

**3GPP TSG CN Plenary Meeting #13
Beijing, China, 19th-21st September 2001**

NP-010462

Source: CN5 (OSA) Chair

Title: Draft Report of CN5 #13, Munich, GERMANY, 11 - 14 September 2001 (N5-010735)

Agenda item: 6.5.1

Document for: Information

3GPP TSG_CN WG 5/Parlay/ETSI SPAN12
WG 5 Meeting #13, Munich, Germany
11st –14th Sept 2001

N5- 010735

Source: CN 5 Vicechair
Chelo.Abarca@alcatel.fr
CN 5 Chairman
ard.jan.moerdijk@eln.ericsson.se

Title: Document Allocation

Agenda item: 1

Document for: APPROVAL

Agenda item	Agenda item title	Tdoc 3GPP N5-00	Title	Source	Result	
1	Opening and approval agenda	730	Proposed agenda	N5 chairman	Election of the ETSI SPAN 12 OSA project leader will take place after lunch. This will not effect the 3GPP side of things.	
2	Allocation of documents	731	Document allocation	N5 chairman		
3	Reporting					
3.1	CN5/SPAN12/Parlay	476	Report Sophia Antipolis	N5 chairman	Approved.	

3.2	SA5#22 meeting	750	Presentation to SA5	N5 vice chair	<p>SA5 is in charge of all telecom O&M in 3GPP. Chelo has presented our group and the work we are doing to SA5 as SA5 was concerned that there was an overlap in the work going on. It was noticed that there was a gap in the 3GPP specifications related to architecture for e.g charging for IMS.</p> <p>SA5's interest is not so much in the OSA interface, but in the data we collect below the API.</p> <p>Need LS to SA2 and SA5 to request guidance on the overlapping items like fault management and charging. Still need to answer the original LS from SA5. Chelo volunteers and will send it for email discussion..</p>
4	Liaison Statements				
		740	LS on IP Based Multimedia Services Framework Report	SA1	<p>LS is draft result from SA1 group on Services. Services are not standardised, but examples are needed to get the interfaces right. They also verified that there are Service Enablers enough.</p> <p>Examples are maybe not detailed enough to understand whether they have been looking at OSA as well. Roaming was main driver. Maybe we need to answer their LS by asking whether OSA was considered.</p> <p>An answer will be discussed by email and wrapped up in Brighton.</p>
		741	Reply from SA5 to SA1 on LS on basic and advanced services examples (S1-010271/ S5-010302)	SA5	Reply from SA5 on 740. We could base our response to SA1 on this LS.
		742	LS from SA5 on Management aspects of OSA	SA5	SA5 response on Chelo's presentation. Will be answered in the same LS to SA2/SA5.
		743	LS on "Access Point Name" usage	SA5	Noted.
		744	Response to Liaison Statement on "Progressing the work in SA3 and CN1 on the IP Multimedia core network subsystem"	CN1	Noted. Concerned about addressing and SIP protocols. Needs to be rediscussed at Brighton meeting.
		745	Requirements from Eurescom	Eurescom	Same document as 897 (see joint session with Parlay 4 Planning).

5	API interfaces OSA version 1					
5.1	status 12070					
		900	51 CRs to 29.198/29.998 Rel-4 agreed by CN5 at and post CN5#12 meeting for submission to CN#13 for Approval	MCC	<p>This contribution includes a document that contains the list of 56 CRs that we're presenting to the Beijing plenary, and the CRs themselves.</p> <p>Adrian gives an introduction on the correct use of the CR template (for example the correct WID for Rel4 is OSA1), and on the editorial modifications he's done on the agreed CRs.</p>	
	Common Data					
		815	Errors and Corrections required for 120070 specifications	Lucent	<p>This document contains a list of error corrections and clarifications that must be made to the ETSI 120070. Since now there will be a Parlay 3.1 allowing bug fixes, then we can still discuss errors in Brighton. It is agreed to try to handle it during this week, after the other contributions are finished; then there will be a period of two weeks for email discussion; all this will speed up the process so that concrete proposals can be presented for approval in Brighton.</p> <p>Conclusion: the contribution will be discussed by email and wrapped up in Brighton.</p>	
		816	Editorial changes required for 120070 specifications	Lucent	Another collection like 815, more of editorial kind. It will be treated in the same way as 815.	

		831	General Issues with the of 3GPP, ETSI and Parlay specifications	SUN	<p>#1 agreed. It will be included in the introduction part of Part 1. To be included in Parlay 3.0 since it is editorial. For 3GPP, to be grouped with other agreed changes in one CR.</p> <p>Agreed to have a note that says that not all packages are found in every specification.</p> <p>#2 and 3 agreed.</p> <p>#4, 5 and 6 not anymore applicable (see Lucent's 801)</p> <p>#7: it will be addressed in the future in another contribution.</p> <p>#8: to be checked off-line which sections are involved.</p> <p>#9, 10 will be taken into account for next versions.</p> <p>Agreed changes will be part of a CR, number 833; new contribution, number 834, will deal with the remaining discussion on issue #8.</p>	
		833		SUN	<p>CR based on 831 with agreed changes.</p> <p>Comments on improving the figure. It will be revised and a new version will be presented to next meeting.</p>	
		834		SUN	<p>Elaborates on issue #8 in contribution 831.</p> <p>This contribution suggests a clean up of the specification: to Remove all Tp*Ref and Ip*RefRef references from all sections and all clauses containing Tp*Ref and Ip*RefRef.</p> <p>An update of the ETSI spec will be produced after the October meeting; this will be the candidate for ETSI version 1.1. This will incorporate the changes resulting from 834.</p>	
		801	Replace TpSessionID by TpAssignmentID in Account Management	Lucent	<p>Modifications based on SUN's suggestions (831, issues #4, 5 and 6).</p> <p>Agreed. Will be written as a CR, number 802.</p>	

		802		Lucent	CR based on agreed 801.	
5.2	Framework					

		773	Handling of ServiceType at service registration	Ericsson	<p>This contribution raises the problem that currently in the specification it is not clear what happens when a registerService() is used. This contribution proposes that the state of the ServiceType is called “available” or “unavailable” (instead of enabled/disabled, as it is now) in the Framework, and that the behaviour is the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When the ServiceType is unavailable and the service wants to register against this type, a new exception will be raised, P_SERVICE_TYPE_UNAVAILABLE. • When the ServiceType is available the registration can proceed and when it has succeeded the ServiceID will be returned (as already stated in de description). <p>As a result the following changes are proposed: the method description of registerSevice() is changed to clarify the exact behaviour, the description of data type TpServiceTypeDescription is clarified and a new exception to the Common Data part of the specification is added.</p> <p>Discussion: how to deal with this CRs for Parlay and ETSI? This is related to having a Parlay 3.1 or not. Richard reports from the Board the current discussion on whether 3.1 (for which a date has not been agreed at the moment, but could be agreed for the plenary) may have new functionality, which cannot be settled. This discussion is postponed until it’s been addressed with the Parlay Board. Ard-Jan and Chelo will discuss with them at lunchtime. In the meantime it is proposed, for the contributions to this meeting, to split them into urgent corrections (without which Parlay 3.0 would not work) and corrections which could wait for 3.1).</p> <p>Fresh news from the Parlay Board: 3.1 is targeted for the first quarter of 2002 (if ready before even better), and will just incorporate errors and fixes, and a UML-to-XML mapping.</p> <p>It is reminded that it’s been agreed that this meeting is the last chance for CRs for Rel4 (and therefore changes to Parlay 3.0 and ETSI version 1).</p> <p>Back to the contribution: proposed to change the file “Reasons for Change” to make it clearer that this is not just a name change proposal.</p> <p>Agreed with editorial corrections. To be included in</p>	
--	--	-----	---	----------	--	--

		791		Ericsson	Update of 773 for the Framework Agreed.	
		792		Ericsson	Update of 773 for the Common Data Agreed.	

		774	Framework exceptions	Ericsson	<p>This contribution points out some exceptional situations are not properly described in the specification:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What exception should be thrown when a requestAccess is received without specifying a callback interface. 2. What exception should be thrown when an announceServiceAvailability is received and the serviceInstanceLifecycleManagerRef is not specified. 3. What exception should be thrown when a signServiceAgreement is received for a serviceToken that is not correctly signed by the application. 4. What exception should be thrown when the abortAuthentication is received after the access is already requested. <p>The contribution proposes the following solutions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When no callback is specified in the requestAccess a P_NO_CALLBACK_ADDRESS_SET exception is thrown, since the framework should have a callback reference for the case where the access is terminated from the framework. 2. When the announceServiceAvailability is received without a reference to the lifecycle manager, a P_INVALID_PARAMETER value is thrown. Since it is not a callback in the strict sense of the word, but a reference to a different interface, this exception is more appropriate than the P_NO_CALLBACK_ADDRESS_SET exception 3. When the application failed to sign the service agreement and invokes a signServiceAgreement on the framework, the framework will throw a P_INVALID_SERVICE_TOKEN exception, since the token expires at the moment the signing by the application failed. 4. Since abortAuthentication only makes sense during the authentication phase calling the abortAuthentication after the access is already returned, this is considered as a illegal sequence of events and hence a P_TASK_REFUSED exception is thrown in this case. <p>Question: issue #1 is applicable to any method with such a parameter, so why not generalising it? Answer: this exception is part of the common exceptions, so the modification in the “raises” clause is not necessary – although the mention in the method description could still remain. Not agreed.</p>	
--	--	-----	----------------------	----------	--	--

		832		SUN	
		777		Ericsson	Update of 774 Agreed.
		851	Agreement management	Ulticom	<p>The TpInterfaceName P_SERVICE_AGREEMENT_MANAGEMENT is missing. The contribution proposes to add P_SERVICE_AGREEMENT_MANAGEMENT in the defined values for TpInterfaceName.</p> <p>The contribution is a CR to Rel4. Agreed, and will be presented to the December plenary.</p>
		890	Event notification Sequence Diagram error correction	Huawei	<p>In the current sequence diagram of Event notification, the application logic gets the reference of IpEventNotifcation using the obtainInterface() method, and then creates an IpAppEventNotification instance; during the course of this process, the Framework has no chance to get the call back interface reference.</p> <p>The contribution proposes two ways to resolve the problem:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One is that the application logic creates the IpAppEventNotifcation instance first, then uses the method of obtainInterfaceWithCallback to get the IpEventNotification reference and set the call back reference. • Another way is adding a setCallback invocation to inform the Framework the callback reference after the step of obtainInterface() in the current sequence diagram. <p>Postponed till later, AJ to study it and present it.</p>
		891	Heartbeat Managment Sequence Diagram error correction	Huawei	<p>Postponed till later, AJ to study it and present it.</p> <p>In the figure for the sequence diagram for Heartbeat management there is an error: instead of "Application" it should be "Framework".</p> <p>Agreed.</p>

		892	Event notification Sequence Diagram error correction	Huawei	Postponed till later, AJ to study it and present it. In the sequence diagram for Enable Event Notification there is an error: the way it is done the Framework cannot know about the application side of the interface. A correction is proposed for that: first the application creates the IpAppEventNotifcation instance, then it invokes obtainInterfaceWithCallback to get the IpEventNotification reference and set the call back reference. The rest stays the same. Agreed.	
5.3	Call Control					

		770	Mandatory reports on routeReq() for GCC	Ericsson	<p>Currently there are no rules on the invocation of the initial routeReq() for application initiated calls. This can result in the fact that there is an initial routeReq() invoked without requesting 'answer' and/or 'failure' events. When the initiated request fails there is no defined way to inform the application, according to the current STD. Result is that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • routeRes() cannot be returned as the event was not armed. • routeErr() is not applicable for call 'failure' events. Furthermore it is also only returned when the application requested to be notified for events. <p>So we can have a call where the initial routeReq() has failed when no events were armed and the application is not informed. Another case is described showing that, the way things are now, there are cases where the application may lose track of the STD.</p> <p>The contribution proposes making the request for 'answer' and 'failure' events mandatory at the invocation of the initial routeReq(). When these requests are not provided exception P_MISSING_PARAMETER is thrown. The same is recommended for the routeReq() on the B party to be able to also track the state of this party in the call. In all these cases routeErr(), as a return method of a routeReq(), has only any value to the call as the events on routeReq() are armed. So only invoke the routeErr() in that case.</p> <p>The main use case for this is the case of an application which starts the set-up of a call with routeReq() to the first party, and only continues with the call (route to the second party) when it knows this was successful.</p> <p>Note that this is for application initiated calls, not supported by CAMEL phase 3 and therefore not part of 3GPP Rel4 (this is part of the Parlay and ETSI specs).</p> <p>Agreed to have this as a note (a recommendation) in the description of routeReq(); it will be made more generic, and not only for application initiated calls, which means it will also impact 3GPP Rel4. The new text is agreed in the meeting. New number will be N5-010778.</p>	
--	--	-----	---	----------	--	--

		778		Ericsson	Update of 770. Agreed.	
		771	CR for Mandatory reports on routeReq() for GCC	Ericsson	It needs to be modified according to conclusions from 770. Will be updated in 778.	
		772	Add Parallel Routing Property for GCC	Ericsson	<p>Looking at the IpCall STDs of GCC, it is possible that two routeReq()s are handled at the same time (in parallel). This can happen when after a createCall() the initial routeReq() is invoked. The STD will then go to state 'Routing to Destination(s) State', where it can handle the routeReq() for the B party. This does not mean that the handling of the initial routeReq() is finished so it is possible that two routeReq()s are handled in parallel.</p> <p>Because for instance IN Protocols do not support this parallel routing it is proposed to add a new property to the list of service properties on GCC, P_PARALLEL_ROUTING_SUPPORTED, so that the SCS can indicate whether it supports parallel routing or not.</p> <p>Discussion: the issue is whether applications should be in charge of this distinction, or the SCS, which knows the underlying network technology. It is agreed that only if the SCS is in charge can applications be kept simple. This will be reflected in the mapping document.</p> <p>Contribution not accepted, Jorgen will decide whether to make a contribution to the mapping.</p>	

		775	Addition of P_CALL_REPORT_NOT_REACHA BLE for GCC	Ericsson	<p>Currently in generic call control the main reasons for call failures have their own call report types, e.g., busy, no answer, route select failure. However, a very common failure in a mobile environment is the fact that the phone of the destination is either switched off or outside the coverage of the mobile network. In these cases a not_reachable event is usually generated. Currently not_reachable is not defined as a separate call report type in the specification, although the TpCallEventName is specified for it. This means that it is possible to trigger (statically) on a not reachable event, but not to monitor (dynamically) on this event. Since there will be applications that are interested in this event, it is proposed to add a new TpCallEventType to the specification for 'not reachable'.</p> <p>Since there will be applications that are interested in this event, it is proposed to add a new TpCallEventType to the specification for 'not_reachable' to allow the application to monitor (dynamically) on this event.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	
		776	CR for Addition of P_CALL_REPORT_NOT_REACHA BLE for GCC	Ericsson	<p>This is the CR for Rel4 resulting from 775.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	

		841	CR on setCallChargePlan in active state of call	Nokia	<p>This CR proposes to re-consider a decision from San Diego: SetCallChargePlan of Generic Call Control was mistakenly agreed in CN5#11 (N5-010306) not to be possible in the active state. However this decision was not implemented in 29.198-4 v. 4.0.0, but it is obviously planned to be taken into v. 4.1.0 because the change has been now implemented in the ETSI/Parlay version of the API. The agreed N5-010660 already corrected some textual descriptions, but the figures were not touched because they were still correct in 29.198 v. 4.0.0.</p> <p>SetCallChargePlan was possible in active state in R99. We see that it is improper to remove it now, because existing implementations might take advantage of this useful feature.</p> <p>Furthermore CAMEL supports FCI operation (to which setCallChargePlan is mapped) also in the active phase of call (see TS 29.078 v. 3.8.0 chapter 11.27 and TS 23.078). It can be utilised in long (hours or days) calls or to affect charging in some special services during the call and certainly in IP Multimedia sessions later on.</p> <p>The current textual descriptions refer in several places to the possibility to invoke setCallChargePlan in active state, so only a modification to the STD is proposed. Besides, it is proposed that the Rel4 specification does not have any statements for R99.</p> <p>The contribution proposes to modify the STD of GCC Call to indicate that setCallChargePlan is possible in active state, and to remove the reference to R99.</p> <p>Discussion: should the method description be changed? There is an explicit mention that this must be called before the call is routed. Besides it is argued that this should be up to the operator, and depend on the service agreement - so if we specified it (it's currently plain text) we'd need a service property for this; now at least we need to refer to it in the service level description.</p> <p>A re-phrasing for the method description is agreed by the meeting.</p> <p>The contribution is approved, and replaced by a new contribution (N5-010749, CR to Rel4) which also includes the re-phrasing to the method description.</p>	
--	--	-----	---	-------	---	--

		749		Nokia	Update of 841. Agreed.	
		842	CR on getInfoReq in active state of call	Nokia	<p>GetInfoReq should be possible also after notification of a call in MPCC Call level. Active state is entered already as the reportNotification is invoked.</p> <p>The contribution proposes that GetInfoReq is also possible in the Active state. This CR is based on agreed contribution 614.</p> <p>This is agreed to be a clear error correction so it would be desired to have it fixed for the Beijing plenary. But this endangers the alignment: Beijing OSA <-> Parlay 3.0, December OSA <-> Parlay 3.1. Tdoc N5-010858, dealing with this, is discussed now.</p> <p>Agreed but a typo found and an editorial proposed. New number N5-010748.</p>	
		748		Nokia	Update of 842. Agreed	
		858	Work-plan proposal	Marconi	<p>During lunch the Parlay Board has been addressed, and they have confirmed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parlay 3.0 only admits editorials • Parlay 3.1 will incorporate omissions, error corrections and bug fixes, plus the mapping to XML. Flexibility in release date, that we have requested to be close to 3GPP December plenary. <p>This contribution reflects this and other agreements in a work-plan proposal. It shows Rel5 in March (although the current date is December, this is expected to change in the Beijing plenary next week).</p> <p>It is proposed to accept CRs in 3GPP until the end of the year, and also that there is an ETSI version every time there is a Parlay version.</p> <p>Jane to prepare new version, keeping the same number since it has not been distributed.</p> <p>An error found, revised into 859.</p>	

		859		Marconi	Update of 858.	
		905	CR: A change to description of the call processing in the network	Nokia	<p>It is inaccurate to state in the leg modelling: "The call processing is resumed in the network when no leg in the call is left suspended." E.g. if a User Interaction is being given for the terminating party (i.e. leg) the originating leg events like release must still be processed in the network. Also the possible other terminating leg call processing must continue in that case.</p> <p>The contribution proposes a description that covers network signal processing in some more detail. The CR is written on top of agreed N5-010614.</p> <p>Agreed to remove the inaccurate sentence. Proposed that the proposed text could fit the mapping document better, or that it could be made into sequence diagrams.</p> <p>Updated into new CR for the removal of the inaccurate sentence: N5-010747.</p>	
		747		Nokia	<p>Replaces 905.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	

		906	CR: Corrections to originating call leg modelling descriptions	Nokia	<p>CR written on top of agreed 614. It proposes the following corrections to the Originating Call Leg modelling descriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disconnect is not necessarily premature in active state of the call leg, so “Premature disconnect” is changed to plain “disconnect”. • The reportNotification for originating release does not have to be shown on the leg model because there is nothing to be done then on the leg level, so it is deleted from the originating call leg descriptions. • The answer signal is agreed not to show up in the originating leg. ReportNotification sending should not be described as leg interface action, because it lies in the responsibility of the call control manager. Therefore the answer signal description is deleted from the active state description in the originating leg model; this is reflected in the figure too. • State releasing has duplicate descriptions, so it is proposed to remove the superfluous section proposed to be removed. • The exit criterion in releasing state is unclear and has been corrected. • An editorial correction: IP corrected to lp in a few places. <p>Agreed with some modifications (see also 907), replaced by N5-010746.</p>	
		746		Nokia	<p>Replaces 906. Agreed.</p>	

		907	CR: Changes to the terminating leg model descriptions	Nokia	<p>CR written on top of agreed 614. It proposes the following corrections to the Terminating Call Leg modelling descriptions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The reportNotification for terminating release does not have to be shown on the leg model because there is nothing to be done then on the leg level; therefore it is deleted. 2. A number of entry events to terminating call leg active state are missing from the description although present in the STD. Therefore a number of additional events are listed for entry conditions to the active state. 3. Call attempt is already detected before the leg model is started. This applies for reportNotifications as well. In some implementations there may be a connection with leg handling and the notification but this specification is only to define the interface and in that sense the notification lies in the responsibility of the call control manager. Therefore the description of call attempt detection as well as initial notification sending is removed, and the call attempt authorised handling description is modified. 4. A "Queued" event may either concern a directly connected or remote subscriber, so a reference to a remote party is deleted here. 5. Unclear exit criterion for releasing state; it is clarified. 6. The MPCC call leg model description fails to tell that an event report is sent, which is however a central feature; the term intercept is used instead in the specification. Therefore the term "intercepted" is replaced with "reported" in several places. 7. IP is corrected to lp in a few places. <p>#1 not accepted and, for alignment between originating and terminating, the same applies for 905.</p> <p>#2, #3 agreed.</p> <p>agreed.</p> <p>#4 not agreed; instead "remote party" will be replaced by "called party".</p>	
--	--	-----	---	-------	---	--

		839		Nokia	Update of 907. Agreed.	
		908	CR: Constant and enum value corrections	Nokia	Editorial: Because of the wrong text font a number of constant and enum values appear incorrectly on the document. The font is changed so as to show the whole number and not just the first digit. Agreed.	
		860	Incomplete implementation of CR 613.	Telcordia	The approved document CR29.198-4-00c_N5-010613-PCC-calleg-std.doc was not fully implemented. On page 21 of this document a figure is presented that contains a transition from QUEUED to ANSWER. This transition is not found in the Parlay/ETSI specification that is now up for approval. This contribution requests from the editors to implement the mentioned CR entirely. Agreed.	
		909	Proposed Enhancement on Conference Reservation	NTT	After an application reserves a conference resource, the application cannot identify the reservation over the API. This contribution proposes an additional parameter for this: it proposes that reserveResources() returns additional information that identifies the reservation made as well as the resourceID, and that a parameter representing the additional information is added to the argument of freeResource(). Agreed. And since this is a bug fix then it will be included in Parlay 3.1. But it does not need a CR because it's for the time being out of the scope of 3GPP.	
5.4	User Interaction					
5.5	Mobility					
5.6	Data Session Control					
5.7	Terminal Capabilities					
5.8	Content-based charging					

5.9	Other Interfaces					
6	OSA version 1 mapping					
6.1	status of 12075					
		790	MPCC: SIP Mapping Tables	Ericsson	<p>This document is intended for discussion of a first outline of the SIP mapping for the Multi-party Call Control API.</p> <p>The focus in this first draft has been on the mapping on MPCC method level and SIP message level. Especially the methods identified to have an impact on the SIP signalling have been addressed, however not yet completed, e.g. detailed mapping on parameter level remains to be worked out.</p> <p>It is proposed that the content in section 2 of this document could be used as a base for further work on 120075-4 Sub-part 4 multiparty call control SIP.</p> <p>Due to lack of time this contribution is postponed to the Brighton meeting.</p>	
6.2	contributions					
		840	CR, Update to setCallChargePlan mapping to CAP	Nokia	<p>This CR partly replaces 540 (Nokia). Changes are based on agreements on 709 (Alcatel, agreed by email).</p> <p>Agreed. This is a CR to the mapping, which is a TR, so it is agreed it will go to the Beijing plenary.</p> <p>It is then also necessary to revise 540, which is in the set of CRs to Beijing. The solution agreed is that 840 is not presented to the plenary, but instead its contents will be used to update 540; the update will be 838.</p> <p>There is a concern that the same change could be needed for Data Session. Contributions on this welcome.</p>	
		838		Nokia	<p>Update of 540, replaces 540 and 840.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	

7	ETSI OSA Project leader election					
		761	Nomination of Chelo Abarca	Alcatel	ETSI SPAN has created a Project for the OSA API, including not only the protocol but also the requirements; the project leader will be part of the ETSI management team, and co-chair the OSA joint meetings. Also ToR for an STF for testing have been prepared. This candidature has been circulated in SPAN management, supported by the SPAN chair; no other candidates were presented. The candidate is elected.	
9	Technical discussions OSA version 2					
9.1	Input from SA1: OSA and VHE requirements					
9.2	ETSI SPAR					
9.2.1	Issues resulting from mapping to SPAR Version 1 requirements.					
9.3	Parlay Call Control requirements					

		843	Parlay API –Phase 4 Requirements	BT	<p>This is a living document that collects the requirements for Parlay 4.0. It includes BT what was presented in San Diego by a number of companies, all requirements from 3GPP SA1 OSA –(though not SA1 VHE), in yellow in the ToC; plus requirements collected by the Parlay Framework WG chair and by the Parlay CBC WG chair (which are also in another contribution to this meeting).</p> <p>SPAR requirements have been given as input to SPAN14. The current document is actually a subset of what the specification does, so for the moment there is no further input to consider from ETSI.</p> <p>This document is proposed as the “official“ requirements document for the joint group.</p> <p>The document notes that Eurescom project 1110 is in the process of producing an information model for the Framework; we need to consider unofficial liaison possibilities with them.</p> <p>This is a living document; for the moment it needs to be updated to include decisions by the Parlay BoD this week, like Parlay X. The document has been sent to the board before this meeting, who raised no objection.</p> <p>Discussion on whether a document on Parlay requirements should contain requirements from 3GPP; whether this joint activity, which from the Parlay point of view is about FW, CC and CBC, is the right place to discuss the general evolution of Parlay. It is also argued that a document containing requirements from all the bodies involved in the joint activity is difficult to maintain, and it would be better if it contained links.</p> <p>A document like this is considered useful as a way to integrate requirements from all sources, and check inconsistencies.</p> <p>Discussions from the Parlay Board have resulted in a proposal to feedback Parlay requirements to 3GPP SA1, thus achieving not only a collection of requirements, but also a synchronization between requirements from all the bodies in the joint activity.</p> <p>The general feeling is that this can be a working document for the joint group. For the time being we’ll discuss the requirements themselves, and will conclude the discussion later.</p>
--	--	-----	----------------------------------	----	--

		753	Charging and supervision separation: proposal 1	Alcatel (Frans Haerens)	<p>In previous OSA meetings it was stated that the charging and supervision functionality should be separated from the Call Control API and made more generic so that it can also be applied to other services such as user interaction and data session. Till now a charging SCF has been defined handling Amount and Unit charging. This contribution provides a proposal to add Usage sessions so that the charging and supervision functionality can be removed from the Call Control API's and the other API's.</p> <p>From the point of view of the discussion on requirements, this contribution proposes to separate the charging and supervision functionality from the rest of the CC interfaces.</p> <p>It is noted that SA2 has just started a new work item called on "Charging implications of IMS architecture". A first draft of their output document, TR 23.815, has just been distributed in the SA2 list. It is argued that considerations like the ones in this requirement are expected to come from that work in SA2. It is also noted that backwards compatibility should not be endangered: today's applications expect this functionality to be in the CC SCF. On the other hand, both ways could co-exist so that new applications use the new way, while old ones don't need to be modified. So the proposal in this contribution does not endanger backwards compatibility.</p> <p>It is agreed to include this is the list of requirements to discuss in Brighton (see 846): the requirement to have a single mechanism for charging and supervision functionality.</p>	
		754	Charging and supervision separation: proposal 2	Alcatel (Frans Haerens)	<p>This contribution provides a second proposal to separate charging and supervision functionality: to inherit at the application and service level from the IpAppUsageSessionGen and IpUsageSessionGen generic interface classes so that the charging and supervision functionality.</p> <p>It is proposed that Alcatel could come to Brighton with a contribution on the pros and cons of each of the two proposals.</p>	

		755	Charge Info methods	Alcatel (Frans Haerens)	<p>This contribution proposes to add methods to request and report charging information. During a call several communication configurations can be established. For each communication configuration it may be possible to request and report charging information allowing the methods to be invoked on multiple occasions.</p> <p>Presently it is not possible for an application to take into account a charging influence communicated from the destination. A typical example is a charge free destination also tariff and add on charging may be requested and reported. Since in some cases the charge registration and generation has to be started and stopped for all tariffs received from the destination charge determination points also identifiers must be included to cater this requirement. Since also several network operators may be involved in sending charging related information a parameter TpNetworkIdentification has been added. A TpChargingMonitorMode has been added as well, in order to indicate in what mode the charging events have to be monitored.</p> <p>The requirement in this contribution is: to request and report charging information, and to support different communication configurations (see 846).</p> <p>Discussion on how to proceed with the feedback of these new requirements to SA1 OSA. They could not attend this meeting because they're meeting at the same time, and the same will happen in Brighton. The chairs have discussed the possibility of a joint meeting but it seems it cannot be done soon. Another way would be to send them our new requirements as contributions to SA1 from the companies that have delegates there. This can e done after we have had the discussion in Parlay this afternoon.</p>	
--	--	-----	---------------------	-------------------------	---	--

		756	Additions to the SetChargePlan: Alignment with content charging.	Alcatel (Frans Haerens)	<p>Request to have in the requirements additions for setChargePlan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> charging information based on duration, price and volume take into account tariffs and sub-tarrifs. <p>Furthermore, it was found out that previous change request on setCallChargePlan not properly taken into account in the specification.</p> <p>Previously volume based charging was moved from Call control to DSC. However, for multi-media session it seems to be useful.</p>	
		758	addOnCharge() methods for usage charging	Alcatel (Frans Haerens)	<p>Proposal to have possibility to add on charges on top of running charges. Only applicable for charging on price.</p> <p>Question whether this could not already be achieved by current setCallChargePlan(). Issue is whether each invocation of setCallChargePlan leads to CDR generation. In case this is, a new method should be defined. However, it is a question of implementation and therefore it could as well be achieved by setChargePlan().</p> <p>Question whether this functionality is not also already supported by CBC. In principle it is, but this is for communication charging.</p> <p>Agreed to have this as requirement</p>	

		759	Supervision Procedure	Alcatel (Frans Haerens)	<p>Before discussing the document it was requested to have in the requirements an item to address which kind of interfaces should have charging functionality (e.g currently in the mediaStream interface there is no charging functionality). Other applicable interface could be user interaction.</p> <p>Proposal of the document is to generalise the supervision: per price, volume, duration. Agreed to have this as requirement.</p> <p>Additional suggestion to have parameter to indicate the network operator in the charging methods.</p> <p>Should QoS also be indicated in the supervision like in DSC ? Agreed to have this as requirement.</p>	
		760	StartCharging() and stopCharging() methods for usage charging	Alcatel (Frans Haerens)	<p>For follow on calls or add-on conferencing it is useful to be able to start and stop the charging. Proposal is to have functionality to start and stop the charging as requirement.</p>	
		910	Requirements on Service Interaction Management	NTT	<p>Proposal to have requirement for defining the behaviour when multiple applications influence a call. This is currently not possible in the API. Seems to be already covered by document 843.</p> <p>How multiple applications influence a call is maybe more a gateway implementation issue.</p> <p>Question is whether we allow overlapping criteria and allow multiple applications to influence the call. Furthermore do we allow multiple point of control where multiple applications are triggered on the same trigger event. ?</p> <p>For the moment section 3 will be included in 843.</p>	
9.4	Parlay Framework requirements					
9.5	Parlay Content based Charging requirements					

		757	Corrections to rateRes	Alcatel (Frans Haerens)	<p>The proposal in this contribution should be understood as a requirement for OSA Rel5: the method rateRes allows returning rates with a validity timer. When considering time depending charging this cannot be supported by the current definition of the method. When a switch from one time period to another occurs (e.g. a switch from a cheap period to a more expensive period) this would involve expiration of the validity timer and a new rateReq. This would not only be too slow to allow accurate charging, it would also create a peak load at the moment of switchover.</p> <p>It is proposed to remove the validity timer from the method and to replace the rates by current and next rates together with the switchover time. The proposal provides alignment with provision of a switchover in the method setChargePlan, as proposed in another contribution.</p> <p>This method is intended for applications to give the user the chance to know how much things are going to cost. It is argued that the operator and the application provider could have different rating systems, and that the merchant will very likely want a simpler mechanism.</p> <p>The question is whether we want that tariffs and sub-tariffs are visible in the interface.</p> <p>The need for this requirement will be further discussed in Brighton. It is added in the list of new requirements (see 846).</p>	
--	--	-----	------------------------	-------------------------	---	--

		846	Proposal for Content Charging Evolution	Siemens	<p>White paper about the evolution of the CBC interfaces.</p> <p>See also 847, which contains a powerpoint presentation. For this white paper.</p> <p>The configuration architecture is explained. Interfaces which cross network boundaries are 2 (where the Payment Engine is the OSA Gateway and the Request Engine the application), and 4 and 7; it is not proposed to standardize 4 and 7.</p> <p>Agreement to remove a second interface 5 (rating) between the Request Engine and the Rating Engine. This interface is not in the figure in 846 (the white paper distributed for this meeting) because it's been under discussion, but it may be found in other Parlay documentation.</p> <p>Summary of proposed requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service properties should be defined for CBC • Different confirmation mechanisms should be investigated. A representative selection of confirmation mechanisms shall be fixed, similar to the benchmark scenarios that comprise the base of the Parlay 3.0 specification of the Content Based Charging API. Eventually, the existing Content Based Charging API should be enhanced in a backwards-compatible manner. • It should be investigated how distributed content can be supported and eventually changes should be introduced that are necessary to support distributed content. This requirement is under discussion and may be withdrawn. • Ensure that Content Based Charging works in Roaming and Multi-Network scenarios. This is in line with 3GPP current OSA applicability (it is not used across networks when users roam). • Discuss if the client should make the intended use of the rating functionality explicit, and if so, provide appropriate means in the specification. It is proposed to use properties for this instead, but this cannot be a full solution since it would not allow deciding run-time; service properties could be added further on though. • Customer relationship management, like loyalty points, discounts or promotions; the problem is that the customer is anonymous from the point of view of the CBC client. There is not much support for this requirement, but it is left for the moment and maybe in a contribution for discussion in 	
--	--	-----	---	---------	--	--

	Joint session with Parlay 4 Planning WG					
			Presentation of Parlay 4 Planning	Parlay 4 Planning, BT	<p>This presentation will be in the Parlay server after the meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to decide what are Parlay 4 WGs, who's going to be in them and chair them, which will join the joint group and what is their schedule. Currently the joint activity comprises Framework, CC, Mobility, Data Session and CBC. • Reminder of the backwards compatibility requirement for Parlay 4. • According to Parlay rules, a new charter needs to be written for any work that will be done in Parlay 4: goals, objectives, deliverables and schedule; this includes activities in the joint group. <p>There is a Parlay Board meeting at the beginning of November; the new WG charters could be discussed there.</p> <p>At the end of this joint session the list of issues that need a charter prepared for next Parlay Board are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CC, Mobility • CBC: Carsten • Framework: Andy • Policy Management: Sheriar • NGN ETS: Telcordia • e-commerce: Koen • Data Hosting: Corrado • Web services: no chair yet • Parlay style <p>A white paper should be prepared too for each.</p>	

		843	Parlay API –Phase 4 Requirements	BT	<p>This continues, in the joint session with Parlay 4 Planning, the discussion of this document started in agenda item 9.3.</p> <p>It is noted that these are Parlay requirements, some of them are not in 3GPP and it could happen that some are not accepted in 3GPP; if this is the case, Parlay will still work on them.</p> <p>It is noted that SIP requirements for Call Control should be added; there is a strong requirement in the Parlay side for Parlay 4, and 3GPP also wants it. As part of Call Control, it is within the scope of the joint group.</p> <p>The document includes a list of proposed new functionality, most of which come from 3GPP requirements. Richard proposes that they are adopted as requirements in Parlay, and that they fall within the scope of the joint group (since the joint group is responsible for OSA, and these are OSA requirements). Parlay does not object to this but would like the TAC to be part of this decision, and that it is ensured that there is no conflict with other interfaces that are not in the scope of the joint group.</p> <p>Coming from 3GPP there are presence requirements for OSA. Richard proposes that these are met using the results of the Parlay PAM WG, and that their specification is taken by the joint group for it. It need to be discussed whether in Parlay 4, that has new requirements for PAM, the PAM WG will stay as part of the joint group.</p> <p>Journalling requirement from 3GPP: a clarification is needed from SA1. It is not clear whether this needs a new interface or not.</p> <p>Service Creation Environment requirement: it comes from Telcordia, and they agree that it fits in the scope of Parlay X.</p> <p>e-commerce requirements: it is understood that they all fit the CBC work; it has been discussed that the Parlay e-commerce WG could be a requirements group, and the corresponding specification would be done in the scope of CBC (and therefore in the joint group).</p> <p>Parlay Lite requirement: now with Parlay X it the need for Parlay Lite has to be confirmed. Anyway it will be outside of the scope of the joint group.</p>	
--	--	-----	----------------------------------	----	---	--

					<p>Presentation from Telcordia on the requirement for ETS (Emergency Telecom Services): to ensure telecoms during a disaster situation. This translates into requiring the ability to communicate anytime, anywhere through readily available public telecommunications resources.</p> <p>Some work has been done already in standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• IEPS (International Emergency Preference Scheme).• IEMS (International Emergency MM Service) <p>They expect these requirements will impact not only CC, but very likely other interfaces. They propose to start with a small focus group; some more detailed requirements are already available for this group to start with.</p> <p>It is believed that these requirements will not result into new interfaces, but rather some parameter modifications in the existing ones.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

		897	Proposal for Enhancements to the Parlay/OSA Specifications	Eurescom (via BT)	<p>Proposal from Eurescom P1110 for Enhancements to the Parlay/OSA Specifications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Balancing Up” of Interfaces: some more functionality is needed at the Application side; some have been identified for CC and Mobility. • Framework Information Model: motivation is that at the moment there is no clear relationship between all the entities involved in processes like SLA, subscription, registration, configuration, and even data related to the usage of the service. • Framework Management Tool: The Information Model for Framework Functions should be accessible from some sort of management tool. To make this possible one should define the API to configure and access the data model. Information from off-line Service Level Agreements and information needed for on-line Service Agreements should be entered via this API. • Support for an OLO Environment: this will be dropped because P1110 has no resources to cover it. • Contribution on Parlay “lite” • Protocol APIs: the aim is to explore the mapping from SIP up to Parlay, so that possible weaknesses in the Parlay interfaces may be identified and improvements suggested to the Parlay group • Data Hosting Service Interface for User Profile and Application Data: the goal is to allow 3rd party applications to store and access application dependent data. <p>Eurescom is not a Parlay member, and it doesn't have a relationship with 3GPP but it does with ETSI. P1110 has three full members of Parlay that could be in charge of this co-operation (like for this meeting, where this contribution comes via BT).</p> <p>Among these, data hosting does not fit any current activity, so if there is interest then a charter for a Parlay WG on this could be prepared.</p> <p>This is a public document, so its contents can be incorporated to the documentation for the requirements discussion in the joint group meeting in Brighton.</p>	
--	--	-----	--	-------------------	--	--

		893	Changing OSA UML from CORBA Model to Analysis Model	Nortel Networks	<p>One of the requirements in OSA is that the OSA API should be independent of transport, distribution mechanism, and language. The primary OSA UML model should not then be based on any one particular technology. Nortel believes that currently the OSA UML model is CORBA biased, as it includes a number of CORBA stereotypes; and that support of other technologies and languages is hampered by the coupling of the UML to CORBA. This contribution proposes to modify the UML such that it is a pure Analysis model rather than a CORBA model.</p> <p>This could be covered by the Parlay Java Realization WG.</p> <p>Discussion in the joint group: Suggestion that Ultan will own the analysis model and editors will work on the technology dependent models. This might require scripting or even editing by hand.</p> <p>Concern that the work involved is underestimated. Maybe multiple UML models would be required. The problem lies with the data-types.</p> <p>At this moment there is only one model to serve as the single source for all our specifications.</p> <p>Suggestion to do the mapping directly from IDL to XML.</p> <p>Maybe we could publise the analysis UML model. However, what would be the use. Question is what do we really need</p>	
--	--	-----	---	-----------------	---	--

		894	Inclusion of SOAP/XML as an Alternative Transport Mechanism	Nortel Networks	<p>This contribution provides a basis for discussion on how to move forward for the inclusion of XML and SOAP as an alternative distribution mechanism for OSA. It proposes to generate an XLM Schema based on the OSA UML. This XML Schema can then be stored as a supporting document, much like the IDLs. An Annex within the 29.198 specs could be provided which would be a set of guidelines for implementing SOAP such that it would be sufficient to provide interoperability between SOAP clients/server within the context of OSA.</p> <p>There is a great interest in Parlay on this. Nortel is not a Parlay member at the moment, but when this is fixed there could be a Parlay WG on this.</p> <p>Discussion in the joint group: Question whether this is only applicable for Parlay X: conclusion is that this has broader scope.</p> <p>Other protocols could also be used like straight http or SIP. (SDP new generation is based on XML).</p> <p>It also might effect CN5 as SA1 requested the API be able to support other distribution technologies than CORBA.</p> <p>David volunteers to serve as liason officer between whatever Parlay group this will be handling and us.</p>	
9.6	other					
		895	Proposal For New SCF – Broadcast Notification	Nortel Networks	Contribution is withdrawn as most of the functionality already exists. Perhaps there is an SCF we might extend to support sending messages to multiple users. This should be an additional requirement.	
10	Organizational aspects					
10.1	Review of 3GPP OSA workplan					

10.2	3GPP OSA Work Item Description	485	Rel5 OSA Stage 3 - Draft Building Block level Work Item Description	CN5 Vice Chair/ MCC	Needs revision because the last sections (that haven't changed since the San Diego version) were not included. Updated into 762, which will be presented to the Beijing meeting.	
10.3	further work on 12076					
10.4	further work on 12075					
10.5	other					
			Rollout of 3GPP, ETSI and Parlay specifications	SUN		
11	Outgoing liaisons					
11.1	Response to ITU-T SG11	477	ITU-T SG 11 input	SG 11	Only ETSI can liaise with ITU-T, so officially our feedback will have to come from the SPAN October meeting. We can provide them with some more material, like the requirement documents, but since they will meet in February we have time to make it more stable. We also need to review their requirements. Jane will use this contribution as the base of the LS, adding further comments if any, and also raising the issue of copyright (since some of the document contents come from web sites that are copyrighted). Comments invited until next meeting, the LS will be finalized in Brighton.	
		751	Comments to ITU-T API document	Alcatel	Agreed (see 477).	
12	Presentation of work on Policy management and PAM					

					<p>Presentation on Policy Management WG by PM chair.</p> <p>Policy is a formalism to express business, engineering and process criteria. It can be used to augment the value of services. Policy management tasks include create, update, delete and view policy information.</p> <p>Parlay defines policy management and information model for policy; policy services are something else, and not covered in Parlay. The information model is based on the IEFT Policy Core information model.</p> <p>Policies can be used to define, for services and applications, service access, load balancing, call management,...</p> <p>The PM WG has started working with the FM WG on a formalization of SLAs,</p> <p>Policy Management is part of the Framework: the Parlay Framework Policy Service. What this service does is policy domain management and policy event management. It does this in a way that the impact on the current specifications is minimized.</p> <p>One of the next steps for Parlay 4 is the extension of the processes of service registration and subscription.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Presentation on PAM WG by PAM chair.</p> <p>Presence is a dynamic state of devices and their owners. It needs to be managed because presence information should be exposed securely and with privacy controls.</p> <p>Being something dynamic, presence Information complements User Profile Management information, which is static.</p> <p>Discussion: 3GPP has at the moment on-going activities on Presence, User Profile Management, etc, and their work is not yet very mature. These results need to be fed back to SA2. On the other hand PAM has already specs to be included in Parlay 3.0. The work of the PAM WG is frozen, and it is proposed that it is taken by the joint group.</p> <p>The PAM WG co-operate with the PAM Forum; the relationship is good, and the PAM Forum is very open to this input.</p> <p>The PAM WG is happy to join the joint activity. Discussions on whether the joint group is not getting to big and will have to have to meet often and in long meetings. It is proposed that the joint group be considered as a super-group of joint groups.</p> <p>There are both Policy and PAM requirements in 3GPP for OSA Rel5, so it is straightforward for the joint group to adopt PAM specifications.</p> <p>Next steps: the PAM specs will be distributed in the joint mailing list.</p>	

13	Future meetings				<p>Future meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • October 16-19, Brighton, co-located with CN1-4. • November 26-30, Cancun, co-located with SA5 and CN1-4; as a fallback solution, meeting rooms will be reserved in ETSI for the same week. The decision will be taken in Brighton. • February 5-8, Hong Kong, co-located with Parlay (Parlay meets 5-7). 	
14	AOB					
		896	TS23.218 v0.6.0	Motorola	<p>This 3GPP CN1 specification is presented for informational purposes and shows the work required of CN5 or with CN5's help to complete Section 12 of this document.</p> <p>This is one of the issues in the agenda for the joint meeting with the CN1-4 groups in Brighton.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	
			Vice-chair resignation and call for candidates.		<p>The group vice-chair, elected ETSI OSA project leader in this meeting, resigns from her position as CN5 vice-chair. This will be announced in the Beijing plenary.</p> <p>Candidates for this position are welcome. An election will take place in the Brighton meeting.</p>	
					<p>Discussion on what to do with the ETSI mapping report, which we haven't approved so far.</p> <p>Conclusion: we aim to finish it for October.</p>	

					<p>Discussion on the conversion of the model into Analysis. There were concerns because the work should not be underestimated. It seems there is manpower in Nortel for this.</p> <p>Concerns what is the use of the Analysis model because all data types are lost. We have a UML model because it can be used to generate documentation.</p> <p>It is necessary to investigate the available tools. The Parlay Java realisation group is looking into it; Dave will follow their conclusions.</p>	