**[FS\_MUSIM] Pre SA2#141E Conference call - meeting notes (held on 24 Sep 2020)**

**Attendees** (35+) : Bell Canada, Qualcomm, Samsung, Huawei, LG Electronics, T-Mobile US, OPPO, Ericsson, Sony, Google, MediaTek, Nokia, NTT DOCOMO, Broadcom, Charter, NEC, China Telecom, MATRIXX, ZTE, DT, Vodafone, vivo, Spirent, China Unicom, Tencent, Apple, Volkswagen, Intel, …

**Rapporteur’s plan for resolving open issues in Q4**:

<https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_sa/WG2_Arch/TSGS2_141e_Electronic/INBOX/CCs/FS_MUSIM_SA2-CC%20Sept.24/RAP%20S2-200xxxx_FS_MUSIM_plan.pptx>

Discussion:

* The plan to proceed based on show-of-hands in a conference call for SA2#141E and SA2#142E seems to be ok. Details to be confirmed with SA2 leadership.
* Should the questions be focused on individual solution principles or on a set of principles? Preferably on individual solution principles.
* It was commented that for SA2#141E the show-of-hands should be done earlier in the meeting than CC#4.

**Samsung**:

<https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_sa/WG2_Arch/TSGS2_141e_Electronic/INBOX/CCs/FS_MUSIM_SA2-CC%20Sept.24/Samsung_FS_MUSIM.zip>

Discussion:

* The EN in Sol#24 on mobility restrictions needs to be resolved.
* Should PDU Session ID be part of the MUSIM-RAI given that a PDU Session has a mix of services?
* Suggestion to replace “Paging Cause” in MUSIM-RAI with something else e.g. “service type”.
* It was clarified that Upper Bound Timer is not meant to be service-specific.

**Ericsson**:

<https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_sa/WG2_Arch/TSGS2_141e_Electronic/INBOX/CCs/FS_MUSIM_SA2-CC%20Sept.24/Erics_Proposal%20on%20assistance%20information%20documentation%20for%203%20key%20issues.doc>

Discussion:

* There seems to be a preference to contribute directly to the conclusions.

**Intel**:

<https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_sa/WG2_Arch/TSGS2_141e_Electronic/INBOX/CCs/FS_MUSIM_SA2-CC%20Sept.24/INT%20S2-200xxxx_FS_MUSIM_wf.pptx>

Discussion:

* Proposal 4 to be reworded to indicate that Busy Indication does not depend on Upper Bound Timer.
* What happens if Busy Indication is not agreed? Will the UE be mandated to respond to paging? No. Based on configuration the UE can decide whether to respond or not.
* Proposal 2: Why is indication of “voice” as part of Leaving useful? So that the network knows whether to page the UE for MT service other than “voice”.
* MTK is ok with 1A, 2, 3, 5, and Busy Indication without Upper Bound Timer. QC have similar view, but only if Busy Indication is RRC-based and want to see progress on RRC-based Busy Indication before committing. Nokia think that RRC-based Busy Indication is insecure.
* Can Paging Cause “SMS” be determined for IMS-SMS? Yes, if a dedicated DSCP marking is used.
* Will Sol#1 be updated to cover the conclusion in slide 13? Not necessarily; the conclusion text can be enhanced instead.
* Proposal 2: indicating to the network that UE is leaving for “voice” may have privacy issues. Should we send an LS to SA3? On the other hand, if UE tells the network upon leaving that it would like to be paged only for “voice”, then there is no privacy issue.
* Slide 13: shouldn’t there be a Paging Cause value = “other service” to allow the UE to discriminate from legacy RAN nodes? It was commented that access stratum coding may already allow for such discrimination.
* Ericsson ok with 1B; PDU Session ID should be kept in MUSIM-RAI; no need for Upper Bound Timer.
* vivo think that more discussion is needed for Proposal 2 and Proposal 4. Ok with the other proposals.

**LG Electronics**:

<https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_sa/WG2_Arch/TSGS2_141e_Electronic/INBOX/CCs/FS_MUSIM_SA2-CC%20Sept.24/LGE_SA2%23141_MUSIM_CC.pptx>

Discussion:

* It was commented that the proposal is too broad (a generic support for Push Notification type solutions). Should be narrowed down to specific solution principles.