

GSMA

<http://www.gsma.com/>

OPG #95 Meeting Minutes

Author:	Tom Van Pelt	Email:	tpelt@gsma.com
		Tel:	+32 479 232846
Date:	28/06/2022	Time:	13:00 – 14:00 BST
Subject:	OPG #95 Meeting Minutes		
Operator Attendees:			
AT&T	Shahram Mohajeri	sm7084@att.com	
China Telecom	Hongmei Zhu	zhuhongm@chinatelecom.cn	
China Unicom	Gao Chen	cheng96@chinaunicom.cn	
KDDI	Toshi Wakayama	to-wakayama@kddi.com	
NTT Docomo	Sora Funayama	sora.funayama.ag@nttdocomo.com	
Orange	Rida Zouaoui	rida.zouaoui@orange.com	
Singtel	Macus Chua	macuschua@singtel.com	
Softbank	Junbeom Lee	junbeom.lee@g.softbank.co.jp	
SK Telecom	Hyeonsoo Lee	hyeonsoo.lee@sktelecom.com	
TIM	Mario Madella	mario.madella@telecomitalia.it	
Telefonica	Alexandre Harmand	alexander.harmand@telefonica.com	
	Jesus Maria Martin Garcia	jesusmaria.martingarcia@telefonica.com	
	Fernando Pascual Blanco	fernando.pascualblanco@telefonica.com	
Telus	Mohamed Eldakrouy	mohamed.eldakrouy@telus.com	
Industry Participants			
CapGemini Engineering	Deepak Gunjal	deepak.a.gunjal@capgemini.com	
Dell	Jeffrey Goldberg	Jeffrey.Goldberg@Dell.com	
Ericsson	Bart van Kaathoven	bart.van.kaathoven@ericsson.com	
	Magnus Olsson	magnus.m.olsson@ericsson.com	
GS Lab	Amit Wankhede	amit.wankhede@gslab.com	
Intel	Neal Oliver	neal.oliver@intel.com	
Nokia	Padmakumar Subramani	padmakumar.subramani@nokia.com	
	Alessio Casati	alessio.casati@nokia.com	
Optare Solutions	Santi Rodriguez	srodriguez@optaresolutions.com	
ZTE	Zhijun Li	li.zhijun3@zte.com.cn	
	Lijuan Chen	chen.lijuan@zte.com.cn	
GSMA Attendees:	Tom Van Pelt	tpelt@gsma.com	
	Mark Cornall	mcornall@gsma.com	
Other Attendees:			
Absent / apologies:			

ALL GSM ASSOCIATION MEETINGS ARE HELD IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE GSMA'S [ANTI-TRUST](#) AND IPR COMPLIANCE POLICY

<i>Security Classification</i>		
Non-Confidential	Project Team or Group	X

© GSMA, 2022. The GSM Association ("Association") makes no representation, warranty or undertaking (express or implied) with respect to and does not accept any responsibility for, and disclaims liability for the accuracy or completeness or timeliness of the information contained in this document. The information contained in this document may be subject to change without prior notice. This document has been classified according to the GSMA [Document Confidentiality Policy](#).

1. GSMA Antitrust Policy and Agenda

GSMA Anti-trust and US entity list statement were noted.

Agenda for the meeting was approved.

2. OPG#94 Meeting minutes

No comments were made.

Minutes of OPG#94 were approved.

Regarding, action OPG 91.06, Magnus indicated that he had slides ready and would share with Sandra and Tom.

3. MWC Las Vegas Release Planning

Tom presented the planning and status of the MWC Las Vegas release.

4. Topic J

Santi presented OPG_95_Doc_03: the first revision of CR0005. Among others, following comments and questions were raised:

- Some editorial issue should be fixed (e.g. "Network and Enhanced Network capabilities" seems to introduce an unnecessary additional term)
- Section 1.2 should be updated to remove bullets for items covered as part of the CR.

5. Topic E

Deepak presented OPG_95_Doc_04: CR0002R6. Among others, following comments and questions were raised:

- SSC Modes 2 and 3 would not be available on handover to 4G
- SSC Mode 2 can be triggered by sending a release with a specific cause code to the UE which might trigger the same behaviour when used on a 4G core.

Deepak presented OPG_95_Doc_05: CR0007R1. Among others, following comments and questions were raised:

- Notifications may be needed to the application provider on which of the requested QoS levels has been assigned to a UE

- Handover notifications would be about intersystem handovers because LTE might connect into a 5G Core
 - The future will proof whether the impact of such notifications is understandable to developers or that a level of notifications is required that abstracts more from the telco technology
- Whether the IP address change notifications refer to the external address or whether support for CG-NAT would be included
 - NAT is currently not covered in 3GPP
- It is to be clarified whether a developer's prioritised list of QoS levels is provided to the core network with the selection being managed there or whether the OP should do that management itself based on the notifications that it receives about the user's access changes.

6. Maintenance CRs

Hyeonsoo presented OPG_95_Doc_06: CR0008. Among others, following comments and questions were raised:

- 3GPP EWBI work is not referred to, why cover ETSI's work in progress?
- OPAG sent an LS to ETSI and 3GPP with its current EWBI status. It is unclear if and how that would be incorporated in the ongoing work of the respective organisations.
- The first change may be unnecessary because ETSI MEC's Phases have never been referred to before and they seem to be incorporated already in the version number that is part of the reference. That's different from what's done for 3GPP references. It does no harm if it stays there though.

Hyeonsoo will provide an updated version of the CR. Tom will check with Sandra how to progress (Offline approval or cover it in the next meeting).

7. AOB

Tom announced that the next OPG meeting would take place on 05 July and provided an update on the face-to-face meeting being planned for the autumn (see OPG_95_Doc_01). Candidate hosts were requested.

#94 Call closed at 14:00 BST

Action points log

Open action points

Action number	Description	Status	Notes
OPG 91.01	Parties that put themselves forward as contributor on a topic to reach out to the topic owner to inquire how and where they can support.	Open	
OPG 91.03	all OPG members to contribute to list of items to be clarified regarding terminal support	Open	
OPG 91.06	Magnus to clarify the issue with OP terminology and propose solutions in another discussion paper.	Open	

OPG 92.01	All to consider how to progress the topics raised by TEC Forum.	Open	
OPG 93.01	Sandra to draft LS proposal towards 3GPP SA5 (including S16) to clarify which function to interface with for Network Slice LCM	Open	
OPG 94.01	Sandra and Tom to provide feedback to Juan Carlos indicating the proposed timeline for handling the TEC Forum requests.	Open	

Closed action points

Action number	Description	Status	Notes

Decisions
