24.380 Rel-17 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-204841](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204841.zip) | Resolve race condition between multiple clients during in-permission state simultaneously | | | Samsung | CR 0269 24.380 Rel-13 | Postponed  requested by NIST, Samsung confirmed Thu 0933.  Thu eve – Fri: David Kiran and Jörgen some discussion.  Several comments by David, Mike and Kiran on the use cases until Mon 15:56.  Kiran Tue 1718: Some answers to David.  David Tue 2120: Comment on use cases. Asking for more time. | |
|  |  | | [C1-204842](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204842.zip) | Resolve race condition between multiple clients during in-permission state simultaneously | | | Samsung | CR 0270 24.380 Rel-14 | Postponed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204843](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204843.zip) | Resolve race condition between multiple clients during in-permission state simultaneously | | | Samsung | CR 0271 24.380 Rel-15 | Postponed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204844](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204844.zip) | Resolve race condition between multiple clients during in-permission state simultaneously | | | Samsung | CR 0272 24.380 Rel-16 | Postponed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204845](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204845.zip) | Resolve race condition between multiple clients during in-permission state simultaneously | | | Samsung | CR 0273 24.380 Rel-17 | Rejected  CR not needed, there is no Rel-17 version of 24.380 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205318](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205318.zip) | Missing floor indicator in On-Network Floor Control procedures | | | Samsung | CR 0251 24.380 Rel-13 | **Postponed**  Requested by David Thu 0936  David, Fri, 0048  Confirms he has issues  Kiran, Fri, 1145  Further explains  Jörgen, Fri, 1407  Also highlighting more time needed  **Revision of C1-204823**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen Thu 14:46:** Better description on what goes wrong is needed. Editorials.  **Kiran Thu 13:57** responds, **David Fri 00:10** comments, Kiran Fri 13:57 responds  David Sat 0255: Further comments  Kiran Monday 0917: Answers. Draft available.  Jörgen: Wed 1026: Terminology and wording. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205319](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205319.zip) | Missing floor indicator in On-Network Floor Control procedures | | | Samsung | CR 0252 24.380 Rel-14 | **Postponed**  Requested by David Thu 0936  Revision of C1-204824 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205320](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205320.zip) | Missing floor indicator in On-Network Floor Control procedures | | | Samsung | CR 0253 24.380 Rel-15 | **Postponed**  Requested by David Thu 0936  Revision of C1-204825 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205321](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205321.zip) | Missing floor indicator in On-Network Floor Control procedures | | | Samsung | CR 0254 24.380 Rel-16 | **Postponed**  Requested by David Thu 0936  Revision of C1-204826 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205341](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205341.zip) | Correct spelling of HPLMN, VPLMN R13 | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0149 24.484 Rel-13 | **Agreed**  **Revision of C1-204695**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen Thu 11:54:** Cover page can be improved. Date format not correct. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205342](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205342.zip) | Correct spelling of HPLMN, VPLMN R14 | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0150 24.484 Rel-14 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204696 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205343](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205343.zip) | Correct spelling of HPLMN, VPLMN R15 | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0151 24.484 Rel-15 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204697 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205344](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205344.zip) | Correct spelling of HPLMN, VPLMN R16 | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0152 24.484 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204698 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205495](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205495.zip) | Corrections to timers-events of On-Network Floor Control procedures | | | Samsung | CR 0246 24.380 Rel-13 | **Agreed**  **Revision of C1-205314**  **David, Fri, 0005**  **OK**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Revision of C1-204818**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen Thu 14:02:** Need better description for this to be essential. Some use case discussion  **David Thu 17:48:** Supports this being essential  **Kiran Fri 16:13:** Gives an example  Jörgen, David, comment on essential Sat,  Kiran, David discuss what should be changed Mon 1444 and 1755.  Kiran and David until Tue 1238: Discussion on further corrections.  Jörgen Wed1012: Wording proposals. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205496](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205496.zip) | Corrections to timers-events of On-Network Floor Control procedures | | | Samsung | CR 0247 24.380 Rel-14 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205315  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-204819 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205497](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205497.zip) | Corrections to timers-events of On-Network Floor Control procedures | | | Samsung | CR 0248 24.380 Rel-15 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205316  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-204820 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205498](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205498.zip) | Corrections to timers-events of On-Network Floor Control procedures | | | Samsung | CR 0249 24.380 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205317  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-204821 | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Rel-13 IMS Work Items and issues:  voE-UTRAN \_PPD-CT  QOSE2EMTSI-CT  DRuMS-CT  RTCP-MUX  IMSProtoc7  PCSCF\_RES\_WLAN  INNB\_IW  mSRVCC  eWebRTCi\_CT  ROI-CT TEI13 (IMS related issues)  + all other Rel-13 IMS related issues | |  | Jörgen – Breakout on IMS | | |  |  | All WIs completed  Voice over E-UTRAN Paging Policy Differentiation  QoS End to End MTSI extensions  Double Resource Reuse for Multiple Media Sessions  Support of RTP / RTCP transport multiplexing (signalling) in IMS  IMS Stage-3 IETF Protocol Alignment for Rel-13  P-CSCF Restoration Enhancements with WLAN  Interworking solution for Called IN number and original called IN number ISUP parameters  Message interworking during PS to CS SRVCC  Enhancements to WEBRTC interoperability stage 3  Video Enhancements by Region-Of-Interest information signalling | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Rel-13 non-IMS Work Items and issues:  eProSe-Ext-CT  RISE  WSR\_EPS  ePCSCF\_WLAN  SAES4  SAES4-CSFB  SAES4-non3GPP  EVSoCS-CT  MONTE-CT  MEI\_WLAN  ASI\_WLAN  NBIFOM-CT  GROUPE-CT  eDRX-CT  SEW1-CT  CIoT-CT  NB\_IOT  EC-GSM-IoT  EASE\_EC\_GSM  DECOR-CT  TEI13 (non-IMS)  + all other Rel-13 non-IMS issues | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | All WIs completed  Enhancements to Proximity-based Services extensions  Retry restriction for Improving System Efficiency  Warning Status Report in EPS  Enhanced P-CSCF discovery using signalling for access to EPC via WLAN  general Stage-3 SAE Protocol Development  Stage-3 SAE Protocol Development related to Circuit Switched Fall Back  Stage-3 SAE Protocol Development related to non-3GPP access  EVS in 3G Circuit-Switched Networks  Monitoring Enhancements CT aspects  Mobile Equipment signalling over the WLAN access  Authentication Signalling Improvements for WLAN  IP Flow Mobility support for S2a and S2b Interfaces  Group based Enhancements  CT aspects of extended DRX cycle for power consumption optimization  CT aspects of Support of Emergency services over WLAN – phase 1  CT1 aspects of WIs with IoT-functionality (WIs from C, RAN & SA  Dedicated Core Networks CT aspects | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 14  work items | | Tdoc | Title | | | Source | Tdoc info | Result & comments | |
|  | Rel-14 Mision Critical Work Items and issues:  MCImp-MCVIDEO-CT MCImp-MCDATA-CT MCImp-eMCPTT-CT MCPTTProtoc1 | |  | Jörgen | | |  |  | All WIs completed  Mission Critical Video – CT aspects Mission Critical Data – CT aspects Enhancements for Mission Critical Push To Talk – CT aspects Technical enhancements for Mission Critical Push To Talk over LTE protocol aspects | |
|  |  | | C1-204679 | Mandatory EmergencyCall element - Rel-14 | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0145 24.484 Rel-14 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-204686](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204686.zip) | Mandatory EmergencyCall element - Rel-14 | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0146 24.484 Rel-14 | Withdrawn  On authors request Fri 16:58 | |
|  |  | | [C1-204687](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204687.zip) | Mandatory EmergencyCall element - Rel-15 | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0147 24.484 Rel-15 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-204688](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204688.zip) | Mandatory EmergencyCall element - Rel-16 | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0148 24.484 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-205455](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205455.zip) | Addressing a potential race/ambiguity condition when MSRP is used | | | AT&T / Val | CR 0016 24.582 Rel-14 | **Agreed**  **Revision of C1-205293**  **Jörgen, Fri, 1520**  **Does not object, a few things to consider for plenary**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Francois Wed 1034:** Improvement. Is success reporting needed. Some more comments  **Revision of C1-204899**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Val Fri 03:25**: Draft exists in drafts folder, minor changes  **Jörgen Fri 13:41:** RFC uses failure reporting for this.  Francois Mon 1226: Agree MSRP REPORT is what the RFC specifies to solve the issue. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205457](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205457.zip) | Addressing a potential race/ambiguity condition when MSRP is used | | | AT&T / Val | CR 0017 24.582 Rel-15 | **Agreed**  Revision of C1-204901 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205458](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205458.zip) | Addressing a potential race/ambiguity condition when MSRP is used | | | AT&T / Val | CR 0018 24.582 Rel-16 | **Agreed**  Revision of C1-204902 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205484](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205484.zip) | Method to handle no active receiver in MCVideo System | | | Samsung | CR 0082 24.581 Rel-14 | **Agreed**  New CR, the issue started in rel-14 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205485](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205485.zip) | Method to handle no active receiver in MCVideo System | | | Samsung | CR 0076 24.581 Rel-15 | **Agreed**  Revision of C1-205075  Moved from 15.1  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Mike Thu 18:39: Concerns, are new media plane messages needed.  Kiran Thu 21:41: Stage 1 and stage 2 requirements  Jörgen Fri 11:21: Why rel-15 what is the error.  Kiran Fri2031 responds.  Mike Kiran discuss issues and release Mon 1846 to Tue 1536. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205486](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205486.zip) | Method to handle no active receiver in MCVideo System | | | Samsung | CR 0077 24.581 Rel-16 | **Agreed**  Revision of C1-205076  Moved from 15.1 | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Rel-14 IMS Work Items and issues:  ISAT MMCMH\_Enh-CT IOC\_UE\_conf PWDIMS-CT IMSProtoc8 V8-CT RobVoLTE-CT REAS\_EXT CH14-DCCII-CT SPECTRE-CT TEI14 (IMS related issues)  + all other Rel-14 IMS related issues | |  | Jörgen – Breakout on IMS | | |  |  | All WIs completed  IMS Signalling Activated Trace CT1 aspects of MTSI Extension on Multi-stream Multiparty Improved operator control using new UE configuration parameters Password based service activation for IMS Multimedia Telephony service IMS Stage-3 IETF Protocol Alignment for Rel-14 CT Aspects of S8 Home Routing Architecture for VoLTE CT Aspects of Robust Call Setup for VoLTE subscriber in LTE SIP Reason header extension CT Aspects of Determination of Completeness of Charging Information in IMS User Controlled Spoofed Call Treatment | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Rel-14 non-IMS Work Items and issues:  EIEI-CT NonIP\_GPRS-CT EWE-CT SAES5 SAES5-CSFB SAES5-non3GPP V2X-CT eDECOR-CT AT\_CIoT SEW2-CT ERP-CT AE\_enTV-CT CIoT-Ext-CT PS\_DATA\_OFF-CT TEI14 (non-IMS)  + all other Rel-14 non-IMS issues | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | All WIs completed     CT aspects of evolution to and interworking with eCall in IMS CT aspects for Non-IP for Cellular Internet of Things for 2G/3G-GPRS EIR check for WLAN access to EPC general Stage-3 SAE Protocol Development Stage-3 SAE Protocol Development related to Circuit Switched Fall Back Stage-3 SAE Protocol Development related to non-3GPP access CT aspects of V2X Services CT aspects of Enhancements of Dedicated Core Networks AT Commands for CIoT CT aspects of Support of Emergency services over WLAN – phase 2 Support of EAP Re-authentication Protocol for WLAN Interworking CT aspects of system architecture enhancements for TV service Core network aspects of extended Architecture support for CIoT CT aspects of PS data off function | |
|  |  | | [C1-204889](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204889.zip) | Failure to transfer emergency session upon successful attach | | | BlackBerry UK Ltd. | CR 3424 24.301 Rel-14 | Withdrawn  Shifted from 14.1  Lin, Mon, 07:20  Not FASMO, rel-17, SAES17 | |
|  |  | | [C1-204890](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204890.zip) | Failure to transfer emergency session upon successful attach | | | BlackBerry UK Ltd. | CR 3425 24.301 Rel-15 | Withdrawn  Shifted from 14.1  Lin, Mon, 07:20  Not FASMO, rel-17 | |
|  |  | | C1-205226 | Failure to transfer emergency session upon successful attach | | | BlackBerry UK Ltd. | CR 3426 24.301 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204891  **Rel-17 CR, SAES17**  **Lin, Thu, 1003**  **Ok, although the tdoc is not yet available**  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Shifted from 14.1  Lin, Mon, 07:20  Not FASMO, rel-17 | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 15  work items | | Tdoc | Title | | | Source | Tdoc info | Result & comments | |
|  | Rel-15 Mission Critical work items and issues:  eMCVideo-CT  eMCDATA-CT  enhMCPTT-CT  MCProtoc15  MONASTERY  MBMS\_MCservices | |  | Jörgen | | |  |  | All work items complete  Enhancements to Mission Critical Video – CT aspects  Enhancements for Mission Critical Data – CT aspects  Enhancements for Mission Critical Push-to-Talk – CT aspects  Protocol enhancements for Mission Critical Services sion Critical Push-to-Talk – CT aspects  Mobile Communication System for Railways  MBMS usage for mission critical communication services | |
|  |  | | [C1-205069](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205069.zip) | Sending emergency notification of MCPTT user's emergency indication | | | Samsung | CR 0638 24.379 Rel-15 | **Postponed**  **Mirror in 17.3.2**  **Jörgen Fri 11:00:** Why rel-15? Other comments.  Mike Fri 17:09: Stage 2 needed  Kiran Fri 2006: Responds  Jörgen Mon 2158, Mike Mon 2210, Kiran Mon 2222: Discussion on release and other issues.  Jörgen Tue 1845: comments on release working procedures | |
|  |  | | [C1-205071](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205071.zip) | Sending emergency notification of MCPTT user's emergency indication | | | Samsung | CR 0640 24.379 Rel-17 | Rejected  CR not needed, there is no Rel-17 version of 24.379 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205072](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205072.zip) | Standalone in-progress emergency group state cancel while not in a call | | | Samsung | CR 0641 24.379 Rel-15 | **Postponed**  **Mirror in 17.3.2**  Jörgen Fri 11:05: Needs better description to be essential. Why is this rel-15, function seems older.  Mike Fri 17:19: Stage 2 discussion needed.  Mike and Kiran further discussions Fri 1808-Fri 19:11.  Mike, Kiran, Jörgen some further discussions Mon 19:20 to Mon 22:37. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205074](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205074.zip) | Standalone in-progress emergency group state cancel while not in a call | | | Samsung | CR 0643 24.379 Rel-17 | Rejected  CR not needed, there is no Rel-17 version of 24.379 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205077](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205077.zip) | Method to handle no active receiver in MCVideo System | | | Samsung | CR 0078 24.581 Rel-17 | Rejected  CR not needed, there is no Rel-17 version of 24.581 | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Rel-15 IMS work items and issues  5GS\_Ph1-IMSo5G  eCNAM-CT  FS\_PC\_VBC (CT3)  IMSProtoc9  bSRVCC\_MT  eSPECTRE  PC\_VBC (CT3)  TEI15 (IMS) | |  | Jörgen | | |  |  | All work items complete  IMS impact due to 5GS IP-CAN  CT aspects of Enhanced Calling Name Service  Study on Policy and Charging for Volume Based Charging  IMS Stage-3 IETF Protocol Alignment for Rel-15  SRVCC for terminating call in pre-alerting phase  Enhancements to Call spoofing functionality Policy and Charging for Volume Based Charging | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Rel-15 non-IMS/non-MC work items and issues  5GS\_Ph1-CT EDCE5-CT ProSe\_WLAN\_DD\_Stage3 VoWLAN-CT PS\_DATA\_OFF2-CT LTE\_LIGHT\_CON-CT AT\_CIoT-Ext SAES6 INOBEAR-CT TEI15 | |  | Peter | | |  |  | All work items complete  CT aspects on 5G System - Phase 1  EPC enhancements to support 5G New Radio via Dual Connectivity Inclusion of WLAN direct discovery technologies as an alternative for ProSe direct discovery Complementary Features for Voice services over WLAN PS Data Off Phase 2 CT aspects of signalling reduction to enable light connection for LTE AT Commands for CIoT-Ext Stage-3 SAE Protocol Development for Rel-15 Increasing the number of EPS bearers Other Rel-15 non-IMS topics | |
|  |  | | [C1-205045](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205045.zip) | Minimum length of "Plain 5GS NAS message" | | | Apple | CR 2563 24.501 Rel-15 | Postponed  Frederic, Thu, 09:20  Clauses affected missing  Christian, Thu, 15:01  **NO FASMO**  but only for Rel-16  Behrouz, Thu, 15:36  Not sure that the CR is correct  Osama, Thu, 16:39  **No FASMO**  Behourz, Thu, 16:51  Asking from Osama  Osama, Thu, 18:13  Explaining to Behrouz  Mikael, Thu, 18:17  Some problems with the logice of the proposal  Sung, Thu, 20:22  Same as Mikael and Benhrouz  Osama, Fri,00:14  Ongoing  Mikael, Fri, 10:08  Further inputs  Osama, Fri, 19:07  Further suggestions  Mikael, Fri, 19:47  Looks for pragmatic way forward, similar to what is there in EPS, but that would not be backward comp  Behourz, Fri, 20:09  Highlights the problem with EPD  Sung, Fri, 20:44  Supports Osama, a NOTE will do it  Behourz, Mon, 02:15  Asking for clarification: what is the proposed change now and what is the target release  Krisztian, Mon, 02:53  Having a NOTE is fine, would prefer Rel-16, can live with Rel-17  Krisztian, Wed, 07:27  Rev  Mikael, Wed, 11:30  Asking for a change | |
|  |  | | [C1-205437](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205048.zip) | Minimum length of "Plain 5GS NAS message" | | | Apple | CR 2564 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205048  **THIS IS NOW Rel-16 ONLY**  Osama, Thu, 1907  FINE  Behrouz, Thu, 2030  FINE  -----------------------  Frederic, Thu, 09:20  Clauses affected missing  Christian, Thu, 15:01  Issue to be fixed, CR not written against latest version of the spec  Krisztian, Wed, 07:27  rev | |
|  |  | | C1-205328 | PAP/CHAP Information over 5GC | | | Vodafone | CR 3228 24.008 Rel-15 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205252  Lin, thu, 12:53  fine  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-205220  Joy, Wed, 13:12  Coverpage update to be inline with Rel-15 cr is needed  Discussion of 5220 happened, however, 5252 was already provided.  Lin, Thu, 09:08  Provides rewording of the NOTE  Lena, Ivo fine with the rewording  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-204537  Joy, Tue, 08:39  Requests that the CT3 CR is shown as linked  Yang, Tue, 15:01  Does not agree with Joy  Joy, Tue, 15:12  If this is more than clarification, than not acceptable  Yang, Tue, 16:04  Not agreeing with Joy  Sung, Tue, 16:29  Supports that this starts from Rel-15, wants to co-sign  Joy, Tue, 16:47  defends  Yang, Tue, 17:12  Not agreeing, CR is needed to clarify that Rel-15 UE support pap/chap  Vivek, Tue, 17:19  Co-sign  Joy, Tue, 17:41  Explains that she only wants CT3 CRs being listed  Sung, Tue, 20:10  What is the issue, CT3 confirmed it does work  Ivo, Tue, 01:24  Ericsson co-signs  Lena, Wed, 02:57  Co-sign  Joy, Wed, 03:46  Explains that a CT3 CRs is needed for the PGW-C/SMF combo  Lena, Wed, 07:02  Explains that CT3 CR is just documenting that feature is supported  Yang, wed, 07:10  Some discussion on the content of the NOTE, likely better to keep it concise  Yang, Wed, 07:51  Does not agree with Joy  Joy, Wed, 09:17  Can live with the CR, but reason for change needs to reflect the conditions, can live with not including the CT3 cr  Yan, Wed, 09:39  Offers some rewording  Joy, Wed, 10:03  Can live with latest offer, and please mention the CT3 LS on cover page  Yang, Wed, 10:15  Will do  Michele, Wed, 10:37  Some comments  Joy, Wed, 13:03  Fine with latest wording form Yang  Lin, Wed, 17:01  Does not agree with the note, need an informative NOTE  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lena, Thu, 09:05  We don’t think the proposed note is needed: there is currently no text precluding the use of PAP/CHAP ePCO parameters in 5GS, so by default they can be used. **Additionally, this is not a FASMO.**  Xu, Thu, 10:10  is it simpler to state in the NOTE that UE could be configured with the same PAP/CHAP information for a DNN and the mapped APN?  Ivo, Thu, 10:55  why is the NOTE 3 limited solely to EPS and 5GS? The same should be true also for 2G/3G and WLCP  Yang, Thu, 14.38  explains some background, new proposal  Ivo, thu, 14:44  Fine with Yang’s proposal  Lena, Thu, 14:50  that this is not FASMO and should be a clarification in Rel-17, provides wording  Yang, Thu, 15:22  Explaining to Lena  JJ, Fri, 18:49  Fine with the wording from Lena, but would like to see it starting from Rel-15  Xu, Mon, 03.13  Provides updates on the wording  Lin, Mon, 10:45  **Work only to start in Rel-17** and then use a WID  Yang, Mon, 11:02  Clarification form Lin requested  Jj, Mon, 11:08  Rel-15 UE can use pap/chap,  Joy, Mon, 12:19  Sufficitn to make this for Rel-17 only  Yang, Mon, 12:38  Defends the rel-15, willing to include “if supported…”  Reinhard, Mon, 13:37  Co-signs  Sung, Mon, 14:48  This works from Rel-15 anyway, but is ok with the Noter  Yang, Mon, 15:29  New words  Joy, Mon, 18:01  Link this to the CT3 Cr | |
|  |  | | [C1-205329](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204538.zip) | PAP/CHAP Information over 5GC | | | Vodafone | CR 3229 24.008 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205253  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-205221  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-204538  Joy, Wed, 13:12  Coverpage update to be inline with Rel-15 cr is needed  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 10:55  why is the NOTE 3 limited solely to EPS and 5GS? The same should be true also for 2G/3G and WLCP | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 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  Rel-16 is frozen | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | CRs and Discussion Documents related to new or revised Work Items | |  | Peter - Main | | |  |  | CRs and Disc papers related to new Work Items  Rel-16 is frozen | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Status of other Work Items | |  | Peter - Main | | |  |  | Status information on other relevant Rel-16 Work Items | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 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  100% | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | SINE\_5G | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | Signalling Improvements for Network Efficiency in 5GS  100% | |
|  |  | | [C1-205107](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205107.zip) | Correction to S-NSSAI based retry restriction | | | Huawei, HiSilicon, MediaTek Inc./Lin | CR 2576 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Ivo, Thu, 10:55  handling in PDU session modification should be aligned with handling in the PDU session establishment  Amer, Thu, 17:37  Agrees with Ivo, legacy behavior should not be changed  Sung, Thu, 19:31  Same as Ivo and Amer | |
|  |  | | C1-205411 | Procedure indication for back-off timer | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 0703 27.007 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205108  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Sung, Thu, 19:46  Not 5G\_SINE, should be 5GProtoc17  Lin, Sat, 03:25  Was introduced under SINE work item, so correction under this wic  Sung, Mon. 01:44  Not agreeing that this is SINE  Lin, Tue, 11:18  Rev  Sung, Tue, 21:10  OK | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | SAES16 WIs | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | Stage-3 SAE protocol pevelopment for Rel-16  100% | |
|  | SAES16 | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | General Stage-3 SAE protocol development  100% | |
|  |  | | [C1-205111](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205111.zip) | Clarification of NAS COUNT handling in 4G | | | Huawei, HiSilicon, Vodafone, Deutsche Telekom/Lin | CR 3430 24.301 Rel-16 | Postponed  Mikael, Fri, 14:10  NAS COUNT requirements have been in place without change since Rel-8 and we are not aware of any issues.  DOES NOT AGREE  Lin, Sat, 03:58  Explains  Mikael, Tue, 21:24  **position remains, we do not agree this change to EPS**  Reinhard, Wed, 10:36  Defends  **Mikael, Wed .11:19**  **Does not agree**  Lin, Wed, 13:15  explaings | |
|  |  | | C1-205239 | Requested PDN type after handover to non-3GPP access | | | vivo | CR 3416 24.301 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204766  Ivo, Wed, 13:50  Right way, cover page  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Sung, Thu, 20:10  Tries to understand the issue  Yanchao, Fri, 06:39  Provides rev1  Ivo, Fri, 08:10  - not essential - should be Rel-17 - does not address stop enforcing of the limitation when the PDN connection is released in non-3GPP access  Yanchoa, Mon, 09:48  New rev, still rel-16  Joy, Mon, 06:00  Comment  Yanchao, Mon, 10:09  New rev  Ivo, mon, 12.13  If essential then Rel-15, otherwise Rel-17  Yancho, Tue, 09:18  Rev, it is now REL17  Ivo, Tue, 23:18  Some minors, co-sign | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 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  100% | |
|  | 5GProtoc16 | |  |  | | |  |  | General Stage-3 5GS NAS protocol development | |
|  |  | | [C1-204883](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204883.zip) | CR#3400 clean up: continuity of emergency session upon attach failure | | | BlackBerry UK Ltd. | CR 3421 24.301 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204959](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204959.zip) | Correction of S-NSSAI based congestion control | | | MediaTek Inc., Huawei, HiSilicon, OPPO / JJ | CR 2533 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Ivo, Thu, 10:51  Prefers QCOM in 5093  Amer, Thu, 22:00  Same as Ivo  Sung, Thu, 22:00  Same as Ivo  JJ, Wed, 11:26  Ongoing  Lin, Wed, 12:46  Same as JJ  Sung, Wed, 1920  Negative on the CR  Amer, Thu, 07:10  Negative on the CR  JJ, Fri, 0757  Some comments | |
|  |  | | [C1-204960](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204960.zip) | Indicating UE capability of IP 3 tuple type and handling multiple components of the same traffic descriptor type | | | MediaTek Inc., Ericsson / JJ | CR 2400 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Request form the author  Revision of C1-203946  Lena, Thu, 09:37  CR is not needed  Rae, Thu, 10:33  Agrees with Lena  Cristina, Thu, 11:09  Good idea, shift to Rel-17  JJ, Mon, 05:31  Offers to wait one more day for comments  Joy, Tue, 06:54  Does not agree on the approach  Jj, Tue, 14:17  Wants to postpone his CR  Joy, Tue, 15:42  Ok  Ivo, Tue, 15:48  Just removing the EN leaves a problem  Joy, Tue, 17:16  Some answer to Ivo  Lena, Wed, 03:29  Ok with jj proposal, 4960 is postponed, 4965 cover page is updated  rae, Wed, 04:29  Ok with jj proposal, 4960 is postponed, 4965 cover page is updated  Ongoing discussion, JJ lists who supports what | |
|  |  | | [C1-204962](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204962.zip) | Delete unimplementable QoS operations in ESM procedure | | | MediaTek Inc. / JJ | CR 2535 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204963](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204963.zip) | Packet filter identifier setting when requesting new packet filters | | | MediaTek Inc. Huawei, HiSilicon / JJ | CR 2536 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204544](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204544.zip) | Mobile Terminated Voice Gap for MPS | | | Perspecta Labs Inc. | CR 2413 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Kaj, Thu, 12:44  Already covered in the spec  PeterM, Thu, 16:13  Defends  Kaj, Fri,08:47  Explains his position  Lin, Mon, 08:26  CR is not needed  peterM, Mon, 17:05  defending  PeterM, Tue, 14:25  Rev  Kaj, Tue, 16:53  This does not work  PeterM, Tue, 17:05  There is an issue in the spec  Lin, Wed, 09:01  Existing spec covers what is needed  PeterM, Wed, 15:31  Can withdraw, asks for the following to be included  The CR was withdrawn with the understanding that the existing words “requests for mobile terminated services” can be interpreted to include registration requests as well as service requests from the UE that result from a page or notification from the AMF.  Chairman: CR is postponed as it was discussed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204587](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204587.zip) | Correcting partial implementation of CR#2221 | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 2423 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204608](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204608.zip) | SIM not applicable for 5GS cases | | | Ericsson / Mikael | CR 2433 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204667](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204667.zip) | Handling of the timer T3584 and T3585 when the UE provided no S-NSSAI during PDU session establishment | | | Qualcomm Incorporated, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, SHARP / Amer | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  JJ, Thu, 13:34  Does not agree  Amer, Fri, 15:46  Answering  JJ, Fri, 17:46  Discussing  Amer, Mon, 06:41  Answering  JJ, Mon, 08:08  Replying to Amer | |
|  |  | | [C1-204668](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204668.zip) | Resolution of editor’s notes on the handling of timers T3484 and T3585 when the UE provided no S-NSSAI during PDU session establishment | | | Qualcomm Incorporated, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, SHARP / Amer | CR 2446 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-204669](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204669.zip) | Handling of timers T3484 and T3585 received with 5GSM cause value #39 | | | Qualcomm Incorporated, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, SHARP / Amer | CR 2447 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-204730](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204730.zip) | Steering of roaming to a forbidden PLMN | | | vivo | CR 0565 23.122 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204765](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204765.zip) | IP restriction | | | vivo | CR 2472 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Ivo, Thu, 10:50  not clear why 24.301 statement is applicable for 5GS  Yanchao, Fri, 05:40  Explains  Ivo, Tue, 23:11  Not always correct | |
|  |  | | [C1-204789](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204789.zip) | Storing SOR secured packet in the UDR | | | DOCOMO Communications Lab. | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  Related with LS out in C1-204791  Ivo, Thu, 10:59  Detailed comments  Ban, Thu, 21:16  Replies to ivo  Ivo, Fri, 09:03  Explaining  Ban, Mon, 12.11  Hints at rev for 4790  Ivo, Mon, 13.42  Right direction, some rewording  Ban, Mon, 14:30  Some proposal | |
|  |  | | [C1-204792](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204792.zip) | SOR-AF UDM exchanges alignment in after registration case | | | Orange, Ericsson, NTT DOCOMO, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell / Mariusz | CR 0571 23.122 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204808](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204808.zip) | Calculation of MAC in NAS transparent containers | | | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR 2482 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1-204852 | Provisioning of DNS server security information to the UE | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 3231 24.008 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-204881](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204881.zip) | Fallback to UE local configuration | | | Intel /Thomas | CR 0086 24.526 Rel-16 | Postponed  Requested by author  Lena, Thu, 09:12  We do not agree with the proposal in this CR that if there is a non-default matching URSP rule and PDU session establishment fails, the UE falls back to UE local configuration: this is NOT aligned with stage 2  Lazaros, Thu, 09:12  Contradicts stage-2, some more comments  Roozbeh, Thu, 11.23  CR is not in agreement with SA2 concept and should be first brought up with SA2. | |
|  |  | | [C1-204917](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204917.zip) | Include Additional GUTI IE in TAU request for N1 mode to S1 mode change | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Cristina | CR 2504 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-204922 | Corrections on the error check of QoS rules | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Cristina | CR 2508 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-204991](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204991.zip) | Clarification on handling of equivalent PLMNs where current PLMN is stored to “PLMNs where registration was aborted due to SOR” list | | | Apple | CR 0575 23.122 Rel-16 | Postponed  Requested by author  Lena, Thu, 09:12  We don’t think the proposed note adds any value: the current text in the spec only talks about the current chosen VPLMN, so it is clear enough.  Ivo, Thu, 10:51  Not essential  Sung, Thu, 23:04  Should not be agreed  Ban, Fri, 07:23  No value  Krisztian, Tue, 09:19  Can accept the comments | |
|  |  | | [C1-204994](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204994.zip) | Handling of Higher Priority PLMN selection with the presence of “PLMNs where registration was aborted due to SOR” list | | | Apple | CR 0577 23.122 Rel-16 | Postponed  Lena, Thu, 09:34  Question on how the ordering of PLMN in terms of priority  Sung, Thu, 23:20  CR is not needed  Krisztian, Tue, 00:32  Answering  Sung, Tue, 01:07  Does not agree  Krisztian, Thu, 0251  Explains  Sung, Thu, 0444  This is an overkill | |
|  |  | | [C1-204998](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204998.zip) | Use of preferred PLMN/access technology combinations received through control Plane signaling SoR | | | Apple | CR 0579 23.122 Rel-16 | Postponed  Lena, Thu, 09:37  We don’t think the CR is needed, already in spec  Ban, Thu, 10:22  Doesn’t agree with the CR  Ivo, Thu, 10:51  what if the USIM contain information which are no longer valid?  Vishnu, Thu, 17:02  CR is incorrect  Krisztian, Wed, 08:30  Explains  Ban, Wed, 12:47  OK  Vishna, Thu, 1124  Does not agree with the argument  Krisztian, Thu, 1706  Answering | |
|  |  | | [C1-205004](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205004.zip) | SOR check during mobility REGISTRATION | | | Apple | CR 0581 23.122 Rel-16 | Postponed  Lena, Thu, 09:47  do not agree with requiring the UE to check the SOR container also during mobility registration  Ban, Thu, 10:08  Same as Lena, does not agree  Ivo, Thu, 10:40  NOT OK  Vishnu, Thu, 17:16  We also don’t support this change as we don’t see the need for this.  Kriszian, Fri, 02:22  Explains to Ivo, Ban, Vishnu, Lena  Ivo, Fri, 09:28  The flag is not mentioned anywhere  Mariusz, Fri, 13:17  Not a fan  Sung, Fri, 23:10  No benefit  Krisztian, tue, 09:56  Explaining  Krisztian, Tue, 10:03  Explains to Mariusz  Sung, Tue, 20:51  Asking  Ban, Wed, 09:06  Not in favor | |
|  |  | | [C1-205013](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205013.zip) | SOR check during mobility REGISTRATION | | | Apple | CR 2546 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Lena, Thu, 09:47  do not agree with requiring the UE to check the SOR container also during mobility registration  Ban, Thu, 10:08  Same as Lena, does not agree  Ivo, Thu, 10:40  NOT OK  Vishnu, Thu, 17:10  We also don’t support this change as we don’t see the need for this.  Krisztian, Fri, 01:20  Explains to Lena, Ban, Vishnu  Kristzian, Fri, 07:55  Explains to Ivo  Ivo, Fri, 09:28  Respnses  Sung, Fri, 23:10  No benefit  Ban, Wed, 09:06  Not in favor | |
|  |  | | [C1-205032](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205032.zip) | Steering of Roaming procedure handling when UE is not reachable or when acknowledgement from UE is not received | | | Apple | CR 0582 23.122 Rel-16 | Postponed  Mariusz, Thu, 10:29  not convinced that we should impact the AMF as proposed in this CR.  Ivo, Thu, 10:50  UDM cannot rely on information from VPLMN  Ban, Thu, 10:58  agree with Orange’s analysis of the use case and the HPLMN possible actions, and in concluding that the **CR is not needed**.  Vishnu, Thu ,19:44  Not needed  Krisztian, Fri, 03:27  Explains to Ivo, Ban and Mariusz  Ivo, Fri, 09:33  CR is **not needed**  **Krisztian, Mon, 08:21**  Explains  Sung, Mon, 20:19  Does not agree with Krisztian  Krisztian, Tue, 20:44  explains  Kristzain, Wed, 02.13  Explains to sung that a CR to SA2 will follow  Sung, Wed, 02:53  Postpone this until SA2 has discussed it | |
|  |  | | [C1-205100](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205100.zip) | Allowed NSSAI assignment based on default configured NSSAI | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | discussion Rel-16 | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-205102](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205102.zip) | Rejected NSSAI due to subscription | | | Huawei, HiSilicon, China Mobile/Lin | discussion Rel-16 | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-205133](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205133.zip) | Handling of T3520 in AUTH REJ | | | MediaTek Inc. / Marko | CR 2587 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1-205136 | Clarification for SR attempt count reset | | | MediaTek Inc. / Marko | CR 2588 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-205140](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205140.zip) | Correction to implementation of CR2297 | | | MediaTek Inc. / Marko | CR 2590 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-205141](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205141.zip) | Correction to the implementation of CR0988 | | | MediaTek Inc. / Marko | CR 2591 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1-205142 | Handling for SR in 5U2 state | | | MediaTek Inc. / Marko | CR 2592 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-205143 | Correction to creation of NSSAIs | | | MediaTek Inc. / Marko | CR 2593 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-205171](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205171.zip) | UE behavior-User plane data protection with full data rate | | | Samsung Nordic | CR 2601 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Ivo, Thu, 10:49  Prefers 4533  Roozbhe, Thu, 11:24  Not clear about the related discussion paper  Lena, Thu, 14:33  Not aligned with SA decision | |
|  |  | | [C1-205173](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205173.zip) | network behavior-User plane data protection with full data rate | | | Samsung Nordic | CR 2603 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Competes with C1-204533  Mariusz, Thu, 10:28  Supports 4533  Ivo, Thu, 10:49  Prefers 4533  Roozbeh, Thu, 11:09  Why not merge with 5171  Lena, Thu, 14:37  CR is wrong | |
|  |  | | C1-205174 | Security handling | | | Samsung Nordic | CR 2604 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-205175 | handling of case for session management | | | Samsung Nordic | CR 2605 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-205181](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\update1\C1-205181.zip) | User plane data protection with full data rate | | | Samsung Nordic | discussion 24.501 Rel-16 | Noted  Revision of C1-205169 (before start of meeting) | |
|  |  | | C1-205209 | CR#3400 related change: continuity of emergency session upon attach failure | | | BlackBerry UK Ltd. | CR 3422 24.301 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Revision of C1-204886  **CHANGED TO REL-17**  Ban, Mon, 05:50  this change is not needed, even with the revision.  Mohamed, Mon, 09:40  Does not agree  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Frederic, Thu, 09:15  Clauses affected missing  Mohamed, Thu, 10:29  Agrees with the CR, but changes are needed  Ivo, Thu, 10:51  does not seem to be essential as only NOTEs are modified  JLB, Thu, 15:25  Work started already in last meeting, so should be possible to be contined  JLB, Thu, 22:48  ME box needs to be ticked  Sunghoon, Fri, 09:23  Not essential | |
|  |  | | C1-205208 | CR#2299 related change: continuity of emergency session upon registration failure | | | BlackBerry UK Ltd. | CR 2493 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Revision of C1-204885  **CHANGED TO REL-17**  **Joy, Mon, 09:42**  Fine for rel-17, but further change is needed  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Mohamed, Thu, 10:27  Ok with the CR, additional changes needed  Ivo, Thu, 10:51  does not seem to be essential as only NOTEs are modified  Ban, Thu, 13.31  If it is a requirement, then why adding a NOTE, do not find the changes in the Notes needed  JLB, Thu, 15:25  Work started already in last meeting, so should be possible to be contined  Sunghoon, Fri, 09:20  Same as Ivo | |
|  |  | | C1-205207 | CR#2299 clean up: continuity of emergency session upon registration failure | | | BlackBerry UK Ltd. | CR 2492 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204882  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 10:52  Requests changing the terminology  JLB, Fri, 01:33  Provides rev1  Ivo, Fri, 09:11  Ok with rev1  Sunghoon, Fri, 09:14  Not FASMO, Protoc17  JLB, Fri, 18:02  defending  Sunghoon, Tue, 07:30  FINE | |
|  |  | | C1-205211 | Correcting handling of #54 "PDU session does not exist" in response to request type "existing emergency PDU sessio | | | BlackBerry UK Ltd. | CR 2494 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Requested by author, mon, 23:14  Revision of C1-204887  **This is now Rel-17, 5GProtoc17**  Mohamed, Mon, 09:36  Comments  JLB, Mon, 21:40  Discussing with Mohamed, will provide a rev  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Mohamed, Thu, 09:24  No benefits in the change, keep existing spec  Rae, Thu, 10:31  Question for clarification  Ivo, Thu, 10:51  Unclear why it helps  Not essential  JLB, Thu, 15:34  Defending  Mohaemd, Thu, 16:12  Not needed  Vishnu, Thu, 16:36  Not needed  JLB,Fri, 01:36  Explaining why it is essential and provides rev1  Sunghoon, Fri, 09:26  Same as Mohamed  Rae, Fri, 11.53  Same as Vishnu  JLB, Fri, 21:10  Defending, fine to go with **Rel**-17 only  Ban, Fri, 23:22  **NOT acceptable.**  **JLB, Fri, 23:29**  Answering to Ban | |
|  |  | | C1-205212 | Correcting handling of #54 "PDN connection does not exist" in response to request type "handover of emergency bearer services" | | | BlackBerry UK Ltd. | CR 3423 24.301 Rel-16 | Postponed  Requested by author, mon, 23:14  Revision of C1-204888  ----------------------------------  Mohamed, Thu, 09:32  No benefits in the change, keep existing spec  Ivo, Thu, 10:51  Not essential  JLB,Fri, 01:36  Explaining why it is essential and provides rev1  Sunghoon, Fri, 09:28  his CR does not seem justified for FASMO reason.  Vishnu, Fri, 14:07  Not needed  JlB, Fri, 15:13  Disagrees with Vishnu  JLB, Fri, 21:10  Defending, fine to go with Rel-17 only  Ban Fri, 23:30  CR is not needed and the UE follows the current defined behaviour. | |
|  |  | | C1-205216 | URSP evaluation after rejection with the same URSP rule | | | OPPO / Rae | CR 2418 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204564  Lazaros, Tue, 09:24  FINE  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lazaros, Thu, 09:15  Support, requests some changes  Roozbeh, Thu, 11:20  Requests a change  Roozbeh, Thu, 22:51  More comments  Rae, Fri, 03:27  Defending current approach  Hannah, Fri, 10:15  Comments  Roozbeh, Fri, 15:16  Not agreeing  Rae, Mon, 03:15  Defending  Roozbeh, mon, 03:54  FINE  Carlson, Mon, 05.21  Rev1 | |
|  |  | | C1-205240 | Resolution of editor’s notes on the handling of timers T3484 and T3585 when the UE provided no S-NSSAI during PDU session establishment | | | Qualcomm Incorporated, Nokia, Nokia SHanghai Bell, SHARP, Ericsson / Amer | CR 2568 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205093  JJ, Fri, 1300  Fine, but cover page needs an update in plenary  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Roozbeh, Thu, 11.24  Coverpage 4888 -> 4088  JJ, Thu, 13:34  Does not agree | |
|  |  | | C1-205241 | Handling of timers T3484 and T3585 received with 5GSM cause value #39 | | | Qualcomm Incorporated, Nokia, Nokia SHanghai Bell, SHARP, Ericsson / Amer | CR 2570 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Only change is to add China Mobile as co-signer  Revision of C1-205095 | |
|  |  | | C1-205280 | T3525 clarification for UE configured with high priority access | | | Apple | CR 2561 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205037  Amer, Wed, 07:50  FINE  Vishnu, thu, 1138  Will not OBJECT  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Roozbeh, Thu, 13:01  List should stay as is  Amer, Thu, 22:47  Requesting some changes  Krisztian, Mon, 01:27  Rev1  Amer, Mon, 07:27  Rev is ok, could be a bit enhanced  Roozbhe, Tue, 06.11  Looks good | |
|  |  | | C1-205256 | NAS MAC terminology | | | Ericsson / Mikael | CR 2434 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204609  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Mahmoud, Thu, 19:41  No concerns, but question  Mikael, Fri, 10:52  Acks | |
|  |  | | C1-205272 | Security checking of Steering of roaming | | | vivo | CR 0564 23.122 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204729  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Mariusz, Thu, 10:36  Additional change needed  Lufeng, Fri, 05:46  Rev1  Mariusz, Mon, 12.31  Fine with the rev | |
|  |  | | C1-205279 | Infinite De-registration attempt | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Cristina | CR 2539 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204988  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Amer, Thu, 22:44  Not needed  Cristina, Fri, 12:18  Defending  Amer, Fri, 16:24  Does not agree with the CR  Cristina, Mon, 08:39  Defending  Mikael, Mon, 10:38  CR is NOT NEEDED  Crisitna, Mon, 12:18  Asking back from Mikael  Mikael, Tue, 08:39  Replying to Cristian  Cristina, Tue, 10:10  Questions  Mikael, Tue, 16:45  Asking a questions  Cristina, Wed, 06:18  rev  Mikael, Wed, 09:20  Fine with the CR, there might be work in a future meeting needed | |
|  |  | | C1-205227 | Storage of SOR related information in the UDR | | | DOCOMO Communications Lab., Orange | CR 0570 23.122 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204790  Ivo, Wed, 14:30  OK  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 10:58  C.1 and C.3 not OK, proposal what is ok  Ban, Thu, 21:20  Ivo’s proposal is proprietary  Sung, Thu, 21:27  Prefers that this is discussed in CT4  Ban, Thu, 22:01  Agrees this is CT4, hence the LS in 4791  Sung, Thu, 23:39  Should go to CT4 directly  Ivo, Fri, 09:04  Commenting, does not agree  Mariusz, Mon, 10.46  Asking Ivo for clarification  Ban, Mon, 12:01  Rev  Ivo, Mon, 12:55  More comments  Mariusz, Mon, 13:00  Clearer now, some rephrasing  Ban, Mon, 02:14  rev  Sung, Mon, 19:48  Supports Ivo’s approach  Ban, Mon, 21:00  Rev  Sung, Tue, 21:00  Rev is fine  Ivo, Tue, 23:00  There is an issue with a NOTE that needs to be sorted out  Ban, Wed, 08:35  Can it be as is?  Ivo, Wed, 13:45  wording | |
|  |  | | C1-205327 | Storage of SOR related information in the UDM/UDR | | | Orange / Mariusz | CR 0584 23.122 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205308  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-205242  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-205083  Ivo, Tue, 14:30  Right way forward, some minor changes  Mariusz, Tue, 16:32  New rev  Ivo, Tue, 20:51  ok  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 10:50  Requests changes  Mariusz, Mon, 15:46  rev | |
|  |  | | C1-205361 | Clarification on the successfully received SoR case when UE is in manual mode | | | Apple | CR 0580 23.122 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205002  Only Rel-17, 5GProtoc17  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 10:51  Not essential, only partly correct  Sung, Thu, 23:27  Even if sentence is corrected, **no value**  Krisztian, Mon ,06:55  Explaining why it is essential  Sung, Mon, 19:56  Add a NOTE in step 7  Ban, Tue, 08:08  **We do not need the CR**  Krisztian, Tue 08:29  Rev and explanation to Ban  Ban, Tue, 08:37  Fine with the explanation  Ivo, Tue, 14:41  Only Rel-17 | |
|  |  | | C1-205367 | Update of emergency number list using Configuration Update Command | | | Apple, Deutsche Telekom | CR 2248 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205081  **THIS IS NOW Rel-17**  **Ivo, thu, 1106**  fine  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-204127  Ivo, Thu, 10:50  Indication of emergency numbers in registration accept is sufficient  Mohemaed, Thu, 11:27  Requests changes, ok with the CR  Chen, Thu, 12:14  CR is **not** an improvement but instead increases overheads for no real gain, not to mention there are shortfalls  Kundan, Thu, 13:53  Not needed  Mohamed, Thu, 14:19  Agrees with Chen’s arguments  JLB, Thu, 15:08  Same as Chen  Sunghoon, Fri, 09:34  Against the CR  Krisztian, Sat, 02:48  Providing a rev  Mohamed, mon, 09:35  Fine with the rev  Ban, Mon, 10:32  Further changes  Reinhart, Mon, 13:40  Fine with the proposed changes  JLB; Mon, 15:07  Baseline incorrect, Rel-17 only  Kundan, Mon, 16:18  Comment  Chen, Mon, 18:34  Not convinced, why Rel-15  Kristzian, Tue, 00:01  explaining  JLB, Tue, 00:22  Not FASMO, still a baseline issue with the text  Ivo, Tue, 14:33  Can be at most Rel-17 NOTE | |
|  |  | | [C1-205350](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204884.zip) | Align description of Request type values with its use in 5GS | | | BlackBerry UK Ltd. | CR 3232 24.008 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204884  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 10:51  - no need to bring DN to 24.008 (not even for IE usage in 24.301). 24.301 does not use DN either. - 10.5.6.17, NOTE 1, part "transfer of a PDN connection from S1 to N1 mode" - incorrect - in this case, the request type specified in 24.501 is used.  JLB; Fri, 20:23  Provides a rev  Joy, Mon, 09:26  Requests a change in the rv  JLB, Fri, 16:14/16:29  Provides a rev3  Ivo, Tue, 22:52  Coments the rev  JLB, Wed. 1815  Rev4 | |
|  |  | | C1-205369 | Transfer of PDN connection from untrusted non-3GPP access connected to EPC to 5GS | | | Ericsson /kaj | CR 2397 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204616  Sung, Thu, 0009  Fine  Joy, thu, 0956  ok  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-204180  Roozbeh, Thu, 11:16  Requests change  Sung, Thu, 20:37  Request change  Sunghoon, Fri, 09:31  Asks for clarification  Kaj, Wed, 00:19  Explains  Sung, Wed, 00:20  Commenting  Sunghoon, Wed, 11:07  Fine  Kaj, Wed, 12:20  Asking back  Joy, Wed, 12:53  Suggests wording  Kaj, Wed. 13:30  Fine, but wait for Roozbeh | |
|  |  | | C1-205394 | Handling of PLMN selection with presence of PLMNs where registration was aborted due to SOR list | | | Apple | CR 0576 23.122 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-204992  Sung, Thu, 02:39  Comments  Krisztian, Thu, 0629  Discussing with Sung  Sung, Fri, 1434  Explains why it does not work  Object  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lena, Thu, 09:34  Question on how the ordering of PLMN in terms of priority  Ivo, Thu, 10.51  Not essential, request for a change  Sung, Thu, 23:11  Same as Ivo  Krisztian, Mon, 08:07  Explains why it is essential to Ivo and lena  Mariusz, Mon, 14.34  Question  Lena, Mon, 18:54  Something missing in the text  Sung, Mon, 19:55  Not agreeing with Krisztian  Krisztian, Mon, 00:05  Answering  Krisztian, Tue, 08:10  Rev  Ivo, Tue, 14:49  Comment still stand  JLB, Tue, 16:18  Commenting  Sung, tue, 20:21  There is an open question  Lena, Wed, 03:51  Requests rewording  Thu, wed, 0218  Defending  Sung, Thu, 0222  commenting  Krisztian, Thu, 2207  Commenting on this thread | |
|  |  | | C1-205306 | Corrections on the error check of QoS rules | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Cristina | CR 2509 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204923  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Mohamed, Thu, 11.19  Some editorials  Jj, Wed, 12:28  Comments  Cristna, Wed, 1400  Rev  Mohamed, Wed, 15:05  ok | |
|  |  | | C1-205313 | Mapped dedicated EPS bearer without default EPS bearer | | | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR 2481 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204807  Cristina, Thu, 0950  Ok  JJ, Thu, 1055  Supports the change, some changes, however, if it is too late, then to make these in Rel-17  Osama, Thu, 1649  Late comment, asks whether we can address this later  JJ, Thu, 1719  FINE  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Cristina, Thu, 10:58  CR not needed  Osama, Thu, 16:57  Defending  Cristina, Mon, 13:10  Why is this needed, asking for a scenario  Osams, Mon, 16:13  Commenting  Crisitna, tue, 06:21  Further commenting  Osama, Tue, 14:54  Does not understand the comment  Cristina, Wed, 04:56  Proposed change looks GOOD  Osama, Wed, 15:44  rev | |
|  |  | | C1-205284 | Removal of Editor’s Notes for URSP related capability indications | | | MediaTek Inc. / JJ | CR 0087 24.526 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204965  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lena, Thu, 09:11  ok to remove the Editor’s notes, but since we don’t agree to add UE capabilities as proposed in C1-204960, we would like the coversheet of this CR to be updated to say instead that UE capabilities are not needed  Joy, Tue, 15:42  Ok  JJ, Wed, 08:29  rev  Lena, Wed, 08.43  Ok | |
|  |  | | C1-205283 | Update of the timers table for 5GS session management | | | MediaTek Inc. / JJ | CR 2537 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204964  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 10.51  Incomplete  JJ, Thu, 19:34  Offers a way forward  Ivo, Fri, 09:17  Explains his preference  Jj, Wed, 09:38  Rev  Ivo, Wed, 13:38  Co-sign | |
|  |  | | C1-205480 | Mobility Registration for Inter-RAT movement | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Cristina | CR 2506 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205303  ---------------------------------------  Revision of C1-204919  Amer, Thu, 0530  Ok with first part, other parts not needed  Cristian, Thu, 0607  Explains  Amer, Thu, 0701  Commenting  Cristina, Thu, 0830  Suggest rewording  Amer, Thu, 0840  Fine with rewording  Kaj, Thu, 0845  Comment from him not considered  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Kaj, Thu, 10:21  No CN impact, request to use “different RAT”  Cristina, Thu, 10:47  Acks  Mohamed, Thu, 11:10  Some rephrasing  Cristina, Thu, 11:31  Explains to Mohamed  Mohemed, Thu, 11:45  Explains his request  Cristina, Thu, 11:53  Fine with Mohamed explanation  Amer, Thu, 22:07  Not needed  Cristian, Fri,02:21  Defending against Amer  Amer, Fri, 16:16  Not agreeing on the CR  Cristina, Mon, 04.33  Offers wording  Amer, Mon, 08:06  **Does NOT agree**  Cristian, Mon, 12.13  Ongoing  Amer, Tue, 09:40  Explaining, **No normative changes are needed**  Cristian, Tue, 11:22  Asking back  Amer, Wed, 07.44  **Not needed**  **Cristian, Wed, 10:11**  **ongoing** | |
|  |  | | C1-205491 | UE to always send Registration Complete at the end of Registration procedure | | | Apple | CR 0578 23.122 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-205395  Mariusz, Thu, 1057  Asks a question  Mariusz, Thu, 1633  Withdraws, new comment, NOT Clear  Ban, Thu, 1706  **I do not agree on the CR revision in C1-205491 for the reasons I explained earlier.**  **Krisztian, Thu, 1756**  **Asking back**  **Ban, Thu, 2001**  **Not convined**  **Mariusz, Fri, 0909**  **Cannot accept**  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-204995  Lena, Thu, 0625  Requests a change  Ban, Thu, 07:32  **Does not accept the CR**  **Krisztian, Thu, 0828**  **Explains**  **Ban, Thu, 0840**  **proposal**  Lena, Thu, 0908  Proposal from Ban does not work  Ban, Thu, 0940  Is concerned with the CR  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lena, Thu, 09:36  There is a problem in the spec, different solution needed  Ban, Thu, 10:45  Proposal how to change the spec  Ivo, Thu, 10:51  Proposal how to change  Krisztian, Wed, 09:13  Rev  Ban, Wed, 10:50  More concerns  Krisztian, Thu, 0231  explains | |
|  |  | | C1-205489 | Corrections to the QoS parameter checks for "unstructured" data and for QoS flow deletion | | | Apple | CR 2437 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204641  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 10:52  Changes needed  Osama, thu, 18:36  Changes for cl 6.4.1.3 case b)1) overlap with similar changes in Rel17 CR C1-204714.  Robert, Thu, 19:04  Offers rewording to Ivo  Robert, Thu. 19:22  Will aovid the overlap, wants to use existing wording  Mahmoud, Thu, 19:29  Asks whether this is Rel-16, or only Rel-17  Robert, Thu, 19:46  Argues his CR is FASMO  Mahmoud, Thu, 19:58  Error he detectected is the same as Robert’s, need to go to same release  Robert, Thu, 20:15  Apple cr corrects an error in the specification of the check, Samsung checks an error in NW implementation  Mahmoud, Thu, 20:44  Asks for clarification from Robert  Robert, Thu, 21:16  Explains  Mahmoud, Thu, 22:06  Asks for more input  Ivo, Fri, 08:44  Provides text  Robert, Fri, 09:42  Explains to Mahmoud  Robert, Fir, 10:16  Rev1  Mahmoud, Fri, 15:33  Comments  Ivo, Mon, 12:31  Fine, add ericsson  Mahmoud, Mon, 20:21  Does not accept this in Rel16, Rel-17 is fine, some overlaps with Samsung cr (4174) to be sorted out  Robert, Tue, 19:47  Explains  Mahmoud, Tue, 20:07  Questions  Robert, Wed, 09:50  Explains  Mahmoud, Thu, 0418  Requests a revision  Robert, Thu, 09:31  Will take on board | |
|  |  | | [C1-205405](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205101.zip) | Allowed NSSAI assignment based on default configured NSSAI | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 2572 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205101  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Kaj, Thu, 12:30  Changes seem not needed  Sung, Fri, 00:01  Current operation is ok, change not needed  Sunghoon, Fri, 09:43  Questions, and this is not FASMO  Lin, Fri, 11:22  Explains  Lin, Fri, 11.25  Seems to ack Sung, explains his view, but wording needs clarification  Lin, Fri, 11.37  Explaining to Sunghoon  Kaj, Fri, 14:45  Further comments and answer to Lin  Sung, Sat, 00:45  Comments  Sunghoon, Mon, 03:18  Same as Kaj  Mahmoud, Tue, 04:42  Support the CR, suggestions  Rae, Tue, 08:36  No issue in the spec, if then go to Rel-17  Lin, Tue, 09:32  New rev  Rae, Tue, 10:34  Comments  Sunghoon, Tue, 12.23  comments  Sung, Tue, 20:31  Comments  Lin, Wed, 11.18  Rev  Lin, Wed, 13.28  Correct the link for the rev  Sunghoon, Wed, 16:33  Cover sheet  Sung, Wed, 2039  All mapped S-NSSAI only apply when UE is romaing  Lin, Thu, 0329  Answers Sunghoon and Sung, with rev  Sung, Thu, 0452  Fine  Sunghoon, Thu, 0630  Fine  Kaj, Thu, 0850  fine | |
|  |  | | C1-205468 | Handling for SR in 5U2 state | | | MediaTek Inc. / Carlson | CR 2469 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204754  ----------------------------------------------------  Mohamed, Thu, 10:44  Ok, but needs small changes  Roozbeh, Thu, 11:22  Change for the cover page  Carlson, Mon, 12:20  Rev1  Mohamed, Mon, 12:42  Rev is ok  Roozbeh, Mon, 20:20  Comments  Carlson, Tue, 04:58  Rev  Roozbeh, Tue, 05:00  perfect | |
|  |  | | C1-205415 | Editor's Note resolution for SOR | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 0585 23.122 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205112  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lin, Sat, 04:03  New rev, to add DoCoMo | |
|  |  | | C1-205426 | No deleting 5G NAS security context when 5G-EA0 used and PLMN changed | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 2579 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205113  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Marko, Thu, 14:42  CR is not needed  Amer, Thu, 23:03  Does not agree with the CR  Lin, Mon, 01:00  Provides rev, now in Rel-17  Amer, Mon, 07:49  Not convinced by the rationale  Marko, Mon, 08:41  Same as Amer  Marko, Mon, 09:30  Can live with the rev  Mikael, Mon, 10.48  Can live with the CR for Rel-17  Amer, Mon, 10:22  Ok with the change, but cover page issues  Lin, Tue, 11:36  **Rev, this is now Rel-17**  **Amer, Wed, 07.59**  **OK**  **Marko, Wed, 08:50**  **CAT D, otherwise fine**  **Mikael, Wed, 09:50**  **Cat d, otherwise fine**  **Lin, Wed, 13:18**  **Rev, it is CAT D, link corrected**  **Marko, THU, 1020**  **perfect** | |
|  |  | | [C1-205467](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204753.zip) | Clarification for SR attempt count reset | | | MediaTek Inc. / Carlson | CR 2468 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204753  Osama, Thu, 1706  Fine  ------------------------------  Mohamed, Thu, 10:36  Agrees with the CR, some revision needed  Ivo, Thu, 10:52  Editorial  Behourz, Thu, 16:09  Is this needed at all?  Osama, Thu, 18:55  Timer expiry not correct, the other condition might by fine  Carlson, Mon, 13:12  Rev  Mohamed, Mon, 14:50  Commenting  Osama, Mon, 21:18  Commenting againg, comments not met  Carlson, Tue, 12:24  Provides a rev  Mohamed, Tue, 13:29  Latest rev looks fine | |
|  |  | | C1-205282 | Handing of QoS errors in ESM procedures | | | MediaTek Inc. / JJ | CR 2534 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204961  Osama, Fri, 0212  FINE  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Osama, Thu, 20:08  Not needed  Jj, Mon, 10:55  Answering  Osama, Mon, 21:40  More questions  JJ, Tue, 14:16  Answers  Osama, Tue, 17:49  Needs a draft rev to see the proposal from JJ  JJ, Wed, 11:00  rev  Osama, Thu, 0208  Still issues  JJ, Thu, 0510  Discussing  Osama, Thu, 0741  Commenting  JJ, thu, 0900  Rev | |
|  |  | | C1-205406 | Remove #43 in PDU session modification command not accepted by UE | | | OPPO / Rae | CR 2419 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204566  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Roozbeh, Thu, 11:21  Does not agree with the CR, not needed  Rae, Fri, 04:55  Defednding  Roozbeh, Fri, 18:07  Withdraws the comment  Lazaros, Wed, 2057  Comment  Rae, Thu, 0319  Provides a rev | |
|  |  | | C1-205504 | Provisioning of DNS server security information to the UE-25.401 | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 2483 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204853  Lin, Fri, 1054  Fine  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lena, Thu, 09:10  Fine, but editorial, hard space  Ivo, Thu, 10:52  information whether a feature is mandatory or optional should not be given in a NOTE but in a normative text  Roozbeh, Thu, 11.23  Hard space  Sung, Thu, 21:57  CR is not needed  Kundan, Tue, 08:26  Explains background of the Note  Lin, thu, 0750  Offers rewording  Sung, Thue, 0800  ok | |
|  |  | | C1-205508 | Provisioning of DNS server security information to the UE-24.301 | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 3419 24.301 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204854  Lin, Fri, 1055  Fine  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lena, Thu, 09:11  Fine with the CR, editorial hard space  Ivo, Thu, 10:52  information whether a feature is mandatory or optional should not be given in a NOTE but in a normative text  Roozbeh, Thu, 11:23  Hard space  Sung, Thu, 21:57  CR is not needed  Kundan, Tue, 08:26  Explains background of the Note  Lin, Thu, 0746  Offers rewording | |
|  |  | | C1-205530 | Clarification on Operator-defined access category definitions IE | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Cristina | CR 2584 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205278  This is Rel-17 only  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-205124  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Maoki, Thu, 10:02  Why to limit the number of ODAC def, operator may want to use more. **Does not agree with the solution**  Ivo, Thu, 10:50  **Not essential**  Cristia, Thu, 13:45  Responding to Maoki  Cristina, Thu, 13:58  Defending against Ivo  Maoki, Thu, 16:54  Explaining, requests something different  Ivo, Thu, 16:57  Asking for more clarification  Chen, Thu, 17:19  **Leave it to implementation, there is no service requirement**  Cristna, Fri, 05:27  Questions from Maoki, answering Ivo, Chen  Maoki, Fri, 11.11  doubt the need for this CR  Lena, Fri, 12:01  **No justification for the CR**  Cristina, Fri, 12:30  Defending  **Discussion no longer captured, so far no support, but 4 opposing companies**  Cristian, Mon, 10:26  Still ongoing  Ivo, Tue, 14:16  His comment is open  Cristina, Wed, 05:55  Rev  Ivo, Wed, 13:20  **Can live with it for REL\_17** | |
|  |  | | C1-205547 | Rejected NSSAI due to subscription | | | Huawei, HiSilicon, China Mobile/Lin | CR 2573 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205407  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-205103  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Kaj, Thu, 11:45  - Issue exists but not essential, hence Rel-17 - Cat C not correct, should be Cat F - Not a good protocol design with redundant information sent to UEs. Consider new UE capability.  Sung, Fri, 00:21  Should go to Rel-17, pls see DP in C1-204940  Sunghoon, Fri, 10.02  **Rel-17**  Lin, Fri, 11.55  Defending the Rel-16, will think a bit about theprotocol design  Lin, Fri, 15:00  Defending against Sunghoon  Sung, Fri, 23:33  **Explaining, not a FASMO**  Xu, Mon, 03:25  Explaining  Sunghoon, Mon, 04:05  Further discussion  Lin, Mon, 08:34  Ansering  Kaj, Mon, 09:12  Same as Sung, i.e. not FASMO  Lin, Mon, 10:28  **Rev, it is now Rel-17, 5GProtoc17**  **Sung, Tue, 21:08**  Asks for a timeout to have chance for review, to see the fate of 4568 first  Lin, Wed, 11.28  Wants to see technical reason for this to be postponed  Sung, Wed, 2013  No technical reason, wants to see 4568 first and then start Rel-17 discussion next meeting  Lin, Wed, 03:52  Wants to progress | |
|  |  | | C1-205545 | Correction the service request is sent not received | | | MediaTek Inc. / Marko | CR 2589 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205139  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Kaj, Thu, 11:22  the issue is that it should be SERVICE **REJECT** instead of SERVICE REQUEST.  Kaj, Thu, 1115  No answer since a week  Marko, Thu, 1130  Will provide a revison  Kaj, Thu, 1150  cosign | |
|  |  | | C1-205257 | Congestion handling of initial registration for emergency | | | Ericsson |  | Agreed  Revision of C1-204611  Is now 5GProtoc16  Previous discussion not captured, macro crash | |
|  |  | | C1-205300 | Handling of 5GSM procedures when fallback is triggered | | | LG Electronics / SangMin | CR 2505 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204918  Osama, Thu, 1739  FINE  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Mohamed, Thu, 11:09  Requests rephrsasig  Ivo, Thu, 13:06  Not essential, number of issues in the CR  Osama, Thu, 19:17  Number of comments  SangMin, Min, 10:42  Offers rewording to Osama, Mohamed, Ivo  Mohamed, Mon, 11:29  Mostly OK last change not  Osama, Mon, 20:13  Looks better, Is there a linkage to sa2 work  SangMin, Tue, 09:20  No CR in sa2, corresponding functionality provided by RAN  SangMin, Tue, 09:26  Offers some rewording to Mohamed  Mohamed, Tue, 09:44  Fine  Ivo, Tue, 22.20  comenting  sangmin, Thu 0630  rev  Osama, Thu, 0830  Suggestion  Sanming, thue, 0920  Ok  Ivo, Thu, 1132  Requests a change  Sangmin, thue, 1150  Rev  Ivo, thu, 1135  Fine  Mohamed, Thu, 1230  ok | |
|  |  | | C1-205562 | Integrity checking of Payload container IE | | | vivo | CR 2455 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-205271  Ban, Thu, 1606  Ok  Ivo,Fri, 1302  **NOT OK**  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-204728  Ban, Thu, 1026  Comment  Lufeng, Thu, 1400  New draft  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 10:52  Not essential, changes are needed  Sung, Thu, 20:55  No value in the CR  Lufeng, Fri, 04:34  Defending against Ivo and Sung  Ivo, Fri, 08:50  Still comments  Lufeng, Fri, 13:15  Explains  Sung, Fri, 23:02  Not essential, needs to go to Rel-17  Lefung, Sun, 01:05  Provides a rev, **Protoc17**  Ivo, Mon, 12:43  Same postion as Sung  Ivo, Mon, 12:50  Good way forward, cover page issues  Lufeng, Tue 10:41  Provides a rev, Rel-17  Ivo, Tue, 23:13  Co-sign  Lena, Wed, 03:16  Ok, still editorials  Lufen, Wed, 04:40  New rev  Lena, Wed, 05:07  Fine with the draft | |
|  |  | | C1-205537 | Fix of Table/Figure numbering issue | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 3240 24.008 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205153  Osama, THU, 1920  FINE  Lin, Fri, 1045  Fine  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Kaj, Thu, 11.24  Not needed  Osama, Thu, 20:37  Not needed  Lazaros, Fri, 17:17  It is minor correction, does not fight | |
|  |  | | [C1-205540](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205159.zip) | Encoding fix | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2597 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205540  Only Rel17  Lin, Fri, 1047  FIne  -------------------------------------  Lin, Mon, 08:17  Not FASMO, Rel-17, some suggestions | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 5Gprotoc16-non3GPP | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | Stage-3 5GS NAS protocol development related to non-3GPP access | |
|  |  | | [C1-205155](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205155.zip) | Remove editor's notes | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0150 24.502 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-205157](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205157.zip) | Corrections on 5G\_QOS\_INFO Notify payload encoding | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0152 24.502 Rel-16 | Agreed  Roozbeh, Thu, 11:20  Ok with CR; editorial  Lazaros, wed, 1400  Explains  Roozbeh, Wed, 16:06  fine | |
|  |  | | C1-205538 | Correction on handling of USE\_TRANSPORT\_MODE in CHILD\_SA | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0149 24.502 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205154  Rel-17 only  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 10:49  Not essential  Roozbeh, Thu, 11:20  CR OK, NOTE may not be needed  Lazaros, Fri, 17:14  Defending  Ivo, Tue, 20:50  This is not essential  Roozbeh, Wed, 05:50  Note not needed, rather got to Rel-17  Lazaros, Wed, 14:43  Ok to go to rel-17  Ivo,thu, 1107  Only rel17 | |
|  |  | | C1-205539 | Corrections on encodings and typos in 24502 | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0151 24.502 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205156  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Frederic, Thu, 09:39  Clauses affected missing | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | ATSSS | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects of Access Traffic Steering, Switch and Splitting support in 5G system  100% | |
|  |  | | [C1-204746](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204746.zip) | Correction on using radio connection user plane resources (lower layer indication or IKEv2 tunnel) by the UE as indication to MA PDU session user plane resources establishment | | | MediaTek Inc. / Carlson | CR 0002 24.193 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Based on request form author, thu, 14:59  Joy, Thu, 09:15  don't think the change is correct, condition is missing in 5.2.5 a) and 5.2.6 a) which should be corrected.  Roozbeh, Thu, 11:18  Might be valid, wants to see other companies positions | |
|  |  | | C1-205158 | Clarification on SM/MM coordination for MAPDUs | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2596 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-205176 | reactivation of user plane resource | | | Samsung Nordic | CR 0009 24.193 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-205205 | RFC for draft-ietf-tcpm-converters | | | Apple | CR 0008 24.193 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205082  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Joy, Thu, 09:15  editor's note below [9] should be removed. | |
|  |  | | C1-205263 | Correcting partial implementation of CR#2029 | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 2422 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204586  Joy, Wed, 05:10  FINE  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Joy, Thu, 09:13  Proposal for reformulation  Ivo, Thu, 13.20  Ok with Joy’s proposal, offers a rev | |
|  |  | | C1-205264 | "MA PDU request" when the 5G-RG performs inter-system change from S1 mode to N1 mode with an MA PDU session with a PDN connection as a user-plane resource | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 2424 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204588  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Joy, Thu, 09:12  CR is needed, but requires changes to iii.)  Roozbeh, Thu, 11:17  Requests change of wording  Ivo,Fri, 13:46  Rev1  Roozbeh,sat, 02:49  Fine  Lazaros, Mon, 01:08  Editorial  Ivo, Mon, 10:01  New rev  Joy, Tue, 03:05  OK with the rev | |
|  |  | | C1-205245 | PMFP messages transported over default QoS flow | | | ZTE / Joy | CR 0007 24.193 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205038  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Roozbeh, Thu, 11:20  Improve summary of change  Jyo, Fri, 05:11  Acks  Roozbeh, Fri, 15:15  FINE  Lazaros, fri, 17:14  Ok with intention, rewording  Joy, Fri, 18:12  Fine with the rewording | |
|  |  | | C1-205302 | Clarification on MAI for PMFP | | | ZTE / Joy | CR 0006 24.193 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204799  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lazaros, Mon, 08:37  Ok but rephrsing needed  Joy, Wed, 10:52  Comments almost fine | |
|  |  | | C1-205247 | ATSSS rule with steering functionality not supported by the UE | | | ZTE / Joy | CR 0005 24.193 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204798  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Sunghoon, Thu, 14:39  “if available” is missing  Joy, Fri, 04:13  Acks  Lazaros, Mon, 01:08  Rephrasing  Joy, Wed, 12:17  Offers some words | |
|  |  | | C1-205460 | Correction on the necessity of ATSSS Container IE | | | MediaTek Inc. / Carlson | CR 0001 24.193 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204745  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Joy, Thu, 09:15  Ok with intention, changes needed  Roozbeh, Thu, 11:18  CR is not needed  Carlson, Thu, 14:35  Defends the CR  Roozbeh, Thu, 23.09  Is there a plan for revision?  Carlson, Fri, 03:30  Will bring revision based on Joy’s reply  Joy, Fri, 03:37  Explains the need for changes  Carlson, Fri, 04:16  Provides rev1  Roozbeh, Fri, 18:05  Proposed rewording  Lazaros, Mon, 01:08  Supports the rev1, but changes needed  Roozbeh, Mon, 01:50  Challenging Lazaros’s proposal for rewording  Christian, Wed, 14:41  Co-sign  Joy, Thu, 1000  Fine | |
|  |  | | [C1-205461](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204747.zip) | Clarification on whether UP resources are established on 3GPP and non-3GPP accesses | | | MediaTek Inc. / Carlson | CR 0003 24.193 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204747  -------------------------------------------------  Joy, Thu, 09:13  CR should make the alignment in  5.2.5 a) and 5.2.6 a) with the condition description in bullet a) of 5.2.1.  Roozbeh, Thu, 11:18  Some of these CRs could have been merged, does not have a strict opinion  Carlson, Thu, 14:59  Provides rev1  Roozbeh, Thu, 22:00  OK  Joy, Fri, 04:31  Fine, update cover page  Lazaros, Mon, 01:08  Rewording  Carlson, Mon, 05:29  Rev1  Joy, Wed, 05:20  Fine, cover page issue  Carlson, Wed, 07:54  rev | |
|  |  | | C1-205462 | Clarification on the applicability of Allowed PDU session status IE to MA PDU | | | MediaTek Inc. / Carlson | CR 2464 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204748  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Joy, Thu, 09:13  Agree with reasone, requests changes  Mikael, Thu, 10:18  Tick CN on cover sheet  Roozbeh, Thu, 11:18  Sounds more 5GProtoc16 WID CR  Sunghoon, Thu, 14:17  Same as Joy, with some proposal  Carlson, Fri, 04:16  Provides rev1  Joy, Fri, 04:42  Fine with the revision  Mikael, Fri, 13:58  Fine  Sunghoon, Mon, 15:32  Fine  Carlson, Wed, 07:54  rev  Roozbe, 2150  fine | |
|  |  | | C1-205463 | Correction on unnecessary restriction for modifying/upgrading a PDU session to an MA PDU session | | | MediaTek Inc. / Carlson | CR 2465 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204749  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Roozbeh, Thu, 11:19  First change reverted, second ok  Sunghoon, Thu, 14:28  First change needs to be reverted,  Carlson, Fri, 05:00  Provides rev1  Roozbeh, Fri, 18:09  Fine  Sunghoon, Mon, 15:34  agrees | |
|  |  | | C1-205465 | Correction on PDU session status IE handling for MA PDU sessions | | | MediaTek Inc. / Carlson | CR 2466 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204751  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Roozbeh, Thu, 11:20  This is 5GProtoc16 and not ATSSS  I don’t think Table 9.11.3.44.1 needs to be modified.  Many text seems to be able to be generalized for the MA PDU session and SA PDU session.  Sunghoon, Thu, 14:31  IMO proposed change requires stage-2 work first, as it seems not only a protocol issue.  Carlson, Mon, 09:07  Provides a rev  Roozbeh, Mon, 19:56  Comments on the rev  Carlson, Wed, 07:54  rev  Roozbeh, Wed, 15:57  happy | |
|  |  | | C1-205466 | local release of an MA PDU session having user plane resources established on both 3GPP access and non-3GPP access | | | MediaTek Inc. / Carlson | CR 2467 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204752  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Joy, Thu, 09:15  Handling of SA PDU session is missing  Roozbeh, Thu, 11:20  But this is not ATSSS but 5GProtoc16 CR.  Sunghoon, Thu, 14:34  Requests changes, should be 5GProtoc16  Carlson, Mon, 09:07  Provides a rev  Joy, Mon, 10:42  More comments  Carlson, Mon, 11:20  Rev  Lazaros, Mon, 12:30  More comments  Carlson, Mon, 13:58  New rev  Roozbeh, Mon, 20:03, 20.15, 20:24  Comments on the rev  Roozbeh, Tue, 23:15  Typo  Carlson, Wed, 07:54  rev  Lazaros, Wed, 14:41  Agrees  Joy, Wed, 15:20  Fine  Roozbeh, Wed, 15:57  happy | |
|  |  | | C1-205464 | Handling of MA PDU session after an inter-system change from N1 mode to S1 mode | | | MediaTek Inc. / Carlson | CR 0004 24.193 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204750  Joy, Fri, 0359  FINE  Lazaros, Fri, 1051  Can accept  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Joy, Thu, 09:15  I don't think the change of this CR is correct.  Mikael, Thu, 10:08  Same as Joy  Roozbeh, Thu, 11:19  Requests changes  Sunghoon, Thu, 14:17  Same as Mikael and Joy  Carlson, Fri, 06:05  Provides rev1  Sunghoon, Tue, 13.50  Fine with the rev  Roozbeh, Wed, 05:30  Minor comment  Carlson, Wed, 05:32  Answering  Roozbeh, Wed, 06:48, 07:03  Changes needed, proosals  Carlson, Wed, 07:54  rev  Joy, Wed, 08:11  Comments  Carlson, Wed, 08:37  Discussing  Joy, Wed, 1915  Different proposal  Roozbeh, wed 2120  Suggestion  Joy, thu, 0559  Proposal  Roozbeh, Thu, 0645  Comenting  Discussion ongoing, no longer captured | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | eNS | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects on enhancement of network slicing  WT#1 "How to handle PDU session establishment request with no S-NSSAI when subscribed S-NSSAIs marked as default are subject to NSSAA."  - C1-204612 from Ericsson fixes this WT.  - However, Samsung comments on how to fill in the allowed NSSAI with default subscribed S-NSSAI.  - CR of C1-205180 from Ericsson is proposed to fix the comments (discussion paper C1-205162 from Samsung is also re  Samsung: problems, open questions, 5180 would address the problems in general.  ZTE: supports 4612, it is inline with SA2 conclusion, not so much support for 5180  Nokia: supports the CR 4612, 5180 against it  Motorola: supports 4612, 5180 NOT  Oppo: can accept 4612, issue with 5180 (has some issue)  Vivo: can accept 4612, no position on 5180  Huawei: in principle fine 4612, problems 5180  QCOM: 4612 can be accepted, cannot accept 5180  Mahmoud: still has concerns.  WT#2 "Outstanding work on excluding the S-NSSAI(s) in the pending NSSAI during the registration procedure."  -C1-204770 from ZTE and InterDigital,  -C1-205033 from Sharp  -C1-205091 from Ericsson  -C1-204770 has beed discussed in CC. During the discussion in the CC, a disc was expected.  Thus a disc of C1-204771 from ZTE is provided to clarify the scenarios. C1-205033 and C1-205091 modify the spec in the similar way.  Huawei: avoid unneccesary restriction on UE behaviour (4770), NW side not complete in 4770, provides detailed discussion. No problem with Ericsson CR  QCOM: same as Huawei, unhappy with restriction on UE  Vivo: same as Huwei, NW behaviour needs modification  Ericsson: asks that comments/details are made via email  Nokia: not sure what is wrong with UE behaviour, NW behaviour can be improved  Samsung: same as QCOM, Huawei, one CR to go forward  Motorola: some problem with UE  Way Forward: NW behaviour can be extended, UE behaviour requires more discussion 4770.  Sharp and Ericsson should be merged.  WT#3  To determine outstanding work for the support of NSSAA in mobility cases across VPLMNs and complete it if need is identified."  C1-205035 from Samsung fixes this WT and has been discussed in CC. Also a disc of C1-205066 from Samsung is provided to discuss more roaming cases.  Ericsson: **concern** remains as in previous meetings. This is not needed  Huawei: supports the solution, should be covered  Vivo: supports in principle  Nokia: **concern** on reNSSAA being mandated  Further discussion via the list to see whether here is a way forward. However,  Samsung: this is not reinitiation, explains that a change is needed.  C1-204769 from ZTE and C1-205092 from Ericsson remove the same EN. | |
|  |  | | [C1-204768](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204768.zip) | Work Plan for eNS in CT1 | | | ZTE Corporation | Work Plan | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-204529](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204529.zip) | Clarification on the S-NSSAI(s) included in a pending NSSAI | | | ZTE / Hannah | CR 2407 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Request from author, Mon, 03:37  Rev counter incorrect  Mahmoud, Thu, 20:37  CR not acceptable  Hannah, Fri, 04:07  Defending  Lin, Fri, 06:05  Current text cannot be removed, same as Mahmoud  Mahmoud, Fri, 16:28  Does not agree with the CR | |
|  |  | | [C1-204718](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204718.zip) | Discussion paper on consideration of NSSAIs for NSSAA not supported UE in roaming scenarios | | | China Mobile | discussion Rel-16 | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-204719](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204719.zip) | Updating the requirements of Rejected NSSAI for UE not supporting NSSAA in roaming scenarios | | | China Mobile, Huawei, HiSilicon, ZTE | CR 2449 24.501 Rel-16 | Posptoned  Based on request from Xu, thu 0737, can live with Oppo CR  Yanchao, Thu, 11:45  Basially prefer type 3 in DP C1-204718 as way forward, one comment on the content  Xu, Thu, 17:49  Defending  Lin, Fri, 05:56  Prefers type 2 reject NSSAI  Kaj, Fri, 06:46  Not backward comp to Rel-15, requires a New IE und UE capability, go to Rel-17  Rae, Fri, 11:09  Has a backward comp issue, problems, 4568 is better, 5103 acceptable  Xu, Fri, 19:28  Explaining to Kaj  Xu, Fri, 06:58  Provides a rev  Sung, Mon, 22:52  Between this CR and C1-204568, **we prefer C1-204568.**  Xu, Tue, 13:01  Expalinst to Sung  Lin, Tue, 17:10  Explains  Sung, Tue, 21:35  **Commenting, prefers the 4568**  Lin, thu, 0448  Not so happy with 4568 | |
|  |  | | [C1-204720](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204720.zip) | The requirements of Rejected NSSAI for unknown cause value | | | China Mobile,ZTE, Huawei, HiSilicon | CR 2450 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Requested by author  Roozbeh, Thu, 11:11  Change “reserved” to “spare”, why is this not part of 4719  Kaj, Fri, 06:54  **This is NBC to Rel-15,** . If Rel-15 UE receives legacy values and the new value the rejected NSSAI IE will be discarded.  Xu, Sat, 03:43  Explaining to Roozbeh  Xu, Sat, 04:20  Explains to Kaj  Roozbeh, Sat, 04:47  No comments about the wording, highlights that Rel-15 UE will ignore some rejected S-NSSAI  Sung, Mon, 23:34  **Harmful, breaks protocol principle**  Roozbeh, Tue, 06:36  **Some concerns with the new wording**  **Lin, Tue, 17:15**  **Asking form Sung**  **Sung, Tue, 22:18**  Answering Lin | |
|  |  | | [C1-204770](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204770.zip) | Excluding the S-NSSAI(s) in the pending NSSAI during the registration procedure | | | ZTE Corporation, InterDigital | CR 2475 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  WT#2, C1-204770, C1-205033 C1-205091 all on WT#2, related disc in C1-204771  Yanchao, Thu, 11:54  *Issue with how UE would know auth is completed, further comment*  Shuang, Thu, 13:13  Explaining to yanchao why it works  Shuang, Thu, 13:33  Acks to ynachao that a rev is needed to address her second comment  Kaj, Thu, 14:57  *Number of things that need to be changed to avoid overlap*  Roozbeh, Thu, 15:52  Some detailed commetns  Lin, Fri, 05:25  *Detailed comments*  Atle, Fri, 15:20  Offers rewording to Kaj  Atle, Fri, 16:16  The scenarios from Lin are not inline with stage-2  Shuang, Fri, 20:36  Responding to Kaj, Roozbeh, Atle  Shuang, Fri, 21:01  Provides a rev  Roozbeh, Fri, 21:16  Further coments  Shuang, Fri, 21:20  Answers and provides a REV  Mahmoud, Fri, 23:44  *Detailed comments*  Roozbeh, Sat, 01:45  Ok, but there is mandatory text in a NOTE  Atle, Sat, 02:38  Explaining why the CR is inline with SA2 and that other scenario is a signalling failure/abnormal case  Shuang, Mon, 03:12  Explains to Roozbeh,  Roozbeh, Mon, 03:54  Discussing on text for the NOTE  Kaj, Mon, 10:15  Some of the changes of the rev are not acceptable  Shuang, Mon, 11.19  Is inline with Kaj  Kaj, Mon ,11:51  Ongoing discussion  Mahmoud, Mon, 14:46  Not agreeing with Atle  **ONGOING DISC no longer captured**  **Mahmoud, Wed, 04:47**  **Provides a rev that reflects his view** | |
|  |  | | [C1-204771](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204771.zip) | Discussion on user cases that the UE changes the slice(s) it is currently registered to | | | ZTE Corporation | discussion | Noted  Yanchao, Thu, 12:02  don’t agree with step 5 for use case:  Lin, Fri, 05:27  Comments  Shuang, Fri, 21:01  Provides a rev  Mahmoud, Fri, 22:49  Detailed explanation of how the way forward should look like | |
|  |  | | [C1-204860](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204860.zip) | Clarification On Allowed NSSAI(s) in Configuration Update Command Procedure | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 2485 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Reqeuested by author  Frederic, Thu, 09:27  Cover page problem **with** extra space  Hannah, Thu, 10:15  Several typos  Kaj, Fri, 06:55  **Not needed**  Sung, Tue, 00:46  **CR not needed**  Kundan, Wed, 12:56  Defending  Kundan, Wed, 14:05  Rev  Kaj, Wed, 17:10  Unclear, prefer to not update 5.4.4.2 | |
|  |  | | [C1-204861](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204861.zip) | Allowed NSSAI with all slice subject to NSSAAA and mobility to EPS | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 2486 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Hannah, Thu, 10:15  one typo  Kundan, Thu, 13:09  Acks Hannah  Kaj, Fri, 07:35  Fine with the intension, requests changes  Lin, Fri, 09:02  Change is confusing  Sung, Fri, 22:49  Aligned with Kaj  Amer, Mon, 08:15  There is no UE impact | |
|  |  | | [C1-204908](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204908.zip) | Network slice-specific EAP result in case of no response by AAA-S | | | LG Electronics / Sunhee Kim | CR 2500 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Requested by author  Discussion taken out | |
|  |  | | [C1-204943](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204943.zip) | Corrections in allowed NSSAI and pending NSSAI handling upon receipt of rejected NSSAI | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2522 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Rae, Thu, 11:27  Proposed different approach  Mahmoud, Sat, 00:13  Comments  Sung, Tue, 01:46  explains | |
|  |  | | [C1-204944](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204944.zip) | Clarification in the term “S-NSSAI for which the NSSAA procedure will be performed or is ongoing” | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2523 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Roozbeh, Thu, 11.12  NOTE should not be numbered  Yanchao, Thu, 12:21  Challenging the need for the CR  Lin, Fri, 09:12  CR is not needed  Kaj, Fri, 11:52  Sympathy for the CR  Sung, Sat, 01:13  Explaining  Mahmoud, Mon, 17:39  **Not needed**  Sung, Tue, 01:30  Explaining  Lin, Wed, 04:21  Not agreeing with Sung  Sung, Wed, 04:40  Hints at 3260, reactive solution  Mahmoud, Wed, 05:16  Commenting, still concerns  Sung, Wed, 05:37  Asking back  Mahmoud, Wed, 05:47  Commenting, still concerns  Sung, Wed, 06:04  Commenting  Kaj, Wed, 11:57  Intention of the CR is good  Sung, Wed, 2330  Commenting  Lin, Wed, 1026  Not clear  Kaj, Thu, 1038  Clarifying  Lin, Fri, 1009  Cannot fly  Sung, Fri, 1223  Asking back from Lin  **Lin, Fri, 1521**  **FINE** | |
|  |  | | [C1-204945](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204945.zip) | Clarification on HPLMN S-NSSAI | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2524 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Rae, Thu, 11:21  pending NSSAI should be removed from the change  Kaj, Thu, 14:29  Same as Rae  Sung, Tue, 01:34  Question  Kaj, Fri, 0931  Some late reply | |
|  |  | | [C1-205001](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205001.zip) | Collision between CUC procedure (due to UDM change of slicing information) and ongoing NSSAA | | | Samsung Guangzhou Mobile R&D | CR 2543 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Roozbeh, Thu, 11.12  Does not see this is abnormal case, but can accept it  Kaj, Fri, 07:32  On CN side thisis not a collision, as NW sends both command messages  Shuang, Fri, 09:37  Requests a change  Mahmoud, Fri, 16:01  Asking for comments form Kaj  Mahmoud, Fri, 16:06  Answering Shuang and Roozbeh  Shuang, Fri, 21:14  Does not agree with Mahmoud  Kaj, Mon, 09:03  still don’t see the abnormal case on NW side as relevant  Mahmoud, Mon, 17:56  Asking back from Kaj  Mahmoud, Mon, 18:00  To Shuang  Sung, Tue, 02:07  Not agreeing with Mahmoud  Mahmoud, Tue, 04:24  Asking for an example from Sung  Kaj, Tue, 16:41  There is no issue for NAS  Sung, Wed, 00:40  Provides the example  Mahmoud, Wed, 03:44  Not agrreing with the comments from Sung  Sung, Wed, 05:03  Discussing  Mahmoud, Wed, 05:23  Discussing with Sung  Sung, Thu, 0039  Answering Mahmoud | |
|  |  | | [C1-205022](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205022.zip) | Sending of NSSAA Complete message when UE does not yet have allowed NSSAI | | | Apple | CR 2549 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Frederic, Thu, 09:38  Clauses affected missing  Roozbeh, Thu, 11.14  proposed method allows the UE to break the protocol with an unrelated NAS message  Yanchao, Thu, 13:01  first and the second change are not needed  Vijay, Fri, 00:29  Explains to Roozbeh  Lin, Fri, 09:23  **Sholuld be merged with 5018**  Roozbeh, Fri, 17:39  Asking for the use case  Vijay, Sat, 04:59  Explains  Vijay, Mon, 01:49  Rev1  Roozbeh, Mon, 21:45  More comments  Sung, Tue, 02.11  **Same as Lin**  Vijay, Tue, 05:18  Provides a rev  Vijay, Tue, 20:20  Explains  Roozbeh, Wed, 00:30  Commenting  Vijay, Wed, 01:29  Commenting  Lin, Wed, 04:37  This is broken, can NOT go forward  Vija, Wed, 05:26  Asking back  Vijay, Wed, 1910  Defending  Sung, Thu, 0143  Does not agree with Vijay  Lin, Thu, 1044  Answers to vijay | |
|  |  | | [C1-205029](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205029.zip) | Clarification of conditions which the rejected NSSAI for the failed or revoked NSSAA is deleted | | | SHARP | CR 2555 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Hannah, Mon, 10:03  Comment  Izumi, Tue, 08:01  Explains to Hannah  Hannah, Wed, 04:18  FINE | |
|  |  | | [C1-205030](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205030.zip) | AMF to trigger Configuration Update Command Procedure indicating pending NSSAI | | | Apple | CR 2556 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Roozbeh, Thu, 11.15  Both use cases are assuming that the AMF cannot know the UE's RRC state which is not correct.  Rae, Thu, 11.50  Commenting  Shuang, Thu, 12:54  **Proposal how this is to be changed**  Krisztian, Fri, 05:40  Explains to rae, Shuang, roozbeh  Kaj, Fri, 07.30  Understands the CR, but there are issue in the CR  Lin, Fri, 09:40  Same a previous commenters, **there are issues**  Rae, Fri, 11:27  No issue on UE side  Roozbeh, Fri, 15:30  Already covered in the spec  Krisztian, Sat, 08:05  Explaining to Rae and Roozbeh, Kaj, Lin  Kaj, Mon, 09:15,  **Not agreeing**  Roozbeh, Mon, 21:06  Comments  Krisztian ,Tue, 03:05  Explains to Kaj  Rae, Tue, 03:50  Questions  Kaj, Tue, 08:08  Sees some of the explanations, do we need to send an LS  Krisztian, Tue, 22:18  Explains  Roozbeh, Wed, 00:30  Ok to send an LS, **no need for the C**R  Lin, Wed, 04:51  Not agreeing with Kaj  Kaj, Wed, 14:50  Asking back from Lin  Lin, THU, 1100  Answering Kaj  Kaj, Thu, 1106  Acks Lin | |
|  |  | | [C1-205033](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205033.zip) | Clarification on UE behavior when the UE store the pending NSSAI | | | SHARP | CR 2558 24.501 Rel-16 | Merged into 4770 and its revisions  Requested by author, fri, 08:04  WT#2, C1-204770, C1-205033 C1-205091 all on WT#2, related disc in C1-204771  Shuang, Thu, 13:42  Could be merged with 5091  Kaj, Thu, 14:58  Overlap with 5091, some issues | |
|  |  | | [C1-205064](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205064.zip) | Reactivation of previously rejected S-NSSAI due to NSSAA failure | | | Apple | CR 2245 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-204096  Hannah, Thu, 10:11  Agrees, but a questions  Roozbeh, Thu, 11:07  Does this need SA2 first?  Roozbeh, Fri, 01:20  CR has dependency on SA2 CRs listed on cover sheet  Kaj, Fri, 07:15  **Breaks basic slicing principles**  Krisztian, Fri, 08:29  Explains to Hannah, highlighting the SA2 dependancy  Krisztian, Fri, 08:29  To Kaj, explaining why, that it is aligned with SA2 and it may require some rewording  Cristina, Wed, 14:47  **Wait for SA2 decision (S2-2005398) i.e. wait until next meeting,** | |
|  |  | | [C1-205066](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205066.zip) | Further discussions on NSSAA for roaming UEs | | | Samsung Guangzhou Mobile R&D | discussion | Noted  WT#3, related CR in C1-205035  Kaj, Mon, 09:08  Negative, does not agree | |
|  |  | | [C1-205092](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205092.zip) | NSSAI storage update during re-NSSAA | | | Ericsson /kaj | CR 2567 24.501 Rel-16 | merged into a revision of C1-204769  C1-204769 and C1-205092 remove the same EN  Roozbeh, Thu, 11:16  Should be merged with 4769  Kaj, Thu, 11:28  Agrees that this can be merged with 4769 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205094](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205094.zip) | PDU session establishment request attempt during ongoing re-NSSAA procedure | | | Ericsson /kaj | CR 2569 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Requested by author  Roozbeh, Thu, 11.16  Suggests modification  Kaj, Thu, 11:31  Explains, will consider to use Note’s  Mahmoud, Thu, 20:55  Too limiting, there is no requirement  Roozbeh, Thu 21:07  Fine with going with a Note  Lin, Fri,06:14  Ok in principle, requess changes  Kaj, Fri, 14:19  Will provide a rev  Mahmoud, Fri, 16:22  Not acceptable  Kaj, Mon, 09:10  Asking back from Mahmoud  Mahmoud, Wed, 05:10  Issue with limiting this to “re-“ NSSAA  Kaj, Wed, 08:37  Asking back | |
|  |  | | [C1-205162](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205162.zip) | Discussion on S-NSSAI selection during PDU session establishment & its relation to NSSAA | | | Samsung Guangzhou Mobile R&D | discussion | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-205180](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205180.zip) | Request for default subscribed S-NSSAI | | | Ericsson /kaj | CR 2571 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Requested by author  WT#1, related CR in C1-204612, related Disc in C1-205162  Revision of C1-205097  Hannah, Thu, 10:06  How does a UE know that if one S-NSSAI is a default subscribed S-NSSAI?  Roozbeh, Thu, 11.16  Editorials  Not sure about the extra effort, requires SA2 discusison  Kaj, Thu, 11:17  Explains to Hannah  Rae, Thu, 12:08  Does not agree with the new indication, different proposal  Kaj, Thu, 14:24  defending  Kaj, Thu, 14:49  Takes some of Roozbeh’s coments on board  Roozbeh, Fri, 00:46  Wants to know whether this goes forward  Hannah, Fri, 03:04  Details the question  Rae, Fri, 09:41  Questions  Lin, Fri, 10:03  **Does not see the problem**  Kaj, Fri, 14:00  Explains  Sung, Mon, 23:10  **CR is not needed**  Mahmoud, Tue, 14:50  **Comments**  **Kaj, Wed, 10:01**  **Discussing with Mahmoud** | |
|  |  | | C1-205210 | NSSAA for UEs that roam across 5GS VPLMNs | | | Samsung Guangzhou Mobile R&D | CR 2559 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-205035  Sung, Thu, 0855  Requires revision  Sung, Thu, 1805  Problematic scenario  Mahmoud, Thu, 2130  Does not agree  Kaj, Thu, 2319  Agrees with Sung, there is an issue  Mahmoud, Thu, 2322  Asking back  Lin, Fri, 1036  Similar as Mahmoud  Kaj, Fri, 1101  Explains his position  Lin, Fri, 1117  Support the Cr  Sung, Fri, 1318  **Object with rationale**  Mahmoud, Fri 1520  Asking from Sung for info  Sung, Fri, 1522  Answering Mahmoud  Mahmoud, Fri, 1524  Answering  Mahmoud, Fri, 1531  Ansering Atle  Kaj, Fri, 1545  Answering  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  WT#3, related Disc in C1-205066  Roozbhe, Thu, 11.15  Editorials  Yanchao, Thu, 13:09  Requests changes  Mahmoud, Fri, 21:59  Provides a revisions, taking Roobzeh and Yanchao’s comments on board  Roozbeh, Sat, 00:20  Fine with the changes, question for clarification  Sung, Mon, 03.45  Changes are requested  Kaj, Mon, 09.08  In an email on 5066 -> Cr is not needed  Mahmoud, Mon, 14:43  Explains to Roozbeh  Mahmoud, Mon, 15:06  Asking Sung  Shuang, Mon, 19:35  Providing her view  Sung, Tue, 02:52  Comments  Mahmoud, Tue, 04:38  Asking back from Sung  Kaj, Tue, 13:54  Comments  Mahmoud, Tue, 14.33  Comments  Lin, Tue, 16:35  Explains  Kaj, Tue, 17:41  Explains that his concern i.e. “NSSAI cannot be in both allowed NSSAI and pending NSSAI at the same time”  Mahmoud, Tue, 18:10  Explains  Atle, Tue, 23:37  Comments  Sung, Wed, 03:10  Comments  Mahmoud, Wed, 05:07  Answering  Atle, Wed, 11.25  Commenting Mahmoud  Kaj, Wed, 11:45  Not agreeing with Mahmoud  Mahmoud, Wed, 17:14  Discussing  Sung, Wed, 2246  Provides a rev that reflects his position  Mahmoud, Wed. 0016  Explains to Atle  Atle, Thu, 0107  Fine with the latest rev | |
|  |  | | C1-205286 | Clairification of Rejected NSSAI | | | vivo | CR 2470 24.501 Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204763  -----------------------------------------------  Hannah, Thu, 10:14  Acks the reasons for change, Asking whether the change should be modified  Yanchao, Fri, 06:07  Rev1  Hannah, Mon, 08:13  Ok with the revision  Kaj, Mon, 11:10  This is a redundant requirement  Yanchao, Tue, 05:17  Explains why it is needed  Kaj, Tue, 11.11  Different proposal  Yanchao, Tue, 12:57  Offers a proposal  Kaj, Tue, 14:30  fine | |
|  |  | | C1-205385 | Rejection of PDU session establishment associated with an S-NSSAI for which NSSAA is re-initiated | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2521 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204942  Lin, Fri,  FINE  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Roozbeh, Thu, 11.12  Comments  Kaj, Fri, 07:34  Fine with the intension, collideses with 5094, can take out the overlaps from 5094  Lin, Fri, 09:08  Ok in principle, changes needed  Mahmoud, Fri, 23:59  Rewording needed  Sung, Sat, 02:08  Provides rev  Mahmoud, Mon, 14:47  Commenting  Sung, Tue, 01:28  Rev  Roozbeh, Wed.00:05  Fine  Lin, wed, 04:13  Almost fine  Kaj, Wed, 14:09  Comments not considered  Mahmoud, Wed, 2135  Explains his comment  Kaj, Wed, 2305  Provides his view, which is differen | |
|  |  | | C1-205393 | Retransmit NSSAA complete after registration procedure is complete | | | Apple | CR 2554 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-205390  Lin, Fri, 1029  CANNOT ACCEPT  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-205028  Sung, thu, 0153  Still has an issue  Sung, Thu, 0237, 0900  Don’t see the need  Lin, Thu, 1050  Has on issue  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Roozbeh, Thu, 11.15  intent of the CR is not clear  Rae, Thu, 11:40  Asks for some clarification  Yanchao, Thu, 13:02  IT doesn’t make sense to re-send NETWORK SLICE-SPECIFIC AUTHENTICATION COMPLETE message after NSSAA has been aborted  Krisztian, Fri, 03:42  Explains  Roozbeh, Fri, 05:05  Fine with the explanation  Lin, Fri, 09:29  Changes is not needed  Yanchao, Fri, 11.35  Does not agree with Krisztian explanation  Krisztian, Mon, 01:27  Eplains to Lin, yanchao,  Rae, Mon, 04:50  Very little benefit  Krisztian, Tue, 09:03  Explains to Rae  Sung, Wed, 02:13  Comments, no need for UE action  Lin, Wed, 04:44  Same as Sung, this breaks NAs | |
|  |  | | [C1-205396](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204525.zip) | Clarification on the condition when the allowed NSSAI IE shall be included in the REGISTRATION ACCEPT message | | | ZTE / Hannah | CR 2403 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204525  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Frederic, Thu, 12:13  Revision count is incorrect  Mahmoud, Thu, 20:26  Original text is good enough, if the cr would go forward, changes are required  Hannah, Fri, 03:45  Explains  Lin, Fri, 06:17  Untick ME, rev counter  Kaj, Fri, 08:09  Unwanted consequence  Mahmound, Fri, 16:14  Existing text is good enough  Hannah, Mon, 03:16  Discussing  Hannan, Mon, 03:21  Answering Kaj  Hannah, Wed, 09:18  Rev  Kaj, Wed, 13:45  ok with the rev  Mahmouder, Wed, 2130  fine | |
|  |  | | C1-205397 | Consistency of the term on rejected NSSAI for the failed or revoked NSSAA | | | ZTE / Hannah | CR 2405 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204527  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Rev counter incorrect  Lin, Fri, 06:19  Some changes needed, rev counter  Hannah, Mon, 02:37  Acks Lin  Kaj, Mon, 09:04  don't agree with the proposal, that Requested mapped NSSAI IE is pointless in this case, further comments  Lin, Wed, 03:50  Fine with the content | |
|  |  | | C1-205398 | Correction to clarify S-NSSAI(s) in allowed NSSAI doesn’t require NSSAA | | | ZTE / Hannah | CR 2409 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204531  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Rev counter incorrect  Lin, Fri, 06:17  Untick ME, rev counter | |
|  |  | | C1-205399 | Additional trigger for mobility registration based on timeout of NSSAA | | | Apple | CR 2548 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-205018  Lin, Fri, 1024  Still questions  Sung, Fri, 1305  Object, with rationale  Roozbeh, Fri, 1518  postponed  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Sunhee, Thu, 09:41  are OK for the intention of this CR, but I have some question on this CR.  Roozbeh, Thu, 11:13  Requests changes  Yanchao, Thu, 12:30  Number of questions on the CR  Krisztian, Fri, 05:57  explaining  Lin, Fri, 09:21  Same change was not agreed in the last meeting, should go to abnormal case  Roozbeh, Fri, 18:19  More comments  Krisztian, Mon, 01:27  Explains to Roozbeh, Lin  Sung, wed, 01.50  Issues with the paper  Lin, Wed, 04:29  This is abnormal case  Krisztian, Thu, 0344  explains | |
|  |  | | C1-205440 | Disabling of N1 capabilities when all requested S-NSSAIs subjected to NSSAA are rejected due to failure of NSSAA or when no slice is available for UE | | | Apple, Samsung | CR 2244 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205379  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-205067  Sung, Thu, 0207  New comment  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-204125  Roozbeh, Thu, 11:16  OK with may to shall  Not clear about the rest  Rae, Thu, 11:58  Seems to need to disable N1 mode  Amer, Thu, 23:12  First change is not acceptable  Krisztian, Fri, 02:36  Explains to Roozbeh and Rae  Kaj, Fri, 07:01  First change not correct, other changes need improvement  Roozbeh, Fri, 17:44  No need for the second change  Krisztian, Mon, 04:41  Explains to Roozbeh  Kristzian, Mon, 08:18  Rev1  Amer, Mon, 09:11  Fine  Kaj, Mon, 09:35  Not all comments are addressed  Krisztian, Tue, 02:01  New rev  Sung, Tue, 03:09  Commenting  Roozbeh, Tue, 06:59  Fine  Krisztian, Tue, 08:38  Asking Sung whether he is commenting in the right thread  Kaj, Tue, 10:48  Fine  Sung, Wed, 03:20  His comment is on this thread | |
|  |  | | [C1-205359](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204737.zip) | NSSAA during PDU session modification procedure | | | Samsung | CR 2462 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204737  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Roozbeh, Thu, 11.11  re-NSSAA can happen independent on the NAS SM procedures.  Mahmoud, thu, 15:41  Needs clarification from Roozbeh  Roozbeh, Fri, 05:51  Withdraws his objection  Kaj, Fri, 07:00  Does not agree with the conclusion  Roozbeh, Fri, 15:40  Puts in his objection  Mahmoud, Fri, 16:18  Explains to Kaj  Sung, Mon, 23:47  Commenting  Mahmoud, Tue, 00:02  Answering Sung  Sung, Tue, 00:39  Commenting  Mahmoud, Tue, 04:19  Asking back form sung  Kaj, Tue, 11:22  Asking for rationale  Mahmoud, Tue, 13:55  Explains  Kaj, Tue, 14:33  Commenting  Mahmoud, Tue, 14:33  Answering  Kaj, Tue, 17:13  Not agreeing  Mahmoud, Tue, 17:18  Not agreeing with Kaj  Sung, Tue, 22:55  Provides an analysis  Sung and Mahmoud discussing a way forward  Vishnu, Wed, 09:29  **Supports** the CR  Sung, Wed, 16:11  Can live with this  Kaj, Wed, 17:02  Is there a draft available  Shuang, Wed, 18:03  **Support** the CR  Mahmoud, Wed, 20:16  Rev that updates the cover sheet  Sung, Wed, 21:00  OK with the Cr | |
|  |  | | C1-205482 | Correction on UE behavior for the rejected NSSAI for the failed or revoked NSSAA when the Allowed NSSAI is received | | | SHARP | CR 2497 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205448  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-204904  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Hannah, Thu, 10:13  Requests a change to bullet 5)  Yoko, Fri, 06:51  Defends  Lin, Fri, 09:08  Ok in principle, changes needed  Yoko, Fri, 10.11  Ok with editorial, asks further clarification  Yoka, Mon, 10:19  Provides rev  Sung, Mon, 21.03  Issues  Yoko, Tue, 03:02  explains  Sung, Tue, 03:05  Looks GOOD  Yoko, Wed, 02:20  New rev  Lin, Wed, 04:03  Fine  Hanna, Wed, 04:24  fine | |
|  |  | | C1-205487 | S-NSSAIs always selected by AMF from allowed NSSAI | | | Ericsson /kaj | CR 2086 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205334  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-204612  Mahmoud, Thu, 0549  Two errors  Kaj, Thu, 0933  Acks, will sort this out in rev  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  WT#1, related CR in C1-205180, related Disc in C1-205162  Revision of C1-203969  Hannah, Thu, 10:07  Agrees with intention, some changes  Lin, Fri, 06.24  Same as Hannah  Kaj, Mon, 13:30  Provides a rev  Mahmoud, Mon, 15:50  Questions and suggestions  Kaj, Mon, 18:21  answers  Sung, Mon, 23:09  Commenting, on Mahmoud’s comments  Mahmoud, Tue, 14:16  Looks for answers  Sung, Tue, 22:14  Provides answers | |
|  |  | | C1-205229 | Deleting Editors note regarding to network slice-specific re-authorization and re-authorization | | | ZTE Corporation | CR 2474 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204769  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  C1-204769 and C1-205092 remove the same EN  Shaung, Mon, 18:57  Will revise and add Ericsson as co-source | |
|  |  | | C1-205514 | Removal of the “failed or revoked NSSAA” definition | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2525 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204946  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lin, Fri, 09:15  Ok in principle, consequences if not approved to be enhanced  Sung, Tue, 01:47  Rev  Lin, Wed, 04:23  Fine  Mahmoud, Wed, 2135  Explains his comments | |
|  |  | | C1-205519 | Clarification on the “NSSAA to be performed” indicator | | | ZTE / Hannah | CR 2410 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204532  Hannah, Thu, 1103  Asking for comments  Sung, Fri, 0119  FINE  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Rev counter incorrect  Lin, Fri, 06:17  Untick NW, rev counter  Kaj, Fri, 07:00  Untick NW  Mahmoud, Fri, 18:51  Fine with the intention, but there needs to be a third bullet  Hannah, Mon, 04:23  Offers wording  Sung, Mon, 22:11  Text not correct, tick UE box ?  Hannah, Tue, 02:37  Ok with Sung comment, but that is covered in 4531  Sung, Tue, 02:57  Fine with Hannah explanation, still a UE commen  Hannah, Wed, 05:47  Explains to Sung  Sung, Wed, 2020  Comments  Hannah, Thu, 0344  Replying  Mahmoud, Thu, 0355  Asking back form Sung  Sung, Thu, 0747  answering | |
|  |  | | [C1-205412](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205109.zip) | Default subcribed S-NSSAIs for re-NSSAA or revoked NSSAA | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 2577 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205109  ---------------------------------------------  Hannah, Thu, 10:10  Question on modified bullets  Lin, Sat, 03:40  Explaining  Hannah, Mon, 05:21  Further questions  Lin, Tue, 11:27  Discussing with Hannah  Hanna, Wed, 03:41  FINE with the CR  Mahmoud, wed, 05:28  Editorial  Lin, Wed, 12:53  New rev  Lin, Wed, 13:33  Corrected link | |
|  |  | | C1-205413 | Deleting pending NSSAI when moving to 4G | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 2578 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205110  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Roozbeh, Thu, 11.17  Asks for clarification, Editorials  Lin, Sat, 03:47  Explaining and provides a rev  Roozbeh, Sat, 04:35  fine | |
|  |  | | [C1-205232](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204568.zip) | NSSAA Slice handling for 1-to-many mapping in roaming scenario | | | OPPO / Rae | CR 2420 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision C1-204568  Lin, Thu, 1400  FINE  -----------------------  Roozbeh, Thu, 11.10  Detailed comments  Yanchao, Thu, 11:30  Comments, conflicts with C1-204719  Rae, Fri, 04:46  Answers to Roozbeh and Yanchao  Lin, Fri, 06:02  Conflicts with 4719, Lin prefers 4719  Kaj, Fri, 07:38  Has sympathy, but will not work well with Rel-15 or Rel-16non supporting UE  Shuang, Fri, 09:04  Question  Rae, Fri, 12:04  Discussing  Marko, Fri, 13:50  Offers rewording  Rae, Mon, 05:26  Rev1  Sung, Mon, 22:49  Comments  Rae, tue, 03:29  Offers rewording to Sung  Sung, Tue, 03:50  OK  Rae, Tue, 03:59  Rev  Kaj Tue, 11:38  Concern remains  Rae, Tue, 11.59  New wording along the lines of Sung  Lin, Tue, 17:29  No SHOULD in the NOTE  Sung, Tue, 21:26  Not convinced about the note, but can accept it if it is reworded, some rewording  Rae, Wed, 11:28  Fine with Sung’s proposal  Sung, Wed, 2038  Fine  Kaj, Wed, 2145  Fine  Rae, Thu, 0312  Rev  Lin, THU, 05:30  Problem with the NOTE  Rae, Thu, 0550  Provides arev  Kaj, Thu, 8:16  Almost fine  Rae, Thu, 0820  Rev  Kaj, Thu, 0910  fine | |
|  |  | | [C1-20537](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204864.zip)5 | Clarification of Rejected NSSAI associated with 5GMM cause #62 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon, Samsung / Vishnu | CR 2488 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204864  --------------------------  Hannah, Thu, 10:11  Last change needs to be revised“UE” -> “network”  Yanchao, Thu, 12:04  UE to network  Vishnu, Thu, 22:17  Acks  Kaj, Fri, 07:00  Coments  Amer, Mon, 08:22  No UE impact  Vishnu, Tue, 13:53  Rev  Vishnu, Tue, 14:15  New rev  Kaj, Tue, 14:16  Editorial  Sung, Wed, 00:04  editoria | |
|  |  | | C1-205564 | AMF behavior in case of NSSAA failure due to “504 gateway timeout” | | | LG Electronics / Sunhee Kim | CR 2498 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-204905  Kaj, Fri, 1002  Requests this to be postpone  Lin, Fri, 1152  Not agreeing with Kaj  Sung, Fri, 1314  Object  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Roozbeh, Thu, 11.11  Not convinced, **but will not stop it**, number of editorials  Yanchao, Thu, 12:13  Issues with the NOTE  Kaj, Fri, 07:04  No policy is needed in the AMF  Lin, Fri, 10:15  Same as Kja  Sunhee, Mon, 03:58  defending  Sunhee, Mon, 04:15  Explains to Yanchao  Amer, Mon, 08:40  Untick ME on the cover sheet  Shuang, Mon, 11:00  Some questions  Sung, Tue, 01:16  NOT OK with the CR  Sunhee, Tue, 03:30  Rev  Sunhee, Tue, 07:23  Explains  Sunhee, Tue, 07:39  Explains  Sung, Wed, 00:06  Still problems  Lin, wed, 03:34  Comments on the NOTE  Sunhee, Wed, 08:23  Rev  Sunhee, Wed, 09:49  Explains  Kaj, Wed, 11:46  Does not agree  Sung, Wed, 2310  Does not agree  Sunhee, Thu, 0908  Defending  Lin, Thu. 0940  Typos  Kaj, Thu, 1014  Asks this to be postponed | |
|  |  | | C1-205378 | S-NSSAI in pending NSSAI not to be requested | | | Ericsson /kaj | CR 2566 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-205091  Atle, Fri, 0105  Looking for some normative changes  Lin, Fri, 0512  **Looking for a complete solution, cannot accept the CR**  Yanchao, Fri, 0638  Same as Lin  Shuang, Fri, 0843  Does not agree with not accepting, this is the baseline  Kaj, Fri, 0853  Explaining that this is the very basic  Roozbeh, Fri, 1507  Sees the cr not dangerous  Kaj, Fri, 1551  explains  --------------------------------------------------------------  WT#2, C1-204770, C1-205033 C1-205091 all on WT#2, related disc in C1-204771  Roozbeh, Thu, 11:16  Should be merged with 5033  Yanchao, Thu, 13:16  Lack of AMF behaviour  Shuang, Thu, 13:42  Could be merged with 5033  Kaj, Thu, 14:13  Explains why nothing for AMF is missing  Lin, Fri, 05:46  Commenting on the text, requesting to merge 5091, 5033 into a rev of 4770  Yanchao, Fri, 11:29  Explains what is expected from NW  Kaj, Fri, 12:06  Not agreeing  Kaj, Mon, 14.21  Rev1  Shuang, Mon, 18:08  Co-sign  Sung, Mon, 23:58  Some parts to be normative, rather than NOTE  Masaki, Tue, 04:12  Sharp is OK  Kundan, Tue, 07:34  Identifies a problem  Atle, Tue, 08:58  Fine with the rev, wants to co-sing, can live with merging, only if it is required. Doe not agree that Kundan’s problem is a real problem  Kaj, Tue, 09:05  Further explanation  Kundan, Tue, 09:16  Not agreeing with Kaj  Kaj, Tue, 09:30  Responding, explaining  Atle, Tue, 10:50  Further comments, offering way forward  Kundan, Tue, 16:02  Not agreeing with Atle  Kundan, Wed, 07:26  Not sure about the note, there is sme work needed. Fine with an EN or hint in chairman report  Kaj, Wed, 09:25  Not happy with EN, as this CR is not related  Atle, Wed, 10:35  Looking for latest version, but he seems fine  Atle, Wed, 13:10  Making it clear that a statement “no pending in requested” | |
|  |  | | [C1-205566](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205024.zip) | Mobility registration with pending NSSAI and no requested NSSAI | | | Apple | CR 2551 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-205203  Lin, Fri, 0507  As 4770 was not agree/will be postponed, CANNOT accept this CR  Vijay, Fri, 1557  Answers  --------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-205024  Roozbeh, Thu, 11.14  Adding an existing condition, questioning the CR  Vijay, Thu, 23.32  Acks Yanchao (email from Yanchao not on the list, only email from yanchao was on 5022)  Vijay, Fri, 00:05  Explains to Roozbeh  Lin, Fri, 05:35  Comments  Yanchao, Fri, 11.35  First and second change not needed  Roozbhe, Fri, 17:02  First change requires clarfication  Vijay, Fri, 20:25  Provides a rev  Roozbeh, Sat, 04:16  Fine, but some editorials  Vijay, Mon, 02:30  Rev1  Sung, Tue, 02.19  Should be merged into 4770  Roozbeh, Tue, 06:00  Changes over changes, no other comments  Lin, Wed, 03:14  Still not resolve the comments | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Vertical\_LAN | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects of 5GS enhanced support of vertical and LAN services | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  | Stand-alone NPN | |
|  |  | | [C1-204548](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204548.zip) | Work plan for Vertical\_LAN | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Work Plan Rel-16 | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-205049](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205049.zip) | Resolution of Editors Note related to HRNN handling of CAG | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 0583 23.122 Rel-16 | Agreed  Related to the exceptions sheet; HRNN (PNI-NPN)  Alternative to C1-204600  Ivo, Thu, 10:48  - conflicts with C1-204600  Ivo, Fri, 1137  OK to agree it | |
|  |  | | C1-204784 | Correcting partial implementation of CR#0545 | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 0567 23.122 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-204785 | void - allocated by error | | | void | CR 2478 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-204788](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204788.zip) | Correction for CAG selection | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 0569 23.122 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204639](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204639.zip) | Correction of the handling of timer TG for SNPNs | | | Apple, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, T-Mobile USA, InterDigital | CR 0514 23.122 Rel-16 | Postponed  Requested by author  Related to the exceptions sheet; Counters  Revision of C1-203366  Lena, Fri, 12:25  Support Alt-1, but this CR has a superfluous requirement  Robert, Fri, 14:07  Can take this on board,  Robert, Fri, 14:34  Rev  Lin, Mon, 04:09  Cannot live with the rev | |
|  |  | | [C1-204574](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204574.zip) | Correction of implementation of CP-201314 | | | MCC | CR 0559 23.122 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204599](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204599.zip) | Human-readable network name for SNPN | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 0533 23.122 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Requested by author  Related to the exceptions sheet; HRNN (SNPN)  Alternative to C1-204927  Related to LS C1-204571  Revision of C1-203087 | |
|  |  | | [C1-204601](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204601.zip) | Providing configured human readable name for CAG-ID | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 2009 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Requested by author  Related to LS C1-204571  Revision of C1-202840  Cristina, Thu, 1233  Considering open SA1 discusson, request this to be postponed  Cristina, Fri, 0327  Request to postpone the CR, wait for SA1 | |
|  |  | | [C1-204517](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204517.zip) | Counters to manage lists in the DoS protection mechanism for SNPN access mode | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, InterDigital | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  Related to the exception sheet; Counters | |
|  |  | | [C1-204521](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204521.zip) | Alternative 1: UE behaviour regarding N1 mode capability upon T3247 expiry | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, T-Mobile USA, InterDigital | CR 2402 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Related to the exceptions sheet; Counters  Lin, Mon, 04:43  based on the Alt#1 for the counter and hence we **object this CR.** | |
|  |  | | [C1-204523](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204523.zip) | Alternative 1: Handling of a UE not allowed to access SNPN services via a PLMN by subscription with 5GMM cause value #72 | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, T-Mobile USA, InterDigital | CR 2151 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Related to the exception sheet; Counters  Revision of C1-202406  Lin, Mon, 04:43  based on the Alt#1 for the counter and hence we **object this CR.** | |
|  |  | | [C1-204524](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204524.zip) | Alternative 2: Handling of a UE not allowed to access SNPN services via a PLMN by subscription with 5GMM cause value #72 | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2252 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Related to the exception sheet; Counters  Revision of C1-203257  Lena, Fri, 12:30  Prefers 4523  Lin, Mon, 05:14  Prefers this CR, no comment | |
|  |  | | C1-204549 | Excessive use of PLMN and SNPN attempt counters for non-3GPP access | | | OPPO, vivo / Chen | discussion Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-204550 | Removal of excessive attempt counters for non-3GPP access | | | OPPO / Chen | CR 2414 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-204551](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204551.zip) | MT - TE split and the support of PLMN services via SNPN (and vice-versa) | | | OPPO / Chen | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  Lena, Fri, 12:33  - The interaction between the EAP layer and the NAS layer is not specified currently in Rel-15 & Rel-16, why do we need something now?  - The AT interface is not the correct interface: the entity receiving the user data packet is not an application, it is the EAP layer, over a tunnel. Specifying the EAP-NAS interaction would require the specification of a new interface, and likely a new WID  Chen, Mond,  Will answer in the CR thread | |
|  |  | | [C1-204725](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204725.zip) | Correction of the conditions of SNPN selection | | | vivo | CR 0563 23.122 Rel-16 | Postponed  Ivo, Thu, 10:49  3.9 is an informative introduction for the feature. The introduction is not expeted to capture all the details. The existing text is sufficient.  Vishnu, Thu, 14:33  Not much value  Kundan, Thu, 14:59  Explaiing  Pengfei, Tue, 09:56  Defending  Ivo, THU, 1104  Comment against the CR  Pengfei, Fri, 0614  Discussing with Ivo | |
|  |  | | [C1-204726](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204726.zip) | Clarification of the UE behavior in state 5GMM-DEREGISTERED.LIMITED-SERVICE | | | vivo | CR 2453 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Ivo, Thu, 10:49  Not essential  Vishnu, Thu, 14:31  Not needed  Lena, Fri, 12:35  Same as Vishnu | |
|  |  | | [C1-204734](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204734.zip) | Correction of counters in an SNPN | | | vivo | CR 2459 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1-204863 | Clarification to SNPN specific attempt counter | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 2487 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-204913](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204913.zip) | UE behavior on SNPN access mode when accessing to PLMN services via a SNPN | | | SHARP | CR 2503 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1-205010 | Handling for SNPN hosted by a Public PLMN | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 2545 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-205020](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205020.zip) | Update of the counters on receiving #27 in an SNPN | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 2367 24.501 Rel-16 | Merged into 4522 and its revisions  Revision of C1-203641  Sung, Fri, 03:05  changes proposed by C1-205020 are part of C1-204521 (Alternative 1) and C1-204522 (Alternative 2)  Lin, Mon, 01:00  I believe this CR can be merged into C1-204524 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205031](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205031.zip) | Clarification On Selecting SNPN in Manual Selection | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 2557 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Ivo, Thu, 10:48  it should be up to the UE implemention to decide whether to state in the SNPN access mode or leave the SNPN access mode  Sung, Fri, 03:15  Same as Ivo  Lena, Fri, 18:17  Same as sung | |
|  |  | | [C1-205104](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205104.zip) | Discussion on SNPN-specific N1 mode attempt counter | | | Huawei, HiSilicon, OPPO/Lin | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  Related to the exception sheet; counters  Sung, Fri, 04:33  Commenting  Lin, Fri, 15:28  Replying  Lin, Sat, 03:07  Clarifying his email  Sung, Mon, 01:44  Explaining  Vishnu, wed, 11:31  Ansering sung | |
|  |  | | C1-205261 | SUPI types of subscriber identifier in "list of subscriber data" | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 0561 23.122 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204578  Lin, Thu, 1000  Fine  Christian, Fri, 15:59  issues with cover sheet, requests this to be postponed. However, the comment had wrong subject line, namely agenda item wrong, title of the tdoc wrong, wrong list. Not taken into consideration,  Chairman:  If seen needed, comments against the CR need to be addressed in Plenary  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lin, Mon, 01:00  Without the changes, I did not see any problems with the current text  Ivo, Mon, 09:56  Provides rewording  Ivo, Wed, 00:19  rev | |
|  |  | | C1-205266 | Human-readable network name for CAG selection | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 0506 23.122 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Requested by author  Revision of C1-204600  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Related to the exception sheet; HRNN (PNI-NPN)  Alternative to C1-205049  Related to LS C1-204571  Revision of C1-202014  Frederic, Thu, 12:24  Rev counter incorrect | |
|  |  | | C1-205267 | Automatic selection with empty "CAG information list" | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 0568 23.122 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204786  Lena, Wed, 05:10  FINE  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lena, Fri, 12:18  We are fine with specifying that a UE configured with empty “allowed CAG list” cannot select a CAG cell, but seems a case is missing.  Ivo, Mon, 11:56  Rev1 | |
|  |  | | C1-205248 | Handling of LADN information when the UE is operating in SNPN access mode | | | SHARP | CR 1970 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204906  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200600  Lena, Fri, 12.39  Condition missing  Yudai, Fri, 17:16  Rev  Lena, Wed, 05:15  Fine | |
|  |  | | C1-205281 | #76 cause handling in case of reception of Registration Reject in roaming scenarios | | | LG Electronics / Sunhee Kim | CR 2507 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204921  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 10:49  Editorials  Sung, Fri, 01:55  Editorials  Sunhee, Mon, 05:32  Rev1  Ivo, Tue, 14:16  fine | |
|  |  | | C1-205312 | Correction in N3AN node selection involving SNPN | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0148 24.502 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204952  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 10:49  Does not seem to be essential  Sung, Fri, 02:49  Explains  Lena, Fri, 14:57  One statement needs to be removed  Joy, Fri, 17:59  No improvement  Sung, Sat, 03:20  Provides a rev  Joy, Sat, 04:04  Explains how the CR should look like  Sung, Mon, 01:48  Defends  Joy, Mon, 03:26  Can accept some, but cr needs changes  Sung, Mon, 04:20  Discussing with Joy  Joy, Mon, 04.34  Explains to Sung  Ivo, Tue, 14:16  Fine  Sung, Tue, 14:58  Rev  Lena, wed, 05:16  The rev looks fine  Joy, Wed, 05:30  fine | |
|  |  | | [C1-205270](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204727.zip) | Abbreviations correction for SNPN | | | vivo | CR 2454 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204727  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 10:49  Not essential  Penfei, Fri, 04:25  Defending  PeterL, Fri, 08:31  This is Rel-17  Lena, Fri, 12:37  Alphabetical order to be kept  Penfei, Mon, 11:30  Rev, now PROTOC17  Ivo, Tue, 14:13  Fine  Lena, Wed, 05:07  Fine with the draft | |
|  |  | | C1-205427 | Alternative 2: UE behaviour regarding N1 mode capability upon T3247 expiry | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2251 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204522  Lin, Thu, 0945  Accept  Lin, Fri, 0827  Fine  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Related to the exception sheet; Counters  Revision of C1-203256  Lena, Fri, 12:30  Prefers 4521  Lin, Mon, 05:08  Prefers this direction | |
|  |  | | C1-205435 | Human readable network name for SNPN | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, Huawei, HiSilicon | CR 0527 23.122 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204927  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Related to the exception sheet; HRNN (SNPN)  Alternative to C1-204599  Revision of C1-204049  Ivo, Thu, 10:48  Conflicts with C1-204599  Lena, Fri, 12:42  Fine with the idea (pending SA1)  Do not mandata the UE with a SHALL  Sung, Sat, 03:05  Takes Lena’s comment on board, rev  Lena, wed, 05:16  The rev looks fine  Vishnua, wed, 09:55  Rev looks fine | |
|  |  | | C1-205439 | T3245 not applicable for a UE operating in SNPN access mode | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2530 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204954  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lena, Fri, 17:14  why can’t T3245 be applicable in SNPNs?  Sung, Sat, 03:32  Asking for clarification from Lena  Kundan, Mon, 05:44  So i don’t agree with the CR.  Lena, Wed, 05:27  use of T3245 should be allowed for a UE operating in SNPN access mode | |
|  |  | | C1-205452 | Timer\_T3245\_Behaviour for SNPN | | | Nokia | CR 0052 24.368 rel-16 | **Agreed**  **NEW** | |
|  |  | | C1-205441 | Add definition of “allowed CAG list” | | | LG Electronics / Sunhee Kim | CR 2512 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204926  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Kundan, Thu, 13:16  Not FASMO, Rel-17 only  Lena, Fri, 12:03  Comments on how to make the correct reference  SangMin, Mon, 10:05  Defending against Kundan  Sunhee, Wed, 10:43  Asking from Kundan  Sunhee, Wed, 11:05  Rev  Kundan, Wed, 11:50  Fine with the rev  Lena, thu, 0505  fine | |
|  |  | | C1-205456 | Handling of back-off due to 5GSM cause value #27 "missing or unknown DNN" by a UE operating in SNPN access mode | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2531 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204955  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lin, Mon.01:00  Cover page, and rewoding requested  Sung, Mon, 02:10  Rev1  Lin, Wed, 07:02  fine | |
|  |  | | C1-205488 | EAB/NAS signalling low priority not applicable for a UE operating in SNPN access mode | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2528 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204951  Lin, Thu, 1038  I would live with changes in NOTE 5 also just due to NLAP is not supported in 5GS, including PLMN and SNPN as well  Sung, Thu, 1038  Providing the link  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lena, Fri, 12:44  Ok, but cover sheet issue  Sung, Sat, 03:11  Rev  Lin, Mon, 01:00  changes on NOTE 5 is not needed, should be clearly indicate for 5G is not defined.  Sung, Mon, 02:06  Rev1  Kundan, Mon, 16:42  Rev is fine  Lena, wed, 05:16  The rev looks fine  Lin, Wed, 07:00  Not touch NOTE5  Sung, Wed, 1400  Asking back | |
|  |  | | C1-205490 | Alternative to CR#0514: Correction of the handling of timer TG for SNPNs | | | Apple | CR 0542 23.122 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204640  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Related to the exception sheet; Counters  Revision of C1-203367  Ivo, Thu, 10:49  Prefers C1-204639  Lena, Fri, 12:21  C1-204639 over C1-204640  Robert, Fri, 14:34  Rev  Lin, Mon, 04:09  No comments | |
|  |  | | C1-205297 | AT command for NAS messages between MT and TE | | | OPPO / Chen | CR 0699 27.007 Rel-16 | Postponed  Requested by the authr  Revision of C1-204552  Lena, Fri, 0606  Like this to be Postponed  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Carlson, Thu, 10:45  Comment on the solution  Chen, Thu, 14:34  Acks Carlson  Sung, Fri, 01:27  Detailed comments, some parts don’t make sense  Carlson, Fri, 06:19  Additional suggesitons  Lena, Fri, 12:34  See comments on the DISC paper, negative  Chen, Mon, 09:14  Answering, provides rev1  Atle, Mon, 10:12  No position if it is needed, but if it goes  Sung, Mon, 19:17  not convinced, offers a proposal  Atle, Tue, 10:01  One more commnet  Carlson, Tue, 14:48  Comment  Sung, Tue, 16:24  Does not agree  Atle, Tue, 16:54  More comment  Chen, Tue, 17:50/18:10  Will provide a rev  Sung, Wed, 03:31  Comments  Lena, Wed, 05:04  interface between NAS and EAP is not the same as that between the TE and the MT, so using the AT command interface for this **is not suitable**.  Carlson, Wed, 14:14  Withdraws all comments | |
|  |  | | C1-205532 | T3245 for a UE operating in SNPN access mode: 24.008 | | | Nokia | CR  3242  24.008 rel16 | **Agreed**  **Revision of C1-205442**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **NEW**  Lena, Thu, 0640  Comment  Sung, Thu, 0700  Rev  Lena, Thu, 0815  ok | |
|  |  | | [C1-205373](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205044.zip) | Clarification to the usage of last visited registered TAI in SNPN registration | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 2562 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205044  ----------------------------  Lena, Fri, 16:58  Ok but some editorial  Vishnu, Wed, 14:10  Rev  Lena, Thu, 0530  fine | |
|  |  | | C1-205438 | Handling of emergency call in SNPN access mode | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 2550 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-205023  Kundan, Thu, 2143  Explaining to Lena  Lena, Fri, 0553  OBJECT  Kundan, Fri, 1005  Defends  Vishnu, Fri, 1108  OK  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 10:48  Broken styles, it might be better to access PLMN via SNPN  Sung, Fri, 03:12  No need to specify anything special  Kundan, Fri, 05:17  Explaining  Vishnu, Frim 09:25  questions to clarify the scenario  Ivo, Fri, 09:45  Further comments  Lena, Fri, 16:55  **No stage-2, can not agree the Cr**  Kundan, Tue, 07:44  CT1 needs to cover this  Kundan, Tue, 07:45  To Vishnu  Kundan, Tue, 08:30  To Ivo  Ivo, Teu, 14:16  Comments  Kundan, Tue, 15:01  Comments  Ivo, Tue, 15:34  Explains  Kundan, Tue, 15:47  Ongoing  Ivo, Tue, 15.50  Explains  Kundan, Wed, 10:00  Offers wording  Ivo, Wed, 14:32  In general ok, some reformulation  Kunden, Wed, 15:00  Rev  Lena, Thu, 0536  No stage-2, **can not agree** | |
|  |  | | C1-205558 | Introduction of a separate counter for each of the SNPN lists for DoS attack protection | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, Apple, T-Mobile USA, InterDigital | CR 2011 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-205414  Lin, Fri, 0624  CANNOT accept  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-204518  Lena, thu, 0848  Cannot accept the compromise. Pref  Preference is alt-1, can live with alt-2,  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Related to the exceptions sheet; Counters  Revision of C1-203255  Robert, Fri, 19:38  Provides a compromise, based on discusson in CC#2  Lin, Mon, 04:38  As your new solution is just Alt#1, so **we cannot accept it..**  Sung, Mon, 05:01  Provides a new rev/compromise  Robert, Mon, 14:34  Explaining his position  Sung, Mon, 15:18  New rev  Michel, Mon, 18:12  Rev is still Alt-1, prefer counter as in spec (alt-2)  Lena, Wed, 04:56  Prefers the 1st compromise from Robert over the rev from Sung  Lin, Wed, 06:52  Highlights cannot live with proposal from Robert  Lin, Wed, 15:00  Offers rewording, i.e. a new compromise  Robert, Wed, 17:33  Editing on top of Lin’s proposal  Sung, Wed, 2147  Fine with lates proposal form Robert  Lin, Thu, 09:43  Not happy with latest adds form Robert | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  | Public network integrated NPN | |
|  |  | | [C1-204735](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204735.zip) | Provisioning of a CAG information list in Service Request procedure | | | vivo | CR 2460 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204858](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204858.zip) | Prevention of registration loop due to man in middle attack | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 2085 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-202249  Ivo, Thu, 10:49  - no need to indicate CAG broadcast list IE - If 5GMM#76 is received and Allowed CAG list contains a CAG-ID of the camped CAG cell, then the base station is a fake base station.  Vishnu, Thu, 14:21  Explains to Ivo  Ivo, Fri, 10:01  Explains further  Vishnu, Fri, 10:15  Replying to Ivo  lena, Sat, 00:22  comments, some aspects to be discussed in SA3 first  Sung, Mon, 01:48  Whether 3GPP should define protection mechanisms for this type of attack has to be discussed in SA3, if needed  Vishn, Mon, 08:29  Explaining to Lena  Kundan, Tue, 12:45  This is Not an issue, wait for SA3  Andrew, Tue, 12:54  Do we need work in sa2 or sa3?  Vishnu, Tue, 13:23  Defending  Ivo, Tue, 13:57  **CR is not needed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-204869](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204869.zip) | CAG information list in Registration reject message | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 2491 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Ivo, Thu, 10:48  - SA2 change is not captured entirely - more complete changes can be found in C1-204582  Lena, Fri, 17:04  are ok with the CR but would like to point out it overlaps with C1-204921 and C1-204582.  Sung, Mon, 01:44  prefer this CR than C1-204582, -204869 and C1-204921 can progress  Vishnu, Thu, 1451  Asks ivo to confirm he is OK  Ivo. Thu 1601  FINE | |
|  |  | | [C1-204924](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204924.zip) | Maximum length of CAG information list | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Cristina | CR 2510 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Requested by author, thu, 1013  Ivo, Thu, 10:48  - conflicts with C1-204601  Cristina, Thu, 11:45  Explains why there is no conflict  Ivo, Fri, 09:48  Conflict as there are different sizes for IE  Cristina, Fri, 11:25  think these two CRs should wait for SA1’s response to see how to process.  Lena, fri, 17:06  **No justification**  Sung, Mon, 01:48  **No need to define a limit as in the CR**  Cristiina, Mon, 05:03  defedning  **Lena, Wed, 05:40**  **Not agreeing with Cristina**  **Cristina, Wed, 09:29**  **Defending**  **Lena, thu, 0531**  **Not NEEDED**  **Cristina, Thu, 09:33**  **ongoing** | |
|  |  | | [C1-204949](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204949.zip) | Finding a suitable cell in a PLMN where a UE is allowed to access a non-CAG cell | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2526 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204953](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204953.zip) | CAG information list handling during the registration procedure | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2529 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Pengfei, Thu, 11:45  Does not agree  Vishnu, Thu, 14:37  Does not agree with the change  Lena, Fri, 17:09  Assumption in the CR is not correct  Sung, Mon, 02:15  discussing  Lena, Wed, 05:51  Not agreeing  Vishnu, Wed, 09:52  Not agreeing  Sung, thu, 0830  Defending  Vishnu, Thu, 0845  Not agreeing  Sung, Thu, 0910  Defending | |
|  |  | | [C1-204993](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204993.zip) | Manual CAG selection procedure | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 2542 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Based on request form author, wed 2119  Ivo, Thu, 11.20  Highlighting an issue with the proposal  Ivo, Thu, 13:22  More issues  Vishnu, Thu, 14:55  Could accept something, but different than the CR  Lena, Fri, 17:12  Not a good idea  Sung, Mon. 02:30  Comments  Kundan, Tue, 09:05  Asking back  Sung, Wed, 05:14  Not agreeing with Kundan | |
|  |  | | [C1-205007](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205007.zip) | UE behavior when UE subscription changes to CAG only | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 2544 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponded  Ivo, Thu, 10.48  Requests changes  Lena, Fri, 17:13  Not correct  Sung, Mon. 02:40  Same as Lena  Kundan, Mon, 04:57  Explaining, would like to send an LS to SA2  Lena, Wed, 05:54  No need to send LS to SA2 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205054](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205054.zip) | Discussion on protecting UE and NW against man in middle attack | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | discussion 24.501 Rel-16 | Noted  Ivo, Thu, 10:47  Preference for solution 1.1, solution 2.1 and 2.2 do not work  Vishnu, Thu, 14:26  Replies to Ivo  Ivo, Fri, 09:52  Explains further  Vishnu, Fri, 1010  Fine to got with sol 1.1 , but there are open points  Ivo, Tue, 13:41  Does not agree | |
|  |  | | [C1-205065](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205065.zip) | Prevention of man in the middle attack via a CAG cell (Solution to Issue 2) | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 2565 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Ivo, Thu, 10:47  No need to indicate CAG broadcast list IE, more problems  Vishnu, Thu, 14:19  Does not agree with Ivo  Ivo, fri, 10:03  Explains  Ban Fri, 10:05  Question  Vishnu, Fri, 10:15  Replying to Ivo  Vishnu, Fri, 12:06  Replies to Ban  lena, Sat, 00:22  comments, some aspects to be discussed in SA3 first  Sung, Mon, 02:44  an attack relying on fake broadcast information is hard to succeed consistently because that is detected easily. Whether 3GPP should define protection mechanisms for **this type of attack has to be discussed in SA3, if needed**  Ban, Mon, 05:51  fake gNB connected to a genuine AMF is an issue that SA3 need to discuss  Vishnu, Mon, 08:40  We believe this is a very serious issue that needs solution.  Ban, Tue, 06:47  **Issues with the approach**  Vishnu, Tue, 09:59  Defending  Ivo, Tue, 13:36  **Sa3 is needed**  **Discussion no longer captured** | |
|  |  | | C1-205290 | AMF including CAG information list in rejection messages | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 2421 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205262  Ivo, Wed, 17:42  Prvoding a use case  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-204582  Lena, Wed, 05:34  Fine but editorials  Ivo, Wed, 09:36  Editorials are fixed in the 5290  -----------------------------  Related to C1-204623  Vishnu, Fri, 12:32  Conflicts with 4869, looking for sa2 requirements  Lena, Fri, 17:14  CR does not take into account the SA2 agreement that when the UE is roaming  Sung, Mon, 01:44  agree with Vishnu. So we prefer C1-204869.  Ivo, Mon, 14:57  Commenting  Ivo, wed, 00:21  rev | |
|  |  | | C1-205459 | 5GMM cause value #76 mapped to a different 5GMM cause value | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2527 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204950  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 10:48  - 5.5.2.2.7 - not clear what "feature" is meant  Lena, Fri, 17:07  Fine in general, comments on details  Atle, Sat, 00:28  “CAG restrictions” should be defined  Sung, Mon, 01:48  Rev  Kundan, Tue, 11:46  Issue in the rev  Ivo, Tue, 13:49  Still has issues  Sung, Wed, 05:10  Rev  Lena, Wed, 05:50  no stage 2 requirement saying a UE configured for high priority access in the PLMN is exempt from CAG restrictions  Ivo, Wed, 13:09  Seems OK  Lena, Thu, 0529  fine | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  | Time sensitive communication | |
|  |  | | [C1-204794](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204794.zip) | Clarification on CNC | | | ZTE / Joy | CR 0009 24.519 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204795](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204795.zip) | Editorial correction | | | ZTE / Joy | CR 0003 24.535 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204796](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204796.zip) | Minimum length of port management information container in SM messages | | | ZTE / Joy | CR 2480 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204956](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204956.zip) | Maximum size of EPMS/BMS messages | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0011 24.519 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-205084](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205084.zip) | Bridge management information correction | | | Intel /Thomas | CR 0012 24.519 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1-205255 | Update PSFP stream identification parameters | | | Intel /Thomas | CR 0010 24.519 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205213  Sung, Wed, 05:39  FINE  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-204878  Sung, Mon, 05:16  We proposed in SA2 that only tsnStreamIdIdentificationType 1 or 2 should be supported and hence the same comment here, revision needed  Ivo, Tue, 13:35  Fine, co-sign  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 10:47  Some of the changes miss change marks | |
|  |  | | C1-205483 | IEI assignment rule between TSN AF and TSN translator | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0130 24.007 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204948  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 10:49  - this should be normal text, not a NOTE.  Lena, Sat, 00:22  Editorial  Sung, mon, 05:30  Rev1  Ivo, Tue, 13:34  Fine  Lena, Wed, 05:40  ok | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 5G\_CioT | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects of Cellular IoT support and evolution for the 5G System | |
|  |  | | [C1-204666](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204666.zip) | 5G CIoT workplan | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Amer | Work Plan Rel-16 | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-204510](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204510.zip) | Correction to PDU session ID inclusion in UL and DL NAS transport | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2401 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204553](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204553.zip) | Discussion on solutions to resolve repeated redirection failure for CIoT UEs | | | OPPO / Chen | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  Overlaps with disc in C1-205144  Behrouz, Thu, 19:07  Asks questions  Amer, Thu, 23:28  Company is neutral, as a WID rapporteur he suggests to delete the EN and then see how to progress  Lin, Mon, 00:59  Comments  Behrouz, Mon, 04:58  Explaining his comments  Lin, Mon, 15:26  Sees Behrouz, issue, still prefers UE stayed in the current serving PLMN  Amer Tue, 10:41  Any soluitn must be optional | |
|  |  | | [C1-204604](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204604.zip) | Clarification on CIoT 5GS optimization in non-allowed area | | | CATT | CR 2431 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Yanchao, Thu, 10:55  **current text deleted by the paper is correct**.  Mikael, Thu, 11:17  **CR not needed**  Chenxi, Thu, 11.47  Asking back from Yanchao and Mikael  Frederic, Thu, 13:58  Editorial  Mahmoud, Thu, 21:01  Not needed  Chenxi, Fri, 07:31  23.501 is unclear here, should we go for LS??  Mikael, Fri, 11:35  Explains to Chnenxi that SA2 is correct  Lin, Mon, 01:00  I do support this CR and if we cannot resovle this by ourselves, as suggested by Chenxi, an LS to SA2 is really needed to resolve this  Amer, Mon, 09:22  **CR is not needed**  Chenxi, Mon, 10:36  Wants to send an LS  Mikael, Mon, 14:41  consider 4604 to be incorrect and not agreeable. | |
|  |  | | [C1-204663](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204663.zip) | Avoiding double barring for CPSR following NAS connection recovery from fallback | | | Samsung, InterDigital | CR 2443 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1-204664 | Truncated 5G-S-TMSI for eMTC UE | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Amer | CR 2444 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Revision of C1-203463 | |
|  |  | | [C1-204665](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204665.zip) | Correction to the 5GS network feature support IE | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Amer | CR 2445 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204672](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204672.zip) | Truncated 5G-S-TMSI for eMTC UE | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Amer | CR 2322 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-203483  Yanchao, Thu, 11:00  Seems against **SA2** LS C1-204621  Lin, Mon; 01:00  based on SA2 reply LS C1-204621 in which this feature was not supported for 5GS and hence, this CR cannot fly anymore | |
|  |  | | [C1-204736](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204736.zip) | 5G-GUTI reallocation after resume from 5GMM-IDLE mode with suspend indication due to paging | | | Samsung, InterDigital | CR 2461 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Kaj, Thu, 11:55  We are still waiting for SA3 decision on this issue, hence we **shall not agree** any related CR in this meeting. **LS out in C1-200967**  . | |
|  |  | | [C1-204767](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204767.zip) | CP data allowed in connected mode in Non-allowed area | | | vivo | CR 2473 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Related with incoming LS C1-204620  Behourz, Thu, 19:14  According to the following note in TS23.501 subclause 5.3.4.1.1, CP data are allowed for a UE in CM-CONNECTED state in non-allowed area.  CATT CR in 4604 states that SA2 has agreed to remove this! i.e. even CIoT User Data Container should not be allowed. Which one is correct here?  Yanchao, Fri, 04:25  Explains  Mikael, Fri, 11:28  Vivo CR is correct, CATT (4604) is incorrect  Lin, Mon, 01:00  Support 4604, not 4767  Behrouz, Mon, 04:29  No postion on 4604 vs, 4767, just highlights that not both of them can be correct  Amer, Mon, 09:25  Support this CR  Mikael, Mon, 11:24  Support  Lin, Fri, 0602  Can live with this | |
|  |  | | [C1-204929](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204929.zip) | Paging not initiated for PDU session transfer to non-3GPP access when CP CIoT 5GS optimization is being used | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2514 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Lastest rev was never uploaded as tdoc  Yanchao, Thu, 11:07  Tick CN box, title of CR not aligned with content of CR  Amer, Thu, 23.42  Tick CN (only)  Sung, Mon, 05.45  Rev1  Mahmoud, Mon, 17:21  Fine but some parts are missing  Sung, Mon, 1052  Asking for clarification | |
|  |  | | [C1-204930](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204930.zip) | UE specific DRX value for NB-IoT | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2515 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204986](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204986.zip) | Rapporteur's cleanup of editor's notes for 5G\_CIoT | | | Qualcomm Tech. Netherlands B.V | CR 2538 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  C1-204986, C1-204554, C1-205145 remove same EN  Lin, Mon, 01:00  First EN cannot be removed without any updated  Chen, Fri, 1556  Requests this to be postponed | |
|  |  | | [C1-205106](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205106.zip) | Retry restriction for NB-IoT UEs due to out of tariff package | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 2575 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Kaj, Thu, 12:09  “may” instead of “shall”  Lin, Sat, 03:10  SHALL is fully aligned with EPC, is this acceptable  Kaj, Mon, 10:52  **Takes back his comment** | |
|  |  | | [C1-205144](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205144.zip) | Discussion on inter-system redirection for CIoT | | | MediaTek Inc. / Marko | discussion 24.501 Rel-16 | Noted  Overlaps with disc in C1-204553  Amer, Thu, 23:28  Company is neutral, as a WID rapporteur he suggests to delete the EN and then see how to progress  Marko, Fri, 10:46  Just deleting the EN is not enough  Lin, Mon, 01:00  Support to do work, but not agreeing on the approach  Chen, Wed, 11:07  Answering  Amer, Wed, 15:14  Answering CHen | |
|  |  | | [C1-205145](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205145.zip) | Avoiding inter-system ping-pong due to redirection | | | MediaTek Inc. / Marko | CR 2594 24.501 Rel-16 | Merged into rev of C1-204554  Requested by the author  Overlaps with CR in C1-204554 (same topic)  C1-204986, C1-204554, C1-205145 remove same EN  Lin, Mon, 01:00  Bullet ii) cannot happen, not in favour of the approach  Marko, Mon, 14:26  defending  Amer, Tue, 11:08  Any solution must be optional  JJ, Tue, 16:16  Solution will be optional, 5145 will be merged into 4554 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205146](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205146.zip) | Avoid unnecessary signalling for CP only PDU sessions after inter-system change from S1 mode to N1 mode | | | Samsung Guangzhou Mobile R&D | CR 2595 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Yanchao, Thu, 11.20  First change and second change not needed, i.e. CR not needed  Mahmpoud, Mon, 05:48  Clarifies | |
|  |  | | C1-205228 | Define “emergency services” for Control plane service type in CPSR | | | Samsung Guangzhou Mobile R&D | CR 2540 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204989  Lin, Thu, 0930  fine  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Yanchao, Thu, 11:11  CR is not needed  Kaj, Thu, 11.58  CR is not complete  Mahmoud, Thu, 14:44  Responds to Yanchao  Amer, Thu, 23:53  Questin for clarification  Behrouz, Fri, 06:05  Basically ok with the CR, aksing a question  Kaj, Fri, 09:40  Agrees with Mahmoud, amer and behrouze, but what about EPS  Amer, Fri, 14:42  Wants to avoid side effect to EPS  Lin, Mon, 01:00  Some comments  Mahmoud, Tue, 00:16  Rev  Kaj, Tue, 10:04  More questios, updates required  Amer, Tue, 11:09  why without an UL data status IE  Mahmoud, Tue, 13:47  Explains  Behourz, Wed, 07:10  Fine with the intention, a question  Mahmoud, Wed, 14:44  revV2 is available  Kaj, Wed, 17:29  FINE | |
|  |  | | C1-205236 | Adding the handling of AMF for case k in the service request procedure | | | SHARP | CR 2499 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204907  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Kaj, Thu, 11:57  Proposal on how to improve  Yudai, Fri, 06.58  Rev1  Kaj, Fri, 09:37  Could work  YUdai, Fri, 13:55  Rev2  Kaj, Mon, 08:55  Fine with the CR | |
|  |  | | C1-205237 | UE behavior when the timer T3347 is stopped | | | SHARP | CR 2502 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204911  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Amer, Thu, 23:39  Typos  Yudai, Fri, 04:48  Provides rev1  Kaj, Fri, 10:26  Some editorial, wants to co-sign  Yudai, Fri, 12:34  rev | |
|  |  | | C1-205521 | Multiple payloads via CPSR | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 2574 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-205105  Kaj, Thu, 1134  Against this, even in rel-17  Lin, Thu, 1355  Defending  Kaj, Fri, 1133  **Cannot agree**  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Yanchao, Thu, 11:15  Some conflicts that need to be resolved  Kaj, Thu, 14:50  No need for multiple payloads, CR is not needed  Mahmoud, Thu, 21:13  Should progress, but some changes are needed  Amer, Thu, 00:02  **Use case is weak, not needed**  Kaj, Fri, 10:31  **Does not agree with Mahmoud**  Lin, Fri, 16:45  To Yanchao  Lin, Fri, 17:19  Defending  Lin, Fri, 17:19  Defending to kaj and amer  Lin, Fri, 17:30  Offering revision to Mahmoud  Mahmoud, Fri, 22:20  Answering Kaj, accepting Lin’s comment  Kaj, Mon, 09:15  Not strong use case, further this is a new feature not coverd in exception sheet  Amer, Mon, 09:46  Not agreing this is needed  Lin, Tue,10:40  Defending and providing a rev  Amer, Tue, 11:23  Not needed  Mahmoud, Fri, 16:51  Fine with the rev  Behrouz, Wed, 02:38  Agrees with Lin  Lin, Wed, 11.42  To Amer, offers to go Rel-17 only  Amer, Thu, 0449  Objects rel-16 | |
|  |  | | C1-205557 | Avoiding repeated failed redirection but balancing getting intended CIoT services | | | OPPO / Chen | CR 2415 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Requested by the author  Revision of C1-205298  Revision of C1-204554  Lin, thu, 1430  Can live with it  Amer, Fri, 0226  CANNOT AGREE  Marko, Fri, 1349  Commenting, wants to EN to stay  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Overlaps with CR in C1-205154 (same topic)  C1-204986, C1-204554, C1-205145 remove same EN  Behrouz, Thu, 19:11  Asks a question on case this next Periodic Update does not occur for a very long time  Amer, Thu, 23:28  Company is neutral, as a WID rapporteur he suggests to delete the EN and then see how to progress  Chen, Fri, 14:46  Explaining  Lin, Mon, 01:00  Ok in principle, changes requested  Behrouz, Mon, 04:58  Explaining his comments  Chen, Mon, 16:24  Discussing  Behrouze, Mon, 16:40  Highlighting that there is still a misunderstanding  Marko, Mon, 16:46  Attempt to start the compromise  Chen, Mon, 17:41  Work on the compromise  Behrouz, Mon, 20:38  Does not have a solution at this point, BUT, we should not simply a solution that is incomplete  Kaj, Tue, 09:41  Same as MediaTek, *concerned in NB-IoT device. NB-IoT UE cannot disable CP CIoT optimization (it’s mandatory to indicate support for it*  Iin, Wed, 05:17  Comment  Chen, Wed, 09:39  Answering, rev  Amer, Wed, 09:52  Some initial comments  Chen, Wed, 10:37, 12:47  Answering  Amer, Wed, 16:17  Serious concerns, can accept some parts,  Lin, Thu, 0445  Provides a rev to show his view  Marko, thu, 1020  Replying | |
|  |  | | C1-205546 | Avoiding inter-system ping-pong due to redirection | | | MediaTek Inc. / Marko | CR 3438 24.301 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-205168  Lin, Fri, 1144  Request to postpone, as the sister CR gets posptoned  Chen, Fri, 1557  Same as Lin  ----------------------------------  Lin, Mon, 01:00  Bullet ii) cannot happen, not in favour of the approach | |
|  |  | | [C1-205541](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205160.zip) | Fix of Timer T3488 encoding | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2598 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205160  ---------------------------------------  Amer, Fri, 00:06  Why is anything unclear  Lazaros, Fri, 17:18  Explains  Amer, Mon, 09:50  Fine with the explanation | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 5WWC | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects on wireless and wireline convergence for the 5G system architecture  100% | |
|  |  | | [C1-204589](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204589.zip) | IPv6 configuration for W-AGF acting on behalf of FN-RG | | | Ericsson, Telecom Italia / Ivo | CR 2220 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204013 | |
|  |  | | C1-204594 | void - allocated by error | | | void | CR 0145 24.502 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-204602](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204602.zip) | W-CP connection in 24.501 | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 2430 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204777](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204777.zip) | IPv6 prefix not allocated | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 2476 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-205172](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205172.zip) | Clarification on TWIF acting on behalf of N5CW device | | | ZTE / Joy | CR 2602 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1-205265 | W-CP connection in 24.502 | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 0144 24.502 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204593  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Joy, Thu, 09:15  W-CP EAP connection should be referenced to TS23.316 somewhere  Roozbeh, Thu, 11:17  Rewording  Ivo, Fri, 14:04  Rev  Roozbeh, Fri, 18:45  Fine with the rewording | |
|  |  | | C1-205554 | Type of the N5GC indication information element | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | CR 2552 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-205351  Ivo, Fri, 1159  Ok with the content, requests cover page changes, requests this to be postponed and continued at plenary  Provides a cover page  Christian, Fri, 1220  Not agreeing with the cover page proposal from Ivo  Ivo, Fri, 1238  Explains  Christian, Fri, 1255  Explains his position  Ivo, Fri,1322  Explains the cover sheet issue  Christian, Fri, 1358  Explains that the actual changes in the CR are not challenged  Ivo, Fri, 1415  Looks for an answer to the question on the issue with “reason for change”  Christian, Fri, 1449  Believes that the cover page as is is correct  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-205182  Shifted from 16.2.4.2, as 5wwc only  Ivo, Thu, 1054  Asking for cover page update, some statemens are unclear  Christian, Thu, 1101  Which statements  Ivo, thu, 1108  Giving them  Christian, Thu, 1111  Asking if Ivo sees no need for the CR  Christian, Thu, 1552  Explains the CR and cover sheet  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-205025  Lazaros, Thu, 10:04  Fine, please add Nokia  Ivo, Thu, 10:49  Solely 5WWC as WIC  Asking for clarification  Behrouz, Wed, 1920  Asking back form Ivo  Christian, Wed, 2049  Asking from Ivo if he is against the Cr  Christian, thu, 0650  Rev | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | PARLOS | |  | Lena – Breakout | | |  |  | CT aspects of System enhancements for Provision of Access to Restricted Local Operator Services by Unauthenticated UEs  100% | |
|  |  | | C1-205544 | Correction to RLOS terminology | | | MediaTek Inc. / Marko | CR 3436 24.301 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205137  Ivo, Fri, 1113  OK  -------------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 8:55  Not aligned with the definitions of RLOS EPS bearer context and PDN connection for RLOS, which refer to "RLOS" rather than "access to RLOS".  Marko, Monday, 12:19  @Ivo: Got it. So, we’ll revise the document without the first and the last changes. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 5G\_eLCS (CT4) | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects of Enhancement to the 5GC LoCation Services | |
|  |  | | [C1-204997](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204997.zip) | CR to support including an eLCS Event Report Ack in DL NAS message | | | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR 2288 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-203364  Mikael, Fri, 14:44  **Not in favor of this optimization**, feature works with current protocol  Sunghoon, Mon, 03:10  Clarification  Lin, Mon, 05:43  **Similar to Mikael**  All in all, the current spec can work well for LCS event reporting and no any further special optimization is needed for it.  Scott, Mon, 12:32  **No need to specify this exclusively**  Sunghoon, Tue, 14.17  Defending  Sunghoon, Tue, 14.30  Explains to Scott  Lin, Wed, 07:19  **Does not Agree** | |
|  |  | | [C1-205058](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205058.zip) | Additional function of MO-LR procedure | | | CATT | CR 0003 24.571 Rel-16 | Agreed  Sunghoon, Fri, 10:59  Comments  Scott, Mon, 11.28  Answering  Sunghoon, Tue, 14:37  Fine | |
|  |  | | C1-205529 | UE initiated Event Reporting Procedure for Low Power Event Reporting | | | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR 0002 24.571 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205307  Mikael, Thu, 1450  Fine  Lin, Fri, 1015  fine  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-204999  Lin, Thu, 1037  Almost fine, there is an issue in the figure  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-203365  Mikael, Fri, 14:44  Fine to add the procedure, but it needs to be completed  Lin, Mon, 06:13  Fine with the new procedure, but number of changes needed  Sunghoon, Wed, 13:01  Provides rev | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | V2XAPP | |  | Lena – Breakout | | |  |  | CT aspects of V2XAPP  100% | |
|  |  | | [C1-204625](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204625.zip) | Addition of used abbreviations | | | Ericsson / Mikael | CR 0001 24.486 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204626](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204626.zip) | Correction of root element term use | | | Ericsson / Mikael | CR 0002 24.486 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204627](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204627.zip) | V2X de-registration procedure correction | | | Ericsson / Mikael | CR 0003 24.486 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-205088 and its revisions  Sapan, Thursday, 9:39  This CR Conflicts with “C1-205088” from Samsung.  There is no URI present in registration response. We need to use AS address received in the response of service discovery procedure. My proposal is to merge this CR with C1-205088.  Chen, Thursday, 10:30  Clause affected includes 6.3.2, but I haven't seen this clause.  Mikael, Thursday, 18:40  @Sapan: I agree and I am happy to merge C1-204627 into C1-205088 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205526](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204629.zip) | V2X message delivery procedure corrections | | | Ericsson / Mikael | CR 0005 24.486 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204629  Mikael, Thursday, 11:57  Changes in C1-205526 are as discussed is different mail threads:   * A <message-reception-uri> element added to signal the address of a reception report * Editorials * Rewording VAE-S handling at receiving a reception report   Complete removal of Reception of a V2X message reception report subclauses is not acceptable to us as will will result in inconsistent and incomplete stage 3 specification. I suggest we do the change we agree is needed (removal of requirement to provide <result> to V2X application server) and replace it with fairly generic text as proposed. We leave the rest of these subclauses untouched and try to resolve the differences in preference for next meeting.  Sapan, Thursday, 1:47  @Mikael: Just to clarify – my second comment related to using V2X UE ID in HTTP Request URI will be resolved in next meeting. Right?  I am fine with other changes.  ---------------------------------------------------  Sapan, Thursday, 10:02   1. There is no URI received in HTTP POST request in clause 6.5.1.1. Proposed changes in clause 6.5.1.3 to use URI received in HTTP POST request is not proper. I agree that we need to have URI to send delivery report. So, can we add new element <message-reception-uri> under <message-info> element? Sender of the message needs to fill this element in clause 6.5.1.4, 6.5.2.4 and 6.5.2.5. 2. In clause 6.5.2.4, identity of the UE is determined by association from the target geographical area indicated by the V2X application server. Does this association provides URL where UE has opened listening socket to accept any HTTP request? I am not sure how this identity will work as HTTP Request URI?   Chen, Thursday, 10:30  Conflicts with C1-205164 and C1-205165. I suggest C1-205164 merged into C1-204629 and the part of reception of a V2X message reception report of C1-204629 merged into C1-205165.  Mikael, Thursday, 18:26  I am happy to merge as indicated in my comments to C1-205165. As for the contents of the colliding subclauses I think they are better kept and corrected to remove signaling to V2X application server.  But please comment on your preferred way ahead.  Mikael, Friday, 14:04  @Sapan:  1) -> Ok, I can fix this in a revision.  2) -> I guess the storing/association of UE identity should be captured in Application level location tracking procedure, 6.4.2. Currently there is only specification of VAE-S storing received geo info. But for the geo area info stored to be useful at a subsequent request to “Sending of a V2X message to target geographical areas” the geo area indicated by V2X application server to VAE-S must be assiciated to the applicable VAE-C´s, right? So in order to get recipients for the Geo Area Messages, the information to store and associated to Geo Areas should be specified in the usable format in 6.4.2, e.g. UE provided URL?  Or how do you see it?  Sapan, Friday, 17:52  @Mikael:  1) -> Ok  2) -> Yes, in TS 23.286 – it is mentioned that “The VAE server maintains the mapping of the GEO ID with the location corresponding to one or more V2X UE IDs.” So, VAE server will maintain association. We can add a NOTE in 6.4.2 if we want to specify this. I am fine with it.  My question is that - in the registration procedure (Clause 6.2.1) or in application level tracking procedure (clause 6.4.1), the client sends <V2X-UE-id> which is set to the identity of the UE which requests for registration. Can we use the identity of V2X UE as URL to send HTTP message? I believe identity is not same as HTTP URL.  Mikael, Thursday, 8:17  A draft revision is available.  Chen, Thursday, 9:19  @Mikael: the link to the draft revision can’t be opened. I still can’t see the significance of these words “evaluates the contents of the <result> element” and don’t understand what the VAE layer needs to do actually with these words.  As upload deadline approaching, I suggest to remove the related subclauses totally this meeting. | |
|  |  | | [C1-204783](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204783.zip) | V2XAPP stage 3 specification overlap | | | Ericsson / Mikael | discussion Rel-16 | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-204979](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204979.zip) | Updates to references | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0013 24.486 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204982](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204982.zip) | XML schema for UE registration procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0016 24.486 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204983](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204983.zip) | Correction to client procedure of V2X UE de-registration procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0017 24.486 Rel-16 | Agreed  Sapan, Thursday, 11:10  Regarding the reason for change – where you have mentioned “the V2X MSG Type and the V2X service ID is the same thing”. Can you clarify on this? How do you conclude both are same?  Chen, Friday, 4:00  First, the deregistration request should be consistent with the registration request, so the V2X MSG Type is corresponding to the V2X service ID so that they are the same thing;  Second, the descriptions of V2X MSG Type and V2X service ID are the same thing, e.g., ETSI ITS DENM, ETSI ITS CAM;  Third, in stage 2 and 3 of V2XARC and eV2XARC, i.e., TS 23.285, TS 23.287, TS 24.386, TS 24.587, the V2X service ID is used but not V2X MSG Type.  Sapan, Friday, 6:14  I see your point – the deregistration request should be consistent with registration request. But wondering why SA6 used “V2X MSG Type” only in deregistration request. May be a clarification in SA6 will help.  I am fine with the changes as of now. If SA6 clarifies further on “V2X MSG Type” element, then we have to take it on board in CT1 spec.  Chen, Monday, 6:31  As clarified by SA colleagues, these changes can be taken on board. Thanks for your understanding. | |
|  |  | | [C1-204985](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204985.zip) | Update to server procedure of application level location tracking procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0019 24.486 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-205164](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205164.zip) | Correction to reception of a V2X message of V2X message delivery | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0021 24.486 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-204629 and its revisions  Chen, Thursday, 3:31  @Mikael:  Please merge C1-205164 and C1-205165 into C1-204629 and its revisions.  I suggest to remove the procedures totally. And if so, please add Huawei and HiSilicon as co-signer. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205165](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205165.zip) | Correction to reception of a V2X message reception report of V2X message delivery | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0022 24.486 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-204629 and its revisions  Sapan, Thursday, 17:47  I request to make the clause void while removing it and keep the clause number as it is.  Also, the proposed changes overlap with CR C1-204629 from Ericsson. I request Huawei and Ericsson to merge their proposals into single contribution so that we can proceed.  Mikael, Thursday, 18:23  On the change covered by 5165 I agree that there is no stage 2 requirement for sending reception report to V2X application server as currently specified. I however think removing the complete “Reception of a V2X message reception report” is a bit too drastic. The message is captured in stage 2 and both receiving and sending entities are covered by 24.486.  Thus I would prefer to keep the subclauses and just capture a minimal action at the receiver. Typically I assume the result would need to be evaluated by the receiver to e.g. at failure trigger recovery action. The sender will have a reason to request the receipt report.  So my preference is to go ahead with these subclauses as proposed in C1-204629 (and merge 5165 as suggested by Chen), but I am happy to correct and update if you have any specific comments.  Chen, Monday, 6:31  @Mikael: Thanks for your clarification.  From my side, it is still unclear if “shall evaluate the contents of the received V2X message and take VAE-S internal action, as needed” as described in C1-204629. These actions are UE/VAE-S implementation.  Since there are no Stage 2 requirements, I’d prefer to remove the procedures totally.  Chen, Thursday, 3:31  @Mikael:  Please merge C1-205164 and C1-205165 into C1-204629 and its revisions.  I suggest to remove the procedures totally. And if so, please add Huawei and HiSilicon as co-signer.  Mikael, Thursday, 6:07  I am working on a revision, trying to address Sapan´s comment:   1. There is no URI received in HTTP POST request in clause 6.5.1.1. Proposed changes in clause 6.5.1.3 to use URI received in HTTP POST request is not proper. I agree that we need to have URI to send delivery report. So, can we add new element <message-reception-uri> under <message-info> element? Sender of the message needs to fill this element in clause 6.5.1.4, 6.5.2.4 and 6.5.2.5.   For the proposal to remove the subclauses on Reception of a V2X message reception report, I think that will result in incomplete and confusing stage 3 specification. Stage 2 describes this report request/receipt as part of the procedure and both sender and receiver are in the scope of 24.486. Obviously the reception report message has significance to the receiver or the request of a reception report would not be meaningful. A suggestion is to change the action at receipt to “evaluates the contents of the <result> element”, and leave it that for the time being at least. Would this be acceptable?  Sapan, Thursday, 6:25  @Mikael: I am fine with the proposed text. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205166](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205166.zip) | Correction to V2X message reception report | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0023 24.486 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1-205424 | Update to server procedure of V2X UE registration procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0015 24.486 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204981  ---------------------------------------------------  Sapan, Thursday, 10:51  I have suggestion for text improvement as follows:  ii) if success and if the V2X service IDs ~~requested~~ as present in the ~~received~~ <registration-info> element of the received HTTP POST request  is not fully acceptable to the VAE-S, the VAE-S may change the V2X service IDs to a subset and shall include one or more  <V2X-service-id> child elements set to the identities of the new V2X service IDs;  Chen, Friday, 4:00  A draft revision is available.  Sapan, Friday, 5:45  I am Ok with the draft revision.  Mikael, Friday, 16:28  Fine in principle to extend registration with multiple services, but again I question whether in line with stage 2 or we need SA6 acknowledgement.  A consequence of multiple services is the added more complex VAE-S indication of partial success. I understand the intention is to return the accepted subset, which is a true subset of the requested services. However, with this new logic, don´t we need to specify how VAE-C handles such response?  Chen, Monday, 7:47  @Mikael: V2X UE always has multiple V2X services, referred to Stage 2 of V2XARC(TS 23.285) and eV2XARC (TS 23.287). Multiple V2X services in the registration request is more appropriate.  For the handling of the response, from my side, there is no need to specify what the VAE-C does in this spec. The VAE-C shall store the new info and deliver it to the application. | |
|  |  | | C1-205425 | Update to server procedure of V2X UE de-registration procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0018 24.486 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204984  ---------------------------------------------  Sapan, Thursday, 17:43  Can you please modify step a) as follows?  “shall remove the received V2X service IDs from registration information corresponding to the V2X UE”  Chen, Friday, 4:00  A draft revision is available.  Sapan, Friday, 5:43  I am Ok with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-205444 | Corrections to request URI and clause reference | | | Samsung / Sapan | CR 0020 24.486 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205088  ----------------------------------------------  Sapan, Friday, 14:16  Based on discussion on CR C1-204627, where Ericsson agreed to merge C1-204627 into C1-205088, I have revised this CR to add Ericsson as cosigner.  I have also removed proposed changes clause 6.3.2 as they were overlapping with Huawei CR C1-204984.  A draft revision is available. | |
|  |  | | C1-205503 | Network monitoring procedure corrections | | | Ericsson / Mikael | CR 0009 24.486 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204633  ----------------------------------------------------  Chen, Friday, 3:33  1. In the Reason for Change,  it is specified tha the VAE-S includes  2. an <identity> element;  3. from my side, separate request and response element is more reasonable since the xml schema is more clear.  4. there is no need to change the <network-monitoring-info-notification> element.  5. <trigger-criteria> element can indicate which network status triggers the sending of the monitoring reports. what do you mean the status of the triggering criteria?  Mikael, Monday, 10:59  @Chen:  1. -> Fixed in a revision  2. -> I assume you mean that an existing “an <identity>“ should be changed to “an <identity>, and that is taken on board in a revision. However there are a number of “a <identity>” in the TS, so let´s consider a cleanup CR for next meeting.  3. -> If that is the way to go, we have a lot more work to fix other procedures and align to such principle. I think we shall decide and be consistent on one way and not mix the two alternative ways. The proposed change is the minimum effort fix that I still prefer. Unless we get an agreement in this meeting to change all procedures for separate request and response elements, I will keep the change.  4. -> agree it is not strictly needed, but aligns to the element naming convention used for other procedures. I prefer consistency in element naming.  5. -> The <triggering-criteria> element is used by the UE to set triggering criteria. The notification is sent by the server when a trigger “hits” and “information on network **status for the triggering criteria**” (stage 2). So the server reporting trigger criteria status is not the same as the triggering criteria (UE->server) that maps criteria to <trigger-id> elements, as currently specified in 24.486.  Chen, Monday, 12:18  1. -> Ok  2. -> Ok  3. -> Yes, we should make just one way to go, which is easy and clear to implement. I can accept this change this meeting and I will re-evaluate it in next meeting.  4. -> As Stage 2 indicates, network monitoring information is a phrase, and the notification is corresponding to subscription. The network-monitoring-info-notification is therefore more appropriate.  5. -> Every trigger criteria has a <trigger-id> element, please see the structure of Clause 8.3. You mean the triggering criteria status is one of the trigger criteria with the trigger id?  Mikael, Tuesday, 9:11  4. -> Ok, but the principle we have used in 24.486 is to label the top element of the procedure with procedure name and “-info” suffix. So following this the element in this case could be “network-monitoring-info-notification-info” or more appropriately “network-monitoring-information-notification-info”. This is clearly too long. For the subscription part of network monitoring, we just used “subscription-request” and “subscription-response” (to be renamed into a common “subscription-info” following 24.486 style), i.e. leaving out the network-monitoring-info(rmation) bit. I suggest we do the same for the notification procedure and simply call the element “notification-info”. Short, consistent and clear  5. -> Yes if you check stage 2, the information for triggers clearly differ in subscription and notification, whereas we have used the same element in stage 3. In my understanding, in the subscription the UE will register what events and the trigger critera with ids. In the notification the server will indicate what triggering criteria (trigger id) triggered the notification, and the status for the triggering criteria. In the CR I propose to define a new element for the response to cover these stage 2 requirements. Maybe you see a different solution?  Chen, Tuesday, 14:03  @Mikael:  4. -> Ok with me  5. -> <triggering-criteria-status> sounds unclear. <trigger-id> can be directly used to make it more clear for corresponding to the <trigger-criteria> and there is no need to be multiple these elements. What’s the meaning of <trigger-id-status>? From my side, <trigger-id> is enough to correspond to the <trigger-criteria>.  Mikael, Tuesday, 16:50  @Chen: Again, I try to interpret the stage 2 specification of the information included by the network at notification. Which is:  This includes *information on network status* for the triggering criteria, and may include the following parameters  I agree that it makes sense to include <trigger-id> as the UE can map this to the triggering critera. However the red text above seems to imply that the network shall include some status information as well in addition to identifying the triggering criteria. I do not know what type of information is intended, so maybe better to leave this for now and come back in next meeting after discussing with SA6 colleagues.  I propose to revise the CR and simplify the <network-monitoring-info> element so that it can contain a list of <trigger-id> in addition to the optional elements.  Mikael, Tuesday, 17:23  A draft revision is available.  Chen, Wednesday, 1:23  @Mikael: The draft has only changed the structure but not the procedure.  Why is **a list of** <trigger-id> not just **a** <trigger-id>?  Mikael, Wednesday, 9:52  A further draft revision is available. About “Why is **a list of** <trigger-id> not just **a** <trigger-id>?”, because stage 2 says so: “This includes information on network status for the triggering criteria…”, i.e. plural criteria and not singular criterion. Assumingly there can be multiple valid triggering conditions for generating the notification.  Chen, Wednesday, 13:09  @Mikael: The problem is, can multiple triggering conditions occur at the same time? From my side, if one triggering condition occurs, the notification should be sent immediately.  Mikael, Wednesday, 13:12  @Chen: I assume they can, and I do not think such immediate notification can be assumed that prevents multiple triggers. It all depends on the triggers requested by the UE.  Anyway, the update follows stage 2.  Chen, Wednesday, 13:20  @Mikael: Ok with me. | |
|  |  | | C1-205505 | V2X application resource management procedure | | | Ericsson / Mikael | CR 0010 24.486 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204636  --------------------------------------------------  Chen, Friday, 3:33  I’m not sure whether these procedures should be kept “void” or removed totally.  Mikael, Tuesday, 10:37  A draft revision removing the CT1/CT3 overlaps completely is available.  Christian, Thursday, 8:09  We have agreed to have revisions of C1-204636 and C1-204637 to remove the “void”s. However, we have noticed that you have not requested revisions yet. Is there any reason for this?  Mikael, Thursday, 8:16  I have shared draft revisions in the drafts folder. Revision TDoc will be requested soon.  Christian, Thursday, 8:21  @Mikael: Now, I understand that you will proceed with the draft revisions so I am glad about it.  Mikael, Thursday, 8:27  Ok, good. I just wanted to get a confirmation on the drafts before proceeding with revision TDoc request, and I saw the ack from Chen this morning. TDocs now requested. Let me know if there are any comments on the drafts, otherwise I will use these for the official revisions. | |
|  |  | | C1-205506 | File distribution procedure | | | Ericsson / Mikael | CR 0011 24.486 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204637  --------------------------------------------------  Chen, Friday, 3:33  I’m not sure whether these procedures should be kept “void” or removed totally.  Mikael, Tuesday, 10:37  A draft revision removing the CT1/CT3 overlaps completely is available.  Christian, Thursday, 8:09  We have agreed to have revisions of C1-204636 and C1-204637 to remove the “void”s. However, we have noticed that you have not requested revisions yet. Is there any reason for this?  Mikael, Thursday, 8:16  I have shared draft revisions in the drafts folder. Revision TDoc will be requested soon.  Christian, Thursday, 8:21  @Mikael: Now, I understand that you will proceed with the draft revisions so I am glad about it.  Mikael, Thursday, 8:27  Ok, good. I just wanted to get an confirmation on the drafts before proceeding with revision TDoc request, and I saw the ack from Chen this morning. TDocs now requested. Let me know if there are any comments on the drafts, otherwise I will use these for the official revisions. | |
|  |  | | C1-205511 | Application level location tracking procedure correction | | | Ericsson / Mikael | CR 0004 24.486 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204628  ----------------------------------------------------  Sapan, Thursday, 9:53  Geographical areas can have overlapping area near boundaries. As soon as the V2X UE enters overlap area – it is entering new geographic area.  As per SA6 defined procedure in TS 23.286, only condition to perform unsubscribe to previous/old geographical area is that – the subscription to new geographical area is successful. That means – as per SA6 defined procedure, at a time UE can have only one active subscription. With your proposal, UE will have multiple subscriptions as long as UE is in overlap area – which is not in line with SA6. Please keep original text as it is which is clear.  Mikael, Thursday, 10:14  Indeed with overlapping areas there would be multiple subscriptions. Maybe we need to think a bit on how it is supposed to work, but if cancelling a subscription can only be done at successful subscription to another area there are as I see it two problems:   1. If the client moves from a subscribed area into an area where it is not configured to subscribe to messages 2. If the subscription to the new area is unsuccessful.   The above would lead to receiving messages for an area where the client is no longer located, or?  Chen, Thursday, 10:30   * the geo-id related change conflicts with C1-204631; * there is no need to clarify that subscribed messages come from V2X AS; * there is no need to clarify that unsubscribe optionally occurs after optional subscribe if the UE had previously successfully subscribed to messages for the exited geographical area; Stage 2 states that upon entering a new geographical area, the client subscribes to the geographic area Geo ID B. * there is no need to add the UE identity element, because the <location-tracking-info> element with an <operation> element set to "subscribe" can identify the UE’s intention uniquely. * a little conflicts with C1-204985, the server procedure can be merged into C1-204985   Chen, Friday, 2:55  This clause is for tracking geographical location, so the UE should belong to only one geographical area even if the UE is in the overlapping area.  On the other hand, although the subscription to the new area is failed, the UE with the old geo id should be kept.  Sapan, Friday, 9:42  @Mikael: Both the points which you have mentioned needs further discussion in SA6. Is Ericsson planning to bring any clarification in SA6 (to unsubscribe only when exit the area)?   * While thinking more, I came across a below scenario where V2X UE will not be able to subscribed due to the defined procedure.   + Consider a V2X UE enters over lapping area and perform successful subscription to new area and unsubscribe to old area (as per the defined procedure). And if the V2X UE returns back to old area from the overlapping area (i.e. without actually exiting the area), then it will not have any active subscription. * Considering above use case I am fine to have unsubscribe only when V2X UE exists the area. But this will lead to further questions on impacts of multiple active subscriptions in V2X UE and in VAE-S which needs to be study or discuss further. * I propose to add Editor’s note to specify that handling of multiple active subscriptions at V2X UE and VAE-S is FFS based on SA6 guidance.   @Chen: Although the clause is for tracking geographical area, it is pre-condition for any UE to subscribed to GEO-ID to receive messages targeted to specific area (as mentioned in clause 9.4.3 of TS 23.286).  Mikael, Friday, 14:52  @Chen:   * You mean in structure part? OK will fix. * Maybe it is not strictly needed, but it is an alignment to other subclauses, e.g. 6.2.1 and 6.3.1 * Issue being discussed separately * Being discussed separately, but we in my understanding need to store/associate information used as target at “Sending of a V2X message to target geografical areas”. Maybe <identity> is not the right information. * Changes to the same subclause, but I think there are no real collisions. Let´s keep separate for now.   Chen, Monday, 8:23  According to SA6 description, from my side, if the V2X UE is in the overlapping area, the V2X UE receives V2X messages from either the old VAE-S or the new VAE-S, but not BOTH. Therefore, if the V2X UE has subscribed a new VAE-S, it should unsubscribe the old one. And the V2X UE belongs to only one GEO ID, not GEO IDs.  @Sapan: for your proposed situation, if the V2X UE returns back, the V2X UE should resubscribe to the “old” VAE-S and then unsubscribe the “new” one.  Chen, Monday, 8:31  @Mikael: Ok with all your comments, except that  from my side, there is no need to add the <identity> element in the reception of the HTTP POST message. Because the <location-tracking-info> element with an <operation> element set to "subscribe" can make the VAE-S do the right decision and actions.  Chen, Monday, 9:18  @Frederic: This “one or more” has been fixed in C1-204980.  Sapan, Monday, 10:15  @Chen:  Please note that in the use case – “V2X UE returns back to old area from the overlapping area (i.e. without actually exiting the area)”. What is the trigger to perform resubscribe? As per SA6, subscription occurs only when UE enters new geographical area. Here, in this case, the V2X UE has not entered the area.  Chen, Monday, 11:46  hen the UE is in the area of c (overlapping area), the UE has 2 options:  1.Subscribes to B and then unsubscribes A;  2.Remain the subscription to A.  Note that the unsubscription occurs after the successful subscription to a new area.  If in the case 1, when the UE returns to Area a, the UE shall resubscribe to A and then unsubscribe to B; If in the Area c, the UE can remain the subscription to B;  If in the case 2, when the UE enters Area b, the UE subscribes to B and then unsubscribe A;  The abnormal case is that when the UE enters the Area b, the UE fails to subscribe to B. Since the UE doesn’t make a successful subscription, the UE should not unsubscribe to A and remain the old subscription to A until a successful subscription to B.  Mikael, Monday, 12:17  Unfortunately, Chen, I do not quite agree to what you are saying. The overlapping areas and failed subscription cases are in my view abnormal cases and/or error cases. This is for stage 3 to solve and we cannot say it is not covered by stage 2 and therefore not valid. But if you really want to look at stage 2, please consider that a pre-condition for the geo subscription is:  3.   The VAE client has subscribed to a certain geographical area identifier group (GEO ID A) in order to receive V2X messages for this area.  So the UE is subscribed to the area it is in. Then at entering a new area the UE subscribes to this area. However the unsubscription steps are marked optional. So it would look like from stage 2 that the UE does not need to unsubscribe at all from the old area if it does not want. Thus, multiple geo subscriptions  are allowed.  And in case of overlapping areas, what is the problem of dual geo subscriptions? It is fully logical as the UE is located in both areas and should be notified following both A and B. And what if the UE moves A->C->A? If applying your logic the UE after such mobility will be located in A while receiving geo notifications for B.  I think we need to take a step back and consider a very basic normal case:  UE is located in A and geo subscribed to A.  UE moves to an area where it has no configuration for geo subscription (i.e. in “white areas” in your figure – Not in A, B or C).  The UE will keep its geo subscription to A if the only way to unsubscribe is to move to an area where the UE has configuration for geo subscription. To me this is simply incorrect.  I believe that the way to get a logical working solution is:   1. Geo subscribe when the UE moves into an area where it is configured for geo subscription; and 2. Geo unsubscribe when the UE moves out of an area where it is geo subscribed.   Simple, works for all cases.  Sapan, Monday, 18:54  @Chen: Can you please provide few more clarification on trigger point for case-1 (based on your figure where area C is actually overlapping area of GEO ID A and GEO ID B)   1. UE moving from A => C    1. ***Trigger point:*** Entering GEO ID B (as mentioned in step#1 of clause 9.3.3.2 in TS 23.286).    2. ***Operations:*** Perform subscribe to GEO ID B and unsubscribe to GEO ID A (as per clause 9.3.3.2 in TS 23.286) 2. Now, if UE moves from C => A (i.e. without existing overlapping area, moves back to GEO ID A)    1. Your proposal: “If in the case 1, when the UE returns to Area a, the UE shall resubscribe to A and then unsubscribe to B;”    2. ***Trigger point:*** What is trigger point to perform resubscribe / unsubscribe?    3. Please note again that UE is not entering GEO ID A, it is already with in scope of GEO ID A. UE is just exiting overlapping area C (or GEO ID B)   Chen, Tuesday, 2:32  From my side, the original idea of SA6 for GEO ID is similar to Cell ID. UE belongs to only one Cell ID so that the tracking is unique. But for V2X VAE-S, it is more complex, there are 3 cases.  @Sapan: when UE is in c, note c is both in A & B, if:  1. UE has subscribed to GEO ID B and unsubscribed to GEO ID A, then UE can remain the GEO ID B. when UE enter Area a(lower case) from c, UE perform subscription to GEO ID A and unsubscription to GEO ID B;  2. UE remains GEO ID A and does not subscribe to GEO ID B, then it doesn’t matter.  Note that, even if UE subscribes to GEO ID A, UE can also receive V2X messages from area B. GEO ID is just a tag and for tracking purpose like Cell ID. There are 4 pre-conditions for reception of V2X messages.  @Mikael: Even if UE subscribes to GEO ID A, UE can also receive V2X messages from area B. GEO ID is just a tag and for tracking purpose like Cell ID. There are 4 pre-conditions for reception of V2X messages.  E.g., in case 1, UE are moving from A to B, but the UE only subscribed to GEO ID A and now in Area a(lower case). When a traffic jam occurs in Area b, this information can be delivered to the UE as well. In the same way, when UE is in the overlapping area c, UE can both receive information from A or B, no matter whether the UE subscribes to GEO ID A or GEO ID B. The V2X message derives from the V2X application specific server. It is GEO ID determines what information from which areas the UE can receive.  When the UE moves from A to a white place (case 3), the UE should remain GEO ID A for tracking purpose like Cell ID and this would not impact what V2X information the UE receives, from my side. Because the server can determine what V2X information should send to GEO ID A’s clients according to the geographic deployments.  I agree with you that for stage 3 to cover the abnormal cases. When the UE fails to subscribe to a new GEO ID, the UE should not unsubscribe to the old one until a successful subscription.  Mikael, Wednesday, 11:23  After discussing with my SA6 colleague we still disagree with the principle for Tracking geographical location at the VAE server outlined by Chen. This functionality cannot be compared to cell Id as the underlaying network structure is fundamentally different. Our understanding is that the VAE-S shall only maintain a geo subscription when the VAE-C is located in the corresponding geo area.  The geo areas used at geo tracking need not cover the complete network where the VAE-C is reachable. This is different compared to cell Id as the UE always has a valid Cell id – or the UE is unreachable.  With the logic outlined by Chen, geo id says nothing on the actual VAE-C location, except that the VAE-C sometime has been in this geo area.  So, if we cannot agree in CT1 that there is a need to unsubscribe from a geo id upon leaving this area, we should send an LS to SA6 to request clarification.  Chen, Wednesday, 12:31  In the case of moving to a white place, the problem is, when the UE moves out of area A, the UE may not connect to the VAE-S (covering A), then how the UE does the unsubscription?   Assume that under a same VAE-S, the GEO IDs are consecutive.  Then if the UE do the unsubscription when UE is leaving A (not out of A), in other cases, the UE may unsubscribe the old one and then subscribe the new one. Therefore, from my side, when the UE enters a white place, the UE can not receive any messages from the VAE-S. On the other hand, at least, there is no harm to receive  messages related to an area/GEO ID where the UE is no longer located in the case of no other GEO ID subscribed. E.g., the UE can receive some information like traffic jam, incident, roadwork and make a better navigation.  Mikael, Wednesday, 13:22  @Chen: probably agree on most, but not a fundamental property of the mechanism. Provides responses to Chen’s questions. Proposes to draft an LS to SA6.  Chen, Wednesday, 14:22  @Mikael: I do not see the need of sending an LS to SA6. According to Stage 2’s description, it is clear that keeping the original text as it is is aligned with SA6.  Sapan, Wednesday, 15:20  Provides comments to Chen. Thinks some clarification from SA6 would help and is fine to have an LS to SA6.  Mikael, Wednesday, 19:53  @Chen:   * About the need to clarify that unsubscribe optionally occurs after optional subscribe, I take these changes out, awaiting SA6 guidance. Thus stage 2 and stage 3 will remain aligned on this aspect, and we will see if we need to do something in next meeting. * About adding the UE identity element, I only add in server procedure where it is missing. It is already present in baseline spec in Client procedure and coding. Thus, I will keep these changes. However, as raised by Sapan, the question is if <identity> is the right form/information, as the server will use this at a later point when sending geo id based messages to the UEs subscribed to that geo id. I.e. is the <identity> correct and sufficient for finding the target UEs? Chen, you seem to suggest that <identity> is not needed at all. I personally do not understand how the server could find target UEs for geo id messages if no “address” of the applicable targets is mapped to the geo id.  Stage 2 includes an identity element in these massages. As <identity> element use is present in baseline spec, I suggest to keep as is for now and do a proper analysis for next meeting and either change to an appropriate address information, or completely remove if you can explain how it can work, Chen.   A draft revision is available.  Chen, Thursday, 3:31  What I mean is the <identity> element in the reception of the HTTP POST, not for the VAE-S’s action. <location-tracking-info> element with an <operation> element set to "subscribe" can make the VAE-S do the right decision. Of course, the VAE-S needs to do the <identity> associations.  Anyway, I can live this. | |
|  |  | | C1-205512 | Geo-id correction | | | Ericsson / Mikael | CR 0007 24.486 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204631  Sapan, Thursday, 1:49  I am fine with the changes now.  ----------------------------------------------  Frederic, Thursday, 7:31  CR number is missing in the “other specs affected” (TS 23.286 CR abcd).  Sapan, Thursday, 10:15  The element <geographical-identifier> is used in PC5 provisioning procedure clause 7.3.3 too. For PC5 provisioning procedure too – does <geographical-identifier> element contains area identifier?  Chen, Thursday, 10:30  From my side, the <geographical-identifier> element could be safely removed too.  Mikael, Thursday, 18:36  @Frederic: it will be fixed in a revision. For early information the 23.286 CR# is 0019.  Mikael, Friday, 14:26  @Sapan: Very good question... In my understanding of stage 2 the <geographical-identifier> in the PC5 parameters provisioning context is a definition of a geographical area and not a geographical area identifier.  If you agree I can include this in the CR and maybe change the PC5 parameter to <geographical-area> with appropriate definition.  Mikael, Friday, 15:11  @Chen: You mean to remove the <geographical-identifier> element and directly use <geo-id> one level “higher”? Can be done, but in some cases <geographical-identifier> contains multiple <geo-id> elements. In that case we would get multiple <geo-id> elements one level higher and not isolated to a single <geographical-identifier> element. We can do so, if you think that would be an improvement.  Sapan, Friday, 17:57  @Mikael: Yes, it will be good if we clarify <geographical-identifier> in the PC5 parameters provisioning context also. Without clarifying that, it will create confusion.  Chen, Monday, 7:54  @Mikael: Yes. The <geo-id> can be directly used and it is easy and convenient for programming.  In the case of multiple <geo-id> elements, the XML schema can be easily programmed as: <xsd:element type="xxx" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="unbounded">  Mikael, Tuesday, 11:06  A draft revision is available.  Chen, Wednesday, 1:55  The new <geographic-area> element should be specified in the structure as well.  Mikael, Wednesday, 10:15  A further draft revision is available.  Sapan, Wednesday, 12:56  I am Ok with the draft revision.  Chen, Wednesday, 13:17  @Mikael: I have not seen the <geographic-area> element with <polygon-area> and  <ellipsoid-arc-area>  child elements specified in the Structure. Did you upload the right draft?  Mikael, Wednesday, 13:24  @Chen: sorry I provided a link to the wrong version, here is the correct link.  Chen, Wednesday, 13:37  Ok with me. | |
|  |  | | C1-205515 | HTTP GET in V2X service discovery procedure | | | Ericsson / Mikael | CR 0006 24.486 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204630  Sapan, Thursday, 1:49  I am fine with the changes now.  ---------------------------------------------------  Sapan, Thursday, 10:05  Can you also add data semantics for <service-discovery-data> element?  Chen, Thursday, 10:30  HTTP GET message cannot contain a body and the content-type header.  Mikael, Friday, 14:57  @Chen: The change to GET was proposed by my SA6 colleague, but I agree with your concern. Could be fixed/aligned in different ways but for now I am happy to revert the 24.486 change and discuss further internally whether to do something in SA6.  I will keep the changes to 8.3 and 8.5, and update the CR title accordingly.  Chen, Monday, 6:31  @Mikael: OK with me and the Reason for Change in the cover page should be updated too.  Mikael, Tuesday, 11:45  A draft revision is available.  Chen, Wednesday, 1:47  @Mikael:   * The <V2X-service-map> with <V2X-service-id> and <V2X-AS-address> child elements is specified in the Data semantics but not in the Structure. * the <V2X-service-id> element can only contain one V2X service identity. If multiple V2X service identities, one or more <V2X-service-id> elements should be used.   Mikael, Wednesday, 10:50  A further draft revision taking into account Chen’s comments is available.  Sapan, Wednesday, 13:08  Why structure of <V2X-service-map> element has been removed from clause 8.3?  Sapan, Wednesday, 13:11  I missed the similar comment given by Chen regarding V2X-service-map element.  I am Ok with latest revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-205516 | V2X service continuity procedure corrections | | | Ericsson / Mikael | CR 0008 24.486 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204632  ------------------------------------------------  Chen, Friday, 3:32   * In clause 6.7.2, a HTTP -> an HTTP * In clause 6.7.2, the first bullet b) seems to conflict with C1-204626.   Mikael, Monday, 11:09  @Chen:   * Ok, fixed in a revision. * Impact to the same sentence, but as far as I see the two changes can be applied at CR implementation without collision.   Chen, Monday, 11:49  Ok with me now.  Mikael, Wednesday, 19:14  A draft revision is available. | |
|  |  | | C1-205518 | Dynamic group management procedure | | | Ericsson / Mikael | CR 0012 24.486 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205504  ----------------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-204638  ------------------------------------------------------  Chen, Friday 3:00   * an <identity> in clause 6.10.2.1. * the annotation should be removed. * The same concern as comments to C1-204636 & C1-204637.   Mikael, Friday, 15:35  @Chen:   * Ok will fix. Same thing in 6.10.2.2 * This was added intentionally as help at CR implementation in the TS as style corrections could easily be missed. But I will let ***Frederic*** say what he prefers. * Yes, I see that this early in the TS “life” maybe we could get away with complete deletion instead of void. Results in a nicer TS, so my preference if we can agree on that.   Chen, Monday, 7:57  @Mikael: Thanks for considering my comments.  Yes, it is early in the TS life and the “void” can be removed.  Frederic, Monday, 8:03  @Chen: Please remove the annotation.  If you can, could you fix the style of the “one or more” in 8.3? it’s not introduced by your CR, but since you’re modifying the subclause, it would be great!  Mikael, Tuesday, 10:41  A draft revision is available.  Chen, Wednesday, 2:24  I am Ok with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-205423 | Correction to client procedure of V2X UE registration procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0014 24.486 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204980  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Sapan, Thursday, 10:48  In clause 6.2.1 – sending HTTP POST request is mentioned twice. Step d) is not needed.  Chen, Friday, 4:00  @Sapan: I have fixed these issues in a draft revision. To keep consistent with other procedures, the first “send” -> “generate”.  Sapan, Friday, 5:41  I am Ok with the draft revision.  Mikael, Friday, 16:19  If we now remove the <identity> element level for <V2X-UE-id> of registration procedure, can this not be done also for the other uses of <identity>. I think <identity> element includes only the <V2X-UE-id> element in all cases but one:  In V2X application resource management procedure the <identity> element can contain <V2X-UE-id> or <V2X-group-id>. Would it not be an idea to use just <V2X-UE-id> element in all other cases and leave <identity> with the alternative contents only for <V2X-app-requirement-request>?  Also I noticed that <identity> is listed as one of the elements directly under the <VAE-info> root element (in fact the first one), but that is not correct I think. The <identity> element (or now <V2X-UE-id> ) is always included in another element level under <VAE-info>. So <identity> as bullet a should be removed.  On multiple services in the request, this is not clear in stage 2 to me and it seems like just one service. Do we need SA6 acknowledgement?  The coding is still a bit unclear/ambiguous. What about:  The <registration-info> element shall include one of the following:  a)   a <V2X-UE-id> element and one or more <V2X-service-ID> element(s); or  b)   a <result> element.  Chen, Monday, 7:28  @Mikael:  Since the <V2X-UE-id> element is explicit and definite in the registration procedure, there is no need to be under an <identity> , which is easy and convenient for programming. As for other uses of <identity>, I will check and fix them in next meeting.  About just using, <V2X-UE-id> element in all other cases, in this situation, I’d prefer to use the <identity> element.  About removing <identity> as bullet a, I agree, and I will recheck them and fix them in next meeting.  On multiple services in the request, V2X UE always have multiple V2X services, e.g., SPaT, CAM, DENM, MAP and so on, refferred to V2XARC(3GPP TS23.285) & eV2XARC(3GPP TS 23.287).  About your proosed changes to the coding, I agree and will take them on board.  A draft revision is available. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | eV2XARC | |  | Lena – Breakout | | |  |  | CT aspects of eV2XARC | |
|  |  | | [C1-204562](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204562.zip) | Add UE requested V2XP into +CSUEPOLICY | | | OPPO / Rae | CR 0700 27.007 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204563](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204563.zip) | Service area restriciton not applicable to SR for PC5 V2X | | | OPPO / Rae | CR 2417 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Sunghoon, Thursday, 8:20  Having Service Request is to move UE into CONNECTED mode and that is only required for Mode 1 operation.  For V2X, UE can always choose Mode 2 and stay in IDLE. Therefore, this is not needed.  In addition, there is no clear requirement that UE should be able to use PC5 in non-allowed area.  SangMing, Thursday, 8:53  If the initiating UE is operating as “UE autonomous resources selection mode” (aka mode 2), UE does not have to request resources to the network for PC5 link. Also as far as I know, there is no stage 2 requirement for bypassing service area restriction, and SA2 has never discussed on this issue.  Also if service area restriction could be overridden for PC5 communication, what about the other similar cases, e.g. MM congestion control, access control?  So in short, we don’t agree with the changes in this CR.  Rae, Monday, 1:32  W.r.t the Mode 1 and 2, I think this is the result of the RRC mode & SIB info, instead of the reason of UE going to connected mode.  Since in non-allowed area, only the signaling for data transmission over Uu is not allowed, UE can still use SR with setting the type to “signaling”.  This is also the difference between service area restriction and MM congestion control or access control which fully forbids the NAS signaling.  This change is related to NAS protocol and does not break stage 2 requirement.  Sunghoon, Monday, 4:30  Using Mode 1 in non-allowed area requires the core network sets up the UE context to the NG-RAN, why CN has to do that for the UE in non-allowed area?  Similarly, In limited-state, UE is only allowed for Mode 2.  (TS 23.287)  Since there is no clear requirement (by stage-1 or stage-2), I don’t think it is right to way to allow it.  SangMin, Tuesday, 6:13  @Rae: What I meant, and maybe what QC meant is that for mode 2, there is no reason for the UE to enter connected mode in order to request radio resources.  About your statement that UE can still use SR with setting the type to “signaling”, this is not correct understanding. In TS 24.501 clause 5.3.5.2 regarding service area restriction:  b)  while camped on a cell whose TAI is in the list of "non-allowed tracking areas", the UE shall enter the state 5GMM-REGISTERED.NON-ALLOWED-SERVICE, and:  1)  if the UE is in 5GMM-IDLE mode or 5GMM-IDLE mode with suspend indication over 3GPP access, the UE:  i)   shall not perform the registration procedure for mobility and periodic registration update with Uplink data status IE except for emergency services or for high priority access; and  ii)  shall not initiate a service request procedure except for emergency services, high priority access, responding to paging, responding to notification received over non-3GPP access, or indicating a change of 3GPP PS data off UE status; and  So while in the non-allowed area or while not in the allowed area, UE is not allowed to initiate SR even for signalling. The exception cases listed do not include signalling case. What a UE can do is performing registration update for mobility and periodic update without UP reactivation.  except for mobility/periodic reg, both service area restriction and MMCC/UAC forbid any further signaling with some exceptions (e.g. emergency, high priority, MT response..). Of course service area restriction is different from MMCC or UAC, but if we add this case of requesting PC5 resource as an exception, we should also consider the exemption for MMCC or UAC.  The exception or the conditions to override service area restriction is clearly specified in stage 2, which does not include the request for PC5 resource. IMO this requires stage 2 requirement.  Rae, Tuesday, 8:49  Since I see no future for this CR, I will postpone this one. | |
|  |  | | [C1-204573](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204573.zip) | Add the missing abbreviation | | | OPPO / Rae | CR 0074 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204579](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204579.zip) | Corrections in V2XP UE policy part | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 0014 24.588 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204580](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204580.zip) | Corrections in UE policies for V2X communication over PC5 | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 0015 24.588 Rel-16 | Postponed  Christian, Wednesday, 12:56  I believe the CR is needed and support it but I got a question now looking into the details. The coding proposed seems not fully correct (octet o3 followed by octet o103).  Ivo, Wednesday, 12:59  Not sure I understand the comment.  o3 and o103 are just different ways of "X" or "Y". We have some many fields that we cannot just use letters.  What do you propose?  Ivo, Wednesday, 13:10  Extending: Not sure I understand the comment.  o3 and o103 are just different ways of "X" or "Y". We have some many fields that we cannot just use letters.  What do you propose?  Or is your concern that the "Privacy config" field should start at (o3+1)?  If so, there is a problem - "Privacy config" field is located after an optional "V2X service identifier to PC5 RAT and Tx profiles mapping rules" field.  If the "V2X service identifier to PC5 RAT and Tx profiles mapping rules" field is absent, then the "Privacy config" field starts already at (o2+1).  There is a NOTE making this clear.  Does this make it clear?  Christian, Fri, 1324  It is essential to have clean specs, requires a revision, happy to work offline to plenary  Ivo, Fri, 1332  Fine to have markers in sequence, ok if Christian starts working for a plenary contri  Christian, Fri, 1353  Reiterates willingness to co-work on plenary contribution  Ivo, Fri,1418  As long as TS rapporteur does the renumbering of the octet markers, Ivo is happy to review and possibly co-sign | |
|  |  | | [C1-204581](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204581.zip) | Corrections in UE policies for V2X communication over Uu | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 0016 24.588 Rel-16 | Agreed  Christian, Fri, 1324  It is essential to have clean specs, requires a revision, happy to work offline to plenary | |
|  |  | | [C1-204583](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204583.zip) | Discussion on additional transport over Uu for V2X messages of V2X services identified by V2X service identifiers | | | Ericsson / Ivo | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  Christian, Friday, 9:53  We observe that C1-204584 and 4585 are resubmission of a set of CRs discussed last meeting and postponed (C1-203127, C1-203128) because of objection including us. The proposal sticks on \***mandating**\* to implementations in the UE and the V2X application server a new redundant unnecessary overhead transportation protocol between TCP and the protocol of the V2X message (aka “V2X envelope”). This is unacceptable to us when Uu has already provided support for TCP transmission for so many years without any “envelope“ for any application data. Also, use of LTE-Uu for V2X messages works without any “V2X envelope”.  We disagree with the related C1-204583 paper:   1. sending and receiving of V2X messages over LTE-Uu is specified from Rel-14 and does not mandate the use of any “V2X envelope”. More importantly as a matter of fact, implementations work without it; 2. lack of requirements in stage 2 to \***mandate**\* a new unnecessary “V2X envelope” to implementations (TS 23.285, 23.287); 3. in fact, stage 2 (re-)used the already existing mechanisms for transport of messages from/to applications as defined for EPS and 5GS; 4. TS 24.501 and 24.301 already support TCP/IP and UDP/IP message transport between the UE and application server for lots of applications. There is nothing new which requires to add a new unnecessary “V2X envelope” for V2X messages; 5. TCP mechanism as defined by IETF already provides segmentation and assembly; 6. V2X service identifiers (i.e., ITS-AID or PSID) are mapped to specific TCP ports, then in principle it is not appropriate to use a single TCP connection for different V2X applications identified by those V2X service identifiers. Anyhow, details should be left to **implementations**, e.g., use of single TCP connection or multiple TCP connections.   There is an alternative in C1-205183, 5043, 5184 from us.  Ivo, Friday, 11:07  (1) -> There are dedicated stage-2 requirements for V2X communication over Uu for a UE with an application identified by PSID or ITS-AID in TS 23.285.  Stage-2 enables such application to send non-IP or IP based V2X messages.  Stage-2 requires that the UE with such application uses TCP (or UDP) to deliver such non-IP or IP based V2X message to a V2X application server.  When TCP is used, the data (i.e V2X message) can be segmented in the TCP stack in the sender and the TCP layer in receiver provides the layer above TCP with the V2X message in several parts. If so, the layer above TCP needs to assemble the entire V2X message from the parts, before providing the V2X message to the application.  V2X envelope as in C1-203127:  - enables the layer above TCP to assemble the V2X message from parts provided by the TCP layer, before providing the V2X message to the application.  - ensures that a single TCP connection can be used for non-IP and IP based V2X messages and for non-IP based V2X messages of different V2X message families, thus miniming TCP resources required at the V2X application server.  - enables the UE to inform the V2X application server about V2X service identifiers (i.e. PSID or ITS-AID) for which the V2X application server is to send V2X messages to the UE.  NOTE: Such application in the UE does not necessarily need to both send and receive V2X messages. In order not to waste radio resources by unwanted V2X messages, the V2X application server needs to know V2X service identifiers (i.e. PSID or ITS-AID) for which the V2X application server is to send V2X messages to the UE.  (2) -> This comment does not make sense. The stage-3 coding is not mandated by stage-2 requirement.  (3) -> There are dedicated stage-2 requirements for V2X communication over Uu for a UE with an application identified by PSID or ITS-AID which requires delivery of non-IP based message to V2X application server.  When TCP is used, the data (i.e V2X message) can be segmented in the TCP stack in the sender and the TCP layer in receiver provides the layer above TCP with the V2X message in several parts. If so, the layer above TCP needs to assemble the entire V2X message from the parts, before providing the V2X message to the application. V2X envelope as in C1-203127 is needed to solve this problem. Additionally V2X envelope:  - ensures that a single TCP connection can be used for non-IP and IP based V2X messages and for non-IP based V2X messages of different V2X message families, thus miniming TCP resources required at the V2X application server.  - enables the UE to inform the V2X application server about V2X service identifiers (i.e. PSID or ITS-AID) for which the V2X application server is to send V2X messages to the UE.  (4) -> this is incorrect.  The application mentioned above are used to send non-IP (or IP) basd V2X messages and those need to be delived to the V2X application server using TCP (or UDP).  When TCP is used, the data (i.e V2X message) can be segmented in the TCP stack in the sender and the TCP layer in receiver provides the layer above TCP with the V2X message in several parts. If so, the layer above TCP needs to assemble the entire V2X message from the parts, before providing the V2X message to the application. V2X envelope as in C1-203127 is needed to solve this problem. Additionally V2X envelope:  - ensures that a single TCP connection can be used for non-IP and IP based V2X messages and for non-IP based V2X messages of different V2X message families, thus miniming TCP resources required at the V2X application server.  - enables the UE to inform the V2X application server about V2X service identifiers (i.e. PSID or ITS-AID) for which the V2X application server is to send V2X messages to the UE.  (5) -> TCP mechanism is octet stream protocol (and not message passing protocol).  If data are passed to TCP layer, the TCP layer segments the data into segments and send the segments to recipient. The recipeint provides the data from the segments to upper layer. I.e. recipient can receive the V2X message in parts. This is described in rfc793.  (6) -> Without V2X envelope, V2X application server would need to have at least one TCP port and one TCP connection per UE, for a V2X service identifier.  Reason: without this, the V2X application server would not be able to determine whether the UE wants to get downlink messages or not.  This would require the V2X application server to reserve a lot of TCP ports and setup a lot of TCP connections.  Quite a but load on the network.  Christian, Friday, 12:42  Sends detailed response to Ivo’s comments.  Concludes that in short, Huawei and HiSilicon believe that there is no need to mandate implementations in the UE and the application server to implement an unnecessary protocol/layer on top called “V2X envelope”. EPS and 5GS already provides means of transportation for application data based on TCP/IP or UDP IP packet. Existing V2X applications, UEs and application servers today work without the new “V2X envelope”. | |
|  |  | | [C1-204584](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204584.zip) | Additional transport over Uu for V2X messages of V2X services identified by V2X service identifiers | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 0023 24.386 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-203127  Christian, Friday, 9:53  We observe that C1-204584 and 4585 are resubmission of a set of CRs discussed last meeting and postponed (C1-203127, C1-203128) because of objection including us. The proposal sticks on \***mandating**\* to implementations in the UE and the V2X application server a new redundant unnecessary overhead transportation protocol between TCP and the protocol of the V2X message (aka “V2X envelope”). This is unacceptable to us when Uu has already provided support for TCP transmission for so many years without any “envelope“ for any application data. Also, use of LTE-Uu for V2X messages works without any “V2X envelope”.  We disagree with the related C1-204583 paper:   1. sending and receiving of V2X messages over LTE-Uu is specified from Rel-14 and does not mandate the use of any “V2X envelope”. More importantly as a matter of fact, implementations work without it; 2. lack of requirements in stage 2 to \***mandate**\* a new unnecessary “V2X envelope” to implementations (TS 23.285, 23.287); 3. in fact, stage 2 (re-)used the already existing mechanisms for transport of messages from/to applications as defined for EPS and 5GS; 4. TS 24.501 and 24.301 already support TCP/IP and UDP/IP message transport between the UE and application server for lots of applications. There is nothing new which requires to add a new unnecessary “V2X envelope” for V2X messages; 5. TCP mechanism as defined by IETF already provides segmentation and assembly; 6. V2X service identifiers (i.e., ITS-AID or PSID) are mapped to specific TCP ports, then in principle it is not appropriate to use a single TCP connection for different V2X applications identified by those V2X service identifiers. Anyhow, details should be left to **implementations**, e.g., use of single TCP connection or multiple TCP connections.   There is an alternative in C1-205183, 5043, 5184 from us.  Ivo, Friday, 11:07  (1) -> There are dedicated stage-2 requirements for V2X communication over Uu for a UE with an application identified by PSID or ITS-AID in TS 23.285.  Stage-2 enables such application to send non-IP or IP based V2X messages.  Stage-2 requires that the UE with such application uses TCP (or UDP) to deliver such non-IP or IP based V2X message to a V2X application server.  When TCP is used, the data (i.e V2X message) can be segmented in the TCP stack in the sender and the TCP layer in receiver provides the layer above TCP with the V2X message in several parts. If so, the layer above TCP needs to assemble the entire V2X message from the parts, before providing the V2X message to the application.  V2X envelope as in C1-203127:  - enables the layer above TCP to assemble the V2X message from parts provided by the TCP layer, before providing the V2X message to the application.  - ensures that a single TCP connection can be used for non-IP and IP based V2X messages and for non-IP based V2X messages of different V2X message families, thus miniming TCP resources required at the V2X application server.  - enables the UE to inform the V2X application server about V2X service identifiers (i.e. PSID or ITS-AID) for which the V2X application server is to send V2X messages to the UE.  NOTE: Such application in the UE does not necessarily need to both send and receive V2X messages. In order not to waste radio resources by unwanted V2X messages, the V2X application server needs to know V2X service identifiers (i.e. PSID or ITS-AID) for which the V2X application server is to send V2X messages to the UE.  (2) -> This comment does not make sense. The stage-3 coding is not mandated by stage-2 requirement.  (3) -> There are dedicated stage-2 requirements for V2X communication over Uu for a UE with an application identified by PSID or ITS-AID which requires delivery of non-IP based message to V2X application server.  When TCP is used, the data (i.e V2X message) can be segmented in the TCP stack in the sender and the TCP layer in receiver provides the layer above TCP with the V2X message in several parts. If so, the layer above TCP needs to assemble the entire V2X message from the parts, before providing the V2X message to the application. V2X envelope as in C1-203127 is needed to solve this problem. Additionally V2X envelope:  - ensures that a single TCP connection can be used for non-IP and IP based V2X messages and for non-IP based V2X messages of different V2X message families, thus miniming TCP resources required at the V2X application server.  - enables the UE to inform the V2X application server about V2X service identifiers (i.e. PSID or ITS-AID) for which the V2X application server is to send V2X messages to the UE.  (4) -> this is incorrect.  The application mentioned above are used to send non-IP (or IP) basd V2X messages and those need to be delived to the V2X application server using TCP (or UDP).  When TCP is used, the data (i.e V2X message) can be segmented in the TCP stack in the sender and the TCP layer in receiver provides the layer above TCP with the V2X message in several parts. If so, the layer above TCP needs to assemble the entire V2X message from the parts, before providing the V2X message to the application. V2X envelope as in C1-203127 is needed to solve this problem. Additionally V2X envelope:  - ensures that a single TCP connection can be used for non-IP and IP based V2X messages and for non-IP based V2X messages of different V2X message families, thus miniming TCP resources required at the V2X application server.  - enables the UE to inform the V2X application server about V2X service identifiers (i.e. PSID or ITS-AID) for which the V2X application server is to send V2X messages to the UE.  (5) -> TCP mechanism is octet stream protocol (and not message passing protocol).  If data are passed to TCP layer, the TCP layer segments the data into segments and send the segments to recipient. The recipeint provides the data from the segments to upper layer. I.e. recipient can receive the V2X message in parts. This is described in rfc793.  (6) -> Without V2X envelope, V2X application server would need to have at least one TCP port and one TCP connection per UE, for a V2X service identifier.  Reason: without this, the V2X application server would not be able to determine whether the UE wants to get downlink messages or not.  This would require the V2X application server to reserve a lot of TCP ports and setup a lot of TCP connections.  Quite a but load on the network.  Christian, Friday, 12:42  Sends detailed response to Ivo’s comments.  Concludes that in short, Huawei and HiSilicon believe that there is no need to mandate implementations in the UE and the application server to implement an unnecessary protocol/layer on top called “V2X envelope”. EPS and 5GS already provides means of transportation for application data based on TCP/IP or UDP IP packet. Existing V2X applications, UEs and application servers today work without the new “V2X envelope”. | |
|  |  | | [C1-204597](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204597.zip) | UE PC5 unicast signalling security policy | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 0075 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204598](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204598.zip) | Knpr ID and Knpr-sess ID | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 0076 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204739](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204739.zip) | Correction of QoS flow descriptions IE | | | InterDigital | CR 0078 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204757](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204757.zip) | Correction to the normal stop of T5009 | | | vivo | CR 0082 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204758](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204758.zip) | Handling of the keep alive procedure conflict | | | vivo | CR 0083 24.587 Rel-16 | Postponed  Sunghoon, Thursday, 8:52  I don’t think UE shall abort the ongoing LIU or re-keying procedure.  There can be a msg from the peer while the initiating UE re-tries Keep-alive procedure.  Could you explain what is the problem if it operates parallel?  Ivo, Thursday, 8:54  Editorial: "pecified" -> "specified"  Wen, Friday, 2:04  @Sunghoon: In this paper, we think the case where the T5003 expires before the initiating UE receives the corresponding response message (such as link modification accept message) is an abnormal case. In this paper, we think the initiating UE shall perform the Keep-alive procedure and abort other ongoing procedure.  According to your comments, if now changes are updated with following descriptions:  “Before the initiating UE receives the DIRECT LINK MODIFICATION ACCEPT message or DIRECT LINK MODIFICATION REJECT message from the target UE, if the timer T5003 expires, the initiating UE shall first ~~abort the PC5 unicast link modification procedure and~~ perform the PC5 unicast link keep-alive procedure as specified in clause 6.1.2.8.”  NOTE 3:  If the PC5 unicast link is still viable, whether the initiating UE still performs the PC5 unicast link modification procedure depends on its implementation.  Similar descriptions also are applied to other cases, so you think it works?  Sunghoon, Friday, 12:00  I would like to clarify what is the issue if it works parallel.  For example, Before the UE receives Direct Link Modification Accept, if T5003 expires, UE sends Keep-alive request, and before the UE receives Keep-alive response, if T5001 expires, the UE performs retransmission of Direct Link Modification Request, and the T5004 expires, the UE re-transmit Keep-alive request, and so on. The UE performs accordingly.  In this scenario, what would be the problem? it seems work without restricting any operation.  Behrouz, Friday, 13:36  We are not in favor of this CR. We believe the procedure, as described now works just fine. The “Direct link keepalive request” message is sent, the Target UE may e.g. reply with the “Direct link modification accept” (assuming the use case described in the contribution) and the initiating UE stops keepalive timer T5004, restarts T5003 and aborts Keepalive procedure. This is better than the proposed solution where all other procedures (i.e. link modification, Link Identifier Update, Link Release, link re-keying) are aborted to let keepalive run!  Rae, Monday, 1:46  For T5003, the timer starts when UE receives the signaling or data, instead of sending. Therefore, T5003 expiration before receiving the response message seems a usual case and the other procedures should not be impacted.  Wen, Tuesday, 1:45  All the comments make sense to me. If possible, this paper can be postponed. Maybe I need some time to think about what you said. | |
|  |  | | [C1-204759](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204759.zip) | Privacy timer for groupcast | | | vivo | CR 0084 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204797](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204797.zip) | Correction of V2XP statement | | | ZTE / Joy | CR 0017 24.588 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204804](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204804.zip) | Correction to PC5 unicast link security mode control procedure | | | InterDigital | CR 0088 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204809](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204809.zip) | Discussion on Multiple Unicast link establishment triggered by one Direct Link Est Req | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | discussion 24.587 Rel-16 | Noted  Sunghoon, Thursday, 9:05  Scenario seems make sense, but there is no need to setup multiple links with different source L2 ID.  Each Link will be identified by the pair of source and destination ID. So, It is Ok to establish multiple links with other UEs but no need to have different source L2 ID.  (The AS layer Logical Channel is identified with src and dst L2 ID pair)  Whether to use different L2 ID can be left to the UE implementation to decide.  Vishnu, Friday, 7:39  @Sunghoon: We also had similar thought as you in the beginning that the source L2 ID can be assigned only if the source UE detects a duplication in the target L2 IDs, but after reconsidering we thought that assigning new source L2 ID will simplify the entire procedure and will keep it nice and simple. Please find some reasons and benefits that we thought of:  1. In order to establish different links triggered by one establishment request (and the request is using SRC L2 ID 1), it is natural for the source UE to assign different source L2 IDs for communicating with different target UEs (which can be found in clause 6.1.2.2.2 bullet c), in order to separate the establishment procedure with different target UEs after receiving security related requests;  2. Assigning different source Layer-2 IDs also minimize the possibility of L2 ID conflict during the future link identifier update procedure (considering if target UEs trigger the procedures, and source UE does not change its L2 ID, whether both sides shall change its L2 ID during the Link Identifier update procedure is still under discussion in SA2 and CT1);  3. Compared to rejecting a peer UE, it is better to accept the authentication request in order to establish the link, rather than trigger complicated following procedures (for example, the rejected target UE or the source UE trigger link establishment procedure again);  4. Also we need to keep in mind that PC5 unicast link authentication procedure can go few rounds during an PC5 link unicast establishment procedure, so the next coming authentication request might come from the same target UE.  Considering the reasons above, the target UEs needs to signal its user info (e.g. application layer ID) to identify its identity during the authentication procedure, and source UE can uniquely identify those target UEs and assign different L2 IDs to establish different links.  Please let us know if you are fine with this.  Behrouz, Friday, 13:37  We are not sure if you have noticed but SA3 has already studied this problem and has a solution document in the TS 33.536 (section 5.3.3.1.4.3). We have submitted a CR also for this week’s SA3 meeting to add clarifications (S3-201609).  Sunghoon, Monday, 6:00  @Vishnu: Let’s handle this topic in C1-204816. | |
|  |  | | [C1-204811](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204811.zip) | Clarification on KNRP ID conflict | | | HiSilicon, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 0090 24.587 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Sunghoon, Thursday, 9:13  IMO, even if Knrp ID conflicts, uniqueness of Knrp-sess ID should be enough.  In addition, I believe it should be clarified in SA3 first.  Therefore, I don’t see this CR is needed.  Vishnu, Friday, 8:44  We are fine to wait for SA3 decision first. Assuming that SA3 might reach some agreement before our meeting finish, we will keep our CR on the table open.  Sunghoon, Monday, 7:06  It is clear from now that each UE contributes part of K\_NRP ID so these bits can be chosen at UE so they are unique for that UE and identify only one K\_NRP.  So I don’t see any need for waiting SA3 agreement. Do you mean there is ongoing SA3 discussion for this?  If you let me know SA3 tdoc number, it would be appreciated.  Behrouz, Tuesday, 18:49  I have received some comments internally: wrong assumption, no Knrp ID conflict! Knrp ID is included on the Establishment Request message only if sent to a specific target UE. Knrp ID is NOT sent when V2X-based link establishment is used. See 24.587, section 7.3.1.6 "The UE may include this IE if it has an existing KNRP for the target UE."  Vishnu, Thursday, 7:24  @Behrouz and Sunghoon: we will withdraw the CR. | |
|  |  | | [C1-204812](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204812.zip) | Correction to requirements for V2X communication | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 0091 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204814](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204814.zip) | Inconsistent security policy during PC5 unicast link modification procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 0093 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204817](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204817.zip) | UP ciphering protection algorithm | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 0096 24.587 Rel-16 | Postponed  Sunghoon, Thursday, 9:22  I don’t think it is realistic requirement that user plane is protected while signaling plane is not protected.  And this requirement should not be decided by stage-3, we need SA3 guidance.  Also chosen algs are applicable for both signaling and user plane, even if it is NULL. Therefore, no need to send algs for user plane protection.  Vishnu, Friday, 9:15  @Sunghoon:  I just checked with our SA3 colleagues (for the sake of simplicity as you suggested), SA3 agree to introduce both CP and UP security on-demand for flexibility purposes, and the scenario of UP ciphering protected while CP ciphering unprotected could exist, that means SA3 allow it happens. We need to cover this scenario as well.  We believe that we cannot achieve ciphering protection by using a Null algorithm. The UP traffic shall be protected with non-Null algorithm if both UEs decide to do so, Null algorithm cannot achieve the purpose. That will be degrading the security.  Sunghoon, Friday, 12:39  I couldn’t find the any text in SA3 specification about ‘on-demand’ security for flexibility purpose for PC5 unicast link. If you provide me a reference, it would be appreciated.  As far as I know, there is a CR in this SA3 meeting, which will be discussed in the next week. I disagree to decide such security requirement by us.  To me, it is problematic use case where unprotected signaling with protected user plane. Isn’t it common that protected signaling and unprotected user plane. (Of course user plane can be protected).  Andrew, Monday, 14:49  If SA3 are going to discuss this at their upcoming meeting then IMO we (CT1) need to wait for the outcome of that discussion before taking any protocol decisions (unless we are doing it in a way which will support whatever decision is made by S3).  Vishnu, Thursday, 7:25  @Andrew and Sunghoon: We will postpone the CR to next meeting and wait for SA3 decision. | |
|  |  | | [C1-204915](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204915.zip) | Minor correction on V2X over NR-PC5 in EPC | | | LG Electronics / SangMin | CR 0028 24.386 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204916](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204916.zip) | Removal of V2X policy for EPC interworking | | | LG Electronics / SangMin | CR 0018 24.588 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204996](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204996.zip) | Work plan for the CT1 part of eV2XARC | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | discussion Rel-16 | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-205012](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205012.zip) | Clarification on Privacy timer running | | | Qualcomm Korea | CR 0104 24.587 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-204740 and its revisions  Behrouz, Friday, 13:36  There are parts of this CR that we cannot agree to.  From the coversheet:  If the target UE decides to change its Layer-2 ID during the PC5 unicast link identifier update procedure… There are no conditions here, i.e. there is no need for “If”, which you also have in the change in section 6.1.2.5.5. Both UEs will have to chenge their IDs.  Perhaps a way forward would be to merge your CR with our CR in C1-204740, which is more complete (?)  Sunghoon, Monday, 4:52  @Behrouz: Thanks, I’ve replied to your paper C1-204740. If you are ok with my suggestion, I’m happy to merge. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205026](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205026.zip) | Resolution of the editor's note under clause 8.4.1 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | CR 0109 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-205041](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205041.zip) | Addition of support for V2X services over LTE-Uu interface using TCP | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  Ivo, Thursday, 8:54  - observation 1 is incorrect - see C1-204583, observation-3, observation-5, observation-6, observation-7, observation-8, observation-9, observation-10 - observation 2 is incorrect - see C1-20458, observation-3, observation-6, observation-7. Particularly, this Huawei's observation ignores the fact that IP or \*non-IP\* based V2X messages are required to be sent to V2X AS using \*TCP\* (stream based protocol) which is not possible without encapsualting the V2X message in envelopes as indicated in C1-20458, observation-6 and observation-7. - observation 3 is incorrect - Huawei actually co-signed C1-200935. The envelope is needed in 5GS for the same reasons as in EPS - see C1-204583, observation-6, observation-7, observation-8, observation-9, observation-10 and addresses stage-2 requirements dedidated to "an application (identified by PSID or ITS-AID) that can use either PC5 reference points or Uu reference point for the transmission of the same V2X messages" as in 23.287 subclause 5.2.3.1. Huawei actually was co-source of the C1-200935. - problem is  incorrect - the existing solution in 24.587 addresses stage-2 requirements for "an application (identified by PSID or ITS-AID) that can use either PC5 reference points or Uu reference point for the transmission of the same V2X messages" as in 23.287 subclause 5.2.3.1. Huawei actually was co-source of the C1-200935. Futhermore, usage of plain IP mechanisms is still possible in 24.587, if the UE is configured with "a list of V2X service identifiers of the V2X services configured for V2X communication over Uu using existing unicast routing". - proposal 1 - not OK, this does not fulfill stage-2 requirements, see C1-204583, observation-1, observation-2, observation-3. - proposal 2 - not OK, this removes stage-3 solution for stage-2 requirements for "an application (identified by PSID or ITS-AID) that can use either PC5 reference points or Uu reference point for the transmission of the same V2X messages" as in 23.287 subclause 5.2.3.1. Those stage-2 requirements would not be addressed in stage-3.  Christian, Tuesday, 12:00  Disagrees with Ivo’s comments and provides counter technical arguments. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205060](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205060.zip) | Coding of direct link reject messages | | | CATT | CR 0111 24.587 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-205089 and its revisions  Wen, Thursday, 7:42  At last meeting the encoding of link modification reject message has been agreed in C1-203265 but unfortunately not captured. A correction may be needed in this contribution: The length of Sequence number is 1. Please add vivo as co-signer.  Rae, Thursday, 8:27  @Wen, for the modification reject message, it is under subclause 7.3.22  Wen, Thursday, 8:55  Okay, now it seems the second change is not needed.  Scott, Thursday, 11:57  For the length of Sequence number, I followed Table 7.3.2.1.1, which is possibly wrong and should be aligned with others.Anyway, I will take your comments onboard.  Sapan, Thursday, 12:37  The proposal in CR C1-205060 related to direct link reject message is similar to the proposal in C1-205089 from Samsung. As CR C1-205060 contains changes for modification reject message which is not needed now, I propose to merge first change related to encoding of direct link reject message in C1-205060 into C1-205089. The length of Sequence Number is set to 1 in C1-20508.  Scott, Friday, 7:15  @Sapan and Wen: Please merge my paper C1-205060 (first change) into your paper and add CATT (maybe Vivo as well, if Wen agrees with it) as a cosigner. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205061](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205061.zip) | The inidications to lower layer triggered by security related procedure | | | CATT | CR 0112 24.587 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-205003 and its revisions  Mohamed, Thursday, 7:05  I see two issues with the CR:   1. We shall inform lower layer about security activation ONLY IF security is really activated, i.e. after the successful exchange of the SECURITY MODE messages between the Initiating UE and Target UE.   Hence the change in 6.1.2.7.2 shall be reverted, and instead add that change in 6.1.2.7.4 (like what is done in another CR which is **C1-205003**) i.e. after the initiating UE receives the reply message (DIRECT LINK SECURITY MODE COMPLETE).   1. Also there is no need to indicate the security activation indication after re-keying, since it will be done anyway within the SECURITY MODE procedure.   Overall I prefer to proceed with C1-205003 rather than this CR.  Rae, Thursday, 7:45  I have the following comments:  1. For the first change, same as the first comment from Mohamed Amin Nassar;  2. During 6.1.2.7.2 and 6.1.2.7.3, the security of UP has not been activated.  3. For the re-keying procedure, as I commented to C1-205003, the security parameters themselves can be the indication requested from RAN2.  Maybe in the end these 2 CRs will be merged.  Sunghoon, Thursday, 9:45   1. Change on re-keying is not necessary as it can be indicated during SMC. 2. I would like to suggest to merge this paper into C1-205003.   Scott, Thursday, 11:57  During initial UE sending of DIRECT LINK SECURITY MODE COMMAND message, the integrity policy has been identified and NRPIK has been produced. I think it is necessary to send these information to lower layer for integrity protection in lower layer during sending DIRECT LINK SECURITY MODE COMMAND message. And I am fine with other comments.  Mohamed, Thursday, 12:27  Regarding the following point you mentioned: “During initial UE sending DIRECT LINK SECURITY MODE COMMAND message, the integrity policy has been identified and NRPIK has been produced. I think it is necessary to send these information to lower layer for integrity protection in lower layer during sending DIRECT LINK SECURITY MODE COMMAND message.”  =>But the Security Mode Command message could be Rejected by the receiver UE, and in this case we may need to revert back to the previous security keys (if exist).  Hence I still see the early indication to lower layer here is not a correct approach…and instead, the lower layer shall be informed after the complete successful exchange of the Security Mode messages between the two UEs, because this is the only point where we can say security is really activated.  Sunghoon, Friday, 13:56  As Rae also pointed out for my paper, Direct Security Mode Command msg shall be sent with integrity protected, therefore, the UE initiating Direct SMC needs to provide at least NRIPK + Chosen Alg to lower layer. I think Yong clarified this aspect.  I think I can capture this aspect in my revision of C1-205003, if you guys are fine with it.  Mohamed, Friday, 14:06  Yes from my side I agree to continue with C1-205003 only, after making the needed modifications which we can review after they are made.  As currently the two CRs (C1-205003  and C1-205061) are trying to solve the same issue, but we have to continue with only one of them anyway.  Scott, Friday, 14:16  I can merge my solution paper into Qualcomm paper, for sure some changes are needed. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205194](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\update1\C1-205194.zip) | Link Identifier Update Procedure | | | InterDigital | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  Revision of C1-204741  Sunghoon, Thursday, 15:56  I disagree with this proposal:   * Not all applications may be configured with privacy requirements; privacy configuration is not mandatory. In that case, if application layer ID is changed due to application level logic, LIU needs to be performed. * The UE can assign same Layer 2 ID for different PC5 unicast link, therefore, the probability is higher than your calculation. * Also, even though it is rare case that two pairs UE have same L2 ID pair, V2X service is critical for safety, so it should be taken into account.   On the other hands, there is CR in SA2 to clarify the use case of LIU procedure, and, as you remember, CT1 couldn’t resolve this issue in the last meeting.  Therefore, CT1 can wait for the outcome of the discussion on stage-2 requirement.  Behrouz, Thursday, 17:43  @Sunghoon:   * If use cases other than privacy need to be supported then they need to be studied in SA2/SA3 to make sure security issues are not introduced for critical safety V2X service , as discussed in our DP * The pair of L2 IDs identifying the unicast link need to be considered, as discussed in our DP * Agree that V2X is critical for safety that’s why unstudied use cases cannot be used for the definition of the LIU procedure. As demonstrated in our DP, security issues (DoS attacks) are enabled when using LIU procedure for L2 ID conflict   As we argued in the ppt, two pairs will have to have the exact same IDs. So, let’s say UE-A and UE-B are one pair and then UE-C and UE-D another one. For our calculation of probability, we are assuming that, e.g. UE-A and C are using the exact same IDs and then UE-B and D are also using the exact same ID. Now, according to your statement above “*The UE can assign same Layer 2 ID for different PC5 unicast link*", UE-A may have used the exact same ID with yet another UE, say UE-F. BUT, as we have shown in Observation#2, UE-F CANNOT have the same ID as UE-B. I hope this is clear now  Sunghoon, Friday, 12:27  @Behrouz: Do you think LIU shall not be performed if there is no privacy configuration?  The pair of L2 ID identifies the unicast link. If the UE uses same L2 ID for different PC5 unicast link, it has more chance to encounter the other peers using same pair of L2 ID. You may say it is still low probability though  About DoS attacks, ] it depends on the detection of L2 ID conflict. It does not mandate to trigger LIU, but LIU can be used if the UE wants to change its L2 ID due to conflict.  NULL security alg is also an option, then it is the problem. Link establishment is not an issue, as it precludes the case to have same pair of L2 ID.  Behrouz, Friday, 23:57  @Sunghoon:  As mentioned during the CC this morning, there are no other use cases in Rel-16. And our focus is finalizing Rel-16.  About the pair of L2 IDs, I am afraid I cannot agree with you as I believe you are wrong! It doesn’t matter how many different PC5 links the UE has at this point. In all these cases, your assumption is that the UE is using the same “Source” ID and I hope that you agree that the Target ID for all other UEs, who have connection with this UE would be different. So, you are now looking at a scenario when 2 UEs have two IDs AND 2 other UEs will end up having the exact same IDs. In this case, we are talking about 48 bits, having been chosen to be the exact same ones. Perhaps, you can provide the probability for this case?  You keep mentioning “L2 ID Conflict” (which has been the root of confusion in SA2), whereas our DP proves that it cannot even occur for the same UE and is an extremely low probable case for two pairs of UE. And, even then, the packets will be discarded!  ----------------------------------------  Sunghoon, Thursday, 8:41  Please note that not all applications may be configured with privacy requirements.  It is also possible the UE detects L2 ID same as its ID, not a destination L2 ID. In this case, the UE needs to decide to change its L2 ID.  Also, even it is rare case, some V2X service is critical for safety, so it should be taken into account.  On the other hands, there is CR in SA2 to clarify the use case of LIU procedure, and, as you remember, CT1 couldn’t resolve this issue in the last meeting.  Therefore, CT1 can wait for the outcome of the discussion on stage-2 requirement. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205183](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\update1\C1-205183.zip) | Addition of support for V2X services over LTE-Uu interface using TCP | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | CR 0029 24.386 Rel-16 | Agreed as a working agreement  Revision of C1-205046  Ivo, Thursday, 8:53  - not OK - impacts TCP protocol implementation as it requires the V2X message to be placed in the "data octets filed". However, placing of data (i.e. V2X message) in the data field of TCP packet is controlled by TCP protocol implementation which can decide to segment the data into several TCP packets. See rfc quote in C1-204583, section 2.3.2.1. - if the TCP layer provides the V2X message is several segments, the recipient does not know how to assemble the V2X message from the parts provided by the TCP layer in recipient. See C1-204583, observation-6. - does not enable the UE to inform the V2X AS about the V2X services for which the UE wants to get the downlink messages.  Ivo, Tuesday, 10:38  C1-205184 is NOT OK. Provides his justification why. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205184](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\update1\C1-205184.zip) | Correction to V2X communication over Uu between the UE and the application server | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | CR 0115 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed as a working agreement  Revision of C1-205161  Ivo, Thursday, 8:53  - not OK - impacts TCP protocol implementation as it requires the V2X message to be placed in the "data octets filed". However, placing of data (i.e. V2X message) in the data field of TCP packet is controlled by TCP protocol implementation which can decide to segment the data into several TCP packets. See rfc quote in C1-204583, section 2.3.2.1. - if the TCP layer provides the V2X message is several segments, the recipient does not know how to assemble the V2X message from the parts provided by the TCP layer in recipient. See C1-204583, observation-6. - does not enable the UE to inform the V2X AS about the V2X services for which the UE wants to get the downlink messages. - requires sending of UDP packet in PDU session of "unstructured" PDU session type  Rae, Friday, 3:45  I support this CR. I support to remove all the envelop related description. We cannot assume TCP protocol can follow the specified behavior in 24.587 and how TCP works should be left to TCP and implementation.  Scott, Friday, 7:04  I support this CR. CATT thinks the V2X message envelope is not needed. Existing TCP mechanism can implement the segmentation and assembly of V2X message. The cost of existing TCP mechanism is just adding several standard TCP port and establishing several TCP connections for different V2X service, which is common consumption for all the applications transmitted through TCP. I don’t think it is a big problem. By contrast, adding V2X message envelope need to add a new abstract layer at both UE and V2X server and extra V2X message copy.  Christian, Tuesday, 10:18  Disagrees with Ivo’s comments and provides technical counter arguments.  Ivo, Tuesday, 10:36  C1-205184 is NOT OK. Provides his justification why.  Christian, Wednesday, 10:45  Disagrees with Ivo’s comments. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205185](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\update1\C1-205185.zip) | Resolution of editor's note under clause 6.1.1 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | CR 0097 24.587 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-205309 and its revisions  Revision of C1-205000  Sunghoon, Thursday, 9:30  C1-205017 cleans up all SA3 related ENs which has conflict with your paper C1-205185, C1-205187, C1-205188, C1-205189.  What do you think if your papers are marked as merged into C1-205017?  Sunghoon, Wednesday, 7:45  @Christian: This is for reminder since I haven’t received any feedback from you. Please check and reply.  Christian, Wednesday, 9:18  I am willing to merge and co-sign, no problem. However, it seems that not all editor’s notes are covered by C1-205017.  After checking all involved documents, I believe that we need to revise C1-205017 and C1-205187. Note that C1-205187 removes an extra editor’s note under 6.1.2.2.1. Hence, my proposal is to revise C1-205017 to take off the changes under 6.1.2.2.1, which removes only one editor’s note and covered by 5187, update the reason for change to explain the rationale for the removal of each editor’s notes and in a detailed way (use the reasons from 5185, 5188, 5189) and we are co-signing the CR. I will then revise C1-205187 to add Qualcomm.  Please, let me know if this way forward is ok.  Sunghoon, Wednesday, 11:32  @Christian: sounds good.  A draft revision of C1-205017 is available.  Christian, Wednesday, 11:54  Just some minor comments to the draft revision of C1-205017; we need to tick the core network box and update the date of the CR.  Christian, Wednesday, 12:28  C1-205185 is merged into C1-205309. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205186](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\update1\C1-205186.zip) | Miscellaneous editorial corrections | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | CR 0099 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205005  -----------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday 8:54  No changes indicated | |
|  |  | | [C1-205188](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\update1\C1-205188.zip) | Resolution of editor's note under clause 6.1.2.2.2 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | CR 0101 24.587 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-205309 and its revisions  Revision of C1-205008  Sunghoon, Thursday, 9:30  C1-205017 cleans up all SA3 related ENs which has conflict with your paper C1-205185, C1-205187, C1-205188, C1-205189.  What do you think if your papers are marked as merged into C1-205017?  Sunghoon, Wednesday, 7:45  @Christian: This is for reminder since I haven’t received any feedback from you. Please check and reply.  Christian, Wednesday, 9:18  I am willing to merge and co-sign, no problem. However, it seems that not all editor’s notes are covered by C1-205017.  After checking all involved documents, I believe that we need to revise C1-205017 and C1-205187. Note that C1-205187 removes an extra editor’s note under 6.1.2.2.1. Hence, my proposal is to revise C1-205017 to take off the changes under 6.1.2.2.1, which removes only one editor’s note and covered by 5187, update the reason for change to explain the rationale for the removal of each editor’s notes and in a detailed way (use the reasons from 5185, 5188, 5189) and we are co-signing the CR. I will then revise C1-205187 to add Qualcomm.  Please, let me know if this way forward is ok.  Sunghoon, Wednesday, 11:32  @Christian: sounds good.  A draft revision of C1-205017 is available.  Christian, Wednesday, 11:54  Just some minor comments to the draft revision of C1-205017; we need to tick the core network box and update the date of the CR.  Christian, Wednesday, 12:28  C1-205185 is merged into C1-205309. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205189](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\update1\C1-205189.zip) | Resolution of editor's note under clause 6.1.2.7.1 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | CR 0103 24.587 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-205309 and its revisions  Revision of C1-205011  Sunghoon, Thursday, 9:30  C1-205017 cleans up all SA3 related ENs which has conflict with your paper C1-205185, C1-205187, C1-205188, C1-205189.  What do you think if your papers are marked as merged into C1-205017?  Sunghoon, Wednesday, 7:45  @Christian: This is for reminder since I haven’t received any feedback from you. Please check and reply.  Christian, Wednesday, 9:18  I am willing to merge and co-sign, no problem. However, it seems that not all editor’s notes are covered by C1-205017.  After checking all involved documents, I believe that we need to revise C1-205017 and C1-205187. Note that C1-205187 removes an extra editor’s note under 6.1.2.2.1. Hence, my proposal is to revise C1-205017 to take off the changes under 6.1.2.2.1, which removes only one editor’s note and covered by 5187, update the reason for change to explain the rationale for the removal of each editor’s notes and in a detailed way (use the reasons from 5185, 5188, 5189) and we are co-signing the CR. I will then revise C1-205187 to add Qualcomm.  Please, let me know if this way forward is ok.  Sunghoon, Wednesday, 11:32  @Christian: sounds good.  A draft revision of C1-205017 is available.  Christian, Wednesday, 11:54  Just some minor comments to the draft revision of C1-205017; we need to tick the core network box and update the date of the CR.  Christian, Wednesday, 12:28  C1-205185 is merged into C1-205309. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205190](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\update1\C1-205190.zip) | Value of the timers T5009 and T5010 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | CR 0107 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205019 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205191](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\update1\C1-205191.zip) | Correction to the values of the timers which control the PC5 unicast link authentication procedure timer and the PC5 unicast link security mode control procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | CR 0108 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205021 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205196](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\update1\C1-205196.zip) | Allocation of IEIs | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | CR 0110 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205192  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-205039  --------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 8:54  No changes indicated. | |
|  |  | | C1-205202 | Configuration parameters for additional transport over Uu for V2X messages of V2X services identified by V2X service identifiers | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 0020 24.385 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-205201  Ivo, Thursday, 8:04  Main changes in revision are:  - correcting description of <X>/V2XoverLTEUu/AuthorizedPLMNs/<X>/V2XServiceIdentifierRelated/AuthorizedV2XServiceList/<X>/V2XASTCPAddresses  - adding node <X>/V2XoverLTEUu/AuthorizedPLMNs/<X>/V2XServiceIdentifierRelated/AuthorizedV2XServiceList/<X>/V2XASTCPAddresses/<X>  - correcting titles of nodes specified in 5.6.45C, 5.6.45D, 5.6.45E  ---------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-204585  -----------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-203128  Christian, Friday, 9:53  We observe that C1-204584 and 4585 are resubmission of a set of CRs discussed last meeting and postponed (C1-203127, C1-203128) because of objection including us. The proposal sticks on \***mandating**\* to implementations in the UE and the V2X application server a new redundant unnecessary overhead transportation protocol between TCP and the protocol of the V2X message (aka “V2X envelope”). This is unacceptable to us when Uu has already provided support for TCP transmission for so many years without any “envelope“ for any application data. Also, use of LTE-Uu for V2X messages works without any “V2X envelope”.  We disagree with the related C1-204583 paper:   1. sending and receiving of V2X messages over LTE-Uu is specified from Rel-14 and does not mandate the use of any “V2X envelope”. More importantly as a matter of fact, implementations work without it; 2. lack of requirements in stage 2 to \***mandate**\* a new unnecessary “V2X envelope” to implementations (TS 23.285, 23.287); 3. in fact, stage 2 (re-)used the already existing mechanisms for transport of messages from/to applications as defined for EPS and 5GS; 4. TS 24.501 and 24.301 already support TCP/IP and UDP/IP message transport between the UE and application server for lots of applications. There is nothing new which requires to add a new unnecessary “V2X envelope” for V2X messages; 5. TCP mechanism as defined by IETF already provides segmentation and assembly; 6. V2X service identifiers (i.e., ITS-AID or PSID) are mapped to specific TCP ports, then in principle it is not appropriate to use a single TCP connection for different V2X applications identified by those V2X service identifiers. Anyhow, details should be left to **implementations**, e.g., use of single TCP connection or multiple TCP connections.   There is an alternative in C1-205183, 5043, 5184 from us.  Ivo, Friday, 11:07  (1) -> There are dedicated stage-2 requirements for V2X communication over Uu for a UE with an application identified by PSID or ITS-AID in TS 23.285.  Stage-2 enables such application to send non-IP or IP based V2X messages.  Stage-2 requires that the UE with such application uses TCP (or UDP) to deliver such non-IP or IP based V2X message to a V2X application server.  When TCP is used, the data (i.e V2X message) can be segmented in the TCP stack in the sender and the TCP layer in receiver provides the layer above TCP with the V2X message in several parts. If so, the layer above TCP needs to assemble the entire V2X message from the parts, before providing the V2X message to the application.  V2X envelope as in C1-203127:  - enables the layer above TCP to assemble the V2X message from parts provided by the TCP layer, before providing the V2X message to the application.  - ensures that a single TCP connection can be used for non-IP and IP based V2X messages and for non-IP based V2X messages of different V2X message families, thus miniming TCP resources required at the V2X application server.  - enables the UE to inform the V2X application server about V2X service identifiers (i.e. PSID or ITS-AID) for which the V2X application server is to send V2X messages to the UE.  NOTE: Such application in the UE does not necessarily need to both send and receive V2X messages. In order not to waste radio resources by unwanted V2X messages, the V2X application server needs to know V2X service identifiers (i.e. PSID or ITS-AID) for which the V2X application server is to send V2X messages to the UE.  (2) -> This comment does not make sense. The stage-3 coding is not mandated by stage-2 requirement.  (3) -> There are dedicated stage-2 requirements for V2X communication over Uu for a UE with an application identified by PSID or ITS-AID which requires delivery of non-IP based message to V2X application server.  When TCP is used, the data (i.e V2X message) can be segmented in the TCP stack in the sender and the TCP layer in receiver provides the layer above TCP with the V2X message in several parts. If so, the layer above TCP needs to assemble the entire V2X message from the parts, before providing the V2X message to the application. V2X envelope as in C1-203127 is needed to solve this problem. Additionally V2X envelope:  - ensures that a single TCP connection can be used for non-IP and IP based V2X messages and for non-IP based V2X messages of different V2X message families, thus miniming TCP resources required at the V2X application server.  - enables the UE to inform the V2X application server about V2X service identifiers (i.e. PSID or ITS-AID) for which the V2X application server is to send V2X messages to the UE.  (4) -> this is incorrect.  The application mentioned above are used to send non-IP (or IP) basd V2X messages and those need to be delived to the V2X application server using TCP (or UDP).  When TCP is used, the data (i.e V2X message) can be segmented in the TCP stack in the sender and the TCP layer in receiver provides the layer above TCP with the V2X message in several parts. If so, the layer above TCP needs to assemble the entire V2X message from the parts, before providing the V2X message to the application. V2X envelope as in C1-203127 is needed to solve this problem. Additionally V2X envelope:  - ensures that a single TCP connection can be used for non-IP and IP based V2X messages and for non-IP based V2X messages of different V2X message families, thus miniming TCP resources required at the V2X application server.  - enables the UE to inform the V2X application server about V2X service identifiers (i.e. PSID or ITS-AID) for which the V2X application server is to send V2X messages to the UE.  (5) -> TCP mechanism is octet stream protocol (and not message passing protocol).  If data are passed to TCP layer, the TCP layer segments the data into segments and send the segments to recipient. The recipeint provides the data from the segments to upper layer. I.e. recipient can receive the V2X message in parts. This is described in rfc793.  (6) -> Without V2X envelope, V2X application server would need to have at least one TCP port and one TCP connection per UE, for a V2X service identifier.  Reason: without this, the V2X application server would not be able to determine whether the UE wants to get downlink messages or not.  This would require the V2X application server to reserve a lot of TCP ports and setup a lot of TCP connections.  Quite a but load on the network.  Christian, Friday, 12:42  Sends detailed response to Ivo’s comments.  Concludes that in short, Huawei and HiSilicon believe that there is no need to mandate implementations in the UE and the application server to implement an unnecessary protocol/layer on top called “V2X envelope”. EPS and 5GS already provides means of transportation for application data based on TCP/IP or UDP IP packet. Existing V2X applications, UEs and application servers today work without the new “V2X envelope”. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205233](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204556.zip) | PC5 security policy determination based on more than one V2X service | | | OPPO / Rae | CR 0069 24.587 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-204556  Ivo, Fri, 1109  NOT OK  -------------------------------------------------  Sunghoon, Thursday, 7:35  It seems the principle of this paper has conflict with C1-204557. My preference is that the UE initiates different PC5 unicast link for the V2X services if the V2X service has different security policy, which is aligned with what C1-204557 tries to achieve.  Wen, Thursday, 7:53  1. In NOTE2, “more than one V2X service”->”more than one V2X service(s)”  2. In NOTE2, “the UE uses the most strictly required”-> the UE shall use the most strictly required”  3. A question for clarification, how to handle the case where only the V2X service(s) without requiring Signalling integrity protection are accepted by the target UE?  Ivo, Thursday, 8:55  "the most strictly required signalling security policy" -> "the most strict signalling security policy" or "the strictest signalling security policy"  Rae, Friday, 1:44  @ Sunghoon @ Wen,  You both comments the conflict between 204556 and 204557.  My intention is that 204556 is for the case that when link establishment is triggered and there are more than one service is included in the request message.  204557 is for the case that a new service should be added to the existing link but the security of the link cannot satisfy the security policy of the new service, for example, the link uses null-integrity but the integrity policy of the new service is “required”.  Maybe because the wording in 204557 is not accurate.  How about I change the wording in 204557 to the following:  2) the security policy (either signalling security policy or user plane security policy) corresponding to the V2X service identifier is not satisfied by the security policy of the existing PC5 unicast link;  @ Wen,  For 1, I think singular is for “more than one”?  For 2, OK.  For 3, My understanding is that if the target UE only accepts the non-integrity, the UE will choose the null algorithm and send to initiating UE.  @ Ivo,  OK, will be reflected in the revision.  Sunghoon, Monday, 2:44  @Rae: I prefer that UE establishes different PC5 unicast link for the different security policy, as security policy is per V2X service.  And in V2X service provider point of view, there should be a reason having different security policy - unnecessary protection should be avoided.  Rae, Monday, 9:56  How about the following wording? The wording is suggested by Sunghoon and I change a little in yellow highlighted.  NOTE 2:  In the case where the different V2X services are mapped to the different PC5 unicast signalling security policies, when the initiating UE intends to establish a single unicast link that can be used for more than one V2X service, each signalling security polices per V2X services shall be compatible e.g., “signalling integrity protection not needed” and “signalling integrity protection required” is not compatible. | |
|  |  | | C1-205234 | Add a new trigger to link establishment due to V2X service with a conflicting security policy | | | OPPO / Rae | CR 0070 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204557  ---------------------------------------------  Wen, Thursday, 8:02  Question for clarification: for your added condition, if the existing link has required of signalling security policy, but the new V2X service to be added without required signalling security policy, is the UE mandatory to establish a new link? It seems to have a conflict with your paper C1-204556 of using the most strictly required signalling security policy.  Sunghoon, Monday, 2:45  I prefer to initiate new PC5 unicast link if the security policy is different.  Rae, Monday, 9:57  Based on the comments, how about the following wording?  2)   the security policy (either signalling security policy or user plane security policy) corresponding to the V2X service identifier is not compatible with the security policy of the existing PC5 unicast link; and | |
|  |  | | C1-205249 | Addition of support for V2X services over LTE-Uu interface using TCP | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | CR 0023 24.385 Rel-16 | Agreed as a working agreement  Revision of C1-205043  Grace, Fri, 1231  Support  Mohamed, Fri, 1254  Support  Ivo, Fri, 1310  Asking back  --------------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 8:53  - conflicts with C1-204585 - contains two subclauses 5.6.45A - contains two subclauses 5.6.45D - missing description of node <X>/V2XoverLTEUu/AuthorizedPLMNs/<X>/V2XServiceIdentifierRelated/AuthorizedV2XServiceList/<X>/V2XASTCPAddresses/<X> - 5.6.45C + 5.6.45D - incorrectly refers to V2XServiceIdentifierUnrelated  Christian, Tuesday, 12:19  Our CR actually belongs to an alternative set of CRs to your C1-204584 and C1-204585 (this one later revised twice to C1-205201 and C1-205202).  We have revised our CR in C1-205043. A draft revision is available. | |
|  |  | | C1-205268 | Corrections to the Link Identifier Update procedure and messages | | | InterDigital | CR 0080 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205193  ---------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-204742  Sunghoon, Monday, 10:13  As I mentioned during the conf call, Qualcomm is fine to mandate target UE’s L2 ID change during LIU procedure.  But I disagree to restrict the use case of LIU only for privacy case in CT1, so my only suggestion to revise this paper is   * Remove related text for the use case in the coversheet.   Hope this is agreeable to you.  Behrouz, Wednesday, 0:32  @Sunghoon: have done as you suggested, i.e. revised the coversheet accordingly. The CR has been revised to C1-205268 and is available.  ----------------------------------------------  Wen, Thursday, 8:24  This topic is also being discussed in SA2, we need to keep eyes on that. At least for now we cannot accept corresponding changes.  Behrouz, Thursday, 16:48  @Wen: Yes, we are aware of that. In fact, InterDigital has provided the same DP (ppt) in SA2 as well. | |
|  |  | | C1-205274 | Handling of T5003 | | | vivo | CR 0081 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204756  --------------------------------------------  Rae, Thursday, 8:10  Considering some PC5 RRC exchange is not known to V2X layer (or PC5-S), the current signaling plus data transmission seem enough.  Sunghoon, Thursday, 8:47  CR seems wrong as V2X layer has no intervention to PC5-RRC. If PC5-RRC detects RLF, it will notify to V2X layer.  Behrouz, Friday, 13:36  We have the following comments:  1) If RRC activity was to be considered, the Keepalive procedure would not have been implemented at the V2X layer  2) Removed EN in section 6.1.2.8.2 - based on which justification?  3) We are OK with changes to Figure 6.1.2.8.2  Wen, Monday, 2:58  I see your concerns. But from my understanding, the lower layer signalling exchange also can reflect the link is still available.  If we ignore this, even though the link is still alive (reflected by lower layer signaling interaction), the UE also initiates the keep alive procedure.  it seems not necessary. As for how the V2X layer knows the lower layer exchange,  I think it can be left to UE implementation.  @ Behrouz, Table 10.3.1 has defined the value of T5003, so we removed it.  Sunghoon, Tuesday, 8:41  @Wen: It is not true that V2X layer knows lower layer signaling exchange in the specification.  There is no indication from the lower layer specified for PC5-RRC operation.  If you are talking about PDCP operations, V2X knows when it sends a packet or receives a packet.  So your first and second changes have nothing to do with the specification, though you can implement if you want.  Rae, Tuesday, 8:48  @Wen; In my understanding, the data reception is enough. AS layer signaling is exchanged usually for data transmission.  Wen, Tuesday, 9:53  @Sunghoon and Rae: I took onboard your comments and removed the lower layer’s descriptions. A draft revision is available.  Sunghoon, Tuesday, 13:28  I am Ok with the draft revision.  Rae, Wednesday, 1:55  I am Ok with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-205275 | Reflect the V2X service id in the accept message | | | vivo | CR 0085 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204760  -----------------------------------------------  Sunghoon, Thursday, 8:57  Editorial suggestions:  b) shall include a PQFI, the corresponding PC5 QoS parameters, and the V2X service identifier(s);  and  a) the PQFI(s), the corresponding PC5 QoS parameters and the V2X service identifier(s) that the target UE accepts,  Wen, Friday, 7:54  I agree with the comments, I took them onboard with some changes. A draft revision is available.  Sunghoon, Monday, 4:54  I am Ok with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-205276 | Updates to the handling of broadcast | | | vivo | CR 0086 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204761  -------------------------------------------------  Sunghoon, Thursday, 8:59  It seems passing the changed source L2 ID is not enough.  According to 23.287 5.4.1.1.3,  1)  To add a new PC5 QoS Flow or to modify any existing PC5 QoS Flow, the V2X layer provides the following information for the PC5 QoS Flow to AS layer.  -    the PFI;  -    the corresponding PC5 QoS parameters; and  -    source/destination Layer-2 IDs for broadcast and groupcast, or the PC5 Link Identifier for unicast  Please take it into account.  Wen, Friday, 2:25  @Sunghoon: The changes in this paper are applied to clause “6.1.3.2.4 Privacy of V2X transmission over PC5”. It is about privacy handling for broadcast. Lower layer needs to know the changed L2 ID for handling the following data/signaling with new L2 ID. Lower layer will accordingly update the lower layer context to associate the new L2 ID with the existing PC5 QoS flow(s).  Sunghoon, Monday, 4:59  From lower layer perspective, it is not clear that the received source L2 ID is for which PC5 communication. At least V2X layer needs to pass PFI together.  So the change should be   * *Pass the changed source layer-2 ID and the corresponding PFI down to lower layer.*   Wen, Monday, 6:37  @Sunghoon: I get your points. But from my understanding it seems the PFI(s) also cannot reflect the information about which PC5 communication. How about the following changes:  *-Pass the changed source layer-2 ID along with the old Layer-2 IDs down to the lower layer*  Sunghoon, Monday, 9:49  @Wen:  What I’ve referred before:  1)  To add a new PC5 QoS Flow or to modify any existing PC5 QoS Flow, the V2X layer provides the following information for the PC5 QoS Flow to AS layer.  -    the PFI;  -    the corresponding PC5 QoS parameters; and  -    source/destination Layer-2 IDs for broadcast and groupcast, or the PC5 Link Identifier for unicast  This is applied for the case when source L2 ID changes – modifying existing QoS Flow.  Therefore, I would suggest   * Pass the changed source layer-2 ID and destination layer-2 ID, along with the corresponding PFI down to lower layer.   Wen, Monday, 12:21  @Sunghoon: Your advice is greatly appreciated. However the changes in this paper are only for Privacy of V2X transmission over PC5.  It seems no impacts on PC5 QoS Flow(s) (PFI) handling. Lower layer only needs to know the changed source layer-2 ID and associates the changed source L2 ID with the lower layer context( already has the PFIs and corresponding QoS parameters info )  As for QoS Flow handling, I think the following descriptions can be reflected in TS24.587 6.1.3.2.1.2                  PC5 QoS flow match and establishment ….  iv)  pass the following parameters to the lower layers:  -     the PQFI;  -     the PC5 QoS parameters; and  -     the source layer-2 ID and the destination layer-2 ID;  So I still think the following can work.  *Pass the changed source layer-2 ID along with the old source layer-2 ID and destination layer-2 ID down to the lower layer*  Sunghoon, Monday, 13:23  @Wen: Well, PFI is just to indicate which QoS flow is affected (as the lower layer has the context, the lower layer can identify the context by the PFI)  In the UE, PFI can identify the PC5 communication context e.g., broadcast, groupcast, or unicast, as V2X layer passes it to lower layer when it create the Qos Flow.  And there must be only one PFI per broadcast (or groupcast), otherwise transmission of V2X msg does not work. (V2X layer passes V2X packet + PFI to lower layer).  If V2X layer passes old source L2 ID, the lower layer needs to look up all PC5 QoS Flow which has same source L2 ID as old source L2 ID (As you know UE may use same source L2 ID for unicast/groupcast/broadcast, also UE may use same source L2 ID for different PC5 unicast links).  In case of using PFI, it could be simpler than previous one as PFI can identify the context in the AS layer.  In order to make consistent operation (even for QoS modification case) I believe using PFI is better way.  Wen, Tuesday, 1:34  @Sunhoon: I took your suggestion on board i.e.:   * Pass the changed source layer-2 ID and destination layer-2 ID, along with the corresponding PQFI down to lower layer.   A draft revision is available.  Sunghoon, Tuesday, 6:27  I am Ok with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-205291 | PC5 unicast link release due to RLF | | | Qualcomm Korea | CR 0105 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205014  ----------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 8:54  Why is it necessary to release KNRP? KNRP may be kept even when the UEs have no active unicast communication session between them.  Sunghoon, Monday, 10:02  @Ivo: I can add “after an implementation specific time” at the end.  Ivo, Tuesday, 11:10  KnrpID can be kept. How about the following?    If the UE receives an indication of radio link failure from the lower layer, the UE shall release the PC5 unicast link locally and may delete the KNRP ID associated with this link after an implementation specific time.  Sunghoon, Tuesday, 13:19  @Ivo: it works for me. A draft revision is available.  Rae, Wednesday, 1:53  @Sunghoon and Ivo: I think “may” here is not correct. Based on the current 24.587 and SA3 requirement, during release procedure, Knrp ID has to be refreshed to avoid using the same ID (has exposed in unprotected establishment request message) during the next establishment procedure.  Sunghoon, Wednesday, 5:16  I don’t have strong opinion to keep ‘may’ here.  But in order to make more safe in terms of security, removing Knrp ID seems good to do so.  @Ivo, can you live without ‘may’ in the sentence?  Ivo, Wednesday, 10:57  I disagree with “shall”. TS 33.526 says “KNRP may be kept even when the UEs have no active unicast communication session between them. The KNRP ID is used to identify KNRP”. So, I do not see why the UE \*has\* to remove the Knrp-ID. Doing so would imply that the UE needs to perform authentication after each radio link failure.  Sunghoon, Wednesday, 11:40  @Ivo: For clarification, new Krnp\_ID is mandatory during Direct Link Release procedure, and the UE may use this Knrp\_ID when it reconnects with same peer UE.  In this context, the yellow text is applied.  Since new Knrp\_ID value is mandatory for release procedure, if UE performs local release, the UE would better to remove ‘used’ Knrp\_ID to avoid security issue.  Rae, Wednesday, 11:58  @Ivo: Removing Knrp ID does not break SA3 requirement as you cited below. Knrp will not change even its ID is removed.  Ivo, Wednesday, 12:08  @Rae: That's not true. Removing Knrp ID means the related Knrp cannot be addressed.  S3-200938 refers to explicit release of the PC5 unicast link. We are discussing RLF here.  Do you agree that if the Knrp ID is removed after RLF, then the UE needs to perform authentication after \*each\* RLF?  Rae, Thursday, 1:38  I can live with “may” in this meeting. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205292](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205009.zip) | Correction on timers | | | Qualcomm Korea | CR 0102 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205009  --------------------------------------------------  Sunghoon, Thursday, 9:39  Changes on 6.1.2.10.2 is resolved the CR in C1-205186. Therefore, I would like to revise it just keeping changes on T5008 set to 8s. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205309](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205017.zip) | Removal of resolved EN for security issue | | | Qualcomm Korea | CR 0106 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205017  -----------------------------------------  Sunghoon, Thursday, 9:30  C1-205017 cleans up all SA3 related ENs which has conflict with your paper C1-205185, C1-205187, C1-205188, C1-205189.  What do you think if your papers are marked as merged into C1-205017?  Sunghoon, Wednesday, 7:45  @Christian: This is for reminder since I haven’t received any feedback from you. Please check and reply.  Christian, Wednesday, 9:18  I am willing to merge and co-sign, no problem. However, it seems that not all editor’s notes are covered by C1-205017.  After checking all involved documents, I believe that we need to revise C1-205017 and C1-205187. Note that C1-205187 removes an extra editor’s note under 6.1.2.2.1. Hence, my proposal is to revise C1-205017 to take off the changes under 6.1.2.2.1, which removes only one editor’s note and covered by 5187, update the reason for change to explain the rationale for the removal of each editor’s notes and in a detailed way (use the reasons from 5185, 5188, 5189) and we are co-signing the CR. I will then revise C1-205187 to add Qualcomm.  Please, let me know if this way forward is ok.  Sunghoon, Wednesday, 11:32  @Christian: sounds good.  A draft revision of C1-205017 is available.  Christian, Wednesday, 11:54  Just some minor comments to the draft revision of C1-205017; we need to tick the core network box and update the date of the CR. | |
|  |  | | C1-205310 | Resolution of editor's notes under clause 6.1.2.2.1 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | CR 0100 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205187  --------------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-205006  Sunghoon, Thursday, 9:30  C1-205017 cleans up all SA3 related ENs which has conflict with your paper C1-205185, C1-205187, C1-205188, C1-205189.  What do you think if your papers are marked as merged into C1-205017?  Sunghoon, Wednesday, 7:45  @Christian: This is for reminder since I haven’t received any feedback from you. Please check and reply.  Christian, Wednesday, 9:18  I am willing to merge and co-sign, no problem. However, it seems that not all editor’s notes are covered by C1-205017.  After checking all involved documents, I believe that we need to revise C1-205017 and C1-205187. Note that C1-205187 removes an extra editor’s note under 6.1.2.2.1. Hence, my proposal is to revise C1-205017 to take off the changes under 6.1.2.2.1, which removes only one editor’s note and covered by 5187, update the reason for change to explain the rationale for the removal of each editor’s notes and in a detailed way (use the reasons from 5185, 5188, 5189) and we are co-signing the CR. I will then revise C1-205187 to add Qualcomm.  Please, let me know if this way forward is ok.  Sunghoon, Wednesday, 11:32  @Christian: sounds good.  A draft revision of C1-205017 is available.  Christian, Wednesday, 11:54  Just some minor comments to the draft revision of C1-205017; we need to tick the core network box and update the date of the CR.  I have revised C1-205187 (will be 5310). A draft revision is available. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205326](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204762.zip) | Updates to the link release | | | vivo | CR 0087 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204762  ----------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 8:54  "all the running timer"  - this would include also timers running for other PC5 unicast links, and this would be incorrect. It would be better to keep listing the related timers.  Sunghoon, Thursday, 9:01  It is not clear to me why it should be ‘may’. Can you explain what is the reason to keep the link? The second change is somehow misleading – UE needs to run the timer for Release procedure. Text should be improved.  Wen, Friday, 2:40  @Ivo: stopping all the running timers is applied to target UE. If taking your opinion, many timers need to be listed. I cannot figure out any other reasons that the target UE need to keep some running timers when target UE receives the link release request.  Wen, Friday, 2:45  @Sunghoon: for your first question, this is due to NOTE 2 in 6.1.2.3.6 and 6.1.2.5.7.1.  For your second question, some clarifications: stopping all the running timers is applied to target UE. I cannot figure out any other reasons that the target UE need to keep some running timers when target UE receives the link release request for this link.  Ivo, Friday, 8:17  The CR does not state "applied to target UE".  Wen, Sunday, 2:02  @Ivo: The changes in “6.1.2.4.3   PC5 unicast link release procedure accepted by the target UE” is applied to target UE. The reason for change also states that is applied to target UE.  Sunghoon, Monday, 5:53  @Wen: Ok I see your point.  Ivo, Tuesday, 11:22  The title does not restrict the statement "all the running timer".  Wen, Wednesday, 2:26  @Ivo: I am little confused, you mean that the title of the paper does not match the changes? However from my understanding, all the changes including  “all the running timer” are applied to the link release.  Ivo, Wednesday, 10:59  @Wen: I am little confused with your statement.  Ivo, Wednesday, 12:03  @Wen: Extending: I am little confused with your statement.  The title is "6.1.2.4.3   PC5 unicast link release procedure accepted by the target UE".  Taking your argument that the title restricts the scope of "all the running timer" further,"all the running timer" would be applicable to the timers related to the "PC5 unicast link release procedure".  it is not clear what timers are those. I assume that all running timers for the PC5 unicast link are meant. If so, can we state it as such "all running timers for the PC5 unicast link"?  Wen, Wednesday, 13:21  @Ivo: I guess I get your points. I took your suggestion (“all running timers for the PC5 unicast link”) and reflected it in an updated draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-205368 | Clarification on Integrity and ciphering of PC5 signalling and user plane | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 0089 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204810  -------------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 8:54  - 6.1.2.7.1, " if the ciphering protection of the PC5 unicast link is activated," - why is solely the ciphering protection mentioned? The integrity protection should be mentioned too. - 6.1.2.7.2, "NRPEK shall not be generated if the selected ciphering protection algorithm is not the null ciphering protection algorithm." - NRPEK needs to be generated when the selected ciphering protection algorithm is not the null ciphering protection algorithm  Sunghoon, Thursday, 9:11  - CR has wrong understanding that UE derives key and select the alg only the security protection is activated. The UE operates homogeneously even if security protection is not activated, so the UE choses NULL algorithm. Therefore, the general section is correct as exists.  - New NOTE seems wrong, CT1 does not have to specify to generate or not. Bullet b) with referencing 33.536 is enough.  - The condition under the bullet 7) is not necessary. UE operates same regardless of security protection activation. (for the sake of simplicity) You may check with your SA3 colleagues.  - In 6.1.2.7.3. The change is duplication with TS 33.536. CT1 does not have to repeat.  - 'Derive' part seems also wrong, UE operates same regardless of security protection activation.  - Changes on 6.1.2.11.3 can be misleading, it is up to PDCP layer which binds the logical channel regards to the security activation  Vishnu, Friday, 8:35  @Ivo: Your concern is already addressed in the text in 6.1.2.7.1, by security protection, it means the signaling integrity protections is also activated and we think there is no real need to repeat that again. Do you agree?  About NRPEK, yes, it should be actually ‘NRPEK shall not be generated if the selected ciphering protection algorithm is the null ciphering protection algorithm.  @Sunghoon:   * Key derivation and algorithm selection introduce additional overhead. Anyway, we are ok to delete this part in the revision as we think it’s better to discuss in SA3 first * I agree that just  adding the reference in bullet b) would be enough * OK to delete ‘for PC5 unicast link’ in 6.1.2.11.3. However we believe the original text cannot cover the unprotected conditions as we need to clarify that when the the integrity protection is not activated, all messages need to be processed. Do you agree?   Sunghoon, Monday, 7:00  @Visnu: It is still not clear whether we have same understanding. Let me comment on your change by change.  6.1.2.7.1.  First change is not correct, as SMC is mandatory procedure even NULL alg is selected.  If Nulll Alg is selected, UE performs SMC with NULL alg, and NULL alg is used for security protection: it means no security protection.  Therefore, no need any change on this section.  6.1.2.7.2.  The first change on 6.1.2.7.2 should be revised:  2)   the initiating UE :  i)    has either identified an existing KNRP based on the KNRP ID included in the DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT REQUEST message or derived a new KNRP; or  ii)   ~~the initiating UE~~ has indicated ~~decided~~ not to activate security protection based on its UE PC5 unicast signalling security policy ~~and the target UE’s PC5 unicast signalling security policy~~; or  + It seems you are ok to remove NOTE as it is resolved by the reference to TS 33.536  6.1.2.7.3,  *The target UE shall determine whether or not the DIRECT LINK SECURITY MODE COMMAND message can be accepted by:*  *a)   checking the integrity of the DIRECT LINK SECURITY MODE COMMAND message using NRPIK, if the selected integrity protection algorithm is not the null integrity protection algorithm;*  It should be aligned with TS 33.536 which says:  *the UE\_1 shall first check the Chosen\_algs and shall accept the NULL integrity algorithm only if its security policy for signalling integrity protection is either NOT NEEDED or PREFERRED.*  6.1.2.7.4.  We should describe the successful case when NULL alg is used.  How about this?  Upon receiving a DIRECT LINK SECURITY MODE COMPLETE message, the initiating UE shall stop timer T5007. If the selected integrity protection algorithm is not the null integrity protection algorithm, the UE checks the integrity of the DIRECT LINK SECURITY MODE COMPLETE message. If the integrity check passes, the initiating UE shall then continue the procedure which triggered the PC5 unicast link security mode control procedure. If the selected integrity protection algorithm is the null integrity protection algorithm, the UE continues the procedure without checking the integrity protection.  Vishnu, Wednesday, 11:43  @Sunghoon: We have taken on board all the comments except the first one.  That is in 6.1.2.7.1.  The reason we made the change in the first sentence is that the procedure is unable to establish security if NULL alg is selected, this also aligned with our comment. we can modify it to:  “The PC5 unicast link security mode control procedure is used to establish security between two UEs during a PC5 unicast link establishment procedure or a PC5 unicast link re-keying procedure, if the UE pC5 signalling integrity protection is activated or needs to be activated. Security is not established if the UE PC5 signalling integrity protection is not activated.”  Will this be OK with you?  A draft revision is available.  Sunghoon, Wednesday, 12:22  @Vishnu: Please remove changes on changes. One more thing on 6.1.2.7.2: the first change on 6.1.2.7.2, I think we don’t need any change because SMC shall be initiated regardless of whatever security protection policy.  So as it is bullet 2), it should be fine.  Vishnu, Thursday, 9:16  @Sunghoon: An updated draft revision is available. Changes on changes are removed. Regarding your comments on 6.1.2.7.2, gree with you that SMC shall be initiated regardless of whatever security protection policy. But I have a different understanding of 6.1.2.7.2: if no signaling integrity protection is not needed, the SMC procedure will be triggered directly (skip the authentication procedure). However, the existing description adds a limit to trigger the SMC procedure, which is not true. The SMC procedure can be triggered even without Knrp if signaling integrity protection is not needed.Thus, we would like to keep  the proposed changes.    Sunghoon, Thursday, 9:22  @Vishnu: Thanks for the clarification on 6.1.2.7.2, I’m fine with it. | |
|  |  | | C1-205370 | Correcting editorial errors on Key parameter name | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 0092 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204813  --------------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 8:54  Conflicts with C1-204598.  Vishnu, Friday, 8:54  @Ivo: Considering that we have more changes in our CR in section 6.1.2.6.2 and 6.1.2.7.2, will you be OK to merge your CR to ours? We will take the changes from section 8.4.9 from your CR.  Ivo, Friday, 10:02  Considering you have more changes in your CR and my CR is focused solely on the Knpr ID and Knpr-sess ID, can you remove Knpr ID and Knpr-sess ID  related changes from your CR? Then both your CR and my CR can progress.  Vishnu, Monday, 7:43  @Ivo: We will keep the changes in 6.1.2.6.2 and 6.1.2.7.2 in our CR  which were not covered by your CR. Rest all the changes you may take in your CR. Is that OK?  Ivo, Monday, 10:01  @Vishnu: Yes, this would be Ok.  Vishnu, Wednesday, 11:57  @Ivo: A draft revision is available. | |
|  |  | | C1-205371 | Removal of Abnormal cases in the target UE | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 0094 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204815  ----------------------------------------------------  Sunghoon, Thursday, 9:17  In my understanding, it can be a separate case 1) only L2 ID conflicts, 2) L2 ID + source user info conflict.  For the case 2), it may be the case when the source UE wants to re-establish the PC5 unicast link due to some reason (e.g., local release on source side)  Vishnu, Friday, 8:57  @Sunghoon:  Yes, the scenario mentioned for case 2) do exist. But for the case 2), there might be other scenarios:   1. Same L2 ID pair and same user info, but different protocol type (e.g. one link for IP and another link for Non-IP), the target UE will acknowledge whether this link is for IP or Non-IP when receiving Direct Link Security Mode Complete message; 2. Same L2 ID pair, same user info and even same Protocol type (e.g. both links are for IP), but different security policy (i.e. one for Required and one for Not Needed), and this can be hard to distinguish as the policy can be really complicated (e.g. integrity and ciphering, control plane and user plane, at least 7 possible combinations).   Considering the complexity listed above, we recommend to reject direct link establishment request with L2 ID conflicts no matter the source user info is different or not.  Please let us know your opinion.  Sunghoon, Monday, 7:24  @Vishnu:  1. -> It should be successful case then, isn’t it? Peer UEs can establish multiple PC5 unicast link. Please refer 5.6.1.4 of TS 23.287  *A UE may establish multiple PC5 unicast links with a peer UE and use the same or different source Layer-2 IDs for these PC5 unicast links.*  2. -> Different security policy means different V2X service. So peer UEs shall be able to establish another PC5 unicast link for other V2X services while it uses same source L2 ID.  I think we would better clarify this in order to make it successful.  Vishnu, Tuesday, 12:14  @Sunghoon: Considering all those scenarios listed, how about the below proposal:   1. If the source L2 ID, source user info, protocol type (IP or non-IP) and security policy, all four elements included in a direct link establishment request and the corresponding security mode complete message, are same to the four elements of an existing link, then follow clause 6.1.2.2.6.2 to handle it as an abnormal case to process the new request. 2. If the source L2 ID of the request message is same as the source L2 ID of the existing link, and one of the source user info, protocol type (IP or non-IP) and security policy is different, then the target UE rejects this request with cause value *#3         conflict of layer-2 ID for unicast communication is detected*.   Sunghoon, Wednesday, 8:00  @Vishnu: Okay with the idea, perhaps some wordsmithing, and removing protocol type – as it is not included in those msg.  1. If the source L2 ID, source user info, ~~protocol type (IP or non-IP)~~ and security policy~~, all four elements~~ ~~are~~ included in a direct link establishment request and the corresponding security mode complete message~~,~~ are same to the four elements of an existing link, then follow clause 6.1.2.2.6.2 to handle it as an abnormal case to process the new request.  2. If the source L2 ID of the request message is same as the source L2 ID of the existing link, and one of the source user info, ~~protocol type (IP or non-IP)~~ and security policy is different, then the target UE rejects this request with cause value *#3         conflict of layer-2 ID for unicast communication is detected*.  Vishnu, Wednesday, 11:46  @Sunghoon: Yes there is no specific protocol type IE, but it is possible to deduct whether it is IP or non-IP based on whether IP address configuration IE is there or not.  We have tried to clarify it in a Note. Will this be OK with you?  A draft revision is available.  Sunghoon, Thursday, 9:52  @Vishnu: I am Ok with it. | |
|  |  | | C1-205402 | UE in limited service state for unicast | | | OPPO / Rae | CR 0073 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205217  ----------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-204561  ------------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 8:54  - not clear what "with meeting the following conditions" relates to - it can be interpretted as related: ---> to "has a valid authorization for V2X communication over PC5 in NR-PC5 when not served by E-UTRA and not served by NR"; or ---> to "the initiating UE is either authorised for V2X communication over PC5 in NR-PC5 in the serving PLMN, or has a valid authorization for V2X communication over PC5 in NR-PC5 when not served by E-UTRA and not served by NR".  Rae, Friday, 2:24  My intention is to apply the conditions to the case “or has a valid authorization for V2X communication over PC5 in NR-PC5 when not served by E-UTRA and not served by NR”.  I change the wording in a draft revision. Also changed “not served by NR or not served by E-UTRA” to “not served by E-UTRA and not served by NR” in bullet 1).  Ivo, Tuesday, 11:26  The draft revision addresses my comments. Could you please add Ericsson as co-signer?  Rae, Wednesday, 2:45  @Ivo: Since I have already uploaded the revision (C1-205217), maybe I can ask a new revision to add Ericsson as co-source.  Ivo, Wednesday, 11:00  Having a new revision to add Ericsson as co-source is OK. | |
|  |  | | C1-205404 | Remove repeated communication mode in 6.1.1 | | | OPPO / Rae | CR 0072 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204560  -----------------------------------------------------  Chen, Wednesday, 12:47  Minor comments:   * In the Reason for Change: which **should be depends** on the configuration; **Besieds**, * If the proposed change is applied, then the whole phrase (*V2X messages carried over PC5 are exchanged using user plane and they can be sent or received over broadcast, unicast or groupcast*) looks weird, since **E-UTRA-PC5** cannot support unicast and groupcast.   Rae, Wednesday, 13:02  @Chen: How about removing the whole paragraph?  Chen, Thursday, 2:07  @Rae: Ok with me. | |
|  |  | | C1-205409 | Change configuration parameters over Uu to meet stage-2 requirements | | | OPPO / Rae | CR 0071 24.587 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-204558  Ivo, Fri, 1056  NOT OK  Rae, Fri, 1108  Defending  Ivo, Fri, 1349  Explains  Vishnu, Fri, 1435  Support the CR  Chen, Fri, 1453  unacceptable that one company thinks that they want to keep this requirement even though there is no Stage 2 for it  Christian, Fri, 1510  Support  Chen, Fri, 1540  Request to postpone, may come directly to plenary  -------------------------------------------------  Sunghoon, Thursday, 7:53  In my understanding, the V2X service with exisiting IP unicast routing is for (from 23.285):  For transport of V2X messages:  - for applications different from the applications with PSID or ITS-AID for PC5 reference point, or  - for configured applications with PSID or ITS-AID sending IP based V2X messages,  existing unicast routing towards application server applies.  NOTE 3: In case V2X application uses TCP/IP or UDP/IP transport then existing unicast routing towards application server applies, i.e. no further encapsulation is performed.  I understand it is not specified in TS 23.287, but it allows the case when encapsulation for Uu is not applied. (e.g., V2X packet itself has valid IP information).  So I suggest to leave it as is  Rae, Friday, 1:49  @Sunghoon: The reason why I want to remove the mapping between service and using existing unicast is that, in my understanding, different from EPS, 5GS V2X for Uu interface does not support MBMS. So the data will always use unicast i.e. PDU session to transmit data.  Sunghoon, Monday, 2:55  @Rae: I have different understanding, there is no UL MBMS link over Uu from the UE. (It seems you have withdrawn this comment in another mail thread)  The configuration per V2X services is for the cases:   * Encapsulation: TCP or UDP encapsulation is necessary, also specific PDU session is required, as configured in the mapping rule. * No encapsulation: V2X packet itself can be transferred over Uu e.g., existing PDU session, no mapping rule needs to be applied.   Rae, Monday, 3:07  @Sunghoon:  My understanding is that:   * UE will be configured with correct traffic descriptor from the network; * The mapping rule is considered as UE local configuration so has a lower priority than URSP rule as defined in 24.526.   So I cannot see the need of this existing unicast routing indication by trusting the network will have the right configuration.  Clearly, there is no stage 2 requirement for this.  Rae, Tuesday, 2:16  A draft revision including removing the description related to existing unicast routing is available.  Sunghoon, Tuesday, 7:30  @Rae: In 6.2.2., if there is the configuration for existing unicast routing, the UE does not have to perform the following steps (1,2,3) in b)  If you remove it, the UE shall perform all following steps even including 6.2.6, which is unnecessary because the V2X application layer passes the V2X msg as IP packet which will be routed to the V2X Application Server as indicated in the IP header.  If you want to change this operation, you also need to change the bullet 2) in the bullet b) of 6.2.2 to skip unnecessary operation.  Your revision is making those steps (including 6.2.6) mandatory.  Hope it clarifies my concern.  Rae, Tuesday, 8:24  @Sunghoon: I re-wrote the description related to the transport and receive V2X message. An updated draft revision is available.  Sunghoon, Tuesday, 13:37  I am Ok with the draft revision.  Vishnu, Wednesday, 11:14  We support this CR and we are fine with the latest draft revision that you provided.  Ivo, Wednesday, 12:13  I am not OK with removal of the list of V2X service identifiers of the V2X services configured for V2X communication over Uu using existing unicast routing.  We have the same concept in Uu in EPC and we should preserve the same feature in Uu in 5GS.  Rae, Wednesday, 12:20  I already providde the technical comment why this is not needed and the mapping rule of PDU session parameters already can do what the existing unicast routing do in EPS.  The most important, there is no stage 2 requirement.  Ivo’s comment is not technical. | |
|  |  | | C1-205410 | Update configuration parameters over Uu to meet stage2 requirements | | | OPPO / Rae | CR 0013 24.588 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-204559  Rae, Thursday, 10:16  Since I still think it is correct to remove the “existing unicast routing”, I kept the related the change in C1-205410.  Ivo, Fri, 1049  Does not agree, cannot be agreed  Chen, Fri, 1448  Unhappy with one company blocking this. This is inline with stage-2  Christian, Fri, 1510  Support  Chen, Fri, 1530  Asks to postpone, may bring it to plenary  --------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 8:55  - configuration for V2X services with IP unicast routing is provided in V2X over Uu in EPS (24.386 subclause 5.2.4 l) 5) and 24.385 subclause 5.6.61 and following). To get the same features in both EPS and 5GS, the same configuration needs to be available in V2X over Uu in 5GS too. - NOT OK to assign a new code point for Transport layer protocol type in the Route selection descriptor list since Route selection descriptor list is speciifed in 24.526 and code points cannot be added in 24.587 (the route selection descriptor component type identifier could be added later in 24.526 but with different semantic).  Rae, Friday, 2:35  @Ivo: The reason why I want to remove the mapping between service and using existing unicast is that, in my understanding, different from EPS, 5GS V2X for Uu interface does not support MBMS. So the data will always use unicast i.e. PDU session to transmit data.  If you consider the interworking, lots of parameters defined in 24.385 and 24.386 are missing in 24.588.  For adding the new RSD component type. I admit this is not usual in CT1 specs, but considering the particularity of V2X and the other features does not need this new type, I think keeping the V2X related change in 24.588 is more clear.  Ivo, Friday, 8:13  V2X services with IP unicast routing are not used for MBMS in LTE-Uu either.  In 24.386, they are used to distinguish whether to apply the handling specified or whether to apply regular IP handling.  24.587 contains similar distinguishing.  About the new RSD component type, we cannot have two specs defining the same field.  Rae, Friday, 13:56  I withdraw my comment that the existing unicast routing indication is used for MBMS.  After I read the spec 23.285, 23.2287, 24.386, 24,.587 and compare between EPS V2X and 5GS V2X mechanism for Uu communication, my understanding is that:  In EPS, the mapping bwt service and using existing unicast routing is used to make UE know whether the App server discovery is needed or not.  But in 5GS, this is not the case based on 23.287.  In current 24.587, the following says only V2X message is IP and identified in the mapping rule will use the PDU session parameters in the configuration for Uu.  This is very strange and also no stage 2 requirement.  For Uu, just reusing the unicast routing mechanism defined in 24.501 and 23.502, i.e. PDU session, is enough.  In short, since there is no stage 2 requirement, I still think the is not needed. The related description as mentioned by Ivo should also be removed in 24.587.  Sorry for missing the change when it was proposed in a large CR.  For the adding new component type, if people think it is good to change 24.526, I am also OK and prepare a CR to 24.526 to October meeting.(PS: I am not sure whether it is OK to request a new Tdoc to 24.526 in this meeting. If OK, I can also draft the CR).  Rae, Tuesday, 2:23  As commented by Ivo, I am OK to move the Transport layer protocol type to 24.526.  I would like to check whether people are OK to add the new CR in this meeting (have checked with Frederic, is OK if the group agree).  I prepared a draft CR to 24.526 to help people to determine whether the new CR is OK in this meeting.  Ivo, Tuesday, 11:32  Given that Transport layer protocol type applies only in V2X and does not influence how to establish a PDU session, it is not good idea to put it into URSP.  It might better to break the linkage between 24.587 / 24.588 on usage of Route selection descriptor component of 24.526.  Rae, Wednesday, 1:26  @Ivo: Do you mean not referring to 24.526 and listing each the session related parameters e.g. DNN, S-NSSAI in the 24.588?  Rae, Wednesday, 1:32  @Ivo: Different from EPS, there is no stage 2 requirement in 5GS to have this existing unicast routing. I think this is clear.  As I commented before, in 5GS there is no such “existing unicast routing” since the evaluation PDU session for V2X communication over Uu is the same as the UE local configuration as defined in 24.526.  Rae, Wednesday, 3:37  @Ivo: A further response: actually the mapping rule of the PDU session parameters can already achieve what the existing unicast routing did in EPS.  Please find the description in the draft revision of C1-204558 in another email thread.  Vishnu, Wednesday, 11:12  We agree that in 5GS there is no stage-2 requirement for unicast routing so we support this CR.  Rae, Thursday, 3:49  Since I have not received the response from Ivo on the coding of transport layer protocol and the deadline is coming soon, I put the following draft on the server based on my understanding of Ivo’s comment, i.e. with not referring to 24.526 and defining the pdu session parameters only in 24.588.  Ivo, Thursday, 8:36  OK with the RDS part.  NOT OK with removal of the "V2X services with IP unicast routing" as this creates inconsistency between V2X over Uu in EPC and V2X over Uu in 5GS. See mails below for details.  Rae, Thursday, 8:43  Anyhow V2X communication over Uu in EPS is different from 5GS primarily.  I explain again that the mapping rule of v2x service to PDU session parameters has the same role of the unicast routing in EPS.  Could you respond to this technical comment? | |
|  |  | | C1-205445 | Encoding for direct link establishment reject message | | | Samsung / Sapan | CR 0114 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205089  -------------------------------------------------  Sapan, Friday, 19:11  A draft revision is available, the only change is to add CATT as co-signer. | |
|  |  | | C1-205446 | Addition of “Privacy timer” | | | InterDigital | CR 0079 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205380  --------------------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-204740  Sunghoon, Thursday, 3:38  @Behrouz: Unfortunately you may need to revise again, because:   1. 6.1.2.4.3 Release accept part has conflict with C1-205326 – IMO it would better to remove this section in your CR 2. Please correct company name – Qualcomm Incorporated.   Behrouz, Thursday, 4:43  @Sunghoon:   1. -> I am not sure we should do as you suggest. In CT1, we normally mention every single timer that could be running. As you can see, I am only following the text the way it was written before, so I will have to keep it as is. Perhaps vivo can make their change in C1-205326 accordingly? 2. -> I will correct the company name.   So, the new revision will only have the correct name “Qualcomm incorporated”.  Sunghoon, Thursday, 6:18 @Behrouz: Regarding 1., If Wen is Ok, then I’m Ok for sure.  --------------------------------------------------  Sunghoon, Thursday, 8:32  CR assumes that target UE must change its L2 ID, which is still under the discussion. (There is CR in SA2)  At this moment we can specify the timer operation if the target UE changes its L2 ID.  Please note that C1-205012 clarifies reset operation of the privacy timer when L2 ID has been changed.  Ivo, Thursday, 8:54  Editorial: "REQUES" -> "REQUEST"  Behrouz, Thursday, 16:52  Thanks Ivo.  Rae, Friday, 6:43  The following description is not accurate since only having privacy configuration does not mean starting the timer.  and shall start timer T5xxx if the target UE has the privacy configuration as specified in clause 5.2.3.  Similar with starting privacy timer for broadcast, the following conditions should be met.  a)   the V2X service identifier of a V2X service requesting transmission of V2X communication over PC5 is in the list of of V2X services which require privacy for V2X communication over PC5 as specified in clause 5.2.3; and  b)   the UE is located in a geographical area in which this V2X service requires privacy for V2X communication over PC5 as specified in clause 5.2.3, or the UE is not provisioned any geographical areas in which this V2X services requires privacy for V2X communication over PC5,  Lider, Friday, 10:18  According to this CR, privacy timer reset on target UE is to avoid the link identifier update procedure unnecessarily frequent. We share same view on this issue but we have different solution in our contribution C1-204717.  Maybe these two CRs can be discussed jointly.  Behrouz, Friday, 18:04  @Sunghoon: Since you acknowledged today (at the CC) that the Target UE shall also change its L2-ID, would you then be OK with this CR as is?  Sunghoon, Monday, 4:50  @Behrouz: Yes we are fine with that target UE changes its L2-ID during LIU. It may bring additional benefit for privacy even this procedure is not triggered by privacy configuration.  I have several suggestions for your CR:   1. Please make consistency – some places ‘the privacy timer T5xxxx’, some places ‘T5xxx’, some places ‘timer T5xxx’ 2. Adding red in 6.1.2.5.3   *,Stops T5xxx if running,*   1. Adding red in 6.1.2.5.4. as separate sentence   *, and the UE shall start timer T5xxx as configured.*   1. Adding red in 6.1.2.5.5,   *And start T5xxx as configured.*  Behrouz, Monday, 14:57  @Sunghoon: I will check your suggestions with the related sections of my CR. Having had a quick first look, all your suggestions seem reasonable, but please let me double check.  Behrouz, Monday, 18:27  @Sunghoon: I am, in general, fine with your proposed comments. Please see my responses:  1. -> Sure, I will make them all “timer T5xxx”  2. -> Agreed  3. -> Not sure if the suggested addition is needed. Since the initiating UE has previously initiated the privacy procedure for this unicast link, this means that the privacy is configured and the UE needs to restart the privacy timer. No need to add this extra check of configuration  4. -> Same comment as in 3 above.  Sunghoon, Tuesday, 6:41  I’ve added ‘as configured’ because your changes restrict the use case of LIU only for privacy configuration available.  Even though there is no privacy configuration, it should be allowed to use this procedure, e.g., when upper layers want to change the application layer ID and there is an existing PC5 unicast link associated with this application layer ID.  But your change proposal sticks every operation to the timer running.  It seems my suggestion does not harm what you want.  In addition, please adding one more change on 6.1.2.5.2  *If the PC5 unicast link identifier update procedure is triggered by a change of the initiating UE’s application layer ID, the initiating UE shall stop the privacy timer T5xxx if running and create a DIRECT LINK IDENTIFIER UPDATE REQUEST message. In this message, the initiating UE*  Hope it clarifies!  Lider, Tuesday, 9:29  We have a CR (please see C1-204717) that is also related to privacy timer. I think the second change in C1-204717 and these changes in this CR are about privacy timer. Therefore, it seems good to merge all of them into single CR. I wonder if you could be fine to merge our second change into this CR. Thanks!  Behrouz, Tuesday, 19:16  @Sunghoon: I will incorporate your comments/changes in the revised version of 4740 and also add Qualcomm as a source company.  Chen, Wednesday, 12:54  I suggest to use “reset and restart” the privacy timer XXXX.  Behrouz, Wednesday, 13:13  @Chen: There is only “one” occurrence of “reset” when it comes to timers in 24.587 and it says:  “The UE shall, on the first expiry of the timer T5010, retransmit the UE POLICY PROVISIONING REQUEST message and shall reset and start timer T5010. This retransmission is repeated four times, i.e. on the fifth expiry of timer T5010, the UE shall abort the procedure and release the allocated PTI".  With that in mind, do you want to still make the change? It may trigger the same change to all other timers!  Chen, Thursday, 2:17  @Behrouz: You may misunderstand me. What I mean is for the privacy timer, not for other timers. Just “start” timer means the timer continues at the last time where stopped.  Sunghoon, Thursday, 3:47  @Chen: In my understanding, in that case, we would better use ‘suspend’ and ‘resume’.  In C1-205380 (rev of 204740) it clarifies ‘the UE starts the timer as configured’, so your concern has been resolved.  Behrouz, Thursday, 5:08  @Chen: So, I guess I don’t have to reply anymore after Sunghoon’s explanation.  Chen, Thursday, 6:16  @Sunghoon and Berhouz: Ok with me. | |
|  |  | | C1-205450 | Privacy timer of Layer-2 ID for unicast | | | ASUSTeK | CR 0077 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204717  -----------------------------------------------  Rae, Thursday, 7:53  1. Has the first change been covered by subclause 6.1.2.5.2?  2. To keep the spec more clear, how about we keeping the current broadcast description and adding “with replacing broadcast to groupcast” to 6.1.4.2.4?  Wen, Thursday, 8:14  1. Now the definition of T5020 is for broadcast in table 10.4.1., we prefer to use dedicated privacy timer for unicast, broadcast and groupcast as our paper C1-204759.  2. Now the descriptions of privacy handling in clause 6.1.3.2.4 are applied to broadcast and groupcast, I am not sure it can be applied to unicast directly.  Sunghoon, Thursday, 8:26  1. the privacy timer value can be same per V2X service, or different per UE. This CR prevent the case that the target UE has different privacy timer based on its configuration.  In C1-205012(my paper), timer reset operation can be clarified.  2. For using T5020 for other cast, IMO it depends on whether broadcast and unicast are sharing the same source L2 ID.  If they are using different IDs, there is no reason to mandate them sharing the same timer. I believe it is not your intention.  Frederic, Thursday, 11:52  All styles have been lost. Please restore them if you revise this document.  Lider, Friday, 9:53  @Sunghoon:  Although the target UE has different configurations of privacy timer, the target UE always needs to change its L2ID in the run of unicast link identifier update procedure. That is why we consider just one UE to maintain the privacy timer for each unicast link for simplicity.  Maybe we can just replace T5020 with Txyz. Txyz could be the definition of privacy timer for unicast.  @Wen:  I have no strong view to use different definition of the privacy timer. T5020 in the first changed can be replaced with Txyz temporarily.  In my view, the operation of privacy timer is mainly for updating L2ID. It could be simpler to reuse majority procedural text and just add some modification for unicast.  @Rae:  I remove the redundant text from the first change. Please see if it is ok to you.  In my opinion, if the procedural text in the sub-clause 6.1.3.2.4 (broadcast) is also reused for unicast and groupcast, it seems better to use common wording. Maybe we can see other company’s view.  Sunghoon, Monday, 4:34  @Lider: What I mentioned is that there is a case where the target UE has different privacy timer value (if it is per UE, by the V2X service provider)  If target UE has shorter value than initiating UE, target UE’s privacy configuration does work with your proposal.  It should be possible to initiate LIU from both initiating UE or target UE.  Lider, Monday, 5:58  @Sunghoon: For a service on a given unicast link, both UEs should have the same privacy configuration of the service (i.e. both UEs should use the same privacy timer value for the service). I didn’t understand the case both UEs could have different privacy configurations for the same service.  If you mean the case of running multiple services on different unicast links but using the same source L2ID for these unicast links, I think the initiating UE can select the shortest privacy timer value among the privacy configurations since the shortest one can fulfill all requirement of the privacy configurations.  If I miss something, please further clarify for me.  Sunghoon, Monday, 9:53  @Lider: I don’t think there is any restriction that peer UEs should be configured with the same privacy timer. There is flexibility from V2X service provider point of view that each UE may be configured with different privacy timer value. For example, peer UE from different V2X service provider (or automobile manufacturer) can communicate each other with using same V2X Service ID.  If you think the privacy timer shall be same per V2X service, who would regulate it?  Lider, Tuesday, 9:07  @Sunghoon:  Thanks for your comments. Since the privacy timer reset also addresses the similar issue, we are fine with your solution.  To all, we tend to remove the first change from this CR. However, since the sub-clause 6.1.3.2.4 for privacy timer operation is referred to both broadcast and groupcast, it would be better to use high level procedural text. Therefore, we still propose the second change in this CR.  Sunghoon, Tuesday, 13:32  I am ok with the second change.  Behrouz, Tuesday, 19:08  we cannot agree to the CR the way it is. Here is the reason: the CR is proposing to run the privacy timer on 1 UE only (not both peer UEs). A possibility is to have the initiating UE in an area where privacy is not required and the target UE in an area where privacy is required. in this case, the timer on the target UE will expire and both UEs MUST change their identifiers.  About broadcast/groupcast: We are OK with that part.  Lider, Thursday, 4:48  A draft revision is available.  Lider, Thursday, 5:02  Since I found an indentation should be also fixed in the sub-clause 6.1.3.2.4, I already included the corresponding change in this draft. | |
|  |  | | C1-205553 | Updates to PC5 unicast link establishment procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 0095 24.587 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-204816  Sunghoon, Thu, 1613  Objects  --------------------------------------------------  Wen, Thursday, 8:47  Question for clarification: what is the intention for the source UE to change the source layer-2 ID? to avoid L2 ID conflict? If so, that is not a problem, because the source UE can reject the next coming authentication request with same pair of L2 ID similar handling with link establishment reject with cause L2 ID conflict.  Ivo, Thursday, 8:54  Editorial: "intiaiting" -> "initiating"  Sunghoon, Thursday, 9:18  Please see my comment for C1-204809.  Vishnu, Friday, 9:05  @Ivo, thanks, we will fix it.  @Sunghoon and Wen, please find our response below (same as the response give to C1-204809):  1. In order to establish different links triggered by one establishment request (and the request is using SRC L2 ID 1), it is natural for the source UE to assign different source L2 IDs for communicating with different target UEs (which can be found in clause 6.1.2.2.2 bullet c), in order to separate the establishment procedure with different target UEs after receiving security related requests;  2. Assigning different source Layer-2 IDs also minimize the possibility of L2 ID conflict during the future link identifier update procedure (considering if target UEs trigger the procedures, and source UE does not change its L2 ID, whether both sides shall change its L2 ID during the Link Identifier update procedure is still under discussion in SA2 and CT1);  3. Compared to rejecting a peer UE, it is better to accept the authentication request in order to establish the link, rather than trigger complicated following procedures (for example, the rejected target UE or the source UE trigger link establishment procedure again);  4. Also we need to keep in mind that PC5 unicast link authentication procedure can go few rounds during an PC5 link unicast establishment procedure, so the next coming authentication request might come from the same target UE.  Considering the reasons above, the target UEs needs to signal its user info (e.g. application layer ID) to identify its identity during the authentication procedure, and source UE can uniquely identify those target UEs and assign different L2 IDs to establish different links.  Please let us know if you are fine with this.  Behrouz, Friday, 13:37  We are not sure if you have noticed but SA3 has already studied this problem and has a solution document in the TS 33.536 (section 5.3.3.1.4.3). We have submitted a CR also for this week’s SA3 meeting to add clarifications (S3-201609).  Wen, Monday, 2:22  In my understanding, once the source UE decides to change the source L2 ID after receiving the authentication request for avoiding the L2 conflict, the source UE shall include the new source L2 ID in the authentication accept message similar behavior to link ID update procedure, instead of using the new source layer-2 ID directly. Otherwise, the target UE cannot figure out authentication accept message in lower layer with new L2 ID.  Sunghoon, Monday, 15:46  @Vishnu:   1. The Source UE can use same source L2 ID for communicating with different target UEs, as the link is identified by the pair of {src L2 ID, dest L2 ID} so it should be fine to do so. No need to restrict this flexibility. 2. Actually using different source L2 Id increase the probability of the L2 ID conflict. It has more chance to encounter the UE using same source L2 ID. And I’m ok to change target L2 ID during LIU procedure always. 3. and 4., I second what Wen mentioned for this.   Vishnu, Tuesday, 11:02  Provides answers to Wen and Sunghoon.  Behrouz, Tuesday, 18:44  As we commented on the discussion paper, we are not in favor of this CR as SA3 already has agreed to a solution and we (IDC) have a CR in their meeting this week (S3-201609) with some clarification for the (agreed) solution.  Behrouz, Wednesday, 19:44  We have some (more up to date) comments that we would like to provide here. Please disregard from our previous comments and take into account the ones below. Apologies if we created any confusion on your side.  We have realized that S3-201609 is not so related to the problem introduced in your discussion paper. Let’s come back to the problem statement and assumptions:   * If two target UEs (e.g. UE A and UE B) use the same source Layer-2 ID to respond to the initiating UE at very close time (i.e. Layer-2 ID conflict), then the initiating UE might get confused by different DIRECT LINK AUTHENTICATION REQUEST messages or DIRECT LINK SECURITY MODE COMMAND messages sent from two target UEs using the same source Layer-2 ID. This issue gets further more complicated when considering that the PC5 unicast link authentication procedure may be run multiple times between a pair of UEs. And one target UE (e.g. UE A) might take the DIRECT LINK AUTHENTICATION REPONSE message or DIRECT LINK SECURITY MODE COMPLETE message targeted for another target UE (e.g. UE B) as for its own, leading to the failure of security establishment   Our answer:   * We agree the V2X service oriented method introduced many problems that you are addressing. * We are ok with the modifications related to timer T5005 and the maximum number of established NR PC5 unicast links allowed in the UE at a time. * We are ok with the new cause value “#5: lack of resources for PC5 unicast link (section 6.1.2.6.5) and the corresponding description in this same section. * We are ok with the addition of the initiating UE’s (e.g. UE A) application layer ID in the link authentication request message (section 6.1.2.6.2) and of the target UE’s (e.g. UE A) application layer ID in the link authentication response message (section 6.1.2.6.3) * We are not in favor of the change of layer-2 ID during the link authentication procedure. We believe that sending a link authentication failure with cause Layer-2 ID conflict when a Layer-2 ID conflict is detected, (based on the new field, i.e. initiating UE’s application layer ID on the link authentication request message) would solve the problem *and would be in line with the rest of the Layer-2 ID conflict detection in other conditions.* * We believe the response to a DCR message using V2X service oriented method is be a link authentication request (authentication procedure may only be skipped if the DCR message contains a Knrp ID. A Knrp ID can only be included if the DCR is sent to a specific peer UE. Knrp ID cannot be included on a broadcast DCR using the V2X service oriented method). Thus, we believe that the proposed modifications related to the link security mode control procedure are not needed.   Vishnu, Thursday, 7:18  @Behrouz: The main reason for assigning a new L2-ID is not only to avoid L2\_ID conflict. It has other motivations too (below bullets ). We believe it will keep the link handling much more simpler.  1. In order to establish different links triggered by one establishment request (and the request is using SRC L2 ID 1), it is natural for the source UE to assign different source L2 IDs for communicating with different target UEs (which can be found in clause 6.1.2.2.2 bullet c), in order to separate the establishment procedure with different target UEs after receiving security related requests;  2. Assigning different source Layer-2 IDs also minimize the possibility of L2 ID conflict during the future link identifier update procedure (considering if target UEs trigger the procedures, and source UE does not change its L2 ID, whether both sides shall change its L2 ID during the Link Identifier update procedure is still under discussion in SA2 and CT1);  3. Compared to rejecting a peer UE, it is better to accept the authentication request in order to establish the link, rather than trigger complicated following procedures (for example, the rejected target UE or the source UE trigger link establishment procedure again);  4. Also we need to keep in mind that PC5 unicast link authentication procedure can go few rounds during an PC5 link unicast establishment procedure, so the next coming authentication request might come from the same target UE.  Considering the reasons above, the target UEs needs to signal its user info (e.g. application layer ID) to identify its identity during the authentication procedure, and source UE can uniquely identify those target UEs and assign different L2 IDs to establish different links.  Also for your comment on changes on the SMC procedure: We admit that the response to a DCR message (V2X service oriented) would be a link authentication request if security is needed. However, as stated in TS 33.536 clause 5.3.3.1.3.1 that:  *Clause 5.3.3.1.3 provides the details on the establishment of KNRP. The key establishment procedures in this clause shall be skipped if signalling integrity protection is not activated based on the decision of receiving UE of this PC5 unicast link.*  Thus if the target UEs, receiving the V2X service oriented direct link establishment request message, decides not to activate the signaling integrity protection (e.g. the security policy included indicates security off or preferred), the first response from the receiving UEs will be Direct Link Security Mode Command message.  Vishnu, Thursday, 7:38  @Wen and Sunghoon: Can you please let us know if you are fine with the explanation and the changes?  Sunghoon, Thursday, 7:49  @Vishnu: I’m sorry to tell you still I don’t see clear benefit to restrict to use different source L2 ID.  IDCC’s discussion paper explains the probability is extremely lower, so we don’t have to put much effort to do so, as we have another way to resolve the L2 ID conflict. The peer sending PC5 signaling message can be identified by the pair of src L2 ID and dest L2 ID, so using different src L2 ID does not have any impact.  Vishnu, Thursday, 8:49  @Sunghoon: We agree that it can be rare, but we cannot rule out the conflict completely. Many random number generation can be based on the system clock and here the signaling happens the same time, the probability is higher. Assigning a new source L2 ID for the initiating UE will make sure there is absolutely no conflict and no additional signaling.  As we see clear benefits with this approach, We can make it optional behavior and the UE implementation can choose if they want to have it or not, will that be acceptable for you?  Sunghoon, Thursday, 9:16  @Vishnu: It sounds a bit strange cuz HiSilicon was co-source of C1-205194 and observation#1 says unlikely what you said here.  It probably seems ok to make optional behavior to assign new source ID during the link establishment, but I’m afraid it is running out of time and C1-204816 contains numerous changes, it seems to difficult to have a time to review thoroughly. (Have you shared any draft? I haven’t seen). So, if you are ok to postpone this issue, I’m happy to work further in the next meeting. | |
|  |  | | C1-205555 | Indication of security protection activation to lower layer | | | Qualcomm Korea | CR 0098 24.587 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205287  ------------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-205003  Mohamed, Thursday, 10:12  @Sunghoon: Thank you for making the final revision below, I am fine with it, and we can take forward any remaining issue/gap in next meeting.  Could you please indicate Nokia as a co-signing company for C1-205287?  -----------------------------------------------  Mohamed, Thursday, 7:05  No need to send the security activation indication to lower layer ALSO AFTER sending DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT REQUEST to Target UE.  Rae, Thursday, 7:37  I have the following comments:   1. In 33.536, it specifies “The Direct Communication Request is always sent unprotected”. The reason for add the passing to AS layer is not correct, so the first change is not needed. 2. RAN2 LS does not say there should be an explicit indication. No need for explicit indication. Using the presence of the key(s) and algorithm can apply the same principle to all cases. 3. For SMC initiation by initiating UE, the integrity related parameters should be passed to AS layer to integrity protection the SMC message. The change to 6.1.2.7.2 is missing.   Sunghoon, Thursday, 8:18  1. -> It is allowed to use previously used PC5 unicast context for subsequent PC5 unicast link establishment. That is the reason why key materials can be exchanged during the PC5 unicast link release procedure.  If the security context is still valid, then why the UE has to sent Direct Link Establishment msg unprotected?  2. -> Do you mean that providing the key and chosen Alg are enough to indicate the security protection activation?  3. -> In my understanding SMC msg is integrity protected by V2X layer, and after passing this msg to lower layer, the lower layer binds this msg to the logical channel for the PC5-S signaling to activate security  Mohamed, Thursday, 9:01  About 1., this is exactly my point. The security context was still set to “Active” in all layers. I mean, nothing “In-validated” the context in Lower layers. So why we shall send an indication to lower layer in that case ?  Or do you mean the release procedure will Invalidate the security context ? => but if this is True, shouldn’t we send a new indication to lower layer for Invalidating the context here ?  Rae, Friday, 4:03  @Sunghoon:  1. -> this is what specified by SA3. If you want to change this requirement, a CR should be sent to SA3. Another point is that if the establishment request can be security protected, then there is no need to delete the Knrp ID each time the link is release. Of course the security context with the same UE can be reused such as the same Knrp. But this does not mean the establishment request message should be protected  2. -> Yes  3. -> in my understanding, both the integrity and cipher protection are executed at PDCP layer. V2X layer just determines the key and algorithm and passes them to AS layer if the security is activated. Since it is possible to integrity protect the SMCommand if the policy is not “not needed”, the related parameters should also be sent to AS layer.  Sunghoon, Friday, 13:03  1. -> So the purpose of the Krnp\_ID exchanged during the release procedure is for Direct SMC procedure (if it is new, it should be exchanged during SMC, otherwise UEs do not have to exhcnage Knrp ID during SMC procedure)  I’m ok with it.  2. -> Okay fine, I can revise the text to say like: The target UE shall provide lower layer with NRPEK, NRPIK, KNPR-sess ID and the selected security algorithms as specified in TS 33.536 [20] to indicate the activation of the PC5 unicast signalling security protection and/or PC5 unicast user plane security protection for the PC5 unicast link.  3. -> I will further check and get back to you. However, it is not related with the security protection activation.  Behrouz, Friday, 13:37  We have quite a few comments (please see below) on this CR and do not believe that it should progress.   * 1. Discussion on this CR is not going in the right direction.   2. The Release procedure is used to exchange new **Knrp IDs** (not keys). **The Knrp/Knrp ID is not the same as the Knrp-sess/Knrp-sess ID**.   3. Knrp-sess ID is used to retrieve the security context associated to a specific unicast link. The security context is deleted when the unicast link is released. A new security context is created each time a unicast link is established.   4. Knrp/Knrp ID is associated to a specific peer UE and may be kept after the unicast link is released. It’s used with other parameters to generate keys when establishing unicast links with the peer UE.   5. If the Knrp/Knrp ID has been preserved after the unicast link release, the authentication steps may be skipped when a new unicast link is established with the same peer UE. The preserved Knrp/Knrp ID is used to generate the Knrp-sess for the new unicast link.   6. See 33.536 (5.3.3.1.2.1) for all the details about the Keys/IDs.   7. The security context cannot be preserved and reused with future unicast links, even with the same peer UE   Sunghoon, Friday, 13:52  The change of DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT REQUEST part will be removed. Hope it is fine with you.  Sunghoon, Monday, 9:58  At Mohamed: As I mentioned to Rae, I will remove the change on Direct Link Establishment part.  For clarification on your comment   * After release procedure, PDCP layer cleans the context, so AS layer has no more the context for the PC5 unicast link. So we don’t need new indication for invalidating the context.   Sunghoon, Tuesday, 6:24  A draft revision is available with the following changes:   * Remove the changes on 6.1.2.2.2 PC5 unicast link establishment procedure initiation by initiating UE * No explicit indication to lower layer, rather the security materials provided to the lower layer itself is to indicate the security activation. * Adding 6.1.2.7.2 to clarify the V2X layer provides lower layer with NRIPK and the chosen alg for integrity protection of Direct SMC msg.   Rae, Tuesday, 6:45  @Sunghoon: For clarification, you use “shall” because UE should provide to AS layer even the key is zero and algorithm is null?  One editorial comment: TS 33.536 [20] -> 3GPP TS 33.536 [20]. Please pay attention to the hard space.  Scott, Tuesday, 9:20  I have several comments on draft revision:   1. Non-explicit indication is not enough to indicate all the cases. For example activation of integrity protection/cipher protection in user plane. The indication of different cases (CP, UP, integrity, cipher) need to design uniformly even though in some case explicit indication is not needed. 2. After the completion of Direct link establishment accept, the indication of user plane security activation is needed to indicate to lower layer if needed. 3. The precondition of sending the indication of security activation to lower layer is needed as described in CR C1-204810, for example non-null algorithm, activation of integrity/cipher protection etc. 4. Now that NRPIK is sent to lower layer in subclause 6.1.2.7.2, it is not needed to be sent to lower layer again in subclause 6.1.2.7.4. 5. If NRPIK is sent to lower layer in subclause 6.1.2.7.2 and lower layer performs integrity protection, how does the lower layer of peer UE verify the integrity protected DIRECT LINK SECURITY MODE COMMAND signaling since no NRPIK is receive from upper layer.   Mohamed, Tuesday, 10:19  There is still one issue in the draft revision as following:  =>I believe the change you made in 6.1.2.7.2 is not needed, i.e. you don’t need to provide an early key (and algorithms) to lower layers.  As I indicated before, the lower layer shall get the keys and algorithms ONLY AFTER the successful completion of the Security Mode Command procedure. This is the only point in time where we can say security has been fully activated and is currently “in-use”. For example, please consider the scenario when Target UE will send SECURITY MODE REJECT to Initiating UE =>Here the security procedure will be aborted, then who will invalidate the key that was provided to lower layer and when ? =>this will cause mismatch between lower layer and V2X layer.  I know that SECURITY MODE COMMAND was sent Integrity Protected, and that’s why you wanted to indicate lower layer with NRPIK at this point of time. BUT this is still an intermediate step where security is still not fully established, hence it is better to wait till the full completion.  Also one editorial comment in the cover sheet:  You can replace the statement (According to LS R2-2005978 (waiting for CT1 tdoc number)…) with the CT1 Tdoc number which is C1-204613.  Other changes look fine to me.  Sunghoon, Tuesday, 13:44  @Rae: yes, I use “shall” because UE should provide to AS layer even the key is zero and algorithm is null, otherwise we need explicit indication.  I will correct the editorial.  In addition, I think I should bring back the explicit indication – as NRPEK/NRPIK + chosen algs are shared for both PC5 signaling protection and User plane protection.  Just sending NRPEK/NRPIK + chosen Alg cannot indicate whether the security protection is for the signaling or user plane.  Please let me know your thought.  Sunghoon, Tuesday, 13:52  @Mohamed: Security Mode Command shall be integrity protected, and it is done by PDCP layer. If you wait until full completion, how the msg can be integrity protected?  Perhaps I can remove this part in my CR, and we can clarify in the next meeting. But let me try if we can get common understanding.  I will update the CT1 tdoc number in the coversheet.  Sunghoon, Tuesday, 14:21  @Scott:   1. I agree that explicit indication is necessary to indicate separate security policy, as the key and chosen algs are used for both signaling and user plane. I will bring it back. 2. Whether to protect user plane or not is identified during SMC procedure. So it can be passed to lower layer during SMC. 3. It has been clarified in TS 33.536. We can just refer. Perhaps I misunderstood what you mean ‘precondition’. 4. I will fix it. 5. Based on the selected alg and Krnp ID received, the UE can calculate Knrp-sess and NRPIK/NRPEK. Please refer 33.536.   Sunghoon, Tuesday, 14:38  @Scott: One more clarification on 5, V2X layer verifies the integrity protection.  Mohamed, Tuesday, 15:04  @Sunghoon: But my understanding is that the SECURITY MODE COMMAND is integrity protected on V2X level, by interfacing with the Hardware cryptographic engine to perform Integrity protection/validation (and ciphering/de-ciphering).  i.e. something like what we have today in 3GPP NAS layer (Non-Access Stratum), where the EMM/5GMM performs the Integrity/Ciphering on NAS level by interfacing with the Hardware cryptographic engine…then there is another integrity/ciphering that happens on PDCP level.  So are you sure this is not the case for V2X ?  Could you please mention the specs reference for that?  Maybe I am wrong…  Sunghoon, Tuesday, 15:32  @Mohamed: I’ve checked with my SA3 colleague: PDCP layer will do integrity protection.  PC5 link is over the air, so PDCP layer protection is enough like RRC.  But at the receiving side, V2X layer checks the integrity protection.  Mohamed, Tuesday, 15:58  @Sunghoon: I was searching for that topic and I found the same like what you mentioned in the V2X security document 3GPP TS 33.536.  But then I believe the integrity validation (at the receiving side) happens at PDCP level as well and not at V2X (as it requires interfacing with the cryptographic engine in the same way to reverse the operation and to Integrity-validate the message).  Hence there maybe a need at the receiver to process the SECURITY MODE COMMAND message and generate the keys before integrity-validating it. And then receiver needs to integrity-validate the message using the generated keys.  (Again this is similar to what happens in NAS layer.)  Anyway my understanding is that you will be working on a new version to return back the explicit indication to lower layer, and for that new revision we can review it further.  Behrouz, Tuesday, 19:00  We are in general OK with this CR now. However, we would like to ask you to consider the comments below:   * Section 6.1.2.7.3, Signaling security protection may be sent to AS layer at this point but NOT user plane security protection since the agreed user plane protection from the peer UE will be received only on the Link Establishment Accept message (not received yet) or rekeying response message. User plane security protection selected algorithm and key may be sent to lower layer when receiving the Link Establishment Accept message or rekeying response message. * Section 6.1.2.7.4, signaling security algo and NRPIK have already been provided to lower layer in section 6.1.2.7.2. No need to re-send.   Rae, Wednesday, 2:11  @Sunghoon: Inspired by Scott, I thought over the detailed timing and parameters provided to AS layer.  Now I am OK to introduce the explicit indication to distinguish the CP and UP for security activation.  Sunghoon, Wednesday, 7:15  C1-205003 is revised to C1-205287. A draft of the revision is available. Changes in the revision include:   * Explicit indication for security activation came back. * Signaling security protection activation is provided when UE sends/receives Direct Link Security Mode Command, as the security policy and chosen alg are decided and NRPIK, NRPEK (if applicable) are calculated at this time. * User plane security protection activation is provided when UE sends/receives Direct Link Establish Accept. The final decision of user plane security policy is made after the UE receives Direct Link Security Mode Complete msg and before sending Direct Link Establish Accept. As NRPIK/NRPEK and chosen alg. are already provided, V2X layer just needs to provide the indication of PC5 user plane security protection activation. * @Behrouz, re-keying procedure does not change the user plane security protection activation. * @Mohamed, Direct Link SMC msg should be handled especially. Other than this msg, all protection/validation is done by PDCP. Here is the reason   + UE-1 sends Direct Link Establishment Request msg including Security capability (supported Algs)   + UE-2 selected the alg (=chosen alg. in the spec) and sends it back to UE-1 in the Direct Link Security Mode Command.   + From UE-1 perspective, it is impossible to know which alg is used for the integrity protection of Direct Link SMC msg.   + Therefore, UE-1 V2X layer needs to check the Direct Link SMC msg, and figure out which Alg is used, then check integrity protection. (it is already specified in our spec)   + Please note that there is dedicated LCID for Direct Link SMC msgs. Other than that, PDCP will do protection/validation.   Rae, Wednesday, 9:02  I have the following questions:   * It seems that the indication of signaling security will always been provided to the AS layer with using “shall”.  What is the meaning of this indication? * For SMC on initiating UE, if NRPIK and NRPEK are both provided to the AS layer, how the AS layer can know that only NRPIK is used?   Sunghoon, Wednesday, 9:15  @Rae:   1. Before SMC, no signaling security protection. After SMC, signaling protection is activated. ‘Shall’ operation make it simple operation. e.g., security protection activation indication with NULL alg à PDCP can take it into account as it is not security protection. 2. If it is not used, why UE needs to derive NRPEK?   Mohamed, Wednesday, 10:18  I believe what Rae meant by her comment (For SMC on initiating UE, if NRPIK and NRPEK are both provided to the AS layer, how the AS layer can know that only NRPIK is used?) is that, we need the SMC to be only Integrity Protected (with the new security context) and not ciphered.  So how PDCP will know that, if you provide the 2 keys to lower layer ?  Since you provide the two keys then the PDCP will do both Integrity and ciphering which is wrong in SMC case.  This is an open issue that we need all to think how to solve it, it is a bit complicated ☹  ==>To solve this issue, we need special handling between V2X and PDCP, only for SMC case.  After SMC then everything can go as normal.  Now some comments from my side that needs to be considered:   1. In subclause 6.1.2.7.2, the UE shall also provide KNPR-sess ID to lower layer, and this is missing in the text…since this parameter shall be included in the PDCP header as per subclause 5.3.3.1.5.4 in TS 33.536. 2. In subclause 6.1.2.7.3, the UE shall also provide the selected security algorithm to lower layer, and this is missing in the text. Because this is a mandatory input to perform the ciphering/deciphering and integrity protection/validation (please check Annex D in TS 33.501). 3. Just a note regarding the phrase “if applicable” that you added in all sections: I think the intention of this phrase is to indicate that; if Security is NOT Activated (i.e. no keys, no containers, no algorithms…etc), then there will be no indication form UE to lower layer. I believe this is ok and correct statement and I agree with it.   This is different from the other case where algorithm can be NULL=>in this case there will be still an indication to lower layer carring the NULL algorithms and keys, and that is ok as well.  Scott, Wednesday, 10:13  During PC5 unicast link establishment procedure, PC5 link identifier, (source layer-2 ID, target layer-2 ID) uniquely identify the a PC5 unicast link in both upper layer and lower layer.  I think in lower layer, PC5 link identifier, (source layer-2 ID, target layer-2 ID) is used to identify the ID of a PC5 unicast link and associate with security policy, security key as well as security algorithm.  If these information is not sent to lower layer but the keys and security policy are sent to lower layer ahead of time. How does the lower layer associate the link ID with these context info?  For the re-keying procedure, technically, the new key can be sent to lower layer after generated by upper layer because the PC5 unicast link ID has existed in lower layer. But I think the new key could not be used during SMC procedure.  I think after sending security mode complete and receiving DIRECT LINK REKEYING RESPONSE, the UE may send the new key to lower layer. I am not sure about it. Anyway, we can discuss together.  Sunghoon, Wednesday, 11:51  @Mohamed: In “Signalling ciphering not needed” case, no need to derive NRPEK.  And it is clear that SM Command shall be integrity protected, and SM Complete shall be both integrity protected/ciphered (of course if ciphering is needed). I’m not sure what is an issue here. Perhaps we can identify and fix in the next meeting.  For your comments   1. Sorry I’ve missed Knrp-sess ID. I will put it back. Correct, It is used for PDCP header. 2. Sorry I’ve missed it too. Thanks for pointing out. 3. Yes it seems we are on the same page.   Mohamed, Wednesday, 12:28  The issue is:      =>SMC shall be Integrity protected only      =>All other messages after SMCommand shall be both Integrity Protected and Ciphered.  How does PDCP at the sender side will differentiate between the two cases to take the correct action?  Will PDCP check the “message type” in order to know it is SMCommand and hence performs only Integrity protection and not ciphering ? =>but I think tis is not a good option and it needs to be agreed with RAN/lower layer.  Also an editorial comment: in the cover sheet please correct the yellow-highlighted text in “*According to LS R2-2005978 (waiting for CT1 tdoc number),”* as discussed before.  Rae, Wednesday, 12:37  Thanks Mohamend for helping explain my comment. I have the same question.  In my understanding, PDCP will only follow the security parameters V2X layer provides.  Another alternative may be UE only provide NRPIK to AS layer when sending SM Command. Then further provide NRPEK, if needed, after receiving the SM Complete.  Sunghoon, Wednesday, 12:41  @Mohamed: Please note that there are dedicated LCID for SM Command and SM Complete msg, which means PDCP layer looks up the msg type and process accordingly.  <quoted>  According to RAN2 agreement on R2-2001668, 4 different LCIDs are allocated for the following SL SRBs:  i) The PC5-S signalling that is not protected, e.g., Direct Communication Request.  ii) The PC5-S signalling to activate security, i.e., Direct Security Mode Command and Direct Security Mode Complete.  iii) Other PC5-S signallings that are protected.  iv) PC5-RRC signallings that are protected.  </quoted>  Mohamed, Wednesday, 14:32  Ok this is fine.  As long as PDCP can distinguish the SMCommand using the Message Type (i.e. dedicated LCID as you indicated below) then there shall be no problem.  So this point is closed now.  But please allow me to propose one modification given the current understanding to have a correct behaviour, and I hop you are a bit patient with me here:  =>Shouldn’t we separate the indication of Security Activation from the indication of Security parameters to lower layer ?  I.e. we shall make two different indications from UE to lower layer as following:  a)**First indication** is to carry the security parameters (keys, algorithms…etc) and it will be sent in the same location exactly like in your final revision (no change). Because this info is needed to process the SMC message (since SMC is a special case and it is known anyway by PDCP).  b)**Second indication** is to indicate security has been finally activated…and this shall happen after the complete SMC has been done successfully (i.e. after SMComplete is sent to lower layer by the receiving UE (same like what is in your final revision, no change) and after the SMComplete is received by the other UE (this is the only request of modification in your proposal))  The reason behind this change request: in order to consider the case that SMCommand is **Rejected**…because if Rejection happens, then we would have provided a wrong indication to lower layer that Security is Activated while it is not.  So it is better to provide the indication after the complete SMC is done successfully. And no worry about SMC itself, as it is a special case and PDCP will take care of it (dedicated LCID).  Please let me know if we can make this modification to have a correct behaviour.  Sunghoon, Wednesday, 14:55  @Mohamed: If SM Reject occurs, in cause reject cause value #d, subsequent SMC procedure will take place again and security indication will be set accordingly. Other failure cases will fall into 6.1.2.7.6.1. If so, perhaps an indication to lower layer seems necessary to indicate lower layer to clean up PDCP entity (rather than ‘second’ indication as you suggested. It only happens when reject happens. We don’t need to indicate secondly every time) But I’m a bit hesitant to add it because  lower layer can determine to clean it up by their own means. It seems better to wait RAN2 completes their work first.  Mohamed, Wednesday, 15:24  @Sunghoon: According to the RAN2 LS, the AS layer is interested also about the cases where security is deactivated. Hence I strongly recommend to send the Secuirty\_Activated\_Indication in the correct places (i.e. my proposal in the last email below), and by this we avoid any side effects.  This is easier than going through all the Rejection/Abnormal cases and adding new text in the specs to indicate lower layer to Invalidate the context, because it will not be the same for all cases but it needs to be checked case by case. So the other way is much easier.  Sunghoon, Wednesday, 15:35  @Mohamed: If I understood correctly your suggestion,  The UE (Initiates SMCommand) passes NRPIK, NRPEK, and chosen alg to lower layer when it sends SMCommand to target UE, and then  If the UE receives the SMComplete from the target UE, the UE passes only an indication of security activation to lower layer.  It is correct?  If so, I would rather change Direct Link Estab. Accept section to provide the security activation indication to lower layer.  Scott, Wednesday, 15:53  If the link identifier is not sent to the lower layer, sending any info to lower layer makes no sense. Because lower layer can not associate the establishing link with these key, algorithm and activation indication. If we follow this way, we don’t consider the failure case either.  Sunghoon, Wednesday, 16:04  @Scott: Ok, let me put in this way   * V2X layer provides NRPIK, NRPEK, and Knrp-sess ID to lower layer during SMC procedure, it is just for integrity protection and/or ciphering the SMC msg. * At the Direct Link Est. Accept stage, V2X layer provides the indication of security activation (signaling, user plane), NRPIK, NRPEK (if applicalble), Knrp-sess ID, and chosen alg to lower layer. (along with link identifier)   Mohamed, Wednesday, 16:05  @Sunghoon: Yes, you understood my suggestion correctly, thanks.  Regarding your last statement *“If so, I would rather change Direct Link Estab. Accept section to provide the security activation indication to lower layer.”*  =>just let’s be careful again where the target is to indicate the lower layer about security at the “earliest **possible** position” for not wrongly skipping the security of any air message.  So you can form the text and send the CR for last review, hopefully.  Mohamed, Wednesday, 16:34  Comment on Sunghoon’s reply to Scott:  Please see the modifications below in RED.   * V2X layer provides NRPIK, NRPEK, chosen security algorithms and Knrp-sess ID to lower layer during SMC procedure, it is just for integrity protection and/or ciphering the SMC msg. * At the Direct Link Est. Accept stage, V2X layer provides the indication of security activation (signaling, user plane), ~~NRPIK, NRPEK (if applicalble)~~, Knrp-sess ID, and chosen alg to lower layer. (along with link identifier)   (no need to resend the NRPIK, NRPEK as they were sent in first step above)  =>this is ok for target UE (who sends Direct Link Est Accept)  =>But do you mean the Initiating UE (who sends the Direct Link Est Req) will send the indication of security activation to lower layer also once it gets Direct Link Est Accept ? But then how lower layer (PDCP) will process the Direct Link Est Accept message because it will be ciphered and integrity protected ?  In my view the indication from Initiating UE to lower layer is needed once it sends the SMComplete  Sunghoon, Wednesday, 16:45  @Mohamed:   * NRPIK, NRPEK needs to be provided again to associate them with the Link ID * lower layer (PDCP) will process the Direct Link Est Accept message with tne info provided during SMC   Sunghoon, Wednesday, 17:14  A draft revision is available.  For the concern from Scott,  before the indication of the security protection activation is provided to the lower layer, the lower layer can map the pair of {source Layer 2 ID and destination Layer 2 ID} to the security materials (NRPIK, NRPEK, Chosen Algorithm) for processing Direct SMC messages.  So I’ve changed to send just indication of the security protection activation when Direct Link Establishment Accept and Direct Link Establishment complete.  Rae, Thursday, 1:55  I can live with the draft. If we find out more issues, we can solve it in the next meeting.  Another comment: the editorial change on Knrp has been covered by other papers.  Sunghoon, Thursday, 4:02  @Rae: I’ve reverted the editorial changes on Knrp-sess ID. Plus, changes on coversheet to clarify. An updated draft revision is available.  Scott, Thursday, 5:53  I drafted a new revision to way forward, proposing to sending security context to lower layer after the completion of PC5 unicast link establishment and rekeying procedure.  The arguments are as follows:   1. The link identifier, (source ID and target ID) exclusively identify a PC5 unicast link are generated after DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT ACCEPT is generated. Before that, sending any security info to lower layer makes no sense. 2. The  PC5 unicast link establishment may fail before DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT ACCEPT is generated, sending generated security information may lead to the withdraw of these security info if The  PC5 unicast link establishment may fail. 3. If rekeying procedure is not completed, sending the new security information makes the lower confused. And the failure of rekeying procedure is possible, sending the new security info during security mode control also brings a lot of problems. It had better send the new security context after completion of rekeying procedure. Of course, it is possible to negotiate with RAN2 when RAN2 replace old security context with new security context.   Mohamed, Thursday, 6:33  I also agree to proceed in the following way, and we can solve any remaining issue in next meeting.  Just two small comments:  1) I recommend to add the phrase “if applicable” in the following statement:  *To Indication of activation of the PC5 unicast signalling security protection for the PC5 unicast link, if applicable*  In the two section where you added it, in order to include the case where there is NO security activated.  2) I recommend to remove the phrase “if applicable” from the:  The target UE shall provide lower layer with NRPIK, NRPEK if applicable  In the two section where you added it, because here we are talking about the SMC and hence for sure there will be key generated.  Mohamed, Thursday, 6:47  @Scott: But then how SMC will be integrity protected, if you pass the keys to lower layer later ? I agree the other proposal may have some few gaps, but we can try to solve those gaps in next meeting, just due to time limitation now.  I am trying to unify the efforts into one proposal only.  Sunghoon, Thursday, 6:49  @Scott:   1. Direct Link Establishment msg shall be integrity protected and ciphered (if applicable) as security materials are available after SMC procedure. From the receiving side of Direct Link Establish Accept msg, it should be able to decode the msg. Therefore, after sending SMComplete msg, the security materials shall be available in the lower layer, before receiving Direct Link Est. Accept. Now does it make sense? 2. Same as above. 3. Ok to provide NRPIK, NRPEK, Knrp-sess ID, and chosen alg when rekeying completed.   So let me summarize   * After sending SMComplete msg, the UE provides security materials to lower layer * After generating Direct Link Est. Accept, the UE provides security materials and the indication along with link ID. * After receiving Direct Link Est. Accept, the UE provides the indication along with Link ID. The lower layer can figure it out which pair of src L2 ID – Dest. L2 ID is applicable for the security protection, and security materials provided before. (at the SMComplete) * After generating Rekeying Response, the UE provides security materials * After receiving rekeying response, the UE provides the indication of security activation, the security materials has been provided during SMComplete.   Is it OK?  Sunghoon, Thursday, 6:51  @Mohamed:  Fine with 1). No for 2), because NRPEK does not have to be derived if ciphering is not required.  Scott, Thursday, 9:03  @Mohamed and Sunghoon: After talking with Sunghoon, I am ok with his upcoming new version. Because we are running out of time. Maybe I will check with my SA3 and RAN2 colleagues further.  Mohamed, Thursday, 9:14  @Scott and Sunghoon: I appreciate the work that we all did together.  Yes I agree that it is a bit complex part and we can try to close any remaining gap in that topic within next CT1 meeting. | |
|  |  | | C1-205567 | Radio parameters for UE neither served by E-UTRA nor served by NR | | | CATT | CR 0113 24.587 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-205062  UPLOADED AFTER TDOC DEADLINE  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Current status: Postponed  Sunghoon, Thursday, 9:50  For the first change, the conditions are connected with ‘And’ conjunction, so the change seems not making any difference.  So I prefer to revert the first change.  Frederic, Thursday, 10:35  Please restore the carriage return at the end of bullet d), otherwise it gets merged with bullet e) when changes are accepted.  Scott, Friday, 9:32  @Sunghoon: In 24.386, validity of EPC PC-5 and EPC PC radio parameter per geographical are two independent bullet. It is fine because there is only one PC5 interface and the relationship between bullet c) and d) is conjunctional.  But in 5G V2X, there are two optional PC-5 interface: E-UTRAN-PC5 and NR-PC5 and the radio parameter per geographical area is associated with respective PC5 interface. They are dependent with each other. Please refer to the latest description in 24.588(C1-205063). If we keep “per geographical area” as an independent bullet, there are no description on the association between geographical area and the type of PC5 interface. It is also impossible assumption that both E-UTRAN-PC5 and NR-PC5 radio parameter are specified per geographical area.So I suggest to keep the first change.  Scott, Tuesday, 3:13  @Frederic: I followed your instruction adding carriage return between bullet d) and bullet e). A draft revision is available.  Sunghoon, Tuesday, 9:55  @Scott: Thanks for clarification. I am Ok with it. | |
|  |  | | C1-205569 | Radio parameters for UE neither served by E-UTRA nor served by NR | | | CATT | CR 0020 24.588 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-205568  Uploaded after deadline  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-205063  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Current status: Postponed  Ivo, Thursday, 8:53  - octets need to be marked as optional - o6 is already used in the spec in different situation - a NOTE needs to be added on what placing "NR radio parameters per geographical area list" when "E-UTRA radio parameters per geographical area list" is absent (as in C1-204580)  Sunghoon, Thursday, 12:13  About the last change: shouldn’t it be - E-UTRA parameters specified in 36.331, NR parameters specified in 38.331?  Scott, Friday, 7:18 I agree with the comments, I will take them onboard in a revision.  Scott, Tuesday, 7:22  A draft revision is available.  Ivo, Tuesday, 10:52  Ok in general. One minor point - please state what happens when the bits are NOT set to "Authorized". If you accept my suggestion, please add Ericsson as co-signer.  Ivo, Tuesday, 11:02  I am sorry, but I found one more problem - end octets of the Radio parameters per geographical area list is not aligned in Figure 5.3.1.6 and Figure 5.3.1.7.  End octet (octet o2\*) of Figure 5.3.1.7 should be octet o121\*  Scott, Wednesday, 3:17  As Ivo suggested, I changed End octet (octet o2\*) of Figure 5.3.1.7 into octet o121\* and added description of “non authorized”. And Ericsson is in the cosigner list. A updated draft revision is available.  Ivo, Wednesday, 10:50  I am Ok with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205570](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205059.zip) | Adding the flag indicating the optional PPPP to PDB mapping rules | | | CATT | CR 0019 24.588 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-205059  Uploaded after tdoc deadline  -------------------------------------  Current status: Postponed  Ivo, Thursday, 8:53  The PPPP to PDB mapping rules field needs to be indicated optional + a NOTE has to be added to next field (i.e. V2X service identifier to V2X E-UTRA frequency mapping rules) that it starts immediately after the last preceding present field + octet numberring needs to be changed - see changes in C1-204580  Scott, Tuesday, 6:50   I revised the paper via adding the NOTE and changing the octet number. I expect that the octect number will not clash with other paper’s one. A draft revision is available.  Ivo, Tuesday, 11:06  Generall Ok. Minor issues: start octets in Figure 5.3.1.19 and figure 5.3.1.24 are not aligned. Please align 5.3.1.24 with 5.3.1.19.  Assuming these issues are addressed, Ericsson would like to co-sign.  Scott, Wednesday, 5:26  I changed Figure 5.3.1.24 to align with Figure 5.3.1.19. And Ericsson is in the cosigner list. An updated draft revision is available.  Ivo, Wednesday, 10:53  The octet numbering in Figure 5.3.1.24 is incorrect - the length indicator is only 2 octets long. Also there is a typo in “Erricsson”.  Scott, Thursday, 9:26  An updated draft revision is available.  Ivo, Thursday, 9:47  I am Ok with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | RACS (CT4 lead) | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects of optimizations on UE radio capability signalling  100% | |
|  |  | | [C1-204660](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204660.zip) | Removal of Editor’s note on inter PLMN mobility under same AMF | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | CR 2441 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204661](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204661.zip) | Removal of Editor’s note on inter PLMN mobility under same MME | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | CR 3414 24.301 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204743](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204743.zip) | Clarification on the scope of a UE radio capability ID in 5GS | | | MediaTek Inc. / Carlson | CR 2463 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Based on request from author  Lena, Sat, 00:22  CR is technically wrong, cr needs to be rejected  Carlson, Mon, 05:01  Discussing  Lena, Mon, 20:24  Explaining  Carlson, Tue, 04:27  Rev  Mikael, Tue, 08:03  Change is not correct, UE should not be required to do filtering | |
|  |  | | [C1-204744](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204744.zip) | Clarification on the scope of a UE radio capability ID in EPS | | | MediaTek Inc. / Carlson | CR 3415 24.301 Rel-16 | Postponed  Based on request form author  Lena, Sat, 00:22  CR is technically wrong, cr needs to be rejected  Carlson, Mon, 05:01  Discussing  Lena, Mon, 20:24  Explaining  Carlson, Tue, 04:27  Rev  Mikael, Tue, 08:03  Change is not correct, UE should not be required to do filtering  Carlson, Tue, 08:15  Asking back from Mikael  Mikael, Tue, 08:30  Answering | |
|  |  | | C1-205362 | Use existing NAS signalling connection to send mobility reg due to receipt of URC delete indication IE. (5GS) | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 2484 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204855  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Sung, Fri, 20:51  Editorial  Kundan, Tue, 08:44  Will fix this | |
|  |  | | C1-205363 | Use existing NAS signalling connection to send mobility reg due to receipt of URC delete indication IE. (EPS) | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 3420 24.301 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204857  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Frederic, Thu, 12:19  Rev counter not correct | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 5G\_SRVCC (CT4 lead) | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects of single radio voice continuity from 5GS to 3G  100% | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 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)  100% | |
|  |  | | [C1-204662](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204662.zip) | Removal of Editor’s note on UAC for IAB | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | CR 2442 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 5GS\_OTAF (CT4 lead) | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | 5GS Enhanced support of OTA mechanism for UICC configuration parameter update  100% | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 5G\_URLLC (CT4 lead) | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects of CT Aspects of 5G URLLC  100% | |
|  |  | | [C1-204910](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204910.zip) | Clarification on the establishment of an Always-on PDU session | | | SHARP | CR 2501 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Request from the author, Tue, 12:36  JJ, Thu, 13:01  Discusse in CT1, SA2, **CR is NOT NEEDED**  Sung, Thu, 21:03  Not needed  Yudai, Fri, 06:02  Asking for information  JJ, Fri, 18:04  Providing the info  Lena, Sat, 00:22  NOTE 4 needs an update  Sung, Sat, 00:50  Note 4 in the current form is OK  Joy, Sat, 04:54  Using “for both” is confusing  Lena, Mon, 18:53  **CR is not needed** | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | SEAL | |  | Lena – Breakout | | |  |  | CT aspects of Service Enabler Architecture Layer for Verticals  100% | |
|  |  | | [C1-204966](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204966.zip) | Miscellaneous editorial corrections | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0019 24.545 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204970](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204970.zip) | XML schema for location based query | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0023 24.545 Rel-16 | Agreed  Sapan, Thursday, 19:42  The proposal defines element LocationBasedQuery and LocationBasedReponse, but clause 6.2.9.1 uses the element <location-based-query> while clause 6.2.9.2 uses element <location-based-response>. (Notice ‘-‘ in the element name)  Kindly use the elements as used in the procedure.  Chen, Friday, 8:01  Generall, XML schema uses combination of the words with the first letter capitalized, as other elements do in the XML schema, e.g., "TriggerId", "TrackingAreaChange" , etc. Therefore, from my side, there is no need to use “-“.  Sapan, Friday, 18:34  See my comments in C1-204968.  Basically we need to use consistent element name in procedure and also in defining XML.  Chen, Monday, 4:01  @Sapan:  I agree with you that the elements defined in XML should be keep consistent with the elements in the procedures, but for the programming convenience, some can be simplified in the XML schema( e.g., identity -> ID, identities -> IDs, application -> App).  The elements in XML follows the XML schema rules that combination of the words with the first letter capitalized.  I change these elements related as below:  <location-based-query> -> LocationBasedQuery, <location-based-response> -> LocationBasedReponse  I will check the rest elements and will make sure they are matched in next meeting.  Sapan, Wednesday, 12:52  @Chen: Thanks for making changes. But we need to use same element in procedure and in XML. We generally follow this in all specifications (example – 24.379, 24.281, etc). The elements “report-id” and “ReportId” can easily be thought as two different elements.  If you want to proceed with “combination of the words with the first letter capitalized” then I am fine but we need to make sure same elements are used in procedures too. Request you to align procedures with same element names as used in XML – in next meeting.  Wednesday, 13:01  @Sapan: Thank you for your understanding.  I will align procedures with same element names as used in XML – in next meeting, and if possible, add a NOTE for clarification.  Sapan, Wednesday, 17:48  @Chen: A NOTE would help. | |
|  |  | | [C1-204972](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204972.zip) | XML schema for location information request | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0025 24.545 Rel-16 | Agreed  Sapan, Thursday, 19:52   1. Element RequestedID is not used in the procedure. What is the use of the element? 2. Also, not able to understand “sealloc:contentType” – why do we need this complex type? Can we set “VAL-user-id” element type to any URI?   Chen, Friday, 8:01   1. The requestedID is used as the identity of the VAL user whose location is requested. 2. the VAL user id can be set to anyURI or just a string. Therefore, a complex type is needed and the last “boolean” may be for other use according to TS 24.379.   Sapan, Friday, 18:31  Thanks Chen for the clarification.  The element name used in the procedure (i.e. element <requested-identity>) is not same as defined in the XML (i.e. element requsestedID).  The comment I gave comment in C1-204968, to fix the XML, applies here also.  Chen, Monday, 4:01  @Sapan:  I agree with you that the elements defined in XML should be keep consistent with the elements in the procedures, but for the programming convenience, some can be simplified in the XML schema( e.g., identity -> ID, identities -> IDs, application -> App).  The elements in XML follows the XML schema rules that combination of the words with the first letter capitalized.  I change these elements related as below:  <requested-identity> -> RequestedID  I will check the rest elements and will make sure they are matched in next meeting.  Sapan, Wednesday, 12:52  @Chen: Thanks for making changes. But we need to use same element in procedure and in XML. We generally follow this in all specifications (example – 24.379, 24.281, etc). The elements “report-id” and “ReportId” can easily be thought as two different elements.  If you want to proceed with “combination of the words with the first letter capitalized” then I am fine but we need to make sure same elements are used in procedures too. Request you to align procedures with same element names as used in XML – in next meeting.  Wednesday, 13:01  @Sapan: Thank you for your understanding.  I will align procedures with same element names as used in XML – in next meeting, and if possible, add a NOTE for clarification.  Sapan, Wednesday, 17:48  @Chen: A NOTE would help. | |
|  |  | | [C1-204974](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204974.zip) | XML schema for location reporting trigger | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0027 24.545 Rel-16 | Agreed  Sapan, Thursday, 19:57  Not able to find usage of “ReportRequest” element. Can you please let me know where this element is used in the procedures?  Chen, Friday, 8:01  The <report-request> element is used in clause 6.2.4.1 of TS 24.545.  Sapan, Friday, 18:33  See my comments in C1-204968.  Chen, Monday, 4:01  @Sapan:  I agree with you that the elements defined in XML should be keep consistent with the elements in the procedures, but for the programming convenience, some can be simplified in the XML schema( e.g., identity -> ID, identities -> IDs, application -> App).  The elements in XML follows the XML schema rules that combination of the words with the first letter capitalized.  I change these elements related as below:  <report-request> -> ReportRequest  I will check the rest elements and will make sure they are matched in next meeting.  Sapan, Wednesday, 12:52  @Chen: Thanks for making changes. But we need to use same element in procedure and in XML. We generally follow this in all specifications (example – 24.379, 24.281, etc). The elements “report-id” and “ReportId” can easily be thought as two different elements.  If you want to proceed with “combination of the words with the first letter capitalized” then I am fine but we need to make sure same elements are used in procedures too. Request you to align procedures with same element names as used in XML – in next meeting.  Wednesday, 13:01  @Sapan: Thank you for your understanding.  I will align procedures with same element names as used in XML – in next meeting, and if possible, add a NOTE for clarification.  Sapan, Wednesday, 17:48  @Chen: A NOTE would help. | |
|  |  | | [C1-204975](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204975.zip) | Miscellaneous editorial corrections | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0001 24.548 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204976](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204976.zip) | Correction to identity element of MBMS bearers request | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0002 24.548 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-205085](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205085.zip) | Removing Heading level-7 as per drafting rules | | | Samsung / Sapan | CR 0007 24.544 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-205086](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205086.zip) | Removing Heading level-7 as per drafting rules | | | Samsung / Sapan | CR 0006 24.546 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1-205416 | Updates to HTTP based location information subscription procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0020 24.545 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204967  -----------------------------------------------------  Sapan, Thursday, 17:51  Minor editorial comment: In clause 6.2.6.1.2.1, step d) 2) – Font is not proper for the text “6.2.6.1.1.1; and”.  Chen, Friday, 4:00  A draft revision is available.  Sapan, Friday, 5:50  I am Ok with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-205417 | Updates to XML schema of configuration for SEAL location management | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0021 24.545 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204968  --------------------------------------------------  Sapan, Thursday, 18:54  Out of 10 changes mentioned in “Summary of change” in cover sheet, can you please clarify reason for changes for 3, 5, 6 and 8.  Chen, Friday, 8:01 Provides justification for these changes.  Sapan, Friday, 18:26  Thanks Chen for the clarification.  I think all confusion arise as the element used in the procedure (for example:  <minimum-interval-length>) is not same as the element defined in the XML (for example: “minimumIntervalLength”).  Can you make sure that the elements defined in the XML are the same elements used in the procedure? I see that there are many elements defined in XML are not matching with their usage in procedures – so I am fine if you want to fix XML in next meeting.  Chen, Monday, 4:01  @Sapan:  I agree with you that the elements defined in XML should be keep consistent with the elements in the procedures, but for the programming convenience, some can be simplified in the XML schema( e.g., identity -> ID, identities -> IDs, application -> App).  The elements in XML follows the XML schema rules that combination of the words with the first letter capitalized.  I change these elements related as below:  <minimum-interval-length> -> MinimumIntervalLength  I will check the rest elements and will make sure they are matched in next meeting.  Sapan, Wednesday, 12:52  @Chen: Thanks for making changes. But we need to use same element in procedure and in XML. We generally follow this in all specifications (example – 24.379, 24.281, etc). The elements “report-id” and “ReportId” can easily be thought as two different elements.  If you want to proceed with “combination of the words with the first letter capitalized” then I am fine but we need to make sure same elements are used in procedures too. Request you to align procedures with same element names as used in XML – in next meeting.  Chen, Wednesday, 13:01  @Sapan: Thank you for your understanding.  I will align procedures with same element names as used in XML – in next meeting, and if possible, add a NOTE for clarification.  Sapan, Wednesday, 17:48  @Chen: A NOTE would help. | |
|  |  | | C1-205418 | XML schema for location information report | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0022 24.545 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204969  --------------------------------------------------  Sapan, Thursday, 18:57   1. Remove “ReportID” element – it is not required. 2. Moves changes related to "Ecgi" -> “Ncgi” into C1-204968 and similar chages are already present there.   Chen, Friday, 8:01   1. The <report-id> attribute is used to return the value in the <request-id> attribute in the <request> element, 2. The change of "Ecgi" -> “Ncgi” in this document has no conflict with C1-204968, so from my side, it is appropriate here   Sapan, Friday, 18:12  Thanks Chen for the clarification.  I was searching for the usage of “ReportID” element, but it seems the element which is used in the procedure is <report-id>. Kindly use the element name same as used in the procedure (clause 6.2.2.2.2).  Chen, Monday, 4:01  @Sapan:  I agree with you that the elements defined in XML should be keep consistent with the elements in the procedures, but for the programming convenience, some can be simplified in the XML schema( e.g., identity -> ID, identities -> IDs, application -> App).  The elements in XML follows the XML schema rules that combination of the words with the first letter capitalized.  I change these elements related as below:  <report-id>  -> ReportId  I will check the rest elements and will make sure they are matched in next meeting.  Sapan, Wednesday, 12:52  @Chen: Thanks for making changes. But we need to use same element in procedure and in XML. We generally follow this in all specifications (example – 24.379, 24.281, etc). The elements “report-id” and “ReportId” can easily be thought as two different elements.  If you want to proceed with “combination of the words with the first letter capitalized” then I am fine but we need to make sure same elements are used in procedures too. Request you to align procedures with same element names as used in XML – in next meeting.  Wednesday, 13:01  @Sapan: Thank you for your understanding.  I will align procedures with same element names as used in XML – in next meeting, and if possible, add a NOTE for clarification.  Sapan, Wednesday, 17:48  @Chen: A NOTE would help. | |
|  |  | | C1-205419 | XML schema for location information notification | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0024 24.545 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204971  ----------------------------------------------------  Sapan, Thursday, 19:45  Element used in clause 6.2.7.2 is <identities-list>. Please rename “IDList” to “identities-list”.  Chen, Friday, 8:01  XML schema usually uses combination of the words with the first letter capitalized, as other elements do in the XML schema, e.g., "TriggerId", "TrackingAreaChange" , etc.  Therefore, from my side, “IdList”, “IDList” or “IdentitiesList” are all appropariate, but with no “-“. Which do you suggest?  Sapan, Friday, 18:35  See my comments in C1-204968.  Chen, Monday, 4:01  @Sapan:  I agree with you that the elements defined in XML should be keep consistent with the elements in the procedures, but for the programming convenience, some can be simplified in the XML schema( e.g., identity -> ID, identities -> IDs, application -> App).  The elements in XML follows the XML schema rules that combination of the words with the first letter capitalized.  I change these elements related as below:  <identities-list> -> IDsList  I will check the rest elements and will make sure they are matched in next meeting.  Sapan, Wednesday, 12:52  @Chen: Thanks for making changes. But we need to use same element in procedure and in XML. We generally follow this in all specifications (example – 24.379, 24.281, etc). The elements “report-id” and “ReportId” can easily be thought as two different elements.  If you want to proceed with “combination of the words with the first letter capitalized” then I am fine but we need to make sure same elements are used in procedures too. Request you to align procedures with same element names as used in XML – in next meeting.  Wednesday, 13:01  @Sapan: Thank you for your understanding.  I will align procedures with same element names as used in XML – in next meeting, and if possible, add a NOTE for clarification.  Sapan, Wednesday, 17:48  @Chen: A NOTE would help. | |
|  |  | | C1-205420 | XML schema for location information subscription | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0026 24.545 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204973  -----------------------------------------------  Sapan, Thursday, 19:47  Element used in clause 6.2.6.1.1.1 is <identities-list>. Please rename “IDList” to “identities-list”.  Chen, Friday, 8:01  Please see my reply on C1-204971.  Chen, Monday, 4:01  @Sapan:  I agree with you that the elements defined in XML should be keep consistent with the elements in the procedures, but for the programming convenience, some can be simplified in the XML schema( e.g., identity -> ID, identities -> IDs, application -> App).  The elements in XML follows the XML schema rules that combination of the words with the first letter capitalized.  I change these elements related as below:  <identities-list> -> IDsList  I will check the rest elements and will make sure they are matched in next meeting.  Sapan, Wednesday, 12:52  @Chen: Thanks for making changes. But we need to use same element in procedure and in XML. We generally follow this in all specifications (example – 24.379, 24.281, etc). The elements “report-id” and “ReportId” can easily be thought as two different elements.  If you want to proceed with “combination of the words with the first letter capitalized” then I am fine but we need to make sure same elements are used in procedures too. Request you to align procedures with same element names as used in XML – in next meeting.  Wednesday, 13:01  @Sapan: Thank you for your understanding.  I will align procedures with same element names as used in XML – in next meeting, and if possible, add a NOTE for clarification.  Sapan, Wednesday, 17:48  @Chen: A NOTE would help. | |
|  |  | | C1-205421 | Updates to MBMS bear quality detection procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0003 24.548 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204977  -------------------------------------------------------  Sapan, Thursday, 20:01  Can you please remove reference to clause 6.2.3.8? Service continuity procedure is defined in clause 6.2.3.5 only.  Chen, Friday, 9:31  I rechecked these 2 clauses in stage 2 that the 2 clauses both have the user plane delivery mode.  But I’m fine with your proposal and the draft revision is now available.  Sapan, Friday, 18:37  I am Ok with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-205422 | Updates to user plane delivery mode | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0004 24.548 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204978  -------------------------------------------------  Sapan, Thursday, 20:09  SA6 has defined Unicast media stream identifier in information table as follows:  “Indicates the unicast media stream to be used to deliver the media currently over multicast, or the unicast to be stopped and switched to multicast.”  Based on this, in clause 7.5.3 - can you please make <unicast-media-stream-id> as a list of unicast media stream ids?  Chen, Friday, 9:31  <unicast-media-stream-id> element  ->  one or more <unicast-media-stream-id> element(s). A draft revision is available.  Sapan, Friday, 18:38 I am Ok with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-205443 | Correcting a reference | | | Samsung / Sapan | CR 0006 24.547 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205087  --------------------------------------------  Chen, Thursday, 7:34  Editorial: some words are highlighted in white.  Sapan, Friday, 5:35  I will fix it in a revision. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Other Rel-16 non-IMS issues | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | Other Rel-16 non-IMS topics  100% | |
|  |  | | [C1-204912](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204912.zip) | Support for Indicating Serialization Format in RDS | | | Intel, Convida Wireless LLC / Vivek | CR 0024 24.250 Rel-16 | Postponed  Requested by author, Tue, 18:10  Ivo, Thu, 10:53  - this is a new feature and not a correction - needs to be a Rel-17 CR - given that SA2 had WID, CT WGs need to have a WID as well  Osama, Thu, 19:02  Should be CAT C  Some questions  Vivek, Fri, 03:39  explaining | |
|  |  | | [C1-205040](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205040.zip) | E-UTRA capability disabling with persistent EPS bearer context | | | Apple | CR 3429 24.301 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-205053](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205053.zip) | Forbidden PLMN list for emergency service | | | Apple | CR 3375 24.301 Rel-16 | Rejected  Revision of C1-203232  Ivo, Thu, 10:53  there should be no repeated attempts  Mohamed, Thu, 11.36  Clarification is needed  Ban, Thu, 14:42  Use case unclear, benefit unclear  Andrew, Thu, 14:54  Questioning  Vishnu, Thu, 20:55  the CR is not needed as we don’t see the purpose of the newly proposed list.  Osama, Thu, 20:59  All changes that were requrested earlier are gone  Krisztian, Sat, 05:27  Explaiing  Osama, Mon, 19:24  On the use case, start this in SA1 and SA2, detailed comments  Krisztian, thu, 0658  Explains  Ivo, Thu, 1023  Explains why this needs SA1  Osama, Thu, 2050  **This has to be REJECTED**  **Vishnu, Thu, 2112**  **REJECTED** | |
|  |  | | [C1-205056](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205056.zip) | Forbidden PLMN list for emergency service | | | Apple | CR 2243 24.501 Rel-16 | Rejected  Revision of C1-203233  Ivo, Thu, 10:53  there should be no repeated attempts  Mohamed, Thu, 11:59  CR is needed, but needs changes  Osama, Thu, 21:08  Not needed  Vishnu, Thu, 22:08  Not needed  Krisztian, Sat, 05:25  Explains the Cr  Osama, Mon, 19:24  On the use case, start this in SA1 and SA2, detailed comments  Osama, Thu, 2044  **This has to be REJECTED**  Vishnu, Thu, 2050  **REJECTED** | |
|  |  | | [C1-205057](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205057.zip) | Forbidden PLMN list for emergency service | | | Apple | CR 0534 23.122 Rel-16 | Rejected  Revision of C1-203234  Ivo, Thu, 10:53  there should be no repeated attempts  Osama, Thu, 21:08  Not needed  Vishnu, Thu, 22:08  Not needed  Krisztian, Sat, 05:28  Explaining  Osama, Mon, 19:24  On the use case, start this in SA1 and SA2, detailed comments  Osama, Thu, 2044  **This has to be REJECTED**  **Vishnu, Thu, 2112**  **REJECTED** | |
|  |  | | [C1-205096](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205096.zip) | Support for fragmentation of Commands and Responses | | | Intel / Vivek | CR 0022 24.250 Rel-16 | Not pursued  Revision of C1-204914  Revision of C1-203884  Ivo, Thu, 10:52  Lists a number of disadvantages  Sung, Fri, 22:54  Asks for clarification from Ivo  Ivo, Mon, 12:06  Clarifying the disadvantage-1 has disappeared  Ivo, Fri, 1028  NOT OK, solution is provided by 5199 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205130](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205130.zip) | Correction to typo in CR#3224 | | | MediaTek Inc. / Marko | CR 3238 24.008 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-205131](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205131.zip) | Handling of T3321 in AUTH REJ | | | MediaTek Inc. / Marko | CR 3239 24.008 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-205132](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205132.zip) | Handling of T3421 in AUTH REJ | | | MediaTek Inc. / Marko | CR 3433 24.301 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-205134](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205134.zip) | Correction to KSI terminology | | | MediaTek Inc. / Marko | CR 3434 24.301 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-205138](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205138.zip) | Service gap control timer and PSM | | | MediaTek Inc. / Marko | CR 3437 24.301 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-205199](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205199.zip) | Segmentation in query port numbers procedure | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 0017 24.250 Rel-16 | Not pursued  See ConfCall#3  Revision of C1-204787  Vivek, Fri, 04:26  preference for C1-205198.  Ivo, Fri, 10:32  Defending  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-204018 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205200](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205200.zip) | Segmentation in RDS port management operations Solution comparison | | | Ericsson | Disc Rel-17 | **Noted**  **LATE** | |
|  |  | | C1-205294 | Support of User Plane Integrity Protection for any data rates | | | Deutsche Telekom AG | CR 2411 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204533  Lin, Wed, 15:13  Support  Chairman, Wed, ConferenceCall  Cr is seen as way forward, any issues can be addressed in next meeting  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  competes with C1-205173  Ban, Thu, 20:45  Asks for clarification  Sung, Fri, 00:35  Asking question  Reinhart, Fri, 09:16  Answers sung and Ban  Sung, Fri, 14:57  Further questions  Joy, Fri, 17:07  Cover page issue, co-sign  Sung, Mon, 04:36  Requests rewording  Yang, Mon, 10:24  Does not agree with the new NOTE from Sung  Sung, Mon,  Shouldn’t we clarify some parts  Grace, Wed, 07:53  Co-sign | |
|  |  | | C1-205299 | Updates to Manage Port Command for long Application Identifiers | | | Intel / Vivek | CR 0025 24.250 Rel-16 | **Agreed**  **Revision of C1-205206**  **Osama, Thu, 1820**  **Fine**  **Lin, Fri, 0609**  **FINE**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Revision of C1-205198**  Ericsson added as co-singer  Lin, Wed, 08:19  Almost ok, some refernce needs to be fixed  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **LATE**  Ivo, Thu, 10:52  - not complete - not backward compatible  Vivek, Fri, 17:05  Rev  Lin, Mon 07:13  Fine with the rev  Ivo, Mon, 14.12  Goes in right direction, number of comments  Vivek, Mon, 21:35  Provides a rev  Osama, Mon, 01:16  Questions on the rev  Vivek, Tue, 04:20  New rev  Ivo, Tue, 11:57  Nearly OK | |
|  |  | | C1-205235 | Support P-CSCF and DNS IPv4 Address in ePCO for N1 mode | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Cristina | CR 3234 24.008 Rel-16 | **Agreed**  **Revision of C1-204987**  **Rel15**  **Cristina, Thu, 1103**  **Explains the cover sheet**  **Ivo, Fri, 1025**  **Still not convinced this is FASMO, however, can live with it being agreed by consensus**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Shifted from 16.3.14**  Ivo, Thu, 11:03  Note is confusing  Ban, Thu, 12:50  This is essential, bring it back to rel-15  Cristian, Fri, 08:40  Happy to bring it to Rel-15  Ivo, Fri, 10:38  Way forward: NOTE and bring it to Rel-17  Cristian, Fri, 11.47  Does not agree with Ivo  Sung, Mon, 14.14  Support change form Rel-15  Lena, Mon, 18:54  Prefers Rel-17, corrects obvious oversight  Ban, Mon, 19:16  Rel-15  Cristian, Tue, 02:19  Defending against Lena  Cristina, Tue, 05:17  Provides a rev for R15 and R16  Ban, Tue, 05:00  Co-sign, rel16 cr needs to be cat a  Sung, Tue, 14:28  Co-sign  Roozbeh, Tue, 23:56  Ok, but it needs to have a backward comp analysis on the cover page  Lena, Wed, 03:08  Can live with it being Rel-15  Roozbeh, Wed, 05:54  Fine  Ivo, Wed, 12:46  Not essential, can go to Rel-17  DoCoMo, Wed 12:53  Wants the change in Rel15  Cristina, Wed, 13:14  Defending  Ivo, Thu, 1019  Still not seeing FASMO | |
|  |  | | [C1-205254](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204909.zip) | Reference model for RDS in 5GS | | | Intel / Vivek | CR 0023 24.250 Rel-16 | **Agreed**  **Revision of C1-204909**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  Ivo, Thu, 10:53  Not clear what is “PFD”  Vivek, Mon, 21.50  Answering  Ivo, Tue, 12:40  PFD is not part of RDS  Vivek, Tue, 18:05  Rev  Ivo, Wed 14:42  works | |
|  |  | | C1-205383 | TA change during Authentication procedure in EMM-CONNECTED mode | | | Apple | CR 3347 24.301 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205050  Lin, Fri, 0905  Fine  Mohamed, Fri, 0955  Fine  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-203107  Mohamed, Thu, 11:31  Requests change  Osama, Thu, 20:20  Was not agreed in April, same CR as in April, no updaes as propose in June  Krisztian, Sat, 02:24  Provides rev  Mohamed, Mon, 15:15  Fine with the revision  Osama, Tue, 01:49  Few comments  Krisztian, Tue, 08:46  Explains to Osama  Osama, Tue, 14.37  Comments  Mohamed, Tue, 15:30  Comments  Krisztian, Tue, 20:44  Rev  Mikael, Tue, 22:01  Ok overall, some rewording of the rev needed  Osama, Tue, 22:20  There is a sync issue  Mikael, Tue, 23:23  More info needed  Mikael, Wed, 07:10  Provides wording  Mohamed, Wed, 09:23  Seems to be ok with the rev from krisztian | |
|  |  | | [C1-205384](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205051.zip) | TA change during Authentication procedure in 5GMM-CONNECTED mode | | | Apple | CR 2092 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205051  Osama, Thu, 1930  FINE  Mohamed, Fri, 0956  Fine  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-204094  Mohamed, Thu, 11.33  Requests a change  Osama, Thu, 20:20  Was not agreed in April, same CR as in April, no updaes as propose in June  Krisztian, Sat, 02:24  Provides rev  Mohamed, Mon, 15:15  Fine with the revision  Osama, Tue, 02.17  Few comments  Krisztian, Tue, 08:46  Explains to Osama  Osama, Tue, 14:44  Comments  Mohamed, Tue, 15:31  Comments | |
|  |  | | C1-205436 | Scope of +CSUPI | | | Apple | CR 0702 27.007 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205042  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Osama, Fri, 23:23  Questions for clarification  Krisztian, Mon, 06:48  Explains  Atle, Thu, 0048  Suggestions  Atle, Thu, 0103  New suggestions | |
|  |  | | C1-205391 | Addition of AT commands for exchange of bit rate recommendation and bit rate recommendation queries | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | CR 0701 27.007 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204658  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Carlson, Thu, 10:52  Commenting  Atle, Mon, 14:35  Proposals  Lena, Mon, 18:26  discussing  Carlson, Tue, 03:56  Ok with Lena’s proposal  Lena, Wed, 07:38  Rev  Atle, Wed, 08:13  Fine, some more suggestions  Carlson, Wed, 08:21  Comments  Lena, Wed, 08:38  New rev  Carlson, Wed, 08:55  Fine, co-sign  Atle, thu, 0015  Co-sign | |
|  |  | | C1-205295 | Editorial changes – red text corrected to black text | | | OPPO / Chen | CR 2416 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204555  **This is now Rel-17, TEI17, CAT D**  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 10:55  CAT D, so Rel-17 | |
|  |  | | C1-205542 | Clarification for SR attempt count reset | | | MediaTek Inc. / Marko | CR 3237 24.008 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205129  Osama, Thu, 1719  OK, tdocs only in the INBOX  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Mohamed, Thu, 10:39  OK, but requests changes  Osama, Mon, 21:18  Commenting againg, comments not met, were nested in an email against4753 | |
|  |  | | C1-205543 | Clarification for SR attempt count reset | | | MediaTek Inc. / Marko | CR 3435 24.301 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205135  Osama, Thu, 1719  OK, tdocs only in the INBOX  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Mohamed, Thu, 10:42  Ok, but requests changes  Osama, Mon, 21:18  Commenting againg, comments not met, were nested in an email against4753 | |
|  |  | | C1-205525 | Support P-CSCF and DNS IPv4 Address in ePCO for N1 mode | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Cristina | CR xxxx  24.008 Rel-15 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205231  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  NEW | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Wis for IMS | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  |  | |
|  | MCCI\_CT | |  |  | | |  |  | Mission Critical Communication Interworking with Land Mobile Radio Systems  100% | |
|  |  | | C1-204675 | Correct XML schema | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0001 29.379 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-204682](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204682.zip) | Correct XML schema | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0004 29.379 Rel-16 | Agreed  Jörgen Fri 13:41: Technically correct, but don't we need to resolve the EN?  Mike Fri 1832: Can we remove emptyType and take definition from mcpttinfo?  Jörgen Mon 2223: Shouldn't the IW specific parts have its own namespace? | |
|  |  | | [C1-205353](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205353.zip) | Correct MIME Subtype name in Annex B.1 | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0007 29.379 Rel-17 | Agreed  **Revision of C1-204707**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen Thu 9:55:** WI code needs to be changed.  **Moved from AI 17.1.2.** | |
|  |  | | [C1-205360](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205360.zip) | Introduction of text for Scope clause | | | Sepura Ltd | CR 0002 29.582 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204519  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Jörgen Fri 13:41: Is clause numbering principle applicable for scope chapter. Some wording questions.  Frederic Fri 15:02: Cover page issue  Frederic, Kit, Jörgen Mike Tue2138 to Wed 1614:  Seem to converge on wording and disposition | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | MCProtoc16 | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | Protocol enhancements for Mission Critical Services for Rel-16  100% | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | MuD | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | Multi-device and multi-identity  100% | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | IMSProtoc16 | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | IMS Stage-3 IETF Protocol Alignment for Rel-16  100% | |
|  |  | | [C1-204511](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204511.zip) | Reference Update RFC8787 | | | Deutsche Telekom, Orange / Michael | CR 6424 24.229 Rel-16 | Agreed  This CR removes the dependency to draft-ietf-sipcore-locparam, this is the only reference in 3GPP. | |
|  |  | | [C1-204874](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204874.zip) | Resource authorization for IMS session establishment | | | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | discussion Rel-16 | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-204877](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204877.zip) | IMS network behavior if RAN is lost during EPS fallback | | | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | discussion Rel-16 | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-204880](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204880.zip) | Indicator for EPS fallback | | | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | CR 6436 24.229 Rel-16 | Postponed  Sung Fri 505: Not supportive, since not supportive of 4875.  Jörgen Fri 1400: Agrees with Sung. Not clear what the feature is or what problem it solves.  Roozbeh Fri 23:16:  Roozbeh: Tue 0135: This and 4875 should be separate issues.  Jörgen Mon 2021: Reference to UPF  Roozbeh Mon 2033: Question on AGW.  Simon, Thu, 1859  Question  Roozbeh, thu, 2030  Agreeing that there is an isse  Roozbeh, Thu, 2107  Would like to go forward | |
|  |  | | [C1-205449](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205449.zip) | IMS registration when interworking without N26 is supported | | | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | CR 0144 24.173 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-204879  Simon, Thu, 1945  Text is vague, need shall or may  Roozbeh, Thu, 2027  Agrees this should be “may”  Roozbeh, Thu, 2106  No other choice than postponing  Simon, Thu, 2238  **Not stable, not agreed**  **Jörgen, Fri, 0957**  **Request to postone**  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Simon Thu 1939: TCP implemented. No huge benefit with this.  Jörgen Fri 1347: Not needed. The should not statement is not meaningful.  Roozbeh and Simon discussion on wording Thu 2000-Fri 0502.  Sung indicates he is against the CR as a consequence of being against 4875  Roozbeh Fri2315: Some response to Jörgen  Roozbeh: Independent from 4875  Roozbeh: Tue 2138: New draft available | |
|  |  | | [C1-205556](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205556.zip) | IMS behavior for EPS fallback | | | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | CR 6435 24.229 Rel-16 | Postponed  **Revision of C1-205447**  **Simon, Thu, 2237**  **Not stable, not agreed**  **Roozbeh, Thu, 2238**  **What is unstable**  **Simon, Thu, 2308**  **Explains**  **Roozbeh, Thu, 2312**  **Accepts this**  **Hiroshi, Fri, 0108**  **Confirms**  **Simon, Fri, 0849**  **Suggestion for rewording**  **Jörgen, Fri, 1001**  **Request to postpone**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Revision of C1-204875**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Rohit Thu 11:30**: OK with buffering, a few questions.  Jörgen Thu 1653: Buffering should be UPF. Some editorials. Not happy with P-CSCF buffering.  Roozbeh Hiroshi, Sung Thu 1950-Fri 1757:  Further discussion, partly about stage 2.  Roozbeh Fri 23:00: some comments  Hiroshi Mon 0255: Better explanation needed, covers sheet should reflect the stage 2 correctly.  Roozbeh and Hiroshi unitl Tue 0553: Further discussion  Roozbeh Tue 1927:New draft, improved cover page.  Hiroshi some questions Wed 0101. Roozbeh responds and Hiroshi seems happy.  Some questions by Bill Wed 0838: | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | MCSMI\_CT | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | Mission Critical system migration and interconnection  100% | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | eMCData2 | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | CT aspects of Enhancements to Functional architecture and information flows for Mission Critical Data  100% | |
|  |  | | [C1-205453](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205453.zip) | Miscellaneous fixes | | | AT&T / Val | CR 0184 24.282 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205016  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Kiran Thu 9:19: Other services might need the same. Some wording proposal.  Val Fri 00:12: New draft available. Other docs for next meeting. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | E2E\_DELAY (CT4) | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | CT Aspects of Media Handling for RAN Delay Budget Reporting in MTSI  100% | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | VBCLTE (CT3 lead) | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | Volume Based Charging Aspects for VoLTE CT  CT1 no longer impacted | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | ISAT-MO-WITHDRAW | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | Withdrawal of TS 24.323 from Rel-11, Rel-12, Rel-13  No CRs needed, listed for the sake of completeness  100% | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | MONASTERY2 | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | Mobile Communication System for Railways Phase 2  100% | |
|  |  | | [C1-204543](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204543.zip) | Editors Notes in IP Connectivity | | | Kontron Transportation France | CR 0180 24.282 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-205149](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205149.zip) | Corrections on MCData related MONASTERY2 CRs implementation | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0185 24.282 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-205151](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205151.zip) | MO corrections due to issues with CR implementation | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0081 24.483 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-205340](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205340.zip) | Increment service authorisations | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0181 24.282 Rel-16 | Agreed  **Revision of C1-204691**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Kiran Thu 9:18**: Similar counter needed elsewhere.  **Jörgen Thu 17:49**: Why this WI?  **Mike Thu 21:16:** Ack to Kiran, next meeting.  Francois, Lazaros, Mike, Francois Monday until 17:02: Further discussion on the solution.  Jörgen, Lazaros, Mike discussion on release: Lazaros shows the MONASTERY2 requirement. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205354](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205354.zip) | De-affiliation upon logoff | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0630 24.379 Rel-17 | Postponed  Mike OK to postpone  Revision of C1-204708  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Jörgen Mon 1518: Need CRs to 24.281 and 24.282?  Mike Mon 1954: Yes, on my ToDo list | |
|  |  | | [C1-205534](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205534.zip) | Corrections on MCPTT related procedures | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0644 24.379 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205148  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Frederic: Clauses affected missing | |
|  |  | | [C1-205535](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205535.zip) | Corrections on configurations documents | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0153 24.484 Rel-16 | Agreed  **Revision of C1-205150**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Kiran Thu 9:19:** Shouldn't delete <AnyExt>?  **Jörgen Thu 18:00**: Responds to Kiran, not happy with EN. Kiran accepts Jörgen's response-  **Val: Fri 6:49:** Cover page issue and editorial  Lazaros Mon 2244 responds, new draft taking care of comments, Mike Mon 2347 OK  Jörgen Tue 1914: Is AnyExt within AnyExt necessary. Schema does not compile (xml:lang} | |
|  |  | | [C1-205549](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205549.zip) | Media plane for IP connectivity | | | Kontron Transportation France | CR 0015 24.582 Rel-16 | Agreed  **Revision of C1-205331**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Revision of C1-204542**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Kiran Thu 9:18 and 16:57, Peter B Thu 11:17**:  Some questions, answers and further comments.  Mike Thu: not according to stage 2  Jörgen Fri Seems not a correction.  Peter and Mike some further discussion  Mike, Peter, Lazaros, Francois further discussions Mon until 1613.  Lazaros Tue 1348: Revised draft  Peter Tue 1457: Revised draft, GRE tunnel proposed  Mike Tue 1515: Good idea, add EN for security.  Francois Wed 0924: Looks fine.  Jörgen Peter and Mike until Wed 1726 discuss possible security work. LS to SA3 proposed by Mike. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | eIMS5G\_SBA | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | CT aspects of SBA interactions between IMS and 5GC  100% | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | enh2MCPTT-CT | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | Enhancements for Mission Critical Push-to-Talk CT aspects  100% | |
|  |  | | [C1-204704](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204704.zip) | Make regroup warning messages generic for MCX | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0628 24.379 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204871](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204871.zip) | Preconfigured group corrections and clarifications | | | Ericsson, FirstNet /Jörgen | CR 0637 24.379 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-205349](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205349.zip) | 10.1.1.4.2 correction | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0629 24.379 Rel-16 | Agreed  **Revision of C1-204705**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Kiran Thu 9:18:** comment on skip wording  Mike and Kiran seems agreeing Thu. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | eIMSVideo | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | Video enhancement of IMS CAT/CRS/announcement services  100% | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Other Rel-16 IMS & MC issues | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | Other Rel-16 IMS topics  100% | |
|  |  | | [C1-205214](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205214.zip) | Add CRS URN in Alert-Info header field | | | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR 0065 24.183 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204645  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Jörgen Fri 1630 Editorial  Simon Fri 1707 Ack  Jörgen OK with draft revision  Helen Mon 1809: No more comments. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 17  work items | | Tdoc | Title | | | Source | Tdoc info | Result & comments | |
|  | Tdocs on work items | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Work Item Descriptions | |  | Peter - Main | | |  |  | New and revised Work Item Descritpions | |
|  |  | | C1-204673 | WID - Enhancements to LMR interworking (enh1MCCI-CT) | | | FirstNet / Mike | WID new Rel-17 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-204674 | WID - CT aspects of Enhanced Mission Critical Push-to-talk architecture (enh3MCPTT-CT) | | | FirstNet / Mike | WID new Rel-17 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-204738](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204738.zip) | CT aspects on PAP/CHAP protocols usage in 5GS | | | China Telecom Corporation Ltd. | WID new Rel-17 | Postponed  Lena, Thu, 09:10  SA2 should discuss these 2 options and select one before CT work can proceed, **ePCO aspect already supported since Rel-15**  Ivo, Thu, 10:47  **Work should be done in Rel-15**  JJ, Thu, 19:19  This should work from Rel-15, **no need for Rel-17 WID in CT1**  Sung, Fri, 02:28  amount of work required would not be significant enough to initiate a WI in CT. Interested companies can directly bring a CR or two under TEI1x or 5GProtoc1x.  Michelle, Fri, 17:54  Defending the WID  Michele, fri, 18:32  Expalinging why it is only Rel-17  Lin, Mon, 01:00  Supports  Sung, Mon, 06:18  Against the WID, hope that we can discuss based on a CR or two, if any is needed in addition to revision of 4537/4538.  Michel, Mon, 11:02  Explainining  Joy, Mon, 12:05  Support the WID  Sung, Mon, 14:58  **Against the WID**  Lin, Mon, 17:15  The NOTE from Yang is normative  Sung, Wed, 03:14  Commenting  Michele, Wed, 16:02  Provides a rev, CT3 led WID now  JJ, Thu, 0432  Ue impacts should be don’t know  Lin, Thu, 0930  Prefers to tick ue  Sung, Thu, 0943  Same as JJ  Ivo, Thu, 1013  Vdf cr does what is needed for 24008  Joy, Thu, 1100  Tick UE  JJ, Thu, 1127  Ok with ticking, no 24008  Michele, Thu, 1215  Provides a rev  Lin, Thu, 12:58  Tick me box  Sung, Thu, 1808  ME Don#t Know  Michele, Thu, 1930  Impact on ME YES  Sung, Fri, 0124  No impact on UE, with ME box ticked, OBJECT  Joy, Fri, 0427  TikcME  Lin, Fri, 0537  Defending UE impact  Lena, Fri, 0639  UE to “Don’t Know”  JJ, Fri, 0730  Based on CC3, Going to plenary would be good  Michel, Fri, 0756  Defending | |
|  |  | | [C1-204773](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204773.zip) | New WID on Enhancement of Network Slicing Phase 2 | | | ZTE Corporation | WID new | Postponed  Based on authors request  Mariusz, Thu, 10:05  Add Orange  Sung, Fri, 00:40  Work item is needed, but it is premature to start now  Ericsson, Fri, 10:16  Same as Nokia, is this really CT1  Shuang, Fri, 10:58  Ok to postpone to next meeting, it is CT1  Amer, Fri, 14:56  Support the WID, too early for specific objectives, could go with generic statement  Lin, Mon, 01:00  Support but premature to start | |
|  |  | | C1-205238 | New WID on Service-based support for SMS in 5GC | | | Orange, China Telecom | WID new Rel-17 | Endorsed  No more comments after CC5  Revision of C1-204535  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  CC#1  CT1 should be somehow involved in the TR phase, i.e in review evaluation  Mariusz, Thu, 16:28  Provides a rev  Mikael, Fri, 07:20  Fine with the rev | |
|  |  | | C1-205218 | Revised WID on Enhancement for the 5G Control Plane Steering of Roaming for UE in CONNECTED mode | | | DOCOMO Communications Lab. | WID revised Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204617  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lena, Thu, 09:05  WID assumes that the proposed terminology of “Steering of roaming connected mode control information” in NTT DOCOMO’s C1-204805 is agreed. But Ericsson has a different proposal in C1-204781 (“SOR connected mode information”). The WID will need to be aligned with whichever CR gets agreed.  Ivo, Thu, 16:01  Steering of roaming connected mode control information" should also be sent among SOR-AF and UDM, but it is not mentioned in the WID.  Robert, Fri, 10:59  don’t see a reason to change the existing wording “new SOR related information”.  Mariusz, Fri, 12:47  Comments/questions  Ban, Fri, 13:07  Offers rewording  Robert, Fri, 13:38  fine  Ivo, Mon, 10:44  Either use same wording as in latest CR from Ban or leave the WID untouched  Mariusz, Mon, 11:07  Align wid with wording in CR  Robert, Mon, 14:59  There is no need to go into the details  Ban, Mon, 08:50  New rev  Ivo, Tue, 08:49  Fine  Mariusz, Tue, 09:45  Fine  Ly Thanh, Tue, 10:17  fine | |
|  |  | | C1-205296 | New WID on Authentication and key management for applications based on 3GPP credential in 5G | | | China Mobile | WID New….REl-17 | Endorsed  No more comments after CC5  Revision of C1-205225  Sung, Wed, 15:08  fine  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  As discussed in CC#3 (came on Tue)  Ivo, Tue, 13.17  Comment to include 24.501 as potentially impacted.  Zhenning, Tue, 15:12  Fine with the comment | |
|  |  | | [C1-205335](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204680.zip) | WID – Enhancements to LMR interworking (enh1MCCI-CT) | | | FirstNet / Mike | WID new Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204680  Dom, Fri, 1251  fine  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lazaros, Thu, 09:11  Fine with the WID, but remove FA  Dom, Mon, 15:58  comments | |
|  |  | | C1-205336 | WID - CT aspects of Enhanced Mission Critical Push-to-talk architecture (enh3MCPTT-CT) | | | FirstNet / Mike | WID new Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204681  Dom, Fri, 1314  Ok, but requires small changes to happen in plenary  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Joergen, Fri, 17:05  Comments  Mike, Fri, 20:57  Some replies  Dom, Mon, 15:02  Detailed comments  Mike, Mon, 16;47  wording  Francois, Mon, 17:06  Some comments | |
|  |  | | C1-205388 | New WID on CT aspects of 5GC architecture for satellite networks | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Amer | WID new Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204671  JeanYves, Thu, 1653  Thales is fine  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Related with incoming LS [C1-204648](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204648.zip)  CC#1  Christian: it is premature to start a study, cannot agree right now, study to captre all WGs. What are the stage-1 requirements??  Sung: some aspects can be started  Chen: in general support to start something, PLMN selection. Some questions  Jean Yves (rapporteur in SA2 for sateilite work): CT1 should start  Jean Yves, Fri, 16:04  Comments on the details, supports  Christian, Mon, 15:15  Detailed comments  Amer, Tue, 08:21  Answers Christian, provides a rev  Chen, Tue, 15:37  Requests more changes  Amer, Wed, 08:26  Rev | |
|  |  | | C1-205493 | Protocol enhancements for Mission Critical Services | | | Ericsson /Jörgen | WID revised Rel-17 | Postponed  Tdoc was not uploaded  Revision of C1-205177  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Frederic, Thu, 11:34  Asks that a new tdoc number is used with “revised work item” | |
|  |  | | C1-205561 | Stop to updating TR 24.980 | | | Ericsson /Jörgen | WID new | Agreed  Revision of C1-205531  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-205311  --------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-204876  Christian, Thu, 10:26  Not acceptable as his request to remove a sentence is not followed  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Mariusz, Thu, 09:54  Asking for clarification  Joergen, Fri, 16:47  Explaining  Sung, Mon, 05:56  Wants to be listed as supporter  Christian, Mon, 15:54  Comments  Frederic, Mon, 16:18  One WID per spec to withdraw a spec  Jörgen, Mon, 17:51  Will provide an update, does not mind to stop other TRs as well, but that requires own WID  Jörgen, Wed, 14:20  Rev  Christian, Wed, 16:01  Comment, requests a change | |
|  |  | | C1-205536 | New WID on Enhancements to Mobile Communication System for Railways (MONASTERY) Phase 2 | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | WID new Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205152  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lazaros, Wed, 2135  Rev  Joy, Thu, 0318  Cosign  Francois  cosign | |
|  |  | | 205376 | New WID on Enhancements to Mobile Communication System for Railways (MONASTERY) Phase 2 | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | WID new Rel-17 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-205301 | New WID on CT aspects of Support for Minimization of service Interruption (MINT-CT) | | | LG Electronics | WID new Rel-17 | Postponed  As discussed inCC#5  Revision of C1-204646  CT1 asks SA before starting the work  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lena, Thu, 09:05  More CT groups impacted, RAN to be listed in section 8, SA3 impact, CT6 impact to be clarified, AN unticked  Ivo, Thu, 10:47  Comments  CC#1  Does it require impact on other CTWGs?  How would the feature work end to end with core network support?  Does this require SA2 involvement for the stage-2  Grace, Wed, 07:02  Co-signs, but clarification  SangMin, wed, 11:16  Rev  Ivo, Wed, 12:30  Comments  Christian, Wed, 16:56  Comments, would like to see progress, but sees that this seems not possible this meeting | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | CRs and Discussion Documents related to new or revised Work Items | |  | Peter - Main | | |  |  | CRs and Disc papers related to new Work Items | |
|  |  | | [C1-204670](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204670.zip) | PLMN selection for satellite networks | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Amer | discussion Rel-17 | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-204772](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204772.zip) | Impacts of eNS\_Ph2 to CT WGs | | | ZTE Corporation | discussion | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-204800](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204800.zip) | Discussion on CT aspects of ATSSS\_Ph2 | | | ZTE / Joy | discussion Rel-17 | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-205090](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205090.zip) | Impacts of EDGEAPP to CT WGs | | | Samsung / Sapan | discussion | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-205099](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205099.zip) | Discussion paper on FS\_enh\_EC | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | discussion Rel-17 | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-205204](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205099.zip) | Discussion on Authentication and key management for applications based on 3GPP credential in 5G | | | China Mobile | Discussion Rel-17 | Noted  LATE doc, | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | | C1-204676 | Affiliation on behalf of the multiple LMR users | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0002 29.379 Rel-17 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-204678 | Add Conference Event Package to IWF | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0003 29.379 Rel-17 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-204683](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204683.zip) | Affiliation on behalf of the multiple LMR users | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0005 29.379 Rel-17 | Agreed  To be discussed on MC list | |
|  |  | | [C1-204685](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204685.zip) | Add Conference Event Package to IWF | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0006 29.379 Rel-17 | Withdrawn  To be discussed on MC list | |
|  |  | | [C1-204692](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204692.zip) | Add altitude, timestamp to MCPTT location XML schema | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0625 24.379 Rel-17 | Agreed  To be discussed on MC list | |
|  |  | | [C1-204702](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204702.zip) | Add preconfigured regroup to MCData | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0182 24.282 Rel-17 | Agreed  To be discussed on MC list | |
|  |  | | [C1-204715](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204715.zip) | Work plan for enh3MCPTT-CT | | | FirstNet | discussion Rel-17 | Noted  To be discussed on MC list | |
|  |  | | [C1-205324](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205324.zip) | MCVideo Functional Alias usage in Transmission Control | | | Samsung | CR 0079 24.581 Rel-17 | **Agreed**  Moved from 17.3.2  Revision of C1-205078  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Jörgen Mon 1601: Should this be eMONASTERY2? | |
|  |  | | [C1-205325](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205325.zip) | Functional Alias usage in MCVideo Call | | | Samsung | CR 0093 24.281 Rel-17 | **Agreed**  Moved from 17.3.2  Revision of C1-205079  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Jörgen Mon 1601: Should this be eMONASTERY2?  Lazaros agrees.Mon 2007.  Lazaros Tue 1943: Some further details | |
|  |  | | [C1-205345](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205345.zip) | Add PreconfiguredGroupUseOnly MO | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0080 24.483 Rel-16 | **Agreed**  **Moved from 16.3.12**  **Revision of C1-204699**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen Fri 15:56:** New feature? Is this enh3MCPTT?  Mike Fri 2133: These go to enh3MCPTT and rel-17 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205346](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205346.zip) | Add preconfigured-group-use-only to group document | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0044 24.481 Rel-16 | **Agreed**  **Moved from 16.3.12**  Revision of C1-204700 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205347](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205347.zip) | Check for Preconfigured Group Use Only | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0626 24.379 Rel-16 | **Agreed**  **Moved from 16.3.12**  Revision of C1-204701  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Kiran Thu 9:18: also for affilitation? Wronge element name.  Frederic: CR numbers needed for the other CRs affected.  **Jörgen Thu 18:05:** No dependencies needed, same WI. Seems more a new feature than essential correction.  Mike Thu acs Kiran comment. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205356](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205356.zip) | Add Conference Event Package to IWF | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0010 29.379 Rel-17 | **Agreed**  Revision of C1-204713  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  To be discussed on MC list | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Status of other Work Items | |  | Peter - Main | | |  |  | Status information on other relevant Rel-17 Work Items | |
|  |  | | [C1-204536](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204536.zip) | Status of study on enhanced support of IIoT in 5GS (FS\_IIoT) | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | discussion Rel-17 | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-204776](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204776.zip) | State of Rel-17 enhancements for non-public networks (eNPN) in other WGs | | | Ericsson / Ivo | discussion | Noted | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 17 documents for information | |  | Peter - Main | | |  |  | Miscellaneous documents provided for information | |
|  |  | | [C1-204570](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204570.zip) | CT aspects of 5G\_ProSe | | | Beijing OPPO Com. corp., ltd | discussion | Noted | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | WIs for common and EPS/5GS | |  |  | | |  |  | WIs mainly targeted for common sessions and EPS/5GS | |
|  | SAES17 WIs | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | Stage-3 SAE protocol development for Rel-17 | |
|  | SAES17 | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | General Stage-3 SAE protocol development | |
|  |  | | [C1-204606](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204606.zip) | Minor corrections | | | Ericsson / Mikael | CR 3413 24.301 Rel-17 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1-204806 | Use existing NAS signalling connection to send TAU to receipt of URC delete indication IE. | | | Samsung Electronics GmbH | CR 3418 24.301 Rel-17 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | SAES17-CSFB | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | Stage-3 SAE protocol development related to Circuit Switched Fall Back | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | SAES17-non3GPP | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | Stage-3 SAE protocol development related to non-3GPP access | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 5GProtoc17 WIs | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | Stage-3 5GS NAS protocol development for Rel-17 | |
|  | 5GProtoc17 | |  |  | | |  |  | General Stage-3 5GS NAS protocol development | |
|  |  | | [C1-204721](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204721.zip) | The error handling on grouped optional IE | | | China Mobile | CR 2451 24.501 Rel-17 | Postponed  Ivo, Thu, 10:46  CR is NOT ok, explanation  Osama, Thu, 18:49  Not OK with explanation  Xu, Mon, 09:12  Providing a rev  Osama, Mon, 16:41  Revised CR not needed  Ivo, Tue, 10:13  Same as Osama  Xu, Tue, 14:16  Replying | |
|  |  | | [C1-204642](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204642.zip) | Corrections to the QoS parameter checks for PDU session establishment | | | Apple | CR 2438 24.501 Rel-17 | Rejected  Ivo, Thu, 11.33  Commenting issue in the CR  JJ, Thu, 12:33  No issues in the spec that need to be solved  Robert, Thu, 21:30  Not agreeing with JJ  JJ, Fri, 19:32  Explains to Robert  Joy, Tue, 10:18  Comments, issues  Lin, Tue, 14:35  Commenting  Ivo, Wed, 11:09  Further comments  Robert, Wed, 12:08  Can live with Ivo’s comment, more views invited,  Lazarors, Thu, 0951  approach provided in the CR is not acceptable.  Ivo, Thu, 1002  Answering Robert | |
|  |  | | [C1-204577](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204577.zip) | Periodic removal of "forbidden location areas for regional provision of service" | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 0560 23.122 Rel-17 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204590](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204590.zip) | Not capitalized 5GSM IE names | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 2425 24.501 Rel-17 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204591](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204591.zip) | Incorrect IE names | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 2426 24.501 Rel-17 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204592](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204592.zip) | Selected PDU session type | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 2427 24.501 Rel-17 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204607](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204607.zip) | Minor corrections | | | Ericsson / Mikael | CR 2432 24.501 Rel-17 | Agreed  Mohamed, Thu, 13:35  Editorial  Mikael, Fri, 11:50  Explaining why the editorial can stay  Mohamed, Fri, 12:29  Fine | |
|  |  | | [C1-204610](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204610.zip) | Dual-registration mode list correction | | | Ericsson / Mikael | CR 2435 24.501 Rel-17 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204643](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204643.zip) | Use existing NAS signalling connection to send mobility reg due to receipt of URC delete indication IE. | | | Samsung Electronics GmbH | CR 2439 24.501 Rel-17 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-204644](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204644.zip) | Emergency Registered State | | | Samsung Electronics GmbH | CR 2440 24.501 Rel-17 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-204732](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204732.zip) | Service Request procedure over non-3GPP access | | | vivo | CR 2457 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204733](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204733.zip) | Several editorial changes | | | vivo | CR 2458 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204778](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204778.zip) | Misleading definition of 5G-IA and 5G-EA in 24.501 | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 2477 24.501 Rel-17 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204779](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204779.zip) | Referencing 5G-IA and 5G-EA definitions in 24.501 | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 3417 24.301 Rel-17 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204925](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204925.zip) | Include NAS message container in security mode complete message | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Cristina | CR 2511 24.501 Rel-17 | Agreed  Mikael, Fri, 15:04  Use “and” or “or”  Cristina, Mon, 05:24  Explaining  Mikael, Mon, 09:15  Can live with the CR as is | |
|  |  | | [C1-204928](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204928.zip) | High priority access before pass the NSSAA | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Cristina | CR 2513 24.501 Rel-17 | Postponed  Kaj, Thu, 10.29  Current spec seems not correct, question for clarification  Cristina, Thu, 12:01  Acks Kaj “Kaj, we share the same opinion with you.”  No further clarification given | |
|  |  | | [C1-204934](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204934.zip) | No VPLMN S-NSSAI change via the generic UE configuration update | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2517 24.501 Rel-17 | Postponed  Kaj, Thu, 12:19  Current version of the spec should be ok  Lin, Mon, 09:02  Same as Kaj  Sung, Tue, 03:33  Defending  Amer, Wed, 08:35  Comments  Lin, Wed, 09:30  Asking for info form Sung  Kaj, Wed, 10:35  explains  Sung, Thu, 0045  Discussing  Lin, Thu, 1005  Fine with the CR | |
|  |  | | [C1-204935](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204935.zip) | Access attempts matching access category criteria type “S-NSSAI” | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2518 24.501 Rel-17 | Postponed  Requested by author  Ivo, Thu, 10:46  CR is NOT ok, explanation  Lena, Mon, 07.57  CR is not needed  Lin, Mon, 09:12  Comments, not good logic, already covered | |
|  |  | | [C1-204937](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204937.zip) | PAP/CHAP usage in 5GS | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | discussion Rel-17 | Noted  Xu, Thu, 11:06  Different postion  Sung, Fr, 02:22  Explaining  Xu, Mon, 03:15  Discussing  Sung, Mon, 06:37  Further explaining  Lena, Mon, 07:57  agree with the paper’s assessment that no CT1 spec changes are needed, some corrections  Lin, Mon, 09:46  Discussion  **Ongoing Discusison no langer captured.** | |
|  |  | | [C1-204938](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204938.zip) | Failure in the integrity protection check of an ATTACH REQUEST message in the MME | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2520 24.501 Rel-17 | Postponed  Lin, Mon, 11.26  Comments  Sung, Thu, 1124  Answering  Lin, Fri, 0959  In some cases something needs to be done, not in all cases  Mikael, Fri, 1118  Same as Lin, postpone | |
|  |  | | [C1-204940](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204940.zip) | Multiple HPLMN S-NSSAIs mapped to a single VPLMN S-NSSAI | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | discussion Rel-17 | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-204957](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204957.zip) | UE behaviour for service reject with #15 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Cristina | CR 2532 24.501 Rel-17 | Agreed  Mohamed, Thu, 09:54  Agrees the problem, suggests a different solution  Osama, Thu, 19:54  Suggested change is not necessary  Cristina, Fri, 04:11  Defending  Mohamed, Fri, 12:41  Commenting, not agreeing  Osama, Sat, 01:06  Further comments  Crisitna, Mon, 06:53  Discussion  Cristian, Mon, 08:23  Replies to Mohamed  Osama, Mon, 20:58  Issues with the CR  Cristina, Tue, 13:14  Explains  Osama, Thue, 2115  Can live with the CR  Mohamed, Fri, 0909  FIne | |
|  |  | | [C1-204990](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204990.zip) | Mapped 5G security context deletion upon IDLE mode mobility from 5GS to EPS over N26 interface | | | NTT DOCOMO INC. | CR 2541 24.501 Rel-17 | Agreed  Mahmoud, Tue, 20:42  Question for clarification  Maoki, Thu, 0501  Explains  Mahmoud, THU, 0515  **NOW fine** | |
|  |  | | [C1-205034](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205034.zip) | Discussion on handling resume procedure on a CAG cell | | | Samsung/Kundan | discussion Rel-17 | Noted  Ivo, Thu, 10:45  LS should be sent to SA2, with RAN2 on CC  Ban, Mon, 05.49  Supports sending the LS  Lena, Mon, 07:57  SA2 has papers this week, for instance [**S2-2005722**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_sa/WG2_Arch/TSGS2_140e_Electronic/Docs/S2-2005722.zip), scenario will not happen.  No point in sending an LS now.  Kundan, Mon, 12:53  Will send LS | |
|  |  | | [C1-205036](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205036.zip) | IRAT coordination between 5GSM and SM | | | Apple | CR 2560 24.501 Rel-17 | Postponed  Kaj, Thu, 12:14  We should not continue to specify inter-working with other systems than EPS  Krisztian, Fri, 08.23  Hints at 23.501 requirement | |
|  |  | | [C1-205147](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205147.zip) | Correction to the octet number in 5GS network feature support IE | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 2489 24.501 Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204865 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205163](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205163.zip) | Periodic update when UE is changed to emergency registered | | | MediaTek Inc. / Marko | CR 2599 24.501 Rel-17 | Postponed  Requested by author  Frederic, Thu, 09:41  Missing clauses affected  Ivo, Thu, 10:58  OK to allow the network to provide the T3512 value IE but it should be optional  Vishnu, Fri, 14:43  Does not see the motivation for the CR  Marko, Mon, 12:37  Defending  Ivo, Tue, 09:17  Asking back form Marko  Marko; Wed, 08.04  Explains and proives a draft rev  Ivo, Wed, 10:50  Does not agree  Vishnu, Wed, 12:12  Does not agree  JLB, Wed, 16:45  harmful | |
|  |  | | [C1-205167](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205167.zip) | Discussion on the UE's usage setting for data-only networks | | | NTT DOCOMO INC. | discussion Rel-17 | Noted  Ivo, Thu, 10:45  stage-2 or stage-1 requirment is needed  Amer, Wed, 08.42  Same as Ivo | |
|  |  | | [C1-205170](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205170.zip) | NW triggered temporary UE's usage setting update | | | NTT DOCOMO INC. | CR 2600 24.501 Rel-17 | Postponed  Requested by author  Ivo, Thu, 10:45  stage-2 or stage-1 requirment is needed  Mohamed, Thu, 13:38  Same as Ivo  Maoki, Fri, 10:27  Defending  Rae, Fri, 11:31  Comments, stage-1 requirement is needed  Maoki, Mon, 11.49  Fine to discuss this in SA1 and SA2 first,  Ivo, Tue, 09:14  Requires sa17sa2 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205178](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205178.zip) | Rejecting access to 5GCN with a timer | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, Verizon | discussion Rel-17 | Noted  Revision of C1-204900  Lena, Mon, 07:57  would prefer this discussion to be re-opened in SA2, if deemed necessary, rather than specifying a new cause value directly in CT1  Lin, Mon, 17:30  Comments  Sung, Mon, 18:15  answering  Mikael, Tue, 09:31  Some comments on Lin’s comments  Lin, Wed, 10:03  Does not agree | |
|  |  | | [C1-205179](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205179.zip) | Rejecting access to 5GCN with a timer | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, Verizon | CR 2496 24.501 Rel-17 | Postponed  Revision of C1-204903  Lena, Mon, 07:57  Postpone until SA2 dicussion takes place  Lin, Mon, 17:30  Comments  Mikael, Tue, 09:32  The proposal is not that strange (as pointed out by Lin)  Lin, Wed, 10:05  Does not agreed  Mikael, Wed, 10:19  Is a solution needed? | |
|  |  | | C1-205288 | Clarification of paging response | | | vivo | CR 2471 24.501 Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204764  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Mahmoud, Mon, 20:40  Ok, but editorial  Yanchao, Tue, 05:00  rev | |
|  |  | | C1-205273 | Definition of Routing Indicator | | | vivo | CR 2456 24.501 Rel-16 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204731  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Roozbeh, Thu, 11:22  Requests a change  Lufeng, Fri, 09:01  Rev1  Lena, Sat, 00:22  Sa2 has a definition, so why not just refor to 23.501  Roozbeh, Sat, 02:15  Fine  Lufen, **Mon**, 05:45  Rev1, now **PROTOC17**  Lena, Wed, 06:00  fine | |
|  |  | | C1-205243 | Optimization of handling unknown or unexpected URSP rules | | | ZTE / Joy | CR 0085 24.526 Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204801  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 10:46  Work item code to include 5wwc, requests reformulation  Roozbeh, Thu, 11:22  “skip” to be replaced with “ignore”  Joy, Fri, 05:04  Offers rev1  Roozbeh, Frim 06:24  Fine  Ivo, Fri, 10:58  Fine, but wants 5wWC on the cover sheet  Joy, Mon, 09:55  Fine with 5wwc  Ivo, Tue, 10:11  Fine, co-sign | |
|  |  | | C1-205305 | Include Additional GUTI IE in TAU request for N1 mode to S1 mode change | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Cristina | CR 3428 24.301 Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204920  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Kaj, Thu, 10:26  No CN impact, wording needs improvement  Cristina, Thu, 11.37  Acks | |
|  |  | | C1-205400 | Clarification on the applicable access type for persistent PDU session | | | ZTE / Hannah | CR 2404 24.501 Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204526  Lin, Thu, 0950  fine  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lin, Tue, 02:28  Ok with the intention, but different solution  Hannah, Tue, 02:53  Asking back from Lin  Hannah, Wed, 09:14  Explains  Hanna, Wed, 09:45  rev | |
|  |  | | C1-205401 | Clarification on protection of initial NAS messages | | | ZTE / Hannah | CR 2406 24.501 Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204528  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Marko, Thu, 12:24  Does not agree with these two changes  Mikael, Thu, 13:45  Not needed  Osama, Thu, 18:23  Similar as Marko and Mikael, some qustions  Vishnu, Thu, 21:32  Not needed  Hanna, Fri, 04:47  Answering Marko, Mikael, Osama, Vishnu  Marko, Thu, 09:23  Can live with it  Mikael, Fri, 12.10  Can live with some changes, not the removal, cover sheet update  Mahmoud, Mon,18:26  Not needed  Hannah, Tue, 03.40  Rev  Mahmoud, Wed, 04.24  Fine  Marko, Wed, 07:10  Fine  Mikael, Wed, 10:04  Fine with the CR ,CAT D, untick CN  Osama, Wed, 14:48  fine | |
|  |  | | C1-205403 | Fixing several typos and adding full form of abbreviation W-AGF | | | ZTE / Hannah | CR 2408 24.501 Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204530 | |
|  |  | | C1-205479 | Clarification to emergency registration procedure | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 2547 24.501 Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205015  Ivo, Thu, 0944  Does not address the concern  Kundan, Thu, 0956  Defending  Ivo, Fri, 1014  Not ok  Kundan, Fri, 1031  Defending  Ivo, Fri, 1244  OK to keep the CR agreed, and work offline with Samsung to CT plenary  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Maoki, Thu, 09:29  Question on UE without USIM and how to calculater null-schem SUCI  Ivo, Thu, 10:45  “authentication procedure fails” needs to be clearer, problem in the CR  Kundan, Thu, 13:02  Acks Maoki  Sunghoon, Fri, 10:16  Similar as Ivo  Kundan, Wed, 2130  Explains  Sunghoon, thu, 0828  Suggests rewording  Kundan, Thu, 0838  rewording | |
|  |  | | C1-205494 | Exceptions in providing NSSAI to lower layers | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2516 24.501 Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204932  Lin, Fri, 0837  fine  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lin, Mon, 08:51  Comments  Sung, Tue, 03:23  Does not agree with Lin  Rae, Tue, 09:03  Not agree with SUngs reply to Lin  Lin, Wed, 09:17  Does not agree with Sung  Sung, Thu, 0616  Explains  Lin, Thu, 1005  Some parts fine, others not | |
|  |  | | C1-205478 | Updating the description of back-off timer | | | China Mobile | CR 3236 24.008 Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205126  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 10:45  there is no normative UE procedure for this  Xu, Mon, 03:11  Rev1  Ivo, Tue, 09:33  Ue handling is inconsistent  Xu, Tue, 16:34  Provides a rev  Ivo, Wed, 11:23  OK, BUT IT DEPENDS ON 5125 to be agreed  Xu, Wed, 17:10  rev | |
|  |  | | C1-205520 | Correction in the session transfer | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2519 24.501 Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204936  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Kaj, Thu 12:20  OK, but changes needed  Lin, Tue, 01:35  Support the CR  Mahmoud, Tue 20:31  typo | |
|  |  | | C1-205477 | The suggestion on back-off timer for 5GSM#29 | | | China Mobile | CR 2585 24.501 Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205125  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 10:45  Comments, parts already existing, UE behaviour missing  Xu, Mon, 03:11  Rev1  Ivo, Tue, 09:32  UE handling inconsistent  Xu, Tue, 16:06  Rev  Ivo, Wed, 11:20  Ok, but changes are needed  Xu, Wed, 17:03  Provides a rev  Ivo, Thu, 0930  ok | |
|  |  | | C1-205429 | Correction on Payload container IE | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 2581 24.501 Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205117  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 10:45  Proposal how to modify the CR  Lin, Sat, 04:55  Rev  Ivo, Tue, 10:02  More rewording  Lin, Tue, 13:18  Rev  Ivo, Wed, 11:28  This has problems  Lin, Wed, 13:20  New rev  Ivo, Thu, 0933  OK | |
|  |  | | C1-205430 | Correction on QoS parameter “value is not used” in 5GS | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 2582 24.501 Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205118  **THIS IS NOW 5GProtoc16**  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 10:45  Not needed, an informative NOTE can be OK  Osama, Thu, 20:34  CR is confusing, wha tis the implication of the NOTE  Lin, Mon, 01:0  Defending and explaining  Osama, Mon, 07:20  Not convinced  Ivo, Tue, 09:54  Comments not addressed  Lin, Tue, 13:11  See Osama’s point, new rev, goes to rel-16  Lin, Tue, 13:12  Not clear about ivo’s comment  Ivo, Wed, 11:25  Informative NOTE ok, normative NOTE NOT OK  Lin, Wed, 13.40  Wording of the NOTE  Osama, Wed, 1920  Unclear comment  Osama, Thu, 07:31  Fine with the CR for Rel-16  Ivo, Thu, 09:31  Can live with it | |
|  |  | | C1-205432 | Single-registration mode without N26 for EPS NAS message container IE | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 2383 24.501 Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205120  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-204153  Sunghoon, Fri, 10:31  Does not resolve the concern  Lin, Tue, 13:48  Rev  Sunghoon, Tue, 15:07  Fine with the rev | |
|  |  | | C1-205533 | Removal of a VPLMN from the forbidden PLMNs list upon T3247 expiry | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0574 23.122 Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204933  Osama, Thu, 1930  FINE  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 10:46  text removes PLMN from forbidded PLMN list but the condition is based on SNPN based counters. Likely, the condition should be changed to refer to counters related to a PLMN (rather than related to SNPN).  Lufeng, Thu, 11:09  Similar to ivo  Osama, Thu, 19:25  Does not see the use case  Lin, Mon, 08:58  Comments  Sung, Tue, 03:30  Rev  Osama, Tue, 04:36  Does not agree on case c)  Sung, Tue, 10:10  Minor issue  Lin, Wed, 09:26  FINE  Lufeng, Wed, 10:20  Fine  Sung, Thu, 0830  Rev  Ivo, thu, 0951  Unneccesary “if”  Sung, Thu, 1045  New rev | |
|  |  | | C1-205434 | Reordering of EMM cause #31 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 3432 24.301 Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205122  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Kaj, Thu, 11:54  Order the cause values  Lin, Mon, 01:00  Explains  Kaj, Mon, 17:51  Is there really a problem  Lin, Tue, 14:16  Explains  Kaj, Tue, 17:19  Can live with it if it is CAT D  Lin, Wed, 14:52  fine  Kaj, Wed, 17:57  fine | |
|  |  | | C1-205527 | Correction to Configred NSSAI updation based on Rejected NSSAI. | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 2490 24.501 Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204867  -------------------------------------  Amer, Wed, 08:33  Misunderstanding of the existing text  Vishnu, Wed, 2130  Offers wording | |
|  |  | | C1-205552 | Clarification of sending multiple service data on the UE side for CPSR | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 2553 24.501 Rel-17 | Postponed  Revision of C1-205454  Amer, Thu, 1612  DOES NOT AGREE  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-205027  Amer, Thu, 0801  Cr is not needed  Kundan, Thu, 0830  Defending  Amer, Thu 0850  Does not agree the change  ----------------------------------------------  Roozbeh, Thu, 11.23  Number of comments, and a question  Kundan, Mon, 20:24  Answering  Roozbeh, Mon, 21:30  FINE with the answer  Amer, Wed, 08:39  Not needed  Kundan, Wed, 08:40  Explains to Amer  Kundan, Wed, 15:21  rev | |
|  |  | | C1-205548 | QoS error checks for unstructured PDU session type | | | Samsung Guangzhou Mobile R&D | CR 2448 24.501 Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205377  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-204714  Robert, Thu, 08:20  Requests to remove some parts  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Robert, Thu, 19:35  Changes requested  Mahmoud, Mon, 15:14  **Fine with the changes, will bring this back to Rel-16**  Robert, Mon, 19:15  Commenting, doubts that this is Rel-16  Mahmoud, Mon, 20.14  Can live with this to be Rel-17, but sees related apple cr as Rel-17 only, too  Mahmoud, Wed, 2219  rev | |
|  |  | | C1-205431 | EMM parameters handling for 5G only causes | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 2583 24.501 Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205119  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 10:45  SNPN is not applicable in EPS. Thus, not clear why there is text on EMM causes for #74 and #75  Sunghoon, Fri, 10:15  Unclear what the CR is trying to resolve  Lin, Mon, 01:00  Replying  Sunghoon, Mon, 17:38  Further comments  Ivo, Tue, 09:45  Does not agree with Lin  Lin, Tue, 13:29  Replying  Sunghoon, Tue, 14:57  Commenting  Lin, Wed, 14:43  Rev  Ivo, Thu, 0930  Cosign  Lin, Thu, 0953  rev | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 5GProtoc17-non3GPP | |  |  | | |  |  | Stage-3 5GS NAS protocol development related to non-3GPP access | |
|  |  | | C1-204595 | void - allocated by error | | | void | CR 2428 24.501 Rel-17 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-204596](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204596.zip) | Overlapping requirements in 5.3.23 | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 2429 24.501 Rel-17 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204603](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204603.zip) | Editorial corrections | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 0146 24.502 Rel-17 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204793](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204793.zip) | Restructure the statement on establishment cause for non-3GPP access | | | ZTE / Joy | CR 2479 24.501 Rel-17 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | C1-205522 | Handling of the OVERLOAD START message in the NWu interface | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0147 24.502 Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205382  Christian, Thu, 1130  fine  Roozbeh, Thu, 03:20  question  Sung, Thu, 1812  Answering  Roozbeh, Thu, 2030  Think this should be postponed  Sung, Thu, 2217  Explains  Roozbhe, Thu, 2248  Comments  Sung, Thu, 2339  Answering  Roozbeh, Fri, 0003  Should change something  Sung, Fri, 0047  Anseirng  Roozbeh, Fri, 1458  Fine  --------------------------------------  Revision of C1-204939  Long disc Roozbeh-Sung  Roozbeh, Thu, 0238  FINE with the CR  Amer, Thu, 0505  Question on the CR, not clear  Christian, Thu, 0846  Thinks ther are some changes needed, comment against the r4939  Sung, Thu, 1002  Explains to Christian  Christian, Thu, 1019  Requests a change  Sung, Thu, 1053  Which part needs to go out  Christian, Thu, 1058  Informs Sung  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 10:44  N3IWF handling reads very difficault, new UE handling seems incorrect  Roozbeh, Thu, 11:20  Number of comments  Sung, Tue, 03:35  Explains  Joy, Tue, 05:19  Not convinced, could be sorted out in 29.413  Sung, Tue, 14:47  comments  Roozbeh, Wed, 02.14  disagrees  Joy, wed, 03:14  24.502 is wrong place, rather than a CR, send an LS  Sung, Wed, 06:36  Provides a rev and a draft of the LS  Ivo, Wed, 10:48  Rev is ok  Kundan, Wed, 11:57  Does not agree the CR is needed  Sung, Wed, 14:33  Further explains  Kundan, Wed, 14:51  Commenting  Roozbeh, Wed, 2104  Questions  Sung, Wed, 2220  Explains  Roozbeh, Wed, 2232  Asking back  Sung, wed, 2311  Disc with Kundan  Sung, wed, 2311  Asking back from Roozbeh | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | eCPSOR\_CON | |  | Peter –Main | | |  |  | Enhancement for the 5G Control Plane Steering of Roaming for UE in CONNECTED mode | |
|  |  | | [C1-204618](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204618.zip) | Kick-off – Stage-2 required work and project planning for the WI eCPSOR\_CON | | | DOCOMO Communications Lab. | discussion Rel-17 | Noted  Ivo, Thu, 10:46  Comments  Ly-Thanh, Thu, 14:07  Ansering Ivo  Ivo, Thu, 14:26  Replying  Ban, Thu, 20:19  DP is to identify the areas we need to consider for developing the new WID eCPSOR-CM  Ivo, Fri, 10:45  Further comments  **Ongoing discussion, not captured as it is DISC paper**  **Ban, Mon, 07:27**  wants to ask SA1 | |
|  |  | | [C1-204619](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204619.zip) | Rel-17 SOR enhancement – Identifying the session type | | | DOCOMO Communications Lab. | discussion Rel-17 | Noted  Related with LS out in C1-204941  Ivo, Thu, 10.44  benefit in interrupting ongoing NAS (5GMM or 5GSM) procedures is not clear. Those procedures are very quick.  Ban, Thu, 11:20  Defends  **Ongoing discussion, not captured as it is a DISC paper**  Lena, Mon, 07.57  several outstanding issues with the use of OS Id + App Id to identify a service/session type. So for now we would prefer to leave this out of the work on eCPSOR\_CON. The use of DNN, S-NSSAI or 5QI fine  Ban, Mon, 10:40  Acks lena  Mariusz, Mon, 12:26  Comments  Ivo, Wed, 10:42  asking | |
|  |  | | [C1-204780](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204780.zip) | Discussion to providing the SOR connected mode information | | | Ericsson / Ivo | discussion Rel-17 | Noted  Ban, Thu, 09:39  Detailed comments  Robert, Fri, 10:44  Problem with backward comp to pre REl-17, as UE parameter update data set type has the values as reserved, i.e. this triggers error handling  Ivo, Fri, 11:28  Agrees with Robert, there is an issue  Ban, Fri, 12:00  There is an issue  **Ongoing discussion, not captured as it is a DISC paper**  Related with LS out in C1-205055 | |
|  |  | | C1-205289 | Enhancement for CP-SOR for UE in connected mode | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 0566 23.122 Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-204781  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Partial overlap with C1-204805  Ban, Thu, 09:45  Detailed comments, revision proposal  Mariuzs, Thu, 10:58  Detaile domments, for section 1.2 prefers 4805  Ivo, Thu, 16:34  Answering  Lena, Mon, 07:57  Align terminology with 4805, changes to c2 and c3 are premature  Ivo, Mon, 11:13  Rev1  Mariusz, Mon, 12:58  More ok now, looks for an EN  Ban, Mon, 13:46  More comments  Ivo, Mon, 14:29  Explaining  Ivo, Mon, 14.36  Some replies  Ban, Mon, 20:23  Some suggestion  Ban, Tue, 06:12  More suggestions  Mariusz, Tue, 10:09  Comments  Ly Thanh, 12:07  Suppot in USIM needed  Ban, Tue, 13:09  Some comments  Lena, Tue, 19:36  Fine, some minor comments  Ivo, Tue, 23:28  Fine with comment from Ly Thanh, provides a rev  Ban, Wed, 07:10  Fine as it stands  Ivo, Wed, 09:24  New rev | |
|  |  | | C1-205244 | Introducing the definition "Steering of roaming connected mode control information" | | | DOCOMO Communications Lab. | CR 0572 23.122 Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205219  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-204805  Ivo, Tue, 08:45  OK, co-sign  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Partial overlap with C1-204781  Ivo, Thu, 10:44  Requests rewording  Lena, Mon, 07:57  Wording between this and 4781 needs to be aligned | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Other Rel-17 issues (TEI17) | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | Other Rel-17 topics | |
|  |  | | [C1-204534](file:///C:\\Users\\dems1ce9\\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\\3gpp\\cn1\\meetings\\125-e-electronic-0920\\docs\\C1-204534.zip) | Support of User Plane Integrity Protection for any data rates | | | Deutsche Telekom AG | CR 2412 24.501 Rel-17 | Postponed  Based on request from the auther, Mon, 10:11  Wrong agenda item, work item is TEI16  CAT A CR not needed as there is no Rel-17 version of 24.501  Lena, Mon, 07:57  Cr is premature, there is SA3 Rel-17 work, we need to wait for that | |
|  |  | | [C1-204605](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204605.zip) | Minor style correction | | | Ericsson / Mikael | CR 3230 24.008 Rel-17 | Agreed | |
|  |  | | [C1-204722](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204722.zip) | Discussion paper on the suggestion for NPN UE without CAG information list consider CAG cell in automatic network selection mode | | | China Mobile | discussion Rel-17 | Noted  Ivo, Thu, 10:44  Detailed comments  Lena, Mon, 07:57  . We don’t see a problem to solved here.  Xu, Mon, 11:15  Defending  Ivo, Mon, 11:24  Commenting  Lena, Tue, 04:22  Answering Lena | |
|  |  | | [C1-204774](file:///C:\\Users\\dems1ce9\\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\\3gpp\\cn1\\meetings\\125-e-electronic-0920\\docs\\C1-204774.zip) | Discussion about how network can influence UE’s APN configuration selection from multiple input sources | | | MediaTek Beijing Inc. | CR 0222 24.167 Rel-17 | Withdrawn  This is a DISC paper, however, was reserved as CR in 3GU. Correct in 5195 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205195](C:\\Users\\dems1ce9\\OneDrive - Nokia\\3gpp\\cn1\\meetings\\125-e-electronic-0920\\docs\\update1\\C1-205195.zip) | Discussion about how network can influence UE’s APN configuration selection from multiple input sources | | | MediaTek Beijing Inc. | DISC Rel-17 | Noted  Ivo, Thu, 11:32  Commenting problems  Rohit, fri, 05:02  Explains | |
|  |  | | [C1-204892](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204892.zip) | Interrupt PLMN selection when an emergency call is detected | | | BlackBerry UK Ltd. | CR 0573 23.122 Rel-17 | Postponed  Ivo, Thu, 10:43  Typo, some PLMN needs to be selected and this needs to be documented  Chen, Thu, 11:35  Not convinced the CR is needed  Ban, Thu, 13:46  Does not agree on the CR  Andre, Thu, 14:49  Not convinced  Kundan, Thu, 15:53  Should be left to implementation  JLB, Thu, 16:03  Does not agree with Ban  Ban, Thu, 22:18  Does not agree with the CR  JLB, Fri, 02:10  Will come with a rev  Ban, Fri, 06:41  Not acceptable  Vishnu, Fri, 11:29  Does not agree with the CR  JLB, Mon, 20:39  rev  Andrew, Mon, 22:02  No more comments  Ivo, Tue, 08:41  Nearly OK  Vishnu, Tue, 08:46  NOT OK  JLB, Tue, 16:07  Commenting  JLB, Tue, 16:42  Rev  Ban, Wed, 11:53  Do not agree | |
|  |  | | [C1-205115](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205115.zip) | Detach in ATTEMPTING-TO-UPDATE | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 3431 24.301 Rel-17 | Agreed  Mohamed, Thu, 13:46  Why is this TEI17  John-Luc, Thu, 15:09  Wants Mohameds comment to be clarified  Mikael, Thu, 20:04  Explaining background on work items, but Lin needs to explain the logic  Lin, Sat, 04:48  5114, 5115, 5116 now under TEI17 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205116](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205116.zip) | Detach in ATTEMPTING-TO-UPDATE | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 3235 24.008 Rel-17 | Agreed  Mohamed, Thu, 13:46  Why is this TEI17  Lin, Sat, 04:48  5114, 5115, 5116 now under TEI17 | |
|  |  | | C1-205127 | Providing an S-NSSAI in the PDU SESSION RELEASE COMMAND message and PDU SESSION ESTABLISHMENT REJECT message | | | China Mobile | CR 2586 24.501 Rel-17 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-205128 | Discussion paper on indicating an S-NSSAI for UE during PDU session establishment or release procedure | | | China Mobile | discussion Rel-17 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-204958](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204958.zip) | Deal with function overlap in PCO/ePCO | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Cristina | CR 3233 24.008 Rel-17 | **Postponed**  **Request from author**  **Shifted from 17.3.7**  Ivo, Thu, 10:43  selective usage should apply only in situation when both information are received  Cristina, Thu, 12:47  Asking for clarification from Ivo  Ivo, Fri, 11:09  Explains  Crisitna, Fri, 11:38  Some drafting  Ivo, Tue, 08:34  Does not understand the proposal from Cristina  Cristina, Tue, 09:28  Answering  Ivo, Wed, 10:13  There is a PROBLEM | |
|  |  | | C1-205357 | Clarify EMM-DEREGISTERED.LIMITED-SERVICE and EMM-REGISTERED.LIMITED-SERVICE substate entry conditions | | | BlackBerry UK Ltd. | CR 3427 24.301 Rel-17 | Postponed  Revision of C1-204893  Sunghoon, Fri, 1039  Disagrees, cannot accept  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ban, Thu, 22:18  Does not agree with the CR  Sunghoon, Fri, 10:39  Same as Ban, changes harm  Vishna, Fri, 12:16  Can NOT agree  Ban, Mon, 05:51  Can NOT agree  JLB, Tue, 00:28  rev  JLB, Wed, 1859  Rev2 | |
|  |  | | C1-205358 | Clarify 5GMM-DEREGISTERED.LIMITED-SERVICE and 5GMM-REGISTERED.LIMITED-SERVICE substate entry conditions | | | BlackBerry UK Ltd. | CR 2495 24.501 Rel-17 | Postponed  Revision of C1-204894  Sunghoon, Fri, 1039  Disagrees, cannot accept  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ban, Thu, 22:18  Does not agree with the CR  Sunghoon, Fri, 10:39  Disagrees  Vishna, Fri, 12:16  Can NOT agree  Ban, Mon, 05:51  Can NOT agree  JLB, Tue, 00:28  rev  JLB, Wed, 1859  Rev2 | |
|  |  | | C1-205428 | De-registration in ATTEMPTING-REGISTRATION-UPDATE | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 2580 24.501 Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205114  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Shifted from Protoc17  Lin, Sat, 04:48  Provides rev to change the WID | |
|  |  | | C1-205433 | Geo-fencing check for no stored "warning message" matched | | | Huawei, HiSilicon, one2many/Lin | CR 0220 23.041 Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205121  Lena, Thu, 1609  fine  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-204059  Lena, Mon, 07:57  the current text in the specification is clear enough, **hence the CR is not needed**.  Lin, Wed, 01:35  Provides a rev  Lena, Thu, 0745  Provides a rev of what is acceptable | |
|  |  | | C1-205475 | The requirement for NPN UE without CAG information list consider CAG cell in automatic network selection mode | | | China Mobile | CR 0562 23.122 Rel-17 | Postponed  Based on request from author  Revision of C1-204723  Lena, Fri, 0532  Request to POSTPONE  Ban, Fri, 0828  Request to postpone  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 10:43  **Questioning the improvement**,  Carlson, Thu, 10:56  Number of comments  Sung, Mon, 06:53  Questions  Lena, Mon, 07:57  …. hence we don’t think the CR is needed  Xu, Tue, 04:55  defending  Xu, Tue, 07:40  Replies to Carlson  Xu, Tue, 08:34  Replies to Sung  Ivo, Tue, 08:44  Explanation form Xu to Sung is a problem  Xu, Wed, 06:43  Rev  Sung, 05:50  **Does not agree**  Xu, Wed, 07:07  Acks Carlson  Xu, Wed, 08:33  Explains to Sung  Xu, Wed, 09:51  Rev  Ivo, Wed, 10:37  The CR does not solve the problem and thus is **NOT OK**.  Xu, Wed, 14.08  Offers wording  Xu, Thu, 0234  Provides a stage-1 requirement  Xu, thu, 0810  New wording  Ivo, Thu, 0918  Comments, with a different approach  Xu, HTu, 1013  Rev  Ivo, Thu, 1158  Asking back | |
|  |  | | C1-205476 | The requirement of AMF to provide CAG information list for UE supporting CAG | | | China Mobile | CR 2452 24.501 Rel-17 | Postponed  Revision of C1-204724  Lena, Fri, 0524  Open issues   * Overlap with C1-204869 * “should” in a NOTE * “If UE” -> “If the UE” * Missing space between “a” and “”CAG information list”” * “by AMF” -> “by the AMF”   Ivo, Fri, 0959  Suggests to agree, and work on a revision towards plenary  Xu, Fri, 1203  Provides a rev (which would have to go to plenary)  Sung, Fri, 1327  **Object**, second change has an issue  Lena, Fri, 1502  Would be ok to agree, if a revision will come to plenary.  Xu, Fri, 1555  Thanks Lena  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 10:44  the UE has no subscription for CAG and thus the CAG information list should be empty  Xu, Sat, 04:56  Explains the CR  Sung, Mon, 07:10  This proposal does not have supporting stage 2 requirements. So we cannot accept the CR.  Lena, Mon, 07:57  We don’t see a problem to solved here, hence we don’t think the CR is needed.  Xu, Tue, 08:48  Explains to lena  Xu, Tue , 09:21  This has stage-2 support,  Xu, Tue, 11.24  Provides a rev  Sung, Wed, 06:47  Does not agree  Ivo, Wed, 10:28  Does not agree  Xu, Wed, 10:38, 11:46  defending | |
|  |  | | C1-205507 | Message Waiting Data for SMSF | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0156 23.040 Rel-17 | Postponed  Revision of C1-204931  Lin, Fri, 0834  Still has a question  Sung, Fri, 1339  explains  Lin, Fri, 1517  Not needed  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lin, Tue, 07:33  Are there any technical changes, or is this just renaming, changes over changes  Mikael, Tue, 07:46  Further comments  Sung, Wed, 1027  Flags are not renaming, will provide a rev | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | WI for IMS and MC | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | Work items on IMS and Mission Critical | |
|  | IMSProtoc17 | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | IMS Stage-3 IETF Protocol Alignment for Rel-17 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205386](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205386.zip) | Usage of RFC 5688 | | | Ericsson /Jörgen | CR 6433 24.229 Rel-17 | **Agreed**  **Revision of C1-204856**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Bill: Mon 1315:** Also user-initiated reregistration. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205387](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205387.zip) | EPS fallback indication in SIP | | | Ericsson /Jörgen | CR 6434 24.229 Rel-17 | **Agreed**  **Revision of C1-204862**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **MariuszThu 10:30**: Should be optional. Editorials.  Rohit Thu 11:54: No need to send to UE. Why PANI?  Roozbeh: Further comments.  Jörgen responds Mon 1238 and 1303.  Bill and Peter some further comments until 1554  Bill Tue 0844: Agree with Peter the indicator should be implemented if the P-CSCF supports.  Jörgen Tue 1714: Draft available.  Roozbeh Tue 0218: Further comment  Roozbeh Tue 1951: some comments  Jörgen Wed 1507 responds | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | MCProtoc17 | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | Protocol enhancements for Mission Critical Services for Rel-17 | |
|  |  | | [C1-204539](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204539.zip) | Addition of clause 9.2.3.1 (Standalone SDS over Media plane / General) | | | Sepura Ltd | CR 0003 29.582 Rel-17 | **Agreed** | |
|  |  | | C1-204677 | Check for emergency call on constituent group | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0621 24.379 Rel-17 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-204694](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204694.zip) | Update on Plugtest Reported Issues - rev 3 | | | FirstNet / Mike | discussion | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-204709](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204709.zip) | Editorial – SIP URI | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0008 29.379 Rel-17 | **Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-204711](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204711.zip) | Remove EN in 10.1.4.5.1 | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0009 29.379 Rel-17 | **Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-204712](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204712.zip) | Remove space in header field value | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0632 24.379 Rel-17 | **Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-204846](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204846.zip) | Reference corrections in subclause 12.1.3.2 | | | Samsung | CR 0634 24.379 Rel-17 | **Agreed**  Mike Thu 1907: Some words not needed:  Kiran Thu 2037: used existing wording  Mike Fir 1632 is OK with explanation. | |
|  |  | | [C1-204847](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204847.zip) | Text reference corrections in subclause 10.1.1.3.1.3 | | | Samsung | CR 0635 24.379 Rel-17 | **Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-204850](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204850.zip) | Cancel queued floor request and notify to users | | | Samsung | CR 0275 24.380 Rel-17 | **Postponed**  **Related LS in C1-205510**  Jörgen Mon 1555: Questions EN for this WI, a large number of editorials. Should this be enh3MCPTT  Kiran Mike Jörgen, Mon2246 to Tue 1715:  Mike has doubts about SA6 requirements, several comments. | |
|  |  | | [C1-204859](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204859.zip) | Correct name of Acknowledge message | | | Ericsson /Jörgen | CR 0276 24.380 Rel-17 | **Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-204895](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204895.zip) | discussion on additional cause values for pre-established call control | | | Ericsson /Jörgen | discussion | Noted  Mike Mon 1949 and Francois Tue 0959 indicate preference for 4896 over 5197  Kiran Tue 2111: We are fine with content except for the word “a larger effort”. As both the solution requires some amount of effort with pros and cons. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205080](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205080.zip) | Sharing Recording Status inside MCVideo Group Call | | | Samsung | CR 0080 24.581 Rel-17 | **Postponed**  **Related LS out in C1-205513**  Jörgen Mon 1613: Would be good to know from where the requirement comes. Some editorials  Francois Mon 1701: Cannot find requirement.  Kiran Mon 1923: Provides stage 1 and stage 2  Kiran, Mike, Francois Mon 2006 to Tue 1037:  Continued discussion on requirements | |
|  |  | | [C1-205258](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205258.zip) | Addition of clauses 9.2.3.2.1, 9.2.3.2.2 (SDP Offer/Answer) | | | Sepura Ltd | CR 0004 29.582 Rel-17 | **Agreed**  **Revision of C1-204540**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Kit Thu 12:19:** Mike found editorials.  **Jörgen Thu 12:47:** Further editorial, SDP terminology.  Kit Fri 1933, Jörgen Mon 1435: Some comments on SDP terminology RFC 4975 differ from 4566.  Kit Tue 1700: New draft available. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205259](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205259.zip) | Addition of clauses 9.2.3.2.3, 9.2.3.2.4 (Originating & Terminating procedures) | | | Sepura Ltd | CR 0005 29.582 Rel-17 | **Agreed**  **Revision of C1-204541**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Kit Thu 12:19:** Mike found editorials.  **Jörgen Thu 12:48:** Further editorial.  Kit Fri: One more found.  Kit Tue 1433: New draft  Mike Tue 1737: Looks OK | |
|  |  | | [C1-205323](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205323.zip) | Corrections to floor indicator of On-Network Floor Control procedures | | | Samsung | CR 0274 24.380 Rel-17 | **Agreed**  Revision of C1-204849 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205337](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205337.zip) | Check for emergency call on constituent group | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0622 24.379 Rel-17 | **Agreed**  **Revision of C1-204684**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Kiran Thu 9:18:** Applicable also for imminent peril?  Mike Mon 2019: No, stage 2 only mentions emergency. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205348](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205348.zip) | Cancel of regroup in emergency state | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0627 24.379 Rel-17 | **Agreed**  **Revision of C1-204703**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Kiran Thu 9:18:** Editorial and remove a check.  Mike Thu 21:41: Further discussion and a request for people to voice their opinions | |
|  |  | | [C1-205352](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205352.zip) | Align -initial- terminology style with TS 24.379 | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0183 24.282 Rel-16 | **Agreed**  **Moved from 16.3.10**  **Revision of C1-204706**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen Thu:** Should be MCProtoc.  Mike, Dom Fri until 20:34: Seems to go to MCProtoc17 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205355](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205355.zip) | Emergency Alert - Designated Group | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0631 24.379 Rel-17 | **Agreed**  **Revision of C1-204710**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Kiran Thu 9:18:** Rewording proposal.  Mike Thu and Kiran Fri 07:13 seem to agree. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205372](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205372.zip) | Clarify setting of p-id-fa entry in 9A.2.2.2.3 | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0623 24.379 Rel-16 | **Agreed**  **Moved from 16.3.10**  **Revision of C1-205338**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Revision of C1-204689**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Kiran Thu 9:18:** Similar happens in other places.  **Jörgen Thu 17:41:** Wrong WI, this was rel-15. Consequences does not indicate FASMO.  **Mike Thu 20:46**: Ack Kiran comment | |
|  |  | | [C1-205374](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205374.zip) | Correct error in 9A.3.1.2 | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0624 24.379 Rel-16 | **Agreed**  Revision of C1-205339  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Moved from 16.3.10  Revision of C1-204690  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Jörgen Fri 14:47: Error introduced in rel-15. Similar error found in rel-15.  Mike Fri 1842, Lzaros Mon 1307, Jörgen Mon 1357: Seems to be agreement to move to MCProtoc17. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205499](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205499.zip) | Functional alias support and the mcptt-client-id is missing in subclause 12.1.1.2 | | | Samsung | CR 0636 24.379 Rel-17 | **Agreed**  Revision of C1-205322  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-204848  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Jörgen Mon 15:44: Some editorials, questioning the note.  Mike Mon 2001: Several comments  Wed 0840: Kiran responds: This CR aligns with emergency alert. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205500](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205500.zip) | Sending emergency notification of MCPTT user's emergency indication | | | Samsung | CR 0639 24.379 Rel-16 | **Agreed**  Moved from 15.1  Revision of C1-205070 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205501](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205501.zip) | Standalone in-progress emergency group state cancel while not in a call | | | Samsung | CR 0642 24.379 Rel-16 | **Agreed**  Moved from 15.1  Revision of C1-205073 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205502](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205502.zip) | Authentication of the MIKEY-SAKKE I\_Message validation in pre-established session | | | Samsung | CR 0230 24.380 Rel-17 | Postponed  Competes with C1-205565  Mike1742 and Francois1756 indicated support for 5565  K  Revision of C1-205197  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-204851  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-203910  Competes with C1-204896  Jörgen Mon 0818: Some comments if this is agreed.  Mike prefer 4896 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205565](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205565.zip) | Additional cause values for pre-established call control | | | Ericsson /Jörgen | CR 0277 24.380 Rel-17 | **Postponed**  **Request from author**  Competes with C1-205502  **Revision of C1-204896**  **Mike, THU, 1742**  **OK**  **Francois, THU 1742**  **OK**  **Kiran, fri, 1327**  **Requests this to be posponed**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Frederic:** Missing CR# (0277), missing version (16.5.0)  Kiran Tue 2107: Partially competing and not complete. Proposes compromise. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | FS\_eIMS5G2 | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | Study on enhanced IMS to 5GC Integration Phase 2 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205277](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205277.zip) | 23700-10 initial version | | | Huawei, HiSilicon | pCR 23.700-10  Rel-17 | **Agreed**  Revision of C1-204656  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Jörgen Mon 1733: Should start with template and then add content. Not sure the SA2 content is still valid. Remove Editor's Notes from SA2.  Bill Wed 0428: Template version updated  Jörgen: Good  Frederic: Some editorials for Bill to handle as rapporteur. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | MuDe | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | Multi-device and multi-identity enhancements | |
|  |  | | [C1-204716](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204716.zip) | Overview Activation/deactivation of a user's identities | | | vivo Mobile Communication Co., | CR 0003 24.174 Rel-17 | **Agreed**  Roozbeh Thu 2005: Change public user identity to active identities.  Adrian Thu 23:58: Some comments and questions.  Roozbeh and Adrian Fri 16:15 to 17:53 some further discussion.  Roozbeh, Adrian until Mon 1721: Exchange of comments  Roozbe Tue 0257: Withdrawn comments.  Mariusz Tue 1612: Willing to cosign, wants changes also to 4.2.2. | |
|  |  | | [C1-204870](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204870.zip) | Activation and deactivation of identities | | | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | CR 0005 24.174 Rel-17 | Postponed  Bill FRi 13:14: Don't change use of To header field in REGISTER.  Roozbeh: Not changing To header.  Jörgen: Some comments on previous assumptions for 24.174:  Roozbeh: OK to postpne the related CRs. | |
|  |  | | [C1-204872](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204872.zip) | Call flows for new multiple devices and multiple identities | | | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | discussion 24.174 | Noted  Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-204898](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204898.zip) | MuDE - minutes of conference call | | | vivo Mobile Communication Co., | other | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-205123](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205123.zip) | Activation/deactivation of a user's identities | | | Ericsson, vivo Mobile Communications Co. LTD /Jörgen | CR 0008 24.174 Rel-17 | Postponed  Roozbeh Thu 2013: Media feature tag wrong mechanism. 4870 is a better solution.  Simon: Prefer XCAP as in C1-204897.  Bill Fri 1314: Same as Simon, refers to 4.5.2 of 24.174  Jörgen Fri 23:57: Responds  Bill Mon 0554: Preference for C1-204897  Jörgen Mon 11:38: Ut gives no per UE.  Mariusz: Wed 1740: Question on IRS and individual registrations. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205451](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205451.zip) | New use case for MuD and MiD | | | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | CR 0006 24.174 Rel-17 | Postponed  Simon Thu 2041: GRUU not mandatory  Roozbeh: Can postpone  Roozbeh,Fri, 0122  Explains some benefits  Revision of C1-204873  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Simon Fri 0127: GRUU optional in 24.229. MuD and MiD can work without GRUU.  Takayuki Fri 0349 PPI should be PAI  Bill: Share Qualcomm's view.  Roozbeh and Jörgen some comments Fri evening. Some editorial acknowledged.  Roozbeh Fri 2303: Change to that service shall support.  Simon Tue 0207: Agree with Jörgen, further questions.  Roozbeh Tue 0337: Answers to Simon  Simon Tue 2332: Continues discussion | |
|  |  | | [C1-205528](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205528.zip) | MuDe Identity activation status indication via Ut interface | | | Orange / Mariusz | CR 0007 24.174 Rel-17 | Agreed  Revision of C1-205333  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-204897  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Roozbeh, Simon, Bill, Mariusz until Fri16:49 some questions and answers.  Roozbeh: Fri 2330: Comment on GRUU and activation.  Jörgen Fri 2339: Questions Ut solution.  Bill Mon 0555: Fine with answers. Support.  Simon Mon 0714: Good some questions on "Delegated-user".  Jörgen Mon 1133: Answers on "delegated-user", questions if Ut works.  Mariusz Tue 1558: Some answers and further discussion.  Mariusz Wed 1708: Responds to Roozbeh. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | MPS2 (CT3 lead) | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | Stage 3 of Multimedia Priority Service (MPS) Phase 2 | |
|  |  | | C1-204545 | MPS for MMtel discussion | | | Perspecta Labs Inc. | discussion Rel-17 | Noted  Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-205550](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205550.zip) | P-CSCF and UE MPS priority upgrade | | | Perspecta Labs Inc. | CR 6430 24.229 Rel-17 | **Agreed**  Revision of C1-205250  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Yoshihiro Wed 1506: "authorized" and "if supported" needed.  Revision of C1-204546  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Sung Fri 0544: Dial string does not work for in-dialog requests.  Jörgen Fri 2157: Editor's Notes can be introduced.  Peter M Fri 1648: Yes, should remove the dialstring parts.  Jörgen and Peter until Tue 1735: discussion on who inserts the RPH. Conf server can insert RPH. | |
|  |  | | [C1-205551](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205551.zip) | Subsequent MPS priority upgrades | | | Perspecta Labs Inc. | CR 6431 24.229 Rel-17 | **Agreed**  Revision of C1-205251  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Yoshihiro Wed1506: Similar comments  Revision of C1-204547  Peter Mon 1847: Editorials fixed. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | eMCData3 | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | CT aspects of Enhancements to Mission Critical Data | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Other Rel-17 IMS & MC issues (TEI17) | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | Other Rel-17 IMS and MC topics | |
|  |  | | [C1-204803](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204803.zip) | 5GS terminology: PDU session | | | Ericsson / Nevenka | CR 6432 24.229 Rel-17 | **Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-204868](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-204868.zip) | Correct spelling of an element name | | | Ericsson /Jörgen | CR 0004 24.174 Rel-17 | **Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-205052](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205052.zip) | Discussion about how UE can know whether network support for IMS non-voice services (Like RCS/XCAP/McPTT/MCData and MCVideo) to decide whether to initiate IMS PDN request to netowork | | | MediaTek Beijing Inc./Rohit | discussion 24.229 Rel-17 | **Noted**  **Maoki Thu 17:20:** scenario #2/#3 never happen. See also C1-205167.  Simon Thu 2253: XCAP not IMS, so not IMS PDN. Voice is treated with high priority for domain selection.  Rohit: Fri 0534 and 0922: Adding feedback to Simon, responding to Maoki  Rohit: New version taking Jörgens comment into account.  Jörgen Sat 0006: Not sure what the issue is.  Rohit Mon 0859: explains to Jörgen  Yoshihiro Mon 1626: Further comments  Simon and Rohit until Tue 0023: further discussion  Rohit and Jörgen Wed 14:51 to 1629: Further discussion  Simon, Thu, 2006  Replying | |
|  |  | | [C1-205098](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205098.zip) | Fix reference for uniform resource identifier | | | NTT DOCOMO INC. | CR 6437 24.229 Rel-17 | **Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-205389](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205389.zip) | Adding new configuration parameter by which network can configure UE's APN parameter reading order | | | MediaTek Beijing Inc./Rohit | CR 0223 24.167 Rel-17 | **Agreed**  Revision of C1-205047  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Related discussion doc in C1-205195  Simon Thu 1953: CR not needed. Prefer to leave it to UE implementation.  Rohit Fri 0700: Needed for open market devices.  Jörgen Fri 2319: Minor comments  Simon Mon 0550: Questions the need  Rohit Mon 0755: It is needed for operators with open market devices.  Mariusz: Tue 1300: Further discussion  Rohit Wed 0142: Answers | |
|  |  | | [C1-205481](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205481.zip) | No SDP answer in the 200 resopnse to SIP INVITE request after completion of SDP negotiation. | | | NTT corporation | CR 0121 24.182 Rel-17 | **Agreed**  Revision of C1-204775  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Mariusz Tue 1306 Editorial  Haruka Tue 1725: Draft available | |
|  |  | | [C1-205559](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205559.zip) | New SDP a=content value for video annoucement | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Hongxia | CR 6438 24.229 Rel-17 | **Agreed**  Revision of C1-205524  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-205330  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  New CR split off from C1-204755 | |
|  |  | | [C1-205560](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205560.zip) | Indication of video annoucement during established communication | | | Huawei, HiSilicon, China Telecom /Hongxia | CR 0078 24.628 Rel-17 | **Agreed**  Revision of C1-205517  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-205269  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Yoshihiro Wed 1351: Some questions.  Some answers and more questions by Yoshihiro Wed 1654.  Revision of C1-204755  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Simon Thu2005: Video should have user consent. Some proposals.  Helen Fri 0436: draft in Inbox.  Yoshihiro: Only one feature tag. Should be optional  Helen Fri 1244: Some responses  Jörgen Fri 23:10: Questions the non-user consent requirement. What is the need for the user consent?  Yoshihiro Mon 1116: Why " g.3gpp.announce\_i"? UE behaviour will be the same. Further clarifications needed.  Helen Tue 0826: Draft available  Jörgen Tue 1611: Some formal comments.  Helen Tue 1736: EN text OK?  Helen Jörgen Simon Tue 1822 until Wed1557:  Discussion on UPDATE as alternative. SDP should be 24.229. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Output Liaison Statements | | Tdoc | Title | | | Prepared by | To/CC | Result & comment | |
|  |  | | [C1-204693](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204693.zip) | LS on ETSI Plugtest reports | | | FirstNet / Mike | LS out | Approved | |
|  |  | | [C1-204782](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204782.zip) | LS on providing the SOR connected mode information | | | Ericsson / Ivo | LS out Rel-17 | Postponed  Requested by author  Related with C1-205055  Ban, Mon, 09:12  Too early to communicate with SA2 on impacts of their specs, postpone the LS | |
|  |  | | [C1-204791](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204791.zip) | LS on SOR secured packet storage in the UDR | | | DOCOMO Communications Lab. | LS out Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Related with C1-204790, C1-204791  Ivo, Thu, 10:42  LS is not Ok, explaining why  Ban, Thu, 21:26  Explains that Ivo’s solution is proprietary  Sung, Fri, 00:43  LS is not needed, should go directly to CT4  Ivo, Fri, 09:04  Does not agree with sending the LS | |
|  |  | | [C1-204941](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-204941.zip) | LS on high priority service exempt from release due to SOR | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | LS out Rel-17 | Approved  Related with C1-204619  Mariusz, Mon, 12:26  Comments  Sung, Thu, 1000  Fails to see wha needs to be changed  Mariusz, Thu, 1633  Can be sent as is | |
|  |  | | [C1-205068](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\125-e-electronic-0920\docs\C1-205068.zip) | Reply LS on the re-keying procedure for NR SL | | | CATT | LS out Rel-16 | Postponed  Requested by the author | |
|  |  | | C1-205222 | LS on Clarification of CAG only UE accessing EPS network. | | | Kundan |  | **Approved**  **NEW**  Lena, Wed, 05:54  **Not needed** to send the LS to SA2, it is clear in our specs  Ivo, Wed, 13:12  Supports the LS  Sung, conference call  **Not needed**  Vishnu, conf call  Fine, support sending  Marko, conf call  Not against sending  Lena, Wed, 16:17  **Not useful**  Kundan, Wed, 17:18  Defending  Sung, Thu, 0117  Not agreein with Kundan  Kundan, Thu, 2001  Defending  Sung, Fri, 0132  If it is only to Rel-17, then would not object  Lena, Fri, 0212  **I object to this LS.**  **Kunda, Fri, 0712**  Rel17 would be fine  Kundan, Fri, 0806  Ongoing  Robert, Fri, 0923  Supports sending  Ivo, Fri, 0953  Support sending the LS  Vishnu, Fri, 1058  Support sending  Vivek, Fri, 1155  Support sending the LS  Lena, Fri, 1523  Withdraws the objection | |
|  |  | | C1-205223 | LS on resume procedure on CAG cell | | | Kundan |  | **Postponed**  **NEW**  Lena, Wed, 06:35  Wait for outcome of SA2 discussion, **do not send the LS**  Kundan, Wed, 06:55  Defending  Lena, Wed, 07:06  Not agreeing  Sung, Conf Call  Same as Lena  Lena, Wed, 15:42  No need to sed the LS  Kundan, Wed, 16:03  Answering, providing info on SA2  Lena, Thu, 02:34  Not needed  Lena, Fri, 0507  OBJECT | |
|  |  | | C1-205224 | LS on VPLMN release version for Rel-17 enhancement for CP-SOR in connected mode | | | DOCOMO Communications Lab. | LS out | **Postponed**  **Author indicated this, Wed, 07:58**  **Revision of C1-205055 (provided Mon 17:56)**  Ivo, Tue, 08:32  Asking for answers to previous questions  Ban, Tue, 09:13  Explains  Ivo, Tue, 11:29  **C1-205224 is NOT OK and I do NOT agree to send C1-205224 early. However, let's try to work on it till Fri.**  Ban, Tue, 14:07  Provides a rev  Lena, Wed, 06:54  Do not agree sending the LS  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **FLAGGED FOR EARLY LS treatment**  Related with [C1-204780](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_125e/Docs/C1-204780.zip) and [C1-204782](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_125e/Docs/C1-204780.zip)  Mariusz, Thu, 10:41  Comments  Ban, Thu, 11:26  Answering Mariusz  Ivo, Thu, 12:46  **Does NOT support sending the LS**  Ban, Thu, 13:12  Explaining why the LS has to be sent  Ivo, Fri, 11.25  the stage-1 requirements are appropriate.  The LS is not **needed**.  Lena, Mon, 07:56   * LS is too detailed. If it ends up being sent, it should be shortened significantly.   Since there is at least one solution which enables the feature to be used in a pre-Rel-17 VPLMN, there is  **no need to send the LS.**  **Ban, Mon, 08:45**  Provides a rev | |
|  |  | | C1-205246 | LS on Network slice-specific EAP result in case of no response by AAA-S | | | LG Electronics | CT4 | **Postponed**  **NEW**  Sung, Wed, 00:19  If discussion is needed, please initiate it in CT4  Sunhee, Wed, 09:59  Fine to bring this to CT4 without LS  Kaj, Wed, 15:46  Not needed  Amer, Wed, 16:30  Not needed | |
|  |  | | C1-205260 | Reply LS on protection of allowed CAG list against MITM Attack | | | Huawei | CT1 | **Postponed**  **NEW**  Sung, Wed, 05:32  **LS is not needed** as commented in CC4  Lena, Wed, 06:00  **Not ok, Ls not needed**  Kundan, Wed, 07:07  Commenting, does not mind sending the LS  Ivo, ConfCall5  **No reason for sending the LS**  Chen, ConfCall5  Inform SA3  Vishnu, Wed, 09:15  Explains to Lena  Lena, Fri, 0506  OBJECT  Ivo, Fri, 0945  No need | |
|  |  | | C1-205332 | New LS on the stage 2 aspects of MINT | | | LG Electronics |  | **Approved**  **Revision of C1-205285**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **NEW**  Put CT3 in CC  SangMin, Wed, 16:17  Provides a rev  Lena, Thu, 0157  fine | |
|  |  | | C1-205392 | LS on mandatory support of full rate user plane integrity protection for 5G | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | LS out Rel-16 | Approved  Revision of C1-204659  Kundan, Thu, 2051  No need to send the LS  Lena, Fri, 1530  Asks back from Kundan  Kundan, Fri, 1545  FINE  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Kundan, Wed, 2147  No need to send the LS  Lena, Thu, 0220  Explaining the need, i.e. let SA3 know that we wait for them to conclude to start our R17 work  Lena, Fri, 1541  Explaining the need  Kundan, Fri, 1551  Fine to send the LS | |
|  |  | | C1-205509 | LS on Media Feature Tag for IMS Data Channel | | | Ericsson /Jörgen | LS out | Approved  Revision of C1-204866 | |
|  |  | | C1-205523 | LS on handling OVERLOAD START message in the N3IWF | | | Nokia |  | **Approved**  **Revision of C1-205381**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **NEW**  Amer, Thu, 0810  Question for a potential change  Christian, Thu, 0848  Support as is  Sung, Thu, 0950  Explans to amer | |
|  |  | | C1-205571 | LS on temporary NSSAA failure | | | Apple | SA2 | Postponed  Revision of C1-205563  Revision happened THU, 2256  Shuang, Fri, 0254  OK  Kaj, Fri, 0915  Shuang, Fri, 1033  FINE  Lin, Fri, 1133  **Object** the LS, was late, and does not agree the content  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  LATE (THU, 1540)  Shuang, Thu, 1820  Also CT??  Krisztian, | |
|  |  | | [C1-205510](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205510.zip) | LS on clarifications for authorised user learning about the users whose floor requests are queued | | | Samsung /Kiran | SA6 | **Approved**  Late LS from MC group, content not discussed | |
|  |  | | [C1-205513](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2008Elbonia\CT1\Docs\C1-205513.zip) | LS to get the clarifications on sharing MCVideo UE activity (recording video) between members of the group | | | Samsung /Kiran | SA6 | **Postponed**  Late LS from MC group  Francois, Fri, 1023  Object sending the LS  Kira, Fri, 1406  Some followups | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 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 | |
|  |  | | C1-204520 | Void | | | Void | CR 0558 23.122 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-204947 | Void | | | Void | other | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 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 27 August 2020 14:00 UTC**  **Last comments:**  **Friday 28 August 2020 14:00 UTC** | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |