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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 |
| OPPO | Jiangsheng Fan | fanjiangsheng@oppo.com |
| Apple | Yuqin Chen | yuqin\_chen@apple.com |
| Ericsson | Felipe Arraño Scharager | felipe.arrano.scharager@ericsson.com |
| LGE | SungHoon Jung | Sunghoon.jung@lge.com |
| Qualcomm | Ozcan Ozturk | oozturk@qti.qualcomm.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Discussion

## 3.1 Running CR (R2-2205490)

R[2-2205490](file:///E:\3GPP文档\会议文稿\2022\RAN2%20118\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 |
| Ericsson | 1. Naming convention: Type identifiers other than PDU identifiers should be ordinary *mixed* case, e.g UE-Identity not UE-identity.  Thus, *GINs-perSNPN* should be *GINs-PerSNPN,* also to be aligned with *gins-PerSNPN*. 2. *SIB18* states that GINs are used to *enable* UE onboarding, but GINs are optional and UE onboarding can be enabled even if there are no GINs.   Proposal: Use “support” instead of “enable” |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Summary 1**: Two additional comments:

1) It is clearly an editorial error to be corrected

2) The proposed change is good clarification.

**Proposal 1: Implement both comments in the rapporteur's CR: *GINs-perSNPN* changed to *GINs-PerSNPN;* change“enable" to “support” in the description of SIB18.**

## 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 R[2-2206012](file:///E:\3GPP文档\会议文稿\2022\RAN2%20118\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 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. |
| OPPO | No | Same view as Huawei |
| Apple | No | Tend to agree with Huawei. |
| Ericsson | Yes (proponent) | As captured in the field description, *gins-PerSNPN-List* **indicates the association between GINs and SNPNs**. Need R means that the field is released upon absence, i.e., the normal interpretation would be that absence indicates that no association is defined between the GIN(s) and SNPN(s).  In order to indicate that the UE shall associate all GINs with a single SNPN, the *gins-PerSNPN-List* should normally be present with all bits in *supportedGINs* being set to the value ‘1’.  For example, if GINs A, B, and C are broadcast, the network would usually need to set the following:  *gins-PerSNPN-List*: 1 *gins-PerSNPN* item (5 bits for size indication up to 24)  *GINs-PerSNPN* item 0:  *supportedGINs* : 1 1 1 (4 bits for size indication + 3 bits for 3 GINs = 7 bits)  In order to save the bits needed to broadcast gins-PerSNPN, RAN2 agreed on the following optimization at RAN2#117-e:  **It is agreed (the optimization) that *gins-PerSNPN* is absent when the cell only supports a single SNPN.**  How to interpret absence of the field is already captured in the field description, i.e., the UE shall associate all GINs with the SNPN. The alternative interpretation would be that none of the GINs are associated with the SNPN. Thus, absence of the field is in fact specified in the field description, such that Need S would be appropriate. |
| LGE | Yes | Need R mandates UE to interpret in a way that no GIN is associated with the SNPN in SIB1, which is not the intention, because the intention is all GINs is associated with the SNPN. Hence, we think need S is correct. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | The sentence is clearly for how the UE interprets the field so Need S is correct. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**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 (R[2-2205490](file:///E:\3GPP文档\会议文稿\2022\RAN2%20118\R2-2205490.zip)) is fine. |
| Intel | Yes | We are fine with the additional modified text from R[2-2206012](file:///E:\3GPP文档\会议文稿\2022\RAN2%20118\R2-2206012.zip) |
| 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) |
| OPPO | No | The wording in the running CR is clear. |
| Apple | No |  |
| Ericsson | Yes (proponent) | Emphasizes that there is special UE behaviour when there is only a single SNPN and the field is absent. |
| LGE` | No strong view | Proposed wording is a bit more clean, but there is real difference with the current text. |
| Qualcomm | No strong view | The proposed change reads better but it means the same thing. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 2**:

Q2.1: 6 companies disagree to change the NEED code, while 4 companies support it.

Q2.2: 6 companies disagree with the proposed clarifications, while 4 companies support it. Out of the 4 supporting companies 2 says that the revision proposal is just a clarification but does not change the meaning.

**Proposal 2: Changes proposed in [E07] are not agreed.**

# 4 Conclusion

TBD.