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**1. Overall Description:**

There is inconsistency on handling of PDU sessions for emergency services when registering via both 3GPP access and non-3GPP access between stage 2 specification and stage 3 specification as shown below.

a) Quoted from TS 23.501:

"

*5.16.4.9 Handling of PDU Sessions for Emergency Services*

*The QoS Flows of a PDU Session associated with the emergency DNN shall be dedicated for IMS emergency sessions and shall not allow any other type of traffic. The emergency contexts shall not be changed to non-emergency contexts and vice versa. The UPF shall block any traffic that is not from or to addresses of network functions (e.g. P-CSCF) providing Emergency Services. If there is already an emergency PDU Session over a given Access Type (3GPP access or non-3GPP access), the UE shall not request another emergency PDU Session over the other Access Type except for handing over the emergency PDU Session to this other Access Type.* ***The network shall reject any emergency PDU Session requests over a given Access Type (3GPP access or non-3GPP access) if it knows the UE already has an emergency PDU Session over the other Access Type.*** *The ARP reserved for emergency service shall only be assigned to QoS Flows associated with an emergency PDU Session. If the UE is Emergency Registered over a given access, it shall not request a PDU Session to any other DNN over this access.*

"

b) Quoted from TS 24.501:

"

*6.4.1.7 Abnormal cases on the network side*

*The following abnormal cases can be identified:*

*a) If the received request type is "initial emergency request" and there is already another emergency PDU session for the UE, the* ***SMF shall reject*** *the PDU SESSION ESTABLISHMENT REQUEST message with 5GSM cause #31 "request rejected, unspecified"* ***or release locally the existing emergency PDU session and proceed the new PDU SESSION ESTABLISHMENT REQUEST message***

… …

"

Comparing a) and b), the SMF compliant with a) has only one choice which is rejecting the emergency request, but the SMF compliant with b) has one more choice which is processing the emergency request.

From perspective of CT1, it is not uncommon that UE may perform local release of the emergency PDU session due to e.g. loss of non-3GPP access coverage and request a new emergency PDU session. In this case, it is more reasonable for the SMF to proceed the new PDU SESSION ESTABLISHMENT REQUEST message for emergency service and release the existing emergency PDU session locally.

Based on above, CT1 believes the handling specified in TS 24.501 is more flexible and benefits user experience.

Hence, CT1 requests SA2 to re-evaluate and adjust the requirement in TS 23.501.

**2. Actions:**

**To SA2 group.**

**ACTION:** CT1 requests SA2 to re-evaluate and adjust the requirement in TS 23.501

**3. Date of Next CT1 Meetings:**

CT1#138e 10th - 14th October 2022 e-meeting

CT1#139 14th - 18th November 2022 TBD