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These questions and answers will be used to progress the SA5 work for FS\_NSCE.

# Question 1: Relation of exposure governance, AEF and CCF

During the SA5#144e, there are different views on the relation of exposure governance, AEF and CCF.

**Question**: Whether exposure governance can be covered by AEF and CCF?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company’s view** | **Notes** |
| Samsung | No | First we discussed and agreed (after lots of discussions) about this “simplification, filtering and abstraction” were out-of-scope of SA5. This is already documented in TR. Now if we want to bring this in-scope of SA5 then first we need to justify that.CCF as defined by SA6, off course, will not able to provide exposure governance for SA5 MnSes. We need to develop “Exposure Governance Functionality” (e.g an Exposure Governance MnS). |
| Alibaba | No | Some of the functionality of exposure governance can not be covered by AEF and CCF. For example, the access control functionality can not be provided by either CCF and AEF. |
| Huawei | No | Agree with Alibaba, exposure governance includes simplification, filtering and abstraction, then it cannot be simply covered by AEF or CCF, and exposure governance needs to be separated from AEF, APF, AMF and CCF which do not provide the functionality of exposure governance for SA5 MnS. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Question 2: Translation

During the SA5#144e, there are different views on whether exposure governance covers certain aspects of translation.

**Question**: Whether exposure governance cover certain aspects of translation?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company’s view** | **Notes** |
| Samsung | Depends on what is “Translation” | It “Translation” as defined now is out-of-scope. If we want to bring that in-scope we need to define it differently. |
| Alibaba | Depends on what is “Translation” | According the previous endorsed DP ,"translation" is in the scope of CAMARA and is not in the scope of SA5. Detailed information of translation needs to be provided so that we can decide whether or not to include the translation. |
| Huawei | Depends on what is “Translation” | In pCR 224082 we don't talk 'translation', we talk about the Exposure Governance which represents the simplification, filtering and abstraction on management services. We believe this should be in scope of SA5. Agree with xiaobo that ' Detailed information of (CAMARA) translation needs to be provided' - The 'translation' in CAMARA may be different with what we are discussing here about 'simplification, filtering and abstraction on management services' in 3GPP, then no problem for this issue. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Question 3: Direct access to MnS producer

During the SA5#144e, there are different view on whether NSC can directly access to MnS producer.

**Question**: Whether NSC can directly get access to the respective MnS producer?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company’s view** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | Yes | I think this should be allowed. This (MnS shall be exposed to NSC directly but with strong exposure governance) would be a simple approach. Otherwise, we have to create this beast (called EGMF) abstracting/converting (e,g A -> A’/A’’/A’’’) every single MnS we have and then expose it to NSC. What do we get will this? We should not follow somebody just for the sake of doing it. If they did it, I’m sure they had very good reason. I do not see that reason here yet. |
| Alibaba | No | Direct access may have issues. For example, the operator may not want to expose the topology information of management system to the NSC. In this case, an exposure proxy can be used to protection the privacy information of  Network Operator's management system. |
| Huawei | Yes | The management service after applied with Exposure Governance is still a management service. I think it is not conflicting with 'This (MnS shall be exposed to NSC directly but with strong exposure governance) would be a simple approach. ' mentioned by Samsung. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Question 4: Unique granular access for each API invoker

During the SA5#144e, there are different view on the whether each API invoker can have unique granular access.

**Question**: Can each API invoker have its own unique granular access?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company’s view** | **Comments** |
| Samsang | Yes | I do not see any other way. We can say “Each group of API Invoker has it own unique access”, if required. But, the access right shall be dependent on the consumer (i.e API Invoker). It like different people have different requirement for Pizza toppings, you can give Cheese Pepperoni to everybody. |
| Alibaba | Yes | Support to have unique granular access for each invoker. |
| Huawei | Yes | We see this is reasonable. The Authorization is used for NSC to check whether it has the right to get access to certain management services, here, ‘certain management services’ are those management services applied with 'simplification, filtering and abstraction' already. Therefore, the Exposure Governance and Authorization works together to complete the whole management exposure process.   |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

In addition, there are some different view on “simplification, filtering and abstraction”. The following question needs to be answered:

1. what this “simplification, filtering and abstraction”?
2. How that is different than translation being done in CAMARA?
3. why that “simplification, filtering and abstraction” cannot be considered as part of Authorization (built on the intelligence of Exposure Governance)?

# Proposed Conclusions

The proposed conclusions will be used to identify the gaps for network exposure.

<conclusion X>

<conclusion X>

<conclusion X>

<conclusion X>

<conclusion X>