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# 1 Introduction

This document is to kick-off the following email discussion:

* [AT113-e][032][eNPN] UE onboarding and provisioning for NPN (Ericsson)

 Scope: Take into account documents submitted to this section, 1st pass: identify what is required to be supported by AS and determine the RAN2 impact, if possible. Identify common views / potential initial agreements, Identify points that need further discussion. Can also gather comments on the need to ask questions to other group.

 Intended outcome: Report with agreeable proposals and discussion points (not too many, preferably < 10) for treatment on-line

 Deadline: 1st Deadline for Comments: Friday Jan 29 1000 UTC. Other deadline if needed by rapporteur. Report Ready for treatment on-line Feb 3.

## Contact information

To make it easier to find the correct contact delegate in each company for potential follow-up questions, the rapporteur encourages the delegates to provide their contact information in the following table:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | Email address |
| Ericsson | Felipe Arraño Scharager | felipe.arrano.scharager@ericsson.com |
| ZTE | Wenting Li | li.wenting@zte.com.cn |
| OPPO | Jiangsheng Fan | fanjiangsheng@oppo.com |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Lili Zheng | zhenglili4@huawei.com |
| MediaTek | Pradeep Jose | pradeep[dot]jose[at]mediatek[dot]com |
| Intel | Seau Sian Lim | seau.s.lim@intel.com |
| CATT | Rui Zhou | zhourui@catt.cn |
| Sony | Vivek Sharma | Vivek.sharma@sony.com |
| CMCC | Chai Li/Min Wu | chaili@chinamobile.com/wumin@chinamobile.com |
| Qualcomm | Ozcan Ozturk | oozturk@qti.qualcomm.com |
| China Telecom | Jiaxiang Liu | liujiaxiang6@chinatelecom.cn |
| Apple | Sarma Vangala | svangala@apple.com |
| Samsung | Sangbum Kim | sb07.kim@samsung.com |
| vivo | Yanxia Zhang | yanxia.zhang@vivo.com |
| Nokia | Gyorgy Wolfner | gyorgy.wolfner@nokia.com |
| LGE | HyunJung Choe | stella.choe@lge.com |

# 2 Discussion

The following RAN2 centric objectives are captured in the NG\_RAN\_PRN\_enh WID (see [RP-202363](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/TSG_RAN/TSGR_90e/Docs/RP-202363.zip)), regarding the scope of the current email discussion:

* Support UE onboarding and provisioning for NPN including:
	+ The UE onboarding relevant parameter broadcast from SIB [RAN2]
	+ The associated cell selection/reselection, cell access control and the connected mode mobility support [RAN2/RAN3]

Therefore, as indicated above, the intention of the present document is to identify common views regarding what is required to be supported by AS and the related RAN2 impact.

The list of Tdocs considered for this email discussion is available in the Reference section below.

## 2.1 Relevant parameter broadcast in SIB

SA2’s eNPN study item resulting in TR 23.700-07 (see [SP-200967](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_sa/TSG_SA/TSGs_90E_Electronic/Docs/SP-200967.zip)) concluded the following in clause 8.4.1:

- The NG-RAN of the Onboarding network includes an indication for Onboarding enabled in the SIB (per O-SNPN, considering that the NG-RAN can be shared) so that the UE can discover and select an appropriate O-SNPN. The UE may or may not be pre-configured with O-SNPN network selection information (e.g. O-SNPN network identifiers).

NOTE 2: Whether the indication for Onboarding is sufficient or more SIB information is needed can be further discussed in the normative phase.

**Q1.1.a: Do you agree that a 1-bit indication for onboarding is needed in the SIB?**

**Q1.1.b: Do you agree that this indication should broadcast per O-SNPN in shared-cell scenarios?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No (Q1.1**.**a)** | **Yes/No (Q1.1**.**b)** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | Yes | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Yes |  |
| China Telecom | Yes | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes | Yes |  |
| LGE | Yes | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes | Yes |  |

Some companies argue that a 1-bit indication is enough for onboarding purposes, yet others point out that it would be beneficial to broadcast additional information, e.g. the Subscription Owner (SO) SNPN associated with the Onboarding SNPN (O-SNPN), or even the Group ID (GID) of the latter. However, it should be stressed, what is also mentioned in some contributions, that onboarding is a “one-shot” procedure which is not time-critical. Therefore, a 1-bit indication (e.g., in SIB1) could arguably be sufficient to signal whether the O-SNPN’s NG-RAN supports onboarding. In this same line, the amount of onboarding-related information may determine the SIB on which this should be broadcast, given the size constraints imposed by different SIBs. It is therefore important to find consensus on the above.

**Q1.2.a: Do you think any additional SIB information (e.g. SO-SNPN) besides the 1-bit indication is needed?**

**Q1.2.b: Which SIB should be used to indicate support for onboarding?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No (Q1.2.a)** | **SIB** preference **(Q1.2**.**b)** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | FFS | SIB1 | For the Q1.2a, we think whether more SIB information (e.g. Group ID of the SO) is needed, further input from the SA2/CT1 is needed. |
| OPPO | Maybe | depends | For Q1.2.a, GID can be considered, but we should get SA2 input before introducing it. One more thing is for access control for onboarding, maybe both cell level and per AC level access control parameters can be considered.For Q1.2.b, no matter additional SIB information is introduced or not for onboarding, 1-bit indication should be put into SIB1 to enable UE fast cell selection; As for additional SIB information if agreed, we can discuss further. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | FFS | SIB1 | Q1.2.a can wait for SA2 progress.For Q1.2.b, 1-bit indication per O-SNPN will not introduce too much overhead, thus can be included in SIB1. |
| MediaTek | No | SIB1 (for now) | We see no need for additional information to be broadcasted for now. If SA2 agree to additional information, this can be taken into account later.As it is just a 1-bit indication, SIB1 should be able to accommodate this information. However as the process should only rarely occur (i.e. a UE with no NPN credentials), we are open to including this information in other SIBs. |
| Intel | No | SIB1 | If no further SIB information is to be included for onboarding other than the indicator. |
| CATT | FFS | SIB1 | For Q1.2.a, maybe NG-RAN can also indicate whether the SNPN supports onboarding service only, or supports both onboarding service and normal services. With this, it can prevent normal UE from camping on SNPN cell only for Onboarding. For Q1.2.b,it is not worth to introduce a new SIB. |
| Sony | No | SIB1 |  |
| CMCC | FFS | SIB1 | The indication for on-boarding enabled can be defined on per SNPN basis for O-SNPN or per PLMN basis for PLMN on boarding network in the SIB1. We could wait for the progress of SA2 to broadcast optionally the supported SO-SNPN list. |
| Qualcomm | No | SIB1 | If SA2 decides to include more information, they will inform us, and we can include them at that time. Since this is just one bit per SNPN currently, the size is small and should be included in SIB1. |
| China Telecom | No | SIB1 | 1-bit indication is acceptable in SIB1. |
| Apple | No | SIB1 | No additional information for on-boarding beyond the 1-bit is needed.  |
| Samsung | FFS | depends | Share with OPPO for Q1.2.b. |
| vivo | FFS | SIB1 | SA2 has concluded that “Whether the indication for Onboarding is sufficient or more SIB information is needed can be further discussed in the normative phase”. So, we can wait for further progress in SA2. |
| Nokia | No | SIB1 | RAN2 should update the agreement if SA2/CT1 identifies some additional information to be broadcasted |
| LGE | FFS | SIB1 | For Q1.2.a, more input is needed from SA2. |
| Ericsson | No | SIB1 | Q1.2.b Agree with Intel. Include in SIB1 only if we assume that only the 1-bit per SNPN indication is added as the overhead for this indication is limited; other information, if agreed, should be included in another SIB |

Even though it may not be in RAN2 scope, in [R2-2101002](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101002.zip) the question came up whether it is possible for the cells belonging to the same SNPN to broadcast different contents with regard to onboarding (e.g., some of them broadcast the “onboarding supported” indication while others don’t, or, the cells broadcast different SO/DCS IDs).

Thus, it remains to be clarified whether the support is to be homogeneous throughout the O-SNPN or if it may differ from one cell to another.

**Q1.3: Should the broadcast of onboarding-related information be homogenous throughout the O-SNPN (same onboarding related content broadcast in all cells belonging to the O-SNPN)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | No | We think the on-boarding is supported by part of cells and part of AM, that is why 1 bit indication in the system information is needed.For the AMF, SA2 has agreed that the UE need to indicate on-boarding purpose to RAN node to assist the AMF selection, it also means that not all of the AMF in the O-SNPN would support on-boarding feature.Furthermore, from the network deployment aspect, there is no need to support on-boarding feature among the whole network, e.g. deploy on-boarding feature only on the cells that next to a factory (that has lots of UE with on-boarding requirements) |
| OPPO |  | As mentioned by rapporteur, this may be out of RAN2 scope. More addition, Onboarding is one-shot procedure, no cell reselection/Mobility issue involved, so it does not make sense to discuss the network deployment among cells. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | SA2 to clarify | The motivation for this clarification is to facilitate the cell selection process for AS.If the answer from SA2 is “No”, AS procedures will be much easier: after NAS selects an O-SNPN, AS could follow the legacy cell selection procedure. Otherwise, AS needs to take the 1-bit indication for onboarding into consideration as well. |
| MediaTek | SA2 to clarify | It is unclear whether cell reselections can take place while the onboarding/remote provisioning procedure is ongoing (e.g. if the UE can enter Inactive state). If yes, it is important to know whether the onboarding information changes from cell to cell – as it would affect cell reselection. It would be useful to get some clarification from SA2 on the two aspects above. |
| Intel |  | It is unclear to us what is the motivation behind the question as we don’t see any impact from RAN perspective as also pointed out by rapporteur. As per SA2 requirement, the UE register itself to the O-SNPN for onboarding to a SO-SNPN and upon successful onboarding and provisioning, the UE deregisters from the O-SNPN.  |
| CATT | Yes | Our understanding to SA2 conclusion is whether support onboarding should be SNPN specific, so the support status should be same on any cells belongs to this SNPN. |
| Sony |  | Same view as OPPO |
| CMCC |  | Since the information including the on-boarding supported indication or SO ID list is used to assist the UE to select suitable AMF, it is out of scope of RAN2. And whether the on-boarding supported indication is broadcasted may more like a deployment issue. |
| Qualcomm | No | Agree with Oppo. RAN2 should not start discussions beyond its responsibilities. |
| China Telecom | SA2 to clarify |  |
| Apple | No | Same view as Oppo.  |
| Samsung |  | It seems pre-matured to decide now. Also, we need to wait for inputs from other WGs. |
| vivo |  | Agree with the intention of this question is for identifying if any impacts on cell selection re-selection. As this is out of RAN2 scope, maybe we can ask SA2 to clarify. |
| Nokia | Yes | SA2 should be asked to confirm our assumption. |
| LGE | SA2 to clarify |  |
| Ericsson | No | We proposed below that the “onboarding enabled” bit can be toggled when a cell is congested. So the information can be different within the same O-SNPN. |

## 2.2 Cell selection/reselection and mobility support

When addressed, some companies’ view is that the onboarding indication does not impact AS cell selection/reselection and that legacy procedure should be enough for a UE to decide whether it can select a cell given the available onboarding indication. However, there are others that do not agree with this or did not discuss it.

**Q2.1: Do you see any impacts on cell selection/reselection procedures (e.g. a need to change suitable cell criteria) to support UE onboarding in O-SNPNs?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | Yes | We think at least the UE shall select the cell that support on-boarding as suitable cell, which will change suitable cell criteria. |
| OPPO | Maybe | if AMF routing mechanism for onboarding is decoupled with suitable cell criteria check, no enhancement for suitable cell criteria is needed; but we may revisit this if more input is identified from SA2, e.g. GID.  |
| Huawei | Depends | For cell selection, it depends on the answer of Q1.3. See comments to Q1.3.For cell reselection:During the UE onboarding and remote provisioning procedure, it seems that UE will not transit to the idle or inactive states and reselect an O-SNPN cell. Once the credential is provisioned or the onboarding PDU session expires, the UE deregisters with the O-SNPN and will not reselect a cell within the O-SNPN. Therefore we have not identified valid scenarios for cell reselection within O-SNPN. If the network is changed (O-SNPN is changed), the UE will perform cell selection instead of reselection. |
| MediaTek | Yes | At least for cell selection, we see an impact. The UE should only select a cell with the onboarding indication, when the onboarding procedure needs to be performed.For cell reselection, please refer to our comments for Q1.3. It would be useful to get some clarifications from SA2 on this aspect. |
| Intel | No | From the conclusion in the TR, there is neither any requirement to change the cell selection/reselection nor the connected mode mobility. The UE is just performing an initial registration to an onboarding SNPN based on manual selection. If cell selection/reselection occurs while UE is performing such initial registration for onboarding, it will have to abort such procedure and perform the network selection and the onboarding NAS procedure again as like any initial registration.After successful completion of on-boarding, the UE initiates de-registration from the on-boarding network after finishing the remote provisioning or the on-boarding network initiates the de-registration after successful completion of onboarding. Subsequently, the UE performs normal registration as before to a SNPN for normal access. Hence the normal cell reselection procedure is not affected by the onboarding process. |
| CATT | No | “Onboarding indication” should only impact the SNPN selection procedure. The general procedure should be like this,1. If a UE need onboarding , a SNPN with “onboarding indication” set to TRUE will be selected by NAS layer.
2. UE perform the legacy cell selection/rereselection, only the cells belong to the selected SNPN(support onboarding) can be the candidate cell. definitely the selected cell should support onboarding as well.

By the way, Q2.1 seems related to answer to Q1.3. |
| Sony | No | Our understanding from SA2 conclusion is that UE should not prioritize a cell where on-boarding is allowed. FFS for any state change during the procedure. |
| CMCC | Yes | The UE seeking for on-boarding service needs to find the cell with on-boarding supported indication as suitable cell. |
| Qualcomm | No | Onboarding only affects SNPN selection at the NAS layer. It has no impact on AS. |
| China Telecom | No |  |
| Apple  | Yes  | In cases of group ID we might have to change atleast for the cell selection procedures.  |
| Samsung | Maybe | O-SNPN could be considered in suitable cell criteria. On the other hand, it seems pre-matured to decide now. Need to further check. |
| vivo | Yes | We think it affects the definition of suitable cell. |
| Nokia | Depends | It depends on the answer to Q1.3: if homogenous support of onboarding in the O-SNPN can be assumed then it has no impact. |
| LGE | No | To our understanding, the indication is meant to be used by upper layers for O-SNPN discovery and selection. If a new O-SNPN is chosen by upper layers, the selected O-SNPN is reflected in AS as a “selected SNPN” during the suitability criteria during cell selection/reselection as specified in 38.304. Thus, from AS perspective, the indication is not meant to further restrict SNPN access from UEs on top of what is already specified for Rel-16 access restriction for SNPN Access Mode. |
| Ericsson | No | Cell selection: O-SNPN selection is performed by NAS.Cell reselection: same view as Huawei. During the onboarding procedure, the UE would not be moved to INACTIVE/IDLE, and once the credentials are provisioned, there is no need to reselect to an O-SNPN cell. |

Similarly, not all companies indicated their position on the impact of onboarding on connected mode mobility.

**Q2.2: Do you see any impact regarding connected mode mobility?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | Yes | The on-boarding is a one-shot procedure, we don’t think it has impact to the connected state mobility. Instead, once the UE indicate on-boarding purpose to the network, the network shall simplify the procedure as much as possible, e.g. avoid any DC, or handover related procedure. |
| OPPO | No | Onboarding is one-shot procedure, no Mobility issue involved. |
| Huawei | No | No connected mobility issues spotted so far. |
| MediaTek | No |  |
| Intel | No, for UE | No UE behaviour change for connected mode mobility. Any potential network impact can be discussed by RAN3 |
| CATT | No | Legacy handover procedure seems sufficient |
| Sony | No |  |
| CMCC | No | The UE should continue the normal service in desired SNPN instead of the on-boarding SNPN or PLMN. No change for mobility.  |
| Qualcomm | No |  |
| China Telecom | No |  |
| Apple | No |  |
| Samsung | Maybe no | It seems pre-matured. However, the basic assumption is that the connected UEs will perform normal measurement and mobility procedures based on configuration provided by the network. |
| vivo | No |  |
| Nokia | No |  |
| LGE | No |  |
| Ericsson | No | UE onboarding is a one-shot procedure. No impact is foreseen as we think existing mobility procedures can be used. |

## 2.3 Cell access and congestion control

Two trends became apparent with respect to the approach needed to provide congestion control, one is based on using the onboarding indication and the other by means of the Unified Access Control (UAC) mechanism. While the latter allows for higher granularity by allowing the RAN to configure a barring factor and a barring time for onboarding, it also requires additional complexity in terms of specification work since a new Access Class value needs to be introduced by SA1 for the onboarding procedure (which might eventually be a once-in-a-lifetime procedure).

Instead, with the first option, if a 1-bit indication is used to broadcast onboarding support, the O-SNPN’s RAN could toggle this bit in the SIB to control congestion due to UE onboarding requests and, thus, controlling the access.

**Q3: What approach is more suitable for RAN-level congestion control handling?
Option A) Toggle the onboarding indication in the SIB
Option B) Use the UAC approach
Option C) Other mechanism is needed
Option D) There is no need to control congestion due to onboarding at a RAN level**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred option** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | B | We think option A is naturally supported, but only the option A is not enough, UAC approach is also needed |
| OPPO | A or B | For Option A, more like network implementation, no need to specify anything.For Option B, onboarding also belongs to MO signalling, the UAC parameters defined for MO signalling can be reused for most of the time, network can control the access rate by changing the UAC parameters for MO signalling; but new cause for onboarding can be further considered, we should coordinate with CT1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | B | Option B provides a finer granularity than Option A. |
| MediaTek | D | The onboarding/remote provisioning procedure should seldom occur, as the case where a UE does not have NPN credentials to access the NW should only typically occur once in a UE’s lifetime. We therefore see no reason to introduce congestion control for this rare occurrence. |
| Intel | A |  |
| CATT | D | Agree with MTK, do not see the need of UAC |
| Sony | A | We think this is straightforward option and network may also use existing UAC without distinguishing the on-boarding requests. |
| CMCC | B | For Option B, an operator defined UAC value or new normative UAC value could be used for RAN-level congestion control handling to partially block the UEs access. |
| Qualcomm | B | Option A does not give enough granular control to the operator. RAN2 designed UAC to be flexible enough to handle all congestion scenarios.  |
| China Telecom | B |  |
| Apple | A or B | Prefer B due to lesser regression and conformance with current procedures.  |
| Samsung | A (and B if needed) | It seems to be straight forward that Option A can be used for congestion control.If a fine control is required, option B can be also considered. |
| vivo | B | The existing UAC mechanism is enough. There is no need to specify any enhancement on UAC as onboarding procedure does occur frequently. |
| Nokia | B | UAC is the method created for this purpose. If we go for option A then the question is whether onboarding bit should be considered in mobility during onboarding (e.g. during cell reselection). |
| LGE | A and B | SIB1 indication is used for cell access control. For congestion control, UAC can be applied. |
| Ericsson | A | Given that onboarding is a one-shot procedure, we do not see the need to use UAC. We think that onboarding should be separated from MO signaling and should be kept simple. |

## 2.4 Onboarding request

From the conclusions of TR 23.700-07 (see clause 8.4.1), the following information is provided from the UE to the network for the purpose of onboarding.

- Upon registration to an SNPN for Onboarding, the UE provides an indication at RRC level that the RRC connectionis for onboarding. This information will be specified only for SNPN and allows NG-RAN to select an appropriate AMF that supports onboarding procedures.

Most companies agree that an onboarding request indication is needed, while [R2-2100278](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2100278.zip) states this is not necessary.

**Q4.1: Do you agree that UEs should signal an onboarding request indication?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | Yes | As concluded in the 23.700-07 |
| OPPO | Maybe | Implicitly, e.g. new cause if agreedExplicitly, e.g. A new indicator in Msg5 |
| Huawei | Yes | We should respect the SA2 conclusion. However, the motivation is to assist AMF selection, which is more of a RAN3 issue and can be studied in RAN3 first. |
| MediaTek | Yes | SA2 have concluded that there is a need for such an indication. |
| Intel | Yes | For AMF selection |
| CATT | No | As we explained in our paper (R2-2100278), legacy R16 mechanism seems sufficient.If a SNPN support onboarding is selected, then based on R16 NPN mechanism, the index of the selected SNPN will be included in IE “selectedPLMN-Identity” in MSG5.NG-RAN will use it to select the AMF belongs to the selected SNPN. Then naturally the selected AMF should supports onboarding. |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes | To assist the AMF selection. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | This was the SA2 agreement to allow correct AMF selection. There is no technical reason to challenge this in RAN2. |
| China Telecom | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes | FFS details. |
| vivo | Yes | As not all AMF(s) of the O-NPN support onboarding, the onboarding request indication is useful for AMF selection. |
| Nokia | Yes | This is an assumption made by SA2 |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes | We prefer a separate indication for onboarding. |

Several companies' view is to add this indication in *RRCSetupComplete*, i.e., msg5. But some companies have proposed to signal this in the *RRCSetupRequest* message, i.e., msg3. The rapporteur understands that these options require as a minimum:

* For *RRCSetupRequest* (msg3), a new *EstablishmentCause* for onboarding purposes,
* For *RRCSetupComplete* (msg5), a new field indicating onboarding purpose.

**Q4.2: If an onboarding request needs to be signalled, where should it be added?**

**Option A) *RRCSetupComplete* (i.e., msg5)**

**Option B) *RRCSetupRequest* (i.e., msg3)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred option** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | Option A | Normally, if the Msg 5 can work, the Msg 5 shall be selected. Considering that there are only 5 spare values left for the establish cause in the Msg3, it’s better to include such indication in the Msg5.  |
| OPPO | A or B | Depends whether new cause is introduced or not. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | A or B | No strong view. |
| MediaTek | Option A | No strong view, but we have a slight preference to use Msg5 for the same reasons as ZTE |
| Intel | Option A | Msg 3 is size limited and we should choose msg 5 whenever it is sufficient. In this case, AMF selection happens only after msg 5 and hence we think msg 5 should be used. |
| CATT | None |  |
| Sony | Option A |  |
| CMCC | A or B | We more likely prefer option A.  |
| Qualcomm | Option B | We have sufficient spare bits in establishment cause, and it is the natural IE for this indication. It is also better for the gNB to know this sooner than later. Since this is just one bit, no good reason to delay this to msg5. |
| China Telecom | Either |  |
| Apple | A or B |  |
| Samsung | A or B | It seems pre-matured to decide now. |
| vivo | Option B | Same view with QC. |
| Nokia | A | According to SA2 agreements the onboarding indication is needed for AMF selection, thus it is enough to send this in MSG5. As MSG3 size is very limited, there is no need to use any bits there for this purpose. |
| LGE | A | Indication in Msg5 is sufficient. |
| Ericsson | A | Using one of the reserved values as *EstablishmentCause* in msg3 is not justified for onboarding purposes. Plus, it appears more logical to send the onboarding indication in msg5 which also carries the NAS level message containing the onboarding request (to be defined by CT1). |

[R2-2101516](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101516.zip) pointed out the need to include this in other messages, e.g. *RRCResumeComplete*.

**Q4.3: Is the onboarding request information needed in other RRC messages, e.g. *RRCResumeComplete*?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | No | After the on-boarding, the UE will be de-registered from the on-boarding network, the UE would not enter into the Inactive state under the on-boarding SNPN. Thus there is no need to include this indication in the *RRCResumeComplete* message. |
| OPPO | No | Inactive state is not applicable for onboarding.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | Same understanding as ZTE. |
| MediaTek | Depends | We need to check with SA2 if the UE can enter Inactive state while the onboarding/remote provisioning procedure is ongoing. |
| Intel | No | It is only done as part of NAS registration. And UE doesn’t attempt onboarding request during a Resume procedure. |
| CATT | No |  |
| Sony | No |  |
| CMCC | No | Since the on-boarding service is executed only for on-boarding, the UE should continue the normal service in desired SNPN instead of the on-boarding SNPN or PLMN. |
| Qualcomm | No | This is only done during RRC connection setup from Idle. |
| China Telecom | No | No need for one-shot procedure. |
| Apple | No |  |
| Samsung | No |  |
| vivo | No |  |
| Nokia | No | There is no need to assume that INACTIVE state is not applicable even if it is not very probable. As onboarding flag is for AMF selection, there is no need to have onboarding flag during resume. |
| LG | No | Even if we proposed that in R2-2101516, we are fine with not adding that in RRCResumeComplete if we can make a firm assumption that UE will be de-registered from the on-boarding network.  |
| Ericsson | No | Agree with ZTE/OPPO. No need to support INACTIVE state for onboarding. |

Finally, [R2-2101616](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101616.zip) proposes to optionally include more information than only the onboarding request indication.

**Q4.4: Is additional information needed from the UE to the network for onboarding purposes?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | FFS | On this issue, we think more input from SA2/CT1is needed, which depends on SA2/CT1’s requirements. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | FFS | OK to discuss, but SA2 input is preferred. |
| MediaTek | No for now | If SA2 agree to include additional information, this can be taken into account later. |
| Intel | No for now | But can wait for SA2 conclusion on this. |
| CATT | No for now |  |
| Qualcomm | No | If SA2 agrees to new information, they will inform us. |
| China Telecom | No for now |  |
| Apple | FFS  | Needs SA2 input.  |
| Samsung | FFS |  |
| vivo | No for now |  |
| Nokia | No | At the moment, but this may change based on SA2/CT1 progress. |
| LGE | FFS | With more input from SA2/CT1, we are open for further discussion. |
| Ericsson | Not from RAN2 perspective | Given SA2 conclusions, sending the mentioned onboarding request in msg5 is enough. |

## 2.5 Onboarding network types

The support of PLMNs acting as Onboarding Networks has been mentioned in certain contributions, e.g. [R2-2101002](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101002.zip), [R2-2101616](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101616.zip), and [R2-2101930](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101930.zip) provides a draft LS, where SA2 is asked to confirm whether an SNPN capable UE operating in SNPN Access Mode could still register to a PLMN for onboarding and remote provisioning (i.e., to an O-PLMN).

According to the rapporteur’s understanding, discussions on onboarding PLMNs are ongoing in SA2 (see SA2 email discussion). Therefore, it is sufficient to wait for SA2 to conclude and update the TR 23.700-07.

**Q5: Do you agree that we can focus on O-SNPNs and wait for SA2 to conclude on onboarding PLMNs?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | Yes | We agree to give O-SNPN high priority and wait for more inputs on O-PLMN from SA2. |
| OPPO | Yes | At this stage, we agree the suggestion, but also fine to send LS to SA2 to clarify the PLMN scenario, anyway coordination is needed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | - | No strong view on this issue. |
| MediaTek | - | We prefer to send an LS to SA2 to clarify whether PLMNs can be used for onboarding. |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes | We do not see any issue here. UE is not supposed to be in SNPN AM when camp on a PLMN cell.Besides, According to 23.501, activation and deactivation of SNPN access mode are up to UE implementation. UE is free to exit the SNPN AM when it want to camp on a PLMN cell for onboarding. |
| Sony |  | Yes |
| CMCC | No | We think it is needed to ask SA2 to clarify this issue because it impacts the definition of suitable cell in TS38.304. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | SA2 told us to only do SNPN. We don’t need to ask proactive questions. |
| China Telecom | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes | SA2 has concluded that “Using PLMN credentials for UE onboarding and PLMN as Onboarding Network (ON) is already possible”. Thus, we do not need to consider onboarding PLMN as no any impacts has been identified by SA2.  |
| Nokia | Yes | RAN2 should wait for SA2 progress. |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes | The discussion is anyway ongoing in SA2. No need to add extra overhead. |

## 2.6 Other issues

**Q6: Are there any other related issues that are not addressed by the previous questions?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Other issue(s)** |
| ZTE | We also have a question on whether the network can trigger DC or handover procedure during on-boarding? From the RAN side, for the on-boarding access attempt, it shall make the procedure as simple as possible, e.g. avoid the handover/redirection just for the load balancing, unnecessary measurement and so on. Thus about the on-boarding indication, besides the function of AMF selection, it can also be used by the RAN node to simplify the AS procedures as much as possible. |
| OPPO | Cell level access control for onboarding can be further considered. |
| MediaTek | It is unclear if the UE can enter Inactive/Idle state while the onboarding and remote provisioning procedure is ongoing. This can be checked with SA2, and depending on their response, we can determine if there are any cell reselection impacts. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 2.7 Proposed questions to other WGs

**Q7: Any other proposed questions to other WGs related to onboarding in SNPNs?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **WG(s)** | **Proposed question(s)** |
| OPPO | SA2/CT1 | SA2: send LS to SA2 to clarify the PLMN scenario for onboarding;CT1: send LS to CT1 to clarify whether UAC enhancement is needed or not for onboarding. |
| MediaTek | SA2 | 1. Can the UE enter Inactive/Idle mode while the onboarding procedure is ongoing?2. Can the onboarding indication change from cell to cell within the O-SNPN?3. Can PLMNs be used for onboarding? |
| CATT | SA2 | Since there is Q1.3 on whether the support status of onboarding for a specific SNPN should be same on different cells(even the answer is Yes from our view),we still can confirm this with SA2. |
| Nokia | SA2 | Q1: Can RAN2 assume that support of broadcasting is homogenous in an O-SNPN (i.e., the same onboarding related content broadcast in all cells belonging to the O-SNPN)?Q2: Can RAN2 assume that the only purpose of sending onboarding indication from UE to RAN in RRC is to enable the selection of the appropriate AMF? |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Conclusion

To be added.
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