# 3GPP SA2 FS\_5MBS Conference call


## Date:

2020/08/06

## Convener:

LiMeng (rapporteur – Huawei)

## List of participants:



## Minutes

### 0. Architectural assumptions

##### 001: Converged architecture for 5MBS (Rapporteur).

Presented by LiMeng

**Discussion**

Better to rename the architecture, “5G MBS system architecture” could be fine.

David (Samsung): On the role of MBSF, if go with the first sentence of NOTE Y, then it is option #1, not combined.

Miguel (Qualcomm): But without that it would be option #2.

Jianhua (OPPO): If we agree on this document, how to deal with the current existing solutions?

LiMeng (Huawei): we can update the solutions since most of the solutions have ENs and they need to be updated anyway.

David: it would be better to first agree the commonalities of the table as the evaluation criteria.

Hans (Ericsson): What is the relationship between the solutions, and the description in the table? Will the solutions be determined once we figure out the description?

LiMeng: in the table we list both the commonalities and the specific aspects of each architectural options. Once we determine the solution, the description could be updated accordingly.

Fenqin (Huawei): having a combined architecture will be good for further discussion, e.g., solution can refer to the same architecture.

Shabnam (Ericsson): terminology may not be an issue.

Wanqiang (Huawei): If people agree the two architecture options have a lot of commonalities, then there should be no issue to have a converged architecture.

David: agree the benefit, on the architecture we can give it a try, but it would be hard.

**Proposed way forward**

Change the type of the document to a co-signed one, and work offline with active companies if any wording is acceptable.

##### 002 Merged architecture (CATT)

Presented by Duan, Xiaoyan

**Discussion**

Miguel: How to guarantee the compatibility of legacy MBMS? Since there is no xMB/MB2 interface mentioned here.

LiMeng: the interfaces between MB-SMF/SMF, MB-UPF/UPF are not mentioned.

David: on the 2nd figure, what it the relationship between unicast? The unicast means the unicast PDU session, or 5GC Individual MBS traffic delivery method?

Hans: reference point based architecture is good.

Wanqiang: Same concern as Miguel, xMB/MB2 issue.

Duan, Xiaoyan (CATT): See commonalities with 001.

**Proposed way forward**

Off line check with companies, if possible merge with HW’s proposal (001) to have a single architecture document submitted.

### 1. KI1 (session establishment and management) solutions

##### 101 Summary of feature list for 5MBS evaluation and conclusion (Vivo)

Presented by Zhenhua

**Discussion**

Zhendong (ZTE): Would like know the purpose of this document.

Zhenhua (vivo): Provide the criteria for evaluation and vivo will provide evaluation proposal for based on this analysis document.

**Way forward**

Update document and include the text proposal.

##### 102 Principles for Categorization of Solutions for KI1 (Huawei)

Presented by LiMeng

**Discussion**

Shabnam: It is assumed that rapporteur will send LS to RAN for their feedback on RAN-related issues.

Judy (Ericsson): UP-based join method is included, besides IPTV, is there any other use cases requiring UP-based join? For IPTV the Rel-16 method will be used.

Jeffrey (Juniper): UP based join should be supported. It should be a criteria for evaluation.

Miguel: CP should be mandatory, neutral on UP.

David: supporting UP should be separated from supporting IPTV.

Tuan (Broadpeak): Support UP-based join.

Fenqin: For some other cases, UP-based join is still needed.

Jeffrey: Object the requirement on app knowing TMGI.

**Way forward**

Update contribution to address above comments.

**103: Sol#3: Resolving the open issue(s) of sol.3 (Huawei)**

Presented by LiMeng

**Discussion**

(No instant received).

**Way forward**

Further offline talking is welcome.

**104: Sol#3: Resolving the open issue(s) of sol.3 related to UE leaves MBS (Huawei)**

Presented by Fenqin

**Discussion**

(No instant received).

**Way forward**

Further offline talking is welcome.

**105: Sol#16: Resolving ENs (CATT)**

Presented by Xiaoyan

**Discussion**

LiMeng: the main change proposal of this document is to clarify that the message could be MBS session specific as well, right?

Xiaoyan: For SMF, yes, for PCF, the unicast services would be reused.

**Way forward**

Further offline talking is welcome.

### 2. KI3 (Levels of authorization) solutions

##### 201 New solution (Juniper)

Presented by Jeffrey

**Discussion**

Fenqin: on step 4B, what is the meaning of IE “group”?

LiMeng: please clarify the wording “final result” in step 4C.

Hans: clarify ASP somewhere.

Lei (Tencent): ASP may not be able to differentiate UEs by using the IP address.

Fenqin: GPSI could be used as an alternative of IP address.

**Way forward**

Update document to address comments.

##### 202 Way forward of KI #3 (Huawei)

Presented by LiMeng

**Discussion**

(No instant received).

**Way forward**

Further offline talking is welcome.

### 4. Other documents

##### 401 Sol#17: Resolving ENs (CATT)

Presented by Duan, Xiaoyan

**Discussion**

Shabnam: AQP is mandatory?

Fenqin: on N4 rule, is there any specific aspect need to be addressed for multicast use case?

David: on source specific multicast, still not sure whether any enhancement need to be done for multicast on N4.

LiMeng: no need to mention Non-3GPP issue since it is already reflected in architecture assumption section.

**Way forward**

Consider the necessity of including AQP and update the document to address the comments.

## Unhandled documents

* **402**: Sol#18: Resolving ENs (CATT);
* **403**: Sol#31: Resolving ENs (CATT);
* New Solution-delivery mode switching within single RAN or dual RAN (SJTU)