GSMA GSMA

http://www.gsma.com/

OPAG #69 Meeting Minutes

Author:	Tom Van Pelt	**Email:**	tpelt@gsma.com
		Tel:	+32 479 23 28 46
Date:	25/05/2022	**Time:**	13:00 – 15:00 BST
Subject:	OPAG #69 Meeting Minutes		
Attendees:			
(Acting) Chair	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	
	Ming Hsun Lee	mslee@cht.com.tw	
	Tom Van Pelt	tpelt@gsma.com	
	Toyeeb Rehman	trehman@gsma.com	
	Roger Wang	roger.wangrong@huawei.com	
	Uli Kleber	ulrich.kleber@huawei.com	
	Masaharu Hattori	ma-hattori@kddi.com	
	Tetsuya Chiba	chiba@kddi.com	
	Jyrki Penttinen	jyrki.penttinen@syniverse.com	
	Fabrizio Moggio	fabrizio.moggio@telecomitalia.it	
	Antonia Napolitano	antonia.napolitano@telecomitalia.it	
GSMA Attendees:	Tom Van Pelt Toyeeb Rehman	tpelt@gsma.com trehman@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, 2023. 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#68 Meeting minutes and Actions

Minutes of OPAG#68 were approved.

Action points were reviewed. No actions could be closed. Deepak intends to bring an update to the OPG topics backlog for action OPAG 60.02. That should be done shortly to ensure inclusion of those topics in the prioritisation for the MWC Barcelona 24 release. Related to OPAG 60.04 and OPAG 60.06 Miguel expects that some CAMARA APIs could be presented in OPAG#70.

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 the approval milestones in OPG and OPAG have now been included explicitly and that only 3 further meetings remained until OPAG's CR deadline for the release.

4. Traffic Influence Sandbox

Fabrizio presented OPAG_68_Doc_03, a status update on the Traffic Influence Sandbox. Following comments were raised:

- TIM is in conversation with other operators and developers to act as a second party confirming the viability of the API.
- Related to terminology, there seem to be quite a lot of telco terms in the presentation still (e.g. UPF, EAS, etc.). Is it the intention to find developer-friendly alternatives for those also? Most of those are not used in the yaml documentation for developers. Only EAS is used after an introduction as Application Server is an agreed term and thus Edge Application Server seemed to be the best description for the concept.
    - API consumers should review whether they understand and can use the API. The new CAMARA organisation with a specific structure for such developers should allow for such reviews.
- Are CAMARA guidelines expected to evolve and with them the APIs? The guidelines are considered stable, but activities such as the consent management could create further requirements. Those would then be addressed in an agile model because with a moving target, the decision is currently to publish the APIs based on the current guidelines.

5. SBI-NR status and updates

Miguel presented OPAG_68_Doc_04, a proposed update of the SBI-NR document including the updates for QoS management and control of the Chargeable Party. Following comments were raised:

- The use of terms such as "current modifications" is not future proof. Those should be revised to address the
- The references should be updated to refer to the current versions of OPG.02 and the 3GPP specifications.
    - The editor (Milan) will update and put the document in a central place for commenting and adding further updates.

- The introduction of Chargeable Party should clarify that it is not about setting the OP as the new chargeable party, but instead a developer/enterprise customer/Application Provider. Terminology should be aligned with other sections and use in the charging context.
- In the note clarifying that identification of the chargeable party should be aligned across interfaces, “to be defined” could be replaced with “it is for further study” to improve clarity.
- Work may be ongoing in 3GPP to cover this alignment. If this is not clarified in the new 3GPP release, an LS might be sent to 3GPP when the enhanced charging work in OPG has finished and work on the SBI-CHF for OPAG is starting.

6. E/WBI update

Deepak presented OPAG_69_Doc_05, a first version of the CR to bring the enhancements to the E/WBI APIs for the MWC Las Vegas release. Following comments were raised:

- There is no central way in a federation to identify Partner OPs and such identification would thus depend on authentication on a 1-to-1 basis which is hard to scale in large federations.
    - This may need to be addressed in OPG first as requirements and the architecture to address this are missing
    - The Federation Broker role may help here, but is not covered in depth yet
    - **Action**: Deepak to propose a backlog topic in OPG to cover the authentication/identification of partner OPs when scaling to large federations.
- Given the references to JWT claims, is it clear what those claims could be? No, an OPG discussion may be needed first, but they could be standardised and cover aspects such as the identity of the Partner OP.
- Are separate client secrets/credentials needed for the callback requests or could the credentials existing between the partners be reused? This needs to be studied further.
- There was a reference to ongoing trials from which learnings and issues had been included. Could it be clarified what parties are involved in those? As currently this is confidential this needs to be discussed further with the involved parties.
- There had been a discussion on whether the Federation Context ID was required. Does its inclusion in the CR mean that it has been concluded that it is?
    - The Federation Context ID is different from the Federation ID and it is more a resource identifier. The Federation ID might not be needed if it is covered by the oAuth tokens already.
- The References table of OPG.04 needs to be updated as well to refer to the current version of OPG.02.
- For the long inactivity period related to the health check, it may have to be clarified what order of magnitude is considered long and who determines the period (e.g., whether it must be agreed between partners)
- Related to the resource monitoring, it may be good to consider other options next to reporting at fixed intervals, e.g., notifying when thresholds are passed.
- For the section on alarms, it is the intention to expand on the existing sections that act mostly as a placeholder currently.

7. 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 leader as well which would help with topics going across the identified work items (e.g., the structuring of the SBI-OAM documentation).

Next meeting will be OPAG#70 scheduled on the 1st June.

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.

#69 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	
OPAG 69.01	Deepak to propose a backlog topic in OPG to cover the authentication/identification of partner OPs when scaling to large federations.	Open	

Closed action points

Action number	Description	Status	Notes

Decisions