# 3GPP SA2 FS\_5MBS\_Ph2 Conference call
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## Convener:

LiMeng (rapporteur – Huawei)

## List of participants:

Aihua (CMCC), Judy (Ericsson), Thomas (Nokia), Robbie (Ericsson), LaeYoung (LG Electronics), Haris (Qualcomm), Fenqin (Huawei), Zhendong (ZTE), Xiaoyan (CATT), Zhenhua (vivo) and other colleagues…

## Minutes

### 0. Slides from rapporteur (FS\_5MBS\_Ph2 Pre-meeting CC for 152E)

##### Page 3: Work plan review

Presented by LiMeng.

**Discussion**

Xiaoyan (CATT): Whether solution update can be considered in October meeting?

LiMeng (Huawei): Issue related to RAN can be provided for update of course.

Judy (Ericsson): Fine with having the solution update in October.

Thomas (Nokia): Fine as well.

**Proposed way forward**

Work plan will be modified to reflect that solution update mainly addressing RAN dependent issue can be considered in October meeting.

### 1. KI#1

##### [11] Discussion on KI#1 (Rapporteur)

Presented by LiMeng

##### [12] WF RRC Inactive (Qualcomm)

Presented by Haris (Qualcomm)

**Discussion**

**Assistance information:**

* Haris (Qualcomm): Inactive is mandatory for the UE, and should be RAN decision, and it should not be determined by the Application function. Providing the service information to the RAN may violate the layer separation principle. Possibly can reuse current QoS parameters, to not impact current CN.
* Judy: Inactive decision should be made by the RAN. How AF can provide different QoS?
* Fenqin (Huawei): assistant information is used by the RAN node to determine whether can send the UE to RRC Inactive state, need those parameters, but agree final decision should be made by the RAN.
* Thomas: For the case like floor control, also important to inform the RAN whether UE can be transit to inactive. Not proper to let UE frequently asking for floor request to turn into RRC Inactive.

**Mobility:**

* Haris: This issue is RAN dependent. Seems Rel-17 defined behavior is more efficient. Don’t know why there is a need to enhance anything. For unicast it is assumed that the anchor RAN nodes manage the tunnel, not good to have several CN tunnels for Inactive. UE camping at RAN nodes shall know the RAN capability.
* Fenqin: Regardless what solution it to be taken later, the requirement is that when the UE move within the RNA, it should be possible to receive the MBS session data.
* Thomas: Depends on RAN3 decision. Anchor RAN managing forwarding tunnel may result in bi-direct transmission for the same MBS data, and that might be a problem. Whether UE can know/not know capability is RAN dependent (i.e., whether RAN broadcasting that)
* Zhendong (ZTE): Better to check if paging in RRC will include UE list. Regarding Mobility, same view as Haris, we already support that. For the way forward, suggest to conclude the important principles.
* LiMeng (Huawei): Agree to interact with RAN WGs to make the conclusion, but suggest to firstly make the two solutions complete, and tell RAN WGs the progress in SA2 in the LS.

**State transition (i.e., activation/deactivation/release)**

* Judy: We don’t need to differentiate the paging caused by release/activation, if we mandate the UEs with inactive PDU session UPs will not be notified (i.e., paged) upon release MBS session.
* Fenqin: The problem is RRC Inactive UEs share the PO with IDLE mode UEs. In addition, also need some mechanisms to notify Inactive UEs switching back to connected mode.
* LiMeng: For deactivation, seems in Rel-17 we already support?
* Haris: Using group paging or not for the session activation is based on the RAN’s feedback, the RAN may inform UEs by some other means. For deactivation, current TS description seems not clear, can offline check and determine whether to submit CR for Rel-17.

**Others (i.e., Sol#20 and #21)**

* Xiaoyan: this is for quick joining.
* Judy: Not sure how much it can save for having RR contain join request, may be only for some coincidence cases. PDU session status is used for the case when there is pending uplink data, but here it seems that we change the usage.
* Fenqin: PDU session status here is not the same as the original purpose.
* Thomas: Wonder if the solution is really related to KI#1 (i.e., Inactive reception).

**Way forward**

Issue depends on RAN (RAN2, RAN3), conclude the important principles, and send LS to RAN WGs to highlight the open issues and agreement in SA2. Update associating solutions as per the comments in the CC.

### 2. KI#2

##### [21] 5MBS\_ph2 KI#2 Evaluation (Ericsson)

Presented by Robbie

##### [22] Discussion on KI#2 (Rapporteur)

Presented by LiMeng

**Discussion**

LaeYoung (LG Electronics): For KI#8, will provide an update for addressing the "non-symmetric" sharing case.

LiMeng: For the aspects for the comparison, possibly we need another column saying that the issue when release the N3mb happens to be used for transmitting MBS data only. Seems for session establish, we usually don’t require a simultaneous for different PLMNs, and also possible to have the release not at the same time.

Zhendong: Agrees with LiMeng.

Robbie (Ericsson): but broadcast MOCN case, not likely to release one session only. Agree that the current two alternatives are not against each other.

**Way forward**

Authors update the solutions as per the comments.

### 3. LS to RAN

**[31] Rapporteur - LS to RAN regarding Rel-18 FS\_5MBS\_Ph2 progress**

Presented by LiMeng

**Discussion**

Judy: Better to also add the UE radio capability to the LS, and if RAN confirms (most likely), consider NAS request is not needed.

Zhendong: Don’t include NAS request since RAN WGs cannot determine that.

Thomas: OK to include the UE radio capability.

Robbie: In the TR, we also have some other solutions that contain the RAN-related ENs, how to handle that, would that mean they cannot be concluded?

LiMeng: Agree to include UE radio capability in the LS. Regarding other ENs, consider to mention those together but not put a higher priority, since the issues in the LS should be replied to finish the conclusion. We can of course send other LSs in the future meetings.

**Way forward**

Include UE radio capability in the LS. Consider to have one sentence mentioning other ENs related to RAN are in the TR, and SA2 may send LS to RAN WGs requesting the feedback in later meeting.

### 3. AoB

##### Date of the CC#2

People attending the meeting agreed to have an offline CC#2 for Rel-18, possibly on 16th Aug (LiMeng will send the email for checking the time).