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# 1 Introduction

This document is the report of the following email discussion:

* [AT117-e][048][eNPN] Open Issues (Nokia)

      Scope: Treat tdocs on open issues: R2-2202208, R2-2202620, R2-2202832, R2-2202855, R2-2202889, R2-2202896, R2-2202898, R2-2203075, R2-2203264, R2-2203447, Also, review the CR in R2-2202636 and consider the open issues listed there, for UE capabilities.

      Intended outcome: Report

      Deadline: W1 Friday (for on-line CB W2 Monday). It is expected that this discussion continues W2 for final agreement of the CRs.

# 2 Contact Points

Respondents to the email discussion are kindly asked to fill in the following table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | Email Address |
| Nokia (Rapporteur) | Gyuri Wolfner | gyorgy.wolfner@nokia.com |
| Qualcomm | Ozcan Ozturk | oozturk@qti.qualcomm.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Discussion

## 3.1 Number of GINS

The following proposals were submitted in this area:

R2-2202208 (OPPO):

Proposal 1: The maximum number of GIN broadcast per cell is 12.

R2-2202620 (CMCC):

Proposal 1: The maximum number of GINs listed in the new SIB can be 12.

R2-2202832 (China Telecom)

Proposal 1: The maximum number of GINs in the new SIB is twelve.

R2-2202855 (Samsung)

Proposal 1: RAN2 to agree that Maximum number of GINs supported per cell as 16.

R2-2202889 (Huawei, HiSilicon)

Proposal 1: The maximum number of GINs (maxNrofGIN) is 12 or 24.

R2-2202896 (vivo)

The maximum number of GINs per cell is 24.

R2-2202898 (ZTE Corporation, Sanechips)

Proposal 1: The Maximum number of GINs can be 24 or 48.

R2-2203075 (Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell)

Proposal 1: The maximum number of GINs per cell is 32.

R2-2203264 (LG Electronics Inc)

Proposal 3: The maximum value of GINs to be broadcast is [48 or 24].

R2-2203447 (Ericsson)

Proposal 3 : maxNrofGIN can be set to 12, or at most 16.

The following proposals were made: 12, 16, 24, 32, 48.

**Question 1: Please indicate in the table which value(s) you prefer (P) and you can accept (A) (please try to be flexible):**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | 12 | 16 | 24 | 32 | 48 | Comments |
| Intel | A | P | A |  |  | No strong view. |
| Qualcomm | A | A | A | A | P | Having a large maximum value is always the safe option for future. This of course doesn’t mean that all will be needed in the first deployments. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Summary**: TBD.

## 3.2 Meaning of missing *supportedGINs-r17* and other related proposals

The following proposals were submitted in this area:

R2-2202208 (OPPO):

Proposal 2: *supportedGINs-r17* is always present for each SNPN involved in *snpn-AccessInfoList* provided in SIB1.

R2-2202832 (China Telecom)

Proposal 3: If the the n-th entry in gins-PerSNPNList is missing, the n-th SNPN does not have GINs.

R2-2202855 (Samsung)

Proposal 2: If supportedGINs-r17 in nth element in ginsPerSNPN-List is absent, it would indicate that the nth SNPN in snpn-AccessInfoList provided in SIB1 does not support any GINs.

R2-2202889 (Huawei, HiSilicon)

Proposal 2: The n-th entry in *ginsPerSNPN-List* should correspond to the n-th SNPN that supports extCH and/or onboarding as listed in *snpn-AccessInfoList* provided in SIB1.

R2-2202896 (vivo)

Proposal 1: If n-th entry in the snpn-AccessInfoList is absent, there is no supported GIN for the n-th SNPN listed in snpn-AccessInfoList.

R2-2202898 (ZTE Corporation, Sanechips)

Proposal 2: If the n-th entry in the ginsPerSNPN-List is missing, the associated SNPN supports neither Credentials Holder nor the on-boarding feature.

R2-2203075 (Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell)

Proposal 2.1: Missing explicit assignment indicates that the given SNPN cannot be associated with any of the advertised GINs when multiple SNPNs are supported in the cell.

Proposal 2.2: If there is only a single SNPN identifier in the CellAccessRelatedInfo then gins-PerSNPN should not be present as all GINs are associated with that SNPN.

R2-2203264 (LG Electronics Inc)

Proposal 1: RAN2 to decide one of the following options:

- Option1: If a SNPN in SIB1 has no associated GIN, the corresponding gins-perSNPN-r17 is set to all zeros.

- Option2: If a SNPN in SIB1 has no associated GIN, the corresponding gis-perSNPN-r17 is omitted.

Proposal 2a: If option2 is taken, agree to the following:

- Introduce a new bitmap, in SIBxy, representing a subset of SNPNs in SIB1, where each bit corresponds to each SNPN in SIB1 and indicates whether the corresponding SNPN has at least one GIN in the GIN list in SIBxy.

- The field gins-PerSNPN-r17 has the same number of entries as the length of the new bitmap, and n-th entry in ginsPerSNPN-r17 corresponds to n-th SNPN indicated by the new bitmap.

- If a SNPN in SIB1 has no associated GIN, the corresponding GINs-perSNPN-r17 is omitted.

R2-2203447 (Ericsson)

Proposal 1 : Decide whether all SNPNs in snpn-AccessInfoList or, only the SNPNs broadcasting ‘extCH-Supported’ and/or ‘onboardingEnabled’, should be included in the gins-PerSNPN-List.

Proposal 2 : Instead of broadcasting the bitmap with all bits set to ‘0’, the field ‘supportedGINs’ being absent can be used to indicate that a given SNPN does not support any GIN.

Rapporteur's summary is the following:

At least 5 company proposes that the field ‘supportedGINs’ being absent for an SNPN indicates that a given SNPN does not support any GIN.

There is a proposal on the enhancement of SIBXY if a SNPN in SIB1 has no associated GIN, the corresponding gis-perSNPN-r17 is omitted (Proposal 2a of R2-2203264):

Proposal 2a: If option2 is taken, agree to the following:

- Introduce a new bitmap, in SIBxy, representing a subset of SNPNs in SIB1, where each bit corresponds to each SNPN in SIB1 and indicates whether the corresponding SNPN has at least one GIN in the GIN list in SIBxy.

- The field gins-PerSNPN-r17 has the same number of entries as the length of the new bitmap, and n-th entry in ginsPerSNPN-r17 corresponds to n-th SNPN indicated by the new bitmap.

- If a SNPN in SIB1 has no associated GIN, the corresponding GINs-perSNPN-r17 is omitted.

There are proposals that in *ginsPerSNPN-List* only the SNPNs that support either extCH or onboarding or both are listed:

Proposal 2: The n-th entry in *ginsPerSNPN-List* should correspond to the n-th SNPN that supports extCH and/or onboarding as listed in *snpn-AccessInfoList* provided in SIB1.

Proposal 1 : Decide whether all SNPNs in snpn-AccessInfoList or, only the SNPNs broadcasting ‘extCH-Supported’ and/or ‘onboardingEnabled’, should be included in the gins-PerSNPN-List.

There is a proposal that gins-PerSNPN is absent when the cell only supports a single SNPN:

Proposal 2.2: If there is only a single SNPN identifier in the CellAccessRelatedInfo then gins-PerSNPN should not be present as all GINs are associated with that SNPN.

**Question 2.1: Do you agree that the field ‘supportedGINs’ being absent for an SNPN indicates that a given SNPN does not support any GIN?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary**: TBD.

**Question 2.2: Do you agree with proposal 2a of R2-2203264 if a SNPN in SIB1 has no associated GIN is absent (see Q2.1)?**

- Introduce a new bitmap, in SIBxy, representing a subset of SNPNs in SIB1, where each bit corresponds to each SNPN in SIB1 and indicates whether the corresponding SNPN has at least one GIN in the GIN list in SIBxy.

- The field gins-PerSNPN-r17 has the same number of entries as the length of the new bitmap, and n-th entry in ginsPerSNPN-r17 corresponds to n-th SNPN indicated by the new bitmap.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Intel | No | We do not see the need of this enhancement |
| Qualcomm | No | Option 2 in the paper is too complicated at this stage. We probably don’t need a Choice between “empty” and Bitstring, as argued in the paper, but it would be good to confirm. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary**: TBD.

**Question 2.3: Do you agree that in ginsPerSNPN-List only the SNPNs that support either extCH or onboarding or both are listed?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Intel | Yes | This maybe a worthwhile optimisation if majority prefer. |
| Qualcomm | Maybe | It can be easier to signal an empty container for the SNPN without any GIN support. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary:** TBD.

**Question 2.4: Do you agree that gins-PerSNPN is absent when the cell only supports a single SNPN (Proposal 2.2 of R2-2203075)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | It saves signalling so fine. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary**: TBD.

## 3.3 IDLE/INACTIVE mode related proposals

The following proposals were submitted in this area:

R2-2202208 (OPPO)

Proposal 3: Define a separate acceptable cell definition for SNPN.

R2-2202898 (ZTE Corporation, Sanechips)

Proposal 3: The NAS shall indicate AS layer whether the AS need to read/report the GIN.

Proposal 4: The AS layer read the SIBxy for the GINs when the NAS layer indicated.

R2-2203447 (Ericsson)

Proposal 5 : RAN2 to wait for RAN3's resolution on whether there is a need to reconsider how the onboardingEnabled indication is used.

Rapporteur's view is that proposals of R2-2202208 and R2-2202898 can be accepted if other companies support them and there is no strong concern. As proposal 5 of R2-2203447 proposes only to wait for a potential LS, it does not require further discussion before RAN2 receives the LS.

**Question 3.1: Do you agree to define a separate acceptable cell definition for SNPN (Proposal 3 of R2-2202208)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Intel | No | We do not see the need of it |
| Qualcomm | No | These were discussed before; we shouldn’t spend more time. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary**: TBD.

**Question 3.2: Do you agree that the NAS shall indicate to AS layer whether the AS need to read/report the GINs and the AS layer only reads the SIBxy when it is indicated by the NAS (Proposal 3 and 4 of R2-2202898)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Intel | No | This can be left to UE implementation |
| Qualcomm | No | There are many similar AS-NAS interactions for other features. These are all UE internal and left to implementation.  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary**: TBD.

## 3.4 UE capability related proposals

The draft running CR in R2-2202636 is based on the following agreements from RAN2#116bis:

* No UE AS capability signalling is needed for CH and onboarding.
* No CH and onboarding AS capabilities without capability signalling needs to be specified in TS38.306
* There is no need to specify UE AS capability signalling for CGI reporting for CH and onboarding
* No UE AS capability signalling is needed for IMS emergency services.
* The existing conditional mandatory without capability signalling for IMS emergency call can be reused for IMS emergency call for UE in SNPN access mode. Add the following to the existing capability: “It is mandatory to support IMS emergency call over SNPN for UEs that are IMS voice capable over SNPNs”

The following proposals were submitted in this area:

R2-2202896 (vivo)

Proposal 3: Modify the existing capability signaling for IMS emergency call to “It is mandatory to support IMS emergency call over PLMN for UEs which are IMS voice capable in NR”.

Proposal 4: Add the following to the existing capability for IMS emergency call: “For SNPN capable UE, it is mandatory to support IMS emergency call over SNPN for UEs that are IMS voice capable over SNPNs”.

R2-2203447 (Ericsson)

Proposal 4 : For voiceOverNR capability, clarify that IMS voice over NR includes SNPN if the UE is SNPN capable.

Rapporteur's understanding is that the proposals are intending to enhance the current running CR based on the agreements of the previous meeting.

**Question 4: Do you agree**

**a) Proposal 3 of R2-2202896 (**Modify the existing capability signaling for IMS emergency call to “It is mandatory to support IMS emergency call over PLMN for UEs which are IMS voice capable in NR”.**)?**

**b) Proposal 4 of R2-2202896 (**Add the following to the existing capability for IMS emergency call: “For SNPN capable UE, it is mandatory to support IMS emergency call over SNPN for UEs that are IMS voice capable over SNPNs”.**)?**

**c) Proposal 4 of R2-2203447 (**For voiceOverNR capability, clarify that IMS voice over NR includes SNPN if the UE is SNPN capable.**)?**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | a) | b) | c) | Comments |
| Intel | Y | Maybe | Y | The addition in b) w.r.t last meeting agreement (“It is mandatory to support IMS emergency call over SNPN for UEs that are IMS voice capable over SNPNs”) is probably not that essential, but can accept if majority think it is needed.We are fine with c) as UE can only access SNPN or PLMN at any one time and hence the capability can be reused. |
| Qualcomm | Y | Y | Y | Either b or c is fine. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Summary**: TBD.

## 3.5 Other proposals

The following other proposals were submitted

R2-2202832 (China Telecom)

Proposal 2: RAN2 correct the typo of gin-per-SNPN list and recommend to use “gins-PerSNPNList”.

R2-2202889 (Huawei, HiSilicon)

Proposal 3: Use separate bitmaps for extCH and onboarding in SIBYX.

R2-2203264 (LG Electronics Inc)

Proposal 4: RAN2 to discuss allowing early implementation of emergency services support in SNPN by Rel-16 UEs capable of IMS voice in SNPN.

Rapporteur's view on Proposal 2 of R2-2202832 is that it should be corrected in the next version of the draft CR, no need to discuss it. The views on the other proposals are to be discussed.

**Question 5.1: Do you agree with Proposal 3 of R2-2202889 (**Use separate bitmaps for extCH and onboarding in SIBYX**)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Intel | No | We have discussed this in past meeting and it is our understanding that GIN value is transparent to the AS. |
| Qualcomm | No | NAS can differentiate the two cases. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary**: TBD.

**Question 5.2: Do you agree a need to discuss of allowing early implementation of emergency services support in SNPN by Rel-16 UEs capable of IMS voice in SNPN (Proposal 4 of R2-2203264)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Intel | No | As long as NAS support it and UE is support voice over SNPN, everything should work as it is. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | This can help with early adoption of voice support in private networks. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary**: TBD.

## 3.6Other proposals

The rapporteur would like to check if there is any other issue that should be discussed to be able to complete the specification of this feature.

**Question 6: Do you see any other important issue that should be discussed before completing the feature?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Summary**: TBD.

# 4 Conclusion

TBD.