# **Notes from SFC Conference call for SA2#153E preparation**

Attendance:

AT&T, ETRI, Nokia, HW, DOCOMO, Ericsson, LGE, Charter, TNO, Dish, CableLabs, FirstNet, Intel

*Notes provided on best effort basis, please check with the company delegate with any follow ups.*

Agenda discussion:

* Rapporteur provided an outline of document handling submitted for the conference call.
* Rapporteur provided a high-level summary of the solutions for KI#1 on SFC Enhancements and comparison between them for the benefit of all present in the conference call.

pCRs for KI#1 discussion and comments

* Nokia presentation - [S2-22xxxxx\_conclusion for KI#1.docx](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_sa/WG2_Arch/TSGS2_153E_Electronic_2022-10/INBOX/DRAFTS/FS_SFC/S2-22xxxxx_conclusion%20for%20KI%231.docx)
	+ Huawei: Does 5GC need to know and parse the metadata? Is it sent transparently from AF to the SFC?
	+ <missed noting the rest of the questions>
* Intel presentation - [S2-220abcd\_was5919r14\_v2.docx](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_sa/WG2_Arch/TSGS2_153E_Electronic_2022-10/INBOX/DRAFTS/FS_SFC/S2-220abcd_was5919r14_v1.docx)
	+ Ericsson – With respect to Figure 1 and 2, SFP 1,2,3 is shown as separate paths in Figure 1 whereas in Figure two just as one SFP with metadata. Can you clarify if they are the same or different SFPs?
	+ Intel: In Figure 2, it is shown as one SFP with metadata to demonstrate that the Metadata that is can be used a selector inside the SFC to determine which SF should be invoked or skipped for the packet with the operator required to configure a reduced number of Service Function Paths.
	+ Huawei: In this proposal, 5GC does not need to parse the metadata? Is it sent transparently from AF to the SFC?
	+ Intel: Yes it sent transparently in the 5GC and is parsed by the SFFs in the Service Function Chain.
	+ Charter: Is Metadata optional?
	+ Intel: Yes
	+ Charter: Metadata is based on SLA; it is not standardized. Is that correct?
	+ Intel: Yes, that is correct.
	+ Nokia: Why he SFC node(not a UPF) cannot be in PSA ?
	+ Intel: Figure 3 is based on the assumption that the PSA is not impacted which could be one deployment option.
* Ericsson - [Eri-S2-22xxxxx\_SFC\_conclusion\_KI1\_share.doc](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_sa/WG2_Arch/TSGS2_153E_Electronic_2022-10/INBOX/DRAFTS/FS_SFC/Eri-S2-22xxxxx_SFC_conclusion_KI1_share.doc)
	+ Intel: question on the increased SMF complexity which is a c-plane function stated as drawback in the discussion as the update to FAR rule is typically implemented in software running on general purpose processor and the update for this support does not seem like an issue with complexity.
	+ Ericsson: possibility of increased SMF complexity in their view and tracking and reporting of charging, QoS details from two different nodes.
	+ Charter: The conclusion pCRs from does not refer the RFC. Lacks clarification on which protocol and how it is accomplished.
	+ Nokia: IETF does not mandate any specific protocol. SO 3GPP should not do it either. Do you see a need to mandate a specific set of protocols.
	+ <missed noting the rest of the questions and answers>
* Huawei [HW\_S2-220xxxx SFC\_Conclusion for KI#1\_v1.2.docx](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_sa/WG2_Arch/TSGS2_153E_Electronic_2022-10/INBOX/DRAFTS/FS_SFC/HW_S2-220xxxx%20SFC_Conclusion%20for%20KI%231_v1.2.docx)
	+ A quick presentation was given as most of the discussion points was covered in the metadata discussion in the earlier pCRs.