

GSMA

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

OPG #91 Meeting Minutes

Author:	Tom Van Pelt	Email:	tpelt@gsma.com
		Tel:	+32 479 232846
Date:	24/05/2022	Time:	09:00 – 18:00 CEST
Subject:	OPG #91 Meeting Minutes		
Operator Attendees:			
CK Hutchison <i>Chair</i>	Sandra Ondrusova	sandra.ondrusova@hwleurope.com	
BT	Milan Lalovic	milan.lalovic@bt.com	
Deutsche Telekom	Marcin Jarzab	Marcin.Jarzab@t-mobile.pl	
KDDI	Toshi Wakayama Masaharu Hattori	to-wakayama@kddi.com ma-hattori@kddi.com	
NTT Docomo	Sora Funayama	sora.funayama.ag@nttdocomo.com	
Orange	Rida Zouaoui	rida.zouaoui@orange.com	
SK Telecom	Hyeonsoo Lee	hyeonsoo.lee@sk.com	
TIM	Mario Madella	mario.madella@telecomitalia.it	
Telefonica	Alexandre Harmand Jesus Maria Martin Garcia Jose Antonio Ordoñez Lucena David Moro Juan Carlos Garcia Lopez Cristina Santana Casillas	alexander.harmand@telefonica.com jesusmaria.martingarcia@telefonica.com joseantonio.ordonezlucena@telefonica.com david.moro@telefonica.com juancarlos.garcia1@telefonica.com cristina.santanacasillas@telefonica.com	
Telus	James Levy	james.levy@telus.com	
T-Mobile	Murat Karabulut	murat.karabulut@t-mobile.com	
Industry Participants			
Capgemini engineering	Deepak Gunjal	deepak.a.gunjal@capgemini.com	
Dell	Jeffrey Goldberg Saad Sheikh	Jeffrey.Goldberg@Dell.com Saad_Sheikh@Dell.com	
Ericsson	Bart van Kaathoven Magnus Olsson	bart.van.kaathoven@ericsson.com magnus.m.olsson@ericsson.com	
GS Lab	Vikram Barate Amit Wankhede	vikram.barate@gslab.com amit.wankhede@gslab.com	
Huawei	Ulrich Kleber Louis Lou Javier Gonzalez	ulrich.kleber@huawei.com louis.lou@huawei.com javier.gonzalez@huawei.com	
Intel	Neal Oliver	neal.oliver@intel.com	

Nokia	Nurit Sprecher Padmakumar Subramani	nurit.sprecher@nokia.com padmakumar.subramani@nokia.com
Optare Solutions	Fernando Lamela Santiago Rodrigues	flamela@optaresolutions.com srodriguez@optaresolutions.com
Syniverse	Mark Lipford	mark.lipford@syniverse.com
ZTE	Zhijun Li Lijuan Chen	li.zhijun3@zte.com.cn chen.lijuan@zte.com.cn
GSMA Attendees:	Tom Van Pelt Mark Cornall Gemicha West	tpelt@gsma.com mcornall@gsma.com gwest@gsma.com
Other Attendees:		
Absent / apologies:		

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

Security Classification		
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, US entity list and FCC Auction statements were noted.

The agenda for the meeting was approved.

2. OPG#90 Meeting minutes

No comments were made.

Minutes of OPG#90 were approved.

3. Opening of the meeting

Sandra welcomed participants, thanked Telefonica for hosting and highlighted that contributors hardly seem to supporting topic owners even if many parties indicated that they wanted to take up that role on the topics that were prioritised. Contributors should check with topic owner how they can support.

Action: 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.

4. Topic E- Cellular Service Continuity

Deepak presented OPG_91_Doc_03, the fourth revision of the Concept Note for Topic E. Some comments were made requiring updates and clarifications in the next revision, among others:

- The topic is about cellular service continuity. Non-3GPP access should thus be considered out of scope.
- It should be checked how OP knows whether the network supports the notifications that are considered optional by 3GPP
- The focus should be on handovers within the same network. Handovers to other networks are roaming-related and thus covered by a different topic that wasn't prioritised.
- If SSC mode should change on handover from 4G to 5G, the old session would have to be torn down and a new session would have to be established. Otherwise SSC mode 1 is kept.
 - This behaviour was designed in 3GPP with IMS voice in mind, but applies to other services as well.
- Some parts of the CN touch upon areas where OPAG in its work is finding some requirements to be unclear and may thus present a good opportunity to clarify those. This also relates to OPAG needing more detailed requirements in some cases and clarity on whether 3GPP interfaces are assumed to cover the needs. The latter could increase efficiency where those have been checked already upon developing the requirements.
 - This not only applies to Topic E, but to all topics in general
 - **Action:** Sandra to align with Alex on how to bring OPAG feedback to OPG
 - Contributors can support the topic owners among others in this area (see generic comments at the opening of the meeting).
- The requirements should avoid creating too much impact on devices, but should instead rely on 3GPP specs for support and OPG should notify 3GPP of any gaps therein
 - OPG could also liaise with the TSG to check on what is supported in devices on APIs to inform applications regarding connection loss, change of IP address and other events that could impact service continuity
 - **Action:** all OPG members to contribute to list of items to be clarified regarding terminal support
- It should also be clarified whether the current criteria offered to be provided by Application Providers cover the needs or that criteria need to be added to cover an applications wishes regarding session continuity.

5. Topic M – Network Slicing as a Service

Sandra presented OPG_91_Doc_04, the third revision of the Concept Note for Topic M. Several comments were made requiring updates and clarifications in the next revision, among others:

- The OP should not be responsible for E2E NW slice management as defined in 3GPP, but may interact with NBI of slice management to expose them in a federated manner
 - From an OP's perspective, Network Slicing may be a network capability like all others, even if it's more complicated
 - e.g. user subscription needs to enable access to the slice
- The use cases need to be clear and should clarify for example whether Subscriber management by the OP is required
- Work is ongoing on a TR in 3GPP SA5 that may be worthwhile to consider.

- **Action:** Jose Antonio to provide reference on network slicing related TR in 3GPP SA5 to Sandra
- Also in 3GPP SA2 there are activities in this area
- Cloud resources are not part of the slice as per discussion in earlier meeting and thus SBI-CR is not expected to be impacted by NSaaS. Transport between UPF and Application Server may have to take into account slice requirements though.
- There was insufficient time to go through the entire contribution. Participants are asked to review offline and provide feedback to Sandra

Toshi presented OPG_91_Doc_13, KDDI's feedback on CN0001R3 with following comments being raised:

- NG.135 about to be approved, may be referenced. An API activity on that would be starting shortly
 - Regular updates of ENSWI progress would be useful
- Also with ETSI MEC communication (i.e. an LS) could be useful given that they're starting work in the same area.
- It was questioned whether the Application Provider will want to view slice performance separately or as part of application performance in general as that isn't linked specifically to the slice.

Sandra provided a short introduction of OPG_91_Doc_05, a first CR to improve on existing requirements referring to network slicing, but where that reference may not always be appropriate. OPG participants are asked to review offline and provide comments [on SharePoint](#).

6. TEC Forum update

Juan Carlos provided an update on the TEC Forum activities:

- TEC Forum started a discussion with WAS to support the definition of the commercial agreements for OP/TEC Services
 - TEC Forum is to provide input on the value chain and on the charging models and available information for charging
- The value chain for various scenarios was presented
- An overview was given on the charging models and the charging data
 - TEC Forum concluded that there are too many options in this area and that simplification will be required as a starting point.
 - The approach proposed is to focus on the reservation model initially

Action: Juan Carlos to share the slides presented as part of the TEC Forum update with OPG

7. Topic H – Edge Interconnection Network

Vikram presented OPG_91_Doc_07, the third revision of the Concept Note for Topic H. Several comments were made requiring updates and clarifications in the next revision, among others:

- The choice of defining a new interface vs extending the SBI-NR or SBI-CR may depend on the technology that is to be controlled.
 - If that would be an SDN there may be industry work on the SDN's NBI required
- Should OPG solve this in isolation? This may require coordination with other bodies like 3GPP on how to solve this.

- OPG may need to drive standardisation if nothing is available yet
 - This will require the definition of use cases and leading to an understanding of the need for the EIN and the applications' interaction with it.
 - That may allow allowing OPG to define the requirements
- The figure used to illustrate the location of the EIN in the architecture is confusing because EIN is not between UPF and edge cloudlet.

8. Topic J – enhanced Network Capability exposure

Fernando presented OPG_91_Doc_08, the third revision of the Concept Note for Topic J. Several comments were made requiring updates and clarifications in the next revision, among others:

- Updates of existing requirements should be considered as an option when writing the CRs (rather than just adding new requirements)
- The topic is called "enhanced network capabilities", but the scope of the topic was defined as a grouping of some items identified as open issues in previous phase(s) rather than being about providing significant extensions of the capabilities
- Analytics should be part of data model if exposed to developers
- Data model maintenance may be needed when the several topics included in the MWC Las Vegas release bring updates and extensions to the model, but that shouldn't not part of this topic
- CAMARA (or any other industry body) shouldn't be referenced as a way to standardize capability in the requirements proposed in the CRs to the PRD.
- It makes sense to include the proposed requirement on charging given that it may be a chargeable service

Next steps: the topic is considered ready to move to CRs.

9. Maintenance CRs

Tom presented OPG_91_Doc_09, a discussion paper driven by a terminology issue raised in CR0002, CR0003 and CR0004. Several comments were made requiring updates and clarifications in the next revision, among others:

- For Application Provider, it may be useful to refer to the NBI to avoid ambiguity
 - Can be an organisation, a person with a specific role in an organisation or an organisation's system/application.
 - That may create a circular reference though
 - Application Provider is not really tightly related to the other terms and may not have to be included in the exercise
- The term "Cloud Component" may be confusing because the edge is considered a cloud as well. Maybe "Backend Part" works better.
- Definition of terms should consider that applications may consist out of micro services rather than monolithic blocks
 - Terms should not go too deep into the application's architecture or make assumptions about it
- Application as a standalone term should be avoided
- The term OP may have to be clarified as well.
 - Some of the wording in the PRD creates confusion on the boundaries of its scope. 3GPP assumes that network and cloud resources are part of the OP for example.

- **Action:** Magnus to clarify the issue with OP terminology and propose solutions in another discussion paper.

Next steps: Tom and Sandra to propose updated wording and terms based on the discussion.

10. AOB

Feedback was requested on the meeting from the participants:

- Experience:
 - F2F discussion is much more efficient and enables a higher bandwidth of discussion.
 - Progress is much better than in online meetings also because things like coffee breaks could not be replaced when working remotely
 - The discussion could be followed well by remote attendees, but would be even more smooth when attending onsite
 - Most remote attendees expressed the desire to join future meetings on site.
 - Remote participation sometimes results in priority being given to conflicting meetings or other events. So following the full meeting is hard, but participation is still useful.
 - The first experience with a hybrid meeting where that model that really worked. There seemed to be balanced participation from onsite and remote attendees in the discussions.
 - Similar audio/visual equipment should be used for every hybrid meeting.
 - There were no whiteboard or breakout discussions. That could be considered for future meetings.
- It may be an opportunity to interact with other bodies
 - OPG could include updates on ETSI and 3GPP and ETSI. OPAG could include CAMARA updates.
 - It may be good to get input from application developers
- There may be better alignment between the different groups on the work done.

A second F2F will be organised in autumn for the MWC Barcelona release. Currently the week of 17th October is proposed, but that may be revisited based on the experience in this F2F meeting. No candidate host came forward yet. Candidate hosts are invited to inform GSMA (Mark and Tom) of their interest.

#91 Meeting closed at 18:00 CEST

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 91.02	Sandra to align with Alex on how to bring OPAG feedback to OPG	Open	
OPG 91.03	all OPG members to contribute to list of items to be clarified regarding terminal support	Open	
OPG 91.04	Jose Antonio to provide reference on network slicing related TR in 3GPP SA5 to Sandra	Open	
OPG 91.05	Juan Carlos to share the slides presented as part of the TEC Forum update with OPG	Open	
OPG 91.06	Magnus to clarify the issue with OP terminology and propose solutions in another discussion paper.	Open	

Closed action points

Action number	Description	Status	Notes
OPG 90.01	Topic owners to inform Sandra and Tom (or other OPG representatives attending the TEC Forum meeting on 23rd May) of the areas where TEC Forum input is desired for the development of their topic area.	Closed	No further topics were raised

Decisions
