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# Agenda

The following tdocs are checked in breakout session:

|  |
| --- |
| 6.19.21 Study on Enhanced OAM for management exposure to external consumers |
| **WT-1** |
| [S5-242837](file:///D%3A%5CZou%20Lan%5C2024%E5%B7%A5%E4%BD%9C%5C%E6%A0%87%E5%87%86%E5%B7%A5%E4%BD%9C%5C3GPP%5CSA5%23155%5CDocs%5CS5-242837.zip) | pCR TR 28.879 Registration of MnS producer into CAPIF (Ericsson España S.A.) (Jose Antonio Ordoñez Lucena)N: We provided offline comments:* Some concerns with the MnS producer playing the role of the AMF. We would prefer that it is clearly stated that the MnS producer would only be resp. for registering itself with two roles, which are: The AEF and the APF.
* When we look at the UC description, it focuses on how the API provider domain functionalities are registered to the CAPIF core function, and we would prefer that this text is moved to the Concepts and background clause and focus the UC description on how to register the MnS producer to the CAPIF core function.

E: We propose to revise the tdoc to address the comments.Chair: Ok, let’s name it 2837rev1 for now, to be able to review the revision offline before the main session, and then in the main session inform about all comments and updates, to get a new tdoc#.N: There is no clause 5.1.A in the existing TR. So 5.1. A should be with “all revision marks”N: The references should also include TS numbers.H: Thanks for this contribution, it contains many things we need to discuss. For relation to 23.222, what should be the preferred figure in the Rationale? It is good to have but it should be clear where it comes from.H: What is the relation between the UC proposed here and the UCs in 23.222? I have the feeling you are combining some stage 2 and stage 3 descriptions.E: I think we need to use the stage 2 input for the UC description, and stage 3 for the solution.H: Look at 28.824 clause 7.9.2. The diagram is not the same as in your proposal. H: We shouldn’t standardize that the Mns service producer should be responsible for publishing itself.N: For the ref. that is added in the potential solution, it is better to refer to which clause is referred.H. Suggestion for the rapporteur: There should not be any hyperlinks in the references.H. On 5.1.A.3.i.2: How should we understand the red boxes in the figure?E: It should be one MnS producer.E: The proposal according to the comments received may be fine if we all agree to that, but we should be aware that they are not aligned with what was agreed in Rel-18.H: The UC title may be better to name like “MnS producer with CAPIF core function”.H. Can we agree that an MnS producer is equivalent to “API provider domain function”?S: I would say “MnS producer implements API provider functionality”. | pCRr, TS/TR 28.879 v0.2.0, Rel-19, Cat.  |
| [S5-242659](file:///D%3A%5CZou%20Lan%5C2024%E5%B7%A5%E4%BD%9C%5C%E6%A0%87%E5%87%86%E5%B7%A5%E4%BD%9C%5C3GPP%5CSA5%23155%5CDocs%5CS5-242659.zip) | pCR TR 28.879 Add exposure roles and concepts (Huawei) (Kai Zhang)E: For the roles in 4.x: Only “CSP, CSC, NOP” are relevant, for the rest we don’s see that they are relevant.E: 4.y: We don’t agree with this clause because it basically overwrites the agreement in last meeting.E: On 4.1.1. Overview: It differentiates between “Management service exposure” and “Abstraction of management exposure”. We dopn’t agree with the latter, and with the differentiation of the two points. The reason is twofold: 1) The abstraction of Mgmt exposure is outside the scope of SA5, and 2) The figure indicates that the MnS consumer should choose between TMF, SA6, SA5. We don’t agree with this.H: Look at 23.222 Annex B.0: SA6 has taken some SA5 MnS and wrapped them into more “user friendly” services using CAPIF. Should we do t he same for some of our MnSs?E: No we don’t need that because for SA5 we only need to do some formatting to adapt to what SA6 requires. There are already other groups that are closer to the customers, using the information that we define.H: So our focus should be on exposure of the MnS, nit user friendliness (it could be user friendly but we shouldn’t make any extra efforts for that purpose).N: Similar comments as E. N: Also for the abstraction of MnS exposure, we don’t understand the motivation for that.N: On clause 4.1.3, I think it’s hard to understand where this comes from. We already have information on this. Just bring a contribution if you want to enhance the existing text in the TR.H. For the abstraction of MnS exposure, SA6 use some of the SA5 defined MnSs. We think it is the same motivation as them, to make them more user friendly.H: Look at 23.222 “Table B.2.1-1: CAPIF relationship with 3GPP 5GS network exposure” – I think this is a good example for what SA5 should do.H: In SA2, their logic is to use NEF to describe the CAPIF. We think it is better for SA5 to use the same logic as NEF. SA2 also claim they have SBMA.N: The clauses from the baseline version have been changed… not allowed.N: In 4.1.1, first sentence “There are two types of management service concepts potentially could be exposed depends on the granularity of the details and purpose of usages”, this is potential solution rather than an overview. | pCRr, TS/TR 28.879 v0.2.0, Rel-19, Cat.  |
| [S5-242877](file:///D%3A%5CZou%20Lan%5C2024%E5%B7%A5%E4%BD%9C%5C%E6%A0%87%E5%87%86%E5%B7%A5%E4%BD%9C%5C3GPP%5CSA5%23155%5CDocs%5CS5-242877.zip) | Rel-19 pCR TR 28.879 Add use case for publishing management services to the CCF (Nokia UK) (Winnie Nakimuli)S: On req. 1: The Note is basically negating what the requirement -01 says.N: The Note says : “…hence, there is a need to translate/map…”S: Ok.Chair: There are two notes without numbering.S: We need to create publication functionality. Whether it is used or not is not subject to standardisation. The req. -02 needs to be clarified.E: On “However, considering SBMA principles, the definition of a new MnF does not seem ideal” we agree with this. This acknowledges that there is no need for this mgmt function.E: “However, MnS producers should have the capability to determine whether the management service is to be published or not” – related to req. 02. In CAPIF, the API publishing function does not have this functionality.N: Agree, therefore we should define this functionality.E: But why do we need to standardize this? The logic to decide whether we need to publish this or not, does not need to be standardized.H: Agree with E. There is a complex business logic behind this. To just put it in the MnS info is too simplistic. It would be completely insecure as it can be overwritten at any time.E: We could try to merge the reqs. sections from another contribution to this session: Tdoc 2838H: We support the idea, but we need to align the terminologies.H: MnS producer is already a role, so you can’t say that “one role plays another role”.H: On “Publishing mgmt services”… I don’t think it is the right term. What is to be published is the functionality to be supported by the MnS producers.N: Good point. We can work on clarifying the text.N: General comment on the Drafting rules: No auto-numbering of bullets or clauses… | pCRr, TS/TR 28.879 v0.2.0, Rel-19, Cat.  |