

Source: [SA2 Chair&SecretaryMotorola](#)
Title: [Resolved Concerns](#) over SA WG2 CR handling
Agenda item:
Document for: INFORMATION

[An investigation of the comments raised on the SA2 CR's for approval came to the following conclusions.](#)

Td SP-030297: 18 CRs in the 23.060 pack:

Comment: CR 447, 448 and 449 (rel-4, 5 & 6) all appear to be written to 5.4.0 as indicated in the CR headers (note Correct Rel-5 version is 5.5.0). The CRs need to be re-written against the correct versions of the specifications.

Analysis: [The header is incorrect in the PDF version but the base text is correct in all the CRs.](#)

Proposal: [Approve 447, 448, 449 with the comment that the header is incorrect.](#)

Comment: CR 452, states Clause 12.3.2 is impacted, but clause 12.6.3.5 is also impacted. The cover sheet needs to be updated.

Analysis: [Correct](#)

Proposal: [Approve CR 452 with the comment that the cover sheet is incorrect](#)

Comment: CR 431R2 Rel 5 and CR 446 Rel-6 appear to be written to version 5.4.0 as indicated in the CR header (note Correct Rel-5 version is 5.5.0). The CRs need to be re-written against the correct version of the Specifications.

Analysis: [The base text in the CR's are correct](#)

Proposal: [431r2 and 446 can be approved with the comment that the header is incorrect](#)

Comment: CR442R4 clashes with CR 446 at clause 6.9.2.2.1, 6.9.2.2.2 & 6.9.2.2.3, bullet 11) (CR446 is the Rel-6 mirror of

CR 431R2). The CRs should be returned to SA WG2 to be merged.

Analysis: [Correct, send 442r4 back to SA2](#)

Proposal: [Approve 446 and agree that the principles in CR442r4 is agreed by SA and SA2's task is just to reword the CR to make it unambiguously implementable.](#)

Comment: CR 442R4 also shows as R3 in the Tdoc cover sheet, the S2 email approval of this CR is confusing on which version is approved. (email approval started with Rev 1). As the status of the CR is unclear it should be returned to SA2 WG for further review.

Analysis: [442r3 was approved on email and then revised to r4 by MCC to remove changes towards earlier CR versions.](#)

Proposal: [442r4 anyway sent back to SA2 according to previous comment.](#)

Comment: [No R6 Mirror for CR435r2](#)

Analysis: [forgotten at SA2](#)

Proposal: [Approve CR435r2 and give an action to SA2 to create the R6 for next SA plenary](#)

Consequence for CR pack: [New pack available in SP-030343 with proposals as above implemented](#)

Td SP-030298: 21 CRs in the LCS pack:

Comment: Pdf files of 23.171 CR 29 and 23.271 CR 169r2 do not show revisions.

Analysis: [Fix MCC's conversion tools](#)

Proposal: [Approve the word version](#)

Comment: 23.271 CR 166r2 show just one clause impacted on cover, but in fact there are many. The cover sheet needs to be updated.

Analysis: Correct, 7.4, new section 7.5 and 9.1.1 are also impacted

Proposal: Approve 166r2 with the comment that the cover sheet should have shown impacts on 7.4, 7.5 and 9.1.1

Comment: CR 155R10 introduces what appears to be a completely new clause 9.1.9 “Deferred Location Request Procedure for the change of area event”. However CR184R3 makes changes to clause 9.1.9 which has not yet been approved (CR 184r3 written against non existent version of the specification?).

Analysis: Correct

Proposal: Merge CR’s, new version available in SP-030345

Comment: CR 182R3 appears to be a Cat A and not a Cat F as marked. The cover sheet needs to be updated.

Analysis: It’s not a pure mirror CR, different changes in R5 and R6 i.e. only for GERAN A/Gb in R5.

Proposal: No change needed.

Comment: CR 176/177 and CR 181R3/182R3 - there appears to be a clash on clause 9.1.5.3. The CRs should be returned to SA WG2 for further review (176 to be merged with 181 to clarify?)

Analysis: After offline discussions and test implementation of the text in 9.1.5.3 it seems like the CR’s actually are independent and give enough guidance to be correctly implemented.

Proposal: Approve CR176, CR177, CR181r3 and CR182r3 with no changes (as indicated in the CR’s the sentence in 9.1.5.3 from CR176 and CR177 shall be added after the sentence added by CR181r3 and CR182r3 shall be included).

Comment: CR166R2 states Clause 9.1.1 impacted, but in fact changes 7.4 and adds clauses 7.5 as well. The cover sheet needs to be corrected.

Analysis: correct

Proposal: Approve 166r2 with the comment that 7.4 is impacted and new section 7.5 is added

Consequence for CR pack: CR155r10 and 184r3 merged to CR155r11, new CR available in SP-030345 and new CR pack available in SP-030344

Td SP-030303: 24 CRs in the IMS pack:

Comment: Document cover sheet shows wrong version of 23.228 for CR292R2

Analysis: – There is no change in the impacted section between 5.7.0 and 5.8.0

Proposal: Approve CR292r2 with the comment that the cover sheet version is wrong

Comment: CR 317R1 and mirror 318R2 claim Clauses 5.2.1a, 5.2.2.3, 5.2.2.4, 5.2.2.5 are modified, in fact only 5.2.1.a appears to be changed. Is this CR complete or are the revisions to the other clauses missing?

Analysis: The original proposal included further changes, only the changes to 5.2.1a was accepted

Proposal: Approve CR 317r1 and CR318r2 with the comment that 5.2.2.3, 5.2.2.4 and 5.2.2.5 are not impacted

Comment: CR 311R1 & CR 319 The CR text has the header for 23.060 5.4.0. This needs to be corrected and checked – possibly best to return the CRs to SA WG2 for further review.

Analysis: Header field incorrect but base text checked and is correct in both CR’s

Proposal: Approve CR 311r1 and CR319 with the comment that the header is incorrect

Comment: CR 297R3 does not show affected clauses on the cover sheet. The cover sheet needs to be corrected.

Analysis: Correct 5.14.2 and 5.14.3 missing from cover sheet.

Proposal: Approve CR 297r3 with the comment that 5.14.2 and 5.14.3 are missing from cover sheet

Consequence for the CR pack: no revision needed SP-030303 can be approved as is, with the comments above noted in the minutes

Td SP-030304:

Comment: 23.895 CR appears to be against version 6.0.0 and not 6.1.0. The CR should be returned to SA WG2 for review and correction.

Analysis: It’s actually against version 6.1.0 but the header is wrong

Proposal: Approve CR with the comment that the header is incorrect

Consequence for the CR pack: no revision needed SP-030304 can be approved as is, with the comments above noted in the minutes