**SA5 leaders Notes of the SA5-TMF call on Intent mgmt 22-02-23, 12:00-14:00 CET**

**3GPP slides:**

P6: Need to be further aligned on “intent-CSC/CSP/NOP”

E: why is it needed to have 3 different interfaces for intent?

HW: the three interfaces carry different features.

P7: intent MnS concept

E: what’s the semantics/meaning of activate/deactivate intent? If deactivate, whether the resource is still kept? There is difference between whether there is intent and intent is deactivated.

P8: aligned between SA5-TMF on the Intent driven closed loop concept

P9: Need further discussion on the relation of list of use cases between 3GPP and TMF.

E: TMF has broader scope related to the intent discussion which have other use cases, TMF intent could also cover the 3GPP use cases as listed.

HW: 3GPP is contribution driven, the listed use cases are so far collected in Rel-17, it doesn't mean 3GPP only restrict to the listed use cases.

P10: using UML or RDFS, how AI is used in the intent work flow?

E: naming difference between “target” and “expectation”. The difference approach between 3GPP and TMF is 3GPP using UML and TMF using RDFS. We propose federated model and reconfigurable interface.

HW: the 3GPP model has the flexibility to allow operators to provide their expectations. Suggest to compare the stage 3 implementation to see the difference.

P15:

N: the FMC cooperation between TMF and 3GPP focused on the alignment of stage 1 and stage2. It’s not relevant with runtime or not.

T: FNIM is still used in SID. But there are some requirements can’t be satisfied to use FNIM.

O: Operator asked for certain version of standard for RFQ. How it works if there are new models added in during runtime?

CMCC: clarify whether TMF plans to develop stage 3, and seems the current stage 2 is not stable. The down streaming group can’t rely on the moving targets if federation approach is adopted.

**Summary of main Follow-up action points to investigate:**

* P6: Why different interfaces
* P7: Clarify the detailed meaning of activate/deactivate intent
* P9: Clarify if the generic TMF-defined Use Cases can also work for 3GPP-specific UCs
* P10: Are the models conceptually aligned, UML vs. RDF?
* P8/10: Online modification of the model to be supported? Run-time vs. design-time model update.
* P15:
  + Is FNIM still supported by TMF, and for what scope/domain/UCs? Valid for Intent mgmt?
  + Clarify need for Design time vs. run-time federation, and stage 3 definition plans by TMF.

**TMF slides:**

P23:

HW: why knowledge is used?

N: there is basic diff between knowledge and information data. In 3GPP, the information data is transferred in the interface.

P43: federated model

HW: need clarification on how the model can be extended with examples.

N: what’s relation extention and instantiation? How this approach is used in multiple groups environment? 3GPP specified common model which applies for different use cases.

**Summary of main Follow-up action points to investigate:**

* P21: Applies also to 3GPP?
* P23: Clarify meaning of “knowledge”
* P38: Clarify “Model federation”, relation between “blue and red”.
* P43: Clarify “Dynamic online federation” vs. “Static manual federation”, meaning of Extension and Instantiation of the model.

**Way forward：**

VC: The cooperation should not delay the 3GPP Rel-17 publication, 3GPP already has one exception on intent work item.

Chair: Plan for next SA5-TMF call on 16 Mar, 2022. Time TBD by SA5 – suggest 12:00-14:00 CET.