

OPAG #64 Meeting Minutes

Author:	Tom Van Pelt	Email:	tpelt@gsma.com
		Tel:	+32 479 23 28 46
Date:	20/04/2022	Time:	13:00 – 15:00 BST
Subject:	OPAG #64 Meeting Minutes		
Attendees:			
<i>Chair</i>	Miguel Alejandro Hernandez Armengol	miguelalejandro.hernandezarmengol@telefonica.com	
Other members	Deepak Gunjal	deepak.gunjal@altran.com	
	Roberto Jorge Hernandez Perez	roberto.hernandez@americamovil.com	
	Milan Lalovic	milan.lalovic@bt.com	
	Gao Chen	cheng96@chinaunicom.cn	
	Eddy Fung	Eddy.Fung@Dell.com	
	Roger Wang	roger.wangrong@huawei.com	
	Sandra Ondrusova	sandra.ondrusova@hwleurope.com	
	Masaharu Hattori	ma-hattori@kddi.com	
	Laszlo Suto	lsuto@libertyglobal.com	
	Martin Oetl	martin.oetl@nokia.com	
	Diego Preciado Rojas	diego.preciado_rojas@nokia.com	
	Hubert Mariotte	hubert.mariotte@orange.com	
	Macus Chua	macuschua@singtel.com	
	Jyrki Penttinen	jyrki.penttinen@syniverse.com	
	Napolitano Antonia	antonia.napolitano@telecomitalia.it	
	Fabrizio Moggio	fabrizio.moggio@telecomitalia.it	
	Lijuan Chen	chen.lijuan@zte.com.cn	
GSMA Attendees:	Tom Van Pelt Toyeeb Rehman Mark Cornall	tpelt@gsma.com trehman@gsma.com 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

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 and US entity list stated were noted.

Agenda for the meeting was discussed and agreed.

2. OPAG#63 Meeting minutes and Actions

Minutes of OPAG#63 approved

Action points were reviewed. Action OPAG 60.07 can be closed given OPAG_64_Doc_03 on the agenda. Action 60.05 can be closed because the regular OPAG process seems sufficient to keep up with CAMARA.

3. MWC Las Vegas 23 release planning

Tom provided an overview of the planning for the MWC Las Vegas 23 release of the OP specifications and highlighted that a little over 1 month remained until the CR deadline in OPAG.

4. OPG/OPAG – CAMARA communication

Sandra presented OPAG_64_Doc_03, an overview of what was discussed for communication between OPG/OPAG and CAMARA. Following comments have been made:

- LSs are indeed slow and painful and it is thus best to avoid
- The best option of OPG/OPAG joining a CAMARA meeting or CAMARA joining OPG/OPAG will depend on the individual case.
- CAMARA has different APIs. How to identify which ones to engage with? The initial focus would be on the APIs selected for Open Gateway (e.g. QoD, Edge, etc.).

5. SliceTF: Terms of Reference

Miguel presented OPAG_64_Doc_04, a revision of the proposed Terms of Reference for the SliceTF. No comments were raised.

OPAG_64_Doc_04 was approved.

The Terms of Reference only come into effect when SliceTF is started as a formal group rather than running within the OPAG and its meetings.

6. SBI-NR: work split

Milan presented an overview of what could be covered for OPG.03 v3.0 (based on the analysis in OPAG_64_Doc_05). Following comments were raised:

- The common data model is currently being revised. Work depending on that should potentially be postponed to the next release.
- The work on managing URSP can be covered by the SliceTF. Sandra will cover.

- Analytics has overlap with the KPI and analytics work in the SliceTF. Eddy will investigate whether from that the SBI-NR APIs can be contributed.
- Miguel will investigate the API for the Chargeable party.
- The Location Privacy is already on the OPG backlog (part of topic X). It should be postponed until there's further requirements, but if OPAG identifies the need (e.g. based on mapping the CAMARA consent API), OPAG could contribute those to OPG.
- Restricting application availability to the LADN is not covered by 3GPP beyond stage 2. OPAG should propose to OPG to drop the reference. Tom will cover.
- Authentication is covered by the UNI (i.e. OPG.05). It could be removed from the scope of the SBI-NR.
- The enhancements done to QoS management in the latest releases of OPG.03 should be covered. Miguel will investigate whether the current API references cover those.
- Similarly the additional enhancements to the Mobility Control should be covered. Milan will check with ORI (who did the original contribution) whether they can cover.

7. SBI-NR: update to address ISAG comment

Miguel presented OPAG_64_Doc_06, a revision of the CR to PRD OPG.03 to address the comment raised by the ISAG. Following comments were made beyond editorials:

- The change in the section title should be marked as a change.
- It should be made clear to developers that IP Address mappings can change and that the APIs should not be invoked with address information that might be stale as that could lead to inaccurate results.
 - o That is to be covered in the CAMARA documentation rather than in the SBI-NR document and could be raised in the discussions with them on mapping NBI to SBI.

No other comments were raised. Miguel will update the CR to address the editorial comments and to highlight the title change and distribute to OPAG for offline approval.

8. E/WBI update

Deepak presented OPAG_64_Doc_07, a further analysis on the update of the E/WBI API for the MWC Las Vegas 23 release. Following comments were made:

- If from multiple options one can be recommended for the OP use cases, it is best to allow just for that to avoid analysis in deployments on what should be used and interoperability issues.
- In the PRD, a single term should be introduced for the signed JWT as OPAG_64_Doc_07 uses several.
- References should not be introduced if not referred to from the PRD body.
- It may be best to keep the authorisation end points separate. That may allow to cover rate limitation and such aspects.
 - o That seems a deployment architecture decision.
- It would be good to document what data needs to be exchanged between Partner OPs to set up a federation.
 - o That is useful indeed, not just for security
 - o Potentially this could be covered in a table or list in an Annex of OPG.04.
- The OP is not a Network Function and therefore authentication and authorisation should likely not depend on the NRF.

9. AOB

Nominations for a deputy-chair for OPAG were invited. Given the intensity of OPAG's meeting schedule it would be good to have someone fulfilling that role in case the chair cannot attend. The position is kept open to all OPAG members, including operators, and candidates are invited to make their interest known. The SliceTF needs a lead as well.

Member Gateway was launched and some mails have been sent to the new mailing list including the invite for the next meeting. Members that have not received that are requested to inform GSMA.

Next meeting will be OPAG#65 scheduled on the 27th April. It would be the first using the new platform. Participants may do well in allocating some buffer time for joining the meeting in case they meet unexpected issues.

Regarding the Summer/Autumn F2F meeting, the OPG leadership has decided to organise that meeting between 16 and 19 October. Candidate hosts for that F2F meeting are invited to make their interest known.

#64 meeting closed at 14:55 BST

Action points log

Open action points

Action number	Description	Status	Notes
OPAG 60.02	Deepak to bring a topic on charging on the E/WBI and the level of trust between partners to the OPG	Open	
OPAG 60.04	Miguel to align with CAMARA on the intent of the QoD API.	Open	
OPAG 60.06	Miguel to liaise with the CAMARA project leads on whether they can introduce their API(s) to OPAG for the purposes of supporting federation and mapping to the SBI	Open	

Closed action points

Action number	Description	Status	Notes
OPAG 60.03	Milan to identify the tasks to be covered for OPG.03 v3.0 and include them in the SBI-NR presentation to allow to identify whether they are covered by another activity already or need a volunteer.	Closed	Covered by the SBI-NR topic in OPAG#64
OPAG 60.05	Miguel to investigate whether a living document could be supported on GitHub or SharePoint to capture the	Closed	No specific process is needed. Given that

	experience implementing CAMARA APIs and keeping up with their development.		CAMARA expects 4 releases yearly the current OPG/OPAG processes seem sufficient.
OPAG 60.07	Sandra to investigate how to set up communication paths between OPG/OPAG and CAMARA. A special case might be need to be considered for Sandboxes that can exchange code and other artefacts under the Apache 2.0 license with CAMARA projects.	Closed	Covered by OPAG_64_Doc_03

Decisions

OPAG.64.01	OPAG_64_Doc_04 (ToR for SliceTF) was approved. It will come into effect when the SliceTF is started to run outside OPAG.