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# Introduction

This report summarizes the email discussion below that took place during RAN2#115-e meeting:

* [AT115-e][050][NPN] LS out (CMCC)

Scope: LS out acc to discussion, related to P2 in R2-2109017

Intended outcome: Approved LSout

Deadline: Tuesday W2 (CB online only if needed)

# Reference

# Contact information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Contact Name, Email** |
| Nokia | Gyuri Wolfner, gyorgy.wolfner@nokia.com |
| OPPO | fanjiangsheng@oppo.com |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Lili Zheng, zhenglili4@huawei.com |
| vivo | Yanxia Zhang, yanxia.zhang@vivo.com |
| Ericsson | Felipe Arraño Scharager, felipe.arrano.scharager@ericsson.com |
| Qualcomm | oozturk@qti.qualcomm.com |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Discussion

## Comments on the LS

Here companies may provide comments on the LS.

**Question 1:** Do companies have comments on whether the availability of emergency services of the R15/R16 UEs should be included in the LS?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Other comments** |
| Nokia | We think that including the question on R15 and R16 UEs is OK to make the situation clear and avoid further debates. |
| OPPO | Usually, any new function introduced in the later release should not impact the behaviour of legacy UEs if early implementation is not considered. We think RAN2 alone can make the decision, so tend to not include the legacy UEs part in the LS. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are ok to send the questions. However, we’re not sure if SA2 can provide the answers because in R16 SA2 raised the questions regarding the support of emergency service for different kinds of UEs to RAN2 (R2-1908651):   |  | | --- | | Regarding Emergency service in CAG cells:  E1: SA2 concluded that the UE should be allowed to camp for Emergency services for the case where UE supports the CAG feature, but is not authorized for any of the advertised CAG IDs.  E2: SA2 could not conclude whether Rel-16 UEs not supporting the CAG feature should be allowed to camp in a CAG cell in limited service state. There is no SA2 consensus to support this scenario. | |
| vivo | RAN2 has agreed to introduce a new IE/field to indicate the support of IMS emergency service for SNPN. However, the legacy UE cannot identify this new IE/field.  From our view, RAN2 should first discuss if there are solutions which can let legacy UEs know that a SNPN cell can provide emergency service. If there does not exist feasible solution which can let legacy UE know the supporting of emergency cell in a SNPN cell, there is no need to ask SA2 the availability of emergency services of the R15/R16 UEs via SNPN. |
| Ericsson | We agree with what has been brought up by OPPO and vivo. And believe that this can be decided within RAN2. In addition, emergency services and PWS have been explicitly excluded from Rel-16. Therefore, access to these services would only be possible for Rel-17 UEs (and onwards). |
| Qualcomm | Tend to agree with others that this shouldn’t impact legacy UEs. However, it will be good to get feedback from SA2/CT1 since we are already sending an LS. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Rapporteur’s summary:** <tbd>

**Question 2:** Do companies have other comments on this LS?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Other comments** |
| Nokia | Rewording proposal is uploaded in [R2-21xxxx Draft LS on limited service availability of an SNPN-v01-Nokia.doc](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_115-e/Inbox/Drafts/%5BOffline-050%5D%5BNPN%5D%20LS%20out%20(CMCC)/R2-21xxxx%20Draft%20LS%20on%20limited%20service%20availability%20of%20an%20SNPN-v01-Nokia.doc) |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It would be difficult to allow legacy UEs to camp on R17 SNPN to obtain emergency services because legacy UEs cannot recognize the R17 IEs in system information.  On the LS itself, the latest version in the folder (provided by Nokia) looks good to us. |
| Vivo | We tend not to ask SA2’view on the following content.   * **The R17 SNPN-capable UEs that are not in SNPN Access Mode and R17 Non-SNPN capable UEs cannot camp on an SNPN cell supporting emergency services to obtain emergency services.**   In the TS 23.122, it is clearly specified that “*if the MS does not operate in SNPN access mode, the MS attempts to camp on an acceptable cell, irrespective of its PLMN identity*”. Based on our understanding, it means that R17 SNPN-capable UEs that are not in SNPN Access Mode and R17 Non-SNPN capable UEs cannot camp on an SNPN cell cannot camp on SNPN cell for emergency service.  If the majority support to ask SA2, we suggest also ask CT1. |
| Ericsson | See uploaded draft LS document. |
| Qualcomm | The sentence on the “conclusion” is put in the same format as a formal agreement of the above RAN2#113. We shouldn’t do this and it will create confusion. There is actually no conclusion. I suggest we remove it and just ask the questions. See the draft LS. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Rapporteur’s summary:** <tbd>