**SA2#146 MBS CC#2 Meeting Minutes**

**Time**: 2021/08/11

**Participants**: Judy, Robbie, Paul, Shabnam (Ercisson); Laeyoung, Myungjune (LGE); youngkyo, David (Samsung); Xiaoyan (CATT); Fei (OPPO); Chunshan (Tencent); Zhendong (ZTE); Fenqin (Huawei); and many other colleagues…

The slides for discussion was uploaded before the meeting start:

<https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_sa/WG2_Arch/TSGS2_146E_Electronic_2021-08/INBOX/DRAFTS/5MBS/CC%232>

**On documentation of 501/502/503**

Judy asked for the reason that why we have to change 501/502/503.

LiMeng responded that we can firstly focus on the technical parts and once we get the stable idea then we can further considering the revision of the 501/502/503.

**On the Topics to be checked**

Judy also pointed out that User plane management and PCC were worthwhile to be discussed.

LiMeng agreed that and would include those topics later on.

**Topic #1: NF services for SMF/AMF/MB-SMF:**

Judy asked to considered the services from the whole end-to-end procedures point of view. And Judy presented S2-2105636.

Fenqin and Zhendong had different ideas on the services between MB-SMF and AMF mentioned in S2-2105636. The comments included using MB-SMF notification service operation by AMF may cause extra signallings compared with using new AMF service operation. People agreed to have further consideration on the services used for the interactions between MB-SMF and AMF.

Zhendong (or Xiaoyan?) suggested to extend “Namf\_MTMulticast\_EnableReachability” to “Namf\_MTGroup\_EnableReachability” for a more general purpose. Seems people were fine with the proposal.

It seems that people were fine with the following proposal:

*i. Among MBS session activation, deactivation, update procedures, for the interactions between MB-SMF and SMF, they are using same service operations*

*ii. Among MBS session activation, deactivation, update procedures, for the interactions between MB-SMF and AMF , they are using same service operations*

*iii. For session activation:*

*1. step 2, uses MB-SMF service operation that MB-SMF notifies SMF.*

*2. Step 3,4: use AMF service,*

*3. Step 11 FFS.*

**Topic#2: shared tunnel establishment**:

* This part was skipped.

**Topic#3: Session activation/deactivation:**

* S2-2105650 from Ericsson:
  + Judy pointed out that it might not be possible for the AMF to find the SMF handling associating PDU Session after receiving Service request in session activation.
  + Fenqin and Zhendong commented that providing PDU session ID list might not be necessary.
* S2-2106334 from vivo:
  + This document was skipped.
* S2-2106121 from Huawei:
  + Fenqin clarified that the motivation of this document was: we remove QoS flow in deactivation, thus we need to consider how to recover that in activation procedure.
  + Judy asked for clarification that whether N1 message needs to be provided to the UE during deactivation procedure, Fenqin responded that N1 was not needed, only N2 would be provided to the RAN.
  + On the N2 message sent by AMF during activation procedure (step 9 in figure 7.2.5.2-1), Zhendong and Judy asked that for the feasibility when UE is camping on the non-supporting NG-RAN node.
  + Judy and Zhendong asked the exact use case that was missing in the original procedure, Fenqin would further clarify the case later offline.
* S2-2105893 from Samsung:
  + People commented that it might be better for the AMF arranges the paging.
  + Xiaoyan commented that the document from CATT (i.e., S2-2105916) cover the case (AMF paging clarification).
  + Youngkyo and Xiaoyan will offline check the way forward.