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**1. Overall Description:**

TS 24.379 clause 4.9 specifies that prior to using a pre-established session (i.e. during establishment of the pre-established session) the ICE procedures according to RFC 5245 shall be done. Furthermore according to TS 24.379 clause 8.2.1 the MCPTT client shall "include ICE candidates in the SDP offer as per IETF RFC 5245" and according to TS 24.379 clause 8.2.2 the participating MCPTT function shall "include ICE candidates in the SDP answer as per IETF RFC 5245".

Nevertheless RFC 5245 allows that the offerer and/or the answerer does not support ICE at all (see clauses 5.1 and 6.1 in RFC 5245).

⇒ There are two questions:

1. May a participating MCPTT function leave out any ICE candidates in the SDP answer to indicate that support of ICE is not needed?
2. May an MCPTT client – based on UE capability of UE configuration – indicate by leaving out any ICE candidates in the SDP offer, that it does not support ICE? Or – is support of ICE always mandatory for an MCPTT client at establishment of a pre-established session?

**2. Actions:**

**To CT1 group**

**ACTION**: RAN5 respectfully asks CT1 for guidance and action in answering the above questions.

**3. Date of Next TSG-RAN WG5 Meetings:**

TSG-RAN5 Meeting#91 17th – 28th May 2021 Electronic Meeting

TSG-RAN5 Meeting#92 16th Aug – 27th Aug 2021 Electronic Meeting