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**Electronic meeting, 16-24 April 2020**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Meeting documents by agenda item  Meeting: Meeting #123-e  Electronic meeting  16 - 24 April 2020  **All indicated times are CEST** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cyan background means allocated but not available. | | | | | Yellow background means available but not yet treated document. | Green background means this document was agreed at a revious meeting in this plenary cycle. | | | | White background means that the document has been handled in the meeting and a decision has been made. |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Additional Colour coding for Tdocs in the 1st row | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Late Papers | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Easy and uncontroversial papers – can be presented within 2 minutes | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Papers for common sessions | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Low Priority | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |
| Agenda item | Agenda item title | | Tdoc | Title | | | Source | Spec | Result | |
|  | Opening & welcome | | Tdoc | Title | | | Source | Spec | Result | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | | **IPR Policy** Reminder to Individual Members and the persons making the technical proposals about their obligations under their respective Organizational Partners IPR Policy:    I draw your attention to your obligations under the 3GPP Partner Organizations' IPR policies. Every Individual Member organization is obliged to declare to the Partner Organization or Organizations of which it is a member any IPR owned by the Individual Member or any other organization which is or is likely to become essential to the work of 3GPP. | | | | | | | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | | **Antitrust & Competition** I also draw your attention to the fact that 3GPP acti ities are subject to all applicable antitrust and competition laws and that compliance with said laws is therefore required of any participant of this TSG/WG meeting including the Chairman and Vice Chairman. In case of question I recommend that you contact your legal counsel.  The leadership shall conduct the present meeting with impartiality and in the interests of 3GPP.  Furthermore, I would like to remind you that timely submission of work items in advance of TSG/WG meetings is important to allow for full and fair consideration of such matters. | | | | | | | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | | **Usage if WiFi**  During 3GPP meetings, IT support staff have noticed an increasing amount of RF pollution from private, ad hoc, wireless networks (Wi-Fi Direct, hot-spots hosted on mobile phones, …), and this gives rise to reduced throughput capability of the 3GPP WLAN. I would like to remind delegates to disable all such non-3GPP Wi-Fi networks while they are in the meeting rooms or adjacent areas. This will allow the quality of connection to the 3GPP Wi-Fi network which delegates have a right to expect. | | | | | | | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | | **Statement Regarding Engagement with Companies Added to the**  **U.S. Export Administration Regulations (EAR) Entity List in 3GPP Activities**  1. Public Information is Not Subject to EAR  3GPP is an open platform where all contributions (including technology protected or not by patent) made by the different Individual Members under the membership of each respective Organizational Partner are publicly available. Indeed, contributions by all and any Individual Members are uploaded to a public file server when received and then the documents are effectively in the public domain.  In addition, since membership of email distribution lists is open to all, documents and emails distributed by that means are considered to be publicly available.  As a result, information contained in 3GPP contributions, documents, and emails distributed at 3GPP meetings or by 3GPP email distribution lists, because it is made available to the public without restrictions upon its further dissemination, is not subject to the export restrictions of the EAR.  Meeting minutes are maintained for 3GPP meetings. Such meeting minutes for 3GPP meetings are made available to the public without restrictions upon its further dissemination. As a result, information, including information conveyed orally, contained in 3GPP meetings is not subject to the export restriction of the EAR; this would include information conveyed during side meetings that may occur during the main meetings, if these meetings are open to any participants and the results of all said meetings are publicly available without restrictions upon their further dissemination.  2. Non-Public Information  Non-public information refers to the information not contained or not intended to be contained in 3GPP contributions, documents or emails. Such non-public information may be disclosed during informal meetings, exchanges, discussions or any form of other communication outside the 3GPP meetings and email distribution lists, and may be subject to the EAR.  3. Other Information  Certain encryption software controlled under the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR), even if publicly available, may still be subject to US export controls other than the EAR.  4. Conduct of Meetings  The situation should be considered as "business as usual" during all the meetings called by 3GPP.  5. Responsibility of Individual Members  It should be remembered that contributions, meetings, exchanges, discussions or any form of other communication in or outside the 3GPP meetings are of the accountability, integrity and the responsibility of each Individual Member. In addition, Individual Members remain responsible for ensuring their compliance with all applicable export control regulations, including but not limited to EAR.  Individual Members with questions regarding the impact of laws and regulations on their participation in 3GPP should contact their companies’ legal counsels. | | | | | | | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | | Please remember:  - to perform the electronic registration before end-of-meeting  - to wear your badge | | | | | | | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Agenda & Reports | | Tdoc | Title | | | Source | Doctype | Result & comments | |
|  |  | | C1-202048 | 3GPP TSG CT1#123-e – agenda for Tdoc allocation | | | CT1 chairman | agenda | Noted  Revision of C1-202000 | |
|  |  | | C1-202001 | 3GPP TSG CT1#123-e – agenda after Tdoc allocation deadline | | | CT1 chairman | agenda | Noted | |
|  |  | | C1-202002 | 3GPP TSG CT1#123-e – agenda with proposed LS-actions | | | CT1 chairman | agenda | Noted | |
|  |  | | C1-202003 | 3GPP TSG CT1#123-e – agenda at start of meeting | | | CT1 chairman | agenda | Noted | |
|  |  | | C1-202004 | 3GPP TSG CT1#123-e – agenda Thursday (23rd April) evening | | | CT1 chairman | agenda | Noted | |
|  |  | | C1-202005 | 3GPP TSG CT1#123-e – agenda at end of meeting | | | CT1 chairman | agenda |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202006](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202006.zip) | draft C1-122e report | | | MCC | report | Noted | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  | Hightest number 2598 | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | | **Agenda**  Start of e-meeting: Thursday 16th April 09:00 CEST  Comment Free Time Thursday 23rd April 12:00-16:00 CEST  Last revision upload: Thursday 23th April 16:00 CEST  Last comments: Friday 24th April 16:00 CEST  Chairman’s report of the meeting: Monday 27th April 12:00 CEST  1 Opening  2 Agenda and Reports  3 work organization  4 incoming LS  **Rel-15:**  15.1.1 all work items ()  15.1.2 all work items (2)  15.1.3 all work items (11+3)  **Rel-16:**    **Agenda Items from 16.2**  16.2.2 SINE\_5G (1)  16.2.3 SAES16 (all aspects) (5)  16.2.4 5GProtoc16 (all aspects) (104)  16.2.5 ATSSS (19)  16.2.6 eNS (44)  16.2.7.x vertical-LAN (74)  16.2.8 5G\_CIoT (41)  16.2.9 5WWC (12)  16.2.11 5G\_eLCS (2)  16.2.14 RACS (1)  16.2.15 5G\_SRVCC (3)  16.2.16 xBDT (0)  16.2.17 IAB-CT (0)  16.2.18 5GS\_OTAF (0)  16.2.19 5G\_URLLC (0)  16.2.21 Rel-16 non-IMS issues (27)  16.2.1 ePWS (1)  16.2.10 PARLOS (3)  16.2.12 V2XAPP (18)  16.2.13 eV2XARC (50)  16.2.20 SEAL (44)  **Agenda Items from 16.3**  16.3.1 MCCI\_CT (1)  16.3.2 MCProtoc16 (14)  16.3.5 MCSMI\_CT (0)  16.3.6 eMCDATA2 (16)  16.3.10 MONASTERY2 (8)  16.3.12 enh2MCPTT-CT (0)  16.3.3 MuD (2)  16.3.4 IMSProtoc16 (1)  16.3.7 E2E\_DELAY (0)  16.3.8 VBCLTE (0)  16.3.11 eIMS5G\_SBA (2)  16.3.13 eIMSVideo (3)  16.3.14 IMS/MC TEI16 (8)  18 outgoing LS | | | | | | | |
|  |  | |  | | | | | | | |
|  | Work organisation | | Tdoc | Title | | | Source | To / CC | Result & comments | |
|  | Meeting schedule | |  |  | | | | | | |
|  |  | |  | CT1 and CT plenary meeting dates. | | | | | | |
|  |  | |  | Date | | | Meeting | | Venue | |
|  |  | |  | *13 – 17 January* | | | [*CT1-Potential Ad-Hoc*](https://portal.etsi.org/webapp/MeetingCalendar/MeetingDetails.asp?m_id=36254) | | *cancelled* | |
|  |  | |  | 16 – 22 January | | | CT1#121bis-e | | Electronic Meeting | |
|  |  | |  | *24 – 28 February* | | | *CT1#122* | | *cancelled* | |
|  |  | |  | 20 – 28 February | | | CT1#122-e | | Electronic Meeting | |
|  |  | |  | 16 – 17 March 2020 | | | CT plenary #87 | | Electronic Meeting | |
|  |  | |  | *20 – 24 April* | | | *CT1#123* | | *Cancelled* | |
|  |  | |  | 16 – 24 April | | | CT1#123-e | | Electronic Meeting | |
|  |  | |  | *25 – 29 May* | | | *CT1#124* | | *F2fF cancelled* | |
|  |  | |  | 02 – 10 June | | | CT1#124-e | | Electronic Meeting | |
|  |  | |  | 29 June – 1 July. 2020 | | | CT plenary #88-e | | Electronic Meeting | |
|  |  | |  | *13 – 17 July* | | | [*CT1-Potential Ad-Hoc*](https://portal.etsi.org/webapp/MeetingCalendar/MeetingDetails.asp?m_id=36254) | | *cancelled* | |
|  |  | |  | 24 – 28 August | | | CT1#125 | | US | |
|  |  | |  | 14 – 15 September 2020 | | | CT plenary #89 | | Funchal, Madeira | |
|  |  | |  | 12 – 16 October | | | CT1#126 | | India | |
|  |  | |  | 16 – 20 November | | | CT1#127 | | US | |
|  |  | |  | 7 – 8 December 2020 | | | CT plenary #90 | | NAF | |
|  |  | |  | 25 – 29 January 2021 | | | CT1#127bis | | tbd | |
|  |  | |  | 01- 05 March 2021 | | | CT1#128 | | tbd | |
|  |  | |  | 22 – 23 March 2021 | | | CT plenary #91 | | US | |
|  |  | |  | 19 – 23 April 2021 | | | CT1#129 | | tbd | |
|  |  | |  | 24 – 28 May 2021 | | | CT1#130 | | tbd | |
|  |  | |  | 14 – 15 June 2021 | | | CT plenary #92 | | Japan | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  | |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  | |  | |
|  | Work Plan and other adm. issues | | Tdoc | Title | | | Source | Spec / doctype | Result & comments | |
|  |  | | [C1-202007](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202007.zip) | CT1#123-e Electronic Meeting – Process and Scope | | | CT1 chairman | other | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-202051](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202051.zip) | work plan | | | MCC | Work Plan | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-202055](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202055.zip) | Decision making during CT1#123e – electronic show of hands | | | CT1 chairman | other | Noted | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Input Liaison statements | | Tdoc | Title | | | Source | To / CC | Result & comments | |
|  |  | | [C1-202033](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202033.zip) | Specification of NAS COUNT for 5G (FSAG Doc 78\_002) | | | GSMA FSAG | To | Noted  Related CR in C1-202089 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202034](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202034.zip) | Mandatory User Plane Integrity for 5G (FSAG Doc 79\_002) | | | GSMA FSAG | To | Noted  Wait for SA to conclude | |
|  |  | | [C1-202035](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202035.zip) | LS Reply on QoS mapping procedure for FLUS (C3-201460) | | | CT3 | Cc | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-202036](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202036.zip) | LS on Proposal to transfer the study on service-based support for SMS in 5GC to CT WGs (CP-193301) | | | TSG CT | Cc | Postponed  Rel-17 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202037](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202037.zip) | LS on MO exception data (C4-201003) | | | CT4 | Cc | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-202038](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202038.zip) | SMS and UDM (C4-201045) | | | CT4 | To | Noted  Wait on next steps from SA2 on 23.501 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202039](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202039.zip) | LS on the Usage of Version ID (C4-2011218) | | | CT4 | Cc | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-202040](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202040.zip) | Reply LS on Further clarifications on GLI/GCI and Line ID/ HFC\_Identifier (C4-201220) | | | CT4 | Cc | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-202041](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202041.zip) | LS on subscribe/notify for 5G Steering of Roaming (C4-201221) | | | CT4 | To | Proposed tbd  Reply LS in C1-202067 and C1-202151  Related CRs in C1-202068, C1-202069, C1-202152 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202042](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202042.zip) | Clarification on encryption requirements for AGF interfaces (N1, N2, N3) [WWC] (LIAISE-382) | | | Broadband Forum | To | Noted  No action required from CT1 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202043](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202043.zip) | LS on RRC establishment cause value in EPS voice fallback from NR to E-UTRAN (R2-1916530) | | | RAN2 | To | Noted  Related CR C1-202269 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202044](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202044.zip) | Reply LS on Rel-16 NB-IoT enhancements (R2-2001815) | | | RAN2 | To | Noted  CT1 questions on values for UE specific DRX cycle in NB-IoT in C1-201024 are not answered, no consensus in RAN2  Related with incoming LS in C1-202049  Related CRs in [C1-202084](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/Docs/C1-202084.zip) and [C1-202384](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/Docs/C1-202384.zip) | |
|  |  | | [C1-202045](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202045.zip) | LS on Manual CAG ID selection and granularity of UAC parameters for PNI-NPNs (R2-2002417) | | | RAN2 | To | Proposed Noted  Reply LS in C1-202012, C1-202103, C1-202180, C1-202240, C1-202359  Disc paper C1-202102, C1-202239, C1-202493, C1-202499,  Related CR C1-202397, C1-202015 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202047](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202047.zip) | Reply LS on assistance indication for WUS (R3-201397) | | | RAN3 | Cc | Noted  Related with incoming LS in [C1-202058](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/Docs/C1-202058.zip) | |
|  |  | | [C1-202049](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202049.zip) | Reply LS on Rel-16 NB-IoT enhancements (R3-201417) | | | RAN3 | To | Noted  Related with incoming LS in C1-202044  Related CRs in [C1-202084](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/Docs/C1-202084.zip) and [C1-202384](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/Docs/C1-202384.zip) | |
|  |  | | [C1-202050](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202050.zip) | LS on Questions on onboarding requirements (S1-201087) | | | SA1 | Cc | Postponed  Rel-17 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202052](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202052.zip) | LS on PLMN selection solutions for satellite access (S2-1912551) | | | SA2 | To | Postponed  Rel-17 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202053](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202053.zip) | Reply LS on clarification on the requirement for steering of roaming (S2-1912764) | | | SA2 | To | Noted  CR in CP-200094 already approved in last plenary | |
|  |  | | [C1-202054](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202054.zip) | Reply LS on Dual-registration requirements for EHPLMNs (S2-2001130) | | | SA2 | To | Proposed tbd  related CR in C1-202136  Is a reply LS available? | |
|  |  | | [C1-202056](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202056.zip) | LS on GSMA NG.116 Attribute Area of service and impact on PLMN selection (S2-2001726) | | | SA2 | To | Postponed  Rel-17  Related with incoming LS in [C1-202065](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/Docs/C1-202065.zip) | |
|  |  | | [C1-202057](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202057.zip) | Questions on onboarding requirements (S2-2001729) | | | SA2 | Cc | Postponed  Rel-17 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202058](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202058.zip) | Reply LS on assistance indication for WUS (S2-2001732) | | | SA2 | To | Noted  Related with incoming LS in [C1-202047](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/Docs/C1-202047.zip)  CRs in C1-202466 and C1-202467 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202059](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202059.zip) | Reply LS on IANA assigned values for mission critical (S3-194603) | | | SA3 | To | Postponed  Reply LS needed, seems not available | |
|  |  | | [C1-202060](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202060.zip) | Reply LS to LS on native 5G NAS security context activation (S3-200529) | | | SA3 | To | Noted  CR in C1-202594 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202061](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202061.zip) | Reply on QoE Measurement Collection (S4-200241) | | | SA4 | To | Postponed  Are CRs available?  Reply LS needed, seems not availalble | |
|  |  | | [C1-202062](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202062.zip) | LS on RTP/RTCP Verification (S4-200340) | | | SA4 | To | Postponed  Reply LS needed, seems not available | |
|  |  | | [C1-202063](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202063.zip) | Reply LS to Transfer the study on service-based support for SMS in 5GC to CT WGs (SP-191362) | | | TSG SA | To | Postponed  Rel-17 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202064](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202064.zip) | Reply LS on support for eCall over NR (SP-200287) | | | TSG SA | To | Noted  CRs available in C1-202081 and C1-202358 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202065](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202065.zip) | LS reply to SA2 on PLMN Selection (5GJA12\_115r3) | | | GSMA 5G Joint-Activity (5GJA) | To | Postponed  Rel-17  Related with Incoming LS in [C1-202056](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/Docs/C1-202056.zip)  No action from CT1 required | |
|  |  | | [C1-202591](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/Docs/C1-202591.zip) | Reply LS on QoS mapping procedure (S4-200690) | | | SA4 |  | Noted  Wait for CT3 to clarify "a=3gpp-qos-hint" usage  Do we have CRs or DISC paper to the meeting? | |
|  |  | | C1-202597 | LS on Concurrent Broadcasting for CMAS (R3-197749) | | | RAN3 | To | Noted  Reply LS in C1-202232 and C1-202564  Disc paper in C1-202231 and C1-202565  Revision of C1-202046  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  2046 had incomplete tdoc number on the cover sheet | |
|  |  | | C1-202602 | LS on status of 5WWC work (LIAISE-390) | | | Broadband Forum |  | Postponed | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | void | |  |  | | |  |  | Release 5 is closed | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | void | |  |  | | |  |  | Release 6 is closed | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | void | |  |  | | |  |  | Release 7 is closed | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 8  work items | | Tdoc | **NOT PART OF THIS MEETING** | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 9  work items | | Tdoc | **NOT PART OF THIS MEETING** | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 10  work items | | Tdoc | **NOT PART OF THIS MEETING** | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 11  work items | | Tdoc | **NOT PART OF THIS MEETING** | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 12  work items | | Tdoc | **NOT PART OF THIS MEETING** | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 13  work items | | Tdoc | **NOT PART OF THIS MEETING** | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 14  work items | | Tdoc | **NOT PART OF THIS MEETING** | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 15  work items | | Tdoc | Title | | | Source | Tdoc info | Result & comments | |
|  | Rel-15 Mission Critical work items and issues:  eMCVideo-CT  eMCDATA-CT  enhMCPTT-CT  MCProtoc15  MONASTERY  MBMS\_MCservices | |  | Jörgen | | |  |  | All work items complete  Enhancements to Mission Critical Video – CT aspects  Enhancements for Mission Critical Data – CT aspects  Enhancements for Mission Critical Push-to-Talk – CT aspects  Protocol enhancements for Mission Critical Services sion Critical Push-to-Talk – CT aspects  Mobile Communication System for Railways  MBMS usage for mission critical communication services | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Rel-15 IMS work items and issues  5GS\_Ph1-IMSo5G  eCNAM-CT  FS\_PC\_VBC (CT3)  IMSProtoc9  bSRVCC\_MT  eSPECTRE  PC\_VBC (CT3)  TEI15 (IMS) | |  | Jörgen | | |  |  | All work items complete  IMS impact due to 5GS IP-CAN  CT aspects of Enhanced Calling Name Service  Study on Policy and Charging for Volume Based Charging  IMS Stage-3 IETF Protocol Alignment for Rel-15  SRVCC for terminating call in pre-alerting phase  Enhancements to Call spoofing functionality Policy and Charging for Volume Based Charging | |
|  |  | | [C1-202584](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202584.zip) | Reference update for PASSporT Extension for Diverted Calls | | | Orange / Mariusz | CR 6416 24.229 Rel-15 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202585](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202585.zip) | Reference update for PASSporT Extension for Diverted Calls | | | Orange / Mariusz | CR 6417 24.229 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Rel-15 non-IMS/non-MC work items and issues  5GS\_Ph1-CT EDCE5-CT ProSe\_WLAN\_DD\_Stage3 VoWLAN-CT PS\_DATA\_OFF2-CT LTE\_LIGHT\_CON-CT AT\_CIoT-Ext SAES6 INOBEAR-CT TEI15 | |  | Peter | | |  |  | All work items complete  CT aspects on 5G System - Phase 1  EPC enhancements to support 5G New Radio via Dual Connectivity Inclusion of WLAN direct discovery technologies as an alternative for ProSe direct discovery Complementary Features for Voice services over WLAN PS Data Off Phase 2 CT aspects of signalling reduction to enable light connection for LTE AT Commands for CIoT-Ext Stage-3 SAE Protocol Development for Rel-15 Increasing the number of EPS bearers Other Rel-15 non-IMS topics | |
|  |  | | [C1-202032](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202032.zip) | Remove the duplicated cause value for announce request procedure not accepted by the ProSe Function | | | CATT | CR 0328 24.334 Rel-15 | Current Status: Postponed  Frederic, Thu, 11:06  Coversheet, category wrong, source to TSG wrong  Lena, Thu, 16:41  Either start the change from Rel-13 or Rel-16 only  Sung, THU, 16:13  No FASMO  Bao, Thu, 19:07  Answering Frederic  Answering Sung  Answering Lena  Sung, Thu, 19:23  Explaining this is not FASMO  Bao, Thu, 19:37  Is open for other delegates opnions  Lena, Thu, 22:35  Prefers TEI16, i.e. only Rel-16  Christian, Fri, 15:02  CAT D, to go to Rel-16 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202096](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202096.zip) | Correct EPS SRVCC support indication when registering with 5GS | | | BlackBerry Uk Ltd. | CR 1642 24.501 Rel-15 | Withdrawn  Following ConfCall  Revision of C1-198013  Alternative to C1-202133 (is Rel-16 only)  Ivo, Thu, 11:52  need to impact UEs and 5GS core network entities with EPS SRVCC aspects  CR requires a UE not support a feature to perform an action related to the feature - not a good approach.  no need of the CR, there is another alternative  Lena, Thu, 16:41  This is not FASMO  For Rel-16 prefers C1-202133  Ivo, Tue, 00:55  No need to impact ue and 5gs CN, no need for the CR  Oppo, Tue, 04:09  Not needed | |
|  |  | | [C1-202097](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202097.zip) | Correct EPS SRVCC support indication when registering with 5GS | | | BlackBerry Uk Ltd. | CR 1643 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Following ConfCall  Revision of C1-198014  Alternative to C1-202133 (is Rel-16 only)  Ivo, Thu, 11:53  Same comments as for 2096  Lena, Thu, 16:41  prefer Ericsson’s competing proposal without UE impact in C1-202133.  John-Luc, Mon, 18:49  SA2 will follow stage-3 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202227](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202227.zip) | Adding Unstructured type(non-IP) to encoding of UE policy part type URSP(R15) | | | China Telecom Corporation Ltd. | CR 0074 24.526 Rel-15 | Current Status Postponed  Ivo, Thu, 11:58  No FASMO  not clear why the traffic descriptor component value field needs to contain two values  Lena, Thu, 16:41  Not needed.  Roozbeh, Fri, 22:45  CR is incorrect | |
|  |  | | [C1-202231](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202231.zip) | CWMI use in PWS | | | Ericsson / Mikael | discussion Rel-15 | Noted  Lazaros, Thu, 15:01  Ok with the DISC in principle, needs clarification on one case  Mikael, Mon, 11:14  Acks Lazaros, a Note can be needed, which release to start with | |
|  |  | | [C1-202360](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202360.zip) | Remove SUPI in the form of NSI from stage 2(in R15) | | | China Telecom / Michelle | CR 2127 24.501 Rel-15 | Current Status Postponed  Ivo, Thu, 11:53  Not essential, not aligned with stage-2  Lena, Thu, 16:41  Not aligned with stage-2  Can not agree with the CR  Sung, Thu, 16:49  Not FASMO, objects  Christian, Fri, 16:12  Comments, no need to update NAS spec  Michelle, Tue, 17:08  Q for clarification | |
|  |  | | [C1-202361](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202361.zip) | Remove SUPI in the form of NSI from stage 2(in R15) | | | China Telecommunications | CR 0127 24.502 Rel-15 | Ivo, Thu, 11:53  not aligned with 23.501 Rel-15 which enables NSI as a SUPI type  Lena, Thu, 16:41  Not aligned with stage-2  Can not agree with the CR  Sung, Thu, 16:51  NSI is valid option in Rel-16, object the CR  Christian, Fri, 16:12  Comments, no need to update NAS spec | |
|  |  | | [C1-202507](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202507.zip) | Registration at PLMN change at PLMN-SEARCH substate | | | MediaTek Inc. | CR 2189 24.501 Rel-15 | Postponed  Kaj, Thu, 14:32  Questionable that this is essential, would need rewording  Sung, Thu, 17:03  This is not FASMO  Osamah, Thu, 19:06  do not think this is FASMO to be included in Rel15 spec  Christian, Fri, 15:41  is not of FASMO nature. Hence, we cannot agree to roll back to Rel-15  Marko, Mon, 12:04  Explaining, main reason is RAN5 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202561](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202561.zip) | handling of ePWS message | | | Samsung/ Kyungjoo Grace Suh | CR 0216 23.041 Rel-15 | Not pursued  Based on email form Grace  Frederic, Thu, 11:37  ePWS is a Rel-16 work item, use “Rel-15” instead of “Rel 15”, 2563 seems a mirror so has to be in same agenda item  Lena, Thu, 16:41  Rel-15 CR under Rel-16 work item, title is about ePWS, but CR is about concurrent warning message, text adds no value  Grace, Fri, 14:00  Still needs to decide whether to go to rel-15 or rel-16  Grace, Fri, 14:17  Will make a revision so that this is only Rel-16 change | |
|  |  | | [C1-202565](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202565.zip) | Discussion for concurrent broadcast for CMAS | | | Samsung/ Kyungjoo Grace Suh | discussion 23.041 Rel-15 | Noted | |
|  |  | | C1-202831 | Correct N3AN node selection due to LI | | | BlackBerry Uk Ltd. | CR 0119 24.502 Rel-15 | Revision of C1-202672  Amer, Fri, 07:00  This is not a FASMO, not agree  John-Luc, Fri,  Not agreeing  --------------------------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-202092  Amer, Wed, 06:46  Maintains his position, not correcting a FASMO  Ivo, Wed, 12:10  Having comments  John-Luc, Wed, 16:14  Explaining Ivo  John-Luc, Wed, 20:28  Rev  Ivo, Wed, 23:28  Suggest rewording  Lazaros, 00:41  Open aspect  John-Luc, THi, 00:47  Fine to remove problem that Lazaros mentioned  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Frederic, Thu, 09:08  Clauses affected missing  Ivo, Thu, 11:46  Seems not essential, some of the changes are not needed, some are incorrect  Joy, Thu, 11:49  Not all changes are FASMO, changes to 7.2.4.4.2 and 7.2.4.4.2 are OK to be kept  Amer, Thu, 19:33  This is not FASMO  John-Luc, Thu, 20:21  This is FASMO, bypassing LI for all visiting UEs  Roozbeh, Thu, 21:05  Requests a change  Christian, Fri, 15:02  Acknowledges there is a problem, number of comments on how to address this  Amer, Fri, 18:24  UE will follow the procedures in 24.302 to select ePDG.  John-Luc, Fri, 22:22  Uploads a rev to the inbox  Roozbeh, Fri, 22:24  Huge number of comments, not convinced it is FASMO  John-Luc, Fri, 22:36  To Roozbeh, hinting at this rev  Lazaros, Mon, 09:57  Two ways to solve this …  John-Luc, Mon, 17:45  Answering, providing a rev  Lazaros, Mon, 19:43  Withdraws one comment  Ivo, Tue, 00:50  Hints at errors in v3 and asking for CT4 status  John-Luc, Tue, 01:49  CT4 CR withdrand, discussin way forward | |
|  |  | | C1-202832 | Correct N3AN node selection due to LI | | | BlackBerry Uk Ltd. | CR 0120 24.502 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202673  Amer, Fri, 07:24  Maintains his position, **CR is not needed**  John-Luc, Friday  Not agreeing  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-202093  John-Luc, Wed, 20:28  rev  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 11:46  Some of the changes are not needed, some are incorrect  Joy, Thu, 11:49  Some of the changes are not needed  Amer, Thu, 19:38  changes proposed in the CR are not needed because…..  John-Luc, Thu, 20:28  Explains why this is needed, … UE supporting ePDG and N3IWF will not use relevant procedures in 24.302  Amer, Fri, 18:23  Not agreeing with  John-Luc, Fri, 19:32  Commenting to Amer  Lazaros, Fri, 19:49  Cr is NBC, many other comments  John-Luc, Fri, 20:19  Commenting to Lazaros  Roozbeh, Fri, 22:24  Huge number of comments,  John-Luc, Mon, 17:45  Answering, providing a rev | |
|  |  | | C1-202786 | Remove USE\_TRANSPORT\_MODE in response | | | ZTE / Joy | CR 0124 24.502 Rel-15 | Revision of C1-202291  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Christian, Fri, 15:22  Agrees this is an issue, cover sheet needs to be updated, wants to co-signe  Joy, Tue, 17:43  Asks Christian one aspect  Joy, Wed, 17:16  On backward comp approacheds | |
|  |  | | C1-202787 | Remove USE\_TRANSPORT\_MODE in response | | | ZTE / Joy | CR 0125 24.502 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202292  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Christian, Fri, 15:22  Agrees this is an issue, cover sheet needs to be updated, wants to co-signe  Joy, Tue, 17:43  Asks Christian one aspect | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 16  work items | | Tdoc | Title | | | Source | Tdoc info | Result & comments | |
|  | Tdocs on Work Items | |  |  | | |  |  | Papers related to Rel-16 Work Items | |
|  | Work Item Descriptions | |  | Peter - Main | | |  |  | New and revised Work Item Descritpions | |
|  |  | | [C1-202166](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202166.zip) | Revised WID on CT aspects of eV2XARC | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | WID revised Rel-16 | Revision of CP-200291  Rae, Wed, 11:10  Oppo to be added  Adding new co-signers in the next meeting | |
|  |  | | [C1-202570](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202570.zip) | Updated WID MONASTERY2 | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | WID revised Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | CRs and Discussion Documents related to new or revised Work Items | |  | Peter - Main | | |  |  | CRs and Disc papers related to new Work Items | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Status of other Work Items | |  | Peter - Main | | |  |  | Status information on other relevant Rel-16 Work Items | |
|  |  | | [C1-202424](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202424.zip) | 5G\_CIoT WI workplan | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Amer | Work Plan Rel-16 | Noted | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 16 documents for information | |  | Peter - Main | | |  |  | Miscellaneous documents provided for information | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | WIs for common and SAE/5G | |  |  | | |  |  | WIs mainly targeted for common sessions or the SAE/5G breakout | |
|  | ePWS | |  | Lena – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects of enhancements of Public Warning System | |
|  |  | | C1-202814 | handling of ePWS message | | | Samsung/ Kyungjoo Grace Suh | CR 0217 23.041 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202563  **To be shifted to TEI16**  Lena, Thu, 07:16  OK  Lazaros, thu, 08:35  Ok  Discussion ongoing, ban proposal on the cr fine for mikael and peterS  Grace accepting the proposal  Lazaros FIne  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision is | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | SINE\_5G | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | Signalling Improvements for Network Efficiency in 5GS  100% | |
|  |  | | [C1-202581](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202581.zip) | Handling of PDU session authentication | | | Samsung / Kyungjoo Grace Suh | CR 2210 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Ivo, Thu, 11:58  Normative text in NOTE, NOTE does not reflect normative behaviour  Frederic, Thu, 12:01  SHALL in a NOTE  Sung, Thu, 18:46  Echoes Ivo, disagrees with the idea of the Note  Amer, Thu, 19:43  Intent of CR seems ok, but revision is needed  Grace, Fri, 14:38  Acks | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | SAES16 WIs | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | Stage-3 SAE protocol pevelopment for Rel-16  100% | |
|  | SAES16 | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | General Stage-3 SAE protocol development | |
|  |  | | [C1-202519](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202519.zip) | Correction to Handling of #35 | | | MediaTek Inc. | CR 3369 24.301 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202127](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202127.zip) | Consistent usage of "tracking area updating procedure" | | | Samsung Electronics Polska | CR 3341 24.301 Rel-16 | Shifted from 16.2.21 | |
|  |  | | C1-202690 | Correction to Handling of #31 | | | MediaTek Inc. | CR 3368 24.301 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202517  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lin, Fri, 05:31  CR is ok but minor rewording needed | |
|  |  | | C1-202688 | Correction of EMM initiated TAU procedure in EMM-REGISTERED.ATTEMPTING-TO-UPDATE-MM | | | MediaTek Inc. | CR 3366 24.301 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202515  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ricky, Thu, 12:35  Ok with the intent, wants to see two bullets  Lin, Fri, 05:17  Prefers Ricky’s wording with some changes | |
|  |  | | C1-202689 | Correction to Handling of MO CSFB Emergency call in EMM-REGISTERED.ATTEMPTING-TO-UPDATE-MM | | | MediaTek Inc. | CR 3367 24.301 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202516  Lin, fine  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lin, Fri, 05:26  Questions, seems already covered in the spec  Behrouz, Sat, 00:48  WI Code should be “SAES16-CSFB” | |
|  |  | | C1-202824 | Error handling of precedence value conflict | | | MediaTek Inc. / JJ | CR 3372 24.301 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202542  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Osama, Thu, 00:12  Requests changes to the CR  Lin, Fri, 09:09  Agrees there is an issue, different proposal  JJ, Fri, 15:50  Acks the comments, provides rev  Osama, Fri, 22:34  Rev looks OK  Lin, Tue, 09:28  fine | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | SAES16-CSFB | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | Stage-3 SAE protocol development related to Circuit Switched Fall Back | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | SAES16-non3GPP | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | Stage-3 SAE protocol development related to non-3GPP access | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 5GProtoc16 WIs | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | Stage-3 5GS NAS protocol development for Rel-16 | |
|  | 5GProtoc16 | |  |  | | |  |  | General Stage-3 5GS NAS protocol development | |
|  |  | | [C1-202527](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202527.zip) | UE initiating service request over non-3GPP access after stopping T3346 | | | SHARP | CR 2201 24.501 Rel-16 | Merged into 2324  Based on request form author, Fri, 04:45  Joy, Thu, 11:53  Changes are covered by C1-202324, which is more complete  Amer, Thu, 19:54  Needs clarification, isn’t 24.501 already covering this?  Sung, Thu, 23:11  Should be merged with C1-202324  Yoko, Fri, 04:45  Fine to merge into revision of C1-202324 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202530](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202530.zip) | Discussion on S-NSSAI based congestion control | | | MediaTek Inc., Qualcomm Incoporated. / JJ | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  Fei, Thu, 12.15  UE solution only, prefers UE-QC1, no need to impact the network  Ivo, Thu, 12:47  Preference for UE-QC1  Sung, Fri, 00:54  Prefers UE-QC1, keep current behavior  Yudai, Fri, 07:03  prefer UE-QC1 and UE-CQ2 solutions  Jj, Fri, 07:52  Explaining things to Yudai  Lin, Sat, 07:11  Prefer MTK-1  Rae, Mon, 05:58  We prefer UE-MTK1  Yudai, Wed, 09:15  UE-QC1 solution or UE-CQ2  Yanchao, Wed, 12:44  prefer the UE-MTK1  Krisztian, THu  prefer UE-MTK1 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202534](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202534.zip) | Discussion on support of QoS rules/QoS flow descriptions with the length of two octets | | | MediaTek Inc. / JJ | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  Fei, Thu, 12:17  In general, we would support the idea that the indicator is sent when the UE is in the S1 mode. can also be sent in the Modify bearer response or the activate dedicated bearer context response message  Ivo, Thu, 12:48  Prefers alt-1 or alt-2, as alt-3 rquires additional message  Rae  Alt-2 is preferred since Alt-3 will cause additional signaling when UE moves to EPS.  Osama, Fri, 17:46  Alt-2  Sung, Fri, 18:32  Not convinced with the argument against Alt-1 in the Disc  JJ, Sat, 07:03  Answering Sung  Yanchao, Sat, 12:46  Question for clarification  Jj, Mon, 05:51  Explaining, MTK supports Alt-2  Vishnu, Tue, 08:46  Alt-2  STATUS  Alt#1 (1): Ericsson  Alt#2 (5): Ericsson, Oppo, Qualcomm, Huawei, MediaTek  Alt#3 (1): ZTE | |
|  |  | | [C1-202535](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202535.zip) | Indicate support of ePCO length of two octets parameter when establishing the PDU session – Alt#2 | | | MediaTek Inc. / JJ | CR 2204 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202536](file:///C:\\Users\\dems1ce9\\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\\3gpp\\cn1\\meetings\\123-e_electronic_0420\\docs\\C1-202536.zip) | Indicate support of ePCO length of two octets parameter in the bearer resource modification procedure – Alt#3 | | | MediaTek Inc. / JJ | CR 3371 24.301 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Based on request from Author, wed, 07:34 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202541](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202541.zip) | Correction to the URSP coding | | | MediaTek Inc., ZTE / JJ | CR 0068 24.526 Rel-16 | Postponed  Based on request from author, Wed, 12:51  Revision of C1-198970  Ivo, Thu 12:49  Long list of comments  Lena, Thu, 16:41  Some comments, some rewording  Roozbeh, Fri, 04:28  Capitization  JJ, Mon, 09:53  Providing rev  Lazaros, Mon, 13:28  Fine, but some changes needed  JJ, Mon, 13:37  Fine with Lazaros changes  Ivo, mon, 13.30  revision is non-backward compatible | |
|  |  | | C1-202016 | Manual CAG selection | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 0501 23.122 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Not available on time  Revision of C1-200732 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202017](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202017.zip) | Correction for SoR-AF | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 0481 23.122 Rel-16 | Revision of **C1ah-200189**  Ivo, Mon, 2017  Discusson on the correct rev counter  Mariusz, Mon, 15:07  Fine to keep it as is | |
|  |  | | [C1-202068](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202068.zip) | SoR in HPLMN after registration | | | Orange, Ericsson / Mariusz | CR 0508 23.122 Rel-16 | Releated CR in C1-202152 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202071](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202071.zip) | Reference correction in URSP encoding | | | Orange / Mariusz | CR 0071 24.526 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202074](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202074.zip) | Correction to figure | | | one2many B.V. | CR 0212 23.041 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202075](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202075.zip) | Corrections to references | | | one2many B.V. | CR 0213 23.041 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202089](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202089.zip) | Clarification of NAS COUNT handling in 5G | | | Vodafone GmbH | CR 2036 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Fei, Thu, 12:22  Does not agree with the proposal, for this specific SN value, we would prefer not to specify whether to increment the overflow count by one or not. I am thinking that the AMF should trigger the primary authentication procedure.  Yang, Thu, 13:22  Explains his handling of the overflow counter, and that AMF trigger the primary authentication is already in the spe  Marko, Fri, 09:34  Asking for calrificaiton  Fei, Tue, 13:26  fine | |
|  |  | | [C1-202101](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202101.zip) | Clarification on DL only match-all packet filter | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | CR 2037 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Agreed  Vishnu, Fri, 16:10  We don’t think this CR is needed  Lena, Tue, 01:44  Explaining that this has been seen in the field, clarification needed  Vishnu Tue, 14:50  Still not convinced  Lena, Tue, 16:25  Why not clarificying this?  Vishnu, Wed, 11:45  Can live with it, withdraws bjectin | |
|  |  | | [C1-202110](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202110.zip) | Adding Unstructured type(non-IP) to encoding of UE policy part type URSP | | | China Telecom Corporation Ltd. | CR 0072 24.526 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Ivo, Thu, 12:02  not clear why the traffic descriptor component value field needs to contain two values  Lena, Thu, 16:41  Not needed  Roozbeh, Thu 22:46  Not needed  Roozbeh, Sat, 05:49  Not needed, more arguments  Shuzhen, Mon, 11:08  Asking for some clarification  Roozbeh, Mon, 17:55  Nothing is needed  Lena, Tue, 05:51  Not needed | |
|  |  | | [C1-202128](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202128.zip) | Correction of the handling of timer TG | | | Apple, Qualcomm Incorporated, T-Mobile USA | CR 0513 23.122 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202129](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202129.zip) | Correction of the handling of 5GMM cause #27 | | | Apple, Qualcomm Incorporated, T-Mobile USA | CR 2047 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202136](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202136.zip) | Dual-registration requirements for EHPLMNs | | | Intel, Qualcomm Incorporated / Vivek | CR 1974 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-200620 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202146](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202146.zip) | Additional abnormal case handling for NOTIFICATION message | | | Samsung/Anikethan | CR 1791 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Revision of C1ah-200199  Kaj, Thu, 14:55  No need for new IE, solution in 2044 is good enough  Osamah, Thu, 18:16  Editrorial  Yanchao, Fri, 05:52  Same as Kaj  Vishnu, Fir, 16:42  rare case and to solve this we don’t need to do so much changes  Sung, Fri, 17:58  Supports Vishnu  Ani, Sat, 13:48  Defending his proposal  Vishnu, Sun, 11:35  There is no problem to be solved  Ani, Sun, 12:38  discussing | |
|  |  | | [C1-202153](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202153.zip) | Correcting the case when the AMF does not need to provide SOR-info to the UE | | | DOCOMO Communications Lab. | CR 0516 23.122 Rel-16 | Postponed  Based on email form the author  Ivo, Thu, 12:09  Explanation … Thus, we see no need of this CR. The baseline is correct.  Marius, Fri, 10:56  Similar as ivo  Ban, Sat, 10:59  Providing a rev  Ivo, Mon, 12:53  CR does not work  Ivo, Mon, 13:03  More agruments | |
|  |  | | [C1-202158](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202158.zip) | Adding new IMSDoPS indication bits in “EPS network feature support” IE for network to indicate support for “IMS Data over PS” services | | | MediaTek Inc., Apple | CR 2054 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Ivo, Thu, 12:10  Missing stage-2 requirement, without stage-2 this should be solved on IMS layer  Lena, Thu, 17:52  Indicator on NAS level only needed for voice, not for data, CR is not needed  Sung, Fri. 00:11  Same as Ivo and Lena, without stage-2 this can not be done  Bill, Sat, 09:01  No need for this flag  Lena, Thu, 02:20  Can not agree the CR | |
|  |  | | [C1-202201](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202201.zip) | Clarification of the figure of registration procedure | | | vivo | CR 2072 24.501 Rel-16 | Kaj, Thu, 14:59  An “e.g.“ is missing  Yanchao, Mon, 05:27  Clarifying  Kaj, Mon, 14:01  fine | |
|  |  | | [C1-202219](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202219.zip) | UAC for MO-IMS registration related signalling EN resolution | | | NTT DOCOMO INC. | CR 6413 24.229 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-200684 | |
|  |  | | C1-202228 | Possible KSI types in EPS | | | Ericsson / Mikael | CR 2076 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-202229](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202229.zip) | Possible KSI types in EPS | | | Ericsson / Mikael | CR 3346 24.301 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202254](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202254.zip) | No available S-NSSAIs at handover with emergency PDU session established | | | Ericsson /kaj | discussion Rel-16 | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-202272](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202272.zip) | Correct parameters included by AMF during inter-system change from S1 mode to N1 mode in 5GMM-CONNECTED mode | | | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR 2095 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202275](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202275.zip) | Remove invalid cases in error handling for QoS rule operation and TFT operation | | | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR 2096 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202276](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202276.zip) | Clarify PAP/CHAP usage in PCO for 5GS | | | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR 3215 24.008 Rel-16 | Postponed  Based on request from author, tue, 18:03  Lin, Sat, 06:57  Interesting, but we should ask SA2/SA3 whether to use PAP/CHAP and postpone the CR  Osama, Sat, 21:21  If LS, then some input on the content  JJ, Mon, 11:01  Guidance from SA2/SA3 useful | |
|  |  | | C1-202277 | Add handling for UE configured to use timer T3245 in 5GS via 3GPP access | | | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR 2097 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-202325](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202325.zip) | Initiate 3GPP access associated notification procedure over non-3GPP access | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Cristina | CR 2105 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Based on request from author, Tue, 04:23  Kaj, Thu, 15:30  CR is not needed  Amer, Thu, 19:56  Agrees with Kaj  Cristina, Fri, 05:17  Does not agree with Kaj and Amer  Yanchao, Fri, 05:57  Same as Amer and Kaj  Cristina, Fri, 06:11  Does not agree with yanchao  Yanchao, Fri, 06:43  Explains to Cristina  Ani, Mon, 08:32  CR is not needed  Cristina, Mon, 11:08  Commenting  Ani, Mon, 12:57  No change needed | |
|  |  | | [C1-202331](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202331.zip) | Consider PDU session type IE set by UE in IP address allocation | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Cristina | CR 2110 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | C1-202339 | Add MFBR as mandatory parameter in GBR QoS flow | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Cristina | CR 2116 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-202341 | Add MFBR as mandatory parameter in GBR QoS flow | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Cristina | CR 2117 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-202342](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202342.zip) | Fixing a reference in the service request procedure | | | BEIJING SAMSUNG TELECOM R&D | CR 2118 24.501 Rel-16 | Osamah, Thu, 18:45  Needs to be CAT D  Mahmoud, Thu, 19:18  Thinks it is CAT F, happy to chang to CAT D if others see this similar  Roozbeh, Sat, 18:58  Tends to agree with Mahmoud, can go with the group  Osama, Sat, 21:54  This is a typo  Roozbeh, Sun, 20:46  CAT F | |
|  |  | | C1-202343 | Add MFBR as mandatory parameter in GBR QoS flow | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Cristina | CR 2119 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-202347](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202347.zip) | Correcting length of extended emergency number list IE | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Cristina | CR 3352 24.301 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202358](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202358.zip) | Support for eCall over IMS over NR | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Cristina | CR 0521 23.122 Rel-16 | Postponed  Request form author, Mon11:14  Ivo, Thu, 12:16  UE in eCall only mode is allowed to select a PLMN in NG-RAN when the PLMN does NOT advertise support for eCall over, why? Some further problem  Lena, Thu, 22:50  CR is technically wrong (NG-RAN does not support CS)  Sung, Fri, 02:02  CR is not including any specification change needed to support eCall in IMS over NR (with 5G Core), requested by TSG-SA | |
|  |  | | [C1-202375](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202375.zip) | Initial NAS message protection on inter-system change from EPS to 5GS | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 2136 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Amer, Thu, 20:11  Why is this 24.501 and not 24.301?  Fei, Fri, 04:24  Does not undertand the intention of the CR  Kundan, Fri, 06:32  Explaining to Amer  Sung, Sat, 18:03  CR is not needed  Kundan, Mon, 08:32  Explaining to Fei/Sung  Kundan, Mon, 08:47  Explaining to Fei  Fei, Mon, 08.54  CR is not needed | |
|  |  | | [C1-202376](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202376.zip) | Handling of MCS data in various 5GMM states | | | Samsung | CR 1415 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Revision of C1-194530  Ivo, Thu, 12:16  Registration procedure for MCS not defined, PDU session for MCS is a regular PDU session from NAS perspective  Lena, Thu, 16:40  Can not agree to the CR, no SA1 requirement, no definition of PDU session related to MCS  Sung, Fri, 18:16  Echos Lena and Ivo | |
|  |  | | [C1-202377](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202377.zip) | No messages without integrity protection processed after security activation | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2137 24.501 Rel-16 | Not pursued  Andrew, Thu, 12:08  Summery of changes should be improved  Amer, Thu, 20:20  seems OK to us, but the note with the proposed changes could be improved  Sung, Thu, 23:32  Ok with comments, provides new version  Lin, Fri, 10:01  Not convinced anything is needed  Sung, Sun, 01:28  Not agreeing with Lin  Lin, Tue, 04:56  Ongoing  Mikael, Tue, 17:01  Same as Lin, this is not needed | |
|  |  | | [C1-202378](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202378.zip) | Clarification on the AMF behaviour after security activation in case of integrity check failure | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2138 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Requested by author  Fei, Fri, 04:34  CR is not needed  Lin, Fri, 10:04  Does not see conflict that needs to be solved  Sung, Sun, 01:36  Explaining  Lin, Tue, 04:56  ongoing  Mikael, Tue, 17:37  Similar as Lin, not needed | |
|  |  | | [C1-202379](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202379.zip) | Discarding a SECURITY MODE COMMAND message which fails integrity check | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2139 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Amer, Thu, 20:26  CR is not needed, creates a problem  Lin, Fri, 10:14  CR is wrong and not needed.  Sung, Sun, 01:50  Explaining  Ani, Sun, 13:24  Asking Sung, how there will be a NAS counter desynchronization by sending an SMC reject  Lin, Tue, 04:56  Ongoing disc with Sung  Ani, Tue, 06:40  Same as lin and Amer  Sung, Wed, 03:56  Explaining to AN  Ani, Wed, 05:00  Commenting  Fei, Wed, 05:22  The CR is NOT needed  Lin, Wed, 07:20  On same page as Ani | |
|  |  | | [C1-202380](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202380.zip) | Initiation of ESFB by a UE in the state 5GMM-REGISTERED.ATTEMPTING-REGISTRATION-UPDATE | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2140 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Ivo, Thu, 12:18  not backward compatible since Rel-15 AMF will consider such registration procedure as initial registration, not convinced yet tha the CR is needed  Lin, Fri, 10:10  Not inline with SA2, non backward compatible  Sung, Sun, 02:39  Rev which is backward compatible, explaining  Lena, Sun, 22:42  this should be discussed in SA2 first  Rae, Mon, 05:46  SA2 first  Fei, Mon, 09:56  Concerned  Lin, Tue, 05:15  There is still an NBC issue, concerns  Sung, Wed, 01:41  Rev  Lin, Wed, 07:27  Questions  Fei, Wed, 08:01  New IE not needed  Sung, Wed, 14:48  New rev  Lena, Thu, 05:17  Not convinced  Fei, Thu, 05:43  Not needed  Ivo, Thu, 08:53  Not agreeing  Fei, Thu, 09:10  Not clear  Lin, NOT CONVINCED | |
|  |  | | [C1-202381](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202381.zip) | No emergency session transfer after ESFB | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2141 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202394](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202394.zip) | PDU session release for an inactive UE with RAN paging failure | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 1833 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Revision of C1ah-200089  Ivo, Thu, 12:18  SMF does not receive PDU SESSION RESOURCE RELEASE RESPONSE , goes only to AMF  Roozbeh, Fri, 02:59  Cover page to be updated  Lind, Fri, 09:51  we do not see anything need to be done in CT1 for this.  Sung, Fri, 19:43  Provides a rev  Ivo, Mon, 14:08  New comment  Lin, Tue, 05:33  This is not NAS, why add it?  Sung, Wed, 03:37  Defending, should an LS be sent?  Lin, Wed, 08:51  This is all CN internal, why do anything in CT1  Ivo, Wed 09:10  Arguing  Sung, Wed, 23:38  Prposes an LS and provides some justification  Ivo, Thu, 00:24  Does not agree with Sung | |
|  |  | | C1-202417 | Handling of correction to UE configuration update procedure conditions for re-registration | | | LG Electronics France | CR 2160 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Not available on time | |
|  |  | | [C1-202418](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202418.zip) | Correction to conditions for including the S-NSSAI(s) from default NSSAI in the requested NSSAI | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Amer | CR 2161 24.501 Rel-16 | Frederic, Thu, 09:08  Clauses affected missing | |
|  |  | | [C1-202420](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202420.zip) | Definition of current PLMN and serving PLMN | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Amer | CR 2163 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Based on request from author, Tue, 15:49  Frederic, Thu, 09:08  Clauses affected missing  Ivo, Thu, 12:19  Commenting on used terms “current PLMN” “registered PLMN”, asks for single term, cover sheet  Vishnu, Fri, 18:49  do not prefer to have these new definitions in 24.501 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202436](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202436.zip) | Discussion on the selected EPS NAS security algorithms | | | BEIJING SAMSUNG TELECOM R&D | discussion | Noted  Andrew, Thu, 11:59  Has the proposal in C1-202436 been discussed and endorsed by SA3?  Are there supporting requirements in the SA3 specifications to support the change?  Mahmoud, Thu, 16:45  Explaining that the proposal does not need to be discussed in SA3, asking for specific comment against the proposal  Fei, Fri, 04:41  Fine in principle, additional cases needed  Andrew, Fri, 14:41  Does not like if, if the group agrees, andrew can live with it  Mikael, Fri, 23:15  Similar as Andrew, will discuss internally and come back  Mahmou, Fri, 23:39  Fine to wait for further comments  Mahmoud, Mon, 17:40  Fine with Fei’s comment  Mikael, Tue, 16:14  Needs SA3 analysis first, request the CR postponed and await SA3 outcom | |
|  |  | | [C1-202437](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202437.zip) | Condition for setting the Selected EPS NAS algorithm IE to NULL | | | BEIJING SAMSUNG TELECOM R&D | CR 2171 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202477](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202477.zip) | Correction on UE behaviour for service area restriction | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1823 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1ah-200161 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202480](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202480.zip) | Service reject for emergency EPS fallback | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 3359 24.301 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Used CR number against 24.301 although targeted for 24.501 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202481](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202481.zip) | Handling of mapped EPS bearer contexts | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 3360 24.301 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Used CR number against 24.301 although targeted for 24.501 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202482](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202482.zip) | Integrity check interworking in 5GMM-CONNECTED mode | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 3361 24.301 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Used CR number against 24.301 although targeted for 24.501 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202483](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202483.zip) | Correction on LADN DNN based congestion control | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 3362 24.301 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Used CR number against 24.301 although targeted for 24.501 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202504](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202504.zip) | MRU failed due to RRC signalling connection release in restricted service area | | | MediaTek Inc. | CR 2186 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Based on request form author, tue, 12:16  Osama, Thu, 21:34  concern with the idea of moving to not updated state.  Kaj, Fri, 06:51  Fine but should state 5GMM cause #28  Marko, Fri, 09:58  Explains the problem to Osama, fine with kaj comment  Osama, Fri, 16:40  Still commenting  Sung, Fri, 23:18  Some wording fixes | |
|  |  | | [C1-202509](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202509.zip) | Correction to 5G-GUTI handling when received at REGISTRATION ACCEPT | | | MediaTek Inc. | CR 2191 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Osama, Thu, 19:12  Text unclear  Sung, Fri, 22:43  Neutral on the CR, but needs an “if any” | |
|  |  | | [C1-202510](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202510.zip) | Correcting that 5G NAS integrity key is one of the input parameters for integrity protection algorithm | | | MediaTek Inc. | CR 2192 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202518](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202518.zip) | Correction to Handling of #31 | | | MediaTek Inc. | CR 2194 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202523](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202523.zip) | De-registration before initial registration for Emergency Services | | | MediaTek Inc. | CR 2197 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202525](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202525.zip) | Handling of rejected NSSAI for the current RA when the RA includes the TAI belonging to EPLMN | | | SHARP | CR 2199 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Based on request form Author, Wed, 09:17  Kaj, Fri, 07:00  proposed changes are not needed as already covered by 4.6.1  Yoko, Fri, 08:34  Explaining why this is needed  Osama, Fri, 18:50  Same as Kaj  Vishnu, Fri, 18:23  Change is confusing  Yoko, Mon, 04:26  Explaining  Vishnu, Mon, 10:58  Does not agree wit the CR | |
|  |  | | [C1-202526](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202526.zip) | Correction to deletion of Allowed NSSAI | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 2200 24.501 Rel-16 | Ani, Sun, 13:12  Existing text enough, CR not needed  Vishnu, Mon, 20:58  Explaining  Ani, Tue, 03:47  Commenting to Vishnu  Vishnu, Tue,  Coomenting  Ani, Wed, 03:34  Can live with this, would prefer existing spec.  NOT CLEAR so far  Ani, thu, 04:20  CR is ok | |
|  |  | | C1-202583 | Security handling | | | Samsung/ Kyungjo Grace Suh | CR 2211 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-202634 | Add handling for parameter set to “value is not used” in 5GS | | | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR 2093 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202268  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 12:14  semantic of "release/version" is not clear. Can we use solely "version"?  Sung, Fri, 00:22  Prefers “release”  Osama, Sun, 16:28  Checking if “release” is ok  Ivo, Mon, 13:22  Release is fine  Sung, Wed, 01:59  OK | |
|  |  | | C1-202635 | Add handling for UE configured to use timer T3245 in 5GS via 3GPP access | | | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR 1803 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202278  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1ah-200178  Ivo, Thu, 12:14  NOTE in 24.501 subclause 10.2 needs to be updated as well  Osama, Fri, 21:01  Acks Ivo  Osama, Fri, 16:47  Providing rev in Inbox  Vishnu, Mon, 13:23  Fine  Ivo, Mon, 13:28  Some “colors” in the accepted version, wants to co-sign  Sung, Wed, 02:00  Co-sign | |
|  |  | | C1-202607 | OTAF renamed to SP-AF | | | Orange / Mariusz | CR 0510 23.122 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202070  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 12:03  Use 5GS\_OTAF as work item code  Lena, Thu, 16:41  Untick ME box  Mariusz, Fri, 11:12  Provides rev  Ivo, Fri, 11:51  Fine with rev, wants to co-sign  Len, Thu, 01:56  Fine with draft | |
|  |  | | C1-202680 | UAC exception for emergency | | | MediaTek Inc. | CR 2184 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202501  Roozbeh, Tue, 00:43  Fine  Ivo, Wed, 13:20  fine  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 12:23  Editorials  Roozbeh, Fri, 03:20  Editorials | |
|  |  | | C1-202683 | Correction to criteria to enter 5GMM-REGISTERED.UPDATE-NEEDED substate after resumption failure | | | MediaTek Inc. | CR 2187 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202505  Roozbeh, Wed, 01:30  Fine  Ivo, Wed, 23:48  Fine  Sung, FINE  Ivo, Thu, 12:25  Ivo challenging the proposal  Roozbeh, Fri, 03:25  Bulleting to be changed  Sung, Fri, 20:07  no need for the CR.  Marko, Tue, 13:20  Will change some parts | |
|  |  | | C1-202697 | Unify terms network-initiated and network-requested | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Cristina | CR 2103 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202295  Osamah, Thu, 18:41  Needs to be CAT D  Cristina, Fri, 04:20  Will change category  Roozbeh, Sun 20:51  Wants to keep CAT F  Cristina, Mon, 10:53  Explaining on categories  Roozbeh, Mon, 17:56  CAT F  Crisitna, Tue, 01:54  Wants to keep CAT F | |
|  |  | | C1-202698 | Add MFBR as mandatory parameter in GBR QoS flow | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Cristina | CR 2120 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202344  Osama, Wed, 21:39  fine  Osama, Fri, 02:38  GBR ok, non-GBR to be rewritten  Cristina, Fi, 12:20  Asking from Osama  Osama, Fri, 20:07  Suggestion looks good, is it “or” or “and”  Cristina, Sat, 05:09  Acks Osama | |
|  |  | | C1-202684 | T3346 handling when the UE is registered to different PLMNs over 3GPP and non-3GPP | | | MediaTek Inc. | CR 2190 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202508  Sung can live with this  **Kaj, Fri, 11:01**  **Requests this to be postponed**  Kaj, Thu, 17:09  Not needed, already covered  Vishnu, Thu, 17:19  Not needed  Amer, Thu, 20:30  New text could be a NOTE  Behrouz, Thu, 23:50  I am perfectly OK with this CR.  Sung, Fri, 23:41  CR not needed  Amer, Sat, 04:47  Keep text minimal  Kaj, Wed, 10:54  Fine | |
|  |  | | C1-202599 | Subscription management in PWS-IWF | | | one2many B.V. | CR 0214 23.041 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202076  Frederic, Thu, 09:08  Clauses affected missing | |
|  |  | | C1-202623 | Removal of Duplicate Service Operation Details | | | one2many | CR 0207 23.041 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202073  Revision of C1-200308  Ban, Sat, 13:27  Providing comments  Lazaros, Mon, 19:54  Comments  PeterS, Tue, 11.10  Offers an proposal  Lazaros, Tue, 11:26  ok | |
|  |  | | C1-202793 | Modification of exchanges between SOR-AF and UDM | | | Orange, Ericsson / Mariusz | CR 0509 23.122 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202069  Ivo: Fine  Releated CR in C1-202152  Ban, Sat, 09:26  Answering on 2151 LSout, thinks this CR needs to be postponed  Ban, Sat, 13:12  alignment of procedures in stage-2 and stage-3 needed  Mariusz, Tue, 15:50  Can the CR stay unchanged?  Ban, Tue, 20:48  Some comments against the CR  Mariusz, Wed ,11:43  New rev  Ban, Wed, 11:55  fine | |
|  |  | | C1-202812 | Restricting handling of cause #9 to the access on which it was received | | | Samsung/Anikethan | CR 1792 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202149  Revision of C1ah-200031  Osamah, Thu, 18:17  Asks for clarification  Ani, Fri, 05:56  Explaining to Osama  Osama, Fri, 18:15  More con than pro, can live with it, tick ME box on the cover sheet  Ani, Sat, 02:26  Acks to Osama, wants to get a bit more info | |
|  |  | | C1-202815 | Specify UE azaros for NOTIFICATION message for additional state/sub-states | | | Samsung/Anikethan | CR 2051 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202145  Osamah, Thu, 18:15  Editorial  Vishnu, Fri, 16:38  Bullet b) causes inconsistency  Ani, Sat, 15:45  Provides a rev  Osama, Sat, 20:29  Rev looks fine  Vishnu, Sun, 21:37  Fine with the rev | |
|  |  | | C1-202687 | Correction to Handling of T3521 timer | | | MediaTek Inc. | CR 2193 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202514  Roozbeh, Fri, 03:38  Just a NOTE might be better  Kaj, Fri, 06:25  Fine with the proposal, some rewording  Kaj, Fri, 06:34  Asks to disregard his previous email  Kaj, Fri, 06:36  Fine with the proposal, some rewording  Marko, Tue, 20:04  Will revise | |
|  |  | | C1-202652 | Clarification on URSP in EPS | | | ZTE / Joy | CR 0073 24.526 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202144  Ivo, Thu, 12:05  Requires some clarification  Lena, Thu, 16:41  ok but it should be moved to the xBDT WI (AI 16.2.16).  Joy, Fri, 05:34  To Ivo, explaining, is it ok?  Joy, Fri, 06:47  This is xBDT and 5Gprotoc16  Lena, Tue, 03:31  xBDT firt, no problem to list TEI16  Joy, Tue, 04:33  In addition to xBDT, wants 5Gprotoc16  Lena, Tue, 06:32  fine | |
|  |  | | C1-202752 | PS Data Off status report for non-3GPP access | | | LG Electronics, Ericsson / SangMin | CR 2102 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202289  Partially overlaps with C1-202120  Joy, Thu, 11:44  Newly introduced condition is not correct, new NOTE not complete  Roozbeh, Fri, 00:11  Update cover page, requests changes  Roozbeh, Sat, 20:44  Resending the comment, correct Ai  SangMin, Tue, 10:33  Commenting  Roozbeh, Tue, 21:11  Fine with new proposal, i.e SanMin will revise this CR  SangMin, Wed, 10:44  Rev  Roozbeh, wed, 19:21  fine | |
|  |  | | C1-202861 | Missing QoS flow description parameters for GBR QoS flows in 5GSM and ESM coordination | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Cristina | CR 2122 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202651  Osama, thu, 03:45  Commenting  Cristina, Thu, 06:59  Does not agree with Osama  Revision of C1-202349  Osama, Tue, 23:52  Editorials  Osam, Wed, 02:00  Comments and proposals for additions  Cristina, Wed, 05:58  questions  Ivo, Thu, 12:15  Wrong formatting  Osamah, Thu, 18:53  Please revise the CR and check the conditions again if applied to EPS ESM procedure and rewrite UE behavior to use EPS ESM procedures defined in TS 24.301  Cristina, Fri, 07:09  Fine with comments, rev to come later | |
|  |  | | C1-202868 | Correcting order in which connections/sessions are transferred if there is an emergency call | | | BlackBerry Uk Ltd. | CR 1782 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202670  Lena, Thu, 07:06  Fine  Vishnu, Thu, FINE  Revision of C1-202098  Revision of C1-200115  Lena, Thu, 16:41  no need to specify in which order the UE transfers PDU sessions  John-Luc, Thu, 17:22  Explaining that CR has evolved and why it is needed  Vishnu, Fri, 15:47  not OK with the CR.  John-Luc, Tue, 16:42  Explaining the case  Vishnu, Tue, 17:14  Remove the Note  John-Luc, Tue, 18:42  Takes out the Note Fine provides rev  Lena, thu, 0324  Can’t agree | |
|  |  | | C1-202843 | No available S-NSSAIs and emergency PDU session at handover | | | Ericsson /kaj | CR 2088 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-202255  NOT ON THE SERVER  Roozbeh, Thu, 23:53  Is in general agreement, some rewording needed, asks a question  Fei, Fri, 04:05  Clarification fine, capability indication not needed  Sung, Sat, 00:06  Commenting what he sees is needed, minimal  Osama, Sat, 02:49  Asking questions  Ani, Sat, 04:27  Same as Sung  Lena, Sun, 20:39  Agrees with Sung, Ani  Kaj, Mon, 22:47  Explaining the approach, why 5GMM capability is needed  Sung, Wed, 02:12  Not agreeing with Kaj  Sung, Wed.21:03  Not agreeing with Kaj  Kaj, Wed, 22:20  Arguing  Sung, wed, 22:23  Not agreeing  Kaj, wed, 22:50  Not agreeing, Ongoing  Ani, thinks that existing text covers this | |
|  |  | | C1-202873 | Clarification on use of operator-defined access categories | | | Qualcomm Incorporated, Ericsson, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell / Lena | CR 1795 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202100  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1ah-200149  Vishnu, Sat, 11:10  Requires changes in the CR  Lena, Tue, 07:01  Provides rev  Vishnu, Tue, 13:54  Fine  Lena, Wed, 01:00  Additional rev to capture some more  Vishnu, Wed, 09:30  fine | |
|  |  | | C1-202705 | Allowed SSC mode for association between an application and a PDU session | | | OPPO / Rae | CR 0075 24.526 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202491  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Joy, Thu, 12:01  Reason for change not correct, existing bullet va) incorrect  Ivo, Thu, 12:22  Summary of changes seem incorrect  Lena, Thu, 16:40  CR has a point, needs rewording  Roozbeh, Fri, 03:07  Original text works, if there is a need for a change then this needs rewording  Rai, Fri 04:58  Explaining here cse  Joy, Fri, 09:07  This is not correct  Joy, Fri, 10:47  Now agrees, proposes some rewording  Roozbeh, Sun, 02:44  Providing wording  Rae, Mon, 03:41  Discussing  Roozbeh, Tue, 00:42  Some comments  Rae, tue, 04:12  Explaining  Roozbeh, Tue, 18:27  Still some change  Rae, Wed, 04:20  Similar understanding as Roozbeh  Roozbeh, Wed, 05:39  There is a need for some mandatory wording  Roozbeh, 05:41  Is it only me having concerns?  Lena, Thu, 05:36  Not agreeing with Roozbeh proposal  Roozbeh fine with latest proposal from lena | |
|  |  | | C1-202706 | Handling of unallowed SSC mode | | | OPPO / Rae | CR 2183 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202492  Roozbhe fine  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Joy, Thu, 11:58  Same purpose as 2280 and is incoplete, pls see comments on 2280  Lena, Thu, 16:40  CR has a point, but requires rewording  Roozbeh, Fri, 03:07  Original text works, if there is a need for a change then this needs rewording  Rae, Fri, 04:50  Not convinced with Lena rewording  Lena, Tue, 02:48  Fine with Rae explanation, found some more issues, if they are folved then it should be fine  Rae, Tue, 04:19  New rev  Roozbehm Tue, 22:22  New suggestion  Rae, Wed, 04:37  Similar understanding as roozbeh  Roozbeh, Wed, 05:45  Some proposal  Lena, Thu, 02:49  Cover sheet  Rae, Thu, 04:07  Not agreeing with Roozbeh  Roozbeh OK  Lena OK | |
|  |  | | C1-202890 | Additional condition to start T3540 | | | Samsung/Anikethan | CR 2050 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202811  Vishnu: FINE  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-202141  Marko, Thu, 08:01  This is a corner case, i.e. “May”  Ani. Thu 08:22  New rev  Mark, Thu, 08:37  fine  Osamah, Thu,18:14  Wording to be improved  Yanchao, Fri, 05:49  why start T3450 for this case?  **Previous discussion taken out**  Ani, Tue, 19:32  Rev  Osama, Tue, 20:42  Not ok with all changes  Vishnu, Tue, 21:36  Only the last change, with that Huawei co-signs  Ani, Wed, 05:15  New rev  Maoki, Wed, 10:58  Fine with the CR, beef up Cover Sheet  Kaj, Wed, 13:42  New questions  Ani, Wed, 14:46  Answers  Kaj, Wed, 15:56  Questions  Ani, Wed, 16:27  Explaining  Kaj, Wed, 17:33  Asking  Osama, Wed, 19:35  Editorials  Ani, Wed, 20:04  Answering kaj  Kaj, Thu, 00:18  Does not agree  Kaj, Thu, 08:20  Fine | |
|  |  | | C1-202874 | Additional QoS error handling related to mapped EBI | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | CR 2101 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202285  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 12:15  … the check should not be dependent on QoS flow description being associated with the EPS bearer  Discussion not shown, lena<>JJ  JJ, OK | |
|  |  | | C1-202893 | Initial registration for initiating emergency PDU session | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Cristina | CR 2121 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202858  Sung FINE  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-202348  Ivo, Thu, 09:54  comments  Ivo, Thu, 12:15  Broken styles, some of the new bullets are already covered by existing bulltets  Sung, Fri, 01:20  Asks why adding T3502 and T3511 is needed  Cristian, Fri, 06:27  Will provide a revision  Sung, Sat, 00:40  question on the registration type  Cristina, Sat, 05:29  Answering Sung  Lena, Sun, 22:31  Some things not clear, cover page update needed  Cristina, Mon, 04:21  Explaining  Ivo, Mon, 13:48  Challenging the CR  Cristian, Tue, 02:42  Explaining  Ivo, Tue, 12:38  Additional wording  Cristina, Tue, 12:59  Additional change needed?  Ivo, Wed, 13:12  clarifying | |
|  |  | | C1-202783 | Editorial corrections | | | Ericsson / Mikael | CR 2074 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202218  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Roozbeh, Thu, 23:13  Editorial on the cover page  Mikael, Fri, 07:40  Asks roozbeh to use correct subject line | |
|  |  | | C1-202820 | Unsupported 5QI values | | | MediaTek Inc. / JJ | CR 0686 27.007 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202537  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Osama, Fri, 02:33  Why is there difference btw +CGEQOS and +C5GQOS  JJ, Fri, 05:12  Provides revision in INBOX  Atle, Fri, 07:54  Agrees with the rev in INBOX  Osama, Fri, 19:32  Rev looks good | |
|  |  | | C1-202897 | storage of counters for UE in PLMN | | | vivo | CR 2071 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202713  Revision of C1-202200  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Osamah, Thu, 22:01  Not extremely important to repeat DoS related counters in Annex C  Yanchao, Mon, 10:23  Provides a rev  Osama, Mon, 16:14  Further comments  Yanchao, Tue, 08:59  Provides a rev  Osama, Tue, 16:18  Further comments  Yanchao, Wed, 13:29  Asking forn Osama  Osama, wed:20:39  Still an issue with shall to may  Yang, Wed, 08:42  Shall | |
|  |  | | C1-202821 | Addition of 5GSM cause #59 | | | MediaTek Inc. / JJ | CR 2205 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202538  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 12:49  Not convinced that #59 is really needed  Roozbeh, Fri, 04:24  questions for clarification  JJ, Fri, 14:27  Provides a rev  Ivo, Mon, 14:25  Not convinced  Jj, Tue, 09:31  Commenting  Sung, Wed, 04:05  UE behavriou needed  JJ, Wed, 12:37  New rev  Ivo, Wed, 13:39  Asking for a NOTE  Jj, Wed, 14:11  Can do the Note  Ivo, Wed, 19:10  Co-signs | |
|  |  | | C1-202902 | Correcting the parameter "RAT type" for SOR-AF | | | DOCOMO Communications Lab. | CR 0515 23.122 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-202152  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Releated CRs in C1-202068, C1-202069  Ivo, Thu, 12:08  Explanation ….Thus, we see no need of this CR.  Ban  Ivo, Tue, 14:28  **providing "access technology" is not acceptable**.  Mariusz, Tue, 16:33  Sung, Wed, 14:54  negative  Ban,  Providing a rev  Marius ongoing  Marius FINE  Ivo, Thu, 11:26  Ericsson sees no benefit in UDM performing the access technology derivation from RAT type on SOR-AF's behalf.  Ban not agreeing with Ivo  Ivo not agreeing it  Ban not agreeing  Ivo DOES NOT agree | |
|  |  | | C1-202889 | Handling of allowed NSSAI when the RA includes the TAI belonging to EPLMN | | | SHARP | CR 2198 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202524  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Osama, Fri ,18:55  Commenting, asing for changes  Yoko, Tue, 08:24  Asking for clarification form Osama  Kaj, Tue, 15:58  Comments  Yoki, Wed, 05:05  Rev  Osama, Wed ,21:30  Issues, prefers short sentence and a ref  Yoko, thu, 02:24  New rev | |
|  |  | | C1-202696 | UE behaviour when the UE receives the rejected NSSAI for the current RA in the registration reject message and the RA is not stored | | | SHARP | CR 2202 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of [C1-202528](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202528.zip)  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Roozbeh, Fri, 04:08  **Is an implementation issue**  Krisztian, 05:40  Why don’t we align the behavior in 5.5.1.2.5 with the behavior in 5.4.4.3  Yoko, Fri, 06:45  Not agreeing with Roozbeh  Yoko, Fri, 07:52  Explains to Krisztian why it is needed  Osama, Fri, 16:00  Not convinced  Vishnu, Fri, 18:31  Commenting, not right solution  Krisztian, Fri, 21:05  Further comments  Ani, Sat, 04:35  Same as Osama  Roozbeh, Sat, 22:30  Wants clarification  Roozbeh, Sun, 01:19  **I am not convinced if there is any needed text**  Yoka, Mon, 07:37  Providing some wording  Ani, Tue, 04:44  Some proposals  Yoko, Tue, 08:24  Providing a rev  Ani, Tue, 19:52  Fine, co-sign  Ani, Tue, 20:05  Update cover sheet  Vishnua, Tue, 23:02  **Can not agree this CR**  Yoko, Wed, 02:31  Rev  Ani, Wed, 03:30  Defending the CR  Vishnu, Wed, 08:57  More clarification needed  Ani, Wed, 09:04  Is Vishnu OK  Vishnu, wed, 09:28  Not convinced, but will not object  Yoko, Wed, 10:30  New rev  Kaj, Wed, 11:23  New comment  Ani, Wed, 11:41  To Vishnu  Ani; wed, 12:29  Explaining to Kaj | |
|  |  | | [C1-202615](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202280.zip) | Applicable URSP is not optional for a UE | | | Motorola Mobility, Lenovo | CR 2098 24.501 Rel-16 | Reviion of C1-202280  Lena, fri, 00:01  **Not full correct, agrees, that you will bring a revision to the May meeting to address this issue**  **Roozbeh acks that this will be resolved**  **JJ is fine with this assumption**  -------------------------------------------  Joy, Thu, 11:57  Text needs to be more precise,  Lena, Thu, 16:41  Requires rewording  Rae, Fri, 11:47  Comments  Roozbeh, Sun, 19:31  Providing rev in Inbox  Maoki, Mon ,09:18  More to consider  Roozbeh, Tue, 02:24  Explaining  Rae, Tue, 04:15  Some comments on the rev  Joy, Tue, 05:45  Generally fine, editorial  Jj, Tue, 07:36  Agreeing with Rae  Roozbeh, Tue, 20:56  New rev  Maoki, Wed, 06:44  Withdraws comment, fine  Rae, Wed, 11:26  More needed  JJ, Wed, 19:11  More comments  Roozbeh, Wed, 19:12  New rev  Roozbeh, Thu, 00:39  Explanation  Len, Thu, 02:13  Not ok with the rev  Roozbeh, Thu, 03:21  Not clear what lena comment is  JJ, Thu, 04:31  Comments  Lena, Thu, 05:01  More comments  Roozbeh  New rev  Lena, Thu, 06:32  Still issues  Roozbhe, thu  Ongoing w  Lena, Thu, 07.22  Explaining  Roozbeh, Thu, 07:40  Discussing  New REV | |
|  |  | | C1-202801 | Corrections on the abnormal cases of registration procedure for initial registration | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 1379 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202476  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-199032  Kaj, Thu, 16:32  Fine, some rewording  Osama, Fri, 16:18  Commenting  Lin, Sat, 08:33  Provides rev  Osama, Sun 20:07  Further questions  Lin, Tue, 12:01  Rev  Osama, Tue, 22:26  Q for clarification  Lin, Wed, 11:03  Answering Osama  Osama, Wed, 16:20  Not convinced  Lin, Thu, 03:12  Asking for clear advice what is to be changed from Osama  Osama, Thu, 03:21  Provides wording  Lin, thu, 08:33  New rev | |
|  |  | | [C1-202802](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202478.zip) | Single-registration mode without N26 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 2182 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of [C1-202478](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202478.zip)  Lena, Thu, 16.41  Some parts are ok, some changes are not OK  Sung, Fri, 22:29  Same as Lena  Lin, Mon, 12:21  Providing a rev  Sung, Wed, 01.58  Ok either way  Lin, Wed, 11:09  Explaining  Lena, Thu, 02:31  Not ok with some of the changes  Lin, Thu, 05:03  Discussion with Lena  Lena, Thu, 06:41  Explaining  Fei, Thu, 08:46  Condition update  Lena, Thu, 08:59  Does not work | |
|  |  | | C1-202803 | Single-registration mode without N26 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 3358 24.301 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202479  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lena, Thu, 16:40  perform TAU differently depending upon whether there is N26. This is not ok, further issue with security context  Sung, Fri, 22:34  Same as Lena  Lin, Sat, 09:10  Provides a rev, but asks to send an LS to SA3  Sung, sun, 02:45  Fine with the rev, fine with sending LS  Lena, thu, 02:04  Fine with rev, fine with sending LS | |
|  |  | | C1-202805 | Service reject for emergency EPS fallback | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 2213 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-202592  **Lena, Fri, 00:35**  **Cannot agree**  **Sung, Fri, 01:01**  **Has concerns**  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 12:51  Do not see this as mandatory AMF action, not convinced that this is really quicker  Sung, Fri, 20:39  Decision criteria not known in the network  Lena, Sun, 22:52  Not in favour of this change  Lin, Wed, 11:49  Providing a rev  Sung, Wed, 14:04  Asking questions  Lin, Thu, 05:20  answering | |
|  |  | | C1-202806 | Handling of mapped EPS bearer contexts | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 2214 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202593  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu: 12:51  “message” is missing  Lin, Sat, 05:15  Will be done in rev | |
|  |  | | C1-202807 | Integrity check interworking in 5GMM-CONNECTED mode | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 2215 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202594  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Amer, Thu, 20:28  Check the CN box on cover sheet  Fei, Fri, 04:51  Note to be enhanced  Lin, Sat, 05:27  Asking Fei to clarify, acks Amer  Fei, Tue, 08:31  Proposal  Lin, Tue, 12:22  rev  Fei FINE | |
|  |  | | C1-202808 | Correction on LADN DNN based congestion control | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 2216 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202595  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 12:51  Many conditions are missing  Osamah, Thu, 19:02  Changes to clause 6.x not needed, additional comments  Lin, Sat, 09:23  Rev in Inbox  Osama, Tue, 23:44  Some comments  Lin, Wed, 11:55  New rev  Osama, Wed, 16:26  Looks good  Ivo, Thu,  FINE | |
|  |  | | C1-202709 | NW triggered SR over N3GPP under MM congestion control | | | OPPO / Rae | CR 2104 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202324  Amer FINE  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Joy, Thu, 11:53  the changes should be applicable only when the UE is regsitered with the same PLMN over 3GPP access and non-3GPP access, this is missing in the CR  Rae, Thu, 12:56  Explaining her approach  Kaj, Thu, 15:05  Requires changes  Sung, Thu, 23:10  Needs improvement, agrees with some of Kaj’s proposals  Roozbeh, Fri, 01:00  Update cover sheet, some improvement needed  Amer, Sat, 04:41  Answering ot Sung  Ani, Mon, 08:11  Comments  Kaj, Mon, 13:48  Comments,  Chend, Mon, 17:52  Defending  Chen; Tue, 16:58  Providing a rev  Amer, Wed, 07:27  Changes need to go to different clause  Yoko, Wed, 09:07  Fine  Kaj, Wed, 14:09  improvements  Chen, Wed, 17:44  New rev  Roozbeh, Wed, 20:26  Fine  Amer, Thu 01:54  Which aspect of the CR is new?  Ani, Thu, 06:22  Fine, some suggestions  Chen, NEW REV  Ani FINE | |
|  |  | | C1-202921 | Notification over non-3GPP access when UE is deregistered over 3GPP access | | | Ericsson /kaj | CR 2082 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202244  Ani, Fri, 03:56  **We DO NOT agree to this solution**  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Roozbeh, Thu, 23:24  Cover page needs improvement, existing text has a spelling error  Rae, Fri, 12:12  Not clear this can happen  Vishnau, Fri, 16:46  This does not solve the problem  Sung, Fri, 17:58  Supports Vishnu  Ani, Sat, 22:49  Does not solve problem, supported C1-202146 | |
|  |  | | C1-202682 | MRU after SR for ESFB aborted | | | MediaTek Inc. | CR 2185 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202503  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Kristzian, Fri, 06:17  Couple of comments  Sung, Sat, 00:29  First change ok, second change not needed  Krisztian, Mon, 23:05  Can support second change  Marko, Tue, 08:59  Acks  Sung, Wed, 20:47  Taking back one comment, i.e. second change can go forward, first?? | |
|  |  | | C1-202747 | No allowed NSSAI associated with a registration area | | | vivo | CR 2061 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Revision of C1-202175  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Kaj, Thu, 14:39  Does not see that the proposal makes it clearer  Yanchao, fri 06:14  Explaining why the CR is good | |
|  |  | | C1-202931 | Attach request message for N1 mode | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, Ericsson | CR 3150 24.301 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202391  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1ah-200180 | |
|  |  | | C1-202928 | Indication that the emergency services fallback attempt failed | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2142 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202382  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lin, Fri, 10:41  current text is not so accurate but better to modify the existing text  Sung, Fri, 16:48  Asking form Lin  Lin, Tue, 05:20  Commenting  Sung, Wed, 02:36  Rev  Lin, Wed, 08:19  fine | |
|  |  | | C1-202929 | Inclusion of ATTACH REQUEST message in REGISTRATION REQUEST message during initial registration when 5G-GUTI mapped from 4G-GUTI is used | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, Ericsson, Qualcomm Incorporated | CR 0793 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202390  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1ah-200179  Roozbeh, Fri, 02:54  “or” instead of “and”  Fei, Fri, 04:39  asks a question  Lin, Fri, 10:34  Ok in principle, requests some changes  Sung, Tue, 23:04  Provides a rev  Roozbeh, Wed, 01:44  Some more change  Fei, Wed, 04:27  More is needed  Lin, Wed, 08:36  Fine  Fei, Wed, 09:07  Discussing  Sung, Wed, 14:07  Discussing with Fei  Sung, Wed, 22:56  Ongoing with Fei  Fei, Thu, 08:12  Can live with it | |
|  |  | | C1-202932 | Paging with two valid 5G-GUTIs | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 1841 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202392  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1ah-200213  Kai, Thu, 15:35  Fine, some comments  Sung, Fri, 21:45  Provides rev | |
|  |  | | C1-202600 | Addition of Test Flag | | | one2many B.V. | CR 0215 23.041 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-202203  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Current Status Postponed  RAN3 LS not received  Frederic, Thu, 09:08  Clauses affected missing  Lazaros, Thu, 17:03  Wait for RAN3 discussion to conclude  Commenting the content of the CR  PeterS, Thu, 20:46  Agrees to wait for RAN3, is happy to work on improving the text  Lazaros, Tue, 18:24  Wait for the RAN3 LS  PeterS, Tue, 10:45  Commenting | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 5Gprotoc16-non3GPP | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | Stage-3 5GS NAS protocol development related to non-3GPP access | |
|  |  | | [C1-202279](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202279.zip) | Add handling for UE configured to use timer T3245 in 5GS for non-3GPP access | | | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR 0121 24.502 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | C1-202907 | Extending congestion notification to capture ePDG overload | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, Charter Communications | CR 0718 24.302 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202578  Amer Fine  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 12:52  Does not see a need for the CR  Amer, Thu, 20:32  Same as Ivo, not needed  Roozbeh, Sat, 00:13  CR is not needed  Lazaros, Thu, 11:55  NEW REV | |
|  |  | | C1-202903 | Extending congestion notification to capture N3IWF or TNGF overload | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, Charter Communications | CR 0130 24.502 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202579  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Joy, Thu, 12:02  not appropriate to use this private error type”CONGESTION” to reflect the congestion status in N3IWF itself.  Roozbeh, Fri, 23:20  Not sure about Joy’s comment, solution is simpler than the RFC  Roozbeh, Sat: 00:08  Taking back previous comment, CR is NOT needed  Lazaros, Tue, 22:57  Explaining  Roozbeh, Wed, 16:12  Not convinced this is needed  Lazaros, Wed, 17:12  Explaining  Roozbeh, Thu, 02:09  Explaining  Lazaros, Thu, 11:25  Discussing  Joy can live with it | |
|  |  | | C1-202901 | Enable N3IWF to initiate TCP connection establishment upon failure | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0131 24.502 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202580  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 12:52  Is misleading  Roozbeh, Fri, 04:39  Proposes changes  Lazraros, Thu, 01:33  Rev  Roozbeh, Thu, 02:37  New suggestions  Ivo, Thu, 10:05  Commenting  Lazaros providing a rev | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | ATSSS | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects of Access Traffic Steering, Switch and Splitting support in 5G system  Is TS 24.193 sufficiently stable to be sent to CT#88 for approval?  Show of hands, 16.04./17.04.  Support for C1-202019 (Ericsson) **24**  Support for C1-202266 (Apple) **14** | |
|  |  | | [C1-202009](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202009.zip) | EPS interworking of MA PDU session of 5G-RG when N26 is not supported | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 2027 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202142](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202142.zip) | Correction on network steering functionalities information | | | ZTE / Joy | pCR 24.193 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202266](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202266.zip) | ATSSS Performance Measurement Function Protocols and Procedures | | | Apple, Deutsche Telekom, Charter Communications, Ruckus, Commscope | pCR 24.193 Rel-16 | Not Pursued  Based on outcome of show of hands and confirmed in confcall and email from Krisztian  Revision of C1-200655  Ivo, Thu, 12:52  Prefers Ericsson solution | |
|  |  | | [C1-202294](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202294.zip) | Discussion on handling of clause 5.2 in TS 24.193 | | | ZTE / Joy | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  Roozbeh, Thu, 20:54  Looking for related CR, some improval for 4.12  Atle, Thu, 22:54  Good paper, provides some proposals  Peter  See result from ConfCall#3 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202371](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202371.zip) | Clarification of UE azarosi on receiving ATSSS support indicator | | | SHARP | CR 2133 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Based on request from author, Wed, 08:58  Joy, Thu, 11:45  change in this CR is not needed. It has been specified in clause 5.2.5 of 24.193 already.  Atle, Thu, 23:01  Not needed  Mikael, Fri, 16:55  Not needed | |
|  |  | | [C1-202533](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202533.zip) | Correction to the steering modes | | | MediaTek Inc. / JJ | pCR 24.193 Rel-16 | Roozbeh, Thu, 22:13  Not convinced new text is needed  JJ, Fri, 13:36  Explaining to Roozbeh  Roozbeh, Sat, 20:01  CR is fine | |
|  |  | | [C1-202575](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202575.zip) | PMF protocol alternatives analysis | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  Roozbeh, Thu, 22:31  Some comments  Krisztian, Fri, 07:19  comments  Lazaros, Fri, 11:51  answers | |
|  |  | | C1-202576 | Minor clarification for ATSSS-LL support | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2209 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-202577 | Clarification on MAI | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | pCR 24.193 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-202582](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202582.zip) | Service Request for Multiple access PDU session | | | Samsung / Kyungjoo Grace Suh | pCR 24.193 Rel-16 | Postponed  Roozbeh, Thu, 22:35  Asks for rewording  Lena, Fri, 05:14  Where is the stage-2  Lazaros, Fri, 12:16  do not see the need for the CR | |
|  |  | | C1-202622 | Comparison of solutions for performance measurement function (PMF) protocol | | | Ericsson / Ivo | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  Revision of C1-202021  Revision of C1-200313  Roozbeh, Thu, 19:36  Long explanation on security aspects, Lenovo and Motorola Mobility will stay neutral in the selection of the protocol  Krisztian, Fri, 07:49  Does not agree  Lazaros, Fri, 11:55  Comments  Ivo, Fri, 16:46  Long explanation | |
|  |  | | C1-202650 | Editorial fix in 9.11.4 | | | Apple | CR 2169 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202431  Lena, Fri, 05:17  CR is fine, should be CAT F | |
|  |  | | C1-202679 | Performance management function protocol | | | Ericsson / Ivo | pCR 24.193 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202621  Revision of C1-202019  Mariusz, tue, 18:08  Abbreviation to be sorted out  Revision of C1-200314  **Kristzian, Tue, 07:48**  **This is to confirm that Apple has no objection to proceed with C1-202019.** | |
|  |  | | C1-202695 | EPS interworking of MA PDU session of 5G-RG when N26 is supported | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 2029 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202031  Roozbeh, Thu, 20:08  Requests some changes  Ivo, Mon, 11:16  Providing rev in the Inbox  Roozbeh, Mon, 18:39  Fine with the rev | |
|  |  | | C1-202642 | Clarification of SMF and UE azarosi in 5GS to EPS mobility without N26 interface | | | SHARP | pCR 24.193 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202372  Joy, Thu, 11:45  Some of new text is not needed, transfer procedure incorrect, rest ok  Roozbeh, Thu, 21:42  Not sure that the CR is needed  Yudai, Fri, 09:41  Provides a rev in response to Roozbeh  Mikael, Fri, 16:44  Is the added text needed in 24.193?  Roozbeh, Sat, 19:53  Rev is fine  Yudai, Tue, 06:55  Provides rev  Mikael, Tue, 13:38  works | |
|  |  | | C1-202701 | Applicability of PS data off to MA PDU | | | OPPO / Rae | CR 2042 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202120  Partially overlaps with C1-202289  Joy, Thu, 11:44  Newly introduced Note is not sufficient  Roozbeh, Thu, 20:30  Improve cover page, rewording needed for new text  Atle, Thu, 22:27  New and existing text are repetititve, can this be combined?  Mikael,Fri, 16:24  Same view as roozbeh, atle, sentences to be combined  Rae, Mon, 05:37  All comments on board, rev in Inbox  Atle, Mon, 08:39  Fine with the rev, not super happy with some words, can live with it  Rae, Wed, 03:41  New rev, many things taken out  Mikael, Wed, 08:33  good | |
|  |  | | C1-202661 | Correction on EPS interworking | | | ZTE / Joy | pCR 24.193 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202143  Roozbhe, Thu, 20:38  Needs rewording  Joy, Fri, 08:19  Explaining why this is needed  Roozbeh, Fri, 18:25  Further commenting  Joy, Sat, 09:15  Fine with Roozbeh proposal, rev in Inbox  Roozbeh, Sat, 18:11  CR is fine | |
|  |  | | C1-202816 | Handlings of MA PDU session when deregistration from an access | | | MediaTek Inc. / JJ | CR 2203 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202531  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Atle, Thu, 23:08  Asking for clarification  JJ, Fri, 11:31  Answering to Atle, is this sufficient?  Atle, Fri, 12:51  Fine with explanation, doc needs to be revised accordingly  JJ, Mon, 11:19  Providing the rev  Atle, Tue, 01:10  Fine with the rev | |
|  |  | | C1-202818 | Considering allowed NSSAI when requesting MA PDU session upgrade | | | MediaTek Inc. / JJ | pCR 24.193 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202532  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Osama, Thu, 22:07  Update cover page, add a NOTE  Atle, Thu, 23:05  Not convinced that this is correct  JJ, Fri, 13:17  Providing rev  Roozbeh, Sat, 20:12  Rev looks fine  Atle, Mon, 08:42  Rev is fine | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | eNS | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects on enhancement of network slicing | |
|  |  | | [C1-202114](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202114.zip) | Adding the referenced subclause 4.6.2.2 for the UE stored Pending NSSAI. | | | China Telecom Corporation Ltd. | CR 2041 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status merged into 2473  Amer, Fri, 20:17  New bullete needs revision, should have been made against 2113, no open comment against 2114  Fei, Thu, 11:01  Asks that this is revised into 2473 and its revisions  Lin, Thu, agrees with Fei | |
|  |  | | [C1-202123](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202123.zip) | Allowed NSSAI was formed from contents of the requested NSSAI and all default S-NSSAI(s) require network slice-specific authentication and authorisation | | | Samsung Electronics Polska | discussion | Noted  EN#11 & Task #4  See also C1-202123, 2124,2243, 2252 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202124](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202124.zip) | All default S-NSSAI(s) require network slice-specific authentication and authorisation (solution 1) | | | Samsung Electronics Polska | CR 2045 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  EN#11 & Task #4  See also C1-202123, 2124,2243, 2252  Sunhee, Fri, 10:25  Conflicts with 2253, prefers to wati for conclusion in the SA2 discusion  Yanchao, Fri, 16:41  prefer to use the Ericson’s solution in C1-202252  Kaj, Sun, 22:47  2252 is the way to go, depends a bit on SA2  Roozbeh, Mon, 19:19  Prefers 2252 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202134](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202134.zip) | Stopping of T3346 after receiving the NSSA Command message | | | BEIJING SAMSUNG TELECOM R&D | CR 2049 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202150](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202150.zip) | Inclusion of Rejected NSSAI in Registration reject with cause #62 | | | Samsung/Anikethan | CR 2052 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Fei, Fri, 04:57  Including rejected NSSAI is optional  Ani, Sat, 22:11  Defending his CR  Atle, Sun, 10:43  Wants to co-sign  Kaj, Sun, 23:10  Seems the CR is not needed  Ani, Mon, 06:15  Answering Fei, Kaj  Fei, Tue, 08:44  We made decision this is optional  Kaj, Tue, 08:47  Concerns  Ane, Tue, 11:52  Rev  Kaj, Tue, 12:18  Commenting it can be out of synch  Ani, Tue, 12:34  Asking back | |
|  |  | | [C1-202172](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202172.zip) | Discussion paper on the impact of non-standard S-NSSAI mapping to NSSAA and NSSAI storage | | | China Mobile | discussion 24.501 Rel-16 | Noted  Ani, Sat, 23.25  Acks the use case, number of comments  Xu, Sun 17:45  Discussing  Fei, Mon, 05:35  Use cases are valid, two approaches  Ani, Tue, 04:34  Option-2  Xu, tue, 07:04  Asking whether to further study this and find a backward compatible solution  Ani, Tue, 07:45  Will provide comments n the CR in 2173 soon  Kaj, Tue, 08:02  Comments  Fei, Tue, 08:47  only address the rejected NSSAI for the failed NSSAA at this emeeting  Kaj, Tue, 09:37  More comments  Ani, Wed, 04:30  Too many changes  Xu, Wed, 17:29  Providing the rev | |
|  |  | | [C1-202224](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202224.zip) | T3540 is not started if the Registration Accept includes a pending NSSAI | | | BEIJING SAMSUNG TELECOM R&D | CR 2075 24.501 Rel-16 | Amer, Sun, 09:48  Q for clarification, seem to go against existing EN  Mahmoud, Mon, 05:35  Long email  Amer, Wed, 08:04  Some comments  Mahmoud, Wed, 17:05  Answering  Amer, Thu, 02:07  OK with the CR | |
|  |  | | [C1-202241](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202241.zip) | Fixing typo related to eNS | | | BEIJING SAMSUNG TELECOM R&D | CR 2080 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202243](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202243.zip) | All default S-NSSAI(s) require network slice-specific authentication and authorisation (solution 2B) | | | Samsung Electronics Polska | CR 2081 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  EN#11 & Task #4  See also C1-202123, 2124,2243, 2252  Kaj, Sun, 22:47  2252 is the way to go, depends a bit on SA2  Roozbeh, Mon, 21:15  Do not agree | |
|  |  | | C1-202246 | S-NSSAI in rejected NSSAI for the failed or revoked NSSAA not to be requested | | | Ericsson /kaj | CR 2083 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-202250](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202250.zip) | Request S-NSSAI pending the NW slice-specific authentication and authorization | | | Ericsson /kaj | CR 2004 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Revision of C1-200724  Task#3, See also C1-202250, 2472, 2473  Yanchao, Thu, 12:54  Issue with change in 4.6.2.4, editorial in 5.5.3.1.2  Mahmoud, Thu, 22:36  Detailed comments, prefers C1-202473 from Huawei as baseline, both CRs could be merged  Atle, Fri, 13:10  Fine in general, needs different approach  Kaj, Fri, 16:28  Answering the comments  Mahmoud, Fri, 17:33  Commenting  Kaj, Mon, 09:39  Answering Atle  Lin, Mon, 09:50  Could be merged with 2473, many comments  Kaj, Mon, 12:07  Commenting, seems he is willing to merge  Atle, Mon, 14:46  Answering Kaj, accepts to wait for other groups  Atle, Tue, 02:39  Asking if this is going to be merged to 2473  Atle, Wed, 00:34  Not happy to link discussion to a SA2 CR whith unknown status, focus on exsiting requirements  Lin, Wed, 04:27  Explaining to Kaj | |
|  |  | | [C1-202252](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202252.zip) | S-NSSAIs always selected from allowed NSSAI by AMF | | | Ericsson /kaj | CR 2086 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status postponed  EN#11 & Task #4  See also C1-202123, 2124,2243, 2252  Sunhee, Fri, 11:40  Conflicts with C1-202124, prefers to wait for SA2  Ricky, Fri, 13:52  Samsung cannot agree to CR C1-202252  Kaj, Mon, 09:51  I think we have to wait for the outcome from SA2 meeting before progressing  Ricky, Mon, 14:03  agree that we have to wait until SA2 progresses this issue | |
|  |  | | C1-202330 | Abnormal case about missing EAP result for NSSAA | | | China Mobile | CR 2109 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Not available on time | |
|  |  | | [C1-202332](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202332.zip) | Work Plan for eNS in CT1 | | | ZTE | Work Plan Rel-16 | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-202340](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202340.zip) | Deleting Editors note regarding indefinite wait at the UE for NSSAA completion | | | ZTE | CR 1912 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Request from author  Revision of C1-201051  EN#1 & Task #2  Kundan, Tue, 16:05  Wants this to be postponed | |
|  |  | | [C1-202345](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202345.zip) | Discussion on re-initiation of NSSAA | | | BEIJING SAMSUNG TELECOM R&D | discussion | Noted  EN#10 & Task#1  See also C1-202170, 2345,   2351, 2352  Kaj, Wed, 00:06  Describing a third option  Fei, Wed, 08:24  Option 3 seems to mean Do nothing in the spec  Kaj, Wed, 08:53  Yes  Mahmoud, Wed, 16:52  Do nothing not acceptable  Kaj, Thu, 00:04  arguing | |
|  |  | | [C1-202346](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202346.zip) | EPS selection when the UE is deregistered due to NSSAA failure | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 1950 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Revision of C1-200572  Yanchao, Thu, 13:37  Ok in principle, but more changes are needed  Kundan, Thu, 14:37  Ok with Yanchao’s comments  Fei, Fri, 08:28  as commented in the last meeting, the CR is not needed  Roozbeh, Mon, 21:43  Same as Fei  Kund, Tue, 09:27  Defending | |
|  |  | | [C1-202351](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202351.zip) | Re-initiation of NSSAA (solution #1) | | | BEIJING SAMSUNG TELECOM R&D | CR 2124 24.501 Rel-16 | EN#10 & Task#1  See also C1-202170, 2345, 2351, 2352.  Mahmoud, Mon, 05:41  This is more efficient than #2  Kaj, Mon, 07:38  **Current solution preferred, CR not needed**  Vishnu, Mon, 10:22  support Solution #1. (i.e CR C1-202351)  Roozbeh, Man, 20:11  sending the pending NSSAI to the UE during the reNSSAA … not needed  Mahmoud, Mon, 20:23  Not clear with Roozbeh’s statement, seems not aligned with his previous input to the discussion  Sung, Tue, 05:58  Supports, but needs some rewording  Sunhee, Tue, 09:53  Comments  Roozbeh, Tue, 16:45  Asking for clarification from Mahmoud  Mahmoud, Tue, 17:43  Answering Roozbeh  Roozbeh, Tue, 18:26  Concept is fine, however, can it be “may” | |
|  |  | | [C1-202352](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202352.zip) | Re-initiation of NSSAA (solution #2) | | | BEIJING SAMSUNG TELECOM R&D | CR 2125 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  EN#10 & Task#1  See also C1-202170, 2345, 2351, 2352  Amer, Sun, 18:39  prefer this CR versus C1-202351  Kaj, Mon, 07:38  **Current solution preferred, CR not needed**  Roozbeh, Mon, 20:23  Not needed  Mahmound, Mon, 20:46  Answering to Roozbehm this is about new requests  Mahmoud, Mon, 20:47  Anserign Kaj,  Tsuyoshi, Tue, 01:42  Commenting Kaj, case is to be considered | |
|  |  | | [C1-202383](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202383.zip) | Clarification to NSSAA procedure | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 2143 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Kaj, Fri, 10:41  don’t see that the proposed should be in the NAS specification.  Kundan, Fri, 12:08  Sees no issue with capturing this in CT1 spec  Kaj, Fri, 16:47  SA2 needs to do this first  Kundan, Mon, 11:45  Generic sub-clause 4.6.2.4 fits  Kaj, Mon, 14:20  This is a stage-2 group decision  Tsuyoshi, Tue, 01:59  SA2 first | |
|  |  | | [C1-202430](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202430.zip) | Release PDU sessions due to revocation from AAA server , re-auth failure | | | LG Electronics France | CR 2168 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Yanchao, Thu, 13:42  PDU session release via explicit NAS signaling is not needed for this case  Fei, Fri, 08:30  Same as yanchao  Sunhee, Fri, 09:36  Explains that this is inline with SA2  Kaj, Fri, 11:22  not convinced that a new 5GSM cause value is needed  Ricky, Fri, 18:12  Same view as Yanchao and Fei  Fei, Sat, 07:59  Releasing without NAS sig is inline with stage-2  Sunhee, 12:11  Thinks that explicit NAS sig is needed, this goes to Ricky and Fei  Sunhee, Sun, 13:13  NAS sig is needed, to Kaj  Amer, Sun, 19:13  Wrong wording  Roozbeh, Mon, 01:07  CR is not needed  Lin, Mon, 09:08  same view as Yanchao, Fei and Ricky.  Sunhee, Mon ,09:40  Taking Amer comment on board, rev in Inbox  Sunhee, Mon, 12:05  will not insist my CR. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202454](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202454.zip) | Updating NSSAI status in AMF | | | NEC | CR 1990 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Requested by the author  Revision of C1-200691  Overlaps with C1-202111  Kaj, Fri, 10:57  don’t see that NAS spec is the correct document to capture this  Lin, Mon, 08:54  Change is not aligned with the cover page  Tsuyoshi, Tue, 03:41  Want to see outcome of CT4 first before making any progress  Lin, Tue, 09:23  Ct1 and ct4 can do this separately  **Kaj, Tue, 11:15**  **Let’s wait for CT4**  Tsuyoshi, wed, 07:06  No need to wait for CT4, 2 questions  **Lin, Wed ,10:06**  **Answering tsuysohsi**  Tsuyoshi Thu, 03:54  Some questins from Lin  Lin, Thu, 10:55  What is the purpose of the CR?ß | |
|  |  | | [C1-202472](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202472.zip) | Discussion on including pending S-NSSAI(s) in the requested NSSAI | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  Task#3  See also C1-202250, 2472, 2473 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202475](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202475.zip) | Term on rejected NSSAI for the failed or revoked NSSAA | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 2181 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202543](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202543.zip) | Clarification to NW slice-specific re-authentication and re-authorization | | | Ericsson /kaj | CR 2206 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Lin, Mon, 08:32  CR is not needed, covered in the spec  Kaj, mon, 10:33  Not convinced by the arguments  Roozbeh, Mon,22:16  Change does not make sense  Tsuyoshi, Tue, 01:26  Why is AMF description needed for this specific case  Lin, Tue, 09:41  Does not agree on all aspects  Kaj, Tue, 11:32  Ack Lin paritally  Kaj Tue, 11:58  Answering  Tsuyoshi, Wed, 06:36  Still has questions  Lin, Wed, 10:24  Comments  Kaj, Wed, 11:05  Unclear comments  Tsuyoshi, Thu, 05:44  Can not agree  Kaj, Thu, 10:00  Does not agree  Tsuyoshi, Thu, 10:46  Not agreeing | |
|  |  | | C1-202587 | Update Handing EAP Result for NSSAA | | | China Mobile | CR 2212 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Not available on time | |
|  |  | | [C1-202589](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202589.zip) | eNS – way forward for indefinite wait for NSSAA | | | InterDigital / Atle | Discussion | Noted  EN#1 & Task #2  Atle, Tue, 13:04  This is just to secure alignment, paper will be noted | |
|  |  | | C1-202603 | Updating descriptions of NS for NSSAA | | | China Mobile | CR 2058 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202171  Roozbeh, thu, 23:41  **I cannot agree**  Ricky, Thu, 14:51  do not believe that this CR is required  Xu, Fri, 07:34  Explains why it is needed, also announces a revision  Suhnee, Fri, 11:50  Some rewording  Ricky, Fri, 13:17  respectively I disagree with Xu  Xu, Fri, 16:14  Acks Sunhee comments  Xu, Fri, 16:01  Acks ricky, new reve  Ricky, Fri 17:31  Fine, more changes needed  Xu, Sun, 10:06  Checking with Roozbeh there might be clashes with 2282, acks Ricky  Kaj, Sun, 11:26  Incomplete CR, does not see this is needed  Xu, Sun, 12:37  Hinting at rev, explaining to Kaj  Roozeh, Mon, 16:50  Further comments  Roozbeh, Mon, 22:46  Further comments  Kaj, Tue, 09:19  comenting  Roozbeh, Tue, 23:15  Not clear what he proposes  Xu, Wed ,13:16  Commenting  Roozbeh, Wed, 18:53  New update  Ricky, Wed, 19:59  Not agreeing with roozbeh  Roozbeh, Wed, 21:03  answerign | |
|  |  | | C1-202627 | Updating Rejeted NSSAI IE for failed NSSAA case in roaming scenerios | | | China Mobile | CR 2108 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202329  Kaj, thu, 11:54  Cover page, Note is needed  Kaj, Fr, 09:53  Fine with the CR  Amer, Sun, 18:06  New text to go to procedural subclauses  Xu, Tue, 05:19  Provides a rev | |
|  |  | | C1-202629 | Missing condition for inclusion of “NSSAA to be performed” indicatory | | | Samsung Electronics Polska | CR 2043 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202121  Kaj, Sun ,10:56  Comments on bullet a)  Ricky, Mon, 19:01  Provides rev  Kaj, Tue, 08:22  Commenting | |
|  |  | | C1-202678 | Clarify that NSSAA can occur during periodic registration or mobility updating for NB-N1 mode UEs | | | BEIJING SAMSUNG TELECOM R&D | CR 2079 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202234  Kaj, Fri, 14:18  CR is not needed  Mahmoud, Fri, 16:33  Explaining the case  Kaj, Tue, 10:18  Further issues  Mahmoud, Tue, 20:23  Rev  Kaj, Wed, 09:15  Can this really happen??  Mahmoud, Wed, 15:36  Answering  Kaj, Thu, 00:41  Use case not valid  Mahmoud, Thu, 01:18  Not agreeing  Kaj, Thu, 01:38  Use case not valid  Mahmoud, Thu, 01:59  “Kaj is not answering the questin”  Fei, Thu, 04.22  Confirming the use case  Mahmoud, Thu,06:05  “Baseline of the spec support his view”  Kaj, Thu, 10:15  Fine with Fei, The issue I have is the understanding of what such by AMF changed allowed NSSAI may inlcude.  And that I have explained below and with that I don’t see the changes proposed are applicable based on that a S-NSSAI subject to re-NSSAA will still be in allowed NSSAAI and not be inlcuded in pending NSSAI.  Mahmoud, Thu, 10:49  Does not agree with Kaj | |
|  |  | | C1-202702 | The handling of N1 SM information during re-authentication and re-authorization for an S-NSSAI | | | China Mobile | CR 2057 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202170  Sung, Fri, 06:25  OBJECTS  EN#10 & Task#1  See also C1-202170, 2345, 2351, 2352.  Kaj, Sun, 11:16  CR should not be agreed  Amer, Sun, 18:35  Q for clarification  Roozbeh, Mon, 20:46  comments  Xu, Tue, 10:10  Does not agree with Kaj  Kaj, Tue, 11:38  Commenting  Xu, Tue, 12:41  Answering Roozbeh | |
|  |  | | C1-202669 | NSSAA for UEs that roam across 5GS VPLMNs | | | BEIJING SAMSUNG TELECOM R&D | CR 2090  24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-202259  Amer, OK  Kaj, Thu, 11:41  NOT OK with the Cr  Mahmoud, Thu, 12:02  Not happy with this late comment, seems not correct to him  Kaj, Thu, 14:49  Can accept this CR, may come back  Karj, Friday, 11:24  Requests this to be postponed  Amer, Sun, 17:48  Some modification to the text  Mahmoud, Mon, 05.56  Asking for clarification from Amer  Kaj, Mon, 07:50  Change in 5.4.4.3 is and 5.5.1.3.4 not applicable.  Mahmoud, Mon, 15:29  Answering  Mahmour, Tue, 19:32  Providing rev  Amer, Wed, 08:18  New proposal  Mahmoud, Wed, 15:50  New proposal  Amer, Thu, 02:20  Fine with latest draft | |
|  |  | | C1-202827 | Exception to initiate the service request procedure during NSSAA when there is no allowed NSSAI | | | BEIJING SAMSUNG TELECOM R&D | CR 2089 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202257  Fei, Fri, 05:20  Update on condition needed for SMS  Mahmoud, Fri, 05:46  Clarifies for Fei  Fei, Fri, 08:46  Very confused by the condition  Mahmound, Fri, 20:30  Providing a rev, is that ok for Fei?  Amer, Sun 09:44  Q for clarification  Fei, Tue 08:52  Fine  Kaj, Tue, 10:40  SMS in ServiceRequest violates stage-2  Fei, Tue, 11:54  Hinting at decision from last meeting  Kaj, Tue, 14:17  Last time we sent an LS to SA2, should we now ask for their blessing  Mahmoud, Tue, 15:16  Is ok to send LS, but wants to know what is agreeabel  Mahmoud, Tue, 17:31  Answering Amer  Amer, Wed, 08:08  fine | |
|  |  | | C1-202833 | NSSAA in an SNPN | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2135 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202374  Yanchao, Thu, 13:37  usage of ‘RSNPN’ and ’SNPN’ should be aligned  Lin, Mon, 08:51  With comment form Yanchao, could live with the CR, also not big issue to be solved | |
|  |  | | C1-202784 | Missing condition at registration reject due to no available slices | | | Ericsson /kaj | CR 2091 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Revision of C1-202261  Lin, Thu, 09:04  Kaj, Agrees with Lin, new rev will come  Ricky, Thu, 12:05  Cover sheet, and wording improvement  Lin, Mon 07:28  Additional typo  Kaj, Mon ,10:18  Fine  Kaj, Wed, 11.33  New rev  Ricky, Wed, 13:00  Some minor comments | |
|  |  | | C1-202813 | S-NSSAI in rejected NSSAI for the failed or revoked NSSAA not to be requested | | | Ericsson /kaj | CR 1734 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202247  Revision of C1-198417  Ricky, Thu, 13:46  Agrees with the concept, some changes are missing in #62 in some subclauses, cover sheet needs improvement, wants to co-sign  Roozbeh, 20:34  Is this really needed?  Kaj, Wed, 15:46  New rev  Roozbeh is fine | |
|  |  | | C1-202825 | Alignment of UE actions of rejected NSSAI for the failed or revoked NSSAA | | | Ericsson /kaj | CR 2084 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202248  Lin, FINE  Lin, Mon, 10:02  Improves wording  Roozbeh, Mon, 21:20  Wording changes  Kaj, Wed, 16:45  Acks Roozbeh | |
|  |  | | C1-202872 | Update description on whether UE indicate supporting NSSAA | | | China Telecom Corporation Ltd. | CR 2039 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202792  2792 marked withdrawn, so it is a rev of 2112  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-202112  Fei, Wed, 12:13  Editorials  Ricky, Wed, 12:53  Coversheet, cat f, consequences if not approved  Ricky, Thu, 18:49  Long explanation, CR is not neccssary  Kaj, Fri, 11:00  CR is not needed  Amer, Fri, 20:11  Untick ME, tick CN  Shuzehn, thu, 08:24  New rev | |
|  |  | | C1-202778 | Pending NSSAI update for the configured NSSAI in the CUC message | | | China Telecom Corporation Ltd. | CR 2040 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202113  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Shuzhen, Sun, 03:00  Provides a rev, highlighting that Amer comment on 2114 is to be made again 2113  Amer, Wed, 07:47  Fine with the rev | |
|  |  | | C1-202628 | Updating requirements of NSSAA for roaming scenerios | | | China Mobile | CR 2059 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202173  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ani, thu, 05:56  Commenting, same as in the disc paper, just some parts are needed  Shuzhen, thu, 09:51  Agreeing with arni, new rev  New rev  Fei, minor comment, wants to co-sig  Ani FINE | |
|  |  | | C1-202776 | Clarification on the rejected S-NSSAI included in requested NSSAI in registration procedure. | | | China Telecom Corporation Ltd. | CR 2053 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202157  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ricky, Thu, 12.26  Concept not correct, prefers the proposal as in C1-202247  Shuzhen, Sun, 03:48  Discussing with Ricky  Kaj, Sun, 11:09  CR not needed  Ricky, Sun, 18:22  With rev of 2247, this CR is not needed  Shuzhen, Mon, 08:44  Agrees C1-202157 is not needed  Lin, Mon, 08:43  Keep on discussing, proposing a NOTE  Ricky, Mon, 1228  updating the Note  Lin, Mon, 14:56  Leaving it to Shuzhen what to do  Ricky, Mon, 15:20  Leaving it to Shuzehn  Kaj, ute, 08:58  Comments/thoughts | |
|  |  | | C1-202774 | Clarification S-NSSAI status in AMF for NSSAA | | | China Telecom Corporation Ltd. | CR 2038 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202111  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Overlaps with C1-202454  Lin, Mon, 08:57  CR is fine, some changes, wants to co-sign  Ricky, Mon, 13:09  Supports Lin  Lin, Mon, 16:28  Provides proposal for wording  Ricky, Mon, 16:49  Futher refining  Lin, Mon, 16:54  Likes the text from Ricky  Tsuyoshi, Mon, 16:54  Hints at some CT4 work  Kaj, Mon, 23:26  Clarifying that Tsuyohsi’s comment does not require CT1 work  Tsuyoshi, Tue, 00:56  Would be ok to have it in NAS spec, but needs to be aligned between WGs  Atle, Tue 03:04  Some wording discussion  Fei, Tue, 03:18  To Tsyuoshi, just use reference to CT4 spec  Shuzehn, Tue, 07:26  Rev  Kaj, Tue, 08:37  Is this the latest rev  Shezehn, Tue, 09:51  Yes this is latest rever  Ricky, Tue, 13:31  Some changes needed  Lin, Wed, 03:41  Some improvements  Shuzehn, Wed, 05:48  rev | |
|  |  | | C1-202608 | AMF triggers PDU session release | | | Samsung Electronics Polska | CR 2044 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202122  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Kaj, Fri, 11:34  Fine with the CR needs rewording  Sunhee, Fri, 11:43  Fine in general, some rewording  Ricky, Fri, 12:51  Provides rev  Yanchao, Fri, 16:36  CT1 has agreed that the local release of PDU session is enough in last meeting, no need to initiate the PDU session release procedure.  Ricky, Fri, 17:14  Agrees with Yanchao, new rev  Sunhee, Mon, 10:20  Follows majority  Kaj, Tue, 08:25  Explicit NAS sig applies  Ricyk, Tue, 12:16  Not agreeing with kaj  Kaj, Tue, 12:27  Not agreeing with ricky  Ricky, Tue, 17:28  Different view, asking for other companies position  Roozbeh, Tue, 23:06  Not clear  Ricky, Wed, 11:47  Explaining to Roozbeh  Roozbeh, Wed ,16:14  No issue with this cr | |
|  |  | | [C1-202871](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202473.zip) | Inclusion of pending S-NSSAI(s) in the requested NSSAI | | | Huawei, HiSilicon, China Telecom/Lin | CR 2180 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of [C1-202800](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202473.zip)  Revision of [C1-202473](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202473.zip)  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Task#3,  See also C1-202250, 2472, 2473  Mahmoud, Fri, 05:44  generally fine with the paper however it still requires some improvements, wants co-signing  Lin, Fri, 12:49  Provides a rev  Mahmoud, Fri, 17:16  Still has comments  Lin, Sat, 03:59  Answering Mahmoud  Fei, Sat 04:38  Providing his view ,  Lin, Sat, 08:17  Either “add-on” or “replace”, no mixure  Mahmoud, Sat, 21:54  Agrees with Lin,  Atle, Sun, 11:05  Ok with some changes, objecting to some others  Lin, Mon, 04:07  Not agreeing with Atle  Fei, Mon, 04:29  Agrees with Lin  Kaj, Mon, 07.33  1 ok, 2 partly, 3 comments  Lin, Mon, 09:43  Rev2, to Mahmound  Fei, Mon, 09:42  Access agnostic pending NSSAI, need to be areful  Lin, Mon, 09:58  Providing rev2, asking Kaj, whether 2250 can be merged into this  Tsuyoshi, Mon, 11:19  Question  Atle, Mon, 15:16  Commenting  Mahmoud, Mon, 15:43  Answering Atle  Tsuyoshi, Mon, 16:03  Q for clarification  Mahoumd, Mon, 16:36  answering  Tsuyoshi, Mon, 16:46  Fine with Mahmoud reply  Atle, Tue, 02:39  Not agreeing with Mahmoud  Mahmoud, Tue, 05:17  ongoing disc with Atle  Sung, Tue, 0813  Comments on rev2  Lin, Tue, 10:45  commenting  Lin, Tue, 10:59  Commenting  Kaj, Tue, 11:06  Concern, hinting at S2-2002850  Lin, Tue, 11:18  Providing a rev  Fei, Tue, 11:40  comments  Atel, Tue, 11:55  Comments  Atel, Tue, 12:21  Commenting  Atle, Wed, 00:51  **this point in the release, I am not willing to agree stage-3 changes that break stage-2.**  **Wait for SA2**  **Kaj, Wed, 09:18**  **Ok with Lins latest explanation, merging with might be possible**  **Lin, Thu, 04:52**  **To atle, has taken all Task#3 things out, is it fine?**  **Lin, Thu, 08:53**  **New rev**  Mahmoud, Thu, 09:06  OK  Atle, Thu, 10:17  Comments  Lin, new Rev  Atle FINE with REV3 | |
|  |  | | C1-202881 | Handling of Pending S-NSSAI | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 2144 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of [C1-202385](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202385.zip)  ------------------------------------------------  Frederic, Thu, 09:08  Clauses affected missing  Vishnu, Sun, 15:15  Fine, some editorials  Vishnu, Sun, 16:17  Fine  Kundan, Thu, 07:29  New rev  Vishnu, thu, 08:19  Almost ok  KundanThu, 08:45  rev | |
|  |  | | C1-202918 | Network-requested PDU session release due to failed or revoked NSSAA | | | Motorola Mobility, Lenovo | CR 2099 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202618  Xu, Fri, 12:03  **Object the CR**  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-202282  Shuzhen, Thu, 15:27  Does not agree with current wording  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Yanchao, Thu, 13:25  Changes in 5.4.4.3 are not needed  Ricky, Thu, 16:07  Additional changes to subclause 4.6.2.4 are needed  Sunhee, Fri, 11:55  Similar to 2430, there is an additional cause code needed  Roozbeh, Sun, 23.25  Discussing and providing a rev, is it OK?  Roozbeh, Sun, 23:57  Acks that this is similar to 2430, 2282 attempts to adjust existing text  Amer, Mon, 05:04  Comments  Lin, Mon, 09:06  last change given in sub 5.4.4.3 is not needed  Ricky, Mon, 11:58  Fine with theCR, but interaction with 2603 is to be solved  Roozbeh, Mon, 23:21  Provides a rev  Lin, Tue, 04:28  Fine with the rev  Xu, Wed, 11:43  Number of comments  Roozbeh, Wed, 21:03  Rev  Xu, Thu, 03:49  Rewording  Roozbeh, Thu, 06:43  New rev | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Vertical\_LAN | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects of 5GS enhanced support of vertical and LAN services | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  | Stand-alone NPN | |
|  |  | | [C1-202350](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202350.zip) | TSN working domain terminology | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Cristina | CR 2123 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Postponed  Lena, Thu, 17:59  Some rewording needed, overlaps with Nokia’s C1-202435  Cristina, Fri, 05:32  Will provide revision  Sung, Mon, 03:48  Changes in subclause 4.15.2.2 are incorrect  Cristina, Mon, 05.07  Explaining  Sung, Mon, 05:18  Does not agree  Sung, Mon, 05:54  disagree with changing subclause 4.15.2.2  Sung, Mon, 14:57  Some clarification in SA2 is needed  Lena, Tue, 05:37  ok to not have to changes in subclause 4.15.2.2  Cristina, Tue, 05:47  Wants to postponed and wait for SA2  Sung, Tue, 07:28  OK with postponing both C1-202350 and C1-202435, wants to go on with 2433 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202353](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202353.zip) | TSN working domain terminology | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Cristina | CR 0001 24.535 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-202433 and its revisions  Based on request from author  Ivo, Thu, 13:39  overlaps with C1-202433  Lena, Thus, 18:01  Some rewording overlaps with C1-202433  Sung, Mon, 03:23  Prefers 2433  Cristina, Tue, 05:47  Wants to postponed and wait for SA2  Sung,  OK with postponing both C1-202350 and C1-202435, wants to go on with 2433  Sung, Tue, 15:03  2353 to be merged into 2433 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202354](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202354.zip) | Trigger for Initial Registration procedure | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 2126 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Ivo, Thu, 12:54  Change seems unnecessary  Vishnu, Thu, 17:09  Can be useful, needs fixes  Lena, Thu, 23:07  Fine with the CR, editorial  Yanchao, Fri, 06:28  Changes seems unnecessary  Marko, Fri, 15:19  CR is not needed  Sung, Mon, 03:27  Support Ivo, Yanchao, Fei, and Marko, not needed | |
|  |  | | C1-202365 | DISC Configuring UE to enable manual CAG selection procedure | | | Samsung | discussion Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Not available on time | |
|  |  | | [C1-202395](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202395.zip) | Work plan for Vertical\_LAN | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | discussion Rel-16 | Noted | |
|  |  | | C1-202020 | Configured N3IWF identity for SNPN access via PLMN | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 0507 23.122 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Not available on time | |
|  |  | | [C1-202087](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202087.zip) | Correction in UE azarosi upon receipt of 5GMM cause value #74 or #75 via a non-integrity protected NAS message | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2010 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-200970  Ivo, Thu, 12:57  Enables an attacker by sending just \*one\* fake reject message to temporarily prevent the UE from getting any service using the subscription information indicated in an entry of “list of subscriber data  Sung, Sun, 22:59  Requests this to be put on ConfCall  Lin, Mon, 10:53  Supports the CR  Sung, Wed, 01:04  Additional explanation  Ivo, Wed, 19:20  Wants a statement in the report,  Ericsson sees a danger in C1-202086 (and its revision) enabling an attacker to temporarily prevent the UE from getting services from the selected SNPN by attacker sending a single fake reject message.  Then he can accept the CR | |
|  |  | | [C1-202131](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202131.zip) | Correction of the UE requirements for expiry of T3247 | | | Apple | CR 2048 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Request from author  Sung, Mon, 05:50  CR’s scope is a part of that of C1-202402. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202193](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202193.zip) | update of the counter for SNPN | | | vivo | CR 2064 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202194](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202194.zip) | temporarily and permanently forbidden SNPNs lists per access type | | | vivo | CR 2065 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202197](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202197.zip) | 5GMM cause value #74 in an SNPN with a globally-unique SNPN identity | | | vivo | CR 2068 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202366](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202366.zip) | Condition for access to SNPN | | | SHARP | CR 2129 24.501 Rel-16 | Merged in to C1-202399 and or 2469  Based on request form author  Frederic, Thu, 09:08  Clauses affected missing  Lena, Thu, 23:39  Rewording needed, overlaps with Intel’s C1-202399 and Huawei’s C1-202469 | |
|  |  | | C1-202389 | Clarification to SNPN to SNPN selection procedure | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 2146 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Not available on time | |
|  |  | | [C1-202393](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202393.zip) | figures 1, 2a, 2b, 3 and table 2 not applicable in SNPN | | | Intel /Thomas | CR 0524 23.122 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202620](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202396.zip) | Subscription update in case of SNPN | | | Intel /Thomas | CR 2147 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202396  Merged into C1-202412 and its revisions  Ivo, Thu, 13:00  Unclear wording  Sung, Sun, 23:35  scope of the CR is a subset of C1-202412  Thomas, Mon, 14:9  2396 has changes which are not covered in C1-202412  Sung, Mon, 17:50  Agrees to Thomas that there is need for aligning  Thomas, Tue, 21:23  Offers that this is merged into revision of 2412 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202406](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202406.zip) | Handling of a UE not allowed to access SNPN services via a PLMN by subscription with 5GMM cause value #72 | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2151 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202411](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202411.zip) | 5GMM CC in an SNPN | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2155 24.501 Rel-16 | Not Pursued  Requested by author  Lin, Wed, 09:50  Not needed | |
|  |  | | C1-202428 | correction to network selection in case of multiple subscribed SNPNs | | | Intel /Thomas | CR 2167 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-202506](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202506.zip) | 5GS forbidden tracking areas for roaming for SNPN | | | MediaTek Inc. | CR 2188 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Ivo, Thu, 13:05  need to keep “for the current SNPN”  Lena, Fri, 00:02  No need for two lists | |
|  |  | | [C1-202522](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202522.zip) | Correct “theregistration” | | | MediaTek Inc. | CR 2196 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | C1-202777 | correction to network selection in case of multiple subscribed SNPNs | | | Intel /Thomas | CR 0528 23.122 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202432  Ivo, Thu, 13:05  CR seems not needed  Thomas, Thu, 14:50  Explaining his CR  Lena, Thu, 23:46  New NOTE not aligned with stage-2, current text seem sufficient. Provides rewording in case something is done in 23.122  Ivo, Fri, 13:15  Still has problems  Thomas, Fri, 14:51  Explaining to Ivo  Vishnu, Mon, 10:18  New NOTE not needed  Thomas, Mon, 16:16  Providing a draft  Ivo, Mon, 21:24  More changes  Lin, Tue, 09:14  Fine  Thomas, Tue, 10:10  Updated rev  Ivo, Tue, 13:40  Wants to co-sign  Lena, Thu, 02:41  fined | |
|  |  | | C1-202606 | non-3GPP access not supported in SNPN | | | Intel /Thomas | CR 2148 24.501 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-202469  Revision of C1-202399  Ivo, Thu, 13:00  Editorials  Lena, Thu, 23:29  Needs rewording, CR overlaps with SHARP’s C1-202366 and Huawei’s C1-202469.  Yudai, Fri, 07:39  Would like to merge his CR in 2366 into the Intel CR  Thomas, Fri, 10:26  Will update according to Lena, fine to merge with the sharp CR – draft in the INBOX  Ivo, Fri, 11:58  Not clear  Sung, Mon, 00:20  Prefers C1-202469  Lin, Mon, 10:13  Still things unclear, 2469 would solve it  Thomas, Mon, 15:42  Some clarification  Ivo, Mon, 20:52  Further comments  Lin, Tue, 05:38  Wording needs to improve  Thomas, Wed, 10:40  New rev  Thomas, Wed, 10:54  Wants to merge this into 2469 | |
|  |  | | C1-202710 | 5G GUTI of SNPN | | | vivo | CR 2067 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202196  Lin, Mon, 11:04  CR is fine, more text needed  Yanchao, Mon, 14:57  Providing rev  Lin, Mon, 16:34  Fine | |
|  |  | | C1-202841 | Configured HRNN for SNPN selection | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 0505 23.122 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-202855  Revision of C1-202013  Lena, Thu, 23:33  Not inline with SA2, also the EN hinting at open aspects in RAN2 not correct  Ivo, Fri, 10:32  This is not ruled out in SA2, happy to address the En, has a revision  Vishnu, Fri, 14:58  We don’t support this CR as this is against the current SA2 requirement  Chen, Fri, 16:46  At very least has a dependency ot SA2 CR  Sung, mon, 01:51  We would like to postpone both C1-202013 and C1-202407, as there are papers to SA2  Ivo, Mon, 09:07  Provides a rev, with a dependency to SA2 CR  Sung, Mon, 17:36  Revising Ivo proposal  Ivo, Mon, 20:27  Split from Sung confusing, wants complete solution in this CR  Sung, Mon, 20:38  Wants to keep the not sa2 dependant parts in a separater CR  Ivo, Mon, 22:30  New rev  Vishnu, Tue, 23:14  Prefers Sug CR,  Ivo, Wed, 10:38  Some condition then can merge this to Sung’s Cr  Lena  FINE | |
|  |  | | C1-202852 | MICO in an SNPN | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2154 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202410  Has to be shifted to 5Gprotoc16  Lin can this be shifted into the cleanup CR  Lin, Wed, 09:50  Not needed  Sung, Thu, 01:12  C1-202410 became a Cat. D CR on 5GProtoc16 | |
|  |  | | C1-202853 | NB-IoT not applicable for SNPN | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2149 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202401  Lin, Wed, 01:38  Fine, sent from Sung  Lin, Mon, 11:13  CR is fine, some rewording  Sung, Mon, 17:46  Rev  Lin, Tue, 05:39  Fine | |
|  |  | | C1-202854 | UE in the 5GMM-REGISTERED.ATTEMPTING-REGISTRATION-UPDATE substate operating in SNPN access mode | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2157 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202413  Ivo, Thu, 13:04  Not clear why bullet d) is changed  Sung, Mon, 02:25  Does not understand Ivo’s comment  Lin, Mon, 11:15  CR is fine, come typo  Ivo, Mon, 14:44  Explaiing  Sung, Mon, 18:10  Agrees and provides a rev  Ivo, Mon, 21.08  Fine, wants to co-sign  Lin, Tue, 06:18  Rev is fine | |
|  |  | | C1-202855 | Human readable network name for SNPN | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0527 23.122 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202407  Ivo, Thu, 13:01  given that roaming is not specified, HRNN can be configured in the UE without loosing any functionality and the precious broadcast resources can be saved. This needs to be enabled too. See C1-202013  Sung, mon, 01:51  We would like to postpone both C1-202013 and C1-202407, as there are papers to SA2  Sung, Mon, 17:37  New rev  Ivo, Tue, 22:36  Comments on the rev  Ivo, Wed, 10:38  Some condition then can merge 2013 into this Cr  Sung, Thu, 01:57  All comments on board  Ivo OK | |
|  |  | | C1-202856 | Routing indicator update in an SNPN | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2158 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202414  Ivo, Thu, 13:04  Why is the feature optional  Sung, Mon, 02:30  Provides a rev  Ivo, Mon, 21:12  Commenting  Sung, Wed, 13:49  New rev  Ivo, fine, cosign | |
|  |  | | C1-202859 | Management of forbidden SNPNs list upon receipt of a non-integrity protected reject message | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0511 23.122 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202086  Ivo, Thu, 12:57  enables an attacker by sending just \*one\* fake reject message to temporarily prevent the UE from getting any service using the subscription information indicated in an entry of “list of subscriber data  Osama, Thu, 17:58  Can be done, but changes are not enough  Sung, Sun, 23:15  Discussing  Osama, Mon, 00:34  long email  Sung, Mon, 04:29  Providing a rev  Lin, Mon, 10:46  Comments on the rev  Osama, Mon, 16:30  Comments on the rev  Sung, Mon, 18:25  New rev  Osama, Mon, 20:40  Fine with the rev  Lin, Mon, 03:30  Fine with the rev  Ivo, Wed, 19:20  Wants a statement in the report,  Ericsson sees a danger in C1-202086 (and its revision) enabling an attacker to temporarily prevent the UE from getting services from the selected SNPN by attacker sending a single fake reject message.  Then he can accept the CR | |
|  |  | | C1-202869 | 5GMM cause value #13 not supporting roaming for SNPN | | | vivo | CR 2069 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202712  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-202198  Ivo, Thu, 12:59  - not aligned with 23.122 subclause 4.9.3.0 which expects usage of #13 in SNPN - we do not object the change but would like to agree both CRs at the same time  Sung, Sun, 23:19  Now I am against erasing all the text regarding #13/SNPN  Yanchao, Mon, 05:37  Modifies the CR  Lin, Mon, 11:07  Seem fine with the revision  Sung, Mon, 17:38  Fine with the rev  Ivo, Mon, 20:45  Some rewording  Yanchao, Tue 10:07  Provides rev  Ivo, Tue, 13:36  More is needed  Lin, Wed, 04:02  Comments  Yanchao, Wed, 12:27  New rev  Sung, Wed, 13:52  Fine  Ivo, wed, 14:20  Ok  Lin  FINE | |
|  |  | | C1-202895 | storage of counters for UE in SNPN | | | vivo | CR 2066 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202711  Revision of C1-202195  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lena, Tue, 03:18  Not needed to list DoS counters in Annex C  Yanchao, Tue, 09:03  Acks, provides rev  Lena, Thu, 02:54  Some changes | |
|  |  | | C1-202896 | Correction of the handling of timer TG for SNPNs | | | Apple | CR 0514 23.122 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Revision of C1-202130  Lin, Thu, 14:32  **Does not agree** with new term “SNPN-specific N1 mode attempt counters”  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | |
|  |  | | C1-202609 | Definition of registered SNPN | | | Intel /Thomas | CR 2060 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202174  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lena, Thu, 23:35  cannot agree to have “via a PLMN non-3GPP access” in the definition, provides rewording  Thomas, Fri, 18:37  Providing a rev  Sung, Mon, 03:54  Using a ref to 23.122  Lin, Mon, 11:01  Same as Sung  Thomas, Tue, 12:06  Does not agree  Lin, Wed, 03:53  Need changes  Thomas, Wed, 11:47  Defending  Sung, Wed, 13:44  Seems fine  Thomas, Wed, 19:21  New rev  Sung, Thu, 02:34  Fine  Line, THi, 0559  Fine, minor editorial | |
|  |  | | C1-202799 | Non-3GPP access for PLMN and SNPN | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 2177 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202469  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 13:05  Prefer C1-202399  Lena, Thu, 25:59  Not based on latest version of the spec  Lin, Fri, 11:20  Provides rev, wants to check with Thomas whether they can merge  Ivo, Fri, 12:07  Comments  Lin, Sat, 07:28  Provides a rev  Ivo, Mon, 21:28  Still not convinced  Lin, Tue, 10:31  New rev  Ivo, Tue, 13:44  Nearly ok, some more  Lin, Wed, 10:38  New rev  Lena, Wed, 02:01  Rewording needed  Lin, Thu, 04:14  Rev  Lena ok with latest rev | |
|  |  | | C1-202922 | Introduction of SNPN-specific N1 mode attempt counters | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2011 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Revision of C1-202402  Lin, can not accept  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-201032  Lin, Mon, 11:00  Coments  Sung, mon, 15:32  Does not agree with Lin  Lin, Tue, 06:04  Defends his position  Sung, Tue, 06:36  Why to have same counter for different behaviour  Lin, Wed, 09:10  Commenting  Sung, Wed, 13:40  Commenting  Robert, Wed, 17:01  Commenting, both approaches would work,  Osama, Thu, 02:54  Some input  Sung, Thu, 03:13  Asking lin whether he can live with rev  Lin, thu, 10:37  No to 2 counters  Apple wants to co-sign  Lin DOES NOT AGREE | |
|  |  | | C1-202915 | 5GSM back-off mechanisms in an SNPN | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2156 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202412  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 13:03  not clear in stage-2 whether LADN is in or out of scope for SNPN, EN is needed  Sung, Mon, 00:12  Provides rev  Ivo, Mon, 21:06  Fine, wants to co-sign  Lin, Wed, 09:50  Comments  Sung, Thu, 00:54  Rev  Lin, Thu, 10:40  comments | |
|  |  | | C1-202857 | 3GPP PS data off in an SNPN | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2159 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202415  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 13:04  Info on severl SNPN not available in 31.102 not 24.368, at least an EN is needed  Lena, Thu, 23:41  31.102 and 24.368 CRs needed, does Nokia plan to bring them?  Sung, Mon, 02:38  Asking for more input form Lena and Ivo  Ivo, Mon, 21:19  Supports updating 24.368  Lena, Tue, 05:25  Agrees with Ivo, just update the MO and use if for both cases  Sung, Wed, 13:45  Only MO  Ivo, Wed, 15:16  Only 24.501 this meeting is fine  Sung, thu, 02:08  Rev  Lena, Thu, 06:18  Rev fine, mo change in next meeting is fine  Ivo FINE | |
|  |  | | C1-202920 | Service area restrictions in an SNPN | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2153 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202664  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-202409  Lin, merge this into a rev of 2408, keep changes minimal  Lin can live with it  Ivo, Thu, 13:01  Confusing wording  Sung, Mon, 02:23  Providing a rev  Ivo, Mon, 20:54  Fine, wants to co-sign  Sung, Thu, 01:03  New rev | |
|  |  | | C1-202923 | Miscellaneous clean-up for SNPN | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2152 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202408  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lin, Mon, 04:30  Need to discuss the approach taken for documenting this, copying in or delta  Applies for C1-202409\_C1-202410\_C1-202411\_C1-202412  Sung, Mon, 05:23  Wants to know which clauses are not impacted  Lin, Mon, 05:48  …. Are functions for PLMN and naturally can be supported by SNPN  Sung, Mon, 05:56  Not clear what is requested from Lin  Lin, Tue, 06:15  Examples  Sung, Tue, 06:32  accepting  Lin, Wed, 09:50  Comments  Sung, Thu, 00:40  Rev  Lin, Thu, minor change needed | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  | Public network integrated NPN | |
|  |  | | [C1-202008](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202008.zip) | CAG-ID not provided to lower layers during NAS signalling connection establishment | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 1880 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-200937 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202014](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202014.zip) | Configured HRNN for CAG selection | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 0506 23.122 Rel-16 | Merged in to C1-202845  Lena, Fri, 00:04  Not aligned with stage-2, EN not aligned with RAN2  Ban, Fri, 10:09  Not aligned with stage-2  Vishnu, Fri, 15:08  do not support this CR as this is not aligned with the current SA2 requirement  Chen, Fri, 16:46  At very least has a dependency ot SA2 CR  Kundan, Sat, 22:23  Not aligned with SA2, but Ivo has a point  Ivo, Mon, 09:34  LS to SA2 fine, not SA1, provides a rev  Kund, Mon, 15:26  Sounds fine  Sung, Mon, 21:15  No need to touch the EN  Ivo, Mon, 22:00  Agree both CRs in CT1 , and only one gets approved (2014, 2256).  Peter, Tue, 07:25  Agreeing both CRs is not good  Ivo, Tue, 10:34  Prefers to wait for next CT1 meeting  Lena, Tue, 06:21  Prefers to progress 2256  Ivo, Wed, 10:31  Ok to go with one tdoc, wants to see 2256 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202091](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202091.zip) | CAG information list provided to lower layers after manual CAG selection | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 0512 23.122 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  DISCUSSION before Tue, 18:00 taken out, please see previous version of agenda  **Lena, Yanchao, Vishnu, Robert, Chen against the proposal**  Discussion ongoing, no conclusion  Robert, Tue, 21:40  Cr is not acceptable  Ivo, Tue, 21:51  Discussing with Robert  Robert, Wed, 10:24  Long email being against this | |
|  |  | | [C1-202102](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202102.zip) | Discussion on RAN2’s questions on CAG in LS R2-2002417 | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  Ivo, Thu, 13:05  Proposed answer to Q 1.3 is not correct | |
|  |  | | [C1-202199](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202199.zip) | Clarification of the cause of start of T3550 | | | Vivo | CR 2070 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202239](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202239.zip) | Discussion on reply LS to RAN2 manual CAG selection | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Vishnu | discussion 23.122 Rel-16 | Noted  Ivo, Thu, 13:07   * 1. should be answered, 1.2 partly ok, not OK with 1.3   Vishnu, Thu, 15:16  Answer to ivo  Ivo, Fir, 13:38  Commenting  Vishnu, Fri, 14:50  Answering to Ivo | |
|  |  | | [C1-202242](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202242.zip) | Discussion on protecting CAG list against man in middle attack | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/ Vishnu | discussion 24.501 Rel-16 | Noted  Ivo, Thu, 13:10  To be raised in SA2 first, has a simpler solution  Lena, Fri, 00:26  Seems to assume fake base station can connect to legit nw? seems there is no problem to be solved  Kundan, Sat, 19:37  Bullet e) to go to SA3, highlighting to SA3 TR33.809  Vishnu, Mon, 20:39  Long list of comments  Sung, Tue, 01:50  Should be discussed in SA2 as well  Vishnu, 13:49  Not agreeing with Sung  Kundan, wed, 17:46  Sa3 first  Vishnu, Wed, 17:53  Ongoing  Kundan, Wed, 19:07  Sung, Thu, 03:43  Ongoing with Vishnu | |
|  |  | | [C1-202249](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202249.zip) | Protection of Allowed CAG list against man in middle attack | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 2085 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Ivo, Thu, 13:10  To be raised in SA2 first, has a simpler solution  Lena, Fri, 00:28  CR not needed see comment on 2242  Sung, Mon, 21:03  To be raised in SA2 first | |
|  |  | | [C1-202251](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202251.zip) | Discussion on including CAG Information list in reject messages | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | discussion 24.501 Rel-16 | Noted  Lena, Fri, 00:59  There is ongoing discsussionin SA2, prefers to wait for the outcome | |
|  |  | | [C1-202258](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202258.zip) | Indication to user about allowed CAG IDs for manual CAG selection | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 0519 23.122 Rel-16 | Merged into merged to revision of C1-202398.  Based on request form author, tue, 08:59  Ivo, Thu, 13:30  Not happy with the condition in the second new sentence  Lena, Fri, 01:04  OK with the CR, hard to read, overlaps with Nokia’s C1-202398, preference for Nokia’s CR  Kundan, Sat, 21:04  Fine with intent, rewording | |
|  |  | | [C1-202470](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202470.zip) | No CAG in non-3GPP access | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 2178 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202471](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202471.zip) | Correction on 5GMM #27 for CAG | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 2179 24.501 Rel-16 | Kundan, Sat, 21:55  Fine with parts, other changes to be corrected  Sung, Tue, 01:42  Support the CR as is  Lin, Tue, 10:36  Explaining to Kundan  Kundan, wed, 17:41  fine | |
|  |  | | [C1-202493](file:///C:\\Users\\dems1ce9\\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\\3gpp\\cn1\\meetings\\123-e_electronic_0420\\docs\\C1-202493.zip) | Discussion to RAN2 LS R2-2002417 | | | Ericsson / Ivo | discussion Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Lena, Fri, 01:26  Fine with 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, NOT ok with with 1.3 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202499](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202499.zip) | Discussion paper – Considerations for CAG ID in Unified Access Control | | | Chengdu OPPO Mobile Com. Corp. | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  Ivo, Thu, 13:37  There is no stage-1 requirement, CT1 needs to wait for any stage-1 requirement  Lena, Fri, 01:28  Wait for SA1 before discussion in CT1  Chen, Fri, 11:34  Explaining why there is no need to wait for SA1 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202588](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202588.zip) | CAG Information in Registration Reject | | | InterDigital, Samsung / Atle | CR 1886 24.501 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-202253  Ivo, Thu, 13:39  Long explanation of his concerns, would like to wait with aany solution in CT1 until SA2 concludes on S2-2002843  Lena, Fri, 01:29  wait for the outcome of the SA2 discussion  Atle, Tue, 01:15  Fine to wait for the outcome of SA2  Kunden, Wed, 21:29  SA2 seems to have agreed with this  Sung, thu, 03:47  Discussing with Kundan  Kundan, Thu, 07:50  Not agreeing  Atle, Thu, 08:44  Merge this into 2253 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202355](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202355.zip) | Clarification to Manual CAG selection procedure | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 0520 23.122 Rel-16 | Current status postponed  Frederic, Thu, 09:08  Clauses affected missing  Lena, Thu, 23:09  we cannot agree to this CR  Vishnu, Fri, 14:28  not OK with this CR  Kundan, Fri, 14:51  Answering to Lena, asking for some clarificaiotn  Sung, Tue, 01:24  Does not see the step 2) as described by Kundan  Kundan ongoing replies | |
|  |  | | [C1-202357](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202357.zip) | Discussion paper on RAN2 LS regarding Manual CAG and URC for PNI-NPN | | | Samsung | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  Ivo, Thu, 13:31  Does not agree with the answer to 1.3 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202362](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202362.zip) | Sending CAG information list | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 2128 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Frederic, Thu, 09:08  Clauses affected missing  Ivo, Thu, 13:34  Not ok with the solution, would be ok with sending LS to SA2 asking for a solution  Lena, Thu, 23:19  Not inline with stage-2, if this is needed, then stage-2 is to be changed first  Ban, Fri, 09:16  Does not agree with the CR  Kundan  Can accept to first send an LS to SA2  Ivo, Mon, 22:28  Sung, Mon, 23:40  With the LS, asks this to be postponed | |
|  |  | | [C1-202363](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202363.zip) | Sending CAG information list | | | Samsun/Kundan | CR 0522 23.122 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Frederic, Thu, 09:08  Clauses affected missing  Ivo, Thu, 13:35  Not ok with the solution, would be ok with sending LS to SA2 asking for a solution  Lena, Thu, 23:19  Not inline with stage-2, if this is needed, then stage-2 is to be changed first  Ban, Fri, 09:16  Does not agree with the CR  Kundan, Sun, 17:21  Defending the scenarios  Ban, Mon, 14:40  Supports sending an LS  Sung, Mon, 23:40  With LS, Requesting the CR to be postponed | |
|  |  | | [C1-202364](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202364.zip) | Handling of a CAG UE at non supporting AMF | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 1964 24.501 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Revision of C1-200589  Ivo, Thu, 13:35  Requires AMF not supporting CAG to be CAG specific. Comment how roaming is to be solved  Kundan, Thu, 14:45  Does not agree with Ivo  Lena, Thu, 23:23  Does not make sense, CR requires the AMF to do something that the AMF does not support CR needs to be rejected  Yanchao, Fri, 06:30  Same as Ivo and Lena  DoCoMo, Fri, 08:55  Use case is not correct  Ivo, Mon, 22:19  Does not work in all cases  Sung, Tue, 00:56  same view as Ban, Yanchao, Lena  Kundan, Tue, 07:44  Wants to send LS to SA2, this is a valid use cse, | |
|  |  | | [C1-202368](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202368.zip) | Configuring UE to enable manual CAG selection procedure (24.501) | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 2131 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Ivo, Thu, 13:35  Solution has a problem with VPLMN  Lena, Thu, 23:26  proposal in the CR does not work as well as a SIB indicator  Kundan, Mon, 12.07  Answers Lena  Ban, Mon, 12:47  Negative  Sung, Tue, 00:04  Same as lena and Ivo  Lena, Tue, 06.06  Not aligned with stage-2 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202370](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202370.zip) | Configuring UE to enable manual CAG selection procedure (23.122) | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 0523 23.122 Rel-16 | Curent Status Postponed  Frederic, Thu, 09:08  Clauses affected missing  Ivo, Thu, 13:35  Solution has a problem with VPLMN  Lena, Thu, 23:26  proposal in the CR does not work as well as a SIB indicator  Sung, Tue, 00:04  Same as lena and Ivo | |
|  |  | | [C1-202495](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202495.zip) | Correction to Manual CAG selection procedure | | | Samsung/Kundan | CR 0529 23.122 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | C1-202840 | Providing configured HRNN for CAG selection | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 2009 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202015  Revision of C1-200733  Lena, Fri, 00:13  Not aligned with stage-2, EN not aligned with latest status in RAN2  Ban, Fri, 10:09  Not aligned with stage-2  Ivo, Mon, 09:44  Providing rev, with dependency on SA2 CR | |
|  |  | | C1-202845 | Handling of HRNN information in a CAG cell | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 0518 23.122 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202256  Ivo, Thu, 13:29  Prefers procedure as described in C1-202014  Lena, Fri, 01:02  Fine with the CR, correct editorials  Ban, Fri, 09:50  Fine with the CR  Kundan, Sat, 20:48  Fine with intent, but changes are needed  Vishnu, Tue, 09:29  Providing a rev  Ivo, Tue, 21:19  Wants something like in 2014 in this CR, has some proposed wording  Vishnu, Tue, 21:59  Offers a way forward with an EN  Ivo, Tue, 22:46  Highlighting technical concern  Vishnu, Tue, 21:59  Will take the concern on board  Provides rev at 14:19  Ivo, Wed, 14:55  NOTE0 and clauses affected  Ivo is OK | |
|  |  | | C1-202737 | Correction on no suitable cell | | | Vivo | CR 0517 23.122 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202179  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 13:05  limited service state should apply also in situation when the user selects a PLMN and CAG-ID in manual selection and the UE happens to camp on a non-CAG cell of the PLMN  Yanchao, Mon, 11:00  Questions to Ivo  Ivo, Mon, 21:42  More changes  Yanchao, Tue, 15:11  Ivo’s proposal is unclear  Ivo, Wed, 14:47  Explaining  Yanchao, Wed, 16:44  Ok, rev  Ivo, Wed, 20:15  good | |
|  |  | | C1-202886 | Provision of CAG information list in reject messages | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/ Vishnu | CR 2087 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202253  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 13:28  Long explanation, prefers to wait until SA2 has concluded on S2-2002843.  Vishnu, Thu, 16:50  Explaining that sending CAG information list IE to the UE in the REJECT messages is the more optimized solution than using CUC procedure  Lena, Fri, 00:59  There is ongoing discsussionin SA2, prefers to wait for the outcome  Ivo, Fri, 13:41  Disagrees with Vishn  Kundan, sat, 19:53  Supports the contribution, ID and Samsung have same concept  Kunden, Sat, 20:25  Answering Ivo  Ivo, Mon, 21:51  Wait for S2  Ivo, Thu, 08:03  Sa2 allows this  Kund, Thu, 08:08  Same nfo  Lena, Thu, 08:31  Same infor  Ivo, Thu, 08:32  Comment on the ct1 CR  Vishnu Thu, 08:50  Modification  Vishnu, Thu, 09:02  New rev  Ivo is fine | |
|  |  | | C1-202924 | CAG selection is optional in the manual network selection mode | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0526 23.122 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202405  --------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thu, 13:37  First change not needed  Vishnu, Fri, 14:12  Some changes on the second change  Sung, Tue, 01:01  Discussing way forward  Ivo, wed, 20:18  Asks for a draft rev to see how this looks like  Sung, Thu, 03:52  Rev  Kundan, Thu, 04:30  Not ok  Sung, Thu, 04:35  New rev  Kundan, Thu, 04:41  Not agreeing  Sung, Thu, 04:53  Ongoing  Kundan, Thu, 05:43  Not agreeing with some parts  Ivo, Lena, Vishnu (co-sign)  Agree with Sung | |
|  |  | | C1-202912 | Selected CAG-ID from the NAS layer to the AS layer | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, vivo, Qualcomm Incorporated, Samsung, Huawei, HiSilicon | CR 0525 23.122 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202397  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 13:36  providing the manually selected CAG-ID using separate element has issues  Kundan, Sat, 21:15  Despite co-signing, some rewording needed  Sung, Tue, 02:13  To Ivo ,separate element v. allowed CAG list manipulation should be discussed in a separate thread, explaining some things to Ivo  Sung, Wed, 16:24  Providing rev  Ivo, Thu, 00:00  This goes in the right direction, modification  Sung, Thu, 03:59  Fine with Ivo’s proposal, new rev  Robert, Thu, 11:27  Slight rewording to the rev  Vishnu agrees with Robert  Ivo OK | |
|  |  | | C1-202862 | Manual CAG selection | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bel | CR 0499 23.122 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202398  Vishnu, no objectin, fix it in May  Kundan wants to tick RAN box, fix it in next meeting  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-201052  Ivo, Thu, 13:36  EN hard to read, bullet b) unclear  Lena, Fri, 01:13  Fine with the CR, requests some rewording  Yanchao, Fri, 06:35  Comments  Kundan, Sat, 21:39  Comments, need to discuss this on Monday  Sung, Mon, 21:44  Provides a rev  Ivo, Mon, 22:35  Fine  Vishnu, Tue, 09:03  One thing is missing in the rev  Robert, Tue, 11:22  Slight rewording  Ban, Tue, 12:50  Support Robert, wants to co-sign  Ivo, Tue, 12:51  Support Robert, wants to co-sign  Kundan, wed, 17:33  Provding the changes he wants to see  Sung, Thu, 02:15  Not agreeing with Kundan  Lena, thu, 02:46  Fine, minor editorial  Sung, Thu, 03:00  New rev  Vishnu, thu, 08:28  Almost ok | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  | Time sensitive communication | |
|  |  | | [C1-202192](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202192.zip) | Abbreviation correction | | | vivo | CR 0002 24.519 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202429](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202429.zip) | IEEE Std 802.1Qbv-2016 rolled into IEEE Std 802.1Q-2018 | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0003 24.519 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202435](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202435.zip) | TSN working domain | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2170 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Ivo, Thu, 13:39  C1-202350 is more complete  Lena, Fri, 01:33  CR is ok, overlaps with C1-202350,  - Additional changes to subclause 4.15.2.2 are missing (they are covered in Huawei’s C1-202350)  Sung, Mon, 03:49  Providing rationale  Cristina, Tue, 05:47  Wants to postponed and wait for SA2  OK with postponing both C1-202350 and C1-202435, wants to go on with 2433 | |
|  |  | | C1-202714 | Correction of the abnormal case in NW-TT-initiated Ethernet port management procedure | | | vivo | CR 0001 24.519 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202191  Lena, Fri, 01:30  Fine, but remove unmodified clauses from CR  Yanchao, Mon, 10:15  Providing rev  Lena, Thu, 02:22  Fine with the rev | |
|  |  | | C1-202860 | TSN working domain | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0002 24.535 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202433  Crsitina: Fine  Ivo, Thu, 13:40  Overlaps with C1-202353  Lena, Fri, 01:32  fine with the CR but it overlaps C1-202353  Sung, Mon, 03:50  Defending  Cristina, Tue, 05:47  Wants to postponed and wait for SA2  OK with postponing both C1-202350 and C1-202435, wants to go on with 2433 | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 5G\_CioT | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects of Cellular IoT support and evolution for the 5G System | |
|  |  | | [C1-202078](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202078.zip) | Discussion on the mandatory Integrity protection maximum data rate field for UEs that support control plane only | | | Samsung | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  Amer, Fri, 03:36  If anything, then a NOTE related to AMF  Mahmoud, Fri, 04:16  Explaining to Amer  Amer, Fri, 17:31  Meant SMF not Amf  Mahmoud, Fri, 17:49  Commenting to Amer  Amer, Fri, 19:33  Commenting, could see a NOTE  Mahmoud, Fri, 19:47  Disc goes on  Mikael, Fri, 23:57  Comments and suggestions  Amer, Sat, 06:08  Reacting to Mikael, no need to impact Ue  Mikael, Sat, 10:45  Requires UE action  Amer, Sat, 14:17  Integrity protection maximum data rate IE Is a mandatory IE, Note in table,  Mahmoud, Sat, 22:41  discussing  Behourz, Sun, 01:18  Seconds Mahmoud  Amer, Sun, 08:46  CR is a solution looking for a problem, hard to justify it for Rel-16  Lin, Mon, 05:42  Supports the solution  Mikael, Mon, 07:55  Support the solution  Fei, Mon, 08:24  Support the solution  Amer, Mon, 20:36  Solution is not clean, if no one else has problems, will not object | |
|  |  | | [C1-202079](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202079.zip) | Integrity protection data rate for UEs that don’t support N3 data transfer | | | Samsung | CR 2031 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202082](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202082.zip) | Addition of Control Plane Service Request in the abnormal cases for service request procedure | | | InterDigital Communications | CR 2032 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202085](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202085.zip) | Correcting a wrong reference | | | InterDigital Communications | CR 2035 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202176](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202176.zip) | Correction of SGC | | | vivo | CR 2062 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202202](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202202.zip) | subclause of Negotiated WUS assistance information | | | vivo | CR 2073 24.501 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-202465 and revisions  Based on request from Yanchao, mon, 05:19  Lin, Sat, 11:53  Agrees there is something to be done, asks whether this can be merged into C1-202465 | |
| th |  | | [C1-202245](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202245.zip) | CioT user data container in CPSR message not forwarded | | | Ericsson /kaj | CR 1743 24.501 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-202779  Revision of C1-200675  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  [C1-202169](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/Docs/C1-202169.zip), [C1-202337](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/Docs/C1-202337.zip), [C1-202461](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/Docs/C1-202461.zip)  Amer, Fri, 03:49  Prefers approach with Service Reject (like in 2169 and 2461)  Behrouz, Fri, 05:49  Comments  Kaj, Fri, 12:05  Answering Amer  Amer, Fri, 17:29  Highlights he switched a vs b,  Prefers approach with Service Accept (like in 2245 and 2237)  Amer, Fri, 17:29  Highlights he switched a vs b,  Prefers approach with Service Accept (like in 2245 and 2237)  Behrouz, Fri, 18:15  Support Ericsson  Lin, Sat, 10:35  Number of comments, routing failure to be treated as abnormal case | |
|  |  | | [C1-202367](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202367.zip) | Correction on terminology for the Control plane CioT 5GS optimization | | | SHARP | CR 2130 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202387](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202387.zip) | Discussion on errors on QoS parameter operations in NB-IoT | | | BEIJING SAMSUNG TELECOM R&D | discussion | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-202403](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202403.zip) | Discussion on integrity check failure on the Control Plane Service Request message for WB-N1 mode UEs | | | BEIJING SAMSUNG TELECOM R&D | discussion | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-202419](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202419.zip) | Corrections to CR#1907 | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Amer | CR 2162 24.501 Rel-16 | Overlaps with [C1-202465](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/Docs/C1-202465.zip)  Lin, Sat, 12:32  Offers to take all changes on board in 2465  Amer, Sat, 13:47  Fine to merge  Some offline discussion, the CR is kept yellow | |
|  |  | | [C1-202460](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202460.zip) | Discussion on routing failure of CPSR | | | Huawei, HiSilicon, China Mobile/Lin | discussion Rel-16 | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-202461](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202461.zip) | Routing failure handling of CPSR | | | Huawei, HiSilicon, China Mobile/Lin | CR 2172 24.501 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-202337  Based on request form author, Wed, 06:16  [C1-202169](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/Docs/C1-202169.zip), [C1-202245](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/Docs/C1-202245.zip), [C1-202337](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/Docs/C1-202337.zip)  Amer, Fri, 03:49  Prefers approach with Service Reject (like in 2169 and 2461)  Kaj, Fri, 07:29  preference is to use SERVICE ACCEPT message and solution in C1-202245.  Lin, Fri, 10:58  Explaining the his solution  Amer, Fri, 17:29  Highlights he switched a vs b,  Prefers approach with Service Accept (like in 2245 and 2237) | |
|  |  | | [C1-202462](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202462.zip) | Acknowledgement of truncated 5G-S-TMSI configuration | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 2173 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202463](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202463.zip) | NAS-MAC calculation for RRC connection reestablishment for NB-IoT CP optimisation | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 2174 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202464](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202464.zip) | Removal of Editor’s Note for CP congestion control | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 2175 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | C1-202614 | QoS error checks for UEs in NB-N1 mode | | | BEIJING SAMSUNG TELECOM R&D | CR 2145 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202388  Ivo, Thu, 16:25  Issue with new bullet 5)  Mahmoud, Thu, 16:53  Explaining the logic, asking if Ivo is ok  Ivo, Fri, 11:20  Not yet OK, provides wording  Mahmoud, Fri, 15:58  Offers new wording  Ivo, Fri 16:13  Fine, wants to co-sign | |
|  |  | | C1-202626 | Retransmission of a CPSR message after integrity check failure at the AMF | | | BEIJING SAMSUNG TELECOM R&D | CR 2150 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202404  Amer, Fri, 18:18  Commenting, provides new text  Mikael, Mon, 10:39  Supports Amer proposal  Mahmoud, Mon, 21:06  Provides rev  Amer, Tue, 03:01  Rev looks fine  Mikeal, Tue, 12:21  Looks good | |
|  |  | | C1-202662 | UE specific DRX for NB-S1 mode | | | Vodafone GmbH | CR 3353 24.301 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202384  Amer, Tue, 17:24  OK  Lin, Wed, 08:22  good  Amer, Fri, 04:49  Fine in principle, some changes needed  Behrouz, Fri, 06:10  Type 1 IE, “K-“ cannot be used as IEI.  Yang, Fri, 07:18  Agrees with Behrouz, will revise  Yang, Fri, 07:22  Will take comments form Amer on board  Lin, Fri, 08:20  prefer to keep the full range value in the CT1 CR and then put an EN to indicate RAN2 dependency  Yang, Fri, 08:27  The EN is already there  Yang, Fri, 09:56  Provides a rev in the Inbox, once this is a new TDOC number, it will have TEI16, needs to be shifted to TEI16 agenda item  Amer, Fri, 17:43  Further comments, with revised text  Lin, Sat, 11:03  Does not prefer the new text from Amer  Amer, Mon, 05:14  RAN2 has not agreed on values, CT1 should not do either  Yang, Mon, 08:38 and 11:34  Provding a rev  Lin, Tue, 05:25  Fine with the rev | |
|  |  | | C1-202674 | Correct handling of receiving EMM cause #31 in EPS | | | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR 3349 24.301 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202270  Lin: FINE  Lin, Mon, 07:20  please check whether alternative in CR C1-198212 for 4G and C1-198211 for 5G could be a way forward  Osama, Mon, 19:59  comments  Lin, Tue, 04:08  Not convinced that new counter is needed in 4G  Sung, Tue, 06:53  Seems ok with a revision??  Lin, Wed, 05:29  Fine | |
|  |  | | C1-202676 | Correct UE azarosi for receiving 5GMM cause #31 in 5GS | | | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR 2094 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202271  LIN: FINE  Lin, Mon, 07:20  please check whether alternative in CR C1-198212 for 4G and C1-198211 for 5G could be a way forward  Osama, Mon, 19:59  Comments  Lin, Tue, 04:08  Can live with this, overlap with 2373 to be sorted out  Sung, Tue, 06:53  Seems ok with a revision??  Lin, Wed, 05:29  Fine, minor editorial | |
|  |  | | C1-202749 | Adding new abnormal cases on the network side for CPSR | | | China Mobile, InterDigital | CR 2056 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202169  Overlaps with [C1-202245](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/Docs/C1-202245.zip), [C1-202337](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/Docs/C1-202337.zip), [C1-202461](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/Docs/C1-202461.zip)  Amer, Fri, 03:49  Prefers approach with Service Reject (like in 2245 and 2237)  Behrouz, Fri, 05:49  Asking Amer for clarification (should be resolved as Amer corrected initial statements)  Kaj, Fri, 09:46  Some questions, merge needed with 2461, if this goes forward  Amer, Fri, 17:29  Highlights he switched a vs b,  Prefers approach with Service Accept (like in 2245 and 2237)  Behrouz, Fir, 18:37  Explaining to Kaj  Lin, Tue, 14:53  Ansering Behrouz | |
|  |  | | C1-202735 | Emergency PDU sesseion established after WUS negotiation | | | vivo | CR 2063 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202177  Lin, Fri, 03:56  Fine in principle, needs some changes, wants to co-sign  Amer, Fri, 04:11  does not belong in the NAS specs, could be done by a note.  Yanchao, Fri, 11.22  Answering  Lin, Sat, 11:48  Withdraws the earlier comment, wants co-sign  Amer, Sat, 15:20  T oYanchao: I see your point but I would prefer to not repeat clear mistakes. However, if you feel strongly about keeping the existing text, **I will not object.**  **Yanchao, Mon, 10:40**  Rev with Huawei as support  Lin, Mon, 16:32  fine  Amer, Wed, 07:07  Not happy, will not obect | |
|  |  | | C1-202836 | Non-integrity protected REGISTRATION REJECT message including 5GMM cause #31 or #76 | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2134 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202373  Osama, Tue, 05:27  Asking whether 2271 could be way forward instead of this cr  **Sung: needs to be shifted to 16.2.7.2.**  Lin, Wed, 05:33  Asking on a detail | |
|  |  | | C1-202699 | Handling of PDU session and PDN connection associated with Control plane only indication in case of N26 based interworking procedures | | | SHARP | CR 2132 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202369  Lin Fine  Lin, Mon, 05:05  Fine in principle, more needed  Yudai, Tue, 05:46  Provides a rev  Lin, wed, 06:19  Wording issue  Yudai, Wed, 08:30  New rev | |
|  |  | | C1-202775 | Connection Resumption for Notification | | | ZTE, vivo | CR 2113 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202336  Lin: Fine  Lin, Sat, 12:33  Number of comments  Fei, Tue, 09:49  Rev  Lin, Wed, 06:00  Fine, editorial  Fei, Wed, 09:49  New rev | |
|  |  | | C1-202779 | CioT user or small data container in CPSR message not forwarded | | | ZTE | CR 2114 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202337  Lin FINE  [C1-202169](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/Docs/C1-202169.zip), [C1-202245](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/Docs/C1-202245.zip), [C1-202461](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/Docs/C1-202461.zip)  earlier disc of Amer, Behrouz, Kaj, Lin captured in previous agenda  Fei, Tue, 03.44  Lin, Wed, 06:16  Some more comments  Behrouz, Wed, 06:47  OK with the CR, curious why ID is a co-signer  Amer, Wed, 08:36  Looking for an anwer to his question  Fei, Wed, 08:58  Has already answered 03:27  Kaj; wed, 10:07  One Nate and then Ericsosn co-signs  Fei, Wed, 10:20  Ericsosn added in latest rev  Behrouz, Wed, 15:36  Note from Kaj ok  Amer, Wed, 16:17  Can not agree the CR in its current form  Fei, Wed, 17:24  Answering the third time to Amer  Amer, thu, 02:56  **The CR looks good** | |
|  |  | | C1-202782 | Clarification on the UE behaviour when receiving T3448 | | | ZTE | CR 2112 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of [C1-202335](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202335.zip)  Lin, Sat, 12:04  Some change needed, bullet c) not  Amer, Sat, 15:10  Not clear why timer is stopped, bullet c) is needed  Lin, Tue, 04:36  Commenting to Amer  Fei, Tue, 13:19  Providing rev  Fei, Wed, 03:49  New rev  Lin, Wed, 05:49  Fine for rev2 | |
|  |  | | C1-202878 | Initial APN rate control parameters | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Amer | CR 3216 24.008 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202422  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lin, Sat, 10:19  Cover page issue  Amer, Sat, 16:06  Acks Lin | |
|  |  | | C1-202880 | Signalling of EPS APN rate control parameters during PDU session establishment | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Amer | CR 2164 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202423  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lin, Sat, 10:21  Number of comments  Amer, Sat, 16:39  Provides rev  Lin, Tue, 08:51  Updates  Amer, Wed, 09:15  Rev  Lin, Wed, 09:57  Some changes fine, others not | |
|  |  | | C1-202882 | Ethernet header compression for CP CioT – 5GMM aspects | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Amer | CR 2165 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202425  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Kaj, Fri, 10:14  Cover sheet  Amer, Sat, 05:52  Acks Kaj | |
|  |  | | C1-202888 | Ethernet header compression for CP CioT – 5GSM aspects | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Amer | CR 2166 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202426  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Mahmoud, Sat, 01:03  Questions  Amer, Sat, 05:45  Ansering Mahmoud  Lin, Sat, 11:33  Issues with the proposed IE encoding provides a proposal  Amer, Sat, 16:02  Provides a rev in Inbox  Mahmoud, Sat, 21:41  Interworking aspects not covered  Amer, Sun, 00:25  EPS does not support Ethernet header comp, no need for interworking  Kaj, Mon, 15:37  Minor edit  Mahmoud, Mon, 15:46  Missing aspect in the Cr  Amer, Tue, 03:14  Explaining  Lin, Tue, 09:12  Fine in general, some mistakes  Mahmoud, Wed, 00:17  Comments  Amer, Wed, 10:03  Acks the point, discussing  Mahmoud, Wed, 16:02  Discussing  Amer, Thu, 05.12  New rev  Mahmoud, Thu  Looks good  Amer providing some outlook to next meetng and additional work  Mahmoud wants to see an EN | |
|  |  | | C1-202692 | Correction to handling of T3447 timer | | | MediaTek Inc. | CR 2195 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202521  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lin, Mon, 05:55  Change is needed, rewording | |
|  |  | | C1-202892 | Generic UE configuration update trigger for registration and EC Restriction change | | | Ericsson / Mikael | CR 2077 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202230  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Overlaps with [C1-202077](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/Docs/C1-202077.zip)  Amer, Fri, 04:53  Proposes changes  Behrouz, Fri, 06:37  Different proposal for the IE than Amer  Mikael, Fri, 11:03  Needs to think more and will provide a proposal  Lin, Sat, 11:23  This looks very similar to C1-202077 now  Mikael, Mon, 10:29  Wants a bit, will update according comments  Lin, Tue, 05:42  More proosals  Mikael, Tue, 07:43  Happy to make approach for merging  Mikael, Tue, 10:51  Provides the rev  Mahmoud, Tue, 20:57  Generally fine, some minors, wants co-sign  Mikael, Wed, 08:05  New rev  Lin, fine wants to co-sign, minor edit on the cover page  Mikael, will fix this | |
|  |  | | C1-202904 | Indication of change in the use of enhanced coverage | | | Samsung, InterDigital, Huawei, HiSilicon | CR 2030 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202648  Amer FINE  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-202077  Mikael, Thu, 09:31  Some comments  Mahmoud, Thu, 09:35  Explains to mikael  Mikael, thu, 10:50  Fine, can revise in the future, if needed  Overlaps with [C1-202230](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/Docs/C1-202230.zip)  Amer, Sat, 14:30  New text leaves some aspects undefined  Mahmoud, Sat, 21:38  Asking for wording  Amer, Sun, 00:02  Proposal  Mikael, Mon, 10:10  Comments, suggests to merge with 2230  Mahmoud, Mon, 22:10  Provides wording  Amer, Tue, 03:33  Text works, some more suggestion  Mahmoud, Tue, 05:46  Fine to merge some parts into 2230, wants to wait for Hua and ID  Behrouz, Tue, 05:56  Fine to merge, co-sign the other paper  Amer, Thu, 02:25  Suggestions  Mahmound, Thu, 06:51  fine | |
|  |  | | C1-202866 | PDU session release due to CP only revocation | | | OPPO / Rae | CR 2107 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202707  \_\_------------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-202328  Amer, Thu, 02:30  Untick ME  Amer, Fri, 04:44  Question for clarification  Kaj, Fri, 10:06  New cause not needed  Lin, Sat, 11:58  Same as kaj, use #39  Rae, Tue, 07:13  Rev  Lin; Wed, 05:42  Proposals  Kaj, Wed, 09:54  Fine, also lin’s proposals  Amer, Thu, 02:30  Untick ME box | |
|  |  | | C1-202795 | Enhancement on CPSR for CioT CP data transport | | | Huawei, HiSilicon, Vodafone, ZTE, China Mobile, China Telecom, CATT/Lin | CR 1701 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202459  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200893  Behrouz, Fri, 06:48  Main comment: As I azarosio, this is a resubmission of the CR. Not much has changed since last time and our position is still that the gain (3 octets) **does not justify defining a Non-standard NAS message**  **Amer, Sun, 22:58**  **Qualcomm is neutral** **From the WI rapporteur point of view, I intend to remove this task from the 5G CioT work plan after this meeting. In other words, the WI will be considered complete regardless of the outcome of this discussion (4 meetings no result)**  Sung, Tue, 06:48  Support positin of wid rapporteur  Behrouz, Tue, 06:55  Support positin of wid rapporteur  **Lin, Wed, 10:33**  Asking for technical postion from Sung  Sung, Wed, 14:40  Negative  Vivek, Wed, 18:20  Negative  Lin, Thu, 03:54  Providing a rev  Behourz, Thu ,04:12  Fine with the rev  Sung, Thu, 04:37  Works  Lin ok with Behrouz | |
|  |  | | [C1-202796](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202465.zip) | Correction on WUS assistance | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 2176 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202465  -----------------------------------------  Overlaps with [C1-202419](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/Docs/C1-202419.zip)  Mikael, Mon, 09:39  Hinting at a case that seems not covered  Lin, Mon, 16:46  Answers to Mikael  Mikael, Tue, 09:11  Still concerns  Lin, Tue, 10:14  Acks mikael  Mikael, Tue, 11:31  Mostly ok, some correction  Lin, Wed, 10:34  New rev to ack Mikael  Mikael, Wed, 12:46  Fine, co-signing  Lin, Thu, 04:03  done | |
|  |  | | C1-202926 | DRX parameters for NB-IoT | | | InterDigital Communications | CR 2034 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202865  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-202671  Lin: 2865, below “5GS” should be “NB-N1 mode  Revision of C1-202619  Revision of C1-202611  Amer, Mon, 04:51  CR looks good  Lin, Mon, 16:15  For the time being fine  Behrouz, Mon, 17:34  Fine with Lin email  Amer, Tue, 03:22  define all the code points for the relevant IE ASAP  Revision of C1-202084  Lin, Thu, 05:29  Specify the full range, like Amer  Amer, Thu, 03:06  CR looks good, can you update cover page and a referenc to stage-2  Lin, Sat,10:58  Provides detailed comments in the Inbox  Behrouz, Sat, 20:52  We need to decide whether to not define anything or define the full range | |
|  |  | | [C1-202734](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202326.zip) | Avoid repeated redirection for NB-IoT | | | OPPO / Rae | CR 2106 24.501 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-202326  Amer, Fri, 04:41  proposed text should be converted into a note.  Kaj, Fri, 09:54  Conflicts with existing statements  Ban, Fri, 12:43  Same as Kaj  Rae, 08:45  Proposing some text  Rae, Thu, 04:32  Providing a rev to address Amer comment  Marko, Thu, 09:05  Not a proper solution  Rae, thu, 10:20  New rev  Marko still don’t think this is right solution | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 5WWC | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects on wireless and wireline convergence for the 5G system architecture | |
|  |  | | [C1-202168](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202168.zip) | ANDSP is not supported by 5G-RG and W-AGF | | | ZTE / Joy | CR 2055 24.501 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202207](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202207.zip) | Work plan for the CT1 part of 5WWC | | | Huswei, HiSilicon /Christian | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  Ivo, Thu, 13:42  Some things missing, some not needed | |
|  |  | | [C1-202486](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202486.zip) | Discussion on 3GPP based access authentication for untrusted non-3GPP access to 5GCN | | | Ericsson, BlackBerry UK Ltd., Motorola Mobility, Lenovo / Ivo | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  Lena, Sun, 00:03  Not specific to 5WWC, rather 5Gprotoc16, not inline with SA3 decission, why would CT1 give a security requirement to SA3?  Andrew, Wed, 10:36  First in SA3  Ivo, Wed, 10:55  There is no Cr, | |
|  |  | | C1-202571 | EAP details for N5GC | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2207 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-202572 | Corrections on N5GC SUPI SUCI | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0128 24.502 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-202573 | NAS impacts supporting IPTV | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 2208 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-202574 | Support IPTV via wireline access | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0129 24.502 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-202694 | Secondary authentication and W-AGF acting on behalf of N5GC | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 2028 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202018  Roozbeh, Thu 18:37  Add “device”  Ivo, Fri, 09:33  Fine with comments, rev in Inbox | |
|  |  | | C1-202653 | Error type on failure of reserving QoS resources over non-3GPP access | | | ZTE / Joy | CR 0126 24.502 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202293  Frederic, Thu, 09:08  Clauses affected missing  Roozbeh, Thu, 20:49  Rewording and editorials  Joay, fri, 08:58  Acknowledging roozbeh comments  Roozbeh, Fri, 20:04  Found a new problem with the CR  Joy, Sat, 04:24  Providing answers to Roozbeh  Roozbeh, Sat, 05:06  Answers to Joy  Joy, Sat, 12:02  Provides rev  Roozbeh, Sat, 18:09  More proposals  Joy, Mon, 13:00  New rev  Roozbeh, Tue, 02:41  Fine, type editorial  Joy, Tue, 10:14  Will fix | |
|  |  | | C1-202612 | Inclusion of requested NSSAI in AN parameters | | | Motorola Mobility, Lenovo | CR 0122 24.502 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202284  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 13:42  Wants ot co-sign  Roozbeh, Sun, 19:32  Rev in Inbox  Ivo, Mon, 22:42  fine | |
|  |  | | C1-202613 | Inclusion of NSSAI in AN Parameters for non-3GPP access | | | Motorola Mobility, Lenovo | CR 2100 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202283  Ivo, Fri, 12:11  **CR is NOT OK**  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 13:44  Wants to co-sign  Roozbeh, Sun, 19:32  Rev in Inbox  Ivo, Mon, 22:41  Looks fine  Roozbeh, Wed, 18:37  Some suggetions  Larzaros suggestion, taken on board by Roozbeh, Thu, 00:08  Ivo, Thu, 00:18  NOT OK  Roozbeh, Thu, 00:48  New rev  Lazaros, Thu, 01:09  Minor improvements  Roozbeh, thu, 02:56  drafting | |
|  |  | | C1-202636 | Removal of editor’s notes | | | Motorola Mobility, Lenovo | CR 0123 24.502 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202290  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Ivo, Thu, 13:42  Last EN can’t be removed without specification work  Roozbeh, Sun, 21:53  Questions to Ivo  Ivo, Mon, 22:48  Explaining why EN can’t be removed  Roozbeh, Tue, 03:11  Providing new rev  Roozbeh, Wed, 19:30  Highlighting the new rev, can ivo live with it  Ivo, Wed, 20:25  Nearly ok  Roozbeh  REV | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | PARLOS | |  | Lena – Breakout | | |  |  | CT aspects of System enhancements for Provision of Access to Restricted Local Operator Services by Unauthenticated UEs  100% | |
|  |  | | C1-202125 | Miscellaneous editorial corrections | | | Samsung Electronics Polska | CR 2046 24.501 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | C1-202601 | Miscellaneous editorial corrections | | | Samsung Electronics Polska | CR 3340 24.301 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202126  ------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 11:55  - "Attached for access to RLOS" definition: "requessted" -> "requested" | |
|  |  | | C1-202879 | Clarify UE behaviour for reject cause #9 and #10 received when attached for RLOS | | | Samsung/Anikethan | CR 3342 24.301 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202147  ------------------------------------------------  Lena, Friday, 01:52   1. The changes for TAU reject seem ok but the text does not read well. I suggest instead “Then if the UE is in the same selected PLMN where the last tracking area updating procedure was attempted, the tracking area updating procedure was rejected with an EMM cause value other than #9, #10 and #40, and timer T3346 is not running, the UE shall:” 2. For the  service reject, changes for causes #10 and 40 seem ok but same wording comment applies. About cause #9, according to subclause 4.4.4.3, the network will reject a service request with cause #9 if the UE is not attached for access to RLOS:   “If a SERVICE REQUEST, EXTENDED SERVICE REQUEST or CONTROL PLANE SERVICE REQUEST message fails the integrity check and the UE has only PDN connections for non-emergency bearer services established and the PDN connections are not for RLOS, the MME shall send the SERVICE REJECT message with EMM cause #9 "UE identity cannot be derived by the network" and keep the EMM-context and EPS security context unchanged.”  So changes for cause #9 for the service reject case do not seem justified  Anikethan, Saturday, 19:51   1. -> I think the text proposed in the CR is more clear since it brings out the association between attempt and reject. A comma separated text would end up opening up an interpretation of both these conditions being separate (OR sort of condition). That is how we read many comma separated text formulations in the specification 2. -> I think the text proposed in the CR is more clear since it brings out the association between attempt and reject. A comma separated text would end up opening up an interpretation of both these conditions being separate (OR sort of condition). That is how we read many comma separated text formulations in the specification   Lena, Wednesday, 23:22  I can live with keeping handling of cause #9 for the service reject. But I cannot accept the current wording as it is hard to understand. I propose to use bulleted lists instead.  Anikethan, Thursday, 7:07  I am fine with the suggested changes, a draft revision is available.  Lena, Thursday, 7:24  I am OK with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 5G\_eLCS (CT4) | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects of Enhancement to the 5GC LoCation Services | |
|  |  | | [C1-202548](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202548.zip) | Adding Location Privacy Setting operation | | | CATT | CR 0001 24.571 Rel-16 | Lena, 23:52  More changes needed, want to see a complete solution  Scott, Wed, 18:55  Lena, Thu, 05:41  Thanks for the info. Given you intent to submit the CR to TS 24.080 at the CT4 May meeting, we are OK with C1-202548. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202549](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202549.zip) | Addition of new AT command for 5G Location Services testing | | | CATT | CR 0689 27.007 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision not provided in 3GU  Atle, Fri, 08:27  Many comments  Lena, Sun, 23:49  <plane> parameter should be removed  Scott, Wed, 20:11  Replying with draft  Lena, Thu, 07:14  Ok with the draft  Atle, Thu, 11.11  Comments  Atle Thue11:44  Fine with the rev | |
|  |  | | C1-202562 | Supplementary LCS Service Operations | | | CATT | draftCR 24.080 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  24.080 is a CT4 spec | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | V2XAPP | |  | Lena – Breakout | | |  |  | CT aspects of V2XAPP  Is TS 24.486 sufficiently stable to be sent to CT#88 for approval | |
|  |  | | [C1-202206](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202206.zip) | Work plan for the CT1 part of V2XAPP | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | discussion Rel-16 | **Current Status: Noted** | |
|  |  | | [C1-202208](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202208.zip) | Latest reference version of draft TS 24.486 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | draft TS 24.486 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Noted** | |
|  |  | | [C1-202212](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202212.zip) | Miscellaneous corrections | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.486 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-202458](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202458.zip) | Application unique IDs for the VAE layer | | | Huawei , HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.486 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | C1-202489 | Network monitoring by the V2X UE procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.486 Rel-16 | Withdrawn | |
|  |  | | [C1-202546](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202546.zip) | Structure and data semantics for V2X application resource management procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.486 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | C1-202728 | XML scheme declaration for V2XAPP | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.486 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202544  -------------------------------------------------  Sapan, Friday, 17:00  Editor’s note should not be removed as actual XML schema is not provided yet.  Chen, Saturday, 3:12  OK with me. The complete xml scheme will be provided next meeting. The draft revision with the editor’s note unremoved is now available.  Sapan, Sunday, 19:13  I am fine with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-202729 | V2X application resource management procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.486 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202545  -----------------------------------------------------  Sapan, Friday, 17:07  1)     Two references has same number: IETF RFC 4825 [12] (used in clause 6.8.1) and IETF RFC 2616 [12] (used in clause 6.8.2). Please correct it.  2)     Also, RFC 4825 is for XCAP operations. Does VAE supports XCAP operations?  3)     In clause 6.8.2- clear how server will authorize the sender? Please clarify.  Chen, Saturday, 10:54   1. -> OK 2. -> After some further thinking of the authorization, the step with the reference is removed to be aligned with other procedures 3. -> The VAE layer is over SEAL layer, and clause 5 and stage 2 of TS 23.286 clause 9.1 indicates that the VAE capabilities (VAE client and VAE server) utilizes identity management service procedures (e.g. authentication and authorization of UEs) of SEAL to support V2X services. Therefore, to be aligned with other procedures, the authorization steps were removed   A draft revision is available.  Sapan, Monday, 11:21  I am ok with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-202762 | V2X USD provisioning | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.486 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202213  ---------------------------------------------  Sapan, Friday, 15:33  1)     In clause 7.2.3 – step a) – “the identity of theVAE-C” is used. As per my understanding – such identify is not defined. Which identify we are referring here?  2)     Also for client to listen and accept HTTP connection – notification channel needs to be created.  Christian, Tuesday, 17:29  To answer your comment 2) on notification channel. I wrote my CR based on stage 2, i.e. TS 23.286. the VAE server sends a request to the VAE client (V2X USD announcement). As we know, HTTP is a stateless protocol with request-response mechanism, and therefore there is not notification channel for HTTP (polling?).  Christian, Wednesday, 10:42  I have produced a draft revision which addresses Sapan’s comment 1).  Sapan, Wednesday, 21:34  Thanks for addressing comment 1). About 2), – I do understand that the proposal in this CR is based on SA6 specification only. My comment was – for VAE server to send HTTP request to VAE client, VAE server should act as HTTP client to initiate the HTTP connection and VAE client should act as HTTP server to accept the connection. Is this understanding correct? If yes, we need to mention this in the specification (may be in different CR).  Christian, Thursday, 11:36  To accommodate comment 2), I have produced a new draft revision.  Sapan, Thursday, 12:01  I am OK with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-202763 | PC5 parameters provisioning | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.486 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202214  ------------------------------------------------  Sapan, Friday, 15:38  1)     In clause 7.3.3 – step a) – “the identity of theVAE-C” is used. As per my understanding – such identify is not defined. Which identify we are referring here?  2)     Also for client to listen and accept HTTP connection – notification channel needs to be created.  Christian, Tuesday, 17:24  To answer your comment 2 on notification channel. I wrote my CR based on stage 2, i.e. TS 23.286. the VAE server sends a request to the VAE client. As we know, HTTP is a stateless protocol with request-response mechanism, and therefore there is not notification channel for HTTP (polling?).  Christian, Wednesday, 10:42  I have produced a draft revision which addresses Sapan’s comment 1).  Sapan, Wednesday, 21:33  Thanks for addressing comment 1). About 2), – I do understand that the proposal in this CR is based on SA6 specification only. My comment was – for VAE server to send HTTP request to VAE client, VAE server should act as HTTP client to initiate the HTTP connection and VAE client should act as HTTP server to accept the connection. Is this understanding correct? If yes, we need to mention this in the specification (may be in different CR).  Christian, Thursday, 11:36  To accommodate comment 2), I have produced a new draft revision.  Sapan, Thursday, 11:48  I am OK with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-202764 | Structure and data semantics for V2X USD provisioning | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.486 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202215  -------------------------------------------------  Sapan, Friday, 16:05  1)     In clause 8.5 – multiple references are used but not added in clause 2.  2)     In clause 8.5 – “<frequency> is n optional element encoded as specified in 3GPP TS 29.468 [r29468].” => should be “an”.  Christian, Tuesday, 15:36  A draft revision is available.  Sapan, Wednesday, 21:14  I am OK with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-202765 | Structure and data semantics for PC5 parameters provisioning | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.486 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202216  --------------------------------------------------  Sapan, Friday, 4:55  1)     In clause 8.3 multiple new elements are defined but their data semantics are not defined in clause 8.5 (for ex: <authorized-when-not-served-by-E-UTRAN>, <radio-parameters-content>, <geographical-identifier>, etc)  2)     In clause 8.5 – new references are used. Need to add references in reference clause 2.  Christian, Tuesday, 15:55  A draft revision is available.  Sapan, Wednesday, 21:16  I am OK with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-202766 | MIME types | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.486 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202490  ----------------------------------------------  Sapan, Friday, 16:49  1)     Clause 6.5.2.4 is defined twice – please correct the numbers.  2)     In clause 6.2.1 - There is an extra ‘-‘ => VAE—info. Please remove it.  Mikael, Tuesday, 14:14  Clause 6.7 is not included in the pCR but would need corresponding changes. I have 6.7 included in my C1-202238 and could do the changes, but I think it would be better to include in your C1-202490 to have all related corrections in the same paper.  Christian, Tuesday, 15:08  I agree that it is better to keep the changes in C1-202490, so I’m revising the CR and add clause 6.7 to do the corresponding changes so all corrections are included in the same document. I will indicate when the revision is available on the 3GPP server.  Christian, Tuesday, 15:26  A draft revision addressing Sapan and Mikael’s comments is available.  Sapan, Wednesday, 9:42  I am fine with the draft revision.  Mikael, Wednesday, 10:36  Draft revision looks good. | |
|  |  | | C1-202788 | V2X UE registration procedure corrections | | | Ericsson / Mikael | pCR 24.486 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202235  -------------------------------------------------  Sapan, Friday, 16:41  Please revert correction related to MIME type as those corrections are already done in CR C1-202490 – which is proper.  Mikael, Monday, 10:57  The MIME type alignments were included as current spec included the more specific types. We do however fully support and prefer the proposal to be more generic as in C1-202490. I will update my CRs accordingly.  Mikael, Tuesday, 14:33  A draft revision is available.  Sapan, Wednesday, 7:39  I am fine with the draft revision.  Christian, Wednesday, 11:59  I am ok with the draft revision. I would like to co-sign it.  Mikael, Wednesday, 12:23  I will add Huawei and HiSilicon as co-signers. | |
|  |  | | C1-202789 | V2X UE de-registration procedure corrections | | | Ericsson / Mikael | pCR 24.486 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202236  ----------------------------------------------------  Sapan, Friday, 16:41  Please revert correction related to MIME type as those corrections are already done in CR C1-202490 – which is proper.  Mikael, Monday, 10:57  The MIME type alignments were included as current spec included the more specific types. We do however fully support and prefer the proposal to be more generic as in C1-202490. I will update my CRs accordingly.  Mikael, Tuesday, 14:33  A draft revision is available.  Sapan, Wednesday, 7:39  I am fine with the draft revision.  Christian, Wednesday, 11:59  I am ok with the draft revision. I would like to co-sign it.  Mikael, Wednesday, 12:23  I will add Huawei and HiSilicon as co-signers. | |
|  |  | | C1-202790 | V2X service discovery procedure corrections | | | Ericsson / Mikael | pCR 24.486 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202237  ---------------------------------------------------  Sapan, Friday, 16:41  Please revert correction related to MIME type as those corrections are already done in CR C1-202490 – which is proper.  In clause 6.6.2 – an element <service-discovery-data> is used but in clause 8.3 a <service-discovery-info> is defined. Please make is consistent.  Mikael, Monday, 10:57  The MIME type alignments were included as current spec included the more specific types. We do however fully support and prefer the proposal to be more generic as in C1-202490. I will update my CRs accordingly.  On elements in C1-202237, I do not fully understand your comment. In 6.6.2 both <service-discovery-info> and <service-discovery-data> are used. The <service-discovery-data> element may be included in a <service-discovery-info> element. This is reflected in 8.3:  The <service-discovery-info> element shall include a <result> element and may include a <service-discovery-data> element.  There is no definition of <service-discovery-data> in 8.3. Is that what you want to add?  Sapan, Monday, 13:09  Yes, I was referring definition of <service-discovery-data> element only.  Mikael, Tuesday, 14:33  A draft revision is available.  Sapan, Wednesday, 7:39  I am fine with the draft revision.  Christian, Wednesday, 11:59  I am ok with the draft revision. I would like to co-sign it.  Mikael, Wednesday, 12:23  I will add Huawei and HiSilicon as co-signers. | |
|  |  | | C1-202791 | V2X service continuity procedure corrections | | | Ericsson / Mikael | pCR 24.486 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202238  -----------------------------------------------------  Sapan, Friday, 16:41  Please revert correction related to MIME type as those corrections are already done in CR C1-202490 – which is proper.  Mikael, Monday, 10:57  The MIME type alignments were included as current spec included the more specific types. We do however fully support and prefer the proposal to be more generic as in C1-202490. I will update my CRs accordingly.  Mikael, Tuesday, 14:33  A draft revision is available.  Sapan, Wednesday, 7:39  I am fine with the draft revision.  Christian, Wednesday, 11:59  I am ok with the draft revision. I would like to co-sign it.  Mikael, Wednesday, 12:23  I will add Huawei and HiSilicon as co-signers. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | eV2XARC | |  | Lena – Breakout | | |  |  | CT aspects of eV2XARC | |
|  |  | | [C1-202022](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202022.zip) | Incorrect reference | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 0001 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-202105](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202105.zip) | NR PC5 unicast security policy provisioning | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | CR 0003 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current status: Postponed**  Christian, Monday, 8:41   1. the term defined under 3.1 is “NR-PC5”. Can you replace “NR PC5” then?; 2. the text of the new bullet item “vi)” seems to imply that there are several policies but each entry in the list should provide one security policy so what about “vi) one or more geographical areas where the security policy entry applies”?; and 3. with those changes we would like to co-sign the CR as we support it.   Christian, Monday, 14:23   1. we agree that SA3 CRs have been agreed adding that, quote of TS 33.536 under clause 5.3.3.1.4.2.1:   Security policy for PC5 link shall be provisioned for NR PC5 V2X communication as well.  However, there are two editor’s notes and a NOTE under clause 5.3.3.1.4.2.3 on “Security policy handling” which I have now paid attention since they are not shown on the cover sheet of the CT1 CRs, quote:  The list of V2X services, e.g. PSIDs or ITS-AIDs of the V2X applications, with Geographical Area(s) and their security policy which indicates the following:  •       Signalling integrity protection: REQUIRED/PREFERRED/OFF  •       Signalling confidentiality protection: REQUIRED/PREFERRED/OFF  •       User plane integrity protection: REQUIRED/PREFERRED/OFF  •       User plane confidentiality protection: REQUIRED/PREFERRED/OFF  NOTE 1: No integrity protection on signalling traffic enables services that do not require security, e.g. emergency services.  Editor’s note: Whether policy is OFF or NOT NEEDED is FFS  Editor’s note: The security policy handling related part needs to be clearly defined. It is FFS that how the initiating UE and the receiving UE deal with the security policy, e.g., whether to accept the communication or not with their security policy and local policy   1. in our understanding, the security requirements regarding security policy provisioning and handling are not crystal clear yet. This is obvious looking at the stage 2 specification on security (TS 33.536) which version is v1.0.0 so not approved yet and discussions and CRs are still ongoing. Now, I have found p-CRs from several companies (including Huawei) proposing to modify those initially added requirements to the draft version of TS 33.536 for example, updating the security policies and how they are handling, challenging NOTE1, and resolving the editor’s notes in different ways. Furthermore, I see that there are also discussion about (at least one related CR) this week in SA2 (#138E) on the impacts to the architecture and procedures because of the draft version 1.0.0 of TS 33.536; 2. since the situation in both SA3 and SA2 is not crystal clear yet, TS 33.536 is not stable enough and CT1 are meeting in May, I would like to postpone the two CRs in C1-202105 and 2106 till the dust settles in both SA3 and SA2 so we know exactly what we need to do at stage 3 level in CT1.   Andrew H, Monday, 15:09  Agree with Christian, It would probably be a good idea to postpone these CRs until it is clear what decisions have been taken by SA3.  Lena, Tuesday, 9:00  The good news is that SA3 has made some agreements on UE security policy last week, and my understanding is that this should enable us to make progress at this meeting without necessarily waiting for the May meeting. Specifically:  About (1)   * The Editor’s note stating “The security policy handling …” is no longer in the latest version of TS 33.536 (v0.3.0, available in S3-200528) * The Editor’s note stating “Whether policy is OFF or NOT NEEDED is FFS” has been removed by S3-200690 agreed in SA3 last week (SA3 decided to change “OFF” to “NOT NEEDED”)   About (2)   * Several agreements in SA3 on UE security policy were made last week and our understanding is that C1-202105 and C1-202106 are inline with these agreement.  We are not aware of any open items regarding the UE security policy parameters provisioning and their values. If there are any issues which are still unclear, it would be very beneficial if you could point at what these are. Then we could consider addressing them with Editor’s notes.   About (3)   * C1-202105 and C1-202106 are not about what the UE does with the UE security policy, but about what parameters are in the policy and how they are encoded. I believe the SA3 aspects for these are finalized (the last remaining open item was this “OFF” vs “NOT NEED” question which was settled last week as mentioned above). So I do not really what will change between now and the May meeting, and my preference would be to proceed with the CRs.   In light of the above, I have prepared the following draft revisions with the following changes:   * Updated reason for change with latest SA3 agreement * Changed “NR PC5” to “NR-PC5” * Changed “where the policies apply” to “where the NR-PC5 unicast security policy applies”   Christian, Wednesday, 14:57  Agree that progress was achieved but the thing is that I have checked TS 33.536 v1.0.0 (yes, which is v.0.3.0 sent for information) together with a number of p-CRs submitted and discussed last SA3 meeting (#98-bis-e) which challenge requirements under clause 5.3.3.1.4.2 on “Security policy” (e.g., S3-20072, S3-200790). The p-CR from us was noted so the discussions seem to be continued next meeting. There are further discussion this week at the SA2 meeting also on security policy and its impacts on architecture as you may be aware of. I am sorry but it seems that the requirements are not carved in stone on security policy yet. Furthermore, not only does security policy impact the UE but also the PCF, all this also might need to be checked with CT3 experts too.  I believe that it is sensible for us, stage 3 (CT1), to wait for stable requirements and the group will benefit on waiting for the next meeting.  Lena, Wednesday, 16:37  Thanks for your additional feedback. I checked again with my SA3 colleague and the p-CR from Huawei proposing to mandate security for the PC5 unicast link was noted in SA3 last week because there was no support for the proposal. There is no expectation that the discussion will continue in SA3 next meeting, and the requirements on security policy provisioning remain in TS 33.536. Hence C1-202105 & C1-202106 are fully aligned with the current SA3 requirements.  Based on the above, I don’t think anything will change between now and May. That said, since SA3 meets well ahead of CT1 (SA3#99e takes place May 11-15), I can reluctantly accept to postpone C1-202105 & C1-202106 to see if anything changes in SA3 during their May meeting.  To enable C1-202104 to progress, I will update the draft revision of C1-202104 to remove items related to UE signaling security policy and replace them by Editor’s notes.  Christian, Thursday, 11:48  I do appreciate that we wait-and-see for stage 2 completing and stabilizing their work before we make a decision in our next meeting.  Do not doubt that as rapporteur of the work, we support to complete this remaining work by the next CT plenary. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202106](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202106.zip) | NR PC5 unicast security policy provisioning | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | CR 0001 24.588 Rel-16 | **Current status: Postponed**  Ivo, Friday, 15:39  We need to specify how the UE treats the spare values  Christian, Monday, 8:50   1. we support the CR as the related one in C1-202105 but as we add the “NR-PC5”, which is defined by TS 24.587, this has to be indicated under clause 3.1; 2. with that change we would like to co-sign the CR so that the NR-PC5 unicast link security policies can be provisioned to the UE by means of TS 24.588 so that the stage 2 requirements on security are added to stage 3 by CT1.   Christian, Monday, 14:23   1. we agree that SA3 CRs have been agreed adding that, quote of TS 33.536 under clause 5.3.3.1.4.2.1:   Security policy for PC5 link shall be provisioned for NR PC5 V2X communication as well.  However, there are two editor’s notes and a NOTE under clause 5.3.3.1.4.2.3 on “Security policy handling” which I have now paid attention since they are not shown on the cover sheet of the CT1 CRs, quote:  The list of V2X services, e.g. PSIDs or ITS-AIDs of the V2X applications, with Geographical Area(s) and their security policy which indicates the following:  •       Signalling integrity protection: REQUIRED/PREFERRED/OFF  •       Signalling confidentiality protection: REQUIRED/PREFERRED/OFF  •       User plane integrity protection: REQUIRED/PREFERRED/OFF  •       User plane confidentiality protection: REQUIRED/PREFERRED/OFF  NOTE 1: No integrity protection on signalling traffic enables services that do not require security, e.g. emergency services.  Editor’s note: Whether policy is OFF or NOT NEEDED is FFS  Editor’s note: The security policy handling related part needs to be clearly defined. It is FFS that how the initiating UE and the receiving UE deal with the security policy, e.g., whether to accept the communication or not with their security policy and local policy   1. in our understanding, the security requirements regarding security policy provisioning and handling are not crystal clear yet. This is obvious looking at the stage 2 specification on security (TS 33.536) which version is v1.0.0 so not approved yet and discussions and CRs are still ongoing. Now, I have found p-CRs from several companies (including Huawei) proposing to modify those initially added requirements to the draft version of TS 33.536 for example, updating the security policies and how they are handling, challenging NOTE1, and resolving the editor’s notes in different ways. Furthermore, I see that there are also discussion about (at least one related CR) this week in SA2 (#138E) on the impacts to the architecture and procedures because of the draft version 1.0.0 of TS 33.536; 2. since the situation in both SA3 and SA2 is not crystal clear yet, TS 33.536 is not stable enough and CT1 are meeting in May, I would like to postpone the two CRs in C1-202105 and 2106 till the dust settles in both SA3 and SA2 so we know exactly what we need to do at stage 3 level in CT1.   Lena, Tuesday, 9:00  The good news is that SA3 has made some agreements on UE security policy last week, and my understanding is that this should enable us to make progress at this meeting without necessarily waiting for the May meeting. Specifically:  About (1)   * The Editor’s note stating “The security policy handling …” is no longer in the latest version of TS 33.536 (v0.3.0, available in S3-200528) * The Editor’s note stating “Whether policy is OFF or NOT NEEDED is FFS” has been removed by S3-200690 agreed in SA3 last week (SA3 decided to change “OFF” to “NOT NEEDED”)   About (2)   * Several agreements in SA3 on UE security policy were made last week and our understanding is that C1-202105 and C1-202106 are inline with these agreement.  We are not aware of any open items regarding the UE security policy parameters provisioning and their values. If there are any issues which are still unclear, it would be very beneficial if you could point at what these are. Then we could consider addressing them with Editor’s notes.   About (3)   * C1-202105 and C1-202106 are not about what the UE does with the UE security policy, but about what parameters are in the policy and how they are encoded. I believe the SA3 aspects for these are finalized (the last remaining open item was this “OFF” vs “NOT NEED” question which was settled last week as mentioned above). So I do not really what will change between now and the May meeting, and my preference would be to proceed with the CRs.   In light of the above, I have prepared the following draft revisions with the following changes:   * Updated reason for change with latest SA3 agreement * Added reference to definition of NR-PC5 in TS 24.587 in subclause 3.1 * Changed “NR PC5” to “NR-PC5” * Changed “off” to “not required” for security policy code points * Added a description of how the UE handle spare values   Lena, Tuesday, 9:02  I have taken onboard Ivo’s comments in a draft revision.  Christian, Wednesday, 14:57  Agree that progress was achieved but the thing is that I have checked TS 33.536 v1.0.0 (yes, which is v.0.3.0 sent for information) together with a number of p-CRs submitted and discussed last SA3 meeting (#98-bis-e) which challenge requirements under clause 5.3.3.1.4.2 on “Security policy” (e.g., S3-20072, S3-200790). The p-CR from us was noted so the discussions seem to be continued next meeting. There are further discussion this week at the SA2 meeting also on security policy and its impacts on architecture as you may be aware of. I am sorry but it seems that the requirements are not carved in stone on security policy yet. Furthermore, not only does security policy impact the UE but also the PCF, all this also might need to be checked with CT3 experts too.  I believe that it is sensible for us, stage 3 (CT1), to wait for stable requirements and the group will benefit on waiting for the next meeting.  Lena, Wednesday, 16:37  Thanks for your additional feedback. I checked again with my SA3 colleague and the p-CR from Huawei proposing to mandate security for the PC5 unicast link was noted in SA3 last week because there was no support for the proposal. There is no expectation that the discussion will continue in SA3 next meeting, and the requirements on security policy provisioning remain in TS 33.536. Hence C1-202105 & C1-202106 are fully aligned with the current SA3 requirements.  Based on the above, I don’t think anything will change between now and May. That said, since SA3 meets well ahead of CT1 (SA3#99e takes place May 11-15), I can reluctantly accept to postpone C1-202105 & C1-202106 to see if anything changes in SA3 during their May meeting.  To enable C1-202104 to progress, I will update the draft revision of C1-202104 to remove items related to UE signaling security policy and replace them by Editor’s notes.  Ivo, Wednesday, 20:27  Draft revision looks ok and Ericsson would like to co-sign.  Christian, Thursday, 11:48  I do appreciate that we wait-and-see for stage 2 completing and stabilizing their work before we make a decision in our next meeting.  Do not doubt that as rapporteur of the work, we support to complete this remaining work by the next CT plenary. | |
|  |  | | C1-202109 | Introducing new messages for the Link Identifier Update procedure | | | InterDigital Communications | CR 0006 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Merged into C1-202186 and its revisions**  Tdoc was not available on time  Lena, Friday, 2:34   1. Subclauses to describe when optional IEs are included are missing in clause 7 2. The corresponding procedure in subclause 6.1.2.5 needs to be updated to align with the actual message contents. For instance, subclause 6.1.2.5.2 says the UE shall include “the new security information” in the DIRECT LINK IDENTIFIER UPDATE REQUEST message. It should be replaced with “the MSB of KNRP-sess ID” 3. The LSB of KNRP-sess ID in the DIRECT LINK IDENTIFIER UPDATE ACCEPT message should not be optional, according to TS 33.536 subclause 5.3.3.2.2, the target UE shall include them. 4. The LSB of KNRP-sess ID in the DIRECT LINK IDENTIFIER UPDATE ACK message should not be optional, according to TS 33.536 subclause 5.3.3.2.2, the initiating UE shall include them 5. The definition of the DIRECT LINK IDENTIFIER UPDATE REJECT message is missing 6. Subclause 8.4.1 also needs to be modified 7. Overlaps with vivo’s C1-202186 8. Overlaps with CATT’s C1-202547   Behrouz, Friday, 3:01  Answers to Lena’s comments in red:   1. Subclauses to describe when optional IEs are included are missing in clause 7 [BA: I left them out on purpose as w are awaiting agreements in SA2] 2. The corresponding procedure in subclause 6.1.2.5 needs to be updated to align with the actual message contents. For instance, subclause 6.1.2.5.2 says the UE shall include “the new security information” in the DIRECT LINK IDENTIFIER UPDATE REQUEST message. It should be replaced with “the MSB of KNRP-sess ID” [BA: I know, but those are all defined in my other CR, 2596] 3. The LSB of KNRP-sess ID in the DIRECT LINK IDENTIFIER UPDATE ACCEPT message should not be optional, according to TS 33.536 subclause 5.3.3.2.2, the target UE shall include them. [BA: In fact, I wanted to make it Mandatory, but the ongoing discussions in SA2 seem to make it optional!] 4. The LSB of KNRP-sess ID in the DIRECT LINK IDENTIFIER UPDATE ACK message should not be optional, according to TS 33.536 subclause 5.3.3.2.2, the initiating UE shall include them [BA: Same comment as above] 5. The definition of the DIRECT LINK IDENTIFIER UPDATE REJECT message is missing [BA: See below] 6. Subclause 8.4.1 also needs to be modified [BA: CATT’s CR has it so we can import that from there] 7. Overlaps with vivo’s C1-202186 [BA: Yes, and it seems that Yanchao has defined the Reject message, so we will probably merge at some point. However, there are issues with other messages in her CR. Therefore, I prefer to just incorporate the Reject message from her CR into my revision] 8. Overlaps with CATT’s C1-202547 [BA: Yes, but I have spotted several issues with CATT’s CR and will soon send out my comments!]   Yanchao, Saturday, 10:58   1. The encoding of layer-2 ID is missing 2. The definition of the DIRECT LINK IDENTIFIER UPDATE REJECT message is missing 3. The PC5 signalling message types for the  Link Identifier Update procedure are missing in clause 8.4.1 4. What is the reason for adding the following IEs in the link identifier update accept message  * New Source Layer 2 ID * New Source user info * New Source Link local IPv6 address   And this paper conflicts with C1-202186 from vivo, which captures more aspects.  Behrouz, Saturday, 21:00  Some of Yanchao’s comments are covered by my answers to Lena. The reject message from Yanchao’s CR can be incorporated in my CR.  Behrouz, Tuesday, 2:48  I am ok to merge this CR into C1-202186 and co-sign the revision. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202116](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202116.zip) | L2 ID of target UE used in the direct link establishment request | | | OPPO / Rae | CR 0008 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current status: Postponed**  Ivo, Thursday, 13:54  - "follwoing" - 6.1.2.2.2 - linkage between bullet 2) and bullets i) and ii) is not clear.  Yanchao, Thursday, 16:09  What is the difference between C-2) and “known via prior V2X communication” in C-1?  Lena, Friday, 2:39   1. Typo in 6.1.2.2.2: “follwoing" 2. In 6.1.2.2.2, I don’t understand the combination of the condition “if the application layer provides the target UE's application layer ID and the link layer identifier for the target UE is valid” followed by bullet i) and ii). This needs to be clarified. 3. In 6.1.2.2.2, “does not expire” should probably be “has not expired” 4. The stage 2 requirement “When unicast Layer-2 ID is used, the Target User Info shall be included in the Direct Communication Request message” quoted in the CR coversheet is not covered in the changes 5. I don’t think the text added in 6.1.2.2.4 adds any value. If the purpose is to mention that the pair of L2 ID for the link can be changed, I suggest just adding “until the pair of layer-2 IDs is changed during a PC5 unicast link identifier update procedure as specified in subclause 6.1.2.5” after “This pair of layer-2 IDs shall be associated with a PC5 unicast link context”.   Rae, Monday, 5:24  I took all comments on board in a draft revision.  Ivo, Monday, 23:00  my comment:  - 6.1.2.2.2 - linkage between bullet 2) and bullets i) and ii) is not clear. is still not fully addressed.  The revision now refers to "valid" without it being used anywhere.  2)   the link layer identifier for the target UE is available to the initiating UE (e.g. via prior V2X communication, or obtained from the application layer). The link layer identifier for the target UE is considered as valid:  i)    if the link layer identifier for the target UE is also provided from the upper layers; or  ii)   if the validity timer of the link layer identifier for the target UE has not expired;  is the intention to state the following?  2)   a valid link layer identifier for the target UE is available to the initiating UE (e.g. via prior V2X communication, or obtained from the application layer). The link layer identifier for the target UE is considered as valid:  i)    if the link layer identifier for the target UE is also provided from the upper layers; or  ii)   if the validity timer of the link layer identifier for the target UE has not expired;  and use "valid" also in later text?  After the DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT REQUEST message is generated, the initiating UE shall pass this message to the lower layers for transmission along with the initiating UE's Layer 2 ID for unicast communication and either the destination layer 2 ID used for unicast initial signaling or the valid target UE's destination layer 2 ID, and start timer T5000. The UE shall not send a new DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT REQUEST message to the same target UE identified by the same application layer ID while timer T5000 is running.  Chen, Tuesday, 4:31   * There is no need to add a valid timer for the destination layer 2 ID. If the destination layer 2 ID is not valid, the direct communication would not be established and it is difficult to get the validity timer of the link layer identifier for the UE. And it conflicts the clause 6.1.2.5 PC5 unicast link identifier update procedure, the Layer 2 ID can be changed at any time based on the application layer. * There are confusions between c)1) and c)2):   The current specification statement “the link layer identifier for the unicast initial signaling (i.e. destination layer 2 ID used for unicast initial signaling) is available to the initiating UE (e.g. pre-configured,  obtained as specified in clause 5.2.3 or known via prior V2X communication)”  has included what the bullet c)2) states “the link layer identifier for the target UE is available to the initiating UE (e.g. via prior V2X communication, or obtained from the application layer)”.  And in my understanding, “available” means the link layer identifier is already valid at least the initiating UE supposed.   * There is no need to add the words in this bullet c) : may include the target user info set to the target UE’s application layer ID if received from upper layers or shall include the the target user info set to the target UE’s application layer ID if received from upper layers and the link layer identifier for the target UE is used; please see C1-202316 * About the last changes, I do share the same view with Lena that I don’t think the text added in 6.1.2.2.4 adds any value even if adding the words Lena suggested, which should not appear in the link establishment procedure.   Rae, Tuesday, 5:16  About Chen’s comments:   * I think checking the L2 ID is valid or not by the initiating UE is useful under the case that “the link layer identifier for the target UE is available to the initiating UE (e.g. via prior V2X communication”.   In the case, it is possible that the stored L2 ID has been abandoned or not valid in the perspective of the target UE while the initiating UE has no idea. If the initiating UE still uses the invalid L2 ID, the link establishment will fail. In my understanding, this also align with the intention of designing the PC5 unicast link identifier update procedure. And maybe the timer of updating L2 ID can be reused here. In addition, checking the L2 ID does not conflict with the PC5 unicast link identifier update procedure because this checking happens when UE wants to establish a new PC5 link with the same target UE.   * in my understanding, “available” just means the L2 ID is stored in the initiating UE while “valid” means the L2 ID can be used * OK to not touch this bullet. * for this change, I do not have a strong position. I just think the existing “onward” will give a view that L2 ID will not change. But if people think the change is not needed. I can live with not touching this subclause.   Rae, Tuesday, 5:30  I will take Ivo’s suggestions on board.  Chen, Tuesday, 6:04  - It is very difficult to get the validity timer of the layer 2 ID for the UE due to the privacy policy, and there is even no validity timer of the Layer-2 ID, according to clause 6.1.2.5.2.the upper layer can change the layer 2 ID at any time, quote:  - There is not this validity timer in TS 23.287.  - More comments inline.  Rae, Tuesday, 8:55  I agree that if the L2 ID for target UE is not valid, the initiating UE will delete this L2 ID. But I think the issue is still there if the storage of the L2 ID on peer UEs does not match, which results the initiating UE cannot receive the response from the target UE and the establishment will be delayed. So I propose an FFS:  Editor's note: how long the initiating UE stores the link layer identifier for target UE obtained via prior V2X communication is FFS.  In my understanding, the existing L2 ID is associated with the unicast initial signaling and may associated with V2X service(s), but not with a specific UE. For the green highlighted part, the cases that the initiating UE gets the L2 ID for target UE is different from the cases for the existing LS ID. So the green highlighted is needed. If you still think it is confused, some suggested wording is very welcomed.  Chen, Tuesday, 9:19   * The Main problem is, adding the validity timer will destroy the privacy of the target UE, since stage 2 states the Layer 2 ID shall be changed over time so that the UE cannot be tracked. And there is no requirement for the validity timer in Stage 2. * destination layer 2 ID used for unicast initial signaling has included the link layer identifier for the target UE.   Rae, Tuesday, 9:52   * For getting the L2 ID via prior communication, please note not for the existing communication, it is useful to specify how long the initiating UE stores the L2 ID. It does not destroy the privacy of the target UE and not impact the link identifier update procedure. Every time the initiating UE gets the new L2 ID, the timer will be reset. After the link is released and a new link is to be established, the target UE following the privacy may have deleted the L2 ID. In this case, the initiating UE cannot find the target UE when it still uses the stored L2 ID. * It depends on how to understand “destination layer 2 ID used for unicast initial signaling”. I think there is no harm to make things (i.e. two kinds of L2 IDs) clear. This also aligns with stage 2.   Chen, Tuesday, 10:05   * Initiating UE can find the target UE during the valid time even if the unicast link is not needed. And the validity timer should not be added because there is no requirement in stage 2. * TS 23.287 states explicitly on the destination layer 2 ID used for unicast initial signaling, quote clause 5.6.1.4:   The initial signalling for the establishment of the PC5 unicast link may use the known Layer-2 ID of the communication peer, or a default destination Layer-2 ID associated with the V2X service type (e.g. PSID/ITS-AID) configured for PC5 unicast link establishment, as specified in clause 5.1.2.1  Lena, Wednesday, 23:37  The draft revision you provided addressed my comments, but I have the same concerns as Chen about the introduction of this link layer identifier validity timer. I would be ok with an Editor’s note instead.  Chen, Thursday, 3:12  I would NOT be OK even if with an editor’s note.  Rae, Thursday, 3:48  I think Xiaoguang also thinks that there is no need touching the existing “destination layer 2 ID used for unicast initial signaling” since it already covers the case using the L2 ID of target UE.  If people also think same, I will postpone this CR. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202159](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202159.zip) | Introducing NR PC5 functionality for EPC | | | LG Electronics / SangMin | discussion Rel-16 | **Current Status: Noted** | |
|  |  | | [C1-202165](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202165.zip) | Update to the V2X policies regarding RAN parameters | | | LG Electronics / SangMin | CR 0003 24.588 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-202190](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202190.zip) | Requirements for groupcast over PC5 | | | vivo | CR 0022 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Merged into C1-202119 and its revision**  Ivo, Thursday, 18:06  It would be more logical to have each parameter on a separate bullet, i.e. split bullet 2 to two bullets  Lena, Friday, 3:08  This CR overlaps with OPPO’s C1-202119.  Yanchao, Monday, 5:43  We are fine to merge C1-202190 into C1-202119. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202205](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202205.zip) | Work plan for the CT1 part of eV2XARC | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | discussion Rel-16 | **Current Status: Noted** | |
|  |  | | [C1-202416](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202416.zip) | Discussion on maximum nbr of PC5 unicast links | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | discussion 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Noted** | |
|  |  | | [C1-202434](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202434.zip) | PC5 QoS flow establishment during the PC5 unicast link establishment procedure | | | Huawei, HiSIlicon / Vishnu | CR 0030 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Merged into C1-202745 and its revisions**  Ivo, Thursday, 18:07   * 6.1.2.2.4 - bullet c) iv contains full stop (instead of semicolon) before "and" - why is creation of the PC5 QoS flow(s) optional? Shouldn't it be mandatory on a condition as in the 1st quote in the reason for change?   Lena, Friday, 4:30  This CR overlaps with vivo’s C1-202188 which puts the text in a different subclause. I prefer vivo’s version as it does not mix matching of QoS flows with the signalling procedure between the UEs.  Yanchao, Saturday, 11:10  Same opinion as Lena. The change here is the general description for creating PC5 QoS flows which can be applied after the completion of many other procedures, such as link establishment and modification. It would be better to use a separate subclause.  Also please see the following detailed comments:   1. clause 6.1.2.2.4, for the bullet d), the PC5 unicast link ID as one of parameters to lower layers is missing 2. clause 6.1.2.2.4, for the bullet d), PQFI->PQFI(s)   Vishnu, Tuesday, 10:39  We agree in principle (about PC5 QoS flow establishment) to this CR but we have some concerns.  We understand that we have such a common sub clause in 23.287 for the QoS flow establishment, but when we come to stage 3, we need to define each procedure and the PCQ QoS flow establishment is not the same for each. So we don’t think a common sub clause can be used.  Eg: As proposed in our CR, for the link establishment procedure, the QoS flow establishment is part of the link establishment. Target UE and destination UE exchange the QoS parameters and then establish the QoS flow when they are successful. For the Link modification procedure , if the service data or request don’t have a matching PQFI, then the Flow is created. So in the new sub clause you added, when we say “if service data or request” it is more applicable for the link modification procedure and cannot be directly referred to in the link establishment procedure.  Another reason is that in the new sub clause it says: “If there is no PC5 QoS rules for the existing PC5 QoS flow(s) matching the service data or request, the UE derives PC5 QoS parameters based on the V2X application requirements provided by the upper layers (if available) and the V2X service type (e.g. PSID or ITS-AID) according to the PC5 QoS mapping rules defined in clause 5.2.3 and perform the following:”  This is not correct, because if there is no unicast link existing, then the UE needs to establish a unicast link first and then PC5 QoS flow. So we believe that we will have to change this sub clause for each link procedure.  Considering this , we like to keep C1-202434 to clarify PC5 QoS flow establishment during direct link establishment procedure.  Yanchao, Tuesday, 17:09  To Vishnu: we believe the matching of QoS flows and the PC5 signalling procedure should be specified separately, which will construct a TS with clear logic and structure.  Secondly, I don’t agree with what you said “*when we say “if service data or request” it is more applicable for the link modification procedure and cannot be directly referred to in the link establishment procedure.*” It doesn’t make sense.  It is a general scenario describing there is service data or request from upper layer.  3rd, the UE can create a PC5 QoS flow via either the PC5 link modification procedure or the PC5 link establishment procedure, which procedure to choose depends on where the PC5 link that the UE needs exists or not.  4th, the following statement is not correct, and you have an misunderstanding here. “If there is no PC5 QoS rules for the existing PC5 QoS flow(s)”, the UE may choose to establish a new PC5 unicast link, or the UE may choose to create an PC5 QoS flow in the existing PC5 unicast link. That is exactly the reason why the match of QoS flows should be specified as a generic subclause.  There we think C1-202434 is not needed.  Vishnu, Tuesday, 17:40  To Yanchao: we are not against you CR, but with the current wordings in the subclause it will be difficult to refer it from various procedures.  As a way forward, we like to propose to you: You update the new subclause as suggested below, then QoS flow match (if needed) can be done in the respective procedures. Then we can use this subclause in our CR. 6.1.2.X         PC5 QoS ~~flow match and~~ establishment over PC5 unicast link ~~When service data or request from the upper layers is received, the UE determines if there is any existing PC5 QoS flow(s) matching the service data or request, i.e. based on the PC5 QoS rules for the existing PC5 QoS flow(s).~~  ~~If there is no PC5 QoS rules for the existing PC5 QoS flow(s) matching the service data or request,~~ the UE derives PC5 QoS parameters based on the V2X application requirements provided by the upper layers (if available) and the V2X service type (e.g. PSID or ITS-AID) according to the PC5 QoS mapping rules defined in clause 5.2.3 and perform the following:  Yanchao, Wednesday, 11:25   1. The change only describes the initiating UE’s behavior. The target UE could also use the established PC5 link and PC5 QoS flows to transmit V2X service data. (By the way, this is another reason why a generic subclause is more approapirate) 2. Bullet a) and bullet b) is about constructing a PC5 unicast link context, which has already been cover by our paper in C1-202181(2181 covers both the initiating UE and the target UE); 3. Bullet c) is about setting up a PC5 QoS rule, which has been covered about our paper in C1-202188 in bullet a-3) 4. Bullet d) is about passing parameters to lower layer, however :    1. the “source layer-2 ID and the destination layer-2 ID” has already been covered by Lena’s paper in C1-202104, see “After the DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT ACCEPT message is generated, the initiating UE shall pass this message to the lower layers for transmission along with the initiating UE's layer 2 ID for unicast communication, the target UE's layer 2 ID for unicast communication and an indication that the PC5 signalling message is protected”    2. the PQFI and the PC5 QoS parameters is has already been covered by our paper in C1-202181 (2181 covers both the initiating UE and the target UE)   Therefore I think C1-202434 can be merged into C1-202181/ C1-202104.  Vishnu, Wednesday, 12:46  To Yanchao: we are fine to merge our CR into yours. What about my comments on editing the text in your CR?  Yanchao, Wednesday, 13:21  I am a little confused about Vishnu’s comment.  The last paragraph of the change in C1-202188 described the UE behavior when UE found a match between the existing PC5 QoS flow and the service data or request. So I don’t understand why you propose to delete the text?  Vishnu, Wednesday, 14:49  Looks like you have a  misunderstanding about what our CR is doing.  Our CR intends to clarify that the QoS Flows can be established as part of the Unicast link establishment procedure without doing a QoS flow match based on incoming request/data one more time.  So in the new subclause the QoS flow matching is not needed. Otherwise it gives a feeling that after the unicast link is established , the QoS flow is established with additional request/data from upper layer. This is not the intention of our CR.  If you cannot agree to this, I am afraid, we cannot agree to your CR and to the merging.  Yanchao, Wednesday, 14:59  How about this:  I split the change in my CR into two subclause:  One subclause is “PC5 QoS flow match”  One subclause is “PC5 QoS flow establishment over PC5 unicast link”  Vishnu, Wednesday, 15:12  That is fine with us and use the subclause “PC5 QoS flow establishment over PC5 unicast link” for our changes. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202438](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202438.zip) | Resolution of editor's note under 5.2.3 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | CR 0031 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-202439](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202439.zip) | Resolution of editor's note under 6.1.2.5.2 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | CR 0032 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-202453](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202453.zip) | Miscellaneous corrections | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | CR 0033 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-202547](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202547.zip) | Direct link identifier update procedure messages definition and IEs coding | | | CATT | CR 0038 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Merged into C1-202186 and its revisions.**  Ivo, Thuesday, 18:07  "SL-DestinationIdentity clause 6.3.5 of 3GPP TS 38.331 [11]" - IMO, SL-DestinationIdentity defined in clause 6.3.5 of 3GPP TS 38.331 [11] is not a IE according to 24.007. IMO, it would be better to define a type-3 IE with V format in 24.587, with value containing SL-DestinationIdentity according to clause 6.3.5 of 3GPP TS 38.331 [11]. it would be clearer definition from 24.007 point of view.  Lena, Friday, 4:35   1. Overlaps with InterDigital’s C1-202109 and vivo’s C1-202 2. Is missing subclauses describing when optional IEs are included in clause 7 3. The security information should not be TBD, SA3 has already agreed that the initiating UE sends the new MSB of KNRP-sess ID in the DIRECT LINK IDENTIFIER UPDATE REQUEST message, that the target UE sends back the MSB of KNRP-sess ID and the LSB of KNRP-sess ID in the DIRECT LINK IDENTIFIER UPDATE ACCEPT message, and that the initiating UE sends the LSB of KNRP-sess ID in the DIRECT LINK IDENTIFIER ACK message, see TS 33.536 subclause 5.3.3.2.2 4. except when referring to the new IE, “Layer-2 ID” should be “layer-2 ID” to be consistent with the changes proposed in Huawei’s C1-202453   Behrouz, Friday, 4:58   1. High level comment: This CR should be merged with vivo’s 2186 and our 2109 2. For the **Request** message    1. The names of several IEs are wrong; also Security info should be LSB as defined in SA3    2. For the New Layer-2 ID, you cannot refer to 38.331 in the Type/Reference column 3. For the **Accept** message    1. Several IEs are missing    2. The new target security info should be the MSB    3. The word “UE” in New Target UE info should be “user”    4. Same comment as above for Type/Reference column 4. For the **ACK** message    1. The word “Acknowledgment” should change to “ack” in 7.3.Z    2. All IEs after the Sequence Number should be “Optional” (awaiting ongoing SA2 discussions and decisions)    3. Security Info should be LSB    4. Address/Prefix should be removed from the last IE   Yanchao, Saturday, 11:03   1. in table 7.3.x.1.1, I prefer to define our own NAS IE for Layer 2 ID, not just refer to RAN specs for a NAS IE coding . 2. in Table 7.3.x.1.1, the presence of New initiating UE info should be O 3. in Table 7.3.y.1.1, the presence of New target UE Layer 2 ID and New target UE security information should be O 4. in Table 7.3.z.1.1, the presence of New target UE Layer 2 ID and New target UE security information should be O 5. no definition of the DIRECT LINK IDENTIFIER UPDATE REJECT message | |
|  |  | | C1-202639 | Add the missing figure for UE-requested V2X policy provisioning procedure | | | OPPO / Rae | CR 0007 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202115  Ivo, Tuesday, 13:52  I am ok with C1-202639. If you revise it again, could you please add Ericsson as co-signer?  Lena, Wednesday, 23:25  I am OK with C1-202639.  -------------------------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 13:54  The figure needs to be referenced from the text - e.g. "(see example in figure xxxxx)"  Lena, Friday, 2:36  The changes in the CR are ok but the CR should be Cat F, not Cat D.  Rae, Monday, 5:21  I have taken comments from both Ivo and Lena on board in a draft revision.  Ivo, Monday, 22:53  I suggest to add the reference to the figure in "In order to initiate the UE-requested V2X policy provisioning procedure, the UE shall create a UE POLICY PROVISIONING REQUEST message (see example in figure 5.3.2.2.1)." rather than to the bullet d). Reason: this sentence is start of the procedure.  Chen, Tuesday, 3:51  In the Summary of change of the cover page, “In” -> “in”  Rae, Tuesday, 4:26  I will reflect all the comments in a revision of this CR. | |
|  |  | | C1-202704 | Non-standadized QoS characteristics over PC5-S | | | OPPO / Rae | CR 0009 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202117  Lena, Thursday, 1:08  I am OK with C1-202704.  ------------------------------------------------  SangMin, Friday, 5:27  Intent of the CR is okay, but Default averaging window (0DH, newly added) and Averaging window (06H, existing) seem redundant, so default averaging window seems not needed to be added.  I also think that some spare values would be beneficial.  Also what is the reason for removing the following text?  ~~The network shall consider all other values not explicitly defined in this version of the protocol as unsupported.~~  Lena, Sunday, 20:05  For the Resource type and Default priority level, it would be beneficial to make some of the unused code points spare, instead of making them all reserved (just in case new Resource types or Default priority levels are defined in future releases).  Rae, Monday, 4:07  @Lena  I will change “Reserved” to “Spare” except the value "00000000”.  @Sangmin  I will remove the “Default averaging window”.  For the removed sentence, since the parameters are transmitted over PC5-S, then there is no “network”.  After a second thinking, how about changing “network” to “UE”?  Chen, Tuesday, 4:49  In principle, it aligns with the PC5 QoS characteristics defined by TS 23.287 so it is needed. But I do not understand the removal of "The network shall consider all other values not explicitly defined in this version of the protocol as unsupported".  Rae, Tuesday, 4:53  For the removed sentence, since the parameters are transmitted over PC5-S, then there is no “network”.  After a second thinking, how about changing “network” to “UE”?  Rae, Wednesday, 4:10  A draft revision is available. Changes:   * Change “Reserved” to “Spare” except the value "00000000” * Remove default averaging window; * "The ~~network~~ UE shall consider all other values not explicitly defined in this version of the protocol as unsupported". * Change the value of new parameters to align with the revision of C1-202118 where some values are removed.   SangMin, Wednesday, 5:24  This revision addresses my previous comment on averaging window. And also not I understand the reason for removing texts, and I agree to replace “network” to “UE”. SO I’m okay with this draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-202708 | Group size and menber ID from application layer for groupcast | | | OPPO / Rae | CR 0011 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202119  ---------------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 16:39  - "optianl" -> "optional" - "optianlly" -> "optionally " - "whichi" -> "which"  Lena, Friday, 2:47   1. Stage 2 says “NOTE:   The mechanism for converting the V2X application layer provided group identifier to the destination Layer-2 ID is defined in Stage 3” but subclause 6.1.4.2.1.2 does not address that. It says “if group identifier information is provided and there is no context for the group identifier information, then UE shall use the destination layer-2 ID as specified in clause 6.1.4.2.1” but there is not text in subclause 6.1.4.2.1 (subclause 6.1.4.2.1 is just a header for subclauses 6.1.4.2.1.1 and 6.2.4.2.1.2). How does the UE determine the destination layer 2 ID if there is no context for the group identifier information? 2. Typo in 6.1.4.2.1.1: “optianlly” 3. Typo in 6.1.4.2.1.2: “optianl” 4. Overlaps with vivo’s C1-202190   Chen, Friday, 9:55  “the request from the upper layers may include” overlaps with “which is optionally provided in the request from upper layers” in the sub-bullet;  Rae, Monday, 5:33  I took all comments on board in a draft revision. For the first comment from Lena, for the case  “if group identifier information is provided and there is no context for the group identifier information”,  I think the v2x service identifier with L2 ID mapping rule should be used.  Lena, Wednesday, 23:55  I have the following issue with the draft revision:  the UE just uses the destination layer-2 ID corresponding to the V2X service identifier, even if group identifier info is provided, which does not seem right. It is also not aligned with stage 2 which says: “OTE:   The mechanism for converting the V2X application layer provided group identifier to the destination Layer-2 ID is defined in Stage 3”. So the expectation is that in stage 3, we will define some way for the UE to derive a destination layer-2 ID based on the group identifier information. This is current missing from stage 3. To resolve this, I propose to delete bullet 3) and replace it by the following Editor’s note: “Editor’s note:       If group identifier information is provided and there is no context for the group identifier information, how the UE determines the destination layer-2 ID based on the group identifier information is FFS.”  Rae, Thursday, 3:25  For the case in bullet 3), for now, I think UE has no choice but to use the L2 ID associated with a v2x service if there is no group identifier related context.  But I am fine to remove this bullet and add the EN if people are also OK, as touching bullet 3) is not the intention of this CR. This CR aims to add the missing Group size and member ID.  Another option is that we leave the bullet 3) as it is and the interested companies send a CR to the next meeting.  Lena, Thursday, 4:44  My preference is to remove bullet 3) and add the EN.  Rae, Thursday 11:12  In the uploaded version of the revision, I have added the EN. | |
|  |  | | C1-202730 | Corection for the target user info in the DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT REQUEST message | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0025 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202316  ------------------------------------------------  Lena, Friday, 3:11  Subclause 7.3.1.2 also needs to be modified in a similar way.  Chen, Friday  Thanks Lena for your feedback. The draft revision with the modified subclause7.3.1.2 is available in the drafts folder.  Lena, Wednesday, 23:12  I am OK with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-202731 | Correction for the IP address configuration IE in the DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT ACCEPT message | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0026 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202317  -------------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 13:55  The conditions in the bullets are not opposite and in some situation, this might result into impossibility to select a value. Please remove "only" in c) 1).  Chen, Friday, 5:33  Thanks Ivo for your advice. I agree with you that the “only” should be removed. Please see the draft revision in the drafts folder.  Ivo, Friday, 2:11  I am ok with the draft revision and Ericsson would like to co-sign. | |
|  |  | | C1-202732 | Correction for the link local IPv6 address IE in the DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT ACCEPT message | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0027 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202318  --------------------------------------------------- | |
|  |  | | C1-202739 | Handling of link modification accept | | | vivo | CR 0014 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202182  ---------------------------------------------  Chen, Tuesday, 8:31  It is true that NAS needs to pass some information to AS when sending messages but I fail to understand why new paragraphs are added under clause 6.1.2.3.3. A new sentence needs to be added to the existing paragraph saying "The target UE shall provide the <xx> to lower layers". Having said that, I do not understand why the PC5 unicast link identifier(s) needs to be provided during PC5 unicast link modification procedure to lower layers as there is procedure for it defined, i.e., PC5 unicast link identifier update procedure. Also, note that in that procedure already are requirements of passing information to AS.  Yanchao, Tuesday, 15:48  I can’t understand Chen’s comment. The paper is for PC5 link modification accept procedure, what he refers to is a different procedure. The PC5 QoS parameters are changed via the PC5 link modification accept procedure, shouldn’t the UE provide the added or modified PQFI(s) and corresponding PC5 QoS parameters to the lower layer. Please note that it is the PQFI(s) and corresponding PC5 QoS parameters provided to the lower layer, “provide xx along with PC5 link identifier” is just to identify which PC5 link that xx is related to.  Chen, Wednesday, 4:25  I suggest to be aligned with TS 23.287, using “PC5 Link Identifier” with the first letter capitalized.  Yanchao, Wednesday, 5:54  I check TS24.587, “PC5 link identifier” is used in subclause 6.1.2.9 without the first letter capitalized. Also please check Huawei’s paper C1-202453, wherein it changes “Layer-2 ID” to “layer-2 ID”.  Chen, Wednesday, 6:06  OK with me. Please make sure these words aligned in all your related contributions, e.g., C1-202181, C1-202188, and etc. | |
|  |  | | C1-202741 | Updates to link release procedure | | | vivo | CR 0016 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202184  Lena, Thursday, 0:35  I am OK with C1-202741.  --------------------------------------------------  Lena, Friday, 2:58  “Proposed” is not ok in “lack of resources for proposed link” since in this case the link is already established. I suggest changing it to “lack of resources for PC5 unicast link”.  Yanchao, Tuesday, 5:59  The name of cause#5 is updated to “lack of resources for PC5 unicast link” in 6.1.2.4.2.  The name of cause#5 is aligned in the table 8.4.9.1: PC5 signalling protocol cause information element as well. (new change in this revision)  We also plan to submit a paper to align the name of cause#5 used in other procedures in next meeting.  A draft revision is available. | |
|  |  | | C1-202742 | Correction of the timers of link identifier update procedure | | | vivo | CR 0017 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202185  Lena, Thursday, 0:42  I am OK with C1-202742.  ----------------------------------------------  Lena, Friday, 3:01  We are fine with changes in the CR, but it would be good to take this opportunity to correct the style of second bullet d) in 6.1.2.5.2.  Yanchao, Tuesday, 6:03  I fixed the style of the bullet, a draft revision is available. | |
|  |  | | C1-202743 | Encoding of link identifier update messages and parameters | | | vivo | CR 0018 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202186  ---------------------------------------------------  Lena, Friday, 3:03   1. Overlaps with InterDigital’s C1-202109 2. Overlaps with CATT’s C1-202537 3. Is more complete than C1-202109 since its includes the DIRECT LINK IDENTIFIER UPDATE REJECT message, and the changes to subclause 8.4.1 4. Is missing subclauses describing when optional IEs are included in subclause 7 5. The security information should not be TBD, SA3 has already agreed that the initiating UE sends the new MSB of KNRP-sess ID in the DIRECT LINK IDENTIFIER UPDATE REQUEST message, that the target UE sends back the MSB of KNRP-sess ID and the LSB of KNRP-sess ID in the DIRECT LINK IDENTIFIER UPDATE ACCEPT message, and that the initiating UE sends the LSB of KNRP-sess ID in the DIRECT LINK IDENTIFIER ACK message, see TS 33.536 subclause 5.3.3.2.2 6. except when referring to the new IE, “Layer-2 ID” should be “layer-2 ID” to be consistent with the changes proposed in Huawei’s C1-202453   Behrouz, Friday, 3:58   1. At a high level, I think we should merge your CR with my 2109 2. In the **Request** Message:    1. Security Establishment Info should be “MSB…” [See 2109]    2. IP Address Configuration is not needed 3. In the **Accept** Message:    1. Security Establishment Info: Which one is this? The MSB is Mandatory and the LSB is Optional in this message    2. Layer-2 ID: Is this Source or Target? Target should be Mandatory!    3. IP Address Configuration is not needed    4. Link Local IPv6 address: There should be 2 of these; Source and Target 4. In the **Ack** message    1. Security Info should be the LSB    2. Layer-2 ID should be Target    3. IP Address Configuration is not needed   Yanchao, Monday, 17:12  A draft revision is available with the following changes:   1. Add missing subclauses describing when optional IEs are included in subclause 7； 2. Add The security information IEs; 3. Correct “Layer-2 ID” to “layer-2 ID” where needed; 4. Delete IP Address Configuration, based on Behrouz’s comments   About Behrouz’s comments I did not take onboard:   * I cannot agree to merge my CR in C1-202109 * I don’t agree that the target layer-2 ID should be mandatory, I think the Target is optional based on current SA2 agreement * I don't understand why the source IP is needed in the accept message * only one layer 2-ID is included in each message(request, accept, ACK), it belongs to the UE who send the message, hence no need to mention “target” or “source”   Behrouz, Tuesday, 2:48   1. When two CRs overlap (or 3 in this case), it is very customary to merge them. Unlike others, I do not have a very strong preference on “who merges with whom”. What matters is to complete the work and try to finalize the specification. Therefore, hoping that you are OK with this approach, I can merge my CR with yours and co-sign yours. 2. As for certain IEs whether they should be optional or mandatory, this is what Lena commented on your (and my) CR:   “The security information should not be TBD, SA3 has already agreed that the initiating UE sends the new MSB of KNRP-sess ID in the DIRECT LINK IDENTIFIER UPDATE REQUEST message, that the target UE sends back the MSB of KNRP-sess ID and the LSB of KNRP-sess ID in the DIRECT LINK IDENTIFIER UPDATE ACCEPT message, and that the initiating UE sends the LSB of KNRP-sess ID in the DIRECT LINK IDENTIFIER ACK message, see TS 33.536 subclause 5.3.3.2.2”  The LSB of KNRP-sess ID in the DIRECT LINK IDENTIFIER UPDATE ACCEPT message should not be optional, according to TS 33.536 subclause 5.3.3.2.2, the target UE shall include them.  The LSB of KNRP-sess ID in the DIRECT LINK IDENTIFIER UPDATE ACK message should not be optional, according to TS 33.536 subclause 5.3.3.2.2, the initiating UE shall include them  So, do you still believe they should be optional?   1. I guess, we will have to wait 1-2 days to decide exactly what IEs should be there in both Accept and ACK messages. Meanwhile, for the IEs that are optional, but are supposed to be included according to the procedure, I don’t think it is a good idea to say e.g. “This IE is included when the target UE decides to change its identifiers based on the privacy configuration…”. Instead, we should say something like “The UE shall include IE this to change its identifiers …” 2. In 7.3.C:    1. Change “acknowledgement” to “ack”    2. I don’t think it is a good idea to use “initiating” and “target” UE in the message definition. Please use the same terminology as you have done for the Request and Accept messages.   Yanchao, Tuesday, 16:23   1. -> Thank you 2. -> My bad, fixed in draft revision 3. Agree, I chose to use the wording “This IE is included when the target UE changes its layer-2 ID.”   4-a) OK  4-b) your question made me re-think this procedure:   1. The initiating UE send its ID and info in the request message; 2. The target UE respond with the ACCEPT message with the target UE’s ID and info; 3. The initiating UE can just send an ‘empty’ ACK message for acknowledgement, why include any ID or info here in ACK message, they already shared information needed in the REQUEST message and ACCEPT message.   So I updated the definition for the ACK message.  A draft revision is available.  Lena, Tuesday, 19:44  Regarding the new definition of the ACK message, it is not aligned with the latest version of TS 33.536 (v0.3.0, available in [S3-200528](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_sa/WG3_Security/TSGS3_98e/Docs/S3-200528.zip)): per TS 33.536 subclause 5.3.3.2.2, the ACK message includes both the LSB of K\_NRP-sess ID and the target UE’s new layer-2 ID. So the target’s UE new layer-2 ID needs to be kept in the message.  Yanchao, Wednesday, 10:27  Yes in TS 33.536 figure 5.3.3.2.2-1, the ACK message includes both the LSB of K\_NRP-sess ID and the target UE’s new layer-2 ID. But the step 3 only describes the UE\_1 shall send the Link Identifier Update Ack message to UE\_2 including the LSB of KNRP-sess ID, not mention anything about the target UE’s new layer-2 ID. So my question is what is the purpose of including target UE’s new layer-2 ID in the Ack message? I will gather people’s opinion on the definition of the ACK message and will follow what most people want.  Lena, Thursday, 7:57  My understanding is that the UE\_1 replays the UE’s new Layer-2 ID in the ACK so UE\_2 can check that the data has not been altered (just like UE\_1 replays the MSBs of K\_NRP-sess ID received from UE\_2 in the ACK).  Yanchao, Thursday, 10:25  An updated draft revision is available.  Lena, Thursday, 10:39  I have the following comments:   * There is a comment in table 7.3.b.1.1 which will need to be removed before submission * The IEs defined in C1-202104 (now revised to C1-202875) are LSBs of KNRP-sess ID and MSBs of KNRP-sess ID, not LSB of KNRP-sess ID and MSB of KNRP-sess ID.  I think having an “s” is clearer, but I won’t argue over it at this point in the meeting. If you prefer to not add an “s” that is fine, we can have an interesting discussion in May on MSB/LSB vs MSBs/LSBs and then we harmonize the spec based on the outcome | |
|  |  | | C1-202744 | Handling of link identifier update not accept | | | vivo | CR 0019 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202187  Lena, Thursday, 0:46  I am OK with C1-202744.  -------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 18:06  - NOTE 2 without NOTE 1. - "For other reasons that causing the failure of link establishment, " -> "For other reasons that cause the failure of link establishment, " or "For other reasons causing the failure of link establishment, "  Lena, Friday, 3:04   1. “Layer 2 ID” should be “layer-2 ID” to be consistent with the changes proposed in Huawei’s C1-202453 2. NOTE 2 should be NOTE (only one note) 3. “For other reasons that causing” should be “For other reasons causing   Chen, Friday, 10:00  In “For other reasons that causing the failure of link establishment, the target UE shall send a DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT REJECT message with PC5 signalling protocol cause value #111 "protocol error, unspecified",  DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT REJECT should be DIRECT LINK  IDENTIFIER UPDATE REJECT  Yanchao, Tuesday, 6:12  I have taken the comments onboard, a draft revision is available. | |
|  |  | | C1-202745 | Handling of PC5 unicast QoS flow match and establishment | | | vivo | CR 0020 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202188  Vishnu, Thursday, 11:32  I am OK with C1-202745.  ----------------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 18:06  - bullet c: "UE" -> "the UE" - shouldn't the text be normative? If informative, it is not required to be implemented.  Lena, Friday, 3:06   1. “and perform the following” -> “and performs the following” 2. “with following operations” -> “by performing the following operations” 3. “set up a new PC5 QoS rule, the PC5 QoS rule contains” -> “create a new PC5  QoS rule which contains” 4. “to lower layers” -> “to the lower layers” 5. “.” at the end of bullet a-4-iv) should be an “;’. 6. “.” at the end of bullet b) should be “; and” 7. In bullet c), “UE uses” -> “the UE uses” 8. In bullet c), “the new created PC5 QoS flow as bullet a)” -> “the new PC5 QoS flow created as described in bullet a)” 9. In bullet c), “as bullet b)” -> “as described in bullet b)” 10. Overlaps with Huawei’s C1-202434. I have a preference for this CR as it does not mix matching of QoS flows with the signalling procedure between the UEs.   Yanchao, Monday, 16:41  I took onboard all of Ivo and Lena’s comments in a draft revision.  Ivo, Monday, 23:10  Nearly ok - "The UE" should be "the UE" in bullet c).  Vishnu, Tuesday, 10:25  We agree in principle (about PC5 QoS flow establishment) to this CR but we have some concerns.  We understand that we have such a common sub clause in 23.287 for the QoS flow establishment, but when we come to stage 3, we need to define each procedure and the PCQ QoS flow establishment is not the same for each. So we don’t think a common sub clause can be used.  Eg: As proposed in our CR, for the link establishment procedure, the QoS flow establishment is part of the link establishment. Target UE and destination UE exchange the QoS parameters and then establish the QoS flow when they are successful. For the Link modification procedure , if the service data or request don’t have a matching PQFI, then the Flow is created. So in the new sub clause you added, when we say “if service data or request” it is more applicable for the link modification procedure and cannot be directly referred to in the link establishment procedure.  Another reason is that in the new sub clause it says: “If there is no PC5 QoS rules for the existing PC5 QoS flow(s) matching the service data or request, the UE derives PC5 QoS parameters based on the V2X application requirements provided by the upper layers (if available) and the V2X service type (e.g. PSID or ITS-AID) according to the PC5 QoS mapping rules defined in clause 5.2.3 and perform the following:”  This is not correct, because if there is no unicast link existing, then the UE needs to establish a unicast link first and then PC5 QoS flow. So we believe that we will have to change this sub clause for each link procedure.  Considering this , we like to keep C1-202434 to clarify PC5 QoS flow establishment during direct link establishment procedure.  Yanchao, Tuesday, 16:39  A draft revision is available with “The UE" changed to "the UE" in bullet c).  Yanchao, Tuesday, 17:07  To Vishnu: we believe the matching of QoS flows and the PC5 signalling procedure should be specified separately, which will construct a TS with clear logic and structure.  Secondly, I don’t agree with what you said “*when we say “if service data or request” it is more applicable for the link modification procedure and cannot be directly referred to in the link establishment procedure.*” It doesn’t make sense.  It is a general scenario describing there is service data or request from upper layer.  3rd, the UE can create a PC5 QoS flow via either the PC5 link modification procedure or the PC5 link establishment procedure, which procedure to choose depends on where the PC5 link that the UE needs exists or not.  4th, the following statement is not correct, and you have an misunderstanding here. “If there is no PC5 QoS rules for the existing PC5 QoS flow(s)”, the UE may choose to establish a new PC5 unicast link, or the UE may choose to create an PC5 QoS flow in the existing PC5 unicast link. That is exactly the reason why the match of QoS flows should be specified as a generic subclause.  Yanchao, Wednesday, 16:28  A draft revision is available.  Vishnu, Wednesday, 17:06  The revision has not captured our CR well.   1. We need to add the following statement as last paragraph to 6.1.2.2.3   If the target UE accepts the PC5 unicast link establishment request, then the target UE may establish the negotiated PC5 QoS flow(s) as specified in 6.1.2.X.   1. Also we need to add the following statement as last paragraph in 6.1.2.2.4   In addition, the initiating UE may establish the negotiated PC5 QoS flow(s) as specified in 6.1.2.X  Ivo, Wednesday, 20:38  Draft revision looks OK and Ericsson would like to cosign.  Lena, Thursday, 0:24  The draft revision looks good except that “.” And the end of bullet a-3-iv) should be “; and”.  Vishnu, Thursday, 10:20  Could Yanchao answer my comments?  Yanchao, Thursday, 10:21  A draft revision is available.  Vishnu, Thursday, 10:37  Almost OK. Please remove ‘and perform the PC5 QoS flow match over PC5 unicast link as specified in clause 6.1.2.Y’ from 6.1.2.2.3 and 6.1.2.2.4. Reason is that the UE can establish QoS flows based on negotiated QoS parameters without further QoS flow match.  Ivo, Thursday, 10:48  My comments were addressed. | |
|  |  | | C1-202748 | Introducing V2X communications over NR PC5 in EPC | | | LG Electronics / SangMin | CR 0024 24.386 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202160  Vishnu, Thursday, 13:29  We are fine with C1-202748. If possible Huawei, HiSilicon would like to co-sign it.  -------------------------------------------------  Lena, Friday, 2:49   1. About the terminology, TS 24.587 defined “NR-PC5” but also uses “NR based PC5”, while TS 23.287 uses “NR PC5”. To be consistent it would be good to use what is defined in TS 24.587 ie “NR-PC5” 2. Typo in clause 1: “speicifies” 3. In clause 1, rather than adding a paragraph below the bulleted list, why not just modify the existing bullet on PC5, as in “for V2X communication among the UEs (over the LTE PC5 interface and over the NR PC5 interface)”? 4. In 5.2.4, “and” the end of bullet j) should be deleted and the “.” at the end of bullet h) should be replaced by a “;” 5. In 5.2.4 bullet l), “for a V2X communication” should be “for V2X communication”   SangMin, Monday, 10:00   1. -> OK 2. -> OK 3. -> OK 4. -> the last comment seems to be on bullet k). Anyhow, I fixed all the editorial errors on bullets in 5.2.4. 5. -> OK   A draft revision is available.  SangMin, Wednesday, 10:33  Updated draft revision is available. Changes:  - Proposed to use the terminology "NR-PC5" for the consistency  - In clause 1, modified existing bullets for specifying the scope of NR-PC5 instead of adding new paragraph.  - Bullet 7) in clause 5.2.4 is aligned with the change proposed in CR0012 against TS 24.587.  - Fixed vaious editorial errors  Lena, Wednesday, 23:58  I am OK with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-202756 | V2X MO update for V2X over NR PC5 | | | LG Electronics / SangMin | CR 0021 24.385 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202161  Vishnu, Thursday, 13:21  Could you add Huawei, HiSilicon as co-signers?  -----------------------------------------------  Lena, Friday, 2:50   1. The DDF needs to be updated. 2. About the terminology, TS 24.587 defined “NR-PC5” but also uses “NR based PC5”, while TS 23.287 uses “NR PC5”. To be consistent it would be good to use what is defined in TS 24.587 ie “NR-PC5”   Rae, Friday, 7:59  I Suggest changing “UnicastDestinationLayer2ID”->“UnicastInitialSignallingDestinationLayer2ID”to avoid misunderstanding  SangMin, Friday, 11:26  To Lena: regarding the DDF, the ddfclient tool didn’t work so I could not finish the xml coding in time. If if it is okay, I would like to submit the ddf update in the next meeting, based on the agreements of each nodes in this meeting. At least it should be clear on each parameters, nodes and their hierarchy in order to avoid re-writing the code.   Regarding the wording issue, I think “NR-PC5” seems to be a good way forward. So I’ll update all related papers with the terminology “NR-PC5” in the revisions (I’ll provide the draft after gathering some more comments).  SangMin, Friday, 11:28  To Rae: changing the name of the node is okay for us. I’ll update it in the revision  Lena, Saturday, 0:24  SangMin’s proposal to address my comments is ok.  SangMin, Monday, 10:32 A draft revision is available taking all comments from Rae and lena onboard. | |
|  |  | | C1-202757 | Indicating support of V2X over NR-PC5 | | | LG Electronics / SangMin | CR 3344 24.301 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202162  Vishnu, Thursday, 13:30  As Chen indicated we are fine with the CR. If possible Huawei, HiSilicon would like to co-sign it.  ---------------------------------------------  Lena, Friday, 2:51  About the terminology, TS 24.587 defined “NR-PC5” but also uses “NR based PC5”, while TS 23.287 uses “NR PC5”. To be consistent it would be good to use what is defined in TS 24.587 ie “NR-PC5”.  SangMin, Monday, 10:38  I’m fine with using “NR-PC5” for consistency. A draft revision is available.  Chen, Tuesday, 8:45  There seems to be confusion between the new added V2X NR-PC5 and the current V2X PC5. In my understanding, V2X PC5 is general and includes E-UTRAN PC5 and NR PC5.  SangMin, Tuesday, 8:58  Changing an existing terminology “V2X PC5” to “E-UTRAN PC5” or “LTE PC5” would bring more confusion since it has been there since Rel-13.  How about adding a definition for “V2X PC5” saying such as “V2X PC5 in this specification only refers V2X communication over LTE-PC5 interface,” or similar things?  SangMin, Wednesday, 10:27  A draft revision is available. Change:   * cleaned up the use of “NR-PC5” terminology. * clarified the condition of indicating “V2X PC5 bit” by adding “E-UTRA-“ to the condition and the descriptions of values. As I said changing the name of the bit is not desirable so the name of the bit is still “V2X PC5 bit”.   Lena, Thursday, 0:01  I am OK with the draft revision.  Chen, Thursday, 5:04  I am OK with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-202758 | Clarifications on configuration parameters for the PC5 QoS profile | | | LG Electronics / SangMin | CR 0012 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202163  Vishnu, Thursday, 13:31  We are fine with C1-202758. If possible Huawei, HiSilicon would like to co-sign it.  -------------------------------------------------  Yanchao, Thursday, 16:12  The following change is strange, should the default value be used as last?  v)    the PC5 QoS profile can contain the priority level, the averaging window, and/or the maximum data burst volume if the default value for the corresponding parameter is not used  Ivo, Thursday, 18:05  Bullet 7) - NOT OK to add "e.g." in "an AS configuration, e.g. a list of SLRB mapping rules" - adding "e.g." is OK for stage-2 but 24.587 is a stage-3 specification and we need to be precise what the AS configuration consists of.  Lena, Friday, 2:55  The text in bullet v) of 5.2.3 seems ok as it is, the change is not needed.  SangMin, Tuesday, 8:05  I’m not sure if I understand Yanchao’s concerns correctly. You are right that the default value should be used at last but it depends on the NW policy. If the NW decided to use the default value, these parameter values will not be included in this PC5 QoS profile. If the NW decided not to use them, then the values will be included. So the condition “if the default value for the corresponding parameter is not used” indicates when the NW should include these values. I hope this answers to your concerns.  SangMin, Tuesday, 8:07  Ivo are you okay if I update the change bullet 7 using “including” instead of “e.g.”?  7)  an AS configuration, including a list of SLRB mapping rules applicable when the UE is not served by E-UTRA and is not served by NR. Each SLRB mapping rule contains a PC5 QoS profile and an SLRB. The PC5 QoS profile contains the following parameters:  SangMin, Tuesday, 8:17  To Lena:  1) about the first and second changes in the reason for change (regarding PC5 Link Aggregated Bit Rates and Range), there is no limitation described in TS 24.587 that these parameters should be only used in specific communication mode. Clause 5.2.3 is the only place where range and PC5 Link Aggregated Bit Rates is mentioned. So if we don’t describe any limitation in stage 3, the readers will assume that these parameters can be used regardless of the communication mode.  2) about the third change, as I responded to Yanchao, this is a condition to include these parameters in PC5 QoS profile by the network, so without this, stage 3 will be incomplete.  3) currently the AS configuration only has “SLRB mapping rules”, so the change might not be needed as is. However, SA2 updated the terminology for future use, so I guess using more generic name where other AS parameter than SLRB rule can be added in the future would be more beneficial and futureproof  Ivo, Tuesday, 8:57  Yes, this would address my comments.  Christian, Tuesday, 17:11  Can you please consider converting the new text you propose to add, quote “, which is only used for unicast mode communications over PC5” to a NOTE?  Lena, Tuesday, 22:45  I only commented on the last change in the CR (to bullet v)). I have no problem with the other changes in the CR.  About the change to bullet v), I basically see no difference between the existing text, and what you are proposing, plus I think the existing text is clearer. It already says that if the PC5 QoS profile does not contain a value for certain parameters, the default value is used. What more is needed?  SangMin, Wednesday, 8:55  To Christian: OK to convert the quoted text into a NOTE, i.e.  NOTE: PC5 Link Aggregated Bit Rate is only used for unicast mode communications over PC5  SangMin, Wednesday, 9:09  To Lena: I still believe that current text is not clear. However since you (and also Yanchao) are not so happy about the proposed change in bullet v), I can live without the change. So I will remove the change. A draft revision is available. | |
|  |  | | C1-202760 | Clarifications on the V2X policies regarding QoS | | | LG Electronics / SangMin | CR 0002 24.588 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202164  Vishnu, Thursday, 13:32  We are fine with C1-202760. If possible Huawei, HiSilicon would like to co-sign it.  ------------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 18:05  Not aligned with C1-202163 which still refers to "SLRB mapping rules". Either keep "SLRB mapping rules" here or align C1-202163 to refer to "AS configuration mapping rules"  SangMin, Tuesday, 8:21  To Ivo: if C1-202163 cannot survive, then I have to revert the “SLRB” related changes and only an editorial fix will remain. But anyhow I’ll align the terminologies in two CRs in the revision.  Sang Min, Wednesday, 9:35  I found the reason for the inconsistency in terminology. I see 2 options: 1) reverting changes on “SLRB mapping rule” from this CR and leaving it as is, or 2) changing the structure of SLRB mapping rules to be nested in new intermediate clause for “AS configuration”. Which one is preferred?  Ivo, Wednesday, 23:52  Technically, both of the below is possible. The 2nd option is better aligned with the last revision of C1-202164.  SangMin, Thursday, 8:10  A draft revision is available. I reverted original changes, and added new “AS configuration” parameter instead of SLRB mapping rules in the config. parameter for PC5. SLRB mapping rules parameter is nested in AS configuration. Also I updated octet number accordingly.  Also the CR in C1-202756 (was C1-202161) on NAS MO will be updated aligning with this CR.  Ivo, Thursday, 10:16  I am OK with the draft revision and Ericsson would like to co-sign. | |
|  |  | | C1-202767 | Correction to the privacy timer | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | CR 0024 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202226  -----------------------------------------------  Yanchao, Thursday, 16:21  Two while in the change in the table:  “Upon T5020 expiration while while”  Lena, Friday, 3:10  The CR is fine except for “while while” in table 10.4.1.  Christian, Tuesday, 14:40  A draft revision addressing the comments is available.  Lena, Thursday, 0:56  I am OK with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-202768 | Resolution of editor's note under 6.1.2.3.6 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | CR 0034 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Open Questions**  Is Ivo OK with C1-202768?  Revision of C1-202455  ----------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 13:55  For good interoperability, the handling should not be implementation specific.  Lena, Friday, 4:32   1. typo (“initiaing”) 2. “during the initiating UE-requested PC5 unicast link modification procedure” should be “during the PC5 unicast link modification procedure” (there is no “UE-requested PC5 unicast link modification procedure”)   Christian, Tuesday, 10:40  A draft revision is available. About Ivo’s comment, I believe that there is some misunderstanding about what the proposal actually is. Please, note that this is a very rare abnormal case (race condition) and the proposal is in fact not left to implementation but it is solved, i.e. “the initiating UE shall abort the PC5 unicast link modification procedure”. What we propose to leave to implementation is “the following handling” and we provide an example of what the UE could do but all depends on the current situation in the UE after the procedure is aborted  Ivo, Wednesday, 20:47  If I understand the CR correctly, the added case is for situation when both UEs initiate DIRECT LINK MODIFICATION REQUEST  at  the same time. In such case, both UEs abort the procedure and are supposed to perform implementation dependent handling, e.g. wait for implementation dependent time. What will happen when both UEs select the same implementation dependent time? Wouldn't the problem occur again?  it would be more logical if one of the UE waits longer time than the other.  Christian, Thursday, 11:41  I am not sure what the problem is actually or what behaviour you would like to have instead.  The implementation dependent time is random as any implementation can choose a different one, if they finally the very same procedure is (re-)started. Furthermore, different initiating UE can decide to do differently than (re-)start the procedure as that would depend on the current situation in the UE after the abortion of the procedure. Additionally, the very same description exists for other NAS protocols and I have not heard of resulting in problems. | |
|  |  | | C1-202769 | Resolution of the editor's note under 6.1.2.5.7.2 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | CR 0035 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Open Questions**  Is Ivo OK with C1-202769?  Revision of C1-202456  -------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 13:55  For good interoperability, the handling should not be implementation specific.  Lena, Friday, 4:33   1. Coversheet needs update as it refers to link modification procedure but the abnormal case handling is added for the link identifier update procedure 2. “procedure procedure” in 6.1.2.5.7.1 3. “initiaing” in 6.1.2.5.7.1 4. “a new PC5 unicast link update procedure” should be “a new PC5 unicast link identifier update procedure”   Christian, Tuesday, 14:22  A draft revision is available. About Ivo’s comments, I believe that there is some misunderstanding about what the proposal actually is. Please, note that this is a very rare abnormal case (race condition) and the proposal is in fact not left to implementation but it is solved, i.e. “the initiating UE shall abort the PC5 unicast link identifier update procedure”. What we propose to leave to implementation is “the following handling” and we provide an example of what the initiating UE could do but all depends on the current situation in the initiating UE after the procedure is aborted.  Ivo, Wednesday, 20:48  If I understand the CR correctly, the added case is for situation when both UEs initiate DIRECT LINK IDENTIFIER UPDATE REQUEST at  the same time. In such case, both UEs abort the procedure and are supposed to perform implementation dependent handling, e.g. wait for implementation dependent time. What will happen when both UEs select the same implementation dependent time? Wouldn't the problem occur again?  it would be more logical if one of the UE waits longer time than the other.  Lena, Thursday, 0:55  I am OK with the draft revision.  Christian, Thursday, 11:43  I am not sure what the problem is actually or what behaviour you would like to have instead.  The implementation dependent time is random as any implementation can choose a different one, if they finally the very same procedure is (re-)started. Furthermore, different initiating UE can decide to do differently than (re-)start the procedure as that would depend on the current situation in the UE after the abortion of the procedure. Additionally, the very same description exists for other NAS protocols and I have not heard of resulting in problems. | |
|  |  | | C1-202773 | Timer values for timers of PC5 unicast link management procedures | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | CR 0023 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202598  ------------------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-202225  Lena, Monday, 0:49  We are ok with setting the timer values to 5 sec for timers other than T5005.  Regarding T5005, 2 hrs as default (which is the same as the default TCP keep-alive timer) seems too long for a dynamic environment such as V2X. Would it be possible to set it to something in the order of minutes, for instance 10 min?  Christian, Wednesday, 10:42  We agree that T5005 should be set in the order of minutes for V2X. A draft revision is available.  Lena, Thursday, 0:58  I am OK with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-202780 | T3540 for service request for V2X communications | | | ZTE | CR 2111 24.501 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202333  Lena, Wednesday, 23:14  I am OK with C1-202780.  -----------------------------------------  Rae, Friday, 9:08  Service type “signaling” seems more appropriate under the case that UE only wants to get resources for PC5 from RAN without pending UL data.  Fei, Friday, 11:14  I am fine to change the service type to "signalling" for this case.  Fei, Saturday, 9:11  A draft revision is available. The changes are:  1) service type is changed from data to signalling.  2) the summary of change is also updated.  Lena, Sunday, 20:08  Having the service request type set to “signalling” rather than “data” makes more sense since no DBR will be set up. | |
|  |  | | C1-202838 | Additional transport over Uu for V2X messages of V2X services identified by V2X service identifiers | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 0023 24.386 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Open Questions**  Is Christian ok with C1-202838?  Revision of C1-202010  ------------------------------------------------  Christian, Monday, 8:41   1. the cover sheet has some issue; the reason for change indicates, quote “\*\*A method\*\* for uplink and downlink transport of V2X messages over TCP and unicast downlink transport of V2X messages over UDP are specified”. The CR should not introduce any new \*\*method\*\* but should align with stage 2 requirements (TS 23.285). Hope you agree. 2. we agree with the need of changes to TS 24.386 but again those have to be aligned with stage 2 which just add the support for TCP/IP packet to the existing UDP/IP. The reason for change indicates, quote “Furthermore, given that V2X communication over Uu in 5GS in TS 24.587 specified unicast downlink transport over UDP too, \*it is proposed to also enable unicast downlink transport over UDP in TS 24.386.\*". But TS 24.386 already states in clause 4.1 "can use unicast transport (**in uplink, downlink or both of them**)". I am confused. I also fail to see the mandatory distinction of UDP port for uplink and downlink in stage 2 spec (TS 23.285) being added in Rel-16. Additionally, implementations based on TS 24.386 already work well for UDP for uplink and downlink traffic. We do wonder whether you considered backwards compatibility when defining the new method for UDP port handling. 3. Now, you would say that TS 24.587 the mandatory distinction exists. True, but this first of all this is for 5GS and not EPS but now more important, it seems not to be backed up in stage 2 (TS 23.287). We fail to find the requirement for the mandatory distinction of UDP ports for uplink or downlink so we might have gone too far in TS 24.587 with the \*\*method\*\* and this needs to be rethought. 4. In short, initially, only the updates backed up by stage 2 (i.e., TS 23.285) are acceptable to us, i.e., support of TCP/IP packet.   Ivo, Tuesday, 0:40   1. I can work on the cover page 2. You raise several aspects above.   Regarding downlink V2X communication over Uu using UDP, transporting a V2X message of a V2X service identified by a V2X service identifier:  - In 24.386, the downlink V2X communication over Uu using UDP for such V2X messages is specified solely using MBMS bearer (see 24.386 subclause 6.2.4 last paragraph). I.e. there is no downlink V2X communication over Uu using UDP using unicast bearers for such V2X messages.  - In 24.587, there is no MBMS yet. Thus, we agreed that downlink V2X communication over Uu using UDP for such V2X messages can use unicast bearers. Else, we would only have uplink transport and no downlink transport, for such V2X messages.  - given that the UE can move between EPS and 5GS, the CR proposes to specify the downlink V2X communication over Uu using UDP using unicast bearers for such V2X messages also in 24.386, in the same way as specified in 24.587. As the same functionality would be defined both in EPS and 5GS, the same transport for such V2X messages would be used in EPS and 5GS.  In 24.386, the text you quoted above is true only for V2X message of a V2X service \*NOT\* identified by a V2X service identifier, where the application in the UE just uses regular IP routing.  The port is different in uplink and downlink V2X communication over Uu using UDP, transporting a V2X message of a V2X service identified by a V2X service identifier: - to ensure backward compatibility with uplink V2X communication over Uu using UDP for such V2X messages, a specified in 24.386.  - to enable the V2X application server to distinguish uplink V2X messages from the UE and UE's requests for reception of downlink V2X messages, of such V2X service.  - to inform the UE whether the V2X application server supports the added downlink V2X communication over Uu using UDP using unicast bearers.  I indeed considered the backward compatibity - if the UE is NOT configured with the UDP port for downlink transport for a V2X service identified by a V2X service identifier, then the UE does not use the procedures for downlink V2X communication over Uu using UDP using unicast bearers for V2X messages of the V2X service identified by the V2X service identifier.  Does this address your comment?   1. The port is different in uplink and downlink V2X communication over Uu using UDP, transporting a V2X message of a V2X service identified by a V2X service identifier, due to the reasons identified in the previous answer. 2. Disadvantage of the above is that the UE will need to adjust its behaviour in Uu depending whether the UE is in EPS or in 5GS.   However, if you insist that you only want to focus on TCP, then this is of course possible.  Christian, Tuesday, 16:51  I fail to see justification in your comments for the proposed new method of introducing mandatory separation and support of UDP ports for downlink and uplink in V2X for EPS; can you please share the requirements at stage 2 level to back your proposal to TS 24.386 and 24.385 (in C1-202010 and 2011)?  As I already said in my initial e-mail, yes, they were added to TS 24.587 (V2X for 5GS) but again can you share the stage 2 requirements also for 5GS? I may miss something but I cannot find them. I believe that all this of mandatory separation of UDP ports for downlink and uplink needs to be re-considered actually. Again, in my view, a single UDP port can be used for both uplink and downlink. I still don’t understand why the 3GPP-based UE implementation has to be limited and be forced to have separate UDP ports. This actually has an impact on the upper layers.  Frankly, we seem to have gone too far about the Uu data transmission in TS 24.587 in specifying a number of details, for example, mandatory UDP ports for downlink and uplink as in our view, the need of defining all this should lie on upper layers which are out-of-scope of 3GPP (e.g., WAVE in North America, GeoNetworking protocol for the EU –ETSI-, DSMP protocol for China, whatever protocol used in India, etc). The 3GPP-based UE implementation should follow the way used by upper layers on how to configure the use of UDP and TCP port(s). CT1 should not introduce duplication or conflictive requirements actually.  Again, please your CRs should align with stage 2, i.e., support of TCP/IP packet. Nothing else.  Ivo, Tuesday, 19:53  A draft revision is available. Main changes:  - downlink transport of V2X messages over UDP was removed from the scope of the CR.  - related configuration parameters were also removed from the scope of the CR. | |
|  |  | | C1-202839 | Configuration parameters for additional transport over Uu for V2X messages of V2X services identified by V2X service identifiers | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 0020 24.385 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Open Questions**  Is Christian ok with C1-202839?  Revision of C1-202011  ----------------------------------------------  Christian, Monday, 8:41   1. The CR should not introduce any new \*\*method\*\* but should align with stage 2 requirements (TS 23.285); 2. we agree with the need of changes to TS 24.385 but again those have to be aligned with stage 2 which just add the support for TCP/IP packet to the existing UDP/IP; 3. we do wonder whether you considered backwards compatibility when defining the new method for UDP port handling. Note that you take the existing MO leaf for the UDP port (UDPPort) and change the meaning of it; 4. initially, only the updates backed up by TS 23.285 are acceptable to us, i.e., support of TCP/IP packet.   Ivo, Tuesday, 0:43  The comments above are similar to those raised against C1-202010.  I have provided answers to them in the other mail threat.  Let's conclude on C1-202010 first.  I will update C1-202011 based on the conclusions of C1-202010.  Ivo, Tuesday, 19:53  A draft revision is available. Main changes:  - downlink transport of V2X messages over UDP was removed from the scope of the CR.  - related configuration parameters were also removed from the scope of the CR. | |
|  |  | | C1-202842 | Correction on conditions to initiate a PC5 unciast link establishment procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 0036 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202457  --------------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 13:55  The sentence does not seem to be an English sentence. Not clear what "are" in "are not identical" relates to.  Vishnu, Sunday, 12:09  Agree that the ‘are’ does not make sense. How about the following modification:  "e)    there is no existing PC5 unicast link for the pair of peer application layer IDs, or there is an existing PC5 unicast link for the pair of peer application layer IDs and the network layer protocol of the existing PC5 unicast link is not identical to the network layer protocol required by the upper layer in the initiating UE for this V2X service."  Ivo, Monday, 23:14  Proposed text seems OK.  Vishnu, Tuesday, 10:47  A draft revision is available.  Frederic, Tuesday, 12:42  Could you please restore the styles in your revision? Everything is in “normal”.  Vishnu, Tuesday, 14:37  An updated draft revision fixing the styles is available.  Ivo, Wednesday, 20:49  I am OK with the draft revision. Please add Ericsson as co-signer. | |
|  |  | | C1-202844 | Packet filter for PC5 QoS flows | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 0037 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202485  ----------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 18:07  "The IP packet filter set is defined in TS 23.501 [X] clause 5.7.6.2." - it would be more appropriate to refer to stage-3 specification.  Vishnu, Sunday, 13:01  IP packet filter set is defined in 23.501 5.7.6.2. Not sure the contents of IP packet filter set is in the scope of stage-3. If you know any stage-3 specification with this definition, kindly let us know.  Lena, Monday, 0:54  Regarding the proposal on the contents of the V2X packet filter:  We are ok with all proposed components except the TC field of GeoNetworking Common header: filtering based on this field would require deep inspection of the packet at the UE since the UE would first need to determine that this is the GeoNeworking format in the non-IP header, and then the UE would need to read into the GeoNetworking headers – which may still have a few variants in realization.  Also, there is no stable implementable specification for the GeoNetworking yet. So we would prefer not to have this component in Rel-16.  Ivo, Monday, 23:18  24.501 Figure 9.11.4.13.4 Packet filter contents field specifies packet filter in a QoS rule.  Vishnu, Tuesday, 11:04  To Lena: we have a different view on the Geonetworking TC field.   1. The protocol format of the non-IP header is fixed when the UE can locate itself (e.g. GeoNetWorking in Europe, WAVE in USA and DSMP in China), and the  request from upper layer to transfer a packet also indicates to UE’s 3GPP layer in which protocol format this packet is, thus no specific procedure to determine the protocol format. 2. It is specified in SA2 that if V2X Application Requirements is provided by the V2X application layer, the UE determines the QoS parameters for the V2X services based on the V2X Application Requirements and the V2X service type (e.g. PSID or ITS-AID). When GeoNetworking is used, TC field is where the application layer provides the V2X Application Requirements, thus it is a must-do for UE to read into the GeoNetworking headers to get the TC field, and then the UE can determine the QoS parameters for the packet or V2X services. If the UE cannot or does not read into the GeoNetworking headers, then the UE will fail to meet the application layer’s requirements and SA2’s design.    Also in our understanding, the GeoNetworking is the most stable Non-IP type specification for V2X, if GeoNetworking  Vishnu, Tuesday, 11:10  To Ivo: 24.501 Figure 9.11.4.13.4 specifies a QoS rule and packet filter set is only a parameter in it. It could be confusing to use it as a reference to IP packet filter set. But if you insist, we can change the reference to the stage-3 QoS rule figure.  Vishnu Wednesday, 17:25  A draft revision addressing Ivo’s comment is available.  @Lena, will you be ok with the Geonetworking TC field based on below explanation?  Ivo, Wednesday, 20:59  Can we state: “The IP packet filter set is defined as content of the packet filter contents field specified in 3GPP TS 24.501 [6] figure 9.11.4.13.4 and table 9.11.4.13.1.”?  Vishnu, Wednesday, 22:29  A draft revision addressing Ivo’s comment is available.  Ivo, Wednesday, 22:36  Nearly OK. There should be hard spaces after "figure" and after "table".  With those changes, Ericsson would like to cosign.  Lena, Thursday, 1:44  Regarding your point that when GeoNetworking is used, TC field is where the application layer provides the V2X Application Requirements, so the UE must read that field, that is not necessarily true: implementations where the modem passes this field to the application layer and gets back the QoS parameters from the application are possible. However by including this field in the V2X filter components, you force the modem to read that field and we are not ok with that. So we can’t agree with the CR if it contains the GeoNetworking TC field as a mandatory filter component that the UE has to support.  Vishnu, Thursday, 9:12  A draft revision is available. Changes:   1. Reference changed as proposed by Ivo. 2. Removed Geonetworking field from PF.   Lena, Thursday, 9:39  I have the following comments on the draft revision:   * The mention of the Geo networking TC field needs to be removed from the Reason for change in the coversheet * The reference to ETSI EN 302 636-4-1 v1.4.1 is no longer needed   Vishnu, Thursday, 10:00  A draft revision addressing Lena’s comments is available.  Lena, Thursday, 10:02  I am OK with the draft revision.  Ivo, Thursday, 10:52  Draft revision is OK and Ericsson would like to co-sign. | |
|  |  | | C1-202867 | Remove FFS on GFBR and MFBR for UL and DL | | | OPPO / Rae | CR 0010 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202703  Rae: change in revision consists of changing the NOTE to “The GFBR and MFBR apply to both directions of the PC5 unicast link”.  -----------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-202118  Lena, Wednesday, 23:43  In the NOTE, “The GFBR and MFBR apply to both uplink and downlink” does not make sense because there is no uplink or downlink for PC5. I suggest instead “The GFBR and MFBR apply to both directions of the PC5 link”.  Rae, Thursday, 3:32  Thanks for the suggested wording.  I propose to change it a little to “The GFBR and MFBR apply to both directions of the PC5 unicast link”. Whether it is OK for you?  Lena, Thursday, 4:44  Yes, it is OK for me.  ---------------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 13:54  Sending the same value twice is waste of radio resources.  Lena, Friday, 2:43  We don’t think it makes sense to keep two values ie one value for UL and one value for DL, given that this is PC5 (no UL/DL, only SL). One singe value is sufficient.  Rae, Monday, 5:26  I have no strong view on whether use GFBR and MFBR for UL and DL separately. If the majority agree to use one value for both UL and DL, I am also OK. A draft revision is available.  Ivo, Monday, 23:03  Nearly OK: the reason for change needs to be aligned with the changes. Please add Ericsson as co-signer.  Chen, Tuesday, 4:54  Cover sheet not good enough as the reason for change fails to quote the stage 2 requirements which are in fact crystal clear, quote "For PC5 communication, the same GFBR and MFBR are used for both directions.". Then, the removal of the editor's notes only is not sufficient. Either we have only one code point for GFBR and another one for MFBR or we keep two for each (uplink and downlink) BUT it has to be specified that the value of uplink and downlink shall be the same in this version of the protocol.  Rae, Tuesday, 5:26  A draft revision addressing Chen’s comments is available. I will also update the change.  Chen, Thursday, 5:30  I’m OK with adding the stage 2 requirements in the coversheet in next revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-202875 | PC5 unicast link security establishment | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | CR 0002 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202104  -----------------------------------------------  Yanchao, Thursday, 15:55   1. In 6.1.2.6.3, “the initiating UE” should be “the target UE”   a)      during a PC5 unicast link establishment procedure, the initiating UE shall pass an indication to the lower layers that the PC5 signalling message is for security establishment; and  b)      during a PC5 unicast link re-keying procedure, the initiating UE shall pass an indication to the lower layers that the PC5 signalling message is protected.   1. In 6.1.2.6.5, “the initiating UE” should be “the target UE”   a)       during a PC5 unicast link establishment procedure, the initiating UE shall pass an indication to the lower layers that the PC5 signalling message is for security establishment; and  b)       during a PC5 unicast link re-keying procedure, the initiating UE shall pass an indication to the lower layers that the PC5 signalling message is protected  Sanpan, Thursday, 16:01   1. The terms (5G-EA and 5G-IA) defined in clause 3.1 doesn’t look like definitions. You can add them in clause 3.2 and the text after the abbreviation can be moved to clause 8.4.c as NOTE. 2. In clause 6.1.2.6.2 – in step a) 1) - For precondition related to DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT REQUEST message seems not proper. – the precondition should be   “if KNRP ID is not included in the DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT REQUEST message, the target UE does not have an existing KNRP for the KNRP ID included in DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT REQUEST message or the target UE wishes to derive a new KNRP” (Same condition added in clause 6.1.2.2.3).   1. In clause 6.1.2.6.2 – in step b) - For precondition related to DIRECT LINK REKEYING REQUEST – ReAuth flag needs to be checked. 2. In clause 6.1.2.6.2 – “The target UE shall start timer T5aaa” -> it should be initiator UE. 3. In clause 6.1.2.6.5 – “ the initiating UE shall pass an indication to the lower layers” -> it should be target UE (2 instances) 4. In clause 6.1.2.6.5 – “The target UE shall abort the ongoing procedure” – I do not see abort procedure defined anywhere? What should be done to abort the procedure? 5. In clause 6.1.2.6.6.1 – Same comment as above for aborting procedure 6. In clause 6.1.2.7.1 – “The PC5 unicast link security mode control procedure is used to establish a security ~~association~~ between two UEs during …..” (Terminology used from clause 5.3.3.1.4.3 of TS 33.536) 7. In clause 6.1.2.7.3 – steps to “derive KNRP-sess from KNRP” and “derive NRPEK and NRPIK from KNRP-sess” should be move after step e) – as we need to derive keys only after checking whether message can be accepted or not. 8. In clause 6.1.2.7.5 – if DIRECT LINK SECURITY MODE COMMAND message is rejected due to cause specified in step d) of clause 6.1.2.7.3  OR step e) of clause 6.1.2.7.3 – then what will be values of PC5 signalling protocol cause IE value? 9. Table 8.4.1.1 and in Table 8.4.9.1– Why 9 bits are used?   Rae, Friday, 7:44  The indication from PC5-S to AS layer to indicate whether PC-S message is protected or not is not necessary, with the following reasons:   * RAN2 has determined the value of LCIDs corresponding to the different PC5-S message. I copy the table from the agreed RAN2 CR R2-2001969 as below. * The new indication cannot be handled in the existing AS layer, which will impact AS layer e.g. a new layer such as SDAP should be added. * Actually the same mechanism is also in ProSe without the proposed indication and there is no issue.   Fei, Friday, 10:45  The term 5G-EA and 5G-IA can be referred to 24.501.  In the subclause 8.4.g, the EEA/EIA should be changed to 5G-EA/IA;  I have a question, why the the Knrp ID is defined for 32 bits. I have not found clear statement that the Knrp id should be 32bits. And since the Knrp\_sess id is 16bits, whether 16 bits are sufficient for the Knrp id.  Lena, Monday, 3:08  To Yanchao:  I have uploaded a draft revision with the following changes (also incorporated comments from other companies):   * Referred to the definition of 5G-EA and 5G-IA in TS 24.501 rather than adding the same definition in TS 24.587, and removed the addition of the reference to TS 33.501 which as a result is no longer needed * Replaced “initiating UE” by “target UE” in 2 places in 6.1.2.3 * Replaced initiating UE” by “target UE” in 2 places in 6.1.2.5 * In clause 6.1.2.6.2, for the preconditions related to the case when the authentication procedure is triggered by a direct link establishment procedure, added a condition that “the KNRP ID is not included in the DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT REQUEST message or the initiating UE does not have an existing KNRP for the KNRP ID included in DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT REQUEST message or the initiating UE wishes to derive a new KNRP, derive a new KNRP” * In clause 6.1.2.6.2, for the preconditions related to the case when the authentication procedure is triggered by a direct link re-keying procedure, added a condition that the DIRECT LINK REKEYING REQUEST message includes a Re-authentication indication * Replaced “target UE” by “initiating UE” in 6.1.2.6.2 * Changed “to establish a security association between two UEs" to “to establish security between two UEs” during In subclause 6.1.2.7.1 * In clause 6.1.2.7.5, clarified that if DIRECT LINK SECURITY MODE COMMAND message is rejected due to cause specified in step d) of clause 6.1.2.7.3  orstep e) of clause 6.1.2.7.3, the UE shall use PC5 signalling protocol cause #d "UE PC5 unicast signalling security policy mismatch" in the SECURITY MODE REJECT message * Fixed the number of bits used from 9 to 8 in 8.4.1.1 and 8.4.9.1 * In subclause 8.4.g, changed EEA/EIA to 5G-EA/IA   Lena, Monday, 3:09  To Sapan:   1. -> They are actually defined in TS 24.501. Fei suggested just referring to the definitions in TS 24.501, which is what I have done in the draft revision 2. -> OK 3. -> OK 4. -> OK 5. -> OK 6. -> Aborting the procedure means no longer pursing it, no longer sending any related signalling and cleaning up all related timers. We have this terminology also in TS 24.008, TS 24.301 and TS 24.501, without any specific definition of what aborting the procedure means, and I see no need to start defining it now. 7. -> See 6) 8. -> OK 9. -> No because the first check to see whether the message can be accepted it to check the integrity protection of the message, which requires NRPIK 10. -> The UE shall use PC5 signalling protocol cause #d "UE PC5 unicast signalling security policy mismatch" in the SECURITY MODE REJECT message,  I have clarified this in the revision 11. -> That was a mistake, thanks for pointing it out. I have fixed it in the draft revision   Lena, Monday, 3:12  To Fei: I agree with your suggestion to refer to TS 24.501, and I also agree with the comment about changing EEA/EIA to 5G-EA/IA. I have taken both comments onboard, as well as comments from Yanchao and Sapan in a draft revision available.  Regarding the length of KNRP ID, although TS 33.536 does not explicitly define the length of KNRP ID (probably an oversight), the rationale section of S3-200501 explains that the security for the PC5 unicast link “is based on the ProSe text [2] and the conclusion of the TR but includes at least the following changes: (…) Renaming the KD (…) to KNRP”. For ProSe, KD ID is 32 bits long, so I have used the same length. If some companies think this value is not appropriate, we can always send an LS to SA3 to ask them how long it should be.  Sapan, Monday, 8:17  Thanks for considering my comments and taking it on board. While reviewing the draft revision, I found few more issues and here are the comments:   1. In clause 6.1.2.6.3 – after step b), please mention about deriving KNRP as follows -   “Upon sending the DIRECT LINK AUTHENTICATION RESPONSE message, the target UE shall derive a new KNRP as specified in 3GPP TS 33.536 [yy]. “   1. In clause 6.1.2.6.4 – please add below text at end of the first paragraph.   “and derive a new KNRP as specified in 3GPP TS 33.536 [yy]”   1. In clause 6.1.2.7.3 – reference number for TS 33.536 is used as [x] => it should be [yy] as specified in reference clause 2.   I am fine with changes done for previous comments.  Lena, Monday, 23:44  To Sapan:   1. -> Adding this statement would not be correct, because it might take several authentication procedures (ie several authentication request/response exchanges) to derive the K\_NRP depending on the authentication method used, see TS 33.536 subclause 5.3.3.1.3.2.   Also, some authentication methods might require some info in the DIRECT SECURITY MODE COMMAND message to complete the K\_NPR derivation (see in TS 33.536 figure 5.3.3.1.3.2-1 that the Direct Security Mode Command message optionally includes a Key establishment info IE) . So we can have text saying the UE derives the new K\_NRP only in the security mode control procedure, not in the authentication procedure   1. -> Same as above 2. Thanks for pointing this out, I have fixed it in v2 of the draft revision   Lena, Tuesday, 7:28  To Rae:  I do think this indication from the V2X layer to the AS layer of whether a PC5 signalling message is unprotected, for security establishment, or protected, would be useful. We already have in the spec a lot of info passed from the V2X layer to the AS (destination layer-2ID, etc). Yes it can be handled in implementation, but having it in the spec makes the interactions between the layers easier to understanding in my view.  That said, if I am the only who think the indication is useful, I am ok to remove it. I would be interest to hear other companies’ view.  Sapan, Tuesday, 7:43   1. -> ok 2. -> I agree that there could be multiple authentication request/response exchanges occur but I would like to add clarification on exactly when a new KNRP has been derived by the initiating UE. So, my proposal is to add below text in clause 6.1.2.6.4: “Upon completion of final link authentication request/response exchange, the initiating UE shall derive KNRP as specified in 3GPP TS 33.536 [yy].” 3. -> Thanks   Fei, Tuesday, 13:34  Thanks for your clarification.  I am fine with the length of Kd ID and the revision is Ok to me.  Christian, Tuesday, 16:18  We would like to proceed with the CR but we believe that some parts of the proposal are still under discussion at stage 2 level and we would like to propose some updates:   * 1. under clause 6.1.2.2.2, we would like to remove bullet item g) from now and replace it by an editor’s note, for example, whether the PC5 unicast signaling security policy is needed to be included is FFS waiting for SA3 conclusion;   2. also under clause 6.1.2.2.2, we do not see need of indication of inter-layer interaction about providing an indication to lower layers about the PC5 signalling message is unprotected. Firstly, it seems not settled whether the PC5 signalling would be sent unprotected for signalling in the end (wait for SA3 conclusion). Even if so, there is no need of this interaction defined in TS 24.334 (in ProSe) where your proposal seems to be based on;   3. under clause 6.1.2.7.1, the proposal removes both editor’s note given the impression that all is fixed by SA3 but this is not understanding as discussions are ongoing there;   4. under clause 6.1.2.7.2, we think that at this moment in time we should not add the text quote:   The initiating UE shall select security algorithms in accordance with its UE PC5 unicast signalling security policy and the target UE’s PC5 unicast signalling security policy. If the PC5 unicast link security mode control procedure was triggered during a PC5 unicast link establishment procedure, the initiating UE shall not select the null integrity protection algorithm if the initiating UE or the target UE’s PC5 unicast signalling integrity protection policy is set to "signalling integrity protection required".  in our understanding there are still SA3 discussion on this aspect. Editor’s note;   * 1. also under clause 6.1.2.7.2, similarly as above, we would like to remove the bullet item 7. Editor’s note instead, if necessary;   2. under clause 6.1.2.7.3, we would like to remove bullet items c and d, and add an editor’s notes instead;   3. under clause 6.1.2.7.5, 8.4.9, we would like not add yet the proposed new value “#d UE PC5 unicast signalling security policy mismatch“;   4. under clause 7.3.1.1, 7.3.d.1, 7.3.e.1, we would like not to add the UE PC5 unicast signalling security policy IE so new 8.4.d and 8.4.k are not acceptable to us yet;   Lena, Wednesday, 2:23  To Christian:  a. -> UE signalling security policy is in SA3 spec. ongoing discussions abou UE user plane security policy, ok to remove that one  b. -> ok  c. -> reverted deletion of EN on user plane security policy, kept removal of the other one  d. -> CR is aligned with SA3 spec  e. -> CR is aligned with SA3 spec  f. -> CR is aligned with SA3 spec  g. -> ok to moreve items related to user plane security policy  A draft revision is available.  Lena, Wednesday, 2:53  To Sapan:  Regarding “I would like to add clarification on exactly when a new KNRP has been derived by the initiating UE”, it is actually not possible to put a statement on exactly when the UE does this in the PC5 unicast link authentication procedure because it will depend on the authentication method in use: how many times the procedure itself is performed to derive a new K\_NRP depends on the authentication method in use. Also depending on the method in use, the derivation of K\_NRP might be performed in successive steps. So I would prefer to only list the fact that K\_NRP has been derived as pre-condition for the start of the security mode control procedure, without specifying exactly when the initiating UE has derived K\_NRP (since it can’t be pin-pointed).  A draft revision is available, addressing also comments from Christian and Rae.  Lena, Wednesday, 2:55  To Rae:  I have removed the iindication from UE to AS layer of whether a PC5-signalling message is unprotected, for security establishment or protected. A draft revision is available.  Sapan, Wednesday, 10:34  I completely agree with you on the fact that link authentication procedure may run multiple times depending on the authentication method used. But in TS 33.536 - clause 5.3.3.1.3.2 – it is clearly mentioned that KNRP shall be calculated after step#2 and before UE\_2 sends Direct Security Mode Command message. So here is my new proposal: If Qualcomm do not want to add normative text in clause 6.1.2.6.4, then Can you add NOTE in clause 6.1.2.6.4 to specify that initiating UE derives KNRP during link authentication procedure at any time depending on authentication method use?  Yanchao, Wednesday, 10:35  I have checked with my RAN2 colleague,  our view on “whether the indication from UE to AS layer of whether a PC5-signalling message is unprotected is needed or not” is needed.  AS layer cannot tell  whether the a PC5-signalling message is unprotected based on existing information, therefore an explicit indication is needed from upper layer by AS layer.  Lena, Wednesday, 22:27  To Yanchao: thanks for taking the time to checking on this and for your feedback. I agree that some indication is needed from the V2X layer to the AS. But since this is internal to the UE, it is true that strictly speaking this can be handled in UE implementation. Given that 2 companies (Huawei, OPPO) prefer to leave this up to implementation, in the interest of progress have removed this indication from the updated draft revision. I hope this is an acceptable way forward for you.  Lena, Wednesday, 22:48  An updated draft revision is available. I have added a NOTE in 6.1.6.2.4 as requested by Sapan, and I have removed all mentions of UE security policy and replaced them by Editor’s notes as requested by Christian.  Ivo, Wednesday, 22:56  In one place, there is "MSB" while other places use "MSBs". Is that intentional?  Lena, Wednesday, 23:07  No, it was not intentional, thanks for pointing it out. I have changed that one instance of “MSB” to “MSBs” in an updated draft revision.  Sapan, Wednesday, 23:07  I am OK with the proposed tex for the NOTE.  Christian, Thursday, 11:49  Thanks for considering our comments. The CR is fine by me. | |
|  |  | | C1-202876 | PC5 unicast link re-keying procedure | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | CR 0004 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202107  -----------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 13:54  We need to specify how the UE treats the spare values.  Yanchao, Thursday, 15:58  Is it possible that the target UE does not accept the PC5 unicast link re-keying procedure?  Sapan, Thursday, 16:30   1. In clause 6.1.2.x.2 – Need to add below NOTE. (Similar NOTE added in C1-202104)   “In order to ensure successful PC5 unicast link re-keying, T5ccc should be set to a value larger than the sum of T5aaa and T5bbb”   1. Table 8.4.1.1 – 9 bits are used.   Fei, Friday, 11:00  My preference would be that the target UE sends the Rekey response using the existing security context before triggering the re-authentication procedure.  After sending the rekey response to the initial UE, the target UE will trigger the authentication procedure as in the CR 2104.  Ivo, Friday, 15:43  I withdraw my comment on this document, it was related to C1-202106.  Lena, Tuesday, 7:42  To Fei: the reason for having the Rekeying response is so that the initiating UE can consider the procedure complete. If you send it before authentication and security mod control are performed then you do not know whether the rekeying of the link will actually succeed. Hence we would prefer to keep the Rekeying response at the end of the procedure (as was done for ProSe in TS 24.334).  Lena, Tuesday, 7:43  To Yanchao: I do not think the target UE has the option of not accepting the PC5 unicast link re-keying procedure. Note that for ProSe in TS 24.334, there is also no way for the target UE to reject the rekeying request.  Lena, Tuesday, 7:51  To Sapan: I have taken your comments onboard in a draft revision.  Sapan, Tuesday, 8:13  I am fine with the draft revision.  Fei, Tuesday, 8:16  Thanks for your clarification. I am fine with the CR. | |
|  |  | | C1-202877 | Adding general subclause on security of PC5 signalling messages | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | CR 0005 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202108  -------------------------------------------------  Ivo, Friday, 3:51  Please do not use "and/or"  Christian, Monday, 16:06   1. we support the CR in order to have a general clause on PC5 unicast security into TS 24.587 in a similar way as TS 24.501 or TS 24.301 (i.e., a clause on “NAS security” exists); 2. there are a number of aspects which seems not to be crystal clear at stage 2 as there are p-CRs tabled at the last meeting and the specification is not approved yet (TS 33.536). Hence, we would like to propose some updates and clarify some questions from my side:    1. I would like to remove the word “possible” in front of “integrity protection and ciphering of PC5 user-plane data” and add an editor’s note instead till this is settled in SA3;    2. I would like to remove the NOTE under clause 6.1.2.1a.1 at this moment in time and see how all this ends up in stage 2. Also, in my view, I find strange that at least integrity protection is not used by default;    3. I would like to know how many security contexts can exist in the UE, e.g., clause 6.1.2.1a.2 reads “[..] PC5 unicast security contextS” but the text under the clause is not clear to me. When checking the draft version of TS 33.536, I am unsure how many PC5 unicast security contexts you think of. I see that the initiating UE can establish different PC5 unicast security contexts for each peer UEs during the PC5 unicast link establishment procedure but that is not clear in your proposal and get further confused by the use of “current” later one. If needed, and editor’s note could be added; and    4. I fail to see the concept of “current” PC5 unicast security context at stage 2 level (draft TS 33.536). The introduction of the concept of “current” PC5 unicast security context seems to imply that there is also “non-current” one or? Though existing in EPS and 5GS for NAS security in TS 24.301 and 24.501, I fail to see those two concepts at stage 2 level at this moment in time. Editor’s notes or clarification?   Lena, Wednesday, 5:22  Due to comments from Christian, the NOTE with this “and/or” is gone. I have also made the following additional changes based on his comments:   * Removed “possible” in front of “integrity protection and ciphering of PC5 user-plane data” and added an Editor’s note instead * Updated wording to remove the use of “current” to avoid giving the impression that the UE maintains multiple security contexts a given PC5 unicast link (there is only one, except for a short time during the re-keying procedure)   A draft revision is available.  Lena, Wednesday, 5:32  A draft revision addressing Christian’s comments is available.  Christian, Thursday, 11:55  I am OK with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-202908 | Handling of link establishment accept | | | vivo | CR 0013 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202738  -------------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-202181  Ivo, Wednesday, 20:34  C1-202738 look ok. If you happen to make a revision, can you please indicate Ericsson as cosigner?  Lena, Thursday, 1:26  I am OK with C1-202738.  ---------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 18:05  - 6.1.2.2.3 - storage of this assigned layer-2 ID and the source layer 2 ID used in the transport of this message provided by the lower layers in the PC5 unicast link context, should be normative. - 6.1.2.2.4 - the source layer-2 ID and the destination Layer-2 ID used in the transport of this message provided by the lower layers, should be normative.  Lena, Friday, 2:54   1. Some overlap with the changes in C1-202140 in subclause 6.1.2.2.3 2. The changes to 6.1.2.2.3 in the CR miss mentioning that the UE passes the DIRECT LINK ESTABSLISHMENT ACCEPT message to the lower layers for transmission (which is covered in C1-202140, see “After the DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT ACCEPT message is generated, the initiating UE shall pass this message to the lower layers for transmission along with the initiating UE's layer 2 ID for unicast communication, the target UE's layer 2 ID for unicast communication and an indication that the PC5 signalling message is protected”) 3. The changes in 6.1.2.2.3 have the UE pass the source and destination L2 ID to the lower layers “after sending the DIRECT LINK ESTABSLISHMENT ACCEPT message”. This is not ok, the lower layers need this info along with the message itself, to be able to send it 4. In 6.1.2.2.4, “After receiving the DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT ACCEPT message, the target UE” should be “After receiving the DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT ACCEPT message, the initiating UE” 5. Bullet c) in 6.1.2.2.4 is not needed, the source and destination layer 2 ID pair is already known to the lower layers from the time the initiating UE send the DIRECT LINK AUTHENICATION RESPONSE message or the DIRECT LINK SECURITY MODE COMPLETE message.   Behrouz, Friday, 3:44  Please see my comments below. The Green text is from your CR and the Blue is my comment. 6.1.2.2.3              PC5 unicast link establishment procedure accepted by the target UE Upon receipt of a DIRECT LINK ESTABLISHMENT REQUEST message, if the target UE accepts this request, it [Change to “the target UE”] shall uniquely assign a PC5 unicast link identifier, create a PC5 unicast link context [What are these two?] and assign a layer-2 ID for this PC5 unicast link. Then the target UE stores this assigned layer-2 ID and the source layer 2 ID used in the transport of this message provided by the lower layers in the PC5 unicast link context. This pair of layer-2 IDs is associated with a PC5 unicast link context.  Yanchao, Tuesday, 4:58  I have changed “the UE does xx” to “the UE shall do” based on Ivo’s comments. A draft revision is available.  Yanchao, Tuesday, 5:03  I have taken onboard Lena’s comments. A draft revision is available.  Chen, Tuesday, 5:19   * The CR should be Cat B, not F. * In the Summary of change, wording "accpets" -> "accepts"; * In clause 6.1.2.2.3, the title has indicated the target UE accepts this request, therefore there is no need to add the sentence "if the target UE accepts this request"; * As clause 6.1.2.5 described the unicast link identifier for unicast, which conceptually conflicts with the unicast link identifier proposed by the CR; * The current specification has already the indication in clause 6.1.2.2.4 "with a PC5 unicast link context"; * In TS23.287 clause 6.3.3.1 bullet 5, there are no PQFI(s) and its corresponding PC5 QoS parameters from the V2X layer to the AS layer in the PC5 unicast link establishment procedure, quote:   *The V2X layer of the UE that established PC5 unicast link passes the PC5 Link Identifier assigned for the unicast link and the PC5 unicast link related information down to the AS layer. The PC5 unicast link related information includes Layer-2 ID information (i.e. source Layer-2 ID and destination Layer-2 ID). This enables the AS layer to maintain the PC5 Link Identifier together with the PC5 unicast link related information.*   * It seems to conflict with existing requirements under thePC5 unicast link identifier update procedure (i.e., .PC5 unicast link identifier update procedure (6.1.2.5.4) where is stated, quote   Yanchao, Tuesday, 15:25  A draft revision with the following changes is available:   * it is changed to “the target UE”,done; * “PC5 unicast link context” is changed to “PC5 link context”   Yanchao, Tuesday, 15:35  To Chen: a draft revision is available. I did not take onboard the following comments:   * I don’t agree CR should be Cat B, this CR just propose correction to existing procedure, not add a new feature * About “no need to add the sentence "if the target UE accepts this request";”, that is the common for stage 3 specification. If you check TS24.587 and TS24.501, you will find dozens of instances in the accept subclause, which specifies”if the UE/NW accepts…… , the UE/NW shall do * About “no PQFI(s) and its corresponding PC5 QoS parameters from the V2X layer to the AS layer in the PC5 unicast link establishment procedure”, see requirements in 23.287 * About “conflict with existing requirements under thePC5 unicast link identifier update procedure”, there is no conflict, the paper propose changes to the PC5 unicast link establishment procedure, not the  PC5 unicast link establishment [should be identifier update instead?] procedure   Behrouz, Tuesday, 15:42  The revision looks ok and InterDigital would like to co-sign. | |
|  |  | | C1-202913 | ENs resolving in modification pocedure | | | vivo | CR 0015 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202909  -----------------------------------------  Revision of C1-202898  Frederic, Thursday, 11:56  This CR was revised 2 times: to C1-202898 (rev 2) and to C1-202909 (rev 3). The author marked 2909 as withdrawn, leaving 2898 as open. I would have preferred to have the opposite done, i.e. withdraw 2898 so that the highest revision is kept. Therefore I would like to have 2898 revised (it will become rev 4).  -----------------------------------------  Revision of C1-202740  -------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-202183  Ivo, Wednesday, 20:37  C1-202740 look ok. If you happen to make a revision, can you please indicate Ericsson as cosigner?  Lena, Thursday, 0:28  C1-202740 adds “#5 lack of resources for proposed link” in 6.1.2.3.5, which is not aligned with what is proposed in C1-202741 (#5 ack of resources for PC5 unicast link). Is it possible to revise C1-202740 to align?  -----------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 18:06  - "For other reasons that causing the failure of link modification." ->  "For other reasons that cause the failure of link modification." or "For other reasons causing the failure of link modification." - there should be some minimum value for the timer T (else the UE might set it to zero which voids the requirement on not attempting to start PC5 unicast link modification with the same target UE)  Lena, Friday, 2:56   1. In 6.1.2.3.5, “For other reasons that causing” should be “For other reasons causing” 2. In 6.2.1.3.5, I don’t think “If the PC5 signalling protocol cause value in the DIRECT LINK MODIFICATION REJECT message is #X "required service not allowed" or #5 "lack of resources for proposed link", then the initiating UE shall not attempt to start PC5 unicast link modification with the same target UE at least for a time period T” is justified. The restriction should be limited to the same kind of modification, as in “If the PC5 signalling protocol cause value in the DIRECT LINK MODIFICATION REJECT message is #X "required service not allowed" or #5 "lack of resources for proposed link", then the initiating UE shall not initiate a PC5 unicast link modification procedure with the target UE to add or remove the same V2X service, or to add, modify or remove the same PC5 QoS flow(s) at least for a time period T”   Rae, Friday, 8:43  How the target UE can determine which service is allowed or not? There is no such configuration in 5.2.3.  Yanchao, Tuesday, 5:36  I have taken Ivo’s comments onboard, for the second comment, I added “The length of time period T is not less than 30 minutes.” in the note. A draft revision is available.  Yanchao, Tuesday, 5:49  All of Lena’s comments have been taken on board. For the second one, I added “to add the same V2X service, or to add or modify the same PC5 QoS flow(s)”, because I think the UE can’t reject a request to remove a V2X service or a PC5 QoS flow. A draft revision is available.  Yanchao, Tuesday, 5:52  To Rae: Our understanding is the V2X service is not allowed if there is no corresponding service authorisation provisioning for this V2X service. Please see the draft revision.  Rae, Tuesday, 8:08  I understand Yanchao used the same wording as in TS 24.334. But the configuration for V2X is different from ProSe and there is no such “service authorisation provisioning”. Meanwhile I found there is also such word under the subclause 6.1.2.2.5. In my understanding “service authorisation provisioning” should be changed to “Configuration parameters for V2X communication over PC5” and the subclause 5.2.3 is referred.  Chen, Tuesday, 8:37  Glad to see that editor's notes are resolved but I do not agree with just removing the one about multiple modification operation under clause 6.1.2.3.2. TS 23.287 indicates that the UE can establish multiple PC5 unicast links so it is natural that the UE could also modify multiple PC5 unicast links.  Yanchao, Tuesday, 15:55  I have taken Rae’s comments onboard in a draft revision.  Yanchao, Tuesday, 15:58  To Chen: I think you have a misunderstanding here, the PC5 unicast link modification procedure is used to modify one existing PC5 unicast link. If the UE want to modify multiple PC5 unicast links, the UE has to initiate multiple the PC5 unicast link modification procedures, one procedure for one PC5 unicast link. | |
|  |  | | C1-202914 | Handling of PC5 broadcast QoS flow match and establishment | | | vivo | CR 0021 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202910  -------------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-202900  --------------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-202899  ---------------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-202746  ------------------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-202189  Ivo, Wednesday, 20:40  C1-202746 is OK and Ericsson would like to co-sign.  Lena, Thursday, 0:51  The bulleted list has the following issue:  “and” at the end of bullets b) and c-3) need to be removed.  ---------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 18:06  - "there is no existing PC5 QoS rules" -> "there is no existing PC5 QoS rule" - shouldnt bullet d) and its sub-bullets be normative? - bullet 3): "UE" -> "the UE"  Lena, Friday, 3:09   1. “.” at the end of bullet c-3) should be “;” 2. “and perform the following” -> “and performs the following” 3. “with following operations” -> “by performing the following operations” 4. “set up a new PC5 QoS rule, the PC5 QoS rule contains” -> “create a new PC5  QoS rule which contains” 5. “to lower layers” -> “to the lower layers” 6. “a precedence value.” Should be “a precedence value; and” 7. “source and destination layer-2 IDs.” Should be “source and destination layer-2 IDs;” 8. “.” at the end of bullets d-2) should be an “;’. 9. “.” at the end of bullets d-3) should be an “; and”. 10. “.” at the end of bullet b) should be “; and” 11. In bullet d-3), “UE uses” -> “the UE uses” 12. In bullet d-3), “the new created PC5 QoS flow as bullet a)” -> “the new PC5 QoS flow created as described in bullet 1)” 13. In bullet d-3), “as bullet 2)” -> “as described in bullet 2)”   Yanchao, Tuesday, 6:37  I took onboard Lena’s comment in a draft revision.  I also added ‘and’ at the end of bullet d-2);  Not sure why “.” at the end of bullet b) should be “; and”. But if so, should I add ‘and’ at end of bullet c)? | |
|  |  | | C1-202919 | Maximum number of NR PC5 unicast links for a UE | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | CR 0029 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202848  -------------------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-202427  SangMin, Thursday, 12:19  I can live with C1-202848.  Ivo, Thursday, 12:39  I am OK with this version. Could you please add Ericsson as co-signer?  ------------------------------------------------------  Ivo, Thursday, 13:55  6.1.2.2.5 - superfluous "or" and inconsistent usage of "due to ".  Rae, Friday, 7:37  Based on the discussion paper related to this CR, the reason why V2X layer limits the number of unicast links is to follow the limitation over Uu interface.  However, PC5 is different because:   1. For PC5, the number of DRB is per PC5 link, not shared by all the links of one UE; 2. In RAN2, it is determined that the 5-bits link identifier is included in the RRC signaling for UE requesting PC5 resources to RAN. This is already a limitation actually. Whether it is necessary to do the limitation duplicated in V2X layer and AS layer.   Vishnu, Sunday, 11:49  To Ivo: I will fix it.  To Rae: the main reason is not to follow the limitation in Uu interface. Main reason is that we need hardware storage for ( Eg: storing the security keys) which is limited in the UE. Why we quoted comparison to Uu interface is as an example. E.g we have limited the number of QoS rules in the UE before because of storage limitation of storing packet filters. So in CT1, we have taken care of such situations where the resources in the UE is limited.  Rae, Monday, 11:16  I still want to have response to the following comment: In RAN2, it is determined that the 5-bits link identifier is included in the RRC signaling for UE requesting PC5 resources to RAN. This is already a limitation actually. Whether it is necessary to do the limitation duplicated in V2X layer and AS layer.  Vishnu, Monday, 15:17  When we define the bit size of IDs it will always be a higher number due to backward compatibility issues. It will be very difficult to change it in the future otherwise. What we are trying to define here on NAS level considering the storage aspect of the security keys and also packet filters. In reality most of the V2X communication will be done by group cast and broad cast, only 2-3 unicast links will be there at a time. So 8 is a reasonable number. It can also be changed in NAS spec without backward compatibility issues. So we hope you can support this.  Rae, Tuesday, 9:57  Thanks for the clarification. It is OK for me.  Vishnu, Tuesday, 10:34  A draft revision is available.  Lena, Tuesday, 23:07  This limitation to 8 simultaneous link seems arbitrary. Our view is that the maximum number of links supported by a UE should be left to UE implementation. If a UE has reached its maximum number of supported links, it can always reject new requests for direct link establishment from other UEs.  Ivo, Wednesday, 20:42  The draft revision addresses my comments. Could you add Ericsson as co-signer?  SangMin, Thursday, 9:24  We also have same view as expressed by Lena that the maximum number of links should be left to UE implementation. So this CR is not needed.  Vishnu, Thursday, 9:57  The reason why we want to specify an upper limit is that unlike other scenarios where we set the max limit as implementation specific  (eg PDU session , packet filter etc), there is an ID defined in NAS specification ( eg: 4 bits ) and so there is already an implicit Max number and then we have a UE defined implementation specific max number. But for PC5 unicast link we don’t have that yet kind of ‘id defined’ in NAS specifications. So we think its good to have a recommended upper limit.  So we will change the normative text to implementation specific number as you proposed and add a Note, with recommended maximum number as 8. Will that be acceptable for you ?  Lena, Thursday, 10:01  Yes, that would be acceptable.  Vishnu, Thursday, 10:16  A draft revision is available.  Lena, Thursday, 10:20  Would it be possible to change the text in the NOTE to the following?  NOTE:   The recommended maximum number of established NR PC5 unicasts link is 8.  Vishnu, Thursday, 10:24  A draft revision with the NOTE updated as requested is available.  Lena, Thursday, 10:31  I am OK with the draft revision.  Vishnu, Thursday, 12:12  Can SangMin also confirm he is ok with the draft revision? | |
|  |  | | C1-202930 | Defining new parameters needed for the Link Identifier Update procedure | | | InterDigital Communications | CR 0028 24.587 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202870  Friday, Christian, 10:02  Requests text to be added to the final report,  “Huawei and HiSilicon prefer the first version of the proposal (in C1-202870) as it is to us the way to go to solve the identified issue. We can reluctantly accept C1-202930 for now but we believe that further changes are required in CT1 specifications to achieve consistency and provide clear description of the proposal. We also believe that SA3 would need to be informed so that their related specification is also aligned to avoid different interpretation for readers of the specifications”  Behrouz, Thursday, 15:40  C1-202870 was revised to C1-202930 changing MSB to MSBs and LSB to LSBs. However, I would like to point out that I noted inconsistency in the comments received vs actions done as well as the fact that we have now created inconsistency between SA3 spec and our spec. I only did this to make progress as my personal opinion is that we are making a mistake here going against definitions that have been there, and used, in our own spec as well as SA3’s spec!!    Christian, Thursday, 15:57  In my view, everyone has brought up a number of valid points.However, I personally believe that we should keep the way we have specified in CT1 till now and which is actually aligned with the SA3 specification.Note that we are dealing with the understanding of how implementers need to encode the bits. Hence, we have to be careful in order not to allow different interpretations.I am afraid that if not, first of all implementers will ask what the difference is or changing now from MSB to the plural form and the misalignment with security in stage 3. As rapporteur of TS 24.587, I would like to keep consistency if possible. Secondly, implementers can get different understandings which can lead to different implementations. This would lead to undesirable effects in interoperability and testing.  Overall, as us, CT1 delegates and writers of the standard seem to have not the very same understanding.  -------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-202596  Ivo, Thursday, 11:00  C1-202870 still contains "MSB" and "LSB". However, values of those IEs contains more than 1 bit. Thus, IMO, it would be more appropriate to use "MSBs" and "LSBs". I understand that the intention is to align with EPS ProSE, but eV2XARC is being documented separately.  ------------------------------------------  Revision of C1-202327  Ivo, Thursday, 18:07  "MSB" and "LSB" indicate a single bit. Is it intentional?  Behrouz, Thursday, 19:59  SA3 has defined both of them as “bytes” and not bits.  Ivo, Friday, 11:07  I cannot find such statement in 33.536 - there is no "byte" in 33.536. 33.526 refers to 21.905 for abbreviations and 21.905 defines MSB and LSB as follows:  LSB                       Least Significant Bit  MSB                      Most Significant Bit  Or do I miss anything?  Furthermore, at least in CT1, we normally use "octet" rather than "byte" so if SA3 really meant most/least significant byte, "most/least significant octet" would be more appropriate in CT1.  Behrouz, Friday, 19:41  I was trying to mimic the same terminology as used in 24.334 (ProSe spec). Here is what I “actually” meant:  From 24.334  an MSB of KD-sess ID IE set to the most significant 8 bits of the KD-sess ID; and  the LSB of KD-sess ID IE set to indicate the least significant 8-bits of KD-sess ID  Yanchao, Saturday, 10:53   1. In clause 6.1.2.5.3, deleting ‘UE decides to change its identifier’ is not aligned with TS 23.287. The first change also means target UE needs to check whether the privacy configuration requires privacy protection 2. Clause 6.1.2.5.3, for the bullet f), why add the source UE’s new layer 2 ID in the link identifier update accept message? 3. Clause 6.1.2.5.3, same question as above, for the bullet g) why add the source UE’s new application layer ID in the link identifier update accept message? 4. Clause 6.1.2.5.3, the added bullet h) is coverd by the existing bullet c) 5. Clause 6.1.2.5.4，the existing “shall” is correct.   Ivo, Monday, 23:22  If the field is meant to keep 8 bits then the field should be called "MSBs of KD-sess ID" / "LSBs of KD-sess ID".  If it just kept singular, it is very confusing.  Behrouz, Tuesday, 0:48  We could add the “s” but just for me to understand; how come it was not deemed “confusing” when it was defined in 24.334 for ProSe? All we need to do is defining the LSB and MSB as the “8 bits…” in the beginning of the spec.  Ivo, Tuesday, 9:03  I do not know why it was not confusing in 24.334 for ProSe. Likely, it was not detected.  Behrouz, Tuesday, 16:28  Do you plan on changing the Prose spec as well? May I remind you that 24.334 was specified in Rel-12 and up to now nobody has shown any issues whatsoever with these definitions that have been used in that spec. These two MSB/LSB were defined in the body of 24.334 and will also be defined the same way in 24.587, so why is this a major problem now?  Ivo, Wednesday, 21:00  We start with a new spec and we should be consistent on the terminology.  Behrouz, Wednesday, 21:53  That’s exactly my point. There is no need to get stuck with a definition in 21.905, which has nothing to do with this spec. As I suggested earlier, all we need to do is that we will define LSB and MSB in 24.587 “exactly as it was done in 24.334” and there has not been any confusion. As far as I know, the implementers will follow the Stage 3 spec and definitions there (and not a Stage 1 spec).  Behrouz, Thursday, 1:31  To Yanchao:   1. -> this text is being modified in SA2 2. ->Please check TS 33.536 3. ->UE identifiers as received in request needs ->to be sent back in accept 4. ->Ok 5. ->Already addressed in C1-202596 | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | RACS (CT4 lead) | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects of optimizations on UE radio capability signalling  100% | |
|  |  | | C1-202693 | RACS parameters in generic UE configuration procedure | | | Ericsson / Mikael | CR 2078 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202233  Lena, thu, 04:53  Fine  Lena, Fri, 01:43  Fine with the CR, needs an additional “either”  Mikael, Fri, 08:01  Acks Lena, will come with rev | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 5G\_SRVCC (CT4 lead) | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects of single radio voice continuity from 5GS to 3G  100% | |
|  |  | | [C1-202094](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202094.zip) | Introduce support for 5G SRVCC support indication when registering with EPS | | | BlackBerry Uk Ltd. | CR 3213 24.008 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Following ConfCall  Alternative to C1-202133  Ivo, Thu 13:43  No need for this CR, impact on EPS to be avoided  Lena, Fri, 05:21  prefer E solution with no UE impact, C1-202133. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202095](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202095.zip) | Introduce support for 5G SRVCC support indication when registering with EPS | | | BlackBerry Uk Ltd. | CR 3290 24.301 Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Following ConfCall  Revision of C1-198012  Alternative to C1-202133  Ivo, Thu 13:43  No need for this CR, impact on EPS to be avoided  Lena, Fri, 05:21  prefer E solution with no UE impact, C1-202133 | |
|  |  | | C1-202638 | Initial Registration after 5G-SRVCC | | | ZTE, China Unicom | CR 2115 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202529  Revision of C1-202338  Ivo, Thu, 13:43  Minor editorial  Fei, Sat, 09:14  Provides the rev in Inbox  Ivo, Mon, 23:26  Editorial  Fei, Tue, 05:10  Acks Ivo | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | xBDT (CT3 lead) | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects on 5GS Transfer of Policies for Background Data  100% | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | IAB-CT (CT4 lead) | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects of support for integrated access and backhaul (IAB)  CT1 no longer affected by this work item | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 5GS\_OTAF (CT4 lead) | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | 5GS Enhanced support of OTA mechanism for UICC configuration parameter update | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | 5G\_URLLC (CT4 lead) | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | CT aspects of CT Aspects of 5G URLLC | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | SEAL | |  | Lena – Breakout | | |  |  | CT aspects of Service Enabler Architecture Layer for Verticals  Is TS 24.548 sufficiently stable to be sent to CT#88 for approval? | |
|  |  | | [C1-202137](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202137.zip) | Updates to User Authentication Client (SIM-C) procedure | | | Intel / Vivek | CR 0001 24.547 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-202138](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202138.zip) | Updates to User Authentication Server (SIM-S) procedure | | | Intel / Vivek | CR 0002 24.547 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-202209](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202209.zip) | Latest reference version of draft TS 24.548 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | draft TS 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Noted** | |
|  |  | | [C1-202297](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202297.zip) | Updates to structure and data semantics for request for unicast resource at VAL service communication establishment procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-202299](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202299.zip) | Structure and data semantics for request for modification of unicast resources procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Sapan, Friday, 10:31   * New elements defined in this pCR i.e. <modification> and <modification-result> elements, are exactly same as elements defined in another pCR C1-202297 (<request> and <request-result> elements) * I do not see need to define new elements in this pCR. We can reuse elements defined in C1-202297 by adding request type within <request> element.   Chen. Saturday, 11:13  This p-CR just followed the requirements of stage 2 of TS 23.434 clause 14.3.2.6, clause 14.3.2.7, clause 14.3.2.8 and clause 14.3.2.9. And as described in TS 23.434 clause 14.3.3.2, there are differences between the request for unicast resources procedure and the request for modification of unicast procedure.  Sapan, Monday, 11:27  Thanks for the clarification, I am ok with the changes. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202301](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202301.zip) | Structure and data semantics for network resource adaptation procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-202305](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202305.zip) | Use of pre-established MBMS bearers procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-202312](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202312.zip) | MBMS bearer event notification procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-202313](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202313.zip) | Switching between MBMS bearer bearer and unicast bearer procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-202314](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202314.zip) | Resolution of editor's note on application unique ID | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-202319](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202319.zip) | IANA registration template of SEAL location management | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0001 24.545 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-202320](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202320.zip) | Removal of editor’s note on MIME types | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0002 24.545 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-202321](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202321.zip) | Resolution of editor's note on application unique ID | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0003 24.545 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-202322](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202322.zip) | Structure and data semantics for query list of users based on location procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0004 24.545 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-202440](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202440.zip) | Create SIP based subscription for SLM | | | Samsung, Huawei, HiSilicon / Sapan | CR 0006 24.545 Rel-16 | **Current status: Postponed**  Sapan, Wednesday, 19:55  All SIP based subscription procedures proposed in CRs (C1-202440, C1-202441, C1-202442, C1-202443, C1-202444, C1-202445, C1-202446) are postponed. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202441](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202441.zip) | Modify SIP based subscription for SLM | | | Samsung / Sapan | CR 0007 24.545 Rel-16 | **Current status: Postponed**  Frederic, Thursday, 12:54  Incorrect clauses affected: 6.2.6.1.1.1 (NEW) should be 6.2.6.1.1.2 (NEW)  Sapan, Monday, 14:04  A draft revision is available.  Sapan, Wednesday, 19:55  All SIP based subscription procedures proposed in CRs (C1-202440, C1-202441, C1-202442, C1-202443, C1-202444, C1-202445, C1-202446) are postponed. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202442](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202442.zip) | Delete SIP based subscription for SLM | | | Samsung / Sapan | CR 0008 24.545 Rel-16 | **Current status: Postponed**  Sapan, Wednesday, 19:55  All SIP based subscription procedures proposed in CRs (C1-202440, C1-202441, C1-202442, C1-202443, C1-202444, C1-202445, C1-202446) are postponed. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202443](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202443.zip) | Handling of abnormal cases for SIP based subscription in SLM | | | Samsung / Sapan | CR 0009 24.545 Rel-16 | **Current status: Postponed**  Sapan, Wednesday, 19:55  All SIP based subscription procedures proposed in CRs (C1-202440, C1-202441, C1-202442, C1-202443, C1-202444, C1-202445, C1-202446) are postponed. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202444](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202444.zip) | Message Formats for location management subscription | | | Samsung / Sapan | CR 0010 24.545 Rel-16 | **Current status: Postponed**  Sapan, Wednesday, 19:55  All SIP based subscription procedures proposed in CRs (C1-202440, C1-202441, C1-202442, C1-202443, C1-202444, C1-202445, C1-202446) are postponed. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202445](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202445.zip) | Timers used in location management | | | Samsung / Sapan | CR 0011 24.545 Rel-16 | **Current status: Postponed**  Sapan, Wednesday, 19:55  All SIP based subscription procedures proposed in CRs (C1-202440, C1-202441, C1-202442, C1-202443, C1-202444, C1-202445, C1-202446) are postponed. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202446](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202446.zip) | Annex for registering ICSI and MIME for SLM | | | Samsung / Sapan | CR 0012 24.545 Rel-16 | **Current status: Postponed**  Sapan, Wednesday, 19:55  All SIP based subscription procedures proposed in CRs (C1-202440, C1-202441, C1-202442, C1-202443, C1-202444, C1-202445, C1-202446) are postponed. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202447](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202447.zip) | SIP based subscribe/notify procedures for SEAL group management | | | Samsung / Sapan | CR 0001 24.544 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-202449](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202449.zip) | Indication from SGM-S to SGM-C about group join required | | | Samsung / Sapan | CR 0003 24.544 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | [C1-202450](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202450.zip) | SIP based subscribe/notify procedures for configuration management | | | Samsung / Sapan | CR 0001 24.546 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed** | |
|  |  | | C1-202715 | Updates to request for unicast resource at VAL service communication establishment procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202296  -------------------------------------------  Sapan, Thursday, 21:32  The only concern with me for this CR is that – server is sending HTTP 200 OK, only after receiving SIP 200 OK. I believe server should not wait till SIP based procedures are completed.  Server can send HTTP 200 OK if HTTP POST request from VAL server is authorized. And once resources are reserved (i.e. SIP 200 OK is received) – server can send another HTTP message to notify about the success.  Chen, Friday, 5:33  I understand Sapan’s concern, but it needs SA6’s requirement. This p-CR just followed the procedure description of TS 23.434 clause 14.3.3.2.1.2.  Sapan, Friday, 8:45  I do understand that the contribution is based on SA6 specification. The problem here is that the SIP procedure can take longer time to respond  (at times more than 32 seconds) and I do not think HTTP client can wait for such long time.  My proposal is: - On receiving HTTP POST request, the server will sends HTTP 202 Accepted as intermediate response and once SIP procedure is completed, the server will send actual response in form of new HTTP message (for this client should have opened notification channel);  Chen, Saturday, 9:47  Thanks for your explanation. In my understanding,   1. It is the VAL server not the client that requests for unicast resources; 2. It is only the 3GPP system that provides the unicast resources and the VAL server needs the unicast resources ASAP. If HTTP 202 response message is sent, the connection between the VAL server and the SNRM-S might be dropped; 3. HTTP is a stateless protocol with request-response mechanism. If HTTP 202 response message is sent, the VAL server should do polling (long polling or periodic polling?). In my point of view, the 32s is not long for the persistent connection, which could ensure the VAL server can get the resources ASAP.   With the above consideration, it’s better to keep the current status and align with TS 23.434.  Sapan, Monday, 10:04  I understand that Huawei do not want to send HTTP 202 Accepted response to VAL server due to reasons mentioned in your below email, but I will atleast prefer to add clarification in VAL serve side procedure about terminating the connection.  I propose to add following NOTE as compromise solution in VAL server side procedure:  NOTE 1: Before terminating connection due to no response from SRM-S, the VAL server allows sufficient time for SRN-S to reserve resources and respond. It is up to implementation to decide how long the VAL server waits for receiving response.  I hope you can agree to add above NOTE.  Chen, Monday, 11:12  The NOTE is OK with me. The draft revision with the NOTE and wording fixed is now available.  Sapan, Monday, 13:33  I am OK with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-202716 | Request for modification of unicast resources procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202298  ------------------------------------------------  Sapan, Friday, 9:00   1. In clause 6.2.2.3.1, step b) – How server determines whether bearer modification is required or not? 2. In clause 6.2.2.3.1, step b) 3) i) – the value “failure” is not giving enough information to VAL server. The <modification-result> element can also be used to provide reason for the failure. My suggestion is to change the value to “Modification not required” – to indicate VAL server about the actual result. 3. Same concern as described in previous CR - HTTP 200 OK is sent after receiving SIP 200 OK.   Chen, Saturday, 11:28   1. -> In my understanding, the decision mechanism is NRM-S implementation specific 2. -> The p-CR just followed the requirement of stage 2 of TS 23.434, clause 14.3.2.9 3. -> Please see my replies on C1-202296   Sapan, Monday, 13:43  I am fine with reply for comment 1) and 2).  For comment 3) – can you add similar NOTE as we decided to add in C1-202296.  Chen, Tuesday, 11:07  I’m OK with the NOTE added and the draft revision is available.  Frederic, Tuesday, 12:46  The pCR introduces two subclauses 6.2.2.3.1. While this can be fixed at the implementation, it would be better to have it corrected now.  Chen, Wednesday, 3:39  Thanks Frederic, it is fixed now and I have also fixed clauses affected.  Sapan, Wednesday, 7:34  I am fine with the NOTE added in draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-202717 | Network resource adaptation procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202300  ---------------------------------------------  Sapan, Friday, 9:45   1. In clause 6.2.2.4.1 – “In order to request request unicast resources or modify already……” – The word “request” is written twice. 2. In clause 6.2.2.4.1 – At end of Step d) 1) ii) A) – it should be “or” instead of “and”. 3. In clause 6.2.2.4.2 – same concern as previous CRs – HTTP 200 OK is sent after SIP 200 OK.   Chen, Friday, 10:44   1. -> OK 2. -> OK 3. -> In the adaptation procedure, the NRM server interacts with 3GPP system using HTTP as described in TS 29.514/TS 29.214. The HTTP 200 OK is sent after HTTP 200 OK. Let me know your thinking.   Sapan, Friday, 11:17  For 3), Ok. I am fine with explanation as it is HTTP based procedure.  Chen, Saturday, 9:53  Thanks for your feedback, a draft revision is available.  Sapan, Monday, 11:03  I am ok with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-202718 | Structure and data semantics for MBMS bearer announcement over MBMS bearer procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202302  ---------------------------------------------  Sapan, Friday, 11:54  All 5 pCRs (C1-202302, C1-202304, C1-202306, C1-202309, C1-202311) defines new clause 7.3.3 “MBMSInfo document” (for data structure) and 7.5.3 “MBMSInfo document” (for data semantics). Also, each pCRs define <mbms-info> as root element in the document with different child elements.  It is difficult to understand how all pCRs will be implemented in the specification. I request to merge all pCRs and define both clauses 7.3.3 and 7.5.3 only once with all required child elements in it – this will help us to understand exactly how clause 7.3.3 and clause 7.5.3 will be implemented in specification.   * 1. I do not understand <monitoring-state> element. Can you please clarify its usage? What is the meaning of value “monitoring” for the client when it receives this from server?   2. In clause 7.5.3 - Step h) mentions about element <mcptt-mbms-rohc> - It should be < announcement-acknowlegement> element.   3. Change possible values for <unicast-status> element to “required” and “not-required”.   4. In clause 7.5.3 – Step a) – all references are used with soft space – change it to hard space   Chen, Saturday, 8:57  Acturally, the new clause 7.3.3 and clause 7.5.3 has only one “header” repectively.  Every pCR is corresponding to the related procedures as we did before in other SEAL Ts. Therefore, I merged these overlapped headers into revised C1-202302 and keep only child elements in other pCRs. I will coordinate with the rapporteur Christian to implement these pCRs according to the sequence of procedures (i.e. the apearance sequence of the elements).   * 1. -> As replied to C1-202210, the monitoring state is used to control if the client is actively monitoring the MBMS bearer quality or not. Therefore, the “monitoring” means the client start to monitor the MBMS bearer quality, and “not-monitoring” means the client stops monitoring the MBMS bearer quality. And this is updated in the draft revision   2. -> OK   3. -> As replied to C1-202210,  if the <unicast-status> element is present, the client shall include the <unicast-listening-status> element in the MBMS listening status report message. And this is updated in the draft revision   4. -> ok   A draft revision is available.  Sapan, Monday, 9:40  Although you have merged all headers in to revised C1-202302 but new clauses are still defined in other pCRs. I will prefer to have everything merged to have single description of new clauses. But with your proposed approach, the clarity is improved to some extent and I understand your intention to break into different pCRs due to separate procedures and so as a compromise I am fine with your proposed approach.  To align with your description, I request you to remove “ing” from the value as shown below.  -     The value “monitor~~ing~~” indicates that the SNRM-C shall monitor the MBMS bearer quality; and  -     The value “not-monitor~~ing~~” indicates that the SNRM-C shall not monitor the MBMS bearer quality;  Also:   1. Kindly change the values of <monitoring-state> as specified in above comment – “monitor” and “not-monitor”. 2. Can you add possible values for <unicast-status> to “required” and “not-required” 3. In step j) – element <mcptt-mbms-rohc> is used – it should be <seal-mbms-rohc>.   Chen, Monday, 11:02  I am ok with Sapan’s additional comments except the following: about adding possible values for <unicast-status> to “required” and “not-required”, there is a little difference between the <monitoring-state> and the <unicast-status>. <monitoring-state> is to control the client to monitor or not to monitor no matter what is the client doing. But <unicast-status> is to report a unicast listening status that already exists. Therefore, from my side, the presence of the <unicast-status> is enough to indicate the listening status of the unicast bearer is requested and aligned with the TS 23.434.  A draft revision is available.  Sapan, Monday, 13:04  I am OK with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-202719 | Updates to MBMS bearer quality detection procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202303  --------------------------------------------------  Sapan, Friday, 12:47   1. In clause 6.2.3.4.1 – NOTEs are not in proper style. 2. Need to add condition in step a) 5) –   if MBMS announcement message contained <unicast-status> with value “required”, shall ~~may~~ include an <unicast-listening-status> element set to "listening" or "not-listening" indicating the unicast listening status.  Chen, Saturday, 3:35  Both comments are OK with me. The second point I revised in the following:  If the <unicast-status> element is present in the MBMS announcement message, shall…  The draft revision is available.  Sapan, Sunday, 19:18  I am fine with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-202720 | Structure and data semantics for MBMS bearer quality detection procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202304  ------------------------------------------------  Sapan, Friday, 11:54  All 5 pCRs (C1-202302, C1-202304, C1-202306, C1-202309, C1-202311) defines new clause 7.3.3 “MBMSInfo document” (for data structure) and 7.5.3 “MBMSInfo document” (for data semantics). Also, each pCRs define <mbms-info> as root element in the document with different child elements.  It is difficult to understand how all pCRs will be implemented in the specification. I request to merge all pCRs and define both clauses 7.3.3 and 7.5.3 only once with all required child elements in it – this will help us to understand exactly how clause 7.3.3 and clause 7.5.3 will be implemented in specification.  In clause 7.5.3 – Step b) – all references are used with soft space – change it to hard space  Chen, Saturday, 8:57  Acturally, the new clause 7.3.3 and clause 7.5.3 has only one “header” repectively.  Every pCR is corresponding to the related procedures as we did before in other SEAL Ts. Therefore, I merged these overlapped headers into revised C1-202302 and keep only child elements in other pCRs. I will coordinate with the rapporteur Christian to implement these pCRs according to the sequence of procedures (i.e. the apearance sequence of the elements).  Ok for the comment on clause 7.5.3. A draft revision is available.  Sapan, Monday, 9:40  Although you have merged all headers in to revised C1-202302 but new clauses are still defined in other pCRs. I will prefer to have everything merged to have single description of new clauses. But with your proposed approach, the clarity is improved to some extent and I understand your intention to break into different pCRs due to separate procedures and so as a compromise I am fine with your proposed approach.  I am ok with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-202721 | Structure and data semantics for use of pre-established MBMS bearers procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202306  ------------------------------------------------  Sapan, Friday, 11:54  All 5 pCRs (C1-202302, C1-202304, C1-202306, C1-202309, C1-202311) defines new clause 7.3.3 “MBMSInfo document” (for data structure) and 7.5.3 “MBMSInfo document” (for data semantics). Also, each pCRs define <mbms-info> as root element in the document with different child elements.  It is difficult to understand how all pCRs will be implemented in the specification. I request to merge all pCRs and define both clauses 7.3.3 and 7.5.3 only once with all required child elements in it – this will help us to understand exactly how clause 7.3.3 and clause 7.5.3 will be implemented in specification.  In clause 7.5.3 – Under <mbms-bearers> element – In Step b) – all references are used with soft space – change it to hard space.  Chen, Saturday, 8:57  Acturally, the new clause 7.3.3 and clause 7.5.3 has only one “header” repectively.  Every pCR is corresponding to the related procedures as we did before in other SEAL Ts. Therefore, I merged these overlapped headers into revised C1-202302 and keep only child elements in other pCRs. I will coordinate with the rapporteur Christian to implement these pCRs according to the sequence of procedures (i.e. the apearance sequence of the elements).  Ok for the comment on clause 7.5.3. A draft revision is available.  Sapan, Monday, 9:40  Although you have merged all headers in to revised C1-202302 but new clauses are still defined in other pCRs. I will prefer to have everything merged to have single description of new clauses. But with your proposed approach, the clarity is improved to some extent and I understand your intention to break into different pCRs due to separate procedures and so as a compromise I am fine with your proposed approach.  I am ok with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-202722 | Use of dynamic MBMS bearers procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202307  ---------------------------------------------------  Sapan, Friday, 13:06   1. Following 3 statements refer to same procedure (clause 6.2.3.2.2 ) to perform difference tasks – please check if reference to the procedure are correct or not.    1. In clause 6.2.3.X.2 - send an MBMS bearer announcement message as described in clause 6.2.3.2.2 towards the SNRM-C    2. In clause 6.2.3.X.2 - shall send an MBMS bearers response message as decribed in clause 6.2.3.2.2 towards the VAL server    3. In clause 6.2.3.X.3 - an MBMS bearer listening status report as described in clause 6.2.3.2.2 towards the SNRM-S   Chen, Saturday, 5:19  Thanks for pointing this out. I checked and the last clause 6.2.3.2.2 should be 6.2.3.2.3. The draft revision is now available.  Sapan, Sunday, 20:00  I am fine with the draft revision | |
|  |  | | C1-202723 | Service continuity in MBMS scenarios procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202308  --------------------------------------------  Sapan, Friday, 13:26  In clause 6.2.2.4.2 – step c) “shall send the HTTP POST request towards the SNRM-S according to IETF RFC 2616 [r2616].” => It should be towards VAL server.  Chen, Saturday, 5:05  Thanks for pointing this out. The draft revision is now available.  Sapan, Sunday, 19:29  I am fine with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-202724 | Structure and data semantics for service continuity in MBMS scenarios procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202309  --------------------------------------------  Sapan, Friday, 11:54  All 5 pCRs (C1-202302, C1-202304, C1-202306, C1-202309, C1-202311) defines new clause 7.3.3 “MBMSInfo document” (for data structure) and 7.5.3 “MBMSInfo document” (for data semantics). Also, each pCRs define <mbms-info> as root element in the document with different child elements.  It is difficult to understand how all pCRs will be implemented in the specification. I request to merge all pCRs and define both clauses 7.3.3 and 7.5.3 only once with all required child elements in it – this will help us to understand exactly how clause 7.3.3 and clause 7.5.3 will be implemented in specification.  Chen, Saturday, 8:57  Acturally, the new clause 7.3.3 and clause 7.5.3 has only one “header” repectively.  Every pCR is corresponding to the related procedures as we did before in other SEAL Ts. Therefore, I merged these overlapped headers into revised C1-202302 and keep only child elements in other pCRs. I will coordinate with the rapporteur Christian to implement these pCRs according to the sequence of procedures (i.e. the apearance sequence of the elements).  A draft revision is available.  Sapan, Monday, 9:40  Although you have merged all headers in to revised C1-202302 but new clauses are still defined in other pCRs. I will prefer to have everything merged to have single description of new clauses. But with your proposed approach, the clarity is improved to some extent and I understand your intention to break into different pCRs due to separate procedures and so as a compromise I am fine with your proposed approach.  I am ok with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-202725 | MBMS suspension notification procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202310  ----------------------------------------------  Sapan, Friday, 2:36  1)     Clause 6.2.3.6.2 – Need to do proper heading style  2)     Client needs to send HTP response back to server before generating HTTP POST request.  Chen, Saturday, 4:58  Both comments are accepted. The draft revision is available.  Note that Client sends an HTTP 204 response back to server before generating HTTP POST request.  Sapan, Sunday, 19:26  Minor editorial correction required – kindly use hardspace while referring to IETF RFC 2616 [r2616]. Other than that, I am fine with the draft revision.  Chen, Tuesday, 11:20  Thanks for pointing this out. All the related space will be changed to hard space in the final revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-202726 | Structure and data semantics for MBMS suspension notification procedure | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202311  -------------------------------------------------  Sapan, Friday, 11:54  All 5 pCRs (C1-202302, C1-202304, C1-202306, C1-202309, C1-202311) defines new clause 7.3.3 “MBMSInfo document” (for data structure) and 7.5.3 “MBMSInfo document” (for data semantics). Also, each pCRs define <mbms-info> as root element in the document with different child elements.  It is difficult to understand how all pCRs will be implemented in the specification. I request to merge all pCRs and define both clauses 7.3.3 and 7.5.3 only once with all required child elements in it – this will help us to understand exactly how clause 7.3.3 and clause 7.5.3 will be implemented in specification.  In clause 7.5.2 - <suspension-reporting-client-subset> - It is not clear how subset of clients will be specified.  Chen, Saturday, 8:57  Acturally, the new clause 7.3.3 and clause 7.5.3 has only one “header” repectively.  Every pCR is corresponding to the related procedures as we did before in other SEAL Ts. Therefore, I merged these overlapped headers into revised C1-202302 and keep only child elements in other pCRs. I will coordinate with the rapporteur Christian to implement these pCRs according to the sequence of procedures (i.e. the apearance sequence of the elements).  About clause 7.5.2, the subset is further specified using one or more <NRM-client-id> elements. A draft revision is available.  Sapan, Monday, 9:40  Although you have merged all headers in to revised C1-202302 but new clauses are still defined in other pCRs. I will prefer to have everything merged to have single description of new clauses. But with your proposed approach, the clarity is improved to some extent and I understand your intention to break into different pCRs due to separate procedures and so as a compromise I am fine with your proposed approach.  I am ok with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-202727 | XML scheme declaration for SEAL network resource management | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | pCR 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202315  ----------------------------------------------  Sapan, Friday, 15:09  Adding schema for 3rd document also (may be in next meeting?).  Chen, Saturday, 3:05  OK with me. Yes, for the 3rd document I will think it further and the complete xml scheme will be provided next meeting. The draft revision with the editor’s note unremoved is now available.  Sapan, Sunday, 19:12  I am fine with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-202733 | XML scheme declaration for SEAL location management | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Chen | CR 0005 24.545 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202323  ----------------------------------------------  Sapan, Friday, 15:21  Editor’s note should not be removed as actual schema is not provided yet.  Chen, Saturday, 2:54  OK with me. The complete xml scheme will be provided next meeting. The draft revision with the editor’s note unremoved is now available.  Sapan, Sunday, 19:06  I am fine with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-202770 | Wrong implementation of agreed p-CR C1-200881 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202210  -------------------------------------------------  Sapan, Thursday, 21:02  I am fine with the contribution but some clarifications are required. Also, I have some minor comments to improve clarity for the procedures.   1. In clause 6.2.3.3.2.1, Server may add <monitoring-state> element in announcement message to client. How client will interpret this element? What is the meaning of "monitoring" value for client and also meaning of "not-monitoring"  value for client – when it receives announcement message including <monitoring-state> element? 2. In clause 6.2.3.3.2.1, Server may add <unicast-status> element in announcement message to client. How client will interpret value in this element? 3. Rename clause 6.2.3.3.2.1 to “Generate announcement message” 4. In clause 6.2.3.3.2.1.1 – Need to add reference to clause 6.2.3.3.2.1 to construct application/vnd.3gpp.seal-mbms-usage-info +xml MIME body. 5. In clause 6.2.3.3.2.1.2 – Need to add reference to clause 6.2.3.3.2.1 to construct application/vnd.3gpp.seal-mbms-usage-info +xml MIME body.   Chen, Saturday, 2:54   1. -> As TS 23.434 states, the monitoring state is used to control if the client is actively monitoring the MBMS bearer quality or not. Therefore, the “monitoring” means the client start to monitor the MBMS bearer quality, and “not-monitoring” means the client stops monitoring the MBMS bearer quality. The further description is added in the client procedure. And this will be further detailed in the revision of C1-202302 “Structure and data semantics for MBMS bearer announcement over MBMS bearer procedure”. 2. -> If the <unicast-status> element is present, the client shall include the <unicast-listening-status> element in the MBMS listening status report message.      The further description is added in the client procedure. And this will be further detailed in the revision of C1-202302 “Structure and data semantics for MBMS bearer announcement over MBMS bearer procedure”.   1. -> OK 2. -> OK, add the words ”according to clause 6.2.3.3.2.1”. 3. -> OK, add the words ”according to clause 6.2.3.3.2.1”.   A corresponding draft revision is available.  Sapan, Sunday, 19:03  I am fine with provided changes – make sure to use hardspace while referencing clause 6.2.3.3.2.1.  Also, regarding comment 1) and 2), I will check your revision C1-202302 and let you know if I have any comment or not. | |
|  |  | | C1-202772 | Wrong implementation of agreed p-CR C1-200882 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon /Christian | pCR 24.548 Rel-16 | **Current Status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202211  -----------------------------------------------  Sapan, Thursday, 21:09   1. On cover sheet, Specification number and Agenda item is wrong. 2. In clause 6.2.3.4.1.1 and in clause 6.2.3.4.1.2- Need to add reference to clause 6.2.3.4.1 to construct application/vnd.3gpp.seal-mbms-usage-info +xml MIME body   Chen, Saturday, 2:54  Ok with both comments. A draft revision is available.  Sapan, Sunday, 18:58  I am fine with the draft revision. | |
|  |  | | C1-202809 | Removal of Editor’s notes | | | Samsung / Sapan | CR 0002 24.544 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202448  ----------------------------------------  Chen, Friday, 9:40  In the Reason of change, TS 33.434 states that access tokens shall be communicated from the SIM-C to VAL resource servers, not SGM-C/SCM-C. Therefore, the reason of change needs to be enhanced  Sapan, Monday, 16:32  Although the annex describes about SIM-C, the general description of SEAL service authorization (in clause 6.2.2) and authorization framework (in clause 6.2.5) clearly mention that each SEAL client shall present access-token to SEAL server for authorization. I will update the reason for change accordingly. A draft revision is available.  Chen, Tuesday, 11:00  I’m fine with the revision. As we discussed before, the header will be changed in SEAL location management in next meeting too. | |
|  |  | | C1-202810 | Removal of Editor’s notes. | | | Samsung / Sapan | CR 0002 24.546 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202451  ---------------------------------------------------  Chen, Friday, 9:40  In the Reason of change, TS 33.434 states that access tokens shall be communicated from the SIM-C to VAL resource servers, not SGM-C/SCM-C. Therefore, the reason of change needs to be enhanced  Sapan, Monday, 16:32  Although the annex describes about SIM-C, the general description of SEAL service authorization (in clause 6.2.2) and authorization framework (in clause 6.2.5) clearly mention that each SEAL client shall present access-token to SEAL server for authorization. I will update the reason for change accordingly. A draft revision is available.  Chen, Tuesday, 11:00  I’m fine with the revision. As we discussed before, the header will be changed in SEAL location management in next meeting too. | |
|  |  | | C1-202828 | Updates to Token Exchange Client (SIM-C) procedure | | | Intel / Vivek | CR 0003 24.547 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202139  Vivek, Wednesday, 18:09  The Editor’s Note remains, and the cover sheet has been updated suitably to reflect this.  ------------------------------------------------  Sapan, Monday, 14:49  I believe editor’s note should not be removed as token exchange procedure is not yet defined in SA3. Either we go ahead with this contribution by keeping editor’s note OR alternatively we may also postpone the contribution and we can align the procedure with SA3 once it is available in SA3 specification. I am fine with both options. | |
|  |  | | C1-202829 | Updates to Token Exchange Server (SIM-S) procedure | | | Intel / Vivek | CR 0004 24.547 Rel-16 | **Current status: Agreed**  Revision of C1-202140  Vivek, Wednesday, 18:10  The Editor’s Note remains, and the cover sheet has been updated suitably to reflect this.  ------------------------------------------------  Chen, Thursday, 13:40  The editor’s note should be deleted too.  Sapan, Monday, 14:43  I think Editor’s note should not be removed. As I understand, this contribution is trying to align procedure with other user authentication procedure (in C1-202138). But the token exchange procedure is not defined in SA3 yet.  I am fine with changes but I prefer not to remove Editor’s note.  Either we go ahead with this contribution by keeping editor’s note OR alternatively we may also postpone the contribution and we can align the procedure with SA3 once it is available in SA3 specification. I am fine with both options.  Chen, Wednesday, 11:23  I agree with you that the Editor’s note should not be removed. Therefore, @Vivek, the Summary of change should be corrected too. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Other Rel-16 non-IMS issues | |  | Peter – Main | | |  |  | Other Rel-16 non-IMS topics | |
|  |  | | [C1-202083](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202083.zip) | Correction of certain erroneous Information Element Identifiers | | | InterDigital Communications | CR 2033 24.501 Rel-16 | Ivo, Thu, 13:44  Change in Table 8.2.6.1.1 seems unnecessary  Behrouz, Thu, 19:46  Explains why he wants to keep Type 1 IE  Ivo, Fri, 11:35  We may run out of Type 1, could use Type 2 where possible  Behrouz, Sat, 02:27  Not keen on using Type 2, none was used in 301  Amer, Sat, 04:30  Not convinced by Behrouz argument on Type 2  Behrouz, Sat, 06:25  Commenting  Amer, Sat, 13:57  Commenting to Behrouz  Behrouz, Sat, 20:47  Discussing how to continue type 2 IE  Ivo, Mon, 23:41  Explaining why type 2 IE would be beneficial  Behrouz, Tue, 06:49  ongoing  Ivo, Tue, 09:32  Ongoing  Chrsitian, Wed, 17:32  We are in favour of C1-202083 as it stands.  Ivo, Thu, 11:05  Nobody else has a problem, withdraws his comment  Amer, Friday  OK | |
|  |  | | [C1-202148](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202148.zip) | SMS timer extension for the MS using CP CioT 5GS optimization | | | NTT DOCOMO | CR 0066 24.011 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202265](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202265.zip) | Considerations for AML over SMS in roaming scenarios | | | Apple | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  Revision of C1-200606  Osama, Thu, 21:14  First we need SA1 requirements | |
|  |  | | [C1-202273](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202273.zip) | Remove invalid cases in error handling for TFT operation | | | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR 3214 24.008 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202274](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202274.zip) | Remove invalid cases in error handling for TFT operation in EPS | | | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR 3350 24.301 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202421](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202421.zip) | Definition of current PLMN and serving PLMN | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Amer | CR 3354 24.301 Rel-16 | Current Status Postponed  Frederic, Thu, 09:08  Clauses affected missing  Ivo, Thu, 13:45  Issues wih term “current PLMN”, requrests clarification  Sung, Tue, 22:16  comments | |
|  |  | | [C1-202467](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202467.zip) | WUS assistance for TAU | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 3356 24.301 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202512](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202512.zip) | Correction to Handling of T3321 timer | | | MediaTek Inc. | CR 3217 24.008 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | C1-202633 | Add handling for parameter set to “value is not used” in EPS | | | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR 3348 24.301 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202267  Lin, Thu, 03:22  Some change seems unacceptable  Osama, Thu, 04:43  Does ot agree  Lin suggests a NOTE  Ivo, Thu, 13:44  semantic of “release/version” is not clear, want to use solely “version”  Osama, Tue, 03:01  Goes with releases, provides rev  Ivo, OK co-sign | |
|  |  | | C1-202700 | RPDU transfer for 5GS using Control Plane CioT Optimization | | | NTT DOCOMO INC. | CR 0067 24.011 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202217  Kaj, Thu, 13:52  Don’t tick CN box, not CAT F  Maoki, Fri, 11:41  Acks | |
|  |  | | C1-202781 | Clarification on the UE behaviour when receiving T3448 | | | ZTE | CR 3351 24.301 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202334  Osama, Fri, 22:20  Number of comments  Lin, Sat, 12:12  Number of comments  Fei, Tue, 13:21  Rev  Osama, Tue, 17:08  Can live with the rev  Lin, Wed, 05:51  fine | |
|  |  | | C1-202685 | Reset of PLMN-specific attempt counter | | | MediaTek Inc. | CR 3364 24.301 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202511  Ivo, Wed, 12:39  Reason for change incorret  Ivo, Fr, 10:54  To Marko, JJ  If you confirm there is a problem and it will fixed in May meeting, then I am OK to agree the CR.  If you explain that I am wrong, then I am happy to agree the CR.  If there is no answer, the comment would imply postponing of the CR.  Marko, Fr, 11:00  Acks the problem, will bring a CR to May meeting    Ivo, Thu, 11:58  Reasons for change has issue, resetting counters seem strange  Osama, Thu, 19:26  On Counter reset during power OFF -> against established principles in LTE, ok to do something when USIM is removed  Sung, Thu, 21:56  Aligned with Osama, provides text  Lin, Fri, 04:59  Modifies the text from Sung | |
|  |  | | C1-202736 | Emergency PDN connection established after WUS negotiation | | | vivo | CR 3345 24.301 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202178  Lin, Fri, 03:56  Fine in principle, needs some changes, wants to co-sign  Yanchao, Fri, 11:22  Asking Lin  Lin, Sat, 11:48  Withdraws the earlier comment, wants co-sign  Amer, Sat, 15:20  T oYanchao: I see your point but I would prefer to not repeat clear mistakes. However, if you feel strongly about keeping the existing text, **I will not object.**  **Yanchao, Mon, 10:40**  Rev with Huawei as support  Lin, Mon, 16:32  fine  Amer, Wed, 07:07  Not happy, will not obect | |
|  |  | | C1-202686 | Correction to Handling of T3421 timer | | | MediaTek Inc. | CR 3365 24.301 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202513  Frederic, Thu, 09:08  Clauses affected missing  Osama, Thu, 19:36  Something wrong with case i) | |
|  |  | | C1-202830 | Allow lower layer to change RRC establishment cause during voice EPS fallback | | | Qualcomm Incorporated, Ericsson | CR 3316 24.301 Rel-16 | Current Status postponed  Lin, Fri, 10:03  Asking this to be postponed  Revision of C1-202269  Sung, Wed, 20:52  Fine  Lin, Thu, 09:52  Reduc the content  Osama, thu, discussing  Revision of C1ah-200048  Lin, Fri, 07:14  Has a problem with the Note  Osama, Fri, 07:24  Explaining when the use cas ein the note happens  Marko, Fri, 11:04  Seconds Lin  Osama, Fri, 17:14  Explaining  Lin, Tue, 03:58  commenting  Osama, Tue, 07:20  Asking whether he should beef up cover sheet  Osama, Tue,21:11  Looks for progress, needs preference on which way to go  Sung, Tue, 22:09  Prefers first option  Osama, Wed, 01:51  Rev  Lin, Wed, 05:23  Commenting  Osama, Wed, 07:01  Explaiing  Marko, Thu, 06:30  Perhaps a Note  Osama, Thu, 06:54  Not happy with late comment | |
|  |  | | C1-202850 | TA change during Authentication procedure in EMM-CONNECTED mode | | | Apple | CR 3347 24.301 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202263  Osama, Fri,07:58  should be POSTPONED  Lin Postponed  ------------------------------------  Lin, Fri, 07:18  Challenging the scenario  Osam<>Krisztian disc only shown on previous agenda  Lin, Tue, 03:46  CR not needed, covered  Osama, Tue, 03:51  I won’t object if you change the CRs to be NW only impacting CRs  Krisztian, Wed, 01:52  Explaining to Lin  Krisztian, Wed, 02:01  To Osama, this is serious concern, rev  sama, Wed, 02:39  Not convinced, should be discussed in SA3, LS to SA3 could be a way forward  Lin, Wed, 05:06  Not agreeing with Krisztian  Krisztian, Wed, 08:27  Ongoing  Krisztian, Wed, 08:33  To Osama, SA3 not needed  Osama, Wed, 20:22  Has issues  Krisztian, Thu, 07:09  Not agreeing with Osama  Lin, Thu, 09:29  Comments, if that are taken on board, he can live with it, 2850 requires rev | |
|  |  | | C1-202851 | TA change during Authentication procedure in 5GMM-CONNECTED mode | | | Apple | CR 2092 24.501 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202264  Osama, Fri,07:58  should be POSTPONED  Lin, Postponed  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lin, Fri, 07:18  Challenging the scenario  Osam<>Krisztian disc only shown on previous agenda  Lin, Tue, 03:46  CR not needed, covered  Osama, Tue, 03:51  I won’t object if you change the CRs to be NW only impacting CRs  Krisztian, Wed, 01:52  Explaining to Lin  Krisztian, Wed, 02:01  To Osama, this is serious concern, rev  sama, Wed, 02:39  Not convinced, should be discussed in SA3, LS to SA3 could be a way forward  Lin, Wed, 05:06  Not agreeing with Krisztian  Krisztian, Wed, 08:27  Ongoing  Krisztian, Wed, 08:33  To Osama, SA3 not needed  Osama, Wed, 20:22  Has issues  Krisztian, Thu, 07:09  Not agreeing with Osama  Lin, Thu, 09:29  Comments, if that are taken on board, he can live with it  Lin, Thu, 09:29  Comments, if that are taken on board, he can live with it, 2851 requires rev | |
|  |  | | C1-202691 | Correction to handling of T3447 timer | | | MediaTek Inc. | CR 3370 24.301 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202520  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Frederic, Thu, 09:08  Clauses affected missing  Kaj, Thu, 13:57  1st change, we prefer to keep it on a NAS level  Lin, Fri, 05:08  Don’t touch bullet 1, not force MME to look into RRC cause in a NAS procedure  Sung, Tue, 22:01  Prefers wording from Lin  Marko, Wed, 13:04  Ok to change wording  Kaj, Wed, 16:07  Questions  Marko, wed, 16:34  Not convinced by last kaj proposal  Lin, thu 11:02  Prefers simpler one | |
|  |  | | C1-202906 | Clarification for the use of enhanced coverage in EPS | | | Samsung, Huawei, HiSilicon, InterDigital | CR 3339 24.301 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202645  Amer: OK  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-202088  Osama, Sat, 02:49  Some questions  Mahmoud, Mon, 23:10  Asking for specific comments  Osama, Mon, 23:36  Hinting at discussion of C1-202077  Mahmoud, Tue, 06:37  Will revise this doc, asking for specific comments  Amer, Wed,  comments  Mahmoud, Thu, 06:28  Takes amer on board | |
|  |  | | C1-202822 | New AT command for linking packet filters +CGLNKPF | | | MediaTek Inc. / JJ | CR 0687 27.007 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202539  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Frederic, Thu, 13:02  Incorrect tdoc template, wrong tdoc number on the cover page  JJ, Fri, 15:04  Acks the cover sheet problem  Atle, Mon, 13:40  Comments  JJ, Mon, 14:13  Providing a rev  JJ, Mon, 17:17  New rev  Atle, Tue, 00:32  fine | |
|  |  | | C1-202804 | Correction on retry restriction for ESM#66 | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 3363 24.301 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202484  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Osamah, Thu, 21.19  Proposed deletion is not correct and discussion in the cover sheet is not correct either  Lin, Tue, 12:14  Does not agree with Osama  Osama, Tue, 16:43  Not agreeing  Lin, Wed, 11:15  Defending  Osama, Wed, 20:58  FINE with the CR | |
|  |  | | C1-202798 | Retry restriction for NB-IoT UEs due to out of tariff package | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 3357 24.301 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202468  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Osamah, Thu, 18:58  Untick UE box  Lin, Fri, 11:01  Acks  Lin, thi 04:07  Rev | |
|  |  | | C1-202797 | WUS assistance for emergency | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | CR 3355 24.301 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202466  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Lin, Tue, 10:25  Provides a rev to cover discusson of the 5G cr | |
|  |  | | C1-202823 | New AT command for deleting packet filters +CGDELPF | | | MediaTek Inc. / JJ | CR 0688 27.007 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202540  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Frederic, Thu, 13:02  Incorrect tdoc template, wrong tdoc number on the cover page  JJ, Fri, 15:04  Acks the cover sheet problem  Atle, Mon, 13:40  comments  JJ, Mon, 17:22  New rev  Atle, Tue, 01:02  More questions  JJ, Tue, 10:37  Rev  Atle, Tue, 14:24  fine | |
|  |  | | C1-202681 | NAS Message Container 2 for LPP/LCS messages | | | MediaTek Inc., Qualcomm Incorporated | CR 3308 24.301 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-202502  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-198902  Kaj, Thu, 14:11  Not in favour to add this for EPS  Lin, Fri, 04:47  in principle, we also do not support to have it in legacy EPS  Marko, Tue, 09:44  There is a requirement in stage-2  Lin, Wed, 10:14  Comments  Marko, Wed, 16:40  Fine with lin comment  Kaj, Wed, 17:42  NOT ok  Lin, Thu, 10:58  Should not do this | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Wis for IMS | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  |  | |
|  | MCCI\_CT | |  |  | | |  |  | Mission Critical Communication Interworking with Land Mobile Radio Systems  100% | |
|  |  | | [C1-202610](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202610.zip) | Editorial corrections | | | Sepura Ltd, Hytera Communications Corp | CR 0001 29.582 Rel-16 | **Revision of C1-202286**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen (Thu 19:48):**  Tick the CN box.  **Kit (Tue 16:54), Jörgen (Tue 17:11)** Done, no further comments | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | MCProtoc16 | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | Protocol enhancements for Mission Critical Services for Rel-16  100% | |
|  |  | | [C1-202555](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202555.zip) | Corrections to step reference in terminating controlling function | | | Samsung | CR 0560 24.379 Rel-16 | **Mike (Fri 22:44):** OK | |
|  |  | | [C1-202556](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202556.zip) | Corrections to step reference in create a group regroup using preconfigured group | | | Samsung | CR 0561 24.379 Rel-16 | **Mike (Fri 22:44):** OK | |
|  |  | | [C1-202557](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202557.zip) | Corrected the client origination procedure subclause text of 11.1.6.2.1.1 | | | Samsung | CR 0562 24.379 Rel-16 | **Mike (Fri 22:44):** OK | |
|  |  | | [C1-202558](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202558.zip) | Allow an emergency and immenit peril calls during max simultaneous sessions | | | Samsung | CR 0563 24.379 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202630](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202630.zip) | Check regroup ID | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0553 24.379 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202220 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202631](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202631.zip) | Clarification of 11.1.6.2.1.2 | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0554 24.379 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202221 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202632](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202632.zip) | Update affiliation definition to support preconfigured regroups | | | FirstNet / Mike | CR 0555 24.379 Rel-16 | **Revision of C1-202222**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen (Thu 21:03): U**nclear definition.  **Mike (Thu 23:12), Francois (Fri 12:00), Mike (Fri 15:54), Francois (Fri 17:10), Kiran (Fri (17:40):**  Discussion on affiliation definition.  **Mike (Fri 19:08)**  **Jörgen (Sat 18:44)**  Conclusion seems to be that simplified definition is to be provided by Mike.  **Francois (Tue 12:16):** Fine with the revision | |
|  |  | | [C1-202656](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202656.zip) | Check for MCPTT ID bindng and validity period of existing binding | | | Samsung | CR 0557 24.379 Rel-16 | **Revision of C1-202552**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Francois (Fri 12:44):** Some missing steps  **Kiran (Fri 13:47):** Acknowledges.  **Kiran (Tue 09:23), Francois (Tue 12:22):** revision in drafts folder, Francois agree. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202657](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202657.zip) | Corrections to location sharing during call setup | | | Samsung | CR 0558 24.379 Rel-16 | **Revision of C1-202553**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen (Thu 21:12):**  Some editorials and styles guidelines.  **Kiran (Fri 10:55):** Checking understanding.  **Jörgen (Sun 15:43), Kiran (Mon 11:15), Mike (Mon: 15:07), Kiran (Mon 15:18), Jörgen (Mon 17:10):** Seems to have converged on the wording.  **Kiran (Tue 09:23):** revision in drafts folder | |
|  |  | | [C1-202658](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202658.zip) | Corrections to current talker location in ambient call | | | Samsung | CR 0559 24.379 Rel-16 | **Revision of C1-202554**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen (Thu 21:16):** Is note same as bullet b). Some editorial.  **Kiran (Fri 11:23):** Checking understanding  **Mike (Fri 16:28):** Further comment.  **Jörgen (Mon 15:03), Kiran (Mon 15:03):** Seems converging on the wording. Further comments awaited.  **Kiran (Tue 09:25):** revision in drafts folder | |
|  |  | | C1-202659 | Authentication of the MIKEY-SAKKE I\_Message validation in pre-established session | | | Samsung | CR 0230 24.380 Rel-16 | **Postponed**  **Revision of C1-202559**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen (Thu 21:19):** Should Reason Code field be updated instead?  **Kiran (Fri 11:41):** Prefer Warning text.  **Jörgen (Sun 16:11):** Not convinced, not clear which text to insert.  **Kiran (Mon 13:21):** Text messages and the mechanism exist.  **Mike (Mon 15:37):** Text is likely of minor value, but should continue to use it unless good reason.  **Kiran (Tue 09:35):** revision in drafts folder.  **Jörgen (Tue 17:04)**, Still not convinced, should be Cat B, which code to provide is no specific enough.  **Francois (Tue 17:24):** Agree to not use text from 24.379. Prefer reason code. Why warning added to Disconnect message, it is not used. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202660](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202660.zip) | Talker location sharing in remote ambient call | | | Samsung | CR 0231 24.380 Rel-16 | **Revision of C1-202560**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen (Thu 21:21):** Some clarifications needed.  **Kiran (Fri 12:36):** Checking understanding.  **Jörgen (Sun 16:37), Kiran (Mon 13:53):**  Seems converging, await further comments before revising.  **Kiran (Tue 09:40):** revision in drafts folder.  **Jörgen (Tue 18:15),** remaining editorial  **Kiran (Wed 09:30)** Ack, will be fixed.  Seems to have converged. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202834](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202834.zip) | Authorisation validation for first-to-answer call origination requesting user using pre-established session | | | Samsung | CR 0556 24.379 Rel-16 | **Revision of C1-202655**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Revision of C1-202551**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Francois (Fri 12:29, 17:15), Kiran (Fri 13:14):**  Discussion if this should be done in other places.  **Jörgen (Thu 21:10):** Validation misplaced  **Kiran (Fri 08:39):** Ack, and proposes alternatives  **Mike (Fri 16:23):** States a preference  **Jörgen (Sun 17:44), Mike (Mon 05:49), Kiran Mon (08:42):** Different text proposals. Seems to have converged.  **Kiran (Tue 09:10), Francois (Tue 12:19), Jörgen (Tue 13:11):** revision in drafts folder. Francois and Jörgen are fine.  **Mike Tue and Kiran** **Wed** agree on a further editorial | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | MuD | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | Multi-device and multi-identity  100% | |
|  |  | | [C1-202494](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202494.zip) | Text for empty headings | | | Ericsson /Jörgen | CR 0001 24.174 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202586](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202586.zip) | Reference update for PASSporT Extension for Diverted Calls | | | Orange / Mariusz | CR 0002 24.174 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | IMSProtoc16 | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | IMS Stage-3 IETF Protocol Alignment for Rel-16  100% | |
|  |  | | [C1-202167](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202167.zip) | Adding the definition and criteria for availability of IMS Data Services | | | MediaTek Inc., Apple | CR 6415 24.229 Rel-16 | **Postponed**  **Based on authors request, friday**  **Frederic (Thursday 13:13):**  Styles corrupted, mark which clauses are new, remove and in bullet 1) and 2) of B.3.1.2B and U.3.1.2B.  **Simon (Thu 18:03):**  Not needed. References previous discussions. **See the mail.**  **Jörgen (Thu 21:33):**  Indicate dependency to NAS contribution.  Data off might need stage 1, some other details.  **Rohit (Fri 06:17, 07:38):**  Useful for RCS, data should be separated from voice.  Will indicate dependency and fix issues in update. Can stage 1 be added later?  **Takayuki (Fri 09:22):**  Is IMS data services defined somewhere?  **Bill (Sat 8:53):** See no need.  **Rohit (Mon 03:12):** Further motivations why this is necessary.  **Simon (Mon 19:00), Rohit (Tue 11:30):**  Further discussion and no conclusion yet.  **Simon (Wed 05:40), Rohit (Wed 11:33), Yoshihiro (Wed 12:49):** No convergence between Simon and Rohit. Yoshir asking about stage1/stage2 requirements. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | MCSMI\_CT | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | Mission Critical system migration and interconnection | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | eMCData2 | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | CT aspects of Enhancements to Functional architecture and information flows for Mission Critical Data | |
|  |  | | [C1-202637](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202637.zip) | Deposit an object | | | AT&T | CR 0118 24.282 Rel-16 | **Revision of C1-202023**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Frederic (Thu 14:23):**  Cover sheet issues:  - Wrong rev counter: should have been ‘-‘. This also applies to several CRs of this set: C1-202024, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030  **Jörgen (Fri 15:43):** Some editorials, question on configuration.  **Shahram (Fri 16:48, Fri 17:34):** Responses  **Shahram (Sat 05:35):** Typo in previous mail  **Jörgen (Sun 16:53):** Any MO in 24.483?  **Shahram (Mon 09:22):** This is the server that is configured. Should MO clauses reference RCC.14?  **Jörgen (Mon 19:01):** Clarification of previous comments.  **Shahram (Tue 09:26):**  [[draft] C1-202637 was C1-202023.docx](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/inbox/drafts/%5Bdraft%5D%20C1-202637%20was%20C1-202023.docx) is now available in inbox/drafts. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202640](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202640.zip) | Create a subscription to notifications | | | AT&T | CR 0119 24.282 Rel-16 | **Revision of C1-202024**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen (Mon 11:43):** Bullets 1) and 2 should be merged.  **Shahram (Tue 09:27):**  [[draft] C1-202640 was C1-202024.docx](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/inbox/drafts/%5Bdraft%5D%20C1-202640%20was%20C1-202024.docx)  is now available in inbox/drafts. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202641](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202641.zip) | Delete a subscription to notifications | | | AT&T | CR 0120 24.282 Rel-16 | **Revision of C1-202025**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Shahram (Tue 09:28):**  [[draft] C1-202641 was C1-202025.docx](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/inbox/drafts/%5Bdraft%5D%20C1-202641%20was%20C1-202025.docx)  is now available in inbox/drafts. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202643](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202643.zip) | Update a subscription to notifications | | | AT&T | CR 0121 24.282 Rel-16 | **Revision of C1-202026**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen (Mon 11:45):** and/or in first bullet to be avoided.  **Shahram (Mon 12:35):** Text proposed.  **Shahram (Tue 09:28):**  [[draft] C1-202643 was C1-202026.docx](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/inbox/drafts/%5Bdraft%5D%20C1-202643%20was%20C1-202026.docx)  is now available in inbox/drafts. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202646](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202646.zip) | Synchronization notification | | | AT&T | CR 0122 24.282 Rel-16 | **Revision of C1-202027**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Frederic (Thu 14:26):**  Some comments:  - As already indicated, wrong rev counter on cover sheet  - Discrepancy between clauses affected, which specify 21.2.16 and the actual changes, which use .X  - No need to number the new note  **Shahram (Fri 19:26), Jörgen (Sun 17:13), Shahram (Mon 10:15), Jörgen (11:15):** Some further discussion of style in text.  **Shahram (Tue 09:29):**  [[draft] C1-202646 was C1-202027.docx](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/inbox/drafts/%5Bdraft%5D%20C1-202646%20was%20C1-202027.docx)  is now available in inbox/drafts. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202647](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202647.zip) | Search-based Synchronization | | | AT&T | CR 0123 24.282 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202028  **Jörgen (Mon 12:58):** Two minor editorials: There are curly quotes and recepectivelyrespectively.  **Shahram (Tue 09:29):**  [[draft] C1-202647 was C1-202028.docx](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/inbox/drafts/%5Bdraft%5D%20C1-202647%20was%20C1-202028.docx)  is now available in inbox/drafts. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202649](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202649.zip) | List folder | | | AT&T | CR 0124 24.282 Rel-16 | **Revision of C1-202029**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Shahram (Tue 09:30):**  [[draft] C1-202649 was C1-202029.docx](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/inbox/drafts/%5Bdraft%5D%20C1-202649%20was%20C1-202029.docx) is now available in inbox/drafts. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202677](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202677.zip) | Typo fixes | | | AT&T | CR 0125 24.282 Rel-16 | **Revision of C1-202030**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Frederic (Thu 14:17):**  Cover sheet issues:  - Wrong rev counter: should have been ‘-‘  - Source to TSG should be C1. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202750](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202750.zip) | Configuration of resource priority for MCData emergency | | | AT&T / Val | CR 0137 24.484 Rel-16 | **Revision of C1-202386**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Kiran (Thu 12:25):**  1) New elements shall be added to AddExt elements.  2) The schema shouldn't be changed in my understanding.  3) Update the MCPTT reference with MCData as it is for MCData service.  **Val (Sun 04:21, Sun 20:59):** draft rev1 C1-202386 available in drafts folder.  **Mike (Mon 18:20), Kiran (Tue 16:42):** Fine with the revision. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202751](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202751.zip) | Auxiliary procedures in support of Emergency Alerts for MCData | | | AT&T / Val | CR 0130 24.282 Rel-16 | **Revision of C1-202288**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Kiran (Thu 12:25):**  The subclause 6.3.7.1.1 shall be added once we include the emergency flows for the MCData sub functionalities such as SDS and FD. As both the sub-services has session and non-session based flows and requires careful considerations.  **Val (Sun 06:36, Mon 08:42):** Editor's note added, draft\_rev1\_C1-202288\_24282CR130\_AuxProcEmrgAlrt\_MCData.doc in draft folder.  **Kiran (Tue 15:33):** Fine with revision. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202754](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202754.zip) | Handling of MCData Emergency Alerts at the MCData controlling server | | | AT&T / Val | CR 0129 24.282 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202287  **Kiran (Thu 12:45):**  The 'emergency-ind' handling procedures may be added later once we bring the communication related procedures.  - In subclause 16.2.3.2, Which covers the indication 'emergency-ind' shall be removed. We should cover only for the emergency alert functionalities as per the CR.  **Val (Sun 06:25, Mon 07:55):** Prefer keeping the functions, will add editor's notes, uploaded draft\_rev1\_C1-202287\_24282CR129\_EmrgAlrt\_MCData\_cntrlingSrvr.doc to drafts folder.  **Kiran (Tue 15:42):** Fine with revision. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202755](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202755.zip) | Handling of MCData Emergency Alerts at the MCData participating servers | | | AT&T / Val | CR 0128 24.282 Rel-16 | **Revision of C1-202281**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Kiran (Thu 12:45):**  The 'emergency-ind' handling procedures may be added later once we bring the communication related procedures.  In subclause 16.2.2.2, The step 1) which covers the indication 'emergency-ind' shall be removed. We should cover only for the emergency alert functionalities as per the CR.  **Francois (Fri 15:04, 17:21), Mike (16:15):** Further discussion on applicability of the note.  **Val (Sun 02:38, Sun 06:20, Mon 06:46):**  Some responses, and draft\_rev1\_C1-202281\_24282CR128\_EmrgAlrt\_MCData\_participSrvr.doc uploaded in the drafts folder.  **Francois Tue (12:24), Kiran (14:08, 15:45):** Fine with the revision | |
|  |  | | [C1-202761](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202761.zip) | Emergency Alerts for MCData – client procedures | | | AT&T / Val | CR 0127 24.282 Rel-16 | **Revision of C1-202262**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Kiran (Thu 12:44):**  1) The 'emergency-ind' and 'MCData emergency group communication state' handling procedures may be added later once we bring the communication related procedures.  2) The steps 2) c), 3) and 4) in subclause 16.2.1.3, shall not be included as there are no relevant procedures are available. As per the CR, we should cover only for the emergency alert functionalities.  3) In subclause 6.2.1.1, the indication 'emergency-ind' shall be removed from the description.  **Val (Sun 04:40, Mon (06:12):** Response to Kiran's points. Will use editor's notes. Uploaded draft\_rev1\_C1-202262\_24282CR127\_EmrgAlrt\_MCData\_client.doc in the drafts folder  **Val (Tue 09:33), Kiran (Tue 14:07, Tue 15:32):**  Rev 2 of draft, Kiran OK with way forward and rev 2. Draft: draft\_rev2\_Obsoletes\_rev1\_C1-202262\_24282CR127\_EmrgAlrt\_MCData\_client.doc | |
|  |  | | [C1-202771](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202771.zip) | Support for MCData emergency alert and communications | | | AT&T / Val | CR 0126 24.282 Rel-16 | **Revision of C1-202260**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Kiran (Thu 12:27):**  Some thoughts on this CR, and mostly apply to similar CRs:  We should cover for the emergency alert functionalities as of today as we have other supporting CRs for the emergency alert functionalities. The subclause related to communication shall be added once we include the emergency flows for the MCData sub functionalities such as SDS and FD. As both the sub-services has session and non-session based flows and requires careful considerations.  **Val (Sun 04:28, Sun 22:15):** Response to Kirans comment, draft uploaded in drafts folder.  **Jörgen (Mon 13:24):** Align affiliation with Mike's 2222, schema not BW compatible.  **Mike (Mon 18:28), Val (Tue 09:10), KiranTue (13:58, 15:32):** Common understanding of definition and adding Editor's Notes.  **Abhishek (Tue 18:58):** Define MCData emergency alert and MCData emergency communication. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202794](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202794.zip) | Fix minor issues in MCData pre-etsblished session | | | Samsung / Sapan | CR 0131 24.282 Rel-16 | **Revision of C1-202452**  **Sapan (Mon 20:44):** Offline comments to improve cover sheet. Draft revision in:  <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/inbox/drafts/C1-202452_eMCData2_Minor_Fixes_in_Pre-established_session_draft_rev_v1.zip> | |
|  |  | | [C1-202835](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202835.zip) | Corrections to file upload-download procedure as per stage 2 architecture changes | | | Samsung | CR 0133 24.282 Rel-16 | **Revision of C1-202654**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Revision of C1-202550**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Kiran (Tue 09:51):**  draft available with CR# in EN.  **Jörgen (Tue 11:25), Kit (Tue 11:42):** Is the granularity of MCData client structure needed?  **Kiran (Tue 17:18):** It is more exact and is used in other places. Prefer to agree and come back with new CR if needed.  **Mike (Wed 17:02), Kiran (Wed 17:48):** Further discussion on client terminology. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | E2E\_DELAY (CT4) | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | CT Aspects of Media Handling for RAN Delay Budget Reporting in MTSI  100% | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | VBCLTE (CT3 lead) | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | Volume Based Charging Aspects for VoLTE CT | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | ISAT-MO-WITHDRAW | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | Withdrawal of TS 24.323 from Rel-11, Rel-12, Rel-13  No CRs needed, listed for the sake of completeness  100% | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | MONASTERY2 | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | Mobile Communication System for Railways Phase 2 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202566](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202566.zip) | Work plan for the CT1 part of MONASTERY2 | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | discussion Rel-16 | Noted | |
|  |  | | [C1-202567](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202567.zip) | Sub/Notify FA resolution analysis | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | discussion Rel-16 | **Noted**  **Francois (Fri 16:40):**  Disagrees with comments on cons with SUBSCRIBE/NOTIFY. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202569](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202569.zip) | Update service configuration to support limiting the number of authorized clients per MCPTT user | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0139 24.484 Rel-16 | **Postponed**  **Kirin (Thursday 11:09):**  Harmonize the wordings from stage 2 to avoid the confusion. For e.g 'if the number of simultaneous service authorizations for that MCPTT user "  **Francois (Fri 17:00):**  Should be user profile?  **Lazaros (Tue 13:22)**, **Francois (13:50), Kiran (16:27), Lazaros (17:26), Francois (17:54):**  Kiran fine with handling of his comments. Francois wants LS to SA1 (ccSA6) to ask if a parameter is in service configuration or user profile.  LS proposed to be sent to SA1, cc SA6. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202883](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202883.zip) | IPConnectivity extension to include IP Information | | | Kontron Transportation France | CR 0067 24.483 Rel-16 | **Revision of C1-202496**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen (Fri 18:38):** Nodenode in the table cells. Leaf nodes should have a format other than "node"  Peter B (Tue 09:56): uploaded revision, also off-line comments:  <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/inbox/drafts/C1-202496-24483-CR0067%20IP%20Connectivity%20Extension%20to%20include%20IP%20Information-rev1.docx>  **Jörgen (17:15):** Minor editorial Nodenode in the table cells. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202884](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202884.zip) | IPConnectivity extension to include IP Information | | | Kontron Transportation France | CR 0138 24.484 Rel-16 | **Revision of C1-202497**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Kiran (Thursday 11:30):**  -The section 10.3.2.3, the type="IPInformationListEntryType" should be appended with 'mcdataup:' Result: type="mcdataup:IPInformationListEntryType"  -The structure in 10.3.2.1 should expand the IPInformation element with all the sub-elements.  **Pedro (Thu 18:51)**  **Francois (Friday 15:57)**  **Jörgen (Fri 16:33):**  Further comments, see the mails. Pedro will help Peter in revising.  **Peter (Tue 10:01):** draft uploaded  **Francois (Tue 12:02):** Minor typo  **Kiran (Tue 16:21):** Seems fine, MinOccurs and MaxOccurs can be harmonized  **Jörgen (Tue 17:27):** Minor editorial, or can be comma. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202885](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202885.zip) | IPConnectivity extension to include IP Information | | | Kontron Transportation France | CR 0132 24.282 Rel-16 | **Revision of C1-202498**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Kiran (Thursday 11:31):**  1) Cover page: Reason for change: Needs re-wording as it doesn't provide the information of using pre-defined IP information of the user from user profile configuration can be used for IP connectivity.  2) The proposed text can be re-worded by removing 'Depending on implementation' from the beginning of text and retaining the remaining portion of the text.  3) It's not clear whether the IP information is used in the INVITE request while setting up or determine the MC ID based on the IP information present in the user configuration by comparing with IP connectivity resolved to target.  **Jörgen (Fri 16:42):**  Some further questions  **Peter (Tue 10:01):** draft uploaded  **Kiran (Tue 16:05): Change back to 24.484**  **Peter (Tue 17:23), Jörgen (Tue 17:47):** OK to change back.  **Peter (Tue 20:49)** will use 24.484. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202905](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202905.zip) | Resolution of called functional alias in first-to-answer calls | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR 0564 24.379 Rel-16 | **Postponed**  **Revision of C1-202568**  **Francois: reservation**  **Dom: reservation**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Kiran (Thursday 11:09):**  - In subclause 11.1.1.4.2, step 12) a) can be reworded from "by generating a SIP INVITE request as specified in subclause 9A.2.2.2.x;"  to "by performing actions as specified in subclause 9A.2.2.2.x;".  - In subclause 9A.2.2.2.x, There is no end quote for 'Upon receipt of a "'.  - In subclause 9A.2.2.2.x, the heading can be reworded from "Functional alias resolution from MCPTT server owning functional alias procedure" to either "Sending functional alias resolution request towards MCPTT server owning the functional alias procedure" or "Receiving functional alias resolution request from MCPTT client procedure".  - In subclause 9A.2.2.3.x, the heading can be reworded from "Functional alias resolution procedure" to "Receiving functional alias resolution request procedure".  - In subclause 9A.2.2.2.x, the new INVITE request has been generated and sent to the MCPTT server owning the Functional alias, on receiving the response there is no procedure defined to respond back to the request which is received.  - In subclause 11.1.1.4.2, step 12) b) can be reworded based on above point and shouldn't refer to 9A.2.2.3.x. Shall refer to same entity handling request and response  - In subclause 9A.2.2.3.x, step 2) a) and b) of the response will have duplicate copy of data. We need to somehow manage to have one copy of data.  **Francois (Fri 16:53):**  Security issues with MCPTT ID, <mcptt-request-uri> element does not support a list. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | eIMS5G\_SBA | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | CT aspects of SBA interactions between IMS and 5GC | |
|  |  | | [C1-202066](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202066.zip) | No impact from SBA on main body | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, Ericsson | CR 6408 24.229 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-200353 | |
|  |  | | C1-202675 | Support scenario where the SCC AS sends a request to the HSS to retrieve the SRVCC data for the UE | | | BlackBerry UK Ltd. | CR 1299 24.237 Rel-16 | Merged into C1-202837 and its revisions  **Revision of C1-202099**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Ivo (Thursday 13:47):**- the 5G SRVCC should be indicated using "ue5GSrvccCapability".  - UDM is unaware of UE's capability for SRVCC from E-UTRAN to GERAN/UTRAN  as the UE only indicates this capability in EPS.  **John-Luc (Thursday 17:45):** Whether or not the UDM knows this capability is not relevant in this CR.  Please note that Nhss\_imsSubscriberDataManagement Service API is between the SCC AS and HSS, per subclause 4.1 of 29.562.  TS 29.526 actually specifies an attribute by the name “ueSrvccCapabilities”, which is an array of capabilities  **Ivo (Friday 14:44):**  the comments still stand:  - UDM is unaware of UE's capability for SRVCC from E-UTRAN to GERAN/UTRAN  as the UE only indicates this capability in EPS.  **John-Luc (Friday 14:47):**  How does the comment apply to the CR?  The behavior specified in the CR is based on informati0on received from the HSS, not from the UDM.  **Ivo (Tue 01:10, 11:15), John-Luc (Tue 02:03, 16:16):** Continued discussion. After todays conf call now discussion on merging. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | enh2MCPTT-CT | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | Enhancements for Mission Critical Push-to-Talk CT aspects  100% | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | eIMSVideo | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | Video enhancement of IMS CAT/CRS/announcement services | |
|  |  | | [C1-202817](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202817.zip) | Restrictions of providing video announcement | | | China Telecom,Huawei,China Unicom,HiSilicon / Michelle | CR 0076 24.628 Rel-16 | **Revision of C1-202356**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Yoshihiro (Mon 16:17):** This is too restrictive. Proposes a Note.  **Jörgen (Mon 22:59):** Is this a real or theoretical problem?  **Michelle (Tue 08:10), Jörgen (Tue 14:00), Helen (14:34), Jörgen (16:15), Michelle (Tue 16:15):** Some further discussion. Note proposal by Jörgen  **Yoshihiro (Tue 16:29):** Fine with Jörgen's text. | |
|  |  | | [C1-202863](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202863.zip) | Use preconditions for CRS when terminating UE supports precondition | | | Huawei,China Telecom,China Unicom,HiSilicon /Hongxia | CR 0063 24.183 Rel-16 | **Revision of C1-202605**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Revision of C1-202156**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Simon (Thu 18:32):**  Statement that UE indicates Support for precondition in 18x without receiving support indication in INVITE breaks 24.229.  **Jörgen (Thu 21:56):**  Agree on the 18x issue, somewhat problematic to offer new media in UPDATE as the user cannot indicate consent and resources most likely not available.  **Helen (Fri 11:51):**  Don't want to add precondition in INVITE. Can AS use precondition anyway based on local policy?  **Simon (Sat 00:36)** Not possible according to 24.229.  **Helen (Sat 11:38), Jörgen (Sun 23:05), Simon (Mon 05:13), Helen (Mon 05:17):** Some further description on principles. Seems to start converging.  **Simon (Mon 20:17), Jörgen (Mon23:13), Helen (Tue 04:25):** Some comments on precondition to term side, new draft uploaded:  [draft 2605](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/inbox/drafts/C1-202605%5Bdraft%5D%20revision%20of%20C1-202156%20Use%20preconditions%20for%20CRS%20when%20terminating%20UE%20supports%20precondition%20-%20r3.docx)  Jörgen (Tue 15:04): Answers to questions | |
|  |  | | [C1-202891](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202891.zip) | Use preconditions for CAT when originating UE supports precondition | | | Huawei,China Telecom,China Unicom,HiSilicon /Hongxia | CR 0119 24.182 Rel-16 | **Revision of C1-202604**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Revision of C1-202155**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Jörgen (Thu 21:46) NOTE: No Tdocnumber in Subject line:**  Text needs more work, some wording proposals.  **Helen (Fri 10:54):** Agree to some comments, som responses on others.  **Yoshihiro (Fri 16:47):**  The change from "the originating UE requires" to "if the AS sends an 18x…" seems to change the meaning  **Helen (Sat 04:18), Yoshihiro (Mon 16:02):**  Continued discussion. One of the issues is how optional use of preconditions is for CAT media if preconditions is negotiated end to end.  **Jörgen (Mon 23:48):** Issues with current text.  **Hiroshi: (Tue 04:10):** issuse with can or may, partly cover sheet.  **Helen: Tue 11:29):** checking wording of one paragraph. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Other Rel-16 IMS & MC issues | |  | Jörgen – Breakout | | |  |  | Other Rel-16 IMS topics | |
|  |  | | [C1-202072](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202072.zip) | Correction in CRS interactions with CDIV | | | Orange / Mariusz | CR 0062 24.183 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202080](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202080.zip) | UE must not render local tones in case of call is being forwarded or call is queued | | | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR 0075 24.628 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202081](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202081.zip) | NG eCall support over NR connected to the 5GC | | | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR 6414 24.229 Rel-16 |  | |
|  |  | | [C1-202132](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202132.zip) | Discussion on SRVCC from E-UTRAN to GERAN/UTRAN when IMS voice call is initiated in 5GS | | | Ericsson / Ivo | discussion Rel-16 | Noted  Revision of C1-200940 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202759](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202759.zip) | Correction in IMS\_Registration\_handling policy about how UE should deregister | | | MediaTek Inc. | CR 6404  24.229 Rel-16 | C1-202090 was proived on time and has been reviewed. C1-202590 was revised before submission and not provided. This document is considered a revision of C1-202090.  Revision of C1-202590  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Not provided on time  Revision of C1-202090  Revision of C1-199028 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202837](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202837.zip) | SRVCC from E-UTRAN to GERAN/UTRAN when IMS voice call is initiated in 5GS | | | Ericsson / Ivo | CR 1298 24.237 Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202133  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-200941  Alternative to C1-202094 – C1-202097  **John-Luc (Thu 19:32):**  Overlap with C1-202099, may need changes.  Several comments, see the mail:  -misuse of g.3gpp.accesstype  -no rel-15 support  -diverges from Rel-10 principles  -missing use case at SCC AS  -a condition in D.3.3 is included but not defined.  **Ivo (Fri 14:39):**  General disagreement with John-Luc. **The reader is referred to the mail, this margin is too small.**  **John-Luc (Fri 22:50), Ivo (Mon 10:14), John-Luc (Mon 15:06).** Further comments on the conditions, still clash with C1-202099.  Latest draft revision in <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG1_mm-cc-sm_ex-CN1/TSGC1_123e/inbox/drafts/C1-20iaea-was-C1-202133-was-C1-200941-was-C1-200674-v01.zip> | |
|  |  | | [C1-202887](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202887.zip) | Correction on rendering local tones | | | Ericsson /Jörgen | CR 0077 24.628 Rel-16 | Postponed  Revision of C1-202500 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202917](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202917.zip) | Editorial clean-up | | | Ericsson /Jörgen | CR 0064 24.183 Rel-16 | **Revision of C1-202785**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Revision of C1-202488**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Helen (Thu 13:54):** Why not use GW model for CRS?  "The media types can be…": With this change, it seems not cover audio CRS in video call.  4.3.1.2 and 4.3.1.3: The network needs to support AS actions, so different requirements.  maybe there is a typo in the change of 4.3.1.3, “originating” should be ” terminating”  **Mariusz (Thu 14:27):** 4.5.5.3.6: Remove comment, insert space in are-INVITE.  **Jörgen (Thu 22:15):**  Agree with Mariusz. Response to Helen.  **Helen (Fri 22:15)**  **Jörgen (FriI (17:29):**  Ongoing discussion, mainly of the applicability of gateway model towards terminating user.  **Helen (Sat 11:56), Jörgen (Sun 23:16), Helen (Mon 05:07), Rohit (Mon 05:27):** Further discussion on terminology, clarifying viewpoints. | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Release 17  work items | | Tdoc | **NOT PART OF THIS MEETING** | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Output Liaison Statements | | Tdoc | Title | | | Prepared by | To/CC | Result & comment | |
|  |  | | [C1-202012](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202012.zip) | Reply LS on Manual CAG ID selection and granularity of UAC parameters for PNI-NPNs | | | Ericsson / Ivo | LS out Rel-16 | Withdrawn  Reply to incoming LS in C1-202045  Lena, Mon, 00:23  1.1, 1.2,2.1,2.2 OK, 1.3 NOT ok | |
|  |  | | [C1-202103](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202103.zip) | Reply LS on Manual CAG ID selection and granularity of UAC parameters for PNI-NPNs | | | Qualcomm Incorporated / Lena | LS out Rel-16 | Merged into C1-202240  Chairman, based on confcall#1  Reply to incoming LS in C1-202045  Ivo, Thu, 13:49  Answer to Q 1.3 not OK | |
|  |  | | [C1-202151](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202151.zip) | LS on subscribe/notify for 5G Steering of Roaming | | | DOCOMO Communications Lab. | LS out Rel-16 | Merged into C1-202067  Chairman, based on conf call  Reply to incoming LS in C1-202041  Ivo, Thu, 13:51  Prefers mechanism as in C1-202069, hence, prefers LS in C1-202067  Ivo, Mon, 12:37  commenting | |
|  |  | | [C1-202180](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202180.zip) | [draft] Reply LS on Manual CAG ID selection and granularity of UAC parameters for PNI-NPNs | | | vivo | LS out Rel-16 | Merged into C1-202240  Chairman, based on confcall#1  Reply to incoming LS in C1-202045  Ivo, Thu, 13:52   * 1. to be provided by SA2, 1.2 inonsitent, 1.3 not OK   Lena, Mon, 00:27   * 1. outside CT1, disagrees wih 1.2, 1.3 and 2.2 OK   Yanchao, Mon, 11:58  Asking for info from Lena | |
|  |  | | [C1-202204](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202204.zip) | LS on PWS Test Flag | | | one2many B.V. | LS out Rel-16 | Postponed  We have not seen the incoming LS | |
|  |  | | [C1-202474](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202474.zip) | LS on handling pending NSSAI during ongoing NSSAA | | | Huawei, HiSilicon/Lin | LS out Rel-16 | Postponed  Lin wanted this to be postponed in ConfCall#3  Related to C1-202472 (discussion paper) and C1-202473 (CR).  Roozbeh, Mon, 22.07  Not convinced it is needed, would not object  Atle, Tue, 02:39  Do not agree to send the LS at least not in its current form  Sung, Tue, 07:31  Asking from atle info on SA2 docs  Atle, Tue, 10:04  Gives a tdoc number  Kaj, Tue, 13:53  If sa2 gets agreed, then no need to send the LS  Atle, Tue, 14:14  Sa2 conclucion to be seen  Atle, Wed, 00:15  Does not agree to this LS  Lin, Wed, 04:53  If SA2 cr gets agreed, then LS is not needed  Atle, Wed, 07:46  Against sending the LS | |
|  |  | | [C1-202564](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202564.zip) | Reply LS on concurrent Broadcasting for CMAS | | | Samsung/ Kyungjoo Grace Suh | LS out Rel-15 | Merged into C1-202232 and its revisions  Chairman, based onconfcall#1  Reply to incoming LS in C1-202046/C1-202597  Lena, Mon, 00:30  Prefers the LS out in 2232 | |
|  |  | | [C1-202359](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202359.zip) | LS response on Manual CAG ID selection and granularity of UAC parameters for PNI-NPNs | | | Samsung/Kundan | LS out Rel-16 | Merged into C1-202240  Chairman, based on confcall#1  Shifted from 16.2.7.1  Reply to incoming LS in C1-202045  Ivo, Thu, 13:32  Does not agree with answer to 1.3 | |
|  |  | | C1-202617 | LS on manipulation of CAG Information element by a VPLMN | | | Kundan | To: Sa2, Cc Sa3 | New  Ivo, Mon, 22:28  Comments  Sung, Mon, 23:39  Commenting  Kundan, Tue, 06:12  Fine with Ivo  Kundan, Tue, 06:37  Providing rev  Ban, Tue, 11.23  Comments  Kundan, Tue, 13:26  Answering  **Sung Tue, 15:47**  **Why would CT1 care about amf<>udm**  Kundan, Tue, 16:59  Further to Sung  **Sung, Tue, 17:52**  **Does not agree**  Kundan, Wed, 06:41  Rev, only one question remains  Sung, Wed, 18:15  Fine, some minor comments  Kundan, thu, 05:47  Asking for comments on latest rev  Ivo, Thu, 07:48  fine | |
|  |  | | C1-202663 | Reply LS on Non-UE N2 Message Services Operations | | | PeterS |  | Revision of C1-202663  New  Ban, Wed, 18:20  Good | |
|  |  | | C1-202666 | LS on security context for 5GC to EPC mobility | | | Lin |  | Sung, Wed, 02:58  Comments on the rev  New rev2  Sung, FINE  Lena, Thu,05:25  comments | |
|  |  | | C1-202753 | LS on handling registration procedure for CAG only UE at non supporting AMF | | | Kundan |  | Withdrawn  New  Draft of LS is available, related to 2363  In the ConfCall  Ivo, Sung, Lena: no need for the LS  Kundan, Wed, 18:16  Replying confcall comments  Sung, Wed, 18:25  Commenting  Lena, Thu, 05:52  No need to send an LS | |
|  |  | | C1-202826 | LS on selected EPS NAS algorithms for unauthenticated emergency sessions in 5GS | | | Mahmoud |  | New  Draft available | |
|  |  | | C1-202849 | LS on PDU session release for UE in RRC INACTIVE state with NG-RAN paging failure | | | Sung |  | Postponed  New  Draft available  Sung Lin discussing  Ivo discussing  Lin suggests new wording  Sung and Lin discussing | |
|  |  | | C1-202911 | LS on 3GPP based access authentication for untrusted non-3GPP access to 5GCN | | | Ericsson / Ivo | LS out Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202487  Roozbeh: I think a better way is company contribution to SA2  John-Luc: support  Andrew: support  Lena: I see no reason why this should be triggered via CT1, : I object to this LS.  Ivo: should be sent  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Roozbeh, Thu, 21:57  SA2 in “To”, suggests rewording  Lena, 00:03  Not specific to 5WWC, rather 5Gprotoc16, not inline with SA3 decission, why would CT1 give a security requirement to SA3?  Ivo, Tue, 10:57  Comenting  Roozbeh, Wed, 00:24  Ls not needed to SA3  John-Luc, Wed, 01:06  Some proposal regarding LI  Lena, Wed, 06:27  Why is CT1 giving sec requirement to SA3ß  Lazaros, Wed, 09:39  Not needed  Roozbeh, Wed, 19:52  Same as azaros | |
|  |  | | C1-202668 | Reply LS on 5G Steering of Roaming | | | Orange / Mariusz | LS out Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202067  Reply to incoming LS in C1-202041  Ivo, Thu, 13:49  Don’t use ”may not”, if CR gets agreed, then solution to be described in the LS  Ban, Sat, 13:12  Commenting, how to merge the two LSs  Ivo, Mon, 12:27  Commenting  Sung, Tue, 02:36  Highlighting Q3 to be answered, asking a question  Ivo, Tue, 12:18  Commenting  Mariusz, Tue, 12:59  Providing azarosion  Ban, Tue, 13:20  Commenting  Ivo, Tue, 14:26  providing “**access technology” is not acceptable** for Ericsson.  Sung, Tue, 17:57  Now sees how access technology can be derived from RAT, asks for changes in the answer to Q3  Ban, Tue, 17:59  Further rcomments  Mariusz, Tue, 18:50  Rev  Sung, Tue, 19:02  Q3 not ok  Ban, Tue, 20:19  Rev  Sung, Tue, 21:30  Not convinced yet  Ban, Wed, 09:44  Explaining  Mariusz, Wed, 11:00  New rev  Ban, Wed, 12:40  Looks good only Q1 and Q2  Sung, Wed, 15:07  We are against to providing RAT type, access technology, or access type to SOR-AF.  Sung, Wed, 18:00  Non consensus on Q3  Ivo, Wed, 18:40  Now suggestion for Q3  Ban, Wed, 18:49  Not agreeing on Q3  Ivo, Wed, 18:55  Not agreeing on all parameters being optional  Ongoing. …  Marius  New rev  Ivo, Thu, 10:22  Rev is not ok | |
|  |  | | C1-202927 | LS on manual CAG selection | | | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | LS out Rel-16 | Revision of [C1-202400](file:///C:\Users\dems1ce9\OneDrive%20-%20Nokia\3gpp\cn1\meetings\123-e_electronic_0420\docs\C1-202400.zip)  --------------------------  Revision of C1-201053  Ivo, Thu, 13:53  LS requires agreed CR to be, EN in LS to be updated based on outcome of CR  Sung, thu, 03:21  New rev | |
|  |  | | C1-202846 | Reply LS to RAN2 on Manual CAG selection | | | Huawei, HiSilicon / Vishnu | LS out Rel-16 | Revision of C1-202240  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Shifted from 16.2.7.2  Reply to incoming LS in C1-202045  Ivo, Thu, 13:08  Answer to 1.1 not needed, 1.2 partly ok, 1.3 not oke  Vishnu Tue, 11:16  New revision form Vishnu  Lena, Wed, 06:32  Rev looks good  Chen, Wed ,10:38  Some proposal on 2.2  Ban, Wed, 11:08  Overall good, some sympathy for chen request  Ivo, Wed, 11:11  Some comments  Vishnu, Wed, 12:40  Ongoing  Robert, Wed 13:43  Answering Ivo  Ivo, Wed 15:00  Ongoing  Vishnu, with rev number | |
|  |  | | C1-202925 | LS on the requirement that non-3GPP access node selection information includes an “any PLMN” entry | | | John-Luc |  | Postponed  Revision of C1-202847  Amer: not completey happy, will not object of he is the only one  Ivo, Friday, 10:29  Requests this to be postponed  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Revision of C1-202665  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  New  **Ivo, Wed, 12:20**  No need to send the LS, is incorrect  John-Luc, Wed, 14:55  Answering  Confcall  **Ivo, amer, negative**  Lazaros LS not needed, CR seem to have a point  Christian there is an FASMO, LS neutral  Andrew, Wed, 22:49  Supports sending an LS  John Luc, Wed, 00:00  Rev  Lazaros, Thu, 00:29  No strong objection, i.e. can live with it  **Amer, Thu, 03:41**  **Sending LS is not the right approach** | |
|  |  | | C1-202916 | LS on Concurrent Broadcasting for CMAS | | | Ericsson / Mikael | LS out Rel-15 | Revision of C1-202232  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Reply to incoming LS in C1-202046/C1-202597  Mikael, Wed, 15:19  Draft which has CR attached  PeteS: looks fine  Lazaros, fine, could live without the attachment, minor editorial | |
|  |  | | [C1-202819](file:///C:\Users\etxjaxl\OneDrive%20-%20Ericsson%20AB\Documents\All%20Files\Standards\3GPP\Meetings\2004Dubrovnik\CT1\Docs\C1-202819.zip) | LS on limit the number of simultaneous log ins of an MCX | | | Nokia /Lazaros | LS out Rel-16 | Endorsed by IMS BO | |
|  |  | | C1-202993 | PAP/CHAP and other point-to-point parameters usage in 5GS | | | Osama |  | Revision of C1-202667  To addres the “e.g.” to be “i.e.” comment from Ivo  Ivo is fine with the comment  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  New  Rev available, Wed, 16:02 all comments on board  Jj fine | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Late and misplaced documents | | Tdoc | Title  Prioritization of documents within this category will be done during the meeting.  Some tdocs are left in the main agenda item, although they are late (e.g. papers reporting IETF progress, which are usually more up to date the later they are submitted) | | | Source | Tdoc info | Result & comments  Late documents and documents which were submitted with erroneous or incomplete information | |
|  |  | | C1-202135 | Discussion on SRVCC and 5G-SRVCC NAS capabilities vs. IMS based solution | | | BlackBerry UK Limited | discussion Rel-15 | Withdrawn  Not available on time | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | A.O.B. | | Tdoc | Title | | | Source | Tdoc info | Result & comments | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |
|  | Closing  Friday  by 16:00 at the latest | |  | Did you mark your attendance to this meeting? | | |  |  | Any meeting document which is not mentioned in this report or with no recorded decision shall be interpreted as "reserved", i.e. not defined and shall be ignored if received | |
|  |  | |  | **Last upload of revisions:**  **Thursday 23rd April 2020 16:00 CEST**  **Last comments:**  **Friday 24th April 2020 16:00 CEST**  **Chairman Report of the meeting:**  **Monday 27th April 2020** | | |  |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | | |  |  |  | |