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# 1 Introduction

This document is the report of the following email discussion:

* [AT118-e][035][eNPN] Corrections (Nokia)

Scope: Treat all tdocs under 6.16. ph1 determine agreeable parts. Ph2 agree CRs.

Intended outcome: Report, Agreed CRs

Deadline: Schedule 1

(Discussions with Deadline **Schedule 1**:

* A first round with Deadline for comments W1 Thursd May 12th 1200 UTC to settle scope what is agreeable etc
* A Final round with Final deadline W2 Wednesd May 18th 1200 UTC to settle details / agree CRs etc. )

# 2 Contact Points

Respondents to the email discussion are kindly asked to fill in the following table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | Email Address |
| Nokia (Rapporteur) | Gyuri Wolfner | gyorgy.wolfner@nokia.com |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Lili Zheng | zhenglili4@huawei.com |
| Intel Corporation | Seau Sian Lim | seau.s.lim@intel.com |
| ZTE | Li Wenting | li.wenting@zte.com.cn |
| Samsung | Sriganesh Rajendran | sriganesh.r@samsung.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Discussion

## 3.1 Running CR (R2-2205490)

[R2-2205490](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2205490.zip) is the outcome of "[Pre118-e][006][eNPN] 38331 CR and rapporteur resolutions (Nokia)". It addresses

1. ASN. 1 Class 0 comments 120, 121, 122, 307, 308

2. RIL comments E036, H049, H050

**Question 1**: Do you have any comment on the CR (e.g., cover page issue, editorial mistakes etc)?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Summary 1**: TBD.

**Proposal 1**: TBD.

## 3.2 E037: Changing the “GINs per SNPN list” Need Code

RIL comment in [E037] has not been addressed in the running CR.

In the current specification "Need R" is used for *ginsPerSNPN-List-r17*:

SIB18-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {

gin-ElementList-r17 SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxGIN-r17)) OF GIN-Element-r17 OPTIONAL, -- Need R

ginsPerSNPN-List-r17 SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxNPN-r16)) OF GINs-perSNPN-r17 OPTIONAL, -- Need R

lateNonCriticalExtension OCTET STRING OPTIONAL,

...

}

Section 2.1.2 of [R2-2206012](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2206012.zip) proposes (Proposal 2) to "modify the Need Code for *ginsPerSNPN-List-r17* **from Need R to Need S**".

In addition, section 2.1.2 of [R2-2206012](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2206012.zip) also contains a revision proposal (Proposal 3) for the description of *ginsPerSNPN-List*

|  |
| --- |
| ***ginsPerSNPN-List***  Indicates the supported GINs for each SNPN. The network includes the same number of entries as the number of SNPNs in *snpn-AccessInfoList* in provided in SIB1, and the n-th entry in this list corresponds to the n-th SNPN listed in *snpn-AccessInfoList* provided in SIB1. ~~It~~ The field is not present if there is only a single SNPN in *snpn-AccessInfoList* in SIB1, ~~as in that case~~ and absence of the field indicates that all GINs in this SIB ~~is~~ are associated with that SNPN. |

Note that the description of *ginsPerSNPN-List*has been changed in the running CR in the following way (solving the editorial issue of "It" in the last sentence):

|  |
| --- |
| ***gins-PerSNPN-List***  Indicates the supported GINs for each SNPN. The network includes the same number of entries as the number of SNPNs in *snpn-AccessInfoList* in provided in SIB1, and the n-th entry in this list corresponds to the n-th SNPN listed in *snpn-AccessInfoList* provided in SIB1. This field is not present if there is only a single SNPN in *snpn-AccessInfoList* in SIB1, as in that case all GINs in this SIB is associated with that SNPN. |

**Question 2.1**: Do you agree to change the NEED R to NEED S for *gin-ElementList-r17*?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answers to Question 2 | | |
| Company | Yes/No | Technical Arguments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | Need S is used to specify UE behaviour when the field is absent, or provide a default value.  But the last sentence in the field description is more of guiding the NW implementation in terms of when to configure or not to configure the field. |
| Intel | Yes | There is a description of behaviour on absence in the field description and then by definition, it has to be Need S. Just Need R is not sufficient as the configuration is not just released, but UE also has to apply the configuration defined in the field description. |
| Nokia | No | Same view as Huawei. Note that the special behaviour is only for the case when there is a single SNPN, and in that case a change in the supported GINs is indicated in the listed GINs (no need to update this vector). |
| ZTE | No | Similar view as Huawei, the last sentence doesn’t specify the UE’s behavior, so seems Need R is OK. |
| Samsung | No | Same view as Huawei, the existing field description is sufficient and no need to change from Need R to Need S. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Question 2.2**: Do you agree with the additional proposed changes in the description of *ginsPerSNPN-List*?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answers to Question 2 | | |
| Company | Yes/No | Technical Arguments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | We think the current wording in the running CR (R2-2205490) is fine. |
| Intel | Yes | We are fine with the additional modified text from R2-2206012 |
| Nokia | No | We think the additional modification is not necessary. |
| ZTE | No | We think the wording in the running CR is fine |
| Samsung | No | We are fine the wording in current running CR (R2-2205490) |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 2**: TBD.

**Proposal 2**: TBD.

# 4 Conclusion

TBD.