**Offline Call - SA3#120 Preparations for eZTS**

# 1. Call Information

* **Date:** 05 February 2025, Wednesday
* **Time:** 15:00-16:30 CET
* **Venue:** Microsoft Team Meeting (Online)
* **Goal:** To identify the middle ground towards consensus.
* **Organizer:** Sheeba Backia Mary Baskaran (Motorola Mobility, Rapporteur Rel-19 FS\_eZTS)

# 2. Call Participants:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Participant | Company |
| Sheeba Baskaran | Motorola Mobility |
| German Peinado | Nokia |
| Denisha Jackson | NSA |
| Minpeng Qi | CMCC |
| Andreas Kunz | Lenovo |
| Michael Bilca | Trideaworks |
| Sedjelmaci Hichem | Huawei |
| LOUSHINE MIKE | AT&T |
| David Gabay | Mitre |
| Samir Ferdi | InterDigital |
| Parsel Mike | T-mobile |
| Gallo Luigi | Telecomitalia |
| Yuto Nakano | KDDI |
| R Rohini | IISC |
| Kevin Lees | NPL |
| Gino | JHU/APL |
| Dusty Hoffpauir | Charter |
| Longhua | Huawei |
| PAULIAC Mireille | Thalesgroup |
| Vlasios Tsiatsis | Ericsson |
| Grewal Rajpreet | NTIA |
| Christine Jost | Ericsson |
| Guoyanfei | Not listed |
| Johannes Doerr | BMWK |
| Schäfer Pascal | Accenture |
| Jason Graham | Trideaworks |
| Lee Xiaoyang | CISA |
| Ranganath | Oracle |
| Elizabeth Koser | NSA |
| Yuze Liu | ZTE |
| Shanthala | Verizon |
| Tim Woodward | MSI |
| Alf | NTT Docomo |
| 18174558485 | Not listed |
| Warren Kim | JHU/APL |
| Cho Minkyoung | Tohmatsu |
| SUSANA MARIA SABATER | Vodafone |
| Jorg Andreas | BSI |
| Tyler Hawbaker | OTD\_US |
| Achter Johannes | Magenta |

# 3. Agenda and Minutes

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Agenda** | **Meeting Minutes** |
| 1 | Requirements:   * TS 33.501 or New Spec? * Normative: Mandatory vs Regional vs Optional? * Informative annex as placeholder – alternative to 900 series TR | Sheeba (Motorola Mobility): Initiated the discussion to identify the middle ground and point of consensus for the way forward. Asked to share different companies’ views on possible next step for the requirements agreed in the 33.794 conclusion.  Docomo (Alf): Have to drop in 7mins. Discussing between operators. A new spec is the way to go. Like LI spec only mandatory in certain regions, its separate, no problem can be seen with such way forward. Looking at the conclusions from ZTS, its uncomfortable to say ZTS anymore for further steps, instead call it with different/specific title. Have to drop in 3mins. Asked Minpeng to give introduction of the WID proposal.  Minpeng (CMCC): Have concerns on any further work in the name of ZTS. We just want to study ZT principle and tenets, but we don’t want to spend anything further with ZTS. We can do something in future but not as ZT. But something can be done with management service to collect information from the operator side which can help in network management and operation.  Mike Parsel (T-Mobile US): It is important to see the security management aspect as the new TS. Okay to move forward.  German (Nokia): Nokia supports this initiative proposed by Alf. Supports the way forward on the security management or monitoring.  Mike (AT&T): Supports the general approach and the approach of a new spec.  Dusty (Charter Communications): We also supports the initiative.  Vlasios (Ericsson): We prefer to see the document first on the security management. If the proposal is similar to what we have seen in Rel-19, we could look at the use case as seen in ZT study or if this expands the use case further have to be seen to understand the proposal.  MITRE (David): In general, agrees with the approach, it is important that the proposal covers the usecases studied. Would like to see the proposal.  Sheeba (MM): Do we have any other views for the way forward?  Silence  Sheeba (MM): Thanks for all the views, so far from the comments heard on the floor, it seems there is an inclination towards new TS. |
| 2 | Specific details or clarifications   * Convert existing TR to external TR/900 series TR * Create new 900 series TR | Sheeba (MM): Moving on the next agenda, there were different views and expectations related to having a new 900 series TR vs converting the existing TR to 900 series TR. So, it is good to have the discussion to understand why and for what purpose a 900 series TR is needed, please share your views with justification.  David (MITRE): For policy related things can utilize the 900-series TR.  Vlasios (Ericsson): Is this question just related to conversion of 33.794 to external 900 series. Many solutions in TR. Not clear.  Sheeba (MM): The agenda is to discuss and understand why and for what purpose a 900 series is needed. As there were different views shared on having a new 900 series TR vs converting the existing TR to 900 series.  Vlasios (Ericsson): Operators can implement the solutions from 900 TR; if we convert the existing TR to a 900 series TR, what is the plan? The way forward was to create a new spec and there could be optional things; the existing TR is closed then.  Minpeng (CMCC): When we specify some requirement, objective will define what is to be covered. All of this is related to security monitoring. The proposal doesn’t touch the policy related aspects. As conclusion in KI#2 of ZTS says, no normative work, no 900 series TR is needed.  German (Nokia): Both topics are separate. 1st bullet is related to data collection and 2nd one is related to KI#2. We shall separate both initiatives of TS and conversion of TR to 900 series TR. we should support both initiatives; If we have to prioritize for the next meeting Nokia priority would be to progress in the new specification and any conversion of 900 series TR can be a later one, we have more time. No urgency.  Sheeba (MM): For correct understanding, what do you mean as two topics?  German (Nokia): TS and conversion of TR to 900 series TR are two different topics.  Sheeba (MM): Okay, got it.  Vlasios (Ericsson): In SA3 we will not have time units to do both. Selection of solutions for recommendation would take time. Anyway, we can think further. |
| 3 | Scope of the WID objective:   * Get views from the involved companies.   #1 Data exposure for security evaluation and monitoring: | Sheeba (MM): Moving on the next agenda, for WID objectives, it would be good to discuss the fundamental aspects to identify the agreeable scope. What objective can meet the requirements/conclusion of KI#1 on data exposure?  Minpeng (CMCC): Would it be possible to present/share on screen the WID proposal prepared by Alf.  Minpeng (CMCC): Presented.  David (MITRE): SA5 will specify the events for security monitoring? SA5 management service to collect the data? Is that the idea?  Minpeng (CMCC): Yes, I think so; specify the requirements in SA3. Data collection and reporting procedure will be done by SA5.  German (Nokia): You call it security management service; it’s a broad term; based on the objectives I would call it Security monitoring it will be suitable for the title. I will send the comment/proposal in written. In general, the content is okay for us. In the objectives first are the security events, then the data collection part, you call it handling; then the transfer; this structure would help.  Minpeng (CMCC): In WT1 we have to specify some structure?  German (Nokia): would put it in another order; just format.  Mike (AT&T): Support this general approach. Thanks for the ordering suggested by the German.  Susanna (Vodafone): On the title, would be security monitoring a good title as well? Agrees on the objectives that the ordering is misplaced; this leaves to SA3 only the security requirements; similar to MONSTA.  Sheeba (MM): To confirm, only requirements in SA3 and the rest management up to SA5?  Susanna (Vodafone): The format and so on is for SA5. The security event related requirement is for SA3. Building the interface is to SA5.  Vlasios (Ericsson): Similar comment on the title; its more monitoring than management; Stage 2 and Stage 3 is mentioned. What stage 3 have to do.  Minpeng (CMCC): Not sure, maybe SA5 does the stage 3;  Vlasios (Ericsson): After point e) we did not discuss in the ZTS study; it is different; This proposal has added more than ZTS like login/logoff we have not discussed this before. We need to check internally. This looks like additional use case.  Minpeng (CMCC): This is right; this is focus on continuous monitoring.  Mike (T-Mobile): Support the objectives of this proposal. The naming can be broader than monitoring as the work can be extended in Release 20. proposes to keep it broader than just monitoring.  Tyler (OTD): Just have a question for the work task. looks like there is strict limit on the service layer. Only at the service layer, the data is collected related to NF. Do we want security data to be sent over the service layer or in a different fashion.  Minpeng (CMCC): The data in sent over the management plane (instead of service layer) sent to the management system.  Susanna (Vodafone): Can you repeat the question?  Tyler (OTD): Clarifies. We ask SA5 to do service layer transport and message structures; It changes the way existing things are done.  Mike (AT&T): There is a text under bullet e, does that help.  Tyler (OTD): Seems it needs a way to take the service level data over the management layer/plane.  Mike (AT&T): This is the nature of this feature.  Susanna (Vodafone): May be its not clear in the current reading. the intention is to address the SBA plane and the NFs etc.; they collect events and log them in this signaling at NF level and in additional to that, there are OAM side accesses for provision, and this is something to be logged; separate levels of security monitoring.  Minpeng (CMCC): proposal needs some minor changes, supporting companies and editorials; Alf will upload it.  Sheeba (MM): Initially we planned to discuss the fundamental aspects of the WID and no WID proposal draft was uploaded in the email discussions shared space as per the deadline. But as the WID proposal document itself being presented by companies now, I think it is good to also share the WID proposal that is being prepared using the latest version from the last meeting. Based on the feedback received from last SA3 meeting, the title has been changed and only KI#1 conclusion related security requirement are listed in the objective. No additional aspects added.  Sharing other WID version  Susanna (Vodafone): Some minor changes can be taken on board as well on Alf’s proposal and submitted to Athens; this proposal here, what it is?  Sheeba (MM): This is the WID proposal refined using the latest revision from last meeting to incorporate the feedback received.  Susanna (Vodafone): So, this is a competing proposal? What is your proposal?  Sheeba (MM): There has been continuous effort for the progress 3 years. This is a related effort. As explained, this includes the SA3 agreed requirements of KI#1 conclusion as basis for the objective, this is a revision from the last meeting. This is not a competing proposal. Instead, it is one variation of WID proposal with minimal aspects to identify the consensus point. Of course, operator’s proposal can be the baseline. Do you want to see only one proposal or are you open for several proposals to help in progress? I am open and would like to know the preference of the involved companies and stakeholders.  David (MITRE): There is a large support for the other WID; if we have this WID as well then this causes confusion; we have a general agreement on the way forward; then we should focus our attention only on that WID.  AT&T (Mike): Will the CMCC WID proposal uploaded for Athens?  Minpeng (CMCC): Confirmed that will upload the final WID proposal to the SA3#120 on Monday.  Mike (AT&T): Then we might now need the other WID proposal.  Sheeba (MM): There is a preference to go with one proposal and it is fine for the progress. Minpeng, can you share the WID proposal then with the interested companies, because in the call, we heard like few companies wanted to see the proposal to review it. I hope sharing would help for the progress.  Minpeng (CMCC): Yes, will share to the email discussions folder.  Sheeba (MM): Okay. |
| 4 | Any suggestions for the aspects to be touched in the SA3 offline call and for the SA3#120 F2F | Sheeba (MM) Is there any additional suggestions or aspects to be discussed?  Susanna (Vodafone): I don’t prefer to share the WID any space where everyone can take. Handle the WID and clean it, maybe people signal whether they want to receive the new version.  Minpeng (CMCC): Already uploaded to the email discussions folder. You want me to send the contribution to a group of people?  Susanna (Vodafone): To the group of people  German (Nokia): we will do our best to give feedback; just before the meeting Minpeng can upload a new version.  Sheeba (MM): Okay all is discussed, and thanks everyone for the valuable time and suggestions towards the work progress, hope it helps for the upcoming meeting.  Wrapped up the call. |
| 5 | Any other business | NA |