3GPP TSG_CN
Plenary Meeting #9, Oahu, Hawaii
20th – 22nd September 2000.

Tdoc NP-000479

| | |
|---|---|
| **Source:** | **TSG CN WG2** |
| **Title:** | **Meeting Report #4** |
| **Agenda item:** | **6.5.1** |
| **Document for:** | **Information** |

---

# Meeting Report

# TSG CN WG5#4
# Retz, Austria

# 10th - 11th of July 2000

Chairman: Lucas Klostermann (Ericsson)

Secretary: Monica Hellman (3GPP support team)

Host: Siemens

| | |
|---|---|
| List of participants: | Annex A |
| Output documents: | Annex B |
| Tdoc list (incl. the status) | Annex C |

Documents could be found on the 3GPP-server:

ftp://ftp.3gpp.org/TSG_CN/WG5_osa/TSGN5_04_Retz/Docs

# 1 Opening of the meeting and approval of the agenda

The Chairman of N5, Lucas Klostermann opened the meeting. Peter Markovics from Siemens welcomed the delegates to Retz in Austria and presented the meeting arrangements. He also invited to a social event that will take place in one of the big vine cellars in Retz.

**N5-000104**, source Chairman: *Agenda*

Lucas Klostermann presented a proposed agenda for the meeting.

***Discussion:*** The discussion about R00 will take place before the discussion about R99. An extra agenda item was requested by MCC about working methods.

***Conclusion:*** Agreed with the proposed change.

# 2 Allocation of documents to agenda items

**N5-000105**, source Chairman: *Document allocation*

Lucas Klostermann presented a document with a proposal with allocation of documents to agenda items.

***Conclusion:*** Agreed

# 3 Reporting

Lucas Klostermann reported from the last plenary. At CN#8 the TS 29.198 and TR 29.998 was approved without any questions. The Terms of References for N5 was also presented and approved.

## 3.1 N5#3

**N5-000106**, *Report from Cardiff*

Monica Hellman presented the Report from N5#3. The draft report was presented for information at CN#8. It has been on the server for a week and no comments have been received so it has therefore been agreed earlier.

***Conclusion:*** Noted

## 3.2 Parlay meeting in Boston

Richard Stretch reported from the Parlay meeting. It was a kick off for Parlay 3. 90 delegates from 40 companies participated. The discussion was about split of the organisation and information to the newcomers.

For phase 3 work has been split into the following WGs:

- Call Control

- Mobile eCommerce (although the conclusion of the discussion here was that it may be a bit premature to know what Parlay can add here)

- User Profile Data (profile management) (new)

- Realization of ws

- Network Consistency Management (new)

- Policy Management (replaces connectivity management) between Network Operator and SP, including QoS and service level agreements

- Content Based Charging (meaning really transaction based, or application based; content is not relevant)

The next meeting will take place the 4th to 5th of October in Sophia Antipolis. 4 groups are working on the call control at the moment. ETSI, 3GPP, Parlay and JAIN. AT & Tare chairing the call control group in Parlay.

## 3.3 SPAN3 meeting in Sophia Antipolis

**N5-000113**, source SPAN3: *Report from SPAN3*

Lucas Klostermann presented the draft report from the SPAN3 meeting last week. The cooperation was discussed. The outcome is reflected in the common document from Lucas Klostermann and Frans Haerens in document 112.

***Discussion:*** Lucas Klostermann would like to use the report at the discussion for call control.

***Conclusion****:* Noted

# 4 Input liaison statements: allocation to agenda items as appropriate

No documents

# 5 Organisational aspects of UMTS R00 OSA activities

## 5.1 Handling of common technical base between SPAN3 and 3GPP

**N5-000112**, source SPAN3 chairman / N5 Chairman: *Organisation of the joint SPAN3/N5 work*

Lucas Klostermann presented the proposal from him and Frans Haerens how to organise the work in the future.

***Discussion:*** SPAN3 will be changed to SPAN 12 and the co-operation will be with that group after November.

Section 2:

In the first bullet: Matti Saarenpää would like that we consider including SDLs.

Second bullet: Jane Humphrey clarified that N5 works on a standard and then we work on a norm. Clarifications are needed.

Shall it be a new specification for R00 or should we continue with the old specification? If we choose to continue with the old specification the specifications for R99 and R00 will still be different since they will have different version numbers. R99 will have version 3.x.x and R00 version 4.x.x. S1 will keep their document. Whatever N5 is doing, S2 has to do the same.

Working Procedures:

- The working document for N5 will be the ETSI one, plus a “summary” appendix that collects the delta between the 3GPP spec (29.198 v4xx) and the working (ETSI) document; each CN plenary a CR, or set of CRs, will be presented, that reflects the summary above

- Before every plenary, a CR for the 3GPP specification will be prepared based on the appendix.

- Lucas Klostermann will inform CN plenary at the next plenary about working assumptions.

- N5 will prepare one reconstruction CR for the next plenary for R00. Some parts will be taken out from stage 2 for inclusion in stage 3. The two CRs have both to be approved (or none of them)

- The workingprocedure will be the same for the mapping document.

Agreements:

- The common name space shall be changed.

- Have one set of IDLs. The IDLs contains extra data types that not need to be used.

- Restructuring of the document, grouping per Service Capabilities features.

- The requirements are coming from SA and SPAN11 and SPAN14.

We still have time to think of the changes until the next N5 meeting.

***Conclusion:*** The document will be updated and sent out on via e-mail.

## 5.2 Collaboration with Parlay (based on discussions during Parlay meeting)

In the Parlay phase 3 kick-off meeting, co-operation with 3GPP was only mentioned in the Call Control group of Parlay. We should organise this interaction, and have the Parlay group join our meetings. They will be invited to our December meeting in the USA. The Parlay representatives will be considered individual participants.

JAIN representatives can also join us later on.

## 5.3 Handling of CR's for R99 on 23.127

For R00 it will be a re-organisation of stage 2 and stage 3. Two CRs will be prepared for the next TSG meeting, one for 23.127 and another for 29.198.

## 5.4 Working Methods

Monica Hellman presented the CR template and procedures for R00. Before 3.0.0 anything can be done to a document; afterwards it is necessary to use CRs.

Categories of changes

- corrections

- corrections in another release: if a CR is made up on R99 it will have to be included in R00 as well

- addition of feature (same, also to be put in R00)

This means that CRs may modify both release 99 and R00 (MCC is in charge of keeping this synchronisation), and both releases are distinguished by their version number.

The field "work item" shall be the R00 work item, which means Feature, Building block or Work Task.

When writing a CR a CR number, apart from a Tdoc number, has to be requested (because MCC keeps track of the approval state of a CR). The title needs to be provided when requesting a number.

CRs to a document have to be written to the version that is on the server, otherwise it's a risk that the CRs will not be correct implemented.

# 6 Change Requests for UMTS R99 OSA (29.198 or 29.998)

## 6.1 Framework

**N5-000123**, source Siemens/Ericsson: *Overview of misalignment FW*

Ard-Jan Moerdijk presented the document, which is an overview of the misalignment with Parlay 2.1, for information and discussion. The misalignement is a result of work on Parlay on refinement of data types and parameters (some data types have been merged, some removed).

At the next meeting a proper CR will be presented.

***Discussion:*** Matti Saarenpää suggested that more descriptions and motivations why it's proposed to be added to the specification shall be added in the CR.

***Conclusion:*** Revised

## 6.2 Services

**N5-000107**, CR 001 (cat F) on 29.198, source Ericsson: *Improvement of User Interaction STDs*

*Ard-Jan Moerdijk presented the CR. The reason for change is that* some transitions are missing in the state transition diagrams for the UI and UICall object.

***Conclusion:*** Revised in N5-000118

**N5-000118**, CR 001 rev 1 (cat F) on 29.198, *Improvement of User Interaction STDs*

Revised document of N5-000107. Ard-Jan Moerdijk presented the changes that are now described in the coversheet.

Changes are:

- Introduction of the “Finished” state

- Transition from “Release Pending” to “Active” in case the final request was not successful.

- More clear separation between events that don’t cause a state transition from the application side and events from the network side. The first are shown as a self-transition with a semi-circle while the latter are shown as self-transitions on the bottom right of a state.

- Addition of more descriptive text, explaining the transitions.

***Conclusion:*** Agreed

**N5-000109**, CR 002 (cat F) on 29.198, source Ericsson: *Call Control Alignment of IDL*

Ard-Jan Moerdijk presented the CR that proposes that in the TS 29.198 the complete Generic Call Control IDL is included as well with the addition of a remark that operations that are not supported will throw the exception for method not supported (P_METHOD_NOT_SUPPORTED in TpResultInfo). It also alignes TS 29.198 with the IDL for the Parlay 2.1 specifications.

***Discussion:*** There are other IDLs that are still not in align with PARLAY. A new CR will be produced to for these.

Proposal for the naming space replacing org.threegpp.osa with org.threegpp.oisp, where oisp stands for Open Interface for Service Providers. This does not solve our objective of having a single naming space for 3GPP and SPAN. It may be possible to use different naming spaces and write references from one to the other. This will be studied (it's an OMG thing). When it is decided we will come back to the discussion osa vs oisp.

***Conclusion:*** Revised in N5-000119

**N5-000119**, CR 002 rev 2 (cat F) on 29.198, source Ericsson: *Call Control Alignment of IDL*

Revised version of document N5-000109. Ard-Jan Moerdijk presented the document.

***Discussion:*** It was a discussion if it should be included in R99 or R00. Nokia is not happy with the proposed additions. Nokia was opposing the CR and wanted to discuss the issue further in September. Alcatel propose to include the additiona but not restructure the IDLs for R99. The adding of the methods to the IDLs was agreed for R99. Nokias concerns is that the methods is not in the scope of OSA.

Nokia and Motorola will check it and it will be discussed in the next meeting. It has to be solved via e-mail before the next meeting.

***Conclusion:***Postponed

**N5-000110**, CR 003 rev 1 (cat F) on 29.198, source Ericsson: *Correction of numbering in TpResultInfo*

Revised version of document N5-000108. Ard-Jan Moerdijk presented the document that corrects a few numbering errors in the TpResultInfo

***Discussion:*** B should be A.

***Conclusion:*** Revised in N5-000120

**N5-000120**, CR 003 rev 2 (cat F) on 29.198, source Ericsson: *Correction of numbering in TpResultInfo*

Revised document of N5-000110. The IDLs is included and the relevant corrections are changed.

***Discussion:*** Agreed without presentation.

***Conclusion:*** Agreed

**N5-000111**, CR 004 (cat F) on 29.198, source Ericsson:*Remove of E.164 Mobile and correction of numbering in TpAddressPlan*

***Discussion:*** The changes in the IDLs have to be included.

***Conclusion:*** Revised in N5-000121

**N5-000121**, CR 004 rev 1 (cat F) on 29.198, source Ericsson:*Remove of E.164 Mobile and correction of numbering in TpAddressPlan*

Revision of document N5-000111

***Discussion:*** Agreed without presentation.

***Conclusion:*** Agreed

**N5-000115**, CR 001 (cat F) on 29.998, source Nokia: *Mapping of CallNotification interupted CallNotification continue methods.*

Matti Saarenpää presented the document. callNotificationInterrupted & callNotificationContinued: Interruption means all notifications thus it is not appropriate to monitor only single subscribers CSI statuses. Thus there should be no mapping to MAP or CAP operations.

***Discussion:*** The precondition in the tables shall be changed. Matti Saarenpää will also investigate if the some is applicable for other cases.

***Conclusion:*** Revised in N5-000122

**N5-000122**, CR 001 rev 1 (cat F) on 29.998, source Nokia: *Mapping of CallNotification interupted CallNotification continue methods.*

Revised document of N5-000115. The number is changed. The user interaction part is not included. Matti Saarenpää will prepare a CR to that for the next meeting.

***Discussion:*** The number is changed. The user interaction part is not included. Matti Saarenpää will prepare the revised CR for the next meeting.

***Conclusion:*** Revised in N5-000124

**N5-000116**, CR 002 (cat F) on 29.98, source Nokia:*CallEnd methods Mapping correction*

Matti Saarenpää presented the document. callEnded indicates disconnection from a call party, it should therefore be mapped to CAP eventReportBCSM as the normal operation.

***Conclusion:*** Agreed

# 7 Technical discussions on UMTS R00 OSA

## 7.1 Multiparty/multimedia Call Control SCF

**Extract from the SPAN 3 report included comments from N5:**

**Call control**

- Ard-Jan Moerdijk gave a presentation of the evolution of Call Control. The original phase 2.0 control had specialization of call such as CapCall and INAPCall
- Parlay 2.1 was simplified even further. Only this time Call specialise into MultipartyCall which again specializes into MultimediaCall. ConferenceCall inherit from MultimediaCall. So if one wishes to have conference calls, you can choose to have single or multimedia calls. Legs are associated with multiparty and multimedia calls. It is not possible to associate legs with single standalone calls.
- It was stated that the API no longer refers to controlling or passive legs, this issue is implementation specific.
- IpCall and IpAppCall now contains all of the methods previously contained within IpCapCall and IpINAP1
- GetLastRedirectedAddress appears in IpCallleg but not in IpCall. It is therefor only possible to gain address information for multiparty call legs and not on a leg in a two party call!
- A lot of conversation around the use of Multmedia call control versus Generic Call Control. The result was that it was possible to use generic call control without multimedia even if you required to set up multipoint circuits each having a different media capability.
- on multiparty/multimedia
- various different media types (e.g. also video) can be set up via GCC (but point to point)
- multipoint connections needs MPCC

- two mechanisms now to have multimedia sessions by applications:
- multimedia call control has session and media channels coordinated
- applications can also set up multimedia session via multiple data session interfaces, application does coordination of media channels itself
- whether these two mechanism can be combined, i.e. multimedia CC using data session interface, is for further study
- In a conference call it is not possible for the application to either add a media to a pre-established leg, or for the application to change the media a particular leg is using. In this latter case only the leg can request a change of media channel, which the application may either allow or not via the mediaChannelAllow method.
  This is a limitation of the interface, with the rationale that the whole negotiation procedure would have to be across the API as well, in case the application would be able to change the media (terminal caps, network caps, ..).
- Generic User interaction interface remains unchanged between 2.0 and 2.1
- Within the Generic Call State transition diagram, it is not possible to reflect collected information and analyze info as in the IN BCSM.
- getMoreDialedDigits method in STD, this covers the scenario of one additional cycle of digit collection (in R00, since in CAMEL (R99) this method does not exist)
- use UI in order to have a multiple user input scenario (e.g. authentication before access)
- The Generic Call STD only allows for two parties, if you need to add more parties you need to use the MultiParty Call interface.
- If you are using Generic Call and have only two parties, it is possible to monitor for mid-call triggers however as the separate legs are not identified here it is only possible to release say the B party and not to 'park' it whilst the A party does something.
- in case the two parties are still involved in a call, you can only release the whole call with GCC.
- follow-on calls are possible however, under the restriction that the called party releases
- Below the incoming state of the Call Leg STD we should have a self transition, eventReportResult reflecting the analyzed/collected information situation. A similar transition in GenericCall STD should be added for the getMoreDialledDigits result. See bullet item above, agreed
- Should the cut and paste facility of IN also be reflected at the application? Partial number translation.
- In the text supporting the CallLeg STD there is an explanation of the Connected state. The second paragraph should read; 'In case the request for the connection was made by routeReq() on the call object, the call party is also attached to the call'. The third paragraph, 'In case the request was made by the route() on the call leg, the call party still needs to be attached to the call'. Make sure that this is captured in restructured text in September. Keep record on it, await on procedural agreement with Parlay/3GPP/SPAN3.
- There are some questions about where analysis is performed. Whether this is agreed initially by means of the Framework or another means needs to be discussed. Also the nature of address between two parties e.g. the number portability type of addresses, redirecting address and routing address, how will this be identified, or is this function even a concern of the API? Assumption taken that the number will be an (international) directory number, so that applications do not have to be aware of NP. A special case would be where the NP mechanism is using concatenation of numbers. Whether the GW needs to convert this in an international directory number, needs further study, but this might be a rare case, only at transit level.
- The setServiceProfile capability is not part of release 2.1. This may need to be addressed in the next phase.
- MultipartyCallLeg STD. getCallLegs operation needs to be reflected in all states. Agreed
- MultipartyCall STD. In the Active state '1 party in call', there should be a transition shown back to 'routing to destination', this will cater for the first party releasing from the call whilst other parties are in the routing to destination sub-state. This transition should also cater for the case where the application releases a leg. Text

should be added to the explanation of the'1 party in call' sub-state, saying that if you are in this state and there are no outstanding routeRequests and the application subsequently releases this leg, then the call transits to the Application Released call state. Agreed

- In the CallLeg STD. An extra arrow should be added from the Incoming state to the Connected Sub-state 'Attached', labeled attachMedia. Agreed
- By having an incoming call event in the CallLeg state model and transiting to the 'Incoming' call state, what kind of media is assumed, e.g. is it an RTP unidirectional stream or an SCN bearer?

**N5-000126**, source N5: Part of the Report from SPAN3 including the comments from N5.

In the report from the API- meeting. N5 included comments in the document.

**N5-000117**, source BT: Parlay 2.1

The document was presented for information.

**Conclusion:** Noted

**N5-000114**, source BT: Concept of CSCF and SIP

The document was presented for information.

**Conclusion:** Noted

## 7.2 other SCF's

No document.

# 8 Joint session with S1 OSA Ad-hoc

## 8.1 status of requirements for R00

The OSIP WI was presented to last S1 and approved. It was created based on the VHE work item but split from it, since OSA is an enabling mechanism for VHE. The WI is called "Open Interface for Service Provision".

This week they have a meeting where the objective is to agree on version 0.9 of stage 1, that will be finished next week and become version 1.0 and be sent for information to SA#9 in September. The final version is expected to be presented for approval at the SA plenary in December. They do not believe it can be stable before then.

There is an S2 LS on VHE with the time scale of VHE/OSA.

N5's timetable should be included in this WI, because the N5 Workitem is the same as for S1.

S1 OSA needs to have stage 1 in a status of stability enough for N5 to use it in September.

Documents: at the moment the plans are to have:

- two stage 1 documents, one for VHE and one for OSA
- one single stage 2 document, that contains the architecture for both VHE and OSA
- one single stage 3 document, with the specification of only OSA.

Discussion on the name change from OSA to OISP in stages 2 and 3. It have to be discussed further on in N5.

## 8.2 co-ordination of timeframe and Milestones

S2 expects a first draft of the stage 1 specification including a clear scope of the open interface for service provisioning definition at the end of July.

OSA is split in three blocks: enhancement of current OSA, new SCFs and new APIs is meant for clarification, and this is not visible from the S1 viewpoint.

S1 thinks this time schedule is OK, that they can make it, and they will answer that to S2.

Question: how does S1 intend to handle requirements defined in the Parlay group? Answer: for the moment requirements driven by the market have not been taken into account, only operator requirements, and they expect operators provide the same requirements both in Parlay and 3GPP.

Same question but about SPAN11 and SPAN14, that may look at additional requirements coming from wireline; it is more efficient to have S1 directly co-operating with SPAN, and not via N5. Agreed, it will be proposed to the S1 plenary next week.

N5 presents their meeting schedule: the goal is to have stage 3 finished for CN#10 in December. It is generally agreed that there will be a specification at the end of the year, and the question is how complete it is, and whether in the near future the decision will be to allow some extra time so it can include more functionality. Doubts are expressed that stage 3 can be finished at the end of the year, considering that this is also the deadline for stage 1, and the amount of alignment work there needs to be done; it is generally agreed that this is a reasonable doubt, but that it is preferable to aim at a R00 that takes place in year 2000, and re-schedule in the future if necessary.

Discussion that R99, or R00, are just names, and there is no real need to release something every year, but rather when there is something worth releasing. Agreement that there may be a re-scheduling depending on the quality and completeness of what is ready.

For N5 is practical terms, the meeting in September will be a technical meeting and we should not spend meeting time on further organisation, but do it via email.

S1 requests a joint one day meeting with N5 before their next plenary, because just before they plan to meet to refine their contributions there. It would be ideal to do it during the CN plenary, but this is not an N5 meeting, so we could just have a previous email discussion and send a delegation there. Chairs of OSA for S1, S2 and N5 will agree on a date.

Question: the S3, security WI was approved; we need to check what we need to do there.

## 8.3 A.O.B.

VHE WI was discussed, and split from OSA.

The only thing that concerns both is the User Profile and its structure. VHE will work on access rights, and OSA will implement it on the interface. It is expected that a lot of work will have to be done on this in S2, T and maybe others.

N5 reports that we have also discussed the business model for user profile management: in the VHE BM the HE owns the subscribers though applications may be developed by somebody else; the Parlay, or OSA BM, deals just with application developers developing applications on a NO's network. S1 reports this has been discussed in S1 as well: their present view of the HE is based, for R00, in the relationship between a NO and the subscriber. The HE is the company that gives the SIM card, that allows access to the network. It is the SIM card that is the centre of the subscriber-HE relationship – for fixed network or IP access it is still under discussion. The HE may have VASP, that have a common billing system with the operator, and a contract with it that allows them to use the OSA; other VASPs, that are not HE-VASP, do not have a common billing system with the HE. For future - after R00, it may be possible to have other operators offering a Home Environment (would be Bluetooth accessed ISPs, for example) but this is not what we're talking about in release R00.

All this need to be taken into account in N5, but has work on it has not started yet. S1 asks what kind of requirement we need from them on secure access to user profile. The answer is there is a need to expand what is meant by it, and what is the security threat.

User profile in VHE and OSA: VHE is a concept that defines the requirements for user profile management, and thus defines the general picture; then some different parts of the architecture are affected, and OSA is one of them.

This is being discussed also in the S1-IP group, for instance what is a subscription? Does one subscribe to an operator, or to services?

Next week, during the S1 plenary, there will be a stage 1 short meeting (still to be decided during their meeting this week). Another issue is that there was some talk of creating a stage 1 OSA mailing list. S1 proposes, independently of the outcome of this, to create a common mailing list for all OSA stages.

# 9 N5 follow-up of joint meeting

# 10 Liaisons

No outgoing liaison statements from N5#4.

# 11 Any Other Business

## Meeting calendar

The place for the next meeting is still open. N5 would like to have it at the same time and place as the S2 meeting. The host of the S2 meeting is not a delegate in N5 and will therefore not host the N5. Marconi is checking if they can host it. Otherwise Nokia could host the meeting in Finland.

The meeting days for the meeting has been different in different documents. The meetings should be the 18th -19th of October not the 17th -18th.

**N5-000125**, source Chairman: *Meeting schedule*

| Date | Location | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| 3-4 July | Sophia Antipolis | SPAN3 preparation meeting (with N5 participants) |
| 10-11 July | Austria | N5 meeting with S1 11-12 of July |
| 5-7 September | Bristol | N5/SPAN3 meeting<br>collocated with SA2 4-8th |
| S1/S2/N5 OSA chairmen coordination (week before 20th of September, to be decided) | | input for SA plenary milestone<br>(S3 WI needs to be taken into account as well) |
| CN#9<br>20-22 September | | |
| SA plenary<br>25-28 September | | Decision by SA whether content of December release is sufficient, or release 00 should be postponed to March.<br><br>Input:<br>-requirements set<br>–what is available (e.g. parlay), what needs to be started<br>–organizational aspects with impact on schedule (e.g. collaboration with Parlay) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 18-19 October | Vienna | N5/SPAN3 meeting |
| 7-8 November | Sophia Antipolis | The first SPAN meeting taking into account the new organisation will be held from 6 to 10 November 2000 hosted by ETSI at Sophia Antipolis. It is proposed that for next year three meetings will be planned by SPAN. This schedule does not exclude that also interim SPAN 12 meetings will be planned, if required, during the year 2001. |
| End November | US West Coast-Motorola? | In view of collaboration with Parlay<br><br>Date to be determined still. Five working days before CN plenary is one limit, otherwise as late as possible in order to have time for preparation after previous meeting.<br><br>In case CN#10 turns out unachievable for OSA R00, this meeting will be rescheduled for mid December. |
| CN#10<br>6-8 December | | |

# 12 Close (Tuesday, 17:00)

The Chairman thanked the delegates and the host. After that he closed the meeting.

# Appendix A, Participants list

| Name | Company | Phone | E-mail |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ms. Chelo Abarca | ALCATEL France | +33 1 69 63 14 11 | chelo.abarca@alcatel.fr |
| Mr Michael Heinisch | MaxMobil | +43676/5201 | michael.heinisch@maxmobil.at |
| Ms. Monica Hellman | ETSI | +33 4 92 94 42 31 | monica.hellman@etsi.fr |
| Ms. Jane D Humphrey | MARCONI COMMUNICATIONS | +44 1202 853757 | jane.humphrey@marconicomms.com |
| Mr. Lucas Klostermann | ERICSSON L.M. | +31 161 299 057 | lucas.klostermann@etm.111.se |
| Mr. Edward Lau | Motorola Inc | +1 847 632 5698 | elau1@email.mot.com |
| Mr. Peter Markovics | Siemens AG | +43 51707 21760 | |
| Mr. Ard-Jan Moerdijk | ERICSSON L.M. | +31 161 242777 | a.j.moerdijk@ericsson.com |
| Mr. Arto Riikonen | NOKIA Corporation | +358 40 589 2698 | peter.markovics@siemens.at |
| Mr. Matti Saarenpää | NOKIA Corporation | +358 3 257 4666 | matti.saarenpaa@nokia.com |
| Mr. Richard Stretch | BT | +44 1473 607487 | richard.stretch@bt.com |

# Appendix B, Output documents (for approval in the TSG CN plenary)

| TDoc # | spec | CR # | Rev | cat | Title | Source | Conclusion |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| N5-000118 | 29.198 | 001 | 1 | F | Improvement of User Interaction STDs | Ericsson | Agreed |
| N5-000120 | 29.198 | 003 | 2 | F | Renumbering of GCCS exceptions | Ericsson | Agreed |
| N5-000121 | 29.198 | 004 | 1 | F | Remove of E.164 Mobile and correction of numbering in TpAddressPlan | Ericsson | Agreed |
| N5-000124 | 29.998 | 001 | 2 | F | Mapping of CallNotification interupted CallNotification continue methods. | Nokia | Agreed |
| N5-000116 | 29.998 | 002 | | F | CallEnd methods Mapping correction | Nokia | Agreed |

# Appendix C, Tdoc list

| TDoc # | spec | CR # | Rev | cat | Title | Source | Conclusion |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| N5-000104 | | | | | Agenda | Chairman | Approved |
| N5-000105 | | | | | Document allocation | Chairman | Noted |
| N5-000106 | | | | | Report from Cardiff | MCC | Noted |
| N5-000107 | 29.198 | 001 | | F | Improvement of User Interaction STDs | Ericsson | Revised in N5-000118 |
| N5-000108 | 29.198 | 003 | | F | Renumbering of GCCS exceptions | Ericsson | Revised in N5-000110 |
| N5-000109 | 29.198 | 002 | | F | IDL alignment | Ericsson | Revised in N5-000119 |
| N5-000110 | 29.198 | 003 | 1 | F | Renumbering of GCCS exceptions | Ericsson | Revised in N5-000120 |
| N5-000111 | 29.198 | 004 | | F | Remove of E.164 Mobile and correction of numbering in TpAddressPlan | Ericsson | Revised in N5-000121 |
| N5-000112 | | | | | Organisation of the joint SPAN3/N5 work | Lucas. | Revised |
| N5-000113 | | | | | Report from SPAN3 | SPAN3 | Noted |
| N5-000114 | | | | | Concept of CSCF and SIP | BT | Noted |
| N5-000115 | 29.998 | 001 | | F | Mapping of CallNotification interupted CallNotification continue methods. | Nokia | Revised in N5-000122 |
| N5-000116 | 29.998 | 002 | | F | CallEnd methods Mapping correction | Nokia | Agreed |
| N5-000117 | | | | | Parlay 2.1 | BT | Noted |
| N5-000118 | 29.198 | 001 | 1 | F | Improvement of User Interaction STDs | Ericsson | Agreed |
| N5-000119 | 29.198 | 002 | 1 | F | IDL alignment | Ericsson | Postponed |
| N5-000120 | 29.198 | 003 | 2 | F | Renumbering of GCCS exceptions | Ericsson | Agreed |
| N5-000121 | 29.198 | 004 | 1 | F | Remove of E.164 Mobile and correction of numbering in TpAddressPlan | Ericsson | Agreed |
| N5-000122 | 29.998 | 001 | 1 | F | Mapping of CallNotification interupted CallNotification continue methods. | Nokia | Revised in N5-000124 |
| N5-000123 | | | | | Overview of misalignment FW | Siemens/Ericsson | Noted |
| N5-000124 | 29.998 | 001 | 2 | F | Mapping of CallNotification interupted CallNotification continue methods. | Nokia | Agreed |
| N5-000125 | | | | | Meetingschedule | Chairman | |
| N5-000126 | | | | | part of the Report from SPAN3 | SPAN3 | |