**SA WG2 Meeting #142e S2-200**

**Nov16th – 20th , 2020 ; Elbonia (revision of S2-200)**

**Source: Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell**

**Title: Handling of LS on IP address to GPSI translation (S2-2008358 / S6-202008)**

**Document for: Agreement (P-CR)**

**Agenda Item: 4.1**

**Work Item / Release: EDGEAPP / Rel-17**

*Abstract of the contribution: proposed a “moderated email discussion”*

# 1 Discussion

there may be multiple answers about S2-2008358 = S6 LS on IP address to GPSI translation

1. Due to the closing of the study item SA2 agrees not to address this issue in the Rel-17 time frame
2. SA2 Completes NEF API specification to support UE addressing information as UE identifier as much as possible but a statement tells that: “In this release the case of UE addressing information corresponding to NATed Traffic is not supported”
3. SA2 Completes NEF API specification to support UE addressing information as UE identifier as much as possible including support of NAT
4. SA2 provides the exposure API to return a GPSI (if GPSI is available for the UE identified by IP address) when an IP address of the UE is provided.
5. We do not address this topic in SA2 1342E

# 2 Proposal

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **supports** | **Objects to** | **Free text** |
| **Nokia** | 2,3 | 1, 4 | it does not look to be a good idea to not handle in R17Application requests targeting an UE identified by UE addressing information when 3GPP claims Edge Computing is a flagship of R17 . Conversely R17 is more than full.  Having said that, solving the issue of UE addressing information corresponding to NATed IP address may be a second level of discussion  As explained in nokia’s paper, providing back a GPSI to the AF as in alternative 4 does NOT solve the NAT or IP address overlap issues as anyhow Alternative 4 starts with the AF providing UE IP addressing information |
| **Convida Wireless** | 3 | 1, 2 | We view the ability to translate an IP Address and Port Numebr to a GPSI as critical for Rel-17. The Nokia discussion paper (S2-2009003) and the LS from SA6 (S2-2008358/S6-202008) both give good explanations of why this feature is so important for Rel-17.  Since we expect most Edge use cases to involve NAT, we can not justify not supporitng the NAT case.  We have some problems with question 4. If the point of quesiton 4 is to ask if we only need to resolve IP Address to GPSI or do we need to resolve IP Address and Port to GPSI, then our answer is that we beleive that we need to resolve IP Address and Port to GPSI.  If the point of Q4 is to ask if this needs to be done via the NEF, then our answer is that we believe that the NEF seems to make sense, but we are open to other options.  NOTE: any soluton should also address the fact that a UE can have multiple GPSIs. For example, a UE can have multiple External IDs. |
| **Qualcomm** | 3 | 2, 4 | Given the interest shown by the different companies, we are fine to address the issue, with the following clarifications:   * If we want to develop a solution, it should address all scenarios (including the NAT’ed one). An API to return a GPSI purely based on the UE’s IP address would not work for the NAT’ed scenario (the Port Number is also needed). * If SA2 reaches an agreement on a solution it should be technically endorsed and sent to SA3 to get feeback on potential security issues (note that providing the UE’s GPSI to the AF does not solve the tracking issue that SA6 want to avoid). * If no way forward is agreed, we are fine with postponing or not addressing the issue. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

*End of changes*