**Pre SA2#152E eNA Conference call**

1）CMCC: Work plan discussion.

The RAN dependency and other study item dependency should be considered. For KI#5/#9, it seems still not mature and more study is needed from rapportuer point of view but companies are still ok to bring evaluation proposal if they tend to think it is mature to have draft evaluation.

2) Orange: paper on new solution for KI#4.

The motivation of this new solution is to avoid duplicated data collection for the same UE. Several companies points out that existing DCCF can already resolve this issue. Some companies comment whether every Analytics ID needs to be registered in UDM? Should every Analytics ID need to be specified? Orange answered it was good to at least find out the minimum set of features for specification. More offline is needed.

3) Huawei: new solution on interaction between MDAF and NWDAF.

Nokia and Vivo ask what will be documented for normative work in SA2. Jinsook asks which analystic ID use this interaction. It is clarified that this solution is generic, not specific to any analystic ID. It may be useful to document this solution in the TR and make the decision whether to have normative impact on SA2 or SA5. Lenovo points out that SA5 is still under discussion on the MDAF discovery part. So LS to SA5 on this aspect may be useful.

4) Nokia: DCCF relocation.

Discussion on the first change. How the DCCF1 and DCCF2 determines the data resource change is unclear. More offline discussion on the interaction between DCCF1 and DCCF2.

5) Nokia: new function to rating the MI model, TRLF.

Vivo asks whether the model rating is only taking the analystic result into account? Different consumer may have different rating for the same MI model, so how it can work? It was asked whether only the highest rating model will be selected for the consumer. Nokia answers that the rating is per Analytics ID. Regarding the metric, who will define it? Different vendors can provides different metrics. Whether the metric will be standardized? It is clarified that currently the intention is not to standardize the metric.

More offline to discuss this solution is needed.

6) Vivo: URSP enhancement.

Lenovo mentioned that the PCF already take the NWDAF analytics ID into account. Nokia/Qualcomm questions on the first change and comment that the new control plane interface between UE and PCF are out of scope. Vivo mentioned that this update is based on the current available solutions for KI#2 of eUEPO. ATT points out there will be security issue and is very much against it. It is suggest to add NOTE that this depends on the conclusion of eUEPO SID.

7) Lenovo: KI#1 evaluation/conclusion.

Vivo share the same view as Lenovo on the interim conclusion part. MTLF determines the re-training based on AnLF input. The MTLF can also monitor the model performance by itself. Huawei asks why it only concludes the first category, are other categories dropped? Nokia express the concerns that the AnLF normally performs light-weight operation, it cannot calculate the analytics performance. ZTE comments that it is better to list all possible principles as draft conclusion in the conclusion, not just the first bullet. Ericsson comments that the the "ground truth" shoud be one of the examples.

8) Vivo KI#1 evaluation/conclusion.

Huawei asks in the first principle why the second part is FFS? and proposes to have some small group discussions regarding categories. Huawei asks how to do evaluation, whether we evaluate the solution per category or evaluate the solution one by one? Nokia share the similar view here and tend to agree the Category A looks possible to get concluded first and regarding category B have to be discussed one by one.

9) CMCC evaluation on application detection: no comment

10) Nokia: conclusion on DCCF/MEAF relocation.

 It is clarified that NFp is NF provider. No further comment

11) Huawei: no further comment

12) Huawei: LS out on security issue of raw data exchange between PLMNs.

E/// comments it is up to the operator agreement instead of SA3. Nokia comments that in the key issue description there is filtering function to handle the raw data, so it is not sure what SA3 needs to be involved. ZTE agree with Nokia and suggest to ask SA3 to feedback on the filtering solutions captured in SA2 TR. Some companies including CMCC believe this is not only security issue, but also privacy issue. So it is not only related with SA3, but also SA1 and GSMA on roaming agreement. More offline discussion is needed.