**Quick Mintues for the FS\_eUEPO CC**

**Attendees**: Intel (Organizer), China Telecom, OPPO, Ericsson, AT&T, vivo, LGE, Samsung, Google, InterDigital, DT, KDDI, Huawei, FirstNet, Nokia, Sony, CATT, Meta, China Unicom, NEC, Xiaomi, Vodafone, Orange

# 1. Way Forward for KI#1 (URSP in VPLMN)

## 1.1 How to identify the VPLMN specific URSP to UE (Slide#3)

VPLMN ID in RSD as RSVC (Route Selection Validation Criteria)

* Sol#2 (Lenovo), Sol#4 (Huawei), Sol#29 (InterDigital)
* How many VPLMN IDs need to be included in the URSP rules? How many URSP rules need to include the VPLMN ID?
* What about the URSP evaluation efficiency in UE?

Quick notes: InterDigital clarified the above questions. OPPO expressed concern.

VPLMN ID in TD:

* + - Sol#3\_Option#1 (vivo)

Quick notes: Nokia, Ericsson, Huawei expressed concerns on Sol#3\_Option#1.

VPLMN ID along with PSI:

* + - Sol#6 (Qualcomm)

Quick notes: It was commented to resolve the EN in Sol#6. OPPO supports Sol#6.

No impact to URSP and UE:

* + - Sol#1 (Nokia), Sol#3\_Option#2 (vivo), Sol#5 (LGE)

Quick notes: Above solutions were supported by Nokia and Ericsson. Huawei and InterDigital expressed concerns with above solutions.

## 1.2 Which PLMN determines the URSP for VPLMN

Huawei, AT&T, Nokia, Orange, Qualcomm, Intel, Vodafone expressed support on HPLMN determining URSP.

Ericsson, Samsung, NEC expressed support on VPLMN determining its own URSP with authorization control in HPLMN.

# 2. Way Forward for KI#2

## 2.1 UE reporting assistance (Slide#4)

In general, OPPO, Nokia don’t want to introduce new parameter into URSP for reporting purpose.

Nokia expressed support for Sol#11 (URSP enforcement result in UCU).

Huawei and OPPO proposed to categorize the solutions with two categories first based on the URSP enforcement results of positive or negative.

## 2.2 5GC verification (Slide#5)

Huawei commented that Sol#12 and Sol#32 also proposed some UP based traffic detection.

In general, no company had concern with either CP only based verification or CP+UP based verification. It seems CP+UP based verification can be used as way forward. But this aspect has dependency on the conclusion of UE reporting assistance.

Rapporteur asked Huawei and Samsung to hold the pen for drafting a way forward proposal for this key issue by involving the interested parties.

# 3. Way Forward proposal for KI#3

Due to time limitation, this key issue was skipped. Intel and Ericsson will work offline to figure the way forward on the ePCO based solution.

# 4. Way Forward for KI#4 (Slide#8)

OPPO expressed support on Sol#21 and 35.

Huawei commented that Sol#21 and 25 would also require some stage 2 work.

Nokia commented that they support Sol#35, but can also accept new Traffic Categories in TD of a URSP.

Vodafone expressed concern on Sol#25.

AT&T expressed concern with leaving the Traffic Categories determination to UE implementation for any solution on the table. Intel asked how AT&T would deal with the Sol#35 which has been approved in Rel-17 CT1 spec, AT&T asked clarification from Vodafone, but no clear answer was given online. Double check would be done by interested companies.

Need to further check whether Sol#35 is sufficient, otherwise a new Traffic Category component in the TD of URSP rule would be introduced. The controversy on how the UE determines the TC still remains, which would require further online work among the interested companies.