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**1. Overall Description:**

CT1 thanks SA for the LS (SP-240973/C1-244033) tasking CT1 to analyse the gaps in our TSes to meet CEN's requirements in CEN's case #1 to #9 and communicate back to SA (cc to SA1 and SA2) its findings. CT1 understands that CT1 leaves up to SA the "*final decision on how to proceed with normative work*".

Herewith are CT1's findings:

Finding i): CT1 considers that all 9 CEN cases can be aligned, but also considers that CEN case #1 on test call is of utmost urgency. Because of this urgency, CT1 has progressed a CR, (see attached??). With the attached, SA can SA WGs can check if their respective TS need to be updated.  
However even with progressing the attached CR, there are some outstanding issues to aligning to CEN case #1, see following findings.

Question 1 Is aligning CEN requirement #1 first before aligning other CEN requirements agreeable to SA?

Question 2: Is there any CEN requirement which SA considers of utmost importance or should CT1 focus on the cases 2 to 5 as indicated by CEN requirements and for which Release of specification and under which WI?

Finding ii): On CEN Case #1: test call is a normal IMS call based on CEN requirements. CT1 considered that using a dedicated URN can work. However, as the test call is executed as a normal IMS call, then in a home routed scenario, the home P-CSCF has to be profiled to recognise that the normal call is actually to be treated as a test emergency call else, for example, the MSD transfer would not be possible or allowed.

Question 3 SA and SA WGs to decide if this shortfall is acceptable?

Finding iii) CT1 note that CEN requirements if aligned to our specifications in a non-discriminatory way will change existing behaviours and requirements as those CEN requirements will be mandated to all parties. Thus, CT1 feels that existing behaviours are to be kept but make the changes for CEN mandatory to where and when CEN requirements apply. i.e. CT1 will perform changes for alignment to CEN use cases for IVS only and where and when CEN requirements are applicable.

Question 4 Does SA agree that existing behaviours are to be kept and that CEN requirements are mandated only where applicable to CEN?

Finding iv) On PSAP callback – part of CEN Case#1, #2, #3, CT1 finds that   
a) for test eCall being conducted as a normal IMS call, there is no need for the UE to support PSAP callback.  
b) there need to be a wait time that the UE waits for a PSAP callback and that this time can be variable and be provisioned by the PLMN/Operator which is already defined in CEN EN 17184:2024.

Question 5 Is this way-forward agreeable to SA?

Finding v) On CEN case #5, CEN wishes to make the support of in-band modem optional for PSAP. In the current architecture, in-band modem support in PSAP is needed for requesting and providing updated MSD in the cases:-

1) an IMS emergency call of the automatically or manually initiated eCall type of emergency service, which was established in PS and later on handed over to CS;

2) PSAP callback, which was established in PS and later on handed over to CS;

3) PSAP callback, which was accepted by the UE in CS; or

4) IMS non-emergency call of the test eCall type, which was established in PS and later on handed over to CS.

A way forward is to make the PSAP requirements of support of in-band modem conditional to support requesting and providing updated MSD in the cases 1), 2), 3), 4) above.  
i.e Full optionality is not possible but optionality except requesting and providing updated MSD in cases 1), 2) 3) and 4) above can be a way forward.

Question 6 Is this way-forward agreeable to SA?

Finding vi) For all 9 CEN use cases, CT1 considers that the TS (potentially) impacted will be:

Required cases as per CEN requirements/LS:

For Case-1, alignment will impact CT1 TS 24.229. See also case-5.

For Case-2, alignment will impact SA1 TS 22.101, SA2 TS 23.167, possibly TS 23.292 and CT1 TS 24.229. See also case-5.

For Case-3, alignment with CEN impacts SA2 TS 23.167, and CT1 TS 24.229,

For Case-4, alignment with CEN impacts CT1 TS 24.229.

For Case-5, TBD as consideration of above findings need to be taken first. If the finding v) is agreeable, CT1 TS 24.229 is impacted.

Optional cases as per CEN requirements/LS:

For Case-6, Information provided by CEN seems contradicting, but if alignment is needed, there will be impact in TS 23.167, and TS 24.229.

For Case-7, alignment with CEN, impacts SA2 TS 23.167 and CT1 TS 24.229.

For Case-8, alignment with CEN impacts SA1 TS 22.101, SA2 TS 23.167 and CT1 TS 24.229.

For Case-9, alignment with CEN impacts SA1 TS 22.101, SA2 TS 23.167 and CT1 TS 24.229.

**2. Actions:**

**To SA group.**

**ACTION:** CT1 kindly request SA to take note of CT1's findings and provide answers to above questions and provide guidance on proceeding with normative work.

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

CT1#151 14th October- 18th  October 2024..............Hefei, China

CT1#152 18th November- 22nd  October 2024..............Orlando, US