**Meeting minutes: Offline call on the GSMA LSs**

Minpeng (VC) started the meeting

Nokia: 1719 there are 16 requirements and 1720 has 20 requirements

Orange: we can completely skip SA1. Roaming arch it is to be done completely within SA2 and SA3

NTT: currently SA1 is specifying roaming service. So we need to make sure all these gets aligned. We cannot ignore SA1.

Huawei: Requirements looks like new service requirements. SA2 can take lead on the architectural requirement

Vodafone: If the purpose is to standardize the IPX, SA1 and SA2 would know about it. But it’s not the case. The requirement came to us. So do not see the SA2 involvement to do any steps

Nokia: In the LSes, they are new use cases on sponsored roaming and regional breakout. It involves the architecture and the security.

Orange: Did not see SA1 involved in this kind of work. Absolutely do not see the need for SA1. Just make sure they are in line with us. Nothing more to do.

Nokia: In rel-18 to check what is possible with end-to-end architecture. However, GSMA is suggesting adding intermediary and can do manipulation in the messages. What could be done in rel-18 is some technical questions to ask 5GMMR and check what can be done in Rel-19.

For full visibility, use PRINS. Certain use cases up to SA1 to make decision.

Chair: It was discussed in plenary so SA3 need to take decision

Mavenir: Presents a ppt GSMA requirement.

CableLabs: We should pursued hop by hop. GSMA is ok with end to end and not ok with the PRINS. SA1 has study (different study). And should be done by SA3,it is not SA1 requirement.

Mavenir: RH wants to have full access to the message without HN knowing what has to be changed. If you protect the message from visited to the home, then any change by the RH, the other PLMN will know what all messages are being modified?

Huawei: What is it for SA3 to do?. It is not in our expertise. We need feedback from SA2

Mavenir: GSMA working assumption allow us to have hop by hop solution and 3rd party to have end to end validation.

BSI: There is a need to generate a common position between SA3 and other group whether there is an architectural impacts or not.

Since these requirements are not clear, SA3 can respond to 5GMMR to ask questions for clarifications and check whether these requirements can be addressed with the existing things or not. Don’t think it’s a good idea to introduce security weakness for a small amount of traffic.

Vodafone: Concrete proposal: remove the restriction on TLS being end to end in release 18

For rel-19, define an entity, RH.

NTT: Concrete Proposal: it is not security problem. It is architectural. They will start violate SA2 spec. SA2 should take lead on roaming hub architecture then we work on security.

LS to SA2 and ask them to work and SA1 to document the requirement.

Chair: We need to ask fast. LS might take time but do we need LS?

Chair: action item to Alf: to draft LS use 1717 to work on.

NTT: LS content: There is an architecture impact and we need to make sure that SA2 has architecture to fulfil this and then we have security solution to work.

Chair: Request Mavenir to upload the presented slide deck.