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Attachments:

**1. Overall Description:**

In the Reply LS on selecting a PLMN not allowed in the country where a UE is physically located (in S1-211319/ C1-213551) SA1 has answered on the Q3:

Q3: "*… could SA1 provide the necessary guidance for selecting a PLMN that can provide emergency services to the UE over satellite access?*"

*"The UE should first determine a most suitable PLMN based on its own physical location determination. As there may be border cases where the UE cannot determine sufficiently accurate or sufficiently precise in which country it is, the UE may also still attempt to obtain (emergency) services from a PLMN that according to the UE is not allowed to operate in the country of the UE’s location. If the PLMN indicates it is not allowed to operate in the country of the UE’s location, the UE should not (re)-attempt emergency calls."*

With respect to PLMN selection, the definitions in 23.122 for cause #78 ensure that the UE attempts to select a different allowable PLMN if this cause is received.

However for the case that no allowable PLMN is available, and even no acceptable cell is available besides satellite NG-RAN cell(s) of the PLMN which has provided #78, CT1 has the understanding that then there should be no limitations to block request from upper layers to attempt making request for emergency service.

**2. Actions:**

**To SA1**

**Action 1:** CT1 kindly ask SA1 to confirm the CT1 understanding that for the case that there is no other cell available besides the cell on which #78 was received, that there should be no limitations to block request from upper layers to attempt a emergency service.

**Action 2:** If SA1 does not agree with the outlined CT1 understanding, CT1 kindly ask SA1 to provide guidance on the indented UE behaviour.

**To RAN2**

**ACTION:** Should SA1 confirm that SA1 can go with CT1's proposal, that RAN2 to take that into account and make the necessary updates to TS 38.304 and any other RAN2 TS if appropriate.

**3.** **Date of Next CT1 Meetings:**

CT1#136e 12th - 20th May 2022 electronic meeting