Pre SA2#154 CC on FS\_eNS\_Ph3

1. Discussion on work plan at SA2#154 meeting. Jinguo will check with SA Chair and ask slot swap(prefer move to Mon/Tue) after the tdoc submission deadline. If time slot swap is not possible, Jinguo will ask draft session on Monday or Tuesday.
* Conclusion tdoc will be focus at next meeting. Normative CR will be less priority. Tdoc with multiple co-signers will get high priority. The rapporteur will check offline with the moderator in last SA2 meeting to lead the contribution preparation on each key issue. However
* Rapporture comment after the CC: After the submission deadline, I will check if it possible to converge the conclusion. If not then I may select two or more tdocs from different camps as high priority to be discussed.
1. Discussion on KI#3
* Q1: For support of limited AoS slices not matching deployed TAs, the majority view is go with option 2+3+4. 2 companies believe the RAN impacts can be clarified and prefer option 1. It is better to capture principles instead of referring to specific solution. In option 4 what is the S-NSSAI availability (location) should be clarified in the final conclusion.
* Q2: For improved support of temporary network slices, Nokia can live with removing the RAN impact on option 1. Haiyang suggests to consider option 3 also. Peter clarified that there existing mechanisms to enforce the slice timing in the system and prefer without UE impact. Similar as Q1, what is the S-NSSAI availability policy (timing) should be futher clarified in the final conclusion.
* Q3: For the graceful and gradual termination aspect, the discussion is mainly related whether the slice timing is sent to the UE, i.e. has dependency on Q2.
1. Discussion on K#5
* Q4: Whether partially Allowed S-NSSAI should be concluded for normative work. The main concern to consider partially allowed NSSAI is RAN impact since in the SID, there is no RAN impact on this working task. Peter mentioned there is no NGAP impact if the AMF sends the partially allowed NSSAI to the RAN. RAN3 mentioned in their LS that the Xn impact needs to be further studied in RAN3. There is concerns whether the partially allowed NSSAI will cause issues on KI#6(NSAC issue), however there is no consensus. More offline discussion is needed on the impact of KI#6. Kundan asks to revise the counting since some companies is ok with partially allowed NSSAI without RAN impacts.
* Regarding two remaining key issues in KI#5 it is suggest to revise the conclusion text to be more generic so we can remove these two Editor NOTEs, or change them to NOTE.
1. Discussion on KI#6
* Regarding on which entity to determine the policy, some companies support UDM, some companies support PCF. NSSF is not in the conclusion yet. Discussion papers (Ericsson/Nokia)will be summit to assist the discussion.
* Regarding the new indication, Alessio clarified the usage of this new indication.
* We can simply remove the two ENs (3rd and 4th) in the page 9.
* Some companies comment the agreed bullet on AF setting the policy, suggest to offline checking with Huawei.
1. Discussion on KI#1
* Regarding how to determine the alternative S-NSSAI, it seems ok to go with the AM PCF. Peter mentioned the impact on the URSP rule needs to be considered. The conclusion should be clarified that the slice mapping doesn't change the subscribed S-NSSAI so the EN (Editor's note: It is FFS whether to allow the alternative S-NSSAI to be outside of the UE's Subscribed S-NSSAI.) can be removed. Haiyang suggests to discuss this key issue as a whole topic.
* Regarding the Same S-NSSAI associated with multiple NSIs, Iskren suggests to rename the scenario since the slice load balance is within SA5 scope. Haiyang answers that this is about early binding and late binding. Alessio don't know if the issue to be resolved is about control plane load or user plane load, and it is unclear which sessions will be selected to do the slice remapping. Peter suggest to refocus on the slice binging issue.
* Regarding Same NSI associated with multiple S-NSSAI, Alessio suggest to go with resource repartition, instead of slice remapping. Peter ask clarification on why NG-RAN does not support the alternative S-NSSAI. Jinguo answer that it is source NG-RAN, not the target NG-RAN. Alessio comment the RAN no support of S-NSSAI is not scope of this study. Further offline is needed.
* Regarding how the AMF provides alternative NSSAI to UE, there are some supports to reuse the existing mapping of allowed NSSAI/Configured NSSAI. It is asked whether the slice remapping can be applicable for home PLMN S-NSSAI. The 2nd EN should not be removed and needs further clarified on the AMF behavior. The third EN is not about URSP rule update, it is about whether to trigger the URSP rule evaluation.
* Regarding on the PDU session establishment request from the UE on the old S-NSSAI, it is asked why the UE can’t receive the alternative S-NSSAI before it establish the new PDU session on the old S-NSSAI. Alessio mentioned that the network will not send the alternative S-NSSAI to all UEs in order to reduce the signaling load so it is possible that some UEs has no information about the alternative S-NSSAI
* Regarding the Existing PDU Session transfer from old S-NSSAI to alternative S-NSSAI，it seems majority views is to send the alternative S-NSSAI to the UE, instead of sending an indication since it is deterministic and the UE may have only single S-NSSAI in the URSP rule. If the AMF notifies the UE before the new PDU session is established the UE may release the old PDU session.