

Meeting #6, Nice, France

13th - 15th December 1999

Source: CN OSA Adhoc Convenor (Yun-Chao.Hu@era.ericsson.se)
Title: Meeting Report TSG_CN_OSA#02 (Geneva, Switzerland)
Agenda item: 5.5
Document for: Information

3GPP TSG_CN_OSA#02/ETSI SPAN3
OSA Adhoc Meeting, Geneva, Switzerland
7-8 december 1999

N-OSA-990xx

Source: 3GPP CN OSA Convenor (Yun-Chao.Hu@era.ericsson.se)
ETSI SPAN3 Chairman (Frans.Hearens@alcatel.be)
Title: Meeting Minutes of Joint 3GPP CN OSA/ETSI SPAN 3
Agenda item: 7
Document for: Information

Opening of the meeting and approval of the agenda

Yun Chao Hu (Ericsson) and Frans Haerens (Alcatel), welcomed the group of participants. Agenda and terms of reference were approved. The participant list is reflected in Tdoc N-OSA-99077

Introduction & grouping of contributions; allocation of a working session for each subject

Documents were allocated to the relevant agenda items. Four new documents were added by Lucent Technologies.

Reports

[N-OSA-99067](#)

Presented by the SPAN3 chairman

A discussion raised on the API for 3rd Party Service architecture. It was stated that the I/F between SCF and SA-GF was implementation dependent and could encompass the API or is just a propriety interface internal a Service Capability Server.

SPAR requirements from SPAN6 (regulator) – services capabilities provided to a service provider

- INAP
- API

Mapping between SPAR requirements and API methods

Part 2 will also includes procedures. The SPAN3 chairman commented that it would not be a one-to-one mapping of methods and INAP CS-2 operations.

[N-OSA-99053](#)

Presented by Yun Chao Hu and no comments received to the text. It was reported that only the chairman and Siemens commented on the text. The report was agreed.

Input Liaison Statements

[N-OSA-99054](#)

No additional security requirements are identified by S3 beyond the security capabilities already included into the framework service capability features. This LS was noted

[N-OSA-99055](#)

No additional security requirements are identified by S3 beyond the security capabilities already included into the framework service capability features. The LS was noted

[N-OSA-99056](#)

This was our own generated LS from the Kista meeting. The LS was noted.

[N-OSA-99057](#)

This LS was noted.

[N-OSA-99058](#)

The response does not address the concern expressed by the CN OSA Adhoc. However, we agreed that this capability will be handled by the OSA group, if required. This LS was noted.

[N-OSA-99059](#)

This LS was noted.

[N-OSA-99060](#)

This LS was noted.

[N-OSA-99072](#)

The terminal capabilities can provide in three ways

- WAP GW
- CAP operation

The Service Classmark will be contained the terminal capabilities, it will not contain the SAT capabilities.

The service Classmark is questioned if it is equal to the UAprof (if this is not the case then balancing might be required at a later stage)

Work Items & Plans

[N-OSA-99061](#) & [N-OSA-99073](#)

The relationship to All-IP architecture raised. Section 10 of the All-IP report. This document is targeted to Rel 00. Service interaction was raised again. It was agreed that Service Interaction should not be included in Release 99. The meeting also noted that the security requirements are reflected by the functionality available in the framework Service Capability Feature.

The meeting raised further concerns about the state of stage 2 document.

1. Can stage 3 be started without stable stage 2?

Commented from the chairs:

Yes we can start already stage 3 since this has happened in the past on other issues within 3GPP CN and ETSI SPAN.

TS 23.127 editor:

- TS 23.127 is agreed upon in SA2 and TSG SA as version 1.0.0.
- Tasks to be completed – are required to be resolved within stage 2 document, preferable within the output document of S2 meeting in January.
- Contentious issue
 - user profile handling (specific to VHE) and therefore outside scope – what about SPAR?
 - Message transfer (might be deleted by S1),
 - CAMEL Phase 3 → ETSI/3GPP
 - User Profile Handling, Data Download → 3GPP

2. The Leg modelling state and its removal.

The email discussion on this issue will be reflected in 1.2.0

3. Technical details – method descriptions are too simple

SA2 is primarily responsible – however we will continue further detailing and we will provide “proposals” to S2 for inclusion. Needs to be reflected in the report.

[NP-OSA-99062](#)

It was agreed that the ETSI members during the SG11 API Question discussion should defend the work performed in ETSI & 3GPP specifications to be referenced into the ITU-T Recommendations (as a roadmap). ETSI specifications can be referenced by ITU-T. ETSI & 3GPP are prepared to perform the required standardisation work. SG11 API question should only provide a roadmap referencing existing specifications and it should not develop their own API protocol specification to avoid duplication of standardisation activities.

Workplan Alignment

[NP-OSA-99063](#), [NP-OSA-99064](#), [NP-OSA-99065](#)

The documents are presented by Richard (BT). As this meeting is not considered suitable for indepth technical discussions, the documents are taken for information.

[NP-OSA-99066](#)

This document has been noted.

[NP-OSA-99068](#)

The document was presented by Rob Schmersel (Ericsson). It has been decided by S2 that sequence diagrams will be added to the document. Significant changes will be introduced in the version of the document (1.2.0), of which a draft version will be sent out before Christmas, including the results from the Abiko meeting and email discussions on the S2 mail exploder.

[NP-OSA-99069](#)

The document was presented by Musa (Lucent). Rob (Ericsson) provided some clarification. The document provided a clear indication of the mismatches between Parlay and OSA API. The meeting raised the issue of the handling of INAP extensions, which are not covered by CAP. It was agreed that the extensions should be documented in a separate document (part 2) and it was also noted that this should be as thin as possible.

[NP-OSA-99070](#)

The document was presented by Musa (Lucent). Class Diagrams are currently handled by SPAN6. It was questioned if harmonisation of Class Diagrams is required for fixed and mobile networks. CN OSA agreed that harmonisation on the class diagrams is required. Since SA2 agreed not to seek cooperation between SPAN6 and SA2 at this moment in time, SPAN3 and CN OSA should develop the Class diagrams in their specifications.

It was noted that SPAN 6 meeting will take place next week. Mr. Richard Stretch (BT) volunteered kindly to will take this into the SPAN 6 meeting discussions.

[NP-OSA-99071](#)

The document was presented by Musa (Lucent). The document described the usage of UML in the stage 2 specificaiton (i.e. TS 23.127). The meeting considered this document not relevant for the stage 3 activity. Therefore, CN OSA advised the contributor to raise this issue at the S2 meetings.

[NP-OSA-99074](#)

The document was presented by Rob (Ericsson). This LS highlighted the lacking of sufficient security capabilities for the handling of user profiled. The LS indicated that action is required from S3. It also indicated that CN-ad-hoc has to take notice of this liaison statement.

[NP-OSA-99075](#)

The document was presented by Musa (Lucent). This document raised the issue if the Parlay API could be used unchanged. However, the meeting commented that the 3GPP and ETSI delegates, which are NOT part of the Parlay forum would feel very uncomfortable, since they can not take part of the discussions within Parlay.

The initial proposal of this document is changed by the meeting, into the idea to make the 3GPP/ETSI specs a superset of the Parlay specs.

[NP-OSA-99076](#)

The document was presented by the chairman. It describes the report of the CN OSA activities to the 3GPP TSG CN Plenary. A discussion was held on the mapping between OSA operations and network protocols. It was questioned if these mappings should be regarded as normative (as proposed by Nokia) or informative (Ericsson, Alcatel). Based on this discussion it was agreed that the specific references to normative or informative would be deleted from the report (in association with the mapping) and further discussions needs to take place after the CN #06 plenary. This issue should NOT be used to stop the mapping activity.

The proposed working organisation has been extensively discussed. The first proposal was to recommend CN to start a new WG. However, based on reservation from some delegates, alternatives have been added to the working organisation proposals. This is reflected in extensive re-drafting of section 4.4.

After thoroughly review of the proposed TSG CN report, the meeting agreed for submission to the TSG CN Plenary.

Meeting Plan Alignment

The meeting agreed to the following meeting schedule:

Date	Meeting	Venue
06/01 – 07/01 2000	Joint SPAN3/CN OSA adhoc #3	Tilburg (Holland)
27/01 – 28/01 2000	Joint SPAN3/CN OSA adhoc #4	Sophia Antipolis
28/02 – 01/03 2000	Joint SPAN3/CN OSA adhoc #5	Antwerp (Belgium)
13/03 – 15/03 2000	CN#7 plenary	Madrid
20/03 – 24/03 2000	ETSI SPAN3 meeting	Istanbul

The CN OSA group considered the meeting plan to be a challenge considering the amount of work on the API protocol development. The CN OSA would like to highlight that most of the CAMEL API can benefit from the ongoing activity jointly between ETSI SPAN3 & 3GPP CN OSA, however the API protocol development for WAP GW and SAT needs to be developed by 3GPP CN OSA.

Considering this situation, CN OSA Adhoc would like to propose the flexibility from the 3GPP CN Plenary to allocate more meetings or extend existing planned meetings.

Matti (Nokia) is concerned about the amount of work to be done, and about the quality of the release '99 work. It is noted that when the quality of the work is not enough, a stage 3 spec. will not be presented at the CN plenary in march. However, the ad-hoc working group will do its best to meet this deadline.

Document Handling Procedures

As non-ETSI 3GPP delegates have no access to the ETSI server and the ETSI automated document system, it is proposed that the handling of documents shall conform to the usual 3GPP document handling currently. This is the manual MCC support, providing the Tdoc numbers to the requesting delegates and putting the document received from the delegates (including the number) on the 3GPP server (proposed at “ftp://ftp.3gpp.org/TSG_CN/OSA”).

Close

The chairmen would like to thank all delegates for their active participation during the meetings. Special thanks for those participants from 3GPP SA1 and SA2 for their valuable expertise on the stage 1 and stage 2 VHE/OSA specifications. Furthermore, the chairmen would like to express special thanks to the hosting organisation for their excellent meeting facilities.

The chairmen would like to wish all delegates nice Christmas Days and a happy Y2K