3GPP TSG CN Plenary Meeting #15 NP-020033
6th – 8th March 2002. Jeju, Korea.

Agenda item: **6.1.1**

Document for: **INFO**

DRAFT Version 1, 25.02.2002

Meeting Report

TSG CN WG1# 22bis
Oulu, Finland

19 - 22 February 2002

Chairman: Hannu Hietalahti (Nokia)

Secretary: Per Johan Jorgensen (ETSI/MCC)

Host: Elisa Communications, Finnet, Nokia, Sonera, Viestintävirasto

Joint meeting report CN1-4,- VOID	Annex A
List of participants:	Annex B
Agreed CRs	Annex C
Tdoc list (incl. the status)	Annex D
Liaison Statements Out	Annex E
Agreed Work Items	Annex F
Agreed specifications (TS or TR)	Annex G
List of CRs to N1 drafts	Annex H

Documents can be found on the 3GPP-server:

http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_cn/WG1_mm-cc-sm/TSGN1_22bis/Docs/

Table of contents

1 Opening of the meeting. Calls for IPRs

The delegates were welcomed to Oulu where driving car on the ice was now possible upto 3 tons,- and it was informed on the logistics that was much appreciated.

IPR rights were asked to be disclosed according to respective organizations IPR policies. Individual Members should declare at the earliest opportunity, any IPRs which they believe to be essential, or potentially essential, to any work ongoing within 3GPP.

2 Agenda and Reports

N1-020457 : CN1 chairman, Title: Agenda (Oulu0202)

Discussion : This will continue as a living document in the doc Oulu0202.rtf. Documents had been moved around beforehand, and no objections to the proposal was maid.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020546 : H3g, Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Report on conclusions and assumptions from DTMF conference call

Discussion : This was an adhoc activity with proper invitation on the email reflector. The conference call was without any mandate from the previous CN WG1meeting. The syncronization issue was questioned with respect to importance of the delay.

Conclusion : Noted

N1-020641 : Siemens, Type: INFO, Title: Outcome of ad hoc session on IETF conference call report

Discussion : Stephen Hayes reported on a conference call between 3GPP and IETF experts. CN1 delegates discussed the outcome of this conference call in an ad hoc session during CN#22bis meeting. The following text shows the text of the original report message and highlighted the comments and additions from the CN1 ad hoc session.

Conclusion : Noted

3 Input Liaison Statements

N1-020435 : S2-020266, To: SA5, CN1 , Type: LS IN , Title: Liaison on Message Information Flows for the Distribution of the Charging Correlation Information.

Discussion : Forwarded from CN1#22. SA2 have defined that P-CSCF will generate an IMS charging ID (ICID) and include it in the INVITE message. The AS can then extract this ICID and apply it to all subsequent charging information which is generated for the session. CN1 action is required to add charging correlation information to SIP messages. Related contributions to this meeting are 497, 498, 528 and 531. No LS was needed since the issue will have been dealt with in TSG#15 before next S2 meeting.

Conclusion: Noted

N1-020523 : S1-020300, To: SA3, Cc: SA2, T2, CN1, GERAN, Type: LS IN , Title: IMS Security requirements

Discussion : SA1 say that in Rel-5 the IMS call control protocols reside in MT, not in TE. There are no other CN1 related issues in the LS except for that it should not create a backwards compatibility problem if different decision is made for Rel-6.

Conclusion: Noted

N1-020581 : S3z020044, To: CN1 , Type: LS IN , Title: LS on “Authentication reattempts”

Discussion : SA3 have reconsidered the fixed maximum number of reauthentication attempts. They now agree the CN1 proposal to allow maximum three attempts so this confirms our current working assumption which is already reflected in our specifications.

Conclusion: Noted

N1-020582 : S3z020045, To: CN1, CN4 , Type: LS IN , Title: LS on “Transport of IMS-AKA Material”

Discussion : CN1 action is required to do the following: 1) encapsulate IMS-AKA material into http-digest rather than within EAP, 2) provide hop-by-hop mechanism for the IMS-AKA session keys to be transported over the IMS CN SS infrastructure, 3) reply to SA3 and other relevant groups if all this causes a problem. The drafts now needed are not possible to reference (as earlier for this in CN1) since they are not submitted to IETF. To use the XML message body and possibel new headers are recommended by IETF. No documents on this for CN1#22bis.

Conclusion: Noted

N1-020597 : S3z020041, To: CN1 , Type: LS IN , Title: Registrations without user authentication and Identity Spoofing

Discussion : To re-consider the issue of sending the implicitly registered IMPUs to the P-CSCF from the S-CSCF (if only included for security reasons) against the alternative of adding data to all messages to allow the S-CSCF to check the correct integrity was applied to all messages. Related tdocs are 491, 492 and 'loose routing'. The implicitly registered IDs is only used as indicated by SA3 in P-CSCF.

Conclusion: LS OUT in 601 by Kevan

N1-020598 : T2-020254, To: S3, S4, S5, N1, N4, N5, T3, Cc: S1, S2, Type: LS IN , Title: Liaison Statement on coordination of data definitions, identified in GUP development

Discussion : This is a Rel-6 Work Item.

Conclusion: Forwarded to CN1#23

4 Work Plan for TSGN WG1

N1-020458 : MCC, Title: Latest workplan for review

Discussion : The percentage of WI 2233 is very low because the percentage for all IETF draft dependencies has been indicated as not applicable (=0 %). IETF draft batch packets 1, 2 and 3 to be indicated in 'completion rate' coloumn for the next WP update,- by indications from Keith Drage on completion rate for each of the actual IETF drafts.

The following comments were made against the work plan document:

1278 (24.229) is 85 % complete

2255 (23.218) is 100 % complete

1998 (24.228) is 85 % complete. There has been progress on this TS in CN1 since the previous TSGN plenary but at the same time the IETF protocol details have changed.

11014 is 0 %. CN1 is not aware of any requirements and is not doing anything on this task

1296: this is understood to be the PCO & TFT CRs which CN1 provides to TSGN #15 for approval. If this is correct understanding, then the task is 100 % complete.

11016, 11017, 11019, 11020 are duplicates of CN1 work items 1278 and 2255. Based on this, they are all 85 % complete.

11018 is 100 % complete

14002 is 90 % complete

2503 will be started in CN1 on the 8th of April 2002 with completion estimated on the 6th of September 2002.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020513 : Lucent T., Title: Advancement of 3GPP TS 24.228 to Version 2.0.0

Discussion : Proposal to raise the next version of 24.228 with all output from this meeting to version 2.0.0 and to propose it for TSGN #15 for approval.

Is it an editorial correction if the referenced IETF draft is changed from version x to version x + 1?

Many issues were however identified that needs to be done and some could impact many flows:

- Loose routing
- max-forwards
- manyfolks –> unify -> manyfolks -> ?
- digest AKA authentication
- XML body / P-headers (for transferring 3GPP specific information)
- To / From header handling
- branch removal in Route headers
- Integrity check indication from P-CSCF to S-CSCF

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020514 : Lucent T., Title: Advancement of 3GPP TS 23.218 to Version 2.0.0

Discussion : Proposal to raise the next version of 23.218 with all output from this meeting to version 2.0.0 and to propose it for TSGN #15 for approval.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020515 : Lucent T., Title: Advancement of 3GPP TS 24.229 to Version 2.0.0

Discussion : Proposal to raise the next version of 24.229 with all output from this meeting to version 2.0.0 and to propose it for TSGN #15 for approval.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020541 : Chairman, Title: CN1 IMS open items list

Discussion : The rapporteur of 24.228 was asked to add a sentence 'Example of this flow is not shown in this specifications' for respective headings still remaining empty.

Conclusion : Noted

N1-020561 : 23.218, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: Revising TS 23.218 to V2.0.0 and sending to CN#15 for Approval

Discussion : Same as 514 which is agreed.

Conclusion : Noted

5 Maintenance of R98 and older releases

Void.

6 Maintenance of Release 99

Void.

7 Maintenance of Release 4

Void.

8 Release 5

8.1 IMS draft specifications and other documents for information

N1-020459 : 24.229v120, Lucent T., Type: TS , Title: Current draft 24.229: "IP Multimedia Call Control Protocol based on SIP and SDP"

Discussion : Revised to N1-020569 before the meeting due to subclause 5.1.1.3 modification.

Conclusion : Withdrawn

N1-020569 : 24.229v121, Lucent T., Type: TS , Title: Current draft 24.229: "IP Multimedia Call Control Protocol based on SIP and SDP"

Discussion : A correction is needed by a CR or the rapporteur regarding deleted text.

Conclusion : Noted

N1-020460: Lucent T., Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Summary of current IETF documents on SIP

Discussion : 460-463 status: (1) Already being processed in IESG last call: - SDP-IPV6, - AMR-codec . (2) IESG last call result for 8th March are expected to include: 2543bis draft (08 version?), 100Rel (again seperated), offer-answer, events and srv. (3) A second batch going to WG last call on the 1st March are expected to be : manyfolks (changed editor and scope redefined), path (?), call auth (media-authorization), update, privacy, SIP compression items including UDVM. (4) The third bundle is probably not going to make it for TSG#15.

DHCP6 call control is there, but not the server options,- in the not yet submitted draft. Also the Henning document is therefore needed.

The unify draft has been issued.

Conclusion : Noted

N1-020461 : Lucent T., Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Summary of current IETF documents on SIPPING

Discussion :

Conclusion : Noted

N1-010462 : Lucent T., Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Summary of current IETF documents on MMUSIC

Discussion :

Conclusion : Noted

N1-020463 : Lucent T., Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Summary of current IETF documents on SIMPLE

Discussion :

Conclusion : Noted

N1-020535 : 24.228v1a0, Motorola, Type: TS , Title: 24.228v1.10.0 "Signalling flows for the IP multimedia call controlbased on SIP and SDP"

Discussion : No comments received.

Conclusion : Noted

N1-020552 : 23.218v120, Dynamicsoft, Type: TS , Title: 3GPP TS 23.218 V1.2.0 IP Multimedia (IM) Session Handling;IP Multimedia (IM) call model

Discussion :

Conclusion : Noted

8.2 Rel-5 corrections

None.

8.3 IMS Registration

N1-020493 : 24.229, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Usage of PCO for IMS registration

Discussion : N1-020464 and N1-020493 are linked. In CN1#22 it was agreed to obtaining the P-CSCF IP address within the PDP context activation procedure. It was agreed to use the Protocol Configuration Options IE to provide the P-CSCF address(es) to the UE. The coding of the information elements as such will be described in 24.008, but the actual usage of this IE is not within the scope of said TS, but should be described in 24.229 for the UE. It is further proposed to describe the GGSN action for the IMS specific parameters in GGSN in a specification (possibly TS 29.061) belonging to CN3.

Seems as only the deletion of editors note is left after discussing 493.

Conclusion : Merged to 626

N1-020494 : 24.229, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Registration procedure in the UE

Discussion : The latest version of the SIP bis draft (draft-ietf-sip-rfc2543bis-07) has been reviewed with respect to the handling of the registration procedure and the timer negotiation. Previously the 'S-CSCF could adjust this timer up or down. This has changed compared to the text currently written in 24.229. The S-CSCF can now only decrease the registration time indicated from the UE. Due to this, a long registration time period is indicated from the UE, and it is assumed that the network always will negotiate the time proposed from the UE down to a proper time. An expiry time must be indicated from the S-CSCF according to the bis-07 draft.

If the UE provides no expiry time it will receive a default value. A statement about minimum 3600 s should not be cut by the network was discussed. Is 600 000s large enough ? The case to shut down the session after a fixed 'short' time is not covered, but can be easily handled with deregistration. Shall re-registration take place as defined in the proposed 600s case? Yes, but change the wordings somewhat. 423 cause must have the insurance that the user automatically comes back with the correct minimum timing.

Conclusion : Revised to 627

N1-020627 : 24.229, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Registration procedure in the UE

Discussion : Shall be 600 000 and not 600.000,- to be implemented by the rapporteur.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020509 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: Message body for 3rd party REGISTER

Discussion : Further description is needed for the information that will be passed in the message body of the 3rd party REGISTER. For example, there is a need to pass the IMSI in some cases. Should there simply be a generic envelope to pass data received from the HSS or should there be explicit fields? Since IMSI is a known case, it is proposed to define new field for IMSI. Since the other data is not known, it is proposed that the assumption be made that generic XML data will be provided by the HSS and it can be simply inserted as a new part of multipart message body. As such, there is only a need to describe the procedures to add the XML "as is" to the message body.

IMSI definition as private ID was discussed, and it was proposed to insert it in a container which is transparent to S-CSCF. However the issue is connected to filter criteria.

Conclusion : Revised to 628

N1-020628 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: Message body for 3rd party REGISTER

Discussion : XML may be received as a portion and not 'full'. Some more changes needed. The example was requested to be moved due to consistency (no examples for other features).

Conclusion : Revised to 656

N1-020656 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: Message body for 3rd party REGISTER

Discussion : 'transparent-data' to be changed to 'service-info' by the rapporteur.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020524 : 24.228, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.228: Initial Registration - minor modifications

Discussion : Prior to initiating the registration procedure, the subscriber's data in the HSS indicates that no S-CSCF is assigned to the subscriber and that the subscriber has not been authenticated. After successful completion of the initial registration procedure - and prior to receiving or initiating a session - the subscriber's data in the HSS will indicate that the subscriber has been authenticated, and that a S-CSCF has been allocated to the subscriber. The allocation of S-CSCF and the authentication of the subscriber take place during different stages of the registration procedure. The proposed modification of the Clause 6.2 in the document TS 24228 clarifies the atomic nature of these two actions.

The list of S-CSCF with associated capabilities is not received from HSS. The capabilities is provisioned to I-CSCF. In flow 5 the UE is not authenticated and the deletion of this questioned? Also flow 7 was discussed. A S-CSCF needs to be assigned to handle the terminating calls for unregistered subscribers, but some text to be modified in clause 6.2.

Conclusion : Revised to 629

N1-020629 : 24.228, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.228: Initial Registration - minor modifications

Discussion : Step 16,- S-CSCF is not serving the user yet but has been given the authentication vectors. Previously 'selected in step 5'.

Conclusion : Revised to 657

N1-020657 : 24.228, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.228: Initial Registration - minor modifications

Discussion :

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020525 : 24.228, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.228: Optional steps in reregistration

Discussion : Upon successful completion of the initial registration (see TS 24.228, Clause 6.2), the subscriber's data in the HSS indicates that the subscriber has been authenticated and registered, and that the S-CSCF has been assigned to the subscriber. Since the re-registration procedure described in the TS 24.228 Clause 6.3 results in successful authentication and re-registration, it will have no impact on the subscriber data stored in the HSS. Hence, it is proposed that the Step 18 be removed from the Clause 6.3. In addition, some minor text modifications are suggested.

No need for yellowmarking revision marks. Provide the drawings also. Flow 6 change to be reversed (can not the S-CSCF request for multiple authentication vectors and therefore have one available already?). Other flows in 15 and 17 to be modified. Flow 18 is needed in case the AV fails. More time to check with CN4. Only delete last sentence.

Conclusion : Revised to 630

N1-020630 : 24.228, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.228: Optional steps in reregistration

Discussion : The rapporteur needs to fix ICSCF to I-CSCF.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020553 : 24.228, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: Use of the Remote-Party-ID for informing the S-CSCF that the Register Request was Integrity Protected

Discussion : At the previous meeting in Phoenix it was agreed that a mechanism is needed for the P-CSCF to inform the S-CSCF that the Register Request received by the P-CSCF was integrity protected. This contribution proposes to make use of the Remote-Party-ID header for this purpose and proposes modifications to the registration flows in 24.228 to implement this change.

The inclusion of public identity in Remote-Party-ID is not needed as it is in the From header. The discussion should be postponed until the LS (601 response to 597) to be sent to S3 is dealt with regarding authentication. If IK check fails the passing on is not done, and the authentication shall be done. 475 and 554 are linked.

Conclusion : Postponed

N1-020554 : 24.229, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: Remote Party ID P-CSCF and S-CSCF procedures for 24.229

Discussion : Indication from P-CSCF to S-CSCF that the screening of IMPU against IK has been done. What is the P-CSCF supposed to do if IMPU in From header does not match with the IK?

Conclusion : Postponed

N1-020575 : 24.228, Vodafone, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.228 - Removal of Public User Identity from Cx Authentication Request

Discussion : Proposal that S-CSCF does not need to pass IMPU to HSS when requesting for AV.

Conclusion : Withdrawn

8.4 IMS Deregistration

N1-020481 : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: 24.229 S-CSCF Registration / Authentication

Discussion :

Conclusion : Not available

N1-020482 : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: 24.229 P-CSCF Registration / Authentication

Discussion :

Conclusion : Not available

N1-020483 : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: 24.229 UE Registration / Authentication

Discussion :

Conclusion : Not available

N1-020484 : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: 24.229 Registration State Event Package

Discussion :

Conclusion : Not available

N1-020485 : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: 24.229 S-CSCF Access Authorization to Registration State Event Package

Discussion :

Conclusion : Not available

N1-020519 : 24.228, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.228: Cx Deregistration

Discussion : Clarification of the interaction of S-CSCF – HSS procedures and S-CSCF – UE signalling in network initiated de-registration. Based on the contribution N4-020095 agreed on CN4#12, the flow in clause 6.7.2 shall be updated.

SIP in front of methods as a normal terminology ? Due to multipel protocols ?

Conclusion : Revised to 631

N1-020631 : 24.228, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.228: Cx Deregistration

Discussion :

Conclusion : Agreed

8.5 IMS Configuration hiding

None provided.

8.6 IMS Authentication

N1-020475 : 24.229, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Using the RPI to signal Integrity protection

Discussion : 475, 553, 554,597 and 601 are linked. Proposal to use Remote-Party ID header for signalling from P-CSCF to the S-CSCF whether REGISTER was received integrity protected.

Conclusion : Postponed

N1-020476 : 24.229, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Correction to authentication

Discussion : The UE initiated re-registration opens up a potential denial-of-service attack in the sense that an attacker could re-register a subscriber in an unprotected message and respond with the wrong RES and CSCF could then de-register the subscriber. The text in 5.4.1.2.2 of 24.229 opens up this possibility. It is therefore proposed to make needed changes to 24.229.

Separate between a unregistered and registered user was thought needed. If the REGISTER response has indication that it has been integrity protected there should be no problem. Check this with SA3 before proceeding with this CR,- if P-CSCF does already cover the case of failed authentication by dropping REGISTER because wrong keys were used for protecting the message.

Conclusion : Revised to 658

N1-020658 : 24.229, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Correction to authentication

Discussion :

Conclusion : Not available

N1-020544 : 24.229, H3g, Type: CR, Title: Authentication failure scenarios

Discussion : 24.229 section 5.1.1.5 contains two editors notes regarding UE detection of an invalid authentication challenge from the network. This paper proposes some text to replace at least one of these editors notes, and bring the text into line with the latest version of 33.203.

Random time is only meant as ‘in the future’, shall be implementation specific and what about 1s random time ? References ? Clear requirement on MAC needed. SQN beeing in ‘the correct range’ ? Specified elsewhere.

Conclusion : Revised to 642

N1-020642 : 24.229, H3g, Type: CR, Title: Authentication failure scenarios

Discussion :

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020547 : 24.229, H3g, Type: CR, Title: Authentication text duplication clean up

Discussion : There is duplicated text in the UE procedures describing the receipt and response to the 401 Unauthorised message. This contribution proposes to consolidate the description into a single section.

If deregistration takes place after two consecutive invalid challenges it should probably be stated what to do with the GPRS connection etc. The editor's note in 5.1.1 should be deleted. Avoiding duplicated text on UE behaviour during authentication by refererring to 5.1.1.5.1.Proposal to merge 547 revision into 544 revision 642.

Conclusion : Revised to 642

N1-020595 : 24.229, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Corrections to 5.4.1.6

Discussion : When a user needs to be re-authenticated a Notify request on the dialog between the S-CSCF and P-CSCF does not need to be generated. It is therefore proposed to make changes to section 5.4.1.6 of 24.229.

Does not P-CSCF need to be informed from S-CSCF that the authentication takes place,- since it has subscribed to that (undefined?) event package? But is it usefull information for the P-CSCF when the result comes after completed authentication ?

Conclusion : Rejected

8.7 IMS Call initiation

N1-020474 : Nokia, Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Routing in IMS

Discussion : Just recently, the IETF SIP has deprecated Strict Routing, in favour of Loose Routing. The IMS routing is based on the nowadays deprecated strict routing. This contribution proposes to apply the Loose Routing principles as introduced in the latest IETF document RFC2543bis-07, in order to be in line with the IETF SIP.

N1-020474, 477 490-492, 570-571 and 580 are linked.

Conclusion : Noted

N1-020477 : 24.229, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Routing in IMS

Discussion : In order to fulfil the concepts described in N1-020474, it is proposed to update the references and insert a new subsection to clause 4.

The points listed in 4.3 proposed deleted, but contradicted by saying it is picking the 3GPP solution. All P-CSCF and S-CSCF will then become loose routers and can interwork with strict routers. Proposal to take SIP as it is (eg. external interworking aspects),- but opposed by some that limiting options are good. N1-020474, 477 490-492, 570-571 and 580 are linked.

Conclusion : Revised to 625

N1-020625 : 24.229, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Routing in IMS

Discussion : Reference to [1] to be coreected,- please Keith.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020490 : 24.228, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: 24228: Terminating flows based on Contact, non hiding

Discussion : The current terminating flows in TS 24.228 are not aligned with SIP as specified by the IETF. The S-CSCF does not make use of the Contact information provided by the user at registration time.

Linked with 474, 477,490-492, 570-571 and 580. Proposal to use Contact header for routing and put the dialled public ID in the 3GPP specific XML body. The need for solving the problem was accepted, but it was thought to be a general SIP problem to solve the handling of the contact header needed for routing. Use the body now and replace it later when SIP defines a proper header for this or even a 3GPP proprietary header (p header). This feature is similar to the multipel subscriber numbers in ISDN. One proposal was to wait for the header to be available from IETF and wait with fullfilling the feature. It was seen important to preserve the original ‘dialled’ address,- but some thought the UE could only have one number making this feature ‘nice to have’. The IETF dependency could vary in time from ‘2 days to 2’years’, and therefore most people would either define it now in 3GPP or use the body as an interim transport solution. The XML body is not new to the UE since cell-ID is defined there. Two problems was to be solved,- route on contact and deliver the number/address to the UE.

Dynamicsoft volunteered to start the work on standard SIP header while Ericsson will try to get a proprietary header. Many but not all delegations saw that a 3GPP specific container for dialled public user ID would be a good fallback solution if the new header can not be specified in time for Rel-5.Drop the public ID and align contact header with standard SIP for routing purpose agreed.

Conclusion : Revised to 621

N1-020621 : 24.228, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: 24228: Terminating flows based on Contact, non hiding

Discussion :

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020491 : 24.228, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: 24228: Terminating flows based on Contact, hiding

Discussion :

Conclusion : Revised to 622

N1-020622 : 24.228, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: 24228: Terminating flows based on Contact, hiding

Discussion :

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020492 : 24.229, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: 24.229: Terminating procedures

Discussion :

Conclusion : Revised to 623

N1-020623 : 24.229, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: 24.229: Terminating procedures

Discussion : The current terminating procedures in TS 24.229 are not aligned with SIP as specified by the IETF. The S-CSCF does not make use of the Contact information provided by the user at registration time.

c- parameter to be included was a question, but this issue is left open. P-Called-Party-ID header is not 3GPP specific since it can be reused by other organizations, but will be registered.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020495 : 24.229, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Usage of user plane and control plane

Discussion : In order to ensure that the same GGSN that holds the PDP context for IMS signalling also shall hold the PDP context(s) for media, the PDP context(s) for media must be set up as secondary PDP contexts to the IMS signalling context. A first general chapter in 24.229 describing how the PDP contexts for media should be established is proposed. The chapter is not complete, but intended as a start and a placeholder. The corresponding action in GGSN is proposed specified by CN3 (see N1-020493 for a proposed LS to CN3).

The note was meant as a placeholder until the correct specification describing this is known, but decided to be deleted. The binding information will be described here. SA2 is going in the same direction, but this is to be checked while postponing this CR decision. New clause numbering and terminology like IM session.

Conclusion : Revised to 643

N1-020643 : 24.229, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Usage of user plane and control plane

Discussion : The rapporteur is asked to place the new proposed subclause to 9.2.5.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020496 : 24.229, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Compression in the UE

Discussion :

Conclusion : Not available

N1-020517 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Use of identification fields in the UA

Discussion : Linked docs are 517, 556 and 578. This contribution proposes text for the UA for the usage of the From, To, Contact, and Remote-Party-ID fields. It follows the current text of 24.228 and proposes consistent use of the privacy draft for these headers. The text has been currently placed within the clauses relating to Initial INVITE, but the text has been drafted in a general fashion to allow usage with any initial request for a dialog, or any stand-alone transaction.

The UE may include the Remote-Party-ID seems to be an acceptable approach. RPID-Privacy header can only be included if the Remote-Party-ID is used, but the sentence was proposed deleted or rewritten. ‘Within this specification' sounds like we are specifying in initial INVITE stuff which applies to subsequent re-INVITES also. The use of Remote-party ID is optional for the UE, therefore 'may'. The UE shall encode To, From and Contact headers according to the privacy draft.Other modifications needed was pointed out as eg. last part of the note in 5.1.3.1. N1-020517, N1-020556 and N1-020578 are linked.

Conclusion : Revised to 645

N1-020645 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Use of identification fields in the UA

Discussion : Discrepancy with SIP privacy draft not accepted.

Conclusion : Rejected

N1-020520 : 24.228, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.228: Cx Session Initiation

Discussion : Numbering in the script is wrong since 7.2.2 should be 7.3.2.2 and 7.2.3 goes to 7.3.2.3, which the rapporteur is kindly asked to modify.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020526 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Bandwidth for non-RTP streams

Discussion : For conversational media streams the bandwidth information ("b=" line) shall be specified for respective media streams. However, the RFC 2327 specifies also "data," "application," and "control" media types. For these media types, to explicitly specify the bandwidth requirements (in kilobits per second) may sometimes not be appropriate. In many cases "the best effort" transport may be more appropriate for these media streams. Hence, it is proposed that - for these type of traffic - the bandwidth descriptor ("b=" line) be an optional parameter.

The b-line is influencing the radio resources, and opening up not including the b-line for certain media types from UE mean ‘best effort’. CN3 handles mapping and uses more than b-line, eg. Codec type, to map to QoS parameters. The UE ‘should’(?) include b-line, and if not it is automatically taken as ‘background’ (specified in CN3,- pointer needed in a note?).

Conclusion : Revised to 646

N1-020646 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Bandwidth for non-RTP streams

Discussion : The rapporteur is asked to correct the spelling of ‘TS’ and to ensure that 29.208 is listed in the references.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020527 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: SDP profile

Discussion : This contribution define the usage of the SDP parameters in the IM Subsystem Release 5. It is proposed that the SDP usage as described is incorporated into the respective Tables in Annex A Clause 3.2.3 of the document TS 24.229. The use of SDP is defined by the precedence stated as defined in this contribution.

Taken as a discussion paper, since M’s and O’s are needed in the tables by CR(s) in the end, regardless of text moved around. The originator was invited to draft a CR on 24.229. Do we need to redefine SDP syntax in 3GPP TS?

Conclusion : Noted

N1-020550 : 24.229, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: 24.229: Emergency sessions

Discussion : During the CN1 #22 meeting in Sophia it was agreed that the P-CSCF should detect emergency sessions and generate a 380 response with an indication of the alternative CS service that is able to handle the emergency call. However, the stage 3 details are not present in 24.229. This CR proposes to add a new element to the 3GPP IMS XML body that describes the telephone number to contact over the CS domain to complete the call.

Is it better to use a digit string instead of a tel: URL to minimize the UE impact ? Should contact be used? The proposal is to have all info in one container. The UE shall automatically do the alternative call without user interaction, but what about mode C UEs not supporting CS? The Reason header when available could be used in the future. More clarifications discussed goes into the revision.

Conclusion : Revised to 647

N1-020647 : 24.229, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: 24.229: Emergency sessions

Discussion : The reason child element was requested to be mandatory for Mode C mobiles,- but not felt sensibel by all. It was stated as a possibel liability issue. A mandated string could be empty.

Conclusion : Revised to 671

N1-020671 : 24.229, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: 24.229: Emergency sessions

Discussion :

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020556 : Dynamicsoft, Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Use of TO and FROM headers

Discussion : Linked docs are 517, 556 and 578. It is advocated that the changes to the RFC 2543 Bis now allow CN1 to change it's approach with regard to encryption of To and From headers and allow the possibility of the caller determining what is inserted in the From and To headers.

Conclusion : Noted

N1-020557 : Dynamicsoft, Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Use of the Cookie Header mechanism

Discussion : Revised to 599 before the meeting.

Conclusion : Withdrawn

N1-020599 : Dynamicsoft, Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Use of the Cookie Header mechanism

Discussion : It is proposed that CN1 consider the use of the cookie header for transport of parameters between nodes within IMS.

Comment that using the body is likely to reduce and slow down the creation of new applications and services for IMS seemed 'strange'. The draft referenced has been around for 6 month and is about to expire. An UE receiving a cookie shall send any received 'cookie' of up to 4000 bytes in all sent messages.

Conclusion : Noted

N1-020570 : 24.228, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.228: Handling of Contact header by the S-CSCF and P-CSCF

Discussion : This contribution discusses the handling of Contact header in the REGISTER and the initial INVITE requests. It is proposed that the Contact header is left intact by the P-CSCF. In addition, when the S-CSCF receives an initial INVITE request destined for UE, it uses the Contact received in the REGISTER request and the received public user identity to constructing a Route header that is pre-loaded into the initial INVITE request. This contribution recommends that the "Alternative F" - identified on the CN1 discussion list - is accepted as a method of routing the initial INVITE to the UE.

Linked with 490. The problem is acknowledged but the solution varies between using the body or the R-URI.

Conclusion : Rejected

N1-020571 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Handling of Contact header by the S-CSCF and P-CSCF

Discussion : Definition of new 3GPP specific SIP header 'impu-parameter'. N1-020474, 477 490-492, 570-571 and 580 are linked.

Conclusion : Rejected

N1-020577 : Nokia, Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Introduction of the changes proposed in the "unify" draft

Discussion : There is a new Internet-Draft (draft-rosenberg-sip-unify-00 – so-called "unify" draft) appeared in the IETF SIP working group providing new solutions for various problems including early media, coupling of resource reservation and call signaling, and supporting capability negotiation for indicating support any one of one-of-N codecs.

Why are we changing our flows? Because the 2-way handshake of unify draft will affect the manyfolks draft. Some saw benefits in the existing 3-way handshake, but the problem could be missing a draft to reference. Due to the immature level of the drafts this discussion paper is only information on how things will look like in IETF in the future, making the 3GPP procedures defined incompatibel (?) or not in line with standard SIP. SA2 needs to take into account and change accordingly a possible modified manyfolks draft before CN1 can adapt. The IETF decision on two way vs. three-way handshaking (unify, manyfolks), when available needs to be reflected in 24.228. The intention is to retain the principal that the calling user makes the final selection of the codec to be used, and so the intention is not to change any architectural decisions in this area.

Conclusion : Noted

N1-020578 : 24.228, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Changing To: and From: to Anonymous

Discussion : Linked docs are 517, 556 and 578. Setting the To/From headers to the logical call destination/source is not possible because of the requirement related to network applied privacy. The current flows in 24.228 show the information in To: and From: headers in an encrypted form, however we do not see the need to use encrypting algorithms for this purpose but rather use clear text “Anonymous” instead.

The script changes to be done is eg. use a nick name instead of ‘anonymous’. Reflect the use of privacy ?

Conclusion : Revised to 644

N1-020644 : 24.228, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Changing To: and From: to Anonymous

Discussion : To and From Header re-coding possibilities was raised as a problem by two companies for area to be studied further.

Conclusion : Rejected

N1-020580 : 24.229, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Loose routing in 24.229

Discussion : Revised to 600 before the meeting.

Conclusion : Withdrawn

N1-020600 : 24.229, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Loose routing in 24.229

Discussion : This contribution implements the necessary changes to TS 24.229 in order to align the network entities to the loose routing principles.

The I-CSCF part was discussed to be modified with respect to routing and ‘consistently’. The note should be normative. Which one of the two proposed SIP procedures for routing chosen for 3GPP needs to be ‘identified somewhere’. N1-020474, 477 490-492, 570 and 580 are linked.

Conclusion : Revised to 624

N1-020624 : 24.229, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Loose routing in 24.229

Discussion : A sentence as note requested for I-CSCF and S-CSCF to ensure interworking with RFC 2543 and RFC 2543bis networks. The rapporteur is asked to add this editors note in subclause 5.3 and 5.4.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020591 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Reinstatement of text relating to Record-Routeing

Discussion : In order to retain the clarity of usage of the Record-Route header, we believe that the text should be returned to its original clause before the draft update,- and an extra note added for clarity, removing any implication that this statement overrides the existing procedures of SIP relating to the Record-Route header and SIP proxies.

Lenghty discussions on where to describe the THIG and Record-Route, the note and normative changes for I-CSCF. Question outside the changes in this CR but in the reference text: is the handling of SIP headers Via, Path, R-R, Route clear? First, last, top, bottom, topmost...? Allows I-CSCF to Record-Route.

Conclusion : Revised to 649

N1-020649 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Reinstatement of text relating to Record-Routeing

Discussion :

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020593 : Orange France, Type: DISCUSSION, Title: PSTN/CS domain originated call

Discussion : 1- As the I-CSCF received the address of the called party in the format of E.164 address in the INVITE message from the MGCF (corresponding to S-CSCF#1 in the second diagram), how is it able to interrogate the HSS to find the S-CSCF serving the called user? Is the interrogation with E.164 address on Cx interface possible?.

2- If the address contained in the INVITE message received by the I-CSCF is already in a SIP URL format, then this means that the MGCF has been able to make this change (E.164 address of the called party has been changed into SIP URL by MGCF). Has the MGCF the capability to perform DNS-ENUM query in order to obtain SIP URL of the called party, or indication that there is no SIP URL defined for this MSISDN.

Do CN1 think that something is missing ? How does the I-CSCF find the S-CSCF based on E.164 phone number in case of PSTN call? Is MGCF able to solve the SIP URL by DNS-ENUM query? The MSC routing was discussed, and some believed the problem was not real-life. A LS OUT to SA2 is left for off-line discussions to identify if a problem can be identified and agreed. Or alternatively a contribution directly to SA2 is made by the originator.

Conclusion : Noted and LS OUT in 648 by Sofie

N1-020594 : 24.229, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Corrections to 5.3.3.1

Discussion : The Refer-To header may contain information which reveals the internal topology of the network. Therefore it is proposed to make the changes to section 5.3.3.1 of 24.229.

Postponed, see N1-020579 first. The problem was not agreed by all, and some regrets to past situations/words was expressed. Maybe Refer-To can not reveal S-CSCF any more since AS is not part of topology hiding ? Delete Refer-To all together in the clause,- and avoid a list ? Does Refer-To need to be in brackets? Refer-To shall be hidden by the I-CSCF in case it reveals details of network topology. Which CSCFs could be hidden were tried clarified.

Conclusion : Revised to 655

N1-020655 : 24.229, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Corrections to 5.3.3.1

Discussion :

Conclusion : Postponed

N1-020596 : 24.229, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Corrections to 5.3.1.3

Discussion : It has been agreed in May 2001, that a 403 Forbidden message generated by the network and sent to the UE has to contain a Warning header with the relevant information about the reason. It is therefore proposed to add text to section 5.3.1.3 of 24.229.

Some editorials. The warning text and mapping due to language should be done in HSS(?), and the total concept needs to be understood and further specification was requested. CN4 first needs to describe how the warning text crosses Cx.

Conclusion : Noted

8.8 IMS Call clearing

N1-020487 : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: 24.229 I-CSCF default S-CSCF assignment

Discussion :

Conclusion : Not available

8.9 IMS Abnormal cases and error handling

N1-020478 : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: 24.229 P-CSCF Network initiated call release

Discussion : This contribution provides additional information for 24.229 for the description of network initiated call release. The text is based on the agreement during the 3GPP SIPPING ad hoc reached during IETF#52, i.e. the P-CSCF is allowed to act as so-called transparent Back to Back User Agents. As the term transparent Back to Back User Agent is not described in any specification a text proposed describes the detailed behaviour necessary at a P-CSCF in order to release a call.

The referenced specification and not only the reference number,- lost coverage due to driving also,- abnormal cases: this only applies to requests related with the same already BYEd session?,- release of information,- topmost and other comments to be taken in.

Conclusion : Revised to 650

N1-020650 : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: 24.229 P-CSCF Network initiated call release

Discussion : Several editorials. Loose routing consideration is for a contribution in next meeting ? Or a modified version of the contribution to the loose routing.

Conclusion : Revised to 669

N1-020669 : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: 24.229 P-CSCF Network initiated call release

Discussion :

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020479 : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: 24.229 S-CSCF Network initiated call release

Discussion : Similar to 478.

Should other trusted entity beside HSS have the capability to tear down ? Yes. Restriction to release all sessions at deregistration indication should not be made. (Normal) Abnormal terminology instead of eg. exceptional behavior (?) Other comments raised to be included in a revision.

Conclusion : Revised to 651

N1-020651 : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: 24.229 S-CSCF Network initiated call release

Discussion : Response code.

Conclusion : Revised to 670

N1-020670 : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: 24.229 S-CSCF Network initiated call release

Discussion :

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020545 : 24.229, H3g, Type: CR, Title: S-CSCF Interaction with AS

Discussion : There is a need to clarify S-CSCF behaviour and expected responses when forwarding requests to Application servers. This requires changes to describe the S-CSCF behaviour when forwarding to the AS, and what it expects in response, and also it requires a definition of AS behaviour. S-CSCF behaviour can be added to section 5.4.3 and section 5.7 already includes empty sections that are intended to allow AS behaviour to be defined. There are two proposals to add text to 24.229 included.

Initial Request ? Error handling for the case when S-CSCF receives from AS a message which can not be associated with any of the existing sessions. Comments to be given to the originators of 545 and 572.

Conclusion : Revised to 618

N1-020618 : 24.229, H3g, Type: CR, Title: SCSCF Interaction with AS

Discussion : The rapporteur was asked to systematically change 'Exceptional behavior' and 'Abnormal events' to 'Abnormal cases'. Move sentence in 5.7.2 and 5.7.3 as editors note.

Conclusion : Revised to 668

N1-020668 : 24.229, H3g, Type: CR, Title: SCSCF Interaction with AS

Discussion :

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020555 : 24.229, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: UE implementation of Record-Route and Route headers

Discussion : Risk that some terminal manufacturers in the interest of optimisation may choose not to implement the Record-Route and Route procedures, as the Rel 5 P-CSCF should never supply them to the terminal according to the specification. It is therefore necessary to explicitly state that the UE shall support the procedures for Record-Route and Route as specified in RFC2543Bis in TS 24.229.

Makes the 2543 bis draft UA handling of Record-Route and Route headers mandatory for the UE. Should be informative in a revision was one view, and the other view was that this CR was not needed since standard SIP defines it, and that no specific headers be emphasized. Error handling for future ?

Conclusion : Revised to 652

N1-020652 : 24.229, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: UE implementation of Record-Route and Route headers

Discussion : No added value in the note?

Conclusion : Rejected

8.10 Other IMS issues

N1-020464 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Separation of clause 9 into UE and GGSN procedures

Discussion : N1-020464 and N1-020493 are linked. In creating this proposal, an assumption has been made that the additional requirements for the GGSN will be covered in TS 29.061. No contributions have yet been made in this area, but it is assumed that the procedures e.g. for filling the P-CSCF address will be specified there. In addition, N1-020402 (rejected at the last meeting) has been taken into account, and the text of that contribution modified and inserted into this text, except for the area where failure to agree occurred at the last meeting, were alternative text is proposed. These relate specifically to: From reading 23.228, clause 4.2.6, 1st paragraph, it is clear that it is an option for the UE to request a specialised PDP context for signalling (i.e. in our interpretation include the PCO signalling flag) or to use a general purpose PDP context (i.e. in our interpretation not to include the PCO signalling flag). Therefore text relating to this has been made optional.

Option c) I needs to be rephrased, and the network requirement under procedures at the UE modified. The reference to 29.061 is not confirmed. Should state what to do when receiving a P-CSCF address without request. Proposed not to mandate anything (may), and an operator view was to mandate the UE to use it (shall,- need to say something if a list of P-CSCF addresses is received also). Remove the phrases about the signalling flag and handled in a separate contribution due to the criterias for when to use it needs to be discussed further. The UE behavior will be implementation dependant with regard to how to use P-CSCF addresse(s),- ie a 'may'. Merge what is left in 493 to the new revision of 464.

Conclusion : Revised to 626

N1-020626 : 24.229, Lucent T., Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Separation of clause 9 into UE and GGSN procedures

Discussion :

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020465 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Inclusion of the Events draft in profile tables

Discussion : The SIP profile tables do not yet include the provisions for the events draft. This draft adds methods (NOTIFY and SUBSCRIBE), headers and status-codes to the protocol. Support of the extensions at the UA role is left

is optional. This is because some 3GPP entities acting as the UA will need to support the events draft, and others will not. This will need to be reflected in the text of clause 11, by mandatory support at the S-CSCF, P-CSCF and UA at a minimum. Support within the UA role has been left that if the events draft is supported, it is optional to be able to send the SUBSCRIBE request, but it is mandatory to be able to receive the request, and both to send and receive the response. The NOTIFY is mandatory in all cases. The contribution has been split into a number of proposals for convenience of presentation, but they are interrelated and all should be agreed in some form, as follows:

Proposal 1: Updates main body of the specification, adding references and modifying the conformance clause.

Proposal 2: Modifications to the major capabilities and PDU tables in the profile.

Proposal 3: New PDU content tables for NOTIFY and SUBSCRIBE.

Proposal 4: Addition of the Event header

Proposal 5: Addition of the Allow-Events header

Proposal 6: Addition of the Subscription-Expires header

Proposal 7: Addition of 202 status-code

Proposal 8: Addition of 489 status-code

Should timer value be specified for the UE to include ? One contribution considers this. Events draft with subscribe and notify as UA role need to be clarified here.

Conclusion : Revised to 602

N1-020602 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Inclusion of the Events draft in profile tables

Discussion : Anywhere stated that the UE only implements the subscriber functionality part? For later CR ? Changes from agreed tdocs 468, 469, 583, 584 and 604 apply to the new tables in 602,- by the rapporteur please..

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020466 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Valid responses to CANCEL in profile tables

Discussion : CANCEL is a somewhat special method in that treatment is hop by hop, and responses are therefore given hop-by-hop, at least where a stateful proxy is involved. In addition, CANCEL is only applicable to transactions with provisional responses (i.e. currently only INVITE), and therefore its usage is currently defined completely in the bis-draft. A number of status-codes are therefore not valid in responses. This contribution attempts to tidy up the profile tables in this respect.

Is it explicitly stated in our tables that CANCEL is only applicable to INVITE? The bis draft has it.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020467 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Introductory text giving the status of Annex A

Discussion : At the Cancun meeting there was extensive discussion on the status of Annex A. It was agreed that introductory material would be inserted stating the relationship to the IETF documentation. This contribution provides that material.

Using ‘should’ because of the dynamic behavior of the RFC. What about mandatory parts in IETF that has been done 3GPP optional by mistake in the profiles ? The direction for profiling should normally be that 3GPP requirements is made stronger than in IETF. Clause A.1.1 text to be modified accordingly.

Conclusion : Revised to 603

N1-020603 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Introductory text giving the status of Annex A

Discussion :

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020468 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Server header

Discussion : This contribution analyses the various SIP drafts, and identifies the SIP requirements for the Server header. It then identifies the values that need to be inserted in the profile tables of 24.229 regarding this header.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020469 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Error-Info header

Discussion : This contribution analyses the various SIP drafts, and identifies the SIP requirements for the Error-Info header. It then identifies the values that need to be inserted in the profile tables of 24.229 regarding this header.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020470 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Retry-After header

Discussion : This contribution analyses the various SIP drafts, and identifies the SIP requirements for the Retry-After header. It then identifies the values that need to be inserted in the profile tables of 24.229 regarding this header.

No normative text found on what to do when receiving it, but should 3GPP state such behavior? In the profile only the encoding is specified, but the UE procedure would then need an update.

Conclusion : Revised to 604

N1-020604 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Retry-After header

Discussion :

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020471 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Content-Disposition header

Discussion :

Conclusion : Not available

N1-020497 : Lucent T., Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Charging Information

Discussion : SA2 has provided liaison N1-020435 / S2-020266 that requests CN1 to investigate solutions for carrying charging correlation information within SIP messages. 3G TR 23.815 v1.1.0 describes the current SA5 decisions for charging correlation needs. A conference call was held with a number of CN1 delegates on the 6th of February, 2002 to discuss the charging correlation information to pass in SIP messages. The discussion captures the comments from the conference call and also suggests how to proceed with a solution.

How to incorporate this into 24.228? The CCF address needs to stay in the network and not passed to another local network was clarified due to unclear text. The stage 2 work in S2 and S5 are not agreed yet and it was proposed to agreeing the working assumptions now in CN1 and await agreeing change to the CN1 drafts. Open issue is eg if GPRS CID going to the AS.

Conclusion : Noted

N1-020498 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: Charging Information

Discussion : Implement procedures for passing charging correlation information per N1-020497 for ICID and GPRS CID.

It was expressed that ICID is OK now, but GPRS CID should wait until feedback is received from S2. ICID or icid, brackets or not ? Record-Route, Route and GPRS CID should be grouped and moved to subclause above. Which SIP message should carry the parameters as body was questioned with respect to S2 alignment as written in their TR. ICID is broken out and GPRS CID waits until the next meeting.

Conclusion : Revised to 605

N1-020605 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: Charging Information

Discussion : XML part should be reinstated.

Conclusion : Revised to659

N1-020659 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: Charging Information

Discussion :

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020499 : Lucent T., Type: DISCUSSION, Title: DTMF

Discussion : Document N1-020267 was discussed and noted in the Sophia Antipolis CN1#22 meeting. It describes variations of two options for providing DTMF digits: via SIP signalling versus within RTP payload. A conference call was held on the 7th of February to further discuss the options. Both methods are considered viable and it is expected that a contribution will be provided to CN#22bis that presents the outcome of that meeting. There was also email discussion of the SIP signalling option. This document provides the recommendation from Lucent for providing DTMF digits in the IM CN subsystem,- using the RTP payload method described in RFC 2833 for providing DTMF digits in 3GPP Release 5 IMS.

Existing media gateways already provides this. INFO method to be progressed as needed in IETF was regarded as low. Include DTMF in the AMR profile ? RTP approach needs involvement from RAN on the framework. Discussion between using one RTP stream with different type or two RTP streams. Singel PDP context with multiplexed DTMF is proposed as the way forward. What happens to DTMF with unequal error protection or the optimized voice scenario expected in Rel-6 ? By informing S2 and RAN2 on the working assumption to use RTP with singel PDP context it should be stated that a forward compatibel solution be sought with respect to Rel-6. Event indicator to replace the audio packet, with informing S4 ? The LS needs to go GERAN also, mentioning what happens with header stripping.

Agreed the principle to use RTP as proposed in the document, and that :

- DTMF transfer in RTP payload was taken as working assumption
- Setting up dedicated PDP contexts for DTMF only is not attractive solution for CN. Therefore multiplexing two media streams to single PDP context, one for DTMF, one for codec should be studied if RTP solution according to RFC 2833 is chosen.
- INFO method for DTMF transfer has been commented on and not liked by IETF
- INFO related drafts have expired and as there is no work ongoing it is not realistic to expect that this could be the IETF defined solution for Rel-5.

This may impact UEP and therefore a LS to GERAN, SA2, SA4, CN3 and RAN2 is needed.

Conclusion : Noted and LS OUT in 610 by Eric

N1-020500 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: DTMF and MGCF

Discussion : Define SDP procedures in 3GPP TS 24.229 for providing DTMF via RTP payload transport as referenced in N1-020499. An alternative description for using the SIP INFO signalling method is also shown at the end.

Only the revision marked changes belongs to this CR, the rest is from the latest spec. version. An 24.228 example is needed later. One RTP stream is intended. Agreed the primary (RTP) proposal and the alternative proposal is not agreed.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020501 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: MRFC Tones/Announcements

Discussion : The MRFC communicates with the Application Server (AS) via the S-CSCF to provide tones/announcements, conference bridging and transcoding. The stage 2 descriptions of these functions have been added to 3GPP TS 23.218. There are currently no procedures in 3GPP TS 24.229 describing these interactions. This contribution proposes to introduce SIP procedural descriptions for the MRFC to provide tones and announcements. The MRFC also communicates with the MRFP to allocate the specified resources, but this interaction is outside the scope of 3GPP TS 24.229.

S2 standardize on capabilities and not services. Proposal to merge 501, 502 and 503 in one CR. No connection between ACK and when to start playing. MRFC is sending 100 Trying response since it is waiting for action from MRFP, or ..?

Conclusion : Revised to 611

N1-020611 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: MRFC Tones/Announcements

Discussion :

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020502 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: MRFC Ad Hoc Conferencing

Discussion : This contribution proposes to introduce SIP procedural descriptions for the MRFC for providing ad hoc conferences.

Should the 183 or 200OK be used ? Better refer to the procedure for the UA for these cases.

Conclusion : Revised to 612

N1-020612 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: MRFC Ad Hoc Conferencing

Discussion :

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020503 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: MRFC Transcoding

Discussion : The MRFC communicates with the Application Server (AS) via the S-CSCF to provide tones/announcements, conference bridging and transcoding. The stage descriptions of these functions have been added to 3GPP TS 23.218. There are currently no procedures in 3GPP TS 24.229 describing these interactions. This contribution proposes to introduce SIP procedural descriptions for the MRFC for providing transcoding.

Requirement for the MRFC to support both two-way and three-way codec negotiation when starting transcoding. No statement on the negotiation models should be included here. Which scenarios exist where transcoding is needed in Rel-5 timeframe ? S2 has it defined but no use cases defined ? Eg to PSTN and for AMR with different modes, and not only for voice. The identifier for transcoding was questioned.

Conclusion : Revised to 613

N1-020613 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: MRFC Transcoding

Discussion :

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020504 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: OPTIONS for MRFC

Discussion : The OPTIONS method provides a mechanism for a SIP UA to find out what SIP capabilities are available from another SIP UA. The same mechanism may be used for purposes of discovering higher level capabilities of a UA by placing information in the OPTIONS response message body (200 OK). The interface between the AS and the MRFC is an instance where this would useful. The same mechanism could be used between the AS and MGCF, possibly with a common set of media capabilities that may be passed in the message body. The proposal is to use the OPTIONS method to retrieve MRFC capabilities. The definition of the common set of media capabilities that can be queried from both MRFC and MGCF (e.g. DTMF) will be determined later. A new MIME type could be created for this purpose.

May or shall the MRFC include a message body with …. May is OK since it is optional, while the other view is that then this statement adds nothing.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020505 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: OPTIONS for MGCF

Discussion : The proposal is to use the OPTIONS method to retrieve MGCF capabilities.

When sending a 200 OK for OPTIONS the MGCF may indicate the support of DTMF, conferencing and supported codecs. Is tones/announcement allocated to MRFC only ? For interworking scenario,- but still questioned if the MGCF needs to support the tones/announcement.

Conclusion : Revised to 614

N1-020614 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: OPTIONS for MGCF

Discussion :

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020506 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: Call Transfer and MGCF

Discussion : There are call flows provided in 3GPP TS 24.228 for call transfer after sessions have been established, where all parties are 3GPP UEs. There is a call flow to consider that is not explicitly listed in 3GPP TS 24.228 – call transfer with one party being a circuit switch entity (e.g. MGCF is involved). For this case, the REFER request is sent from UE#2 that gets to an MGCF instead of S-CSCF#1 and P-CSCF#. The MGCF needs to generate the new INVITE request based on the Refer-to header. The MGCF also needs to generate the NOTIFY request when the call transfer is complete. Another flavor is when an MGCF is involved for UE#3. In this case, the MGCF will need to generate the BYE request to tear down the old session after the call transfer is complete.

What is the use case for this contribution,- REFER initiating a new session ? Interwork ISDN/PSTN,- which is not Rel-5 and not a simpel basic service.

Conclusion : Rejected

N1-020507 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: Hold/Resume with MGCF

Discussion : There is a call flow provided in 3GPP TS 24.228 for call hold and resume initiated from the UE that terminates at the MGCF. See 3GPP TS 24.228 sub-clause 10.1.3 for the call flow. There are currently no procedures in 3GPP TS 24.229 in support of this call flow.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020516 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Treatment of IETF draft references

Discussion : This is the first of a number of contributions to clean up the IETF references. This contribution deals with the references that are not directly used by 3GPP SIP.

If the TS is to be published the references to IETF draft needs to be published as well. Why has some WGs used references that was published almost a year later? By freezing it is meant that no new contributions of new or modified features. Unless stage 1 and 2 needs to be aligned. Freezing a spec means strict coverpage control with only essential corrections category F. A new case arises if we need to align to IETF,- is that essential correction ? The new RFC replacing a spec referenced need to go into the next release since it was never referenced. Another issue is what sort of completeness we give the 3 drafts from CN1 to Rel-5, 50% and 80% is the tresholds. How to do the big CRs (eg loose routing?) if we now goes under version control having the approval of CRs only in the TSGs,- interim versions ?

23.218 with Annex B as it is now should not be frozen? To demonstrate stability of IMS and that no missing issues were identified to be included in this stage 2 draft it was agreed to be frozen.

The freezing for 24.228 and 24.229 is not proposed for TSGN#15. But the stage 1s and stage 2s related to CN1 needs to be frozen.

References to IETF drafts:

There can be no references to IETF drafts which are not RFCs in a frozen 3GPP specifications. It should be noted that freezing is not the same thing as putting a TS under version control.

- If the referenced draft becomes an RFC in time then there is no problem
- Some drafts are expected to make it in time
- Some others are already foreseen to be late -> references to these can be either removed or the drafts can be annexed to 3GPP specification. Here it is proposed to do the latter.

- Proposal to remove callerprefs, session timer and SIP state drafts from 3GPP specifications.

Agreed decisions:

- 23.218 is proposed for approval in TSGN #15
- 24.228 is proposed for approval in TSGN #15
- 24.229 is proposed for approval in TSGN #15
- The rapporteurs volunteered to continue to maintain the 3 IMS specifications until June 2002 TSGN plenary
- All other CN1 specs are proposed for freezing for Rel-5 except for 24.228 and 24.229
- The proposal above includes freezing of 23.218. The necessary RFC numbers to replace the references to IETF drafts are not available at this time but are assumed to become available during TSGN #15. It was suggested that the references should be corrected during the plenary.

Additionally to that we need all the CN1 related stage 1s and stage 2s frozen ‘long’ before stage 3.

Conclusion : Agreed the list above

N1-020521 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Cx changes for I-CSCF

Discussion : Minor editorials,- the CR impacts 24.229 and not 24.228, and correction to "registration status query procedure" terminology.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020522 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Cx changes for S-CSCF

Discussion :

Conclusion : Withdrawn

N1-020536 : 24.228, Motorola, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.228: Adding Bandwidth parameter in SDP payload on session level to remaining flows (N1-020426)

Discussion : CR N1-020425 introduced bandwidth parameter to the SDP part of some call flows and this goes through the remaining call flows to do the same change systematically to all flows.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020537 : Motorola., Type: DISCUSSION, Title: SIP Compression

Discussion : Proposal to use SigComp from IETF ROHC group as the 'compression shim'.

Decisions on all of the related SIP compression documents (537-539, 548-549, 574):

Problems:

- IPR situation related with each proposal
- Default algorithm would make the transmission of the initial message more efficient
- downloading the algoritms across the radio interface
- negotiating the processing and memory constraints of the algorithms
- Not agreeing whether it shall be mandatory for the P-CSCF to support compression

Agreed the following:

- SigComp with UDVM is included in the working assumption
- Compression is mandatory for the UE

- Any potential default algorithm is FFS
- Any potential negotiation of another compression shim is FFS.

Conclusion : Noted

N1-020538 : 24.228, Motorola, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.228: SIP Compression

Discussion : In a related discussion contribution (N1-020537), the advantages of standardizing a mechanism whereby the UE can indicate its preference of compression shim [framework or integrated framework and algorithm] is introduced. In a related discussion contribution (N1-020537), the advantages of standardizing a mechanism whereby the UE can indicate its preference of compression shim [framework or integrated framework and algorithm] is introduced.

Conclusion : Noted

N1-020539 : 24.229, Motorola, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: SIP Compression

Discussion :

Conclusion : Noted

N1-020542 : Siemens, Type: INFO, Title: Description of the SigComp functionality

Discussion :

Conclusion : Not available

N1-020543 : 24.229 Siemens, Type: CR, Title: Proposed Changes to 24.229 on signalling compression

Discussion :

Conclusion : Not available

N1-020548 : Ericsson, Type: INFO, Title: ROHC WG report

Discussion : This document is intended as information to 3GPP about the status of the SIP signalling compression work in IETF. The paper presents the author's view of the current status of the work in the ROHC WG regarding SIP signalling compression. This document has been posted on the ROHC mailing list by the author, Jan Christoffersson; the feedback received from the WG has then been incorporated within the document.

ROHC group reports that they are aiming at getting their work ready for WG last call mid-March 2002. Extended SigComp is extensions to the basic mechanism which can be added later. The timeplan is that the 4 drafts will be bundled in one package,- the third bundle from IETF for Rel-5 schedule.

Conclusion : Noted

N1-020549 : 24.229, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: SigComp extended operation

Discussion : This document proposes to use the SigComp extended operation in 3GPP.

The performance figures were presented here. The first negotiation takes place before the first registration on the SigCom layer. Many questions and clarifications were handled.

Conclusion : Noted

N1-020551 : 24.228, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Change of 24.228 scope

Discussion : To better reflect this relationship between 24.228 and 24.229 it is proposed that the clauses 6 to 20 in 24.228 are moved to informative annex A and that the heading of annex A is changed to 'Example call flows'.

Why not clause 4 and 5 as well ? Due to GPRS interaction, but also here 24.229 takes presedence. MMO2 is objecting to this contribution. Prioritizing between 24.228 and 24.229 conflicts needs to be taken to plenary or change the scope in CN1 as responsibel of the TS's ? The majority sees the 24.228 as informative text. Clarifying the scope more clear that this TS is examples and that other ways of implementing exists and are specified in 24.229.

Conclusion : Revised to 616

N1-020616 : 24.228, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Change of 24.228 scope

Discussion : Not available.

Conclusion : Withdrawn

N1-020568 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: Original-Dialog-ID cleanup

Discussion : Clause 5.4.3.3 was a placeholder for the XML definition of the Original-Dialog-ID. Now that the definition exists in clause 7.6, the placeholder may be removed. Also, the references to Original-Dialog-ID need to be changed to point to clause 7.6 and use lower-case letters.

SIP Proxy should not be mandated to understand the XML body. But this depends on feedback from IETF etc. Some editorials were pointed out,- eg XML element. Note in 5.4.3.1 should become normative or replace shall with will ?

Conclusion : Revised to 617

N1-020617 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: Original-Dialog-ID cleanup

Discussion :

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020572 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: AS clause 5.7 cleanup

Discussion : 3GPP 24.229 contains 3 Application Server clauses in 5.7 that currently have no text (5.7.2, 5.7.3, 5.7.4). There should be pointers from these clauses to clause 5.7.5 to ensure the propagation of data within the SIP message bodies. Also, the cases of AS acting as originating UA or terminating UA are similar to one half of a B2BUA and can be referenced in that way. 545 is linked.

Does the term 'propagate' tell clearly enough what the AS shall do with the proxied or redirected message contents? Some content can be taken into the revision of 545, ie. into 618 (5.7.2 is colliding).

Conclusion : Noted

N1-020573 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Removal of INFO from 3GPP parts of specification

Discussion : While essentially editorial in nature, and with an intent to tidy up some of the loose areas of the specification, this contribution is dependent on the decision taken on the means of providing DTMF support. If DTMF support is provided using INFO, rather than the RTP method, then this contribution will require modification in order to provide the appropriate cleanup. Some of the proposals will however still be appropriate.

Do we need to mention methods not supported (N/A), or just treat them as unknown and not described. Otherwise a future method needs to be reflected in the specification also. Could INFO eg be used by the AS ? IETF specified methods not specified in 3GPP shall as a general rule (?) be included stating ‘not applicable’ was not agreeable. We need to investigate the SIP updates anyway for IMS impact or not.

Conclusion : Rejected

N1-020574 : 24.229, Nortel, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229 on SIP compression

Discussion : At the CN1 #22 meeting, it was agreed that the UE and P-CSCF shall support the capability to compress SIP messages. However, no decision was reached on whether a default algorithm should be mandated and if so, what the algorithm should be. This document proposes the UE and P-CSCF at a minimum support the UDVM framework and provides the changes to the SIP Compression clause in 24.229.

537-539, 548-549 and 574 are linked. Is a default algorithm like ‘deflate’ needed, eg for improving efficiency of the initial message(s) ? Not necessarily when the UDVM framework is adopted. But a negotiation is needed from the compressor for conveying capability parameters. Deletion of the dictionary depends on the algorithm. Should 3GPP standardize a minimum of algorithms be defined for the P-CSCF to implement ? How should a default algorithm be selected. Motorolas proposal has IPR rights connected. Nortel is proposing SigCom while Ericsson has the extended SigCom solution. Motorola is using a ‘wrapper’. Who should be responsibel on the IPR handling to understand the dependencies which likely will be there for any algorithm default selection. The existing text in 24.229 now is wrong, but it was heavily debated what to put in there with changing IETF drafts. The SIP compression clause 8 is already in the main body of the TS, so the proposal made on this is wrong.

Agreed issues are listed in 537.

Conclusion : Revised to 619

N1-020619 : 24.229, Nortel, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229 on SIP compression

Discussion : Is this showing the result of the 3 compression documents ? The intention was to have the common parts that were agreeable. A sentence saying that UE should support SigComp as a minimum should not have been removed. SigComp can not be agreed as the only compression. The normative text was the base for the merged contributions. The IPR rights should have been understood, and needs to be done in other standardization forums.

Conclusion : Revised to 660

N1-020660 : 24.229, Nortel, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229 on SIP compression

Discussion : Operator expressed wish for flexibility by writing 'at a minimum …..' as it was stated originally. One company objected that due to IPR concerns. AP put on Hannu to check: Must working assumptions need be changed regarding agreement on full concensus ?

Conclusion : Rejected

N1-020576 : 24.229, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Introduction of IMS in 24.229

Discussion : In order to be consistent with IMS stage1, IMS stage 2 as well as most other 3GPP specifications describing the IP multimedia core network subsystem, it is proposed to introduce the term IMS also in 24.229. Avoiding the term IMS in the stage 3 specification when the term is extensively used in most 3GPP specifications may lead to misunderstandings. As examples; 22.228, 23.207, 23.228, 23.278, 23.815, 32.225, 33.203 and 42.900 use the term IMS, many of the documents also as part of the title. Currently, the term IMS is not used within the text of 24.229, but in previous CN1 meetings the term IMS has been proposed used for convenience, but not agreed. As stated, currently the abbreviation IMS is not used within 24.229. Note that contribution N1-020495 proposes to use the term IMS to describe the IMS signalling.

Copying the existing definition of IMS to 24.229. The terminology is defined in 22.228. Even duplicated abbreviations for the same term was seen as benefitial by all except Lucent, using majority balance for use in the spec for defending IMS CN SS. And that 24.229 is consistently using 'IM CN subsystem'. Should the SA WGs stop using the term IMS also?

To put this in perspective, 22.228 v.5.2.0 uses 'IM CN subsystem' 7 times and 'IMS' 6 times. 23.228 also uses both terms with 'IM CN subsystem' being the more frequent one. But the title of 23.228 already contains 'IMS' so it is not possible to change this without withdrawing the whole 23.228 specification.

Conclusion : Rejected

N1-020579 : 24.228, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Corrections to call transfer procedures

Discussion : The current call transfer procedures assume that UE#2's S-CSCF (UE#2 initiates the call transfer – transferor) encrypts the transfer target's public user identity. However this functionality (if needed) shall remain in a hiding I-CSCF and clause 20 would be appropriate place to reflect it. In the scenarios present in clause 10, S-CSCF-2 shall only change the Refer-To header to include its own address. This is needed because of charging purposes.

Refer-To header is not tokenized or ? More time needed for checking this late contribution.

Conclusion : Not treated due to time

N1-020583 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Min-Expires header

Discussion : 494 and 583 are related. This contribution analyses the various SIP drafts, and identifies the SIP requirements for the Min-Expires header. It then identifies the values that need to be inserted in the profile tables of 24.229 regarding this header. This header has only recently been created in the bis-draft. This contribution assumes that changes relating to the events draft have been incorporated. If agreement to incorporate these changes is not made, then this contribution will require revision.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020584 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Reply-To header

Discussion : This contribution analyses the various SIP drafts, and identifies the SIP requirements for the Reply-To header. It then identifies the values that need to be inserted in the profile tables of 24.229 regarding this header. This header has only recently been created in the bis-draft. This contribution assumes that changes relating to the events draft have been incorporated. If agreement to incorporate these changes is not made, then this contribution will require revision.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020585 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Treatment of IETF draft references - manyfolks draft

Discussion : Due to unify draft, loose routing etc. the IETF drafts in 585 to 588 is not expected to be stable. If however the CN1 drafts are expected to be freezed, the IETF drafts need to be annexed (equals frozen reference status), not if they only go to formal approval. CN1 found it too early to annex any IETF drafts now. For manyfolks draft versus unify draft it is not possible to evaluate since they are not formally available. 23.218 do not reference any other draft than what is in the package 1 from IETF in March.

AP on Hannu to take this to CN1 status report to plenary,- basis for the decisions for N1-020585-588:

- Annexing the current drafts to the 3GPP specifications would cause the 3GPP specifications to be fixed to the current latest versions of IETF drafts.
- It would be too early to do this because the referenced IETF drafts are not stable enough.
- It is impossible to even evaluate the current situation regarding the manyfolks vs. unify drafts because they are formally not available.

What is the latest news of the future, if any, of the manyfolks draft 04?

Proposal to annex the manyfolks (03) draft to 24.229.

Conclusion : Rejected

N1-020586 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Treatment of IETF draft references - call authorization draft

Discussion :

Conclusion : Rejected

N1-020587 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Treatment of IETF draft references - privacy draft

Discussion :

Conclusion : Rejected

N1-020588 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Treatment of IETF draft references - refer draft

Discussion :

Conclusion : Rejected

N1-020589 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Revision of status-code tables

Discussion :

Conclusion : Not available

N1-020590 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Replacement of sdp-new references by SDP RFC and sdp-ipv6 references

Discussion :

Conclusion : Not available

N1-020608 : Vodafone, Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Use of R99 USIM for IMS - Deriving IMS identities from existing 3GPP identities

Discussion :

Conclusion : Not treated due to time

8.11 IMS Editorials and other minor issues

No presentations in this chapter:

N1-020472 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Editorial and minor technical changes - annex A (profile tables)

Discussion :

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020473 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Minor technical and editorial corrections to TS24.229

Discussion :

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020510 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Impact of incorporation of 100 rel draft in bis draft

Discussion : Revised without presentation.

Conclusion : Revised to 615

N1-020615 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Impact of incorporation of 100 rel draft in bis draft

Discussion :

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020511 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Deletion of Annex B

Discussion :

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020512 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Deletion of Annex C

Discussion : Anything that should be remembered goes to open issue list document.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020518 : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 23.218: Minor editorial changes

Discussion :

Conclusion : Not available

N1-020530 : 24.228, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.228: Minor editorial changes

Discussion :

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020540 : 24.228, Motorola, Type: CR, Title: CR to24.228: 24.228 technical consistency review changes

Discussion :

Conclusion : Not available

N1-020564 : 23.218, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: Cleanup and editorial corrections to TS 23.218

Discussion : Revised to 565 before the meeting.

Conclusion : Withdrawn

N1-020565 : 23.218, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: Cleanup and editorial corrections to TS 23.218

Discussion : In eg clause 6.3,- duplication and the use of 'shall' in stage 2 should be avoided. Some requirements on filter criteria data deletion with implementation aspects in eg 5.2 ? Comments are welcomed to the revision.

Conclusion : Revised to 653

N1-020653 : 23.218, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: Cleanup and editorial corrections to TS 23.218

Discussion :

Conclusion : Agreed

8.12 IMS: 23.218

N1-020480 : 23.218, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: 23.218 Usage of Filter Criteria

Discussion : 480 and 567 are alternative proposals. This paper proposes a more detailed defintion and description of Filter Criteria in 24.228. Currently the content of 23.218 is not consistent regarding filter criteria. There are several definitions which are related, but currently it is not shown how they are interconnected.

How to prevent re-triggering ? Due to priority and always going to the next in sequence one by one. SPI should not include NOTIFY. Difference between SPI and trigger point ? Trigger points is pointing to the SPIs defined. HSS just stores and pass the 'Service-Info'. AS can not stop/interrupt or change S-CSCF checking the filter criteria, but can terminate the call. All filter criterias need to be executed correctly as long as R-URI matches. Optional Service Information equals the transparent container which should hide example like IMSI,- delete the bracket example, give all examples or make it clear that this is an example. 6.8.2 last sentence and word is an editorial mistake.

CN4 will be informed in TSGN#15 by Hannus status report that the approach in 480 is the working assumption. Additionally a LS OUT to CN4 was requested to inform of this agreed CR.

Conclusion : Revised to 637 and a LS OUT in 638 by Georg

N1-020637 : 23.218, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: 23.218 Usage of Filter Criteria

Discussion : Hannu to report in CN1 status report to TSGN plenary that CN4 should look at this part of 23.218 work and to produce their part of Cx interface specification.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020488 : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: 24.229 Setting of From header

Discussion :

Conclusion : Not available

N1-020489 : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: 24.229 Setting of To header

Discussion :

Conclusion : Not available

N1-020508 : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 23.218: Text update for Transcoding example

Discussion : Annex B, clause B.5 contains two call flow examples for transcoding. Notes need to be added after the diagrams. The picture is not changed.

The text in 20-23 needs some tidy up of words. Use this CR or what is already included in 620 on the same topic.

Conclusion : Rejected

N1-020528 : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 23.218: Charging in S-CSCF

Discussion : A conference call was held with a number of CN1 delegates on the 6th of February, 2002 to discuss the charging correlation information to pass in SIP messages. The contribution captures the concluded the functional requirements for S-CSCF involved in IMS charging.

The stage 2 should not deal with messages,- as is proposed here. But the term 'may' (receive GPRS CID) needs to be replaced with eg 'shall'. Some clarification on the CDR generation was asked for. No change to the figure. Wrong CDR definition.

Conclusion : Revised to 606

N1-020606 : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 23.218: Charging in S-CSCF

Discussion : One more 'shall'.

Conclusion : Revised to 661

N1-020661 : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 23.218: Charging in S-CSCF

Discussion :

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020529 : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 23.218: Dealing with Clause 5, 9 and 10

Discussion : In clause 5 of 23.218, the description about SCIM is not clear and leads some misunderstanding. In clause 9, the first editor's note can be improved to be the formal text. In clause 10, also, the editor's note can be converted as the formal text to improve this specification.

The discussion around SCIM and eventual relation to AS and SIP AS was lengthy and if the text reflects the architectural figure as also found in 23.228. Delete chapter 10 or not ?

Conclusion : Revised to 632

N1-020632 : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 23.218: Dealing with Clause 5, 9 and 10

Discussion : Not available.

Conclusion : Withdrawn

N1-020531 : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 23.218: Handling charging in application server

Discussion : Similar to 528.

Conclusion : Revised to 607

N1-020607 : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 23.218: Handling charging in application server

Discussion :

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020532 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Accept header

Discussion :

Conclusion : Not available

N1-020533 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Accept-Encoding header

Discussion :

Conclusion : Not available

N1-020534 : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Accept-Language header

Discussion :

Conclusion : Not available

N1-020558 : 23.218, Dynamicsoft, Hutchison 3G, Type: CR, Title: Addition to 23.218 of Informative Annex A: Scalability Issues to be considered for IMS service provision

Discussion : During our deliberations on 23.218 we have identified a number of scalability issues regarding the architecture for IP multimedia service provision and have identified a number of approaches to minimise them. This contribution proposes that some Annex A be made informative and contain some informative text to provide this essential information to the Application architecture developer.

Seen as helpfull for readers. Other comments is that the 'AS' nodes to the other side of the unspecified interfaces is not 3GPP specified. The Si could be indicated ? Could a dotted cloud to the right solve the many comments ?

Conclusion : Revised to 633

N1-020633 : 23.218, Dynamicsoft, Hutchison 3G, Type: CR, Title: Addition to 23.218 of Informative Annex A: Scalability Issues to be considered for IMS service provision

Discussion : Linked to 667 (terminology on external (AS?) server nodes).

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020559 : 23.218, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: Reorganization of Annex B and addition of missing examples for Originating UA and Terminating UA modes to Annex B: Voice Mail service

Discussion : Revised without presentation.

Conclusion : Revised to 620

N1-020620 : 23.218, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: Reorganization of Annex B and addition of missing examples for Originating UA and Terminating UA modes to Annex B: Voice Mail

Discussion : Annex B contains some information flows for some example services, however flows that show the Application Server Originating UA and Terminating UA modes of operation are missing and there is currently no example showing the Third Party Registration procedure. This contribution adds these examples through the use of example flows for a voicemail service. In addition Annex B contains an example of Filter Criteria Triggering, which is not part of an example service flow and therefore does not fit well in this Annex. It is proposed to move this to a new Annex C. This contribution also corrects the existing MRFC flows in Annex B to conform to the unify draft.

(title!) B.3.1 is not the recording of absent user message. Moves filter criteria triggering to a separate informative annex C and adds announcement call flows to annex B. Comments received offline earlier on SDP usage was not incorporated. Just an example.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020560 : 23.218, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: S-CSCF Handling of Subscription and Notification

Discussion : The S-CSCF supports subscription to and notification of registration events by the P-CSCF and Application Servers. This contribution proposes some text for section 6.7 of 23.218 defining this behaviour.

Discussion on what is mandatory and multipel Public IDs in the NOTIFY. First sentence with 'shall' in a stage 2 is softened. Correct the reference, - and removal of P-CSCF ?

Conclusion : Revised to 634

N1-020634 : 23.218, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: S-CSCF Handling of Subscription and Notification

Discussion : The rapporteur to correct the reference in place of xx.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020562 : 23.218, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: Addition of Public User Identity to S-CSCF address resolution function to Sh interface in 23.218

Discussion : CN4 to decide to have one or in separate operations on downloading the User profile and S-CSCF address. But the AS already know the S-CSCF address at this stage,- but what with the Push service ? The SA2 is discussing the same issues and CN1 can not decide now, so this is only informational today.

Conclusion : Revised to 639

N1-020639 : 23.218, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: Addition of Public User Identity to S-CSCF address resolution function to Sh interface in 23.218

Discussion :

Conclusion : Rejected

N1-020563 : 23.218, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: Overview of MRFC Functionality in clause 8 of 23.218

Discussion : Added text for clause 8.1.1 to describe MFRC. Proposal to delete the second paragraph in 8.1.1 as it has not been generally discussed and it will be a CR on this issue in the next meeting. The deleted 3 sentences is kept unchanged in the overview.

Conclusion : Revised to 635

N1-020635 : 23.218, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: Overview of MRFC Functionality in clause 8 of 23.218

Discussion : Preagreed,- but opened. Instead of some explanatory words in 8.1.1 a reference should have been better.

Conclusion : Revised to 662

N1-020662 : 23.218, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: Overview of MRFC Functionality in clause 8 of 23.218

Discussion : Editorials,- rapporteur ?

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020566 : 23.218, NEC, Type: CR, Title: Clarifications and correction to 23.218:Functional Architecture

Discussion : Revised to 592 before the meeting.

Conclusion : Withdrawn

N1-020592 : 23.218, NEC, Type: CR, Title: Clarifications and correction to 23.218:Functional Architecture

Discussion : According to TS 23.228 [2], there is no clear description about the case where the service platform is externally located from the home network. On the other hand, TS23.218 is assumed to apply to the interaction between S-CSCF and Application server in the same manner as internal service platform when the application server platform is located externally. Therefore, it is proposed to describe that in this release one SIP Application Server which communicate with the same ISC interface as internal service platform may act as a gateway function for the external service platform.

Is such an external service platform within the scope of the 3GPP specification? One Gateway AS towards multipel external (to 3GPP (or home network?)) application servers (platforms ?). Wordings to be modified.

Conclusion : Revised to 636

N1-020636 : 23.218, NEC, Type: CR, Title: Clarifications and correction to 23.218:Functional Architecture

Discussion : Modifications to words on external node.

Conclusion : Revised to 663

N1-020663 : 23.218, NEC, Type: CR, Title: Clarifications and correction to 23.218:Functional Architecture

Discussion : No presentation.

Conclusion : Revised to 667

N1-020667 : 23.218, NEC, Type: CR, Title: Clarifications and correction to 23.218:Functional Architecture

Discussion : Linked to 633. The rapporteur is asked to replace 'service platform' with 'other application servers (external)'.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020567 : 23.218, NEC, Type: CR, Title: Clarifications and correction to 23.218:AS Filter Criteria

Discussion : 480 and 567 are alternative proposals. This contribution proposes some clarifications for filter criteria to the TS 23.218. Current section 5.2 (Servie Interaction with IP Multimedia Subsystem) does not describe clearly the defintion of service points of interest, filter criteria, etc. A proposal is described.

Most other companies favored to use 480 as working assumptions, since 567 seems covered in 480 including some more flexibility.

Conclusion : Noted

N1-020609 : 23.218, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: Addition of Public User Identity to S-CSCF address resolution function to Sh interface in 23.218

Discussion :

Conclusion : Not treated due to time

N1-020640 : 23.218, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: SA2 contribution on the Sh interface

Discussion : S2 doc just for information and related to 639.

Conclusion : Not treated due to time

N1-020486 : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: 24.229 Editor's Notes and unnecessary Clauses

Discussion : What is the agenda item for this ?

Conclusion : Not available

9 LS OUT (output liaison statements)

N1-020601 : Kevan, Type: LS OUT , **To:** SA3 **Cc:** Title: [DRAFT] Reply Liaison Statement on Registrations without user authentication and Identity Spoofing

Discussion : Linked to 597. Last sentence in the action created debate for revision. Ignore is what,- discard or passing on?

Conclusion : Revised to665

N1-020665 : Kevan, Type: LS OUT , **To:** SA3 **Cc:** Title: Reply Liaison Statement on Registrations without user authentication and Identity Spoofing

Discussion : Linked to 597.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020610 : Eric, Type: LS OUT , **To:** SA2, SA4, CN3, RAN2, GERAN **Cc:** Title: Liaison Statement on DTMF

Discussion : Take away the phrase saying DTMF is bearer data. Avoid saying it is to the IMS network. AMR frametype to be evaluated ? Listing comprehensive reasons for not using INFO etc.?

Conclusion : Revised to 654

N1-020654 : Eric, Type: LS OUT , **To:** SA2, SA4, CN3, RAN2, GERAN2 **Cc:** Title: Liaison Statement on DTMF

Discussion : Editorials mostly.

Conclusion : Revised to 666

N1-020666 : Eric, Type: LS OUT , **To:** SA2, SA4, CN3, RAN2, GERAN2 **Cc:** Title: Liaison Statement on DTMF
Discussion :

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020638 : Georg, Type: LS OUT , **To:** CN4, **Cc:** Title: [DRAFT] Liaison statement on the definition and usage of Filter Criteria
Discussion : Related to 637. Some modifications edited online.

Conclusion : Revised to 664

N1-020664 : Georg, Type: LS OUT,**To:** CN4**Cc:** Title: Liaison statement on the definition and usage of Filter Criteria
Discussion : Related to 637.

Conclusion : Agreed

N1-020648 : Sofie, Type: LS OUT , **To:** SA2 **Cc:** CN4 Title: Liaison Statement on PSTN/CS domain originated call
Discussion : Related to 593.

Conclusion : Agreed

10 Late and misplaced documents

This agenda item is for the chairmans temporary placement during the meeting, while in this document those not handled are mostly marked 'Not treated due to time' as conclusion, but could also be concluded with 'Not available'.

11 Any Other Business (AOB)

N1-020672 : Chairman, Type: SPARE, Title: Cold facts

Discussion : Brought in for 'heating'.

Conclusion : Noted

12 Closing of the meeting

18:00 Friday 22.02.2002

Review of dates and hosts for future meetings

A SIP adhoc meeting between April and May meeting was seen needed, and Keith Drage from Lucent is mediator of fixing dates,- and HOST is NEEDED. The meeting can not make decisions but only brought enbloc to the CN1#24 meeting for delegates to object docs without individual tdoc presentations of the enbloc package.

Meeting schedule for CN1 in 2002

3GPP Meeting	Date	Place	Host
N1-SIP-adhoc0102	14-18 January 2002	Phoenix, USA	ATTWS
N1#22	28 January-1 February 2002	Sophia Antipolis, France	ETSI
N1#22bis	19-21 February 2002	Oulu, Finland	Elisa Communications, Finnet, Nokia, Sonera, Viestintävirasto

TSGN#15	**6-8 March 2002**	**Korea**	**TTA**
N1#23	8-12 April 2002	Fort Lauderdale, FL, USA	**NA 'Friends of 3GPP'**
N1#24	13-17 May 2002	Amsterdam, Holland	Ericsson
TSGN#16	**5-7 June 2002**	**Marco Island, FL?, USA**	**Motorola**
N1#25	29.July-2.August 2002	Helsinki, Finland	Sonera
TSGN#17	**4-6 September 2002**	**France**	**Alcatel**
N1#26	23-27 September 2002	USA	?
N1#27	11-15 November 2002	Asia	?
TSGN#18	**4-6 December 2002**	**New Orleans ?, USA**	**NA 'Friends of 3GPP'**

Annex A Joint meeting report CN1-2-3-4

No joint meeting took place in this meeting.

Annex B List of participants

Member of 3GPP (ETSI)

Mrs. Sophie Aveline 55 22 23 10	ORANGE FRANCE sophie.aveline@rd.francetelecom.com	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	FR	+33 1
Mr. Gabor Bajko	NOKIA Corporation +36209849259	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) gabor.bajko@nokia.com	HU	
Mr. Xin Chen	Lucent Technologies N. S. UK +441793883137	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) xchen2@lucent.com	GB	
Mr. Sunil Chotai 473 605603	mmO2 plc sunil.chotai@O2.com	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	GB	+44 1
Miss Tao Cui 7138492	TELIA AB Tao.A.Cui@telia.se	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	SE	+46 8
Mr. Francois-Xavier Derome 307 738 34	ALCATEL S.A. francois-xavier.derome@alcatel.fr	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	FR	+33 1
Mr. Keith Drage 1793 776249	Lucent Technologies N. S. UK drage@lucent.com	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	GB	+44
Mr. Miguel Garcia-Martin 40 514 0002	ERICSSON L.M. miguel.a.garcia@ericsson.com	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	FI	+358
Mr. Hannu Hietalahti 40 502 1724	NOKIA Corporation hannu.hietalahti@nokia.com	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	FI	+358
Mr. Kevan Hobbis 7790 771069	Hutchison 3G UK Limited Kevan.Hobbis@hutchison.com	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	GB	+44
Mr. Michel Houde 514 345 2759	ERICSSON L.M. lmcmiho@LMC.ERICSSON.SE	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	SE	+1
Ms. Jane D Humphrey 1202 853757	MARCONI COMMUNICATIONS jane.humphrey@marconi.com	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	GB	+44

Mr. Dieter Jacobsohn 228 936 3361	T-MOBILE DEUTSCHLAND Dieter.Jacobsohn@t-mobil.de	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	DE	+49
Mr. Henri Korhonen 44 299 2465	ERICSSON L.M. Henri.Korhonen@ericsson.fi	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	FI	+358
Mr. Georg Mayer 89 722 33114	SIEMENS AG georg.mayer@icn.siemens.de	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	DE	+49
Mr. Duncan Mills 1635 676074	VODAFONE Group Plc duncan.mills@vf.vodafone.co.uk	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	GB	+44
Mr. Atle Monrad 372 93 665	ERICSSON L.M. atle.monrad@ericsson.com	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	NO	+47
Mr. John O'Hare 21 429 0061	MOTOROLA S.A. oharej@cork.cig.mot.com	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	IE	+353
Mr. Roberto Procopio 011 228 5061	TELECOM ITALIA S.p.A. roberto.procopio@tilab.com	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	IT	+39
Member of 3GPP (T1)				
Mr. Andrew Allen 972 473 5507	dynamicsoft Inc. aallen@dynamicsoft.com	3GPPMEMBER (T1)	US	+1
Mrs. Sonia Garapaty 972 6855110	Nortel Networks sonia.garapaty@nortelnetworks.com	3GPPMEMBER (T1)	US	+1
Mr. Eric Henrikson 425 497 2442	Lucent Technologies ehenrikson@lucent.com	3GPPMEMBER (T1)	US	+1
Mr. Milo Orsic 630 713 5161	Lucent Technologies N. S. UK orsic@lucent.com	3GPPMEMBER (T1)	US	+1
Member of 3GPP (TTC)				
Mr. Yukio Kawanami	NEC Corporation +81471857158	3GPPMEMBER (TTC) kawanami@cj.jp.nec.com	JP	
Organisation partner representative (ETSI)				
Mr. Per Johan Jorgensen 92 94 42 31	Mobile Competence Centre jorgensen@etsi.fr		FR	+33 4

Annex C Agreed CRs

None

CRs for e-mail agreement

None

Documents Endorsed by N1

None

Annex D Tdoc list (incl. the status)

Agenda	TDoc #	Tdoc Title	Source	Spec	WI	C_Version	Rel	Type	Comments	Status
3	N1-020435	Liaison on Message Information Flows for the Distribution of the Charging Correlation Information.	SA2					LS IN	S2-020266, To: SA5, CN1. Forwarded from CN1#22	NOTED
2	N1-020457	Oulu0202	Chairman					AGENDA		AGREED
4	N1-020458	Latest workplan for review	MCC					WORK PLAN	See agreed decisions in the minutes	AGREED
8.01	N1-020459	Current draft 24.229: "IP Multimedia Call Control Protocol based on SIP and SDP"	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	TS	Revised to 569 before the meeting.	WITHDRAWN
8.01	N1-020460	Summary of current IETF documents on SIP	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage		IMS-CCR		Rel-5	DISC		NOTED
8.01	N1-020461	Summary of current IETF documents on SIPPING	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage		IMS-CCR		Rel-5	DISC		NOTED
8.01	N1-020462	Summary of current IETF documents on MMUSIC	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage		IMS-CCR		Rel-5	DISC		NOTED
8.01	N1-020463	Summary of current IETF documents on SIMPLE	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage		IMS-CCR		Rel-5	DISC		NOTED
8.10	N1-020464	CR to 24.229: Separation of clause 9 into UE and GGSN procedures	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 626
8.10	N1-020465	CR to 24.229: Inclusion of the Events draft in profile tables	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 602
8.10	N1-020466	CR to 24.229: Valid responses to CANCEL in profile tables	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		AGREED
8.10	N1-020467	CR to 24.229: Introductory text giving the status of Annex A	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 603
8.10	N1-020468	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Server header	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		AGREED
8.10	N1-020469	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Error-Info header	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		AGREED
8.10	N1-020470	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the	Lucent Technolog	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 604

		Retry-After header	ies / Keith Drage							
8.10	N1-020471	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Content-Disposition header	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		Not available
8.11	N1-020472	CR to 24.229: Editorial and minor technical changes - annex A (profile tables)	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		AGREED
8.11	N1-020473	CR to 24.229: Minor technical and editorial corrections to TS24.229	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		AGREED
8.07	N1-020474	Routing in IMS	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor		IMS-CCR			DISC		NOTED
8.06	N1-020475	Using the RPI to signal Integrity protection	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		POSTPONED
8.06	N1-020476	Correction to authentication	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 658
8.07	N1-020477	Routing in IMS	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 625
8.09	N1-020478	24.229 P-CSCF Network initiated call release	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 650
8.09	N1-020479	24.229 S-CSCF Network initiated call release	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 651
8.12	N1-020480	23.218 Usage of Filter Criteria	Siemens / Georg Mayer	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 637
8.04	N1-020481	24.229 S-CSCF Registration / Authentication	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		Not available
8.04	N1-020482	24.229 P-CSCF Registration / Authentication	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		Not available
8.04	N1-020483	24.229 UE Registration / Authentication	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		Not available
8.04	N1-020484	24.229 Registration State Event Package	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		Not available
8.04	N1-020485	24.229 S-CSCF Access Authorization to Registration State Event Package	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		Not available
8.13	N1-020486	24.229 Editor's Notes and unnecessary Clauses	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		Not available
8.08	N1-020487	24.229 I-CSCF default S-CSCF assignment	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		Not available
8.12	N1-020488	24.229 Setting of From header	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		Not available

8.12	N1-020489	24.229 Setting of To header	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		Not available
8.07	N1-020490	24228: Terminating flows based on Contact, non hiding	Ericsson/ M. Garcia	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 621
8.07	N1-020491	24228: Terminating flows based on Contact, hiding	Ericsson/ M. Garcia	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 622
8.07	N1-020492	24.229: Terminating procedures	Ericsson/ M. Garcia	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 623
8.03	N1-020493	Usage of PCO for IMS registration	Ericsson/A. Monrad	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		Merged to 626
8.03	N1-020494	Registration procedure in the UE	Ericsson/A. Monrad	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 627
8.07	N1-020495	Usage of user plane and control plane	Ericsson/A. Monrad	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 643
8.07	N1-020496	Compression in the UE	Ericsson/A. Monrad	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		Not available
8.10	N1-020497	Charging Information	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson		IMS-CCR		Rel-5	DISC		NOTED
8.10	N1-020498	CR for 24.229: Charging Information	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 605
8.10	N1-020499	DTMF	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson		IMS-CCR		Rel-5	DISC		Noted and LS OUT in 610 by Eric
8.10	N1-020500	CR for 24.229: DTMF and MGCF	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		AGREED
8.10	N1-020501	CR for 24.229: MRFC Tones/Announcements	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 611
8.10	N1-020502	CR for 24.229: MRFC Ad Hoc Conferencing	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 612
8.10	N1-020503	CR for 24.229: MRFC Transcoding	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 613
8.10	N1-020504	CR for 24.229: OPTIONS for MRFC	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		AGREED
8.10	N1-020505	CR for 24.229: OPTIONS for MGCF	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 614
8.10	N1-020506	CR for 24.229: Call Transfer and MGCF	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REJECTED
8.10	N1-020507	CR for 24.229: Hold/Resume with MGCF	Lucent Technolog	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		AGREED

			ies / Eric Henrikson							
8.12	N1-020508	CR for 23.218: Text update for Transcoding example	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REJECTED
8.03	N1-020509	CR for 24.229: Message body for 3rd party REGISTER	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 628
8.11	N1-020510	CR to 24.229: Impact of incorporation of 100 rel draft in bis draft	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised without presentation.	REVISED TO 615
8.11	N1-020511	CR to 24.229: Deletion of Annex B	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		AGREED
8.11	N1-020512	CR to 24.229: Deletion of Annex C	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		AGREED
4	N1-020513	Advancement of 3GPP TS 24.228 to Version 2.0.0	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	WORK PLAN		AGREED
4	N1-020514	Advancement of 3GPP TS 23.218 to Version 2.0.0	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	WORK PLAN		AGREED
4	N1-020515	Advancement of 3GPP TS 24.229 to Version 2.0.0	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	WORK PLAN		AGREED
8.10	N1-020516	CR to 24.229: Treatment of IETF draft references	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	See the minutes for the agreed decision list.	AGREED
8.07	N1-020517	CR to 24.229: Use of identification fields in the UA	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 645
8.11	N1-020518	CR to 23.218: Minor editorial changes	Lucent Technologies / Xin Chen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		Not available
8.04	N1-020519	CR to 24.228: Cx Deregistration	Lucent Technologies / Xin Chen	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 631
8.07	N1-020520	CR to 24.228: Cx Session Initiation	Lucent Technologies / Xin Chen	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	CR		AGREED
8.10	N1-020521	CR to 24.229: Cx changes for I-CSCF	Lucent Technologies / Xin Chen	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	CR		AGREED
8.10	N1-020522	CR to 24.229: Cx changes for S-CSCF	Lucent Technologies / Xin	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	CR		WITHDRAWN

			Chen							
3	N1-020523	IMS Security requirements	SA1					LS IN	S1-020300, To: SA3 Cc: SA2, T2, CN1, GERAN	NOTED
8.03	N1-020524	CR to 24.228: Initial Registration - minor modifications	Lucent Techologies / Milo Orsic	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 629
8.03	N1-020525	CR to 24.228: Optional steps in reregistration	Lucent Techologies / Milo Orsic	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 630
8.07	N1-020526	CR to 24.229: Bandwidth for non-RTP streams	Lucent Techologies / Milo Orsic	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 646
8.07	N1-020527	CR to 24.229: SDP profile	Lucent Techologies / Milo Orsic	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		NOTED
8.12	N1-020528	CR to 23.218: Charging in S-CSCF	Lucent Technologies / Xin Chen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 606
8.12	N1-020529	CR to 23.218: Dealing with Clause 5, 9 and 10	Lucent Technologies / Xin Chen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 632
8.11	N1-020530	CR to 24.228: Minor editorial changes	Lucent Technologies / Xin Chen	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	CR		AGREED
8.12	N1-020531	CR to 23.218: Handling charging in application server	Lucent Technologies / Xin Chen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 607
8.12	N1-020532	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Accept header	Lucent Technologies / Xiao Yan He	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		Not available
8.12	N1-020533	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Accept-Encoding header	Lucent Technologies / Xiao Yan He	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		Not available
8.12	N1-020534	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Accept-Language header	Lucent Technologies / Xiao Yan He	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		Not available
8.01	N1-020535	24.228v1.10.0 "Signalling flows for the IP multimedia call controlbased on SIP and SDP"	Motorola / John O'Hare	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	TS		NOTED
8.10	N1-020536	CR to 24.228: Adding Bandwidth parameter in SDP payload on session level to remaining flows (N1-020426)	Motorola, Nokia / John O'Hare	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	CR		AGREED
8.10	N1-020537	SIP Compression	Motorola / John O'Hare	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	DISC		NOTED

8.10	N1-020538	CR to 24.228: SIP Compression	Motorola / John O'Hare	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	CR		NOTED
8.10	N1-020539	CR to 24.229: SIP Compression	Motorola / John O'Hare	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	DISC		NOTED
8.11	N1-020540	CR to24.228: 24.228 technical consistency review changes	Motorola et all / John O'Hare	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	CR		Not available
4	N1-020541	CN1 IMS open items list	Chairman					WORK PLAN		NOTED
8.10	N1-020542	Description of the SigComp functionality	Siemens / Mark					INFO		Not available
8.10	N1-020543	Proposed Changes to 24.229 on signalling compression	Siemens / Mark	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		Not available
8.06	N1-020544	Authentication failure scenarios	H3g	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 642
8.09	N1-020545	SCSCF Interaction with AS	H3g	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 618
2	N1-020546	Report on conclusions and assumptions from DTMF conference call	H3g		IMS-CCR			DISC		NOTED
8.06	N1-020547	Authentication text duplication clean up	H3g	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 642
8.10	N1-020548	ROHC WG report	Ericsson/ M. Garcia					INFO		NOTED
8.10	N1-020549	SigComp extended operation	Ericsson/ M. Garcia	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		NOTED
8.07	N1-020550	24.229: Emergency sessions	Ericsson/ M. Garcia	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 647
8.10	N1-020551	Change of 24.228 scope	Nokia / Hannu Hietalahti	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 616
8.01	N1-020552	3GPP TS 23.218 V1.2.0IP Multimedia (IM) Session Handling;IP Multimedia (IM) call model	dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	TS		NOTED
8.03	N1-020553	Use of the Remote-Party-ID for informing the S-CSCF that the Register Request was Integrity Protected	dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	CR		POSTPONED
8.03	N1-020554	Remote Party ID P-CSCF and S-CSCF procedures for 24.229	dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.1	Rel-5	CR		POSTPONED
8.09	N1-020555	UE implementation of Record-Route and Route headers	dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.1	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 652
8.07	N1-020556	Use of TO and FROM headers	dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	DISC		NOTED
8.07	N1-020557	Use of the Cookie Header mechanism	dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	DISC	Revised to 599 before the meeting.	WITHDRAWN
8.12	N1-020558	Addition to 23.218 of Informative Annex A: Scalability Issues to be considered for IMS service	dynamicsoft,Hutchison 3G Andrew	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 633

		provision	Allen							
8.12	N1-020559	Reorganization of Annex B and addition of missing examples for Originating UA and Terminating UA modes to Annex B: Voice Mail service	dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 620
8.12	N1-020560	S-CSCF Handling of Subscription and Notification	dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 634
2	N1-020561	Revising TS 23.218 to V2.0.0 and sending to CN#15 for Approval	dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		NOTED
8.12	N1-020562	Addition of Public User Identity to S-CSCF address resolution function to Sh interface in 23.218	dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 639
8.12	N1-020563	Overview of MRFC Functionality in clause 8 of 23.218	dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 635
8.11	N1-020564	Cleanup and editorial corrections to TS 23.218	dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised to 565 before the meeting.	WITHDRAWN
8.11	N1-020565	Cleanup and editorial corrections to TS 23.218	dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 564	REVISED TO 653
8.12	N1-020566	Clarifications and correction to 23.218:Functional Architecture	NEC/Yukio Kawanami	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel 5	CR	Revised to 592 before the meeting.	WITHDRAWN
8.12	N1-020567	Clarifications and correction to 23.218:AS Filter Criteria	NEC/Yukio Kawanami	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel 5	CR		NOTED
8.10	N1-020568	CR for 24.229: Original-Dialog-ID cleanup	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.1	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 617
8.01	N1-020569	Current draft 24.229: "IP Multimedia Call Control Protocol based on SIP and SDP"	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.1	Rel-5	TS	Revised from 459	NOTED
8.07	N1-020570	CR to 24.228: Handling of Contact header by the S-CSCF and P-CSCF	Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	CR		REJECTED
8.07	N1-020571	CR to 24.229: Handling of Contact header by the S-CSCF and P-CSCF	Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.1	Rel-5	CR		REJECTED
8.10	N1-020572	CR for 24.229: AS clause 5.7 cleanup	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.1	Rel-5	CR		NOTED
8.10	N1-020573	CR to 24.229: Removal of INFO from 3GPP parts of specification	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.1	Rel-5	CR		REJECTED
8.10	N1-020574	CR to 24.229 on SIP compression	Nortel Networks/ Sonia Garapaty	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.1	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 619

8.03	N1-020575	CR to 24.228 - Removal of Public User Identity from Cx Authentication Request	Duncan Mills / Vodafone	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	CR		WITHDRAWN
8.10	N1-020576	Introduction of IMS in 24.229	Ericsson/A. Monrad	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REJECTED
8.07	N1-020577	Introduction of the changes proposed in the "unify" draft	Nokia/ Krisztián Kiss		IMS-CCR		Rel-5	DISC		NOTED
8.07	N1-020578	Changing To: and From: to Anonymous	Nokia/ Krisztián Kiss	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 644
8.10	N1-020579	Corrections to call transfer procedures	Nokia/ Krisztian Kiss	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	CR		Not treated due to time
8.07	N1-020580	Loose routing in 24.229	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised to 600 before the meeting.	WITHDRAWN
3	N1-020581	LS on “Authentication reattempts”	SA3					LS IN	S3z020044, To: CN1	NOTED
3	N1-020582	LS on “Transport of IMS-AKA Material”	SA3					LS IN	S3z020045, To: CN1, CN4	NOTED
8.10	N1-020583	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Min-Expires header	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.1	Rel-5	CR		AGREED
8.10	N1-020584	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Reply-To header	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.1	Rel-5	CR		AGREED
8.10	N1-020585	CR to 24.229: Treatment of IETF draft references - manyfolks draft	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.1	Rel-5	CR		REJECTED
8.10	N1-020586	CR to 24.229: Treatment of IETF draft references - call authorization draft	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.1	Rel-5	CR		REJECTED
8.10	N1-020587	CR to 24.229: Treatment of IETF draft references - privacy draft	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.1	Rel-5	CR		REJECTED
8.10	N1-020588	CR to 24.229: Treatment of IETF draft references - refer draft	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.1	Rel-5	CR		REJECTED
8.10	N1-020589	CR to 24.229: Revision of status-code tables	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.1	Rel-5	CR		Not available
8.10	N1-020590	CR to 24.229: Replacement of sdp-new references by SDP RFC and sdp-ipv6 references	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.1	Rel-5	CR		Not available
8.07	N1-020591	CR to 24.229: Reinstatement of text relating to Record-Routeing	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.1	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 649
8.12	N1-020592	Clarifications and correction to 23.218:Functional Architecture	NEC/Yukio Kawanami	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel 5	CR	Revised from 566.	REVISED TO 636

8.07	N1-020593	PSTN/CS domain originated call	Orange France		IMS-CCR			DISC		NOTED and LS OUT in 648 by Sofie
8.07	N1-020594	Corrections to 5.3.3.1	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REVISED TO 655
8.06	N1-020595	Corrections to 5.4.1.6	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		REJECTED
8.07	N1-020596	Corrections to 5.3.1.3	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		NOTED
3	N1-020597	Registrations without user authentication and Identity Spoofing	SA3					LS IN	S3z020041, To: CN1	LS OUT in 601 by Kevan
3	N1-020598	Liaison Statement on coordination of data definitions, identified in GUP development	T2					LS IN	T2-020254, To: S3, S4, S5, N1, N4, N5, T3 Cc: S1, S2	Forwarded to CN1#23
8.07	N1-020599	Use of the Cookie Header mechanism	dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	DISC	Revised from 557	NOTED
8.07	N1-020600	Loose routing in 24.229	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 580.	REVISED TO 624
9	N1-020601	[DRAFT] Reply Liaison Statement on Registrations without user authentication and Identity Spoofing	Kevan					LS OUT	To: SA3	REVISED TO 665
8.10	N1-020602	CR to 24.229: Inclusion of the Events draft in profile tables	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 465	AGREED
8.10	N1-020603	CR to 24.229: Introductory text giving the status of Annex A	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 467	AGREED
8.10	N1-020604	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Retry-After header	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 470	AGREED
8.10	N1-020605	CR for 24.229: Charging Information	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 498	REVISED TO 659
8.12	N1-020606	CR to 23.218: Charging in S-CSCF	Lucent Technologies / Xin Chen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 528	REVISED TO 661
8.12	N1-020607	CR to 23.218: Handling charging in application server	Lucent Technologies / Xin Chen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 531	AGREED
8.10	N1-020608	Use of R99 USIM for IMS - Deriving IMS identities from existing 3GPP identities	Duncan Mills / Vodafone					DISC		Not treated due to time
8.12	N1-020609	Addition of Public User Identity to S-CSCF address resolution function to Sh	dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		Not treated due to time

		interface in 23.218 Revision of 562								
9	N1-020610	Liaison Statement on DTMF	Eric					LS OUT	To: SA2, SA4, CN3, RAN2, GERAN	REVISED TO 654
8.10	N1-020611	CR for 24.229: MRFC Tones/Announcements	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 501	AGREED
8.10	N1-020612	CR for 24.229: MRFC Ad Hoc Conferencing	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 502	AGREED
8.10	N1-020613	CR for 24.229: MRFC Transcoding	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 503	AGREED
8.10	N1-020614	CR for 24.229: OPTIONS for MGCF	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 505	AGREED
8.11	N1-020615	CR to 24.229: Impact of incorporation of 100 rel draft in bis draft	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 510	AGREED
8.10	N1-020616	Change of 24.228 scope	Nokia / Hannu Hietalahti	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 551. Not available.	WITHDRAWN
8.10	N1-020617	CR for 24.229: Original-Dialog-ID cleanup	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.1	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 568	AGREED
8.09	N1-020618	SCSCF Interaction with AS	H3g	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 545	REVISED TO 668
8.10	N1-020619	CR to 24.229 on SIP compression	Nortel Networks/ Sonia Garapaty	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.1	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 574	REVISED TO 660
8.12	N1-020620	Reorganization of Annex B and addition of missing examples for Originating UA and Terminating UA modes to Annex B: Voice Mail service	Dynamicsoft,Lucent, Andrew Allen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 559	AGREED
8.07	N1-020621	24228: Terminating flows based on Contact, non hiding	Ericsson/ M. Garcia	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 490	AGREED
8.07	N1-020622	24228: Terminating flows based on Contact, hiding	Ericsson/ M. Garcia	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 491	AGREED
8.07	N1-020623	24.229: Terminating procedures	Ericsson/ M. Garcia	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 492	AGREED
8.07	N1-020624	Loose routing in 24.229	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 600	AGREED
8.07	N1-020625	Routing in IMS	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 477	AGREED
8.10	N1-020626	CR to 24.229: Separation of clause 9 into UE and GGSN procedures	Lucent Technologies /	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 464 and 493	AGREED

			Ericsson							
8.03	N1-020627	Registration procedure in the UE	Ericsson/A. Monrad	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 494	AGREED
8.03	N1-020628	CR for 24.229: Message body for 3rd party REGISTER	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 509	REVISED TO 656
8.03	N1-020629	CR to 24.228: Initial Registration - minor modifications	Lucent Techologies / Milo Orsic	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 524	REVISED TO 657
8.03	N1-020630	CR to 24.228: Optional steps in reregistration	Lucent Techologies / Milo Orsic	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 525	AGREED
8.04	N1-020631	CR to 24.228: Cx Deregistration	Lucent Technologies / Xin Chen	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 519	AGREED
8.12	N1-020632	CR to 23.218: Dealing with Clause 5, 9 and 10	Lucent Technologies / Xin Chen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 529. Not available.	WITHDRAWN
8.12	N1-020633	Addition to 23.218 of Informative Annex A: Scalability Issues to be considered for IMS service provision	dynamicsoft,Hutchison 3G Andrew Allen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 558	AGREED
8.12	N1-020634	S-CSCF Handling of Subscription and Notification	dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 560	AGREED
8.12	N1-020635	Overview of MRFC Functionality in clause 8 of 23.218	dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 563	REVISED TO 662
8.12	N1-020636	Clarifications and correction to 23.218:Functional Architecture	NEC/Yukio Kawanami	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel 5	CR	Revised from 592	REVISED TO 663
8.12	N1-020637	23.218 Usage of Filter Criteria	Siemens / Georg Mayer	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 480	AGREED
9	N1-020638	[DRAFT] Liaison statement on the definition and usage of Filter Criteria	Georg					LS OUT	Related to 637.To: CN4	REVISED TO 664
8.12	N1-020639	Addition of Public User Identity to S-CSCF address resolution function to Sh interface in 23.218	dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 562	REJECTED
8.12	N1-020640	SA2 contribution on the Sh interface	dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR		Not treated due to time
2	N1-020641	Outcome of ad hoc session on IETF conference call report	Siemens					INFO		NOTED
8.06	N1-020642	Authentication failure scenarios	H3g	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 544 and 547	AGREED
8.07	N1-020643	Usage of user plane and control plane	Ericsson/A. Monrad	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 495	AGREED
8.07	N1-020644	Changing To: and From: to Anonymous	Nokia/ Krisztián Kiss	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 578	REJECTED

8.07	N1-020645	CR to 24.229: Use of identification fields in the UA	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 517	REJECTED
8.07	N1-020646	CR to 24.229: Bandwidth for non-RTP streams	Lucent Techologies / Milo Orsic	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 526	AGREED
8.07	N1-020647	24.229: Emergency sessions	Ericsson/ M. Garcia	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 550	REVISED TO 671
9	N1-020648	[DRAFT] Liaison Statement on PSTN/CS domain originated call	Sofie					LS OUT	Linked to 593. To:SA2 Cc:CN4	AGREED
8.07	N1-020649	CR to 24.229: Reinstatement of text relating to Record-Routeing	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.1	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 591	AGREED
8.09	N1-020650	24.229 P-CSCF Network initiated call release	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 478	REVISED TO 669
8.09	N1-020651	24.229 S-CSCF Network initiated call release	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 479	REVISED TO 670
8.09	N1-020652	UE implementation of Record-Route and Route headers	dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.1	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 555	REJECTED
8.11	N1-020653	Cleanup and editorial corrections to TS 23.218	dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 565	AGREED
9	N1-020654	Liaison Statement on DTMF	Eric					LS OUT	To: SA2, SA4, CN3, RAN2, GERAN2, Revised from 610	REVISED TO 666
8.07	N1-020655	Corrections to 5.3.3.1	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 594	POSTPONED
8.03	N1-020656	CR for 24.229: Message body for 3rd party REGISTER	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 628	AGREED
8.03	N1-020657	CR to 24.228: Initial Registration - minor modifications	Lucent Techologies / Milo Orsic	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.10.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 629	AGREED
8.06	N1-020658	Correction to authentication	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 476	Not available
8.10	N1-020659	CR for 24.229: Charging Information	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 605	AGREED
8.10	N1-020660	CR to 24.229 on SIP compression	Nortel Networks/ Sonia Garapaty	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.1	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 619	REJECTED
8.12	N1-020661	CR to 23.218: Charging in S-CSCF	Lucent Technologies / Xin Chen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 606	AGREED

8.12	N1-020662	Overview of MRFC Functionality in clause 8 of 23.218	dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 635	AGREED
8.12	N1-020663	Clarifications and correction to 23.218:Functional Architecture	NEC/Yukio Kawanami	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel 5	CR	Revised from 636	REVISED TO 667
9	N1-020664	Liaison statement on the definition and usage of Filter Criteria	Georg					LS OUT	Related to 637.To: CN4. Revised from 638	AGREED
9	N1-020665	Reply Liaison Statement on Registrations without user authentication and Identity Spoofing	Kevan					LS OUT	To: SA3. Revised from 601	AGREED
9	N1-020666	Liaison Statement on DTMF	Eric					LS OUT	To: SA2, SA4, CN3, RAN2, GERAN2, Cc: SA2, CN4, Revised from 654	AGREED
8.12	N1-020667	Clarifications and correction to 23.218:Functional Architecture	NEC/Yukio Kawanami	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel 5	CR	Revised from 663	AGREED
8.09	N1-020668	SCSCF Interaction with AS	H3g	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 618	AGREED
8.09	N1-020669	24.229 P-CSCF Network initiated call release	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 650	AGREED
8.09	N1-020670	24.229 S-CSCF Network initiated call release	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 651	AGREED
8.07	N1-020671	24.229: Emergency sessions	Ericsson/ M. Garcia	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.2.0	Rel-5	CR	Revised from 647	AGREED
11	N1-020672	Cold facts	Chairman					SPARE		NOTED

Annex E Liaison Statements OUT

TDoc #	Status	Source	Tdoc Title	Type	Comments
N1-020648	AGREED	Sofie	[DRAFT] Liaison Statement on PSTN/CS domain originated call	LS OUT	Linked to 593. To:SA2 Cc:CN4
N1-020664	AGREED	Georg	Liaison statement on the definition and usage of Filter Criteria	LS OUT	Related to 637.To: CN4. Revised from 638
N1-020665	AGREED	Kevan	Reply Liaison Statement on Registrations without user authentication and Identity Spoofing	LS OUT	To: SA3. Revised from 601
N1-020666	AGREED	Eric	Liaison Statement on DTMF	LS OUT	To: SA2, SA4, CN3, RAN2, GERAN2, Cc: SA2, CN4, Revised from 654

Annex F Ageed Work Items

None

Annex G Agreed specifications (TS or TR)

See the report for Tdoc N1-020516.

Annex H List of CRs to N1 drafts

Spec	TDoc #	C_Version	Tdoc Title	Type	WI	Rel	Status
23.218	N1-020607	1.2.0	CR to 23.218: Handling charging in application server	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
23.218	N1-020620	1.2.0	Reorganization of Annex B and addition of missing examples for Originating UA and Terminating UA modes to Annex B: Voice Mail service	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
23.218	N1-020633	1.2.0	Addition to 23.218 of Informative Annex A: Scalability Issues to be considered for IMS service provision	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
23.218	N1-020634	1.2.0	S-CSCF Handling of Subscription and Notification	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
23.218	N1-020637	1.2.0	23.218 Usage of Filter Criteria	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
23.218	N1-020653	1.2.0	Cleanup and editorial corrections to TS 23.218	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
23.218	N1-020661	1.2.0	CR to 23.218: Charging in S-CSCF	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
23.218	N1-020662	1.2.0	Overview of MRFC Functionality in clause 8 of 23.218	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
23.218	N1-020667	1.2.0	Clarifications and correction to 23.218:Functional Architecture	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel 5	AGREED
24.228	N1-020520	1.10.0	CR to 24.228: Cx Session Initiation	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.228	N1-020530	1.10.0	CR to 24.228: Minor editorial changes	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.228	N1-020536	1.10.0	CR to 24.228: Adding Bandwidth parameter in SDP payload on session level to remaining flows (N1-020426)	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.228	N1-020621	1.10.0	24228: Terminating flows based on Contact, non hiding	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.228	N1-020622	1.10.0	24228: Terminating flows based on Contact, hiding	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.228	N1-020630	1.10.0	CR to 24.228: Optional steps in reregistration	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.228	N1-020631	1.10.0	CR to 24.228: Cx Deregistration	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.228	N1-020657	1.10.0	CR to 24.228: Initial Registration - minor modifications	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020466	1.2.0	CR to 24.229: Valid responses to CANCEL in profile tables	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020468	1.2.0	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Server header	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020469	1.2.0	CR to 24.229: An analysis of	CR	IMS-	Rel-5	AGREED

			the requirements for the Error-Info header		CCR		
24.229	N1-020472	1.2.0	CR to 24.229: Editorial and minor technical changes - annex A (profile tables)	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020473	1.2.0	CR to 24.229: Minor technical and editorial corrections to TS24.229	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020500	1.2.0	CR for 24.229: DTMF and MGCF	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020504	1.2.0	CR for 24.229: OPTIONS for MRFC	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020507	1.2.0	CR for 24.229: Hold/Resume with MGCF	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020511	1.2.0	CR to 24.229: Deletion of Annex B	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020512	1.2.0	CR to 24.229: Deletion of Annex C	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020516	1.2.0	CR to 24.229: Treatment of IETF draft references	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020521	1.10.0	CR to 24.229: Cx changes for I-CSCF	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020583	1.2.1	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Min-Expires header	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020584	1.2.1	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Reply-To header	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020602	1.2.0	CR to 24.229: Inclusion of the Events draft in profile tables	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020603	1.2.0	CR to 24.229: Introductory text giving the status of Annex A	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020604	1.2.0	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Retry-After header	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020611	1.2.0	CR for 24.229: MRFC Tones/Announcements	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020612	1.2.0	CR for 24.229: MRFC Ad Hoc Conferencing	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020613	1.2.0	CR for 24.229: MRFC Transcoding	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020614	1.2.0	CR for 24.229: OPTIONS for MGCF	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020615	1.2.0	CR to 24.229: Impact of incorporation of 100 rel draft in bis draft	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020617	1.2.1	CR for 24.229: Original-Dialog-ID cleanup	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020623	1.2.0	24.229: Terminating procedures	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020624	1.2.0	Loose routing in 24.229	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020625	1.2.0	Routing in IMS	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020626	1.2.0	CR to 24.229: Separation of clause 9 into UE and GGSN procedures	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020627	1.2.0	Registration procedure in the UE	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020642	1.2.0	Authentication failure scenarios	CR	IMS-	Rel-5	AGREED

					CCR		
24.229	N1-020643	1.2.0	Usage of user plane and control plane	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020646	1.2.0	CR to 24.229: Bandwidth for non-RTP streams	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020649	1.2.1	CR to 24.229: Reinstatement of text relating to Record-Routeing	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020656	1.2.0	CR for 24.229: Message body for 3rd party REGISTER	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020659	1.2.0	CR for 24.229: Charging Information	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020668	1.2.0	SCSCF Interaction with AS	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020669	1.2.0	24.229 P-CSCF Network initiated call release	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020670	1.2.0	24.229 S-CSCF Network initiated call release	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020671	1.2.0	24.229: Emergency sessions	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED