Notes of moderated e-mail discussion meeting Wednesday 08 April 2020, 15:00 CEST.

# Meeting opened: 08 April 2020, 15.00 CEST

The e-meeting was chaired by the SA WG2 Chairman, Mr. Puneet Jain (Intel) and these notes were provided by Maurice Pope (MCC).

There were approximately 109 people connected to the conference call.

The following companies were recorded as present (list not exhaustive).

|  |
| --- |
| Airbus |
| Apple |
| Affirmed Networks |
| AT&T |
| Broadcom |
| BT |
| CableLabs |
| CATT |
| Charter |
| China Mobile |
| Cisco |
| Convida Wireless |
| Deutsche Telekom |
| Ericsson |
| ETRI |
| Fraunhofer |
| Futurewei |
| Huawei |
| Intel |
| InterDigital |
| KPN |
| Lenovo |
| LGE |
| Matrixx |
| MediaTek |
| Motorola Mobility |
| NEC |
| Nokia |
| NTT DOCOMO |
| OpenNet Telecom |
| OPPO |
| Orange |
| Perspecta Labs |
| Philips |
| Qualcomm |
| Samsung |
| Sandvine |
| Sony |
| Telecom Italia |
| Tencent |
| T-Mobile |
| Vivo |
| Vodafone |
| ZTE |

Slides on moderated email discussion agreement at <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_sa/WG2_Arch/TSGS2_138e_Electronic/Inbox/CCs/Moderated_Email_Discussion/SA2_Moderated_Email%20_Discussion_Agreements_r1.pptx>.

## Slide 2 ATSSS Open Issues

Moderator Summary and Proposed Way Forward are available here <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_sa/WG2_Arch/TSGS2_138e_Electronic/Inbox/CCs/Moderated_Email_Discussion/SA2%23138E_Email_Discussion_ATSSS_OpenIssues_Final.doc>

**Working Assumptions**

1. During the UE registration, the serving AMF shall inform the UE with network indication for the support of ATSSS, if supported.

2. AMF shall always notify the UE for the ATSSS Network Capability whenever the UE switches RA.

3. During the N2 mobility handover or idle mode mobility for MA PDU session, when network detects that the destination network no longer supports ATSSS, the MA PDU session shall be released by the AMF.

**Discussion summary:**

Nokia asked for item 3 to be left open for now to enable checking of the proposed related CRs.

ZTE commented that a detailed Ericsson CR has been shared for a week but no feedback has been provided from companies who may have issues with this and asked to provide a deadline for comments on this.

Orange commented that they have no strong opinion at present but would like time to discuss this off-line.

Item 3 (AMF release) will be removed for the moment but this needs to be resolved prior to the submission deadline for the SA2#138E e-meeting (Friday 10 April).

Samsung commented that for item 2, the comment from Nokia on the discussion from the UE perspective, that the UE should be informed whether the ATSSS is supported or not when the UE switches to a new registration area.

ZTE asked why this needs to be specified for the UE perspective as this is already implied. Nokia agreed that this was not necessary.

With these agreements, these working assumptions were updated and endorsed.

## Slide 3 eNA Open Issues

Moderator Summary and Proposed Way Forward are available here <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_sa/WG2_Arch/TSGS2_138e_Electronic/Inbox/CCs/Moderated_Email_Discussion/SA2%23138E_Email_Discussion_eNA_OpenIssues_final.doc>

**Working Assumptions**

1. Abnormal behaviour related network data analytics for target of analytics reporting being "any UE" will be supported.

2. Solution on how to alleviate heavy load caused by a request for abnormal behaviour analytics for "any UE" to be further discussed.

Comment from Chairman: Can all of above supported with enough time for stage-3 work before Rel-16 freeze in June 2020?

**Discussion summary:**

Huawei commented that there are alternative solutions from Orange and Ericsson to consider.

Orange commented that their solution has no stage 3 impact.

Ericsson commented that their solution is not an alternative but includes an optimisation.

Samsung added that these are not different solutions as they are complimentary variants.

Competing CRs from different companies should be avoided or merged (before the merged documents deadline).

With these agreements, these working assumptions were updated and endorsed.

## Slides 4-5 Vertical\_LAN Open Issues

Moderator Summary and Proposed Way Forward are available here <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_sa/WG2_Arch/TSGS2_138e_Electronic/Inbox/CCs/Moderated_Email_Discussion/SA2%23138E_Email_Discussion_Vertical_LAN_OpenIssues_FINAL.doc>

**Working Assumptions**

1. Support for PSFP based Hold and Forward Buffering rule

a) Given no clear majority this functionality will not be ~~is not~~ supported in Rel-16.

2. VLAN ID configuration for bridge management

a) Option #2 (OA&M configuration of allowed versus forbidden VLAN IDs across all TSN bridges - NW-TT, DS-TT, IEEE TSN network) shall be supported.

b) Should option #1 (dynamic exchange of forbidden VLAN IDs or allowed VLAN IDs) also be supported as an option?

3. Assumptions on the number of ports per NW-TT within the UPF

a) Option A (There is only one NW-TT per UPF. Each NW-TT can have one or more ports) shall be supported.

4. System Configuration that is not PDU Session specific

a) NEF procedure for invoking system configuration that is not PDU Session specific will not be introduced in Rel-16.

5. Support for CAG specific Access control

a) SA2 should not respond to question directed to SA1.

b) Response to Question 1.1 in LS (S2-2002656): No, the UE cannot camp in manually selected CAG ID if it is not present in Allowed CAG list after registration.

c) Response to Question 1.2 in LS (S2-2002656): No need to support any prioritization of CAG IDs.

**Discussion summary:**

Item 1:

Huawei commented they have summarized that we can try to conclude with a R16 solution without any large impacts, so think we can first try to give a solution, if it is not OK, then can we postpone to postpone this to R17. Huawei proposed 1) Work on a solution such that Hold and Forward Buffering per stream basis is supported in Rel-16 and that it is acceptable for the majority or 2) Hold and Forward Buffering per stream basis is not supported in Rel-16 and suggested taking an informal show of hands and decide on one way or the other during SA WG2 wide CC and proceed accordingly.

Ericsson and Intel did not support continuing this discussion as this was what the moderated discussions were for.

Item 2:

Qualcomm asked for clarification on the TSN bridges supported.

Ericsson suggested using 'local configuration' instead of OAM configuration.

Nokia commented that the implementation could be easily done without specification and suggested this should be the exchange between AF and 5GS.

Huawei had doubts on 2b, and had no idea why make this as way forward, and need to further check the scenarios for 2b

Qualcomm suggested that a discussion paper is needed to clarify what is needed between 5GS and AF.

Item 2b should be removed. Local configuration in the 5GS and exchange between AF and 5GS will be discussed off-line.

Item 3:

Vodafone commented that this was acceptable if there can be different configurations for multiple networks.

Nokia suggested Option A (NW-TT can have one or more ports) is agreed.

Ericsson commented that the Option A restriction has not been discussed.

Intel commented that this is related to plain 'vanilla' Ethernet and not TSN and suggested for this way forward only the TSN is considered.

Nokia commented that there is no real contradiction as the port can be mapped to a network interface.

NW-TT port and TSN port is the same and this will not be deployable.

Intel commented that in this case it is referring to a NW instance and this has not been discussed.

Ericsson proposed to continue this discussion to have a consistent solution.

It was concluded that there can be one or more ports.

Item 4:

This should read 'supported' instead of 'introduced'.

Item 5:

Vivo asked for more discussion to decide on 5b and 5c. It was clarified that this was discussed in the moderated discussions and the majority view is shown in the proposed answers.

OPPO commented that the 5b has no relation to the manual selection question.

Nokia commented that the majority answer to allowing the UE to continue to camp was 'no' and a response to this answer should be awaited before considering further.

Huawei suggested there are other scenarios which should be considered where the answer is not clearly 'no'.

Answer 5b should be changed to 'No' for the scenario in the LS, but other scenarios should be discussed off-line.

With these agreements, these working assumptions were updated and endorsed.

## Slide 6 MT-EDT Open Issues

Moderator Summary and Proposed Way Forward are available here <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_sa/WG2_Arch/TSGS2_138e_Electronic/Inbox/CCs/Moderated_Email_Discussion/SA2%23138E_Email_Discussion_MT-EDT_OpenIssues_FINAL.doc>

**Working Assumptions**

1. Send LS to SA and relevant working groups (CT1, RAN2, RAN3, SA3) informing that there is no consensus in SA2 on specifying any solution for MT-EDT support in 5GC (in Rel-16). Provide high level summary of discussions in the LS as appropriate.

**Discussion summary:**

This working assumption was endorsed.

## Slide 7 FS\_5G\_ProSe Open Issues

Moderator Summary and Proposed Way Forward are available here <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_sa/WG2_Arch/TSGS2_138e_Electronic/Inbox/CCs/Moderated_Email_Discussion/SA2%23138E_Email_Discussion_FS_5G_ProSe_SID_Scope_FINAL.doc>

**Working Assumptions**

1. Service continuity for UE-to-Network Relay is in scope of FS\_5G\_ProSe SID and time will be allocated to discuss solutions to KI#3 in the TR 23.752.

**Discussion summary:**

Intel provided the current text of KI#3 of TR 23.752: *'How to perform communication path switch between a direct Uu path and an indirect Uu path via a UE-to-Network Relay, or between two indirect Uu paths via different UE-to-Network Relays. And how to guarantee service continuity during these communication path switch procedures'*.

It was clarified that the proposal is to discuss a solution, not on whether or what the solution will be. It should be clarified that this will use existing allocated time. **It was clarified that any objection to this can be made to the updated SID resulting from this.**

This working assumption was updated and endorsed **with an objection from Samsung**.

## Slide 8 ETSUN Open Issues

Moderator Summary and Proposed Way Forward are available here <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_sa/WG2_Arch/TSGS2_138e_Electronic/Inbox/CCs/Moderated_Email_Discussion/SA2%23138E_Email_Discussion_WID_ETSUN_FINAL.doc>

**Working Assumptions**

1. In this release of the specification, deployments topologies with specific SMF Service Areas applies only for 3GPP access

2. In this release of the specification, ATSSS assumes SMFs Service Areas covering the whole PLMN

**Discussion summary:**

Nokia clarified that item 1 was not part of the original questions and item 2 received majority support.

Huawei suggested some clarifications to item 2 for when the UE moves out of the SMF service area.

With these agreements, these working assumptions were updated and endorsed.

## Slide 9 eSBA Open Issues

Moderator Summary and Proposed Way Forward are available here <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_sa/WG2_Arch/TSGS2_138e_Electronic/Inbox/CCs/Moderated_Email_Discussion/SA2%23138E_Email_Discussion_eSBA_OpenIssues_FINAL.doc>

**Working Assumptions**

1. Specify HTTP/2 request message routing between multiple SCPs.

2. SEPP aspects should not be specified in this release of the specification.

3. Instance selection shall be performed either at NF service consumer or at last SCP in the path.

4. Dynamic information about SCP availability should be supported.

5. only address discovery of next-hop SCP to be supported.

6. NF should not be aware that multiple SCPs are deployed.

Comment from Chairman: Can all of above supported with enough time for stage-3 work before Rel-16 freeze in June 2020?

**Discussion summary:**

item 2 should be clarified to (not specified in) 'Rel-16'.

There was a comment that this was late work for inclusion in Rel-16. It was clarified that there was strong support for this in Rel-16.

Cisco commented that this can be done if no further complications/scenarios are intended to be included.

AT&T commented that there is a constraint already on Rel-17 and they do not want this to slip again to Rel-18 and therefore it should be aimed for Rel-16.

Ericsson commented that there are simple solutions for this and there should be no stage 3 issues and suggested this is attempted. It was noted that there are competing solutions proposed in CRs which will need to be resolved.

Nokia commented that no additional procedures (e.g. complex dynamic selection) should be proposed.

It was clarified that this needs to be completed in the April 2020 meeting in order to provide it to Stage 3 meetings in May 2020.

These working assumptions were updated and endorsed.

Updated moderated email discussion agreement slides with endorsed working assumptions is available at <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_sa/WG2_Arch/TSGS2_138e_Electronic/Inbox/CCs/Moderated_Email_Discussion/SA2_Moderated_Email%20_Discussion_Agreements_r2.pptx>.

## AOB

There were some questions why there were not formal working agreements made here. The SA WG2 chairman clarified that if Working Agreements are made, then challenged, there will be a need for a formal vote to confirm or overturn the agreement, but there are no electronic voting procedures available at present so this could not be done in the May electronic meeting.

e-mail comment extractor. MCC has produced a macro to extract the e-mail comments to Chairman's notes which relies upon strict adherence to using **<<START>>** and **<<END>>** tags in the e-mails. Each company should follow these comment tag guidelines and inform their colleagues who were not present on the conference call.

The June 2020 meeting has been rescheduled to a 2-phase e-meeting, 01-12 June, to also cover the July ad-hoc which cannot be held due to the shift of TSG SA to the end of June. An e-mail concerning the planning of the June meeting has been distributed by the SA WG2 Chairman.

**It was clarified that no numbers will be allocated after the document deadlines** (including incoming LSs) and any documents needed related to urgent incoming LSs (outgoing LS responses and any necessary CRs) need to be requested and uploaded before the deadlines and placed under the agenda item of the incoming LSs (e.g. agenda item 4.1, for topics not explicitly on the agenda).

# Meeting closed: 08 April 2020, 17.15 CET