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# 1 Introduction

This paper provides summary of discussions at RAN#107bis-e on:

**CB: # 101\_Correction\_connected\_gNBs**

**- ASN.1 is “not wrong”™**

**- should align tabular to ASN.1? confirm**

**- need to indicate which PLMN ID to use?**

**- check details**

(Nok - moderator)

rev in [R3-202593](file:///C:\Users\w00364378\Downloads\Inbox\R3-202593.zip)

1847 rev in [R3-202594](file:///C:\Users\w00364378\Downloads\Inbox\R3-202594.zip)

# 2 For the Chairman’s Notes

No agreement

# 3 Discussion

**- should align tabular to ASN.1? confirm**

The revised CRs (2593 (Rel-15), 2594 (Rel-16)) align tabular to ASN.1 without any modification in the ASN.1. Please comment if you see any issue with this approach.

Company:

Huawei: this solution requires the MME to derive the Global en-gNB ID based on the *en-gNB ID* IE and the first PLMN Identity in the Supported TAs list for the en-gNB. How to guarantee that the first PLMN identity of the list is the one used in global en-gNB ID？

Ericsson: we only see a necessity to align tabular and ASN.1, not more. Especially no new semantics.

**- need to indicate which PLMN ID to use?**

In the revised CRs, we have added semantics description indicating which PLMN ID to use. Please comment if you see any issue.

Company:

Huawei: same concern as above.

Ericsson: we prefer to not have any semantics. We can continue discussions on RAN sharing for EN-DC and say something in stage 2.

Nokia: we need semantics in S1AP. If there is none, the MME might consider the routing table for the en-gNB should be constructed based on en-gNB ID, and not on Global en-gNB ID (so no PLMN information should be used).

Ericsson in response: Given the current structure in S1AP, we do not see the technical justification to change the protocol, as, already stated in the online session, such approach works and “is not wrong”. And if nothing is “wrong”, nothing needs to be corrected.

**- check details**

Please comment if you see any issue.

Company:

Huawei: not know if it is aggregable to have a NBC change, i.e. to fix the tabular and asn.1 by using global en-gNB id directly.

Ericsson: no NBC change necessary, as explained on-line. ASN.1 is as we should have done all the time, would have spared us much headache.

Nokia: Agree with HW, it seems better to fix the tabular and asn.1 by using global en-gNB id directly.

Ericsson in response: this would be the first time we go for a NBC change, although no correction is needed. I do not think we should create such precedent.