3GPP TSG CN Plenary Meeting #18 **NP-020535**
4th - 6th December 2002. New Orleans, USA

Agenda item: 6.5.1

Document for: INFORMATION

---

joint-API-group (Parlay, ETSI Project OSA, 3GPP TSG_CN WG5) **N5-020808**
Meeting #20, Miami, FLORIDA, USA, 23 - 27 Sep 2002

Source: CN5

Title: Report of Meeting CN5#20, Miami, FLORIDA, USA, 23- 27 Sep 2002

Agenda item	Agenda item title	Tdoc 3GPP N5-020	Title	Source	Result	
1	Opening and approval agenda					
		800	Proposed agenda	N5 chairman	Approved.	
2	Allocation of documents			N5 chairman (Ard-Jan Moerdijk, Ericsson)		
3	Reporting					
3.1	CN5/SPAN12/Parlay				Agreed that from now own we present as a contribution a summary of email approvals. This way the report of each meeting will include what has happened between that meeting and the one before. Chelo will do that. Approved.	

3.2	**3GPP CN plenary**			**N5 chairman (Ard-Jan Moerdijk, Ericsson)**		
					We finished Rel5: all CRs were accepted except for one, for Part 1, where for the ETS support references to the Carrier Select specifications was added. It was observed that no use is made of this reference in Part 1, so this CR was not approved and we were requested to look into the issue of maintaining the references, which MCC agreed to take charge of. **The WID for Rel6 was approved. We had included a note saying that we didn't have yet the final requirements and therefore we'd add this for the December plenary.** **Presence WI: any impact on out Part 14 should be in the WID, as well as the mapping document. This was the subject of an update of the Presence WID, presented and approved at the plenary. See 811 below.**	

					For information. It summarises the status of Rel5 and Rel6 as reported in last SA plenary. **During the SA plenary we explained the situation with requirements that were not addressed in OSA Rel5 due to lack of contributions (and not lack of time as generally believed). We expressed our worry that they have been re-inserted in Rel6 stage 1 by companies that are not active in stage 3 work– thus making it likely that they will not be addressed this release either. It is important for the plenary to know that because this is a recurrent issue which usually results in the perception in 3GPP that CN5 systematically does not finish its work on time. We need to follow the case of requirements that don't get contributions and rise the subject again in the SA plenary If necessary.** **Noted.**	

					Presented by Stephen Hayes. **(Most issues here do not affect OSA. Diameter and on-line charging are the main issues.)** **There have been complains from IETF on how we use SIP. The main problem is interoperability, mainly at two levels:** **?? An IETF SIP phone should be able to speak to a 3GPP SIP phone,** **?? When roaming with a laptop, it could be connected sometimes to a 3GPP network, sometimes to a WLAN,…, but it shouldn't have to have two SIP stacks, but rather be able to use one or the other by means profiling.** **CN1 will look into that – how we define a "3GPP profile" SIP.** **Issues that can be solved by December will be part of Rel6, and the others will be discussed and SIP may be changed (IETF is that flexible).** **Comment: ETSI can help organising SIPit kind of events, hosting them and providing some funding resources. Clear to everybody that SIP-IT kind of events are of interest for everybody.** **Noted.**	

3.3	**Parlay BoD and TAC meetings**				**Reported by Richard Stretch.** **The TAC had a conference call in August for discussing enhancements to Parlay interfaces, Parlay X and the new role of Technical Secretariat that has been created in the Parlay Group.** **New requirements considered are for instance (more later, in the requirements discussion):** ?? **Session Management (enhancements to the current SLA management)** ?? **User Interaction – work in 3GPP has been taken into account** **Furthermore, it has been decided to go with our proposal with respect to releases: 6 months between minor releases, mirroring 3GPP; ~18 months for mayor releases.** **There was a BoD meeting as well, which followed the status of WGs and discussed 3GPP work. The BoD discussed OMA as well, and problems like the case of PAM where the existing work may not be being used in OMA. Therefore the Parlay Board has planned to make an official letter for next OMA meeting (not clear which group, or when etc). Richard to find out exactly how, before the end of this week.** **Q: why does the Parlay BoD look at 3GPP work?** **A: this is requirements work for Rel6, and the BoD needs to consider if they're all applicable to Parlay. This does not mean that there should be any differences between OSA and Parlay, but just that the Parlay Board does an official review of the 3GPP work they're going to adopt.** **Q: when is Parlay going to make it clear if theywant Parlay X to be published by ETSI?** **A: the draft Parlay X specs were planned for Dublin but this will not be the case anymore. No clear dates or plans for the moment. Another thing to take into account is that there is a proposal to include support of Parlay X as part of the requirements for OSA Rel6, so it could be anyway part of the standard.** **Also it has been decided that the next Parlay**	

3.4	**Parlay X ad hoc meeting 16 Sept Ipswitch**				**A one-day meeting was not enough, specially because there seemed to be different views of what Parlay X should be. Only Messaging was discussed at length, and some interesting Presence contributions were not discussed.** **Need to produce documentation on how to use Parlay X, because this seems to be discussed in meetings but not written anywhere. There is no document of Parlay X methods, but instead they come in the form of use cases, and some of the methods are the original Parlay methods, because it impossible to reduce them any further.** **No conclusions or next steps because the meeting time run out. Only that contributions of the same scope would be merged, and delegates would be more committed to have some progress for Dublin.** **Some discussion on the advantages of moving Parlay X to the JWG: the feeling of this meeting is that there is interest in Parlay X but nevertheless it is not clear whether there will be something before six months. It may be useful to put together all contributions and have a first spec draft for Dublin. It doesn't seem that just making it part of the JWG would solve anything. The conclusion is that the JWG need not worry about this issue anymore. On the other hand Parlay X has generated so much hype that it is key to deliver something in Dublin, or we'll lose our window of opportunity.**	

3.5	ETSI STF 211				See later in the agenda for the results of STF. Nothing on the PICS document since last meeting, waiting for the results of the discussion on the status of methods. Work is based on Parlay 3 (3GPP Rel4). Drafts of all the specs are ready for this meeting, and everybody is encouraged to review and comment. Based on this a complete PICS document can be ready for the end of October. Drafts of the test specifications will take a bit longer. Work on the application side can be started then, but we need to discuss first what we want to do. Terms of Reference for a continuation of this STF have been presented to ETSI, but there are cost reductions there now so it is uncertain if this proposal will be accepted.	
3.6	Other OSA related activities					
					3GPP2 have created an OSA WG, two conference calls have taken place. Two main activities going on: ?? Try to identify any requirements to bring to Rel6 ?? Study the changes needed for OSA to be applicable to 3GPP2. Once an agreement is reached, contributions to the specs will be brought. Contributions on this are presented to this meeting. 3GPP2 identified the areas of IPR and guest membership as areas of concern. The discussion of this will continue with 3GPP2 leadership and in TSG-N.	
4	Liaison Statements					

					From T2, LS on Joint Meeting SA5/CN5/T2 on MMS charging. **T2 has not yet decided whether OSA will be in the scope of MMS for Rel6 for VASP support, so no need to have discussions with us right now. If they decide on OSA support for MMS Rel6, then they'll first start with studying the OSA service requirements and their implications. No action needed.** **See discussion on 819.**	

					From SA5, LS on Joint Meeting SA5/CN5/T2 on MMS charging. SA5 also points out the T2 has not yet decided whether OSA will be in the scope of MMS Rel6. If it is decided, SA5 will need to study the OSA specs in detail, but this is not necessary for the time being. SA5 acknowledges that a Joint Meeting with CN5 and T2 may be necessary once SA5 has made further progress on prepaid charging for MMS in Rel-6, and will approach the respective WGs should this need arise. Subject to the decisions of SA1 and T2 mentioned above, SA5 will also look forward to future co-operation with T2 and CN5 if requested. SA5 requests CN5 to respond with comments if we disagree with this. Comment: maybe they haven't understood that we believe that we already have support for MMS for VASPs, and that this is what we want to discuss with them. It is not clear either whether it is VASP support what may or may not be in the scope of Rel6, or if it is using OSA for VASP support. It would be useful to point out to them that we have MMS requirements from SA1, and to ask them what they mean by OSA for MMS for Rel6. SA5 is also asking in the meantime to receive CN5's position on the possible correlation between the OSA charging APIs and the CDR based charging for MMS that is part of Rel-5 TS 32.235. The discussion in Tampere was how the CDR is the network could be extended so that they can include MMS charging info. There is no relationship between this and our CBC API, except their potential mapping. Though this is part of the proprietary mapping, we'd need to see if the info we transfer across the API is sufficient. In order to understand their context it would be useful to have a look at TS 32.235, or to request from them a more detailed description on what they're doing.	
					It seems that we're a bit ahead of them and this is why we need to explain what we have, and why they	

		861	Response to IETF LS on Interoperability Issues and SIP in IMS	CN	Noted. For more information see discussions in CN1.	
		862	Handling of IETF SIP interoperability issues	CN	Noted. For more information see discussions in CN1.	
					Security for location services. We sent them an LS explaining the support we currently have, asking SA1 whether there are extra requirements for security and privacy for location services. There is a reply to our LS but we haven't received it officially. See further, 902	
5	OSA version 1 / Rel. 4					
					826-828 and 830 are the Rel4 versions after the Biarritz plenary. They are drafts – their final version has not been put in the 3GPP server because the plenary took place only two weeks ago. They are provided to this meeting for information. This has all been done by Ultan - editors have not helped with these updates. Noted.	
		827	29198-04-450	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	Noted.	
		828	29198-05-450	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	Noted.	
		830	29198-08-450	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	Noted.	
6	OSA version 2 / Rel. 5					

					831-845 are also draft versions after the Biarritz plenary, for Rel5, for information. This has all been done by Ultan - editors have not helped with these updates. Noted.	
		832	29198-02-510	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	Noted.	
		833	29198-03-510	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	Noted.	
					Some problems were encountered when generating the IDL here. They will be corrected for the next draft spec to appear in the 3GPP server (note again that all these documents are only presented to this meting for information, and they have not yet passed the MCC after-plenary process). Noted.	
		835	29198-04-02-510	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	Noted.	
		836	29198-04-03-510	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	Noted.	
		837	29198-04-04-510	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	Noted.	
		838	29198-05-510	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	Noted.	
		839	29198-06-510	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	Noted.	
		840	29198-07-520	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	Noted.	
		841	29198-08-510	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	Noted.	
		842	29198-11-510	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	Noted.	
		843	29198-12-510	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	Noted.	

		844	29198-13-510	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	Noted.	
		845	29198-14-510	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	Noted.	
7	OSA version 3 / Rel. 6					
7.1	Requirements					
7.1.1	Input from SA1					

					Collects and comments the requirements we have from different sources for Rel6. **Summary of sources:** ?? **Rel6 outlook as reported by CN5 to last plenary.** ?? **Result of SA plenary.** ?? **Last SA1 includes a requirement on IP session information. It seems that this requirement should have been removed from Rel5 but was left due to a mistake implementing a CR. This is why this requirement is in the SA1 document but not in the list of new Rel6 requirements in Durango CRs.** ?? **Some contributions to Durango were postponed or required more work. These are noted in this presentation because we may expect further requirements from them.** **Summary of requirements:** ?? **Generic Network Interface Function (GNIF):** **The Generic Network Interface Function (GNIF) shall enable an application to communicate with non-framework service capability features (standardised or non-standardised) whereby the OSA interface does not necessarily understand the application-specific messages exchanged between the client application and the service capability feature.** **The Generic Network Interface Function enables applications to dynamically negotiate communication means with the SCF. The benefit of this approach is to grant access to new service capability features on the OSA interface without additional OSA specification effort.** **This was proposed by Siemens, who is no more active in CN5. Situations like this have been pointed out in the SA plenary.** ?? **LCS support: no requirement on this from SA1 – either an oversight or interest has faded. Requirements could be expected n the future.** **The idea is to support local services to roaming users.**	

		816	Release 6 CRs to 22.127 on OSA	MCC	To be revisited in the requirements drafting session.	
		887			Latest version of the 22.127 v6.1.0 where all CRs from 816 have been incorporated.	

					?? **User Data management: is it now resolved on how this relates to the GUP. Pointed out that there are different opinions in SA1. For this requirement we should ask clarification from SA1 about the relation to GUP and if we can already start working on.** **There is a note that the work on GUP may have influence and needs to be studied carefully. Are we responsible to do this study?** **Can we really do anything on this without the definition of the User profile data? An approach is to design the API in a generic way so that it can be used to restrict access to the data irrespective of the exact data.** **What about the stage 2 aspects of this requirement? As it is described in the requirement that data can be distributed in the network this implies a central User Profile SCS that is able to link up to all data in the network. We should ask SA2 if this assumption is correct.** **The figure shows that there can be user profile data in the application domain. However, the figure is not very clear what is shown in the application domain.** **What is the relation to LDAP? Isn't there support in LDAP for the things noted here? Pointed out that it might be useful to have some business logic shielding the LDAP server(s).** **Last sentence in 10 reads: "The mechanism how a user is able to maintain access rights is for further study" How does this affect us? Are we safe to use the assumption that for the time being this is not impacting further work from us on this?** **Is it correct to understand that section 10 is a more concrete description of the security aspects of general requirement in 7?** **In order to speed up the process we should ask in the Liaison that they will answer before our Dublin meeting, even though their SA1 plenary**	

					MMS WID approved last plenary. Question: whose is the responsibility for the objective that affects us: “Investigate and identify support for enhancements of the interworking with VAS applications”? From this and their LS it seems that they plan to do this investigation themselves, and then come back to us with their requirements. To be revisited in the requirements drafting session.	
7.1.2	ETSI SPAR					
7.1.3	Other related					
					Initial version of the IP Service Architecture written by TSG-S, for comments by the other TSGs. Comments from TSG-N are in 864, and the resulting final version is in 866. See 866.	
			3GPP2 IP-based Service Architecture: System Requirements comments from TSG-N OSA			

					This document is the published version of 863; is in the 3GPP2 web site and can be accessed by everybody. This version 1 has been approved by the 3GPP Steering Committee. Updates can still be done in the future. **The scope of this document is OSA in principle, though it might impact other aspects of the Service Architecture. An analysis was made comparing this document and the VHE stage 1; though it was judged that there was no relationship with OSA, so it hasn't been included, this document is related to this VHE stage 1: a kind of 3GPP's VHE stage 1 but biased towards an all-IP network.** **Q: what about legacy CS networks?** **A: 3GPP2 TSG-N need to find out about members' interest in legacy network; for the moment they have no explicit stage 1 requirement for this. This needs to be solved between 3GPP2 TSG-N and –S. This document is for all-IP: in 3GPP2 there are two fully separate standards – one for legacy and another for all-IP.** **Q: any intention to align terminology? For instance OMSA seems to be something like VASP.** **A: no attempt to align terminology so far, need to check what TSG-S says about this.** **Feedback from meeting: alignment on terms with 3GPP, and try to reduce the existing all-IP bias.** **Comment: 3GPP2 decided to go quickly towards all-IP, at the expense of any further development on the circuit domain. But since then the market situation has changed, and the approach is to extend the circuit domain. Next meeting changes in the lines of those proposed should be expected.** **Q: since this is very much like 22.121, should we expect something like 22.127?** **A: not clear since there is less awareness of OSA in TSG-S.** **3GPP2 will continue this work and bring back their requirements as CRs to OSA stage 1. Though OSA specs are network independent, there still need to**	

					These are initial work on making Part 1 and Part 2 suitable for 3GPP2. Some changes are: ?? **3GPP2 believes that keeping the current OSA documentation the way it is, and just adding new parts with what is necessary for the support of ANSI 41, would be least obtrusive way to proceed.** ?? **A more generic term to replace 3GPP when mentioned in the documentation is needed.** ?? **References to specific 3GPP2 documents are necessary.** ?? **A harmonisation of terms is necessary. Same for abbreviations.** **This is intended to convince 3GPP2 that work can proceed in a very non-obtrusive way.** **Comment: in the JWG this spec belongs to 3GPP, and 3GPP do not like to see references to others (like for instance ETSI). In the ETSI document we've mostly replaced 3GPP by ETSI, and we do refer to a 3GPP document only when there is no ETSI equivalent (when the 3GPP spec is not published by ETSI.** **Note that documents 879 and 880 are based on an old OSA version.** **There are three possible ways to go for 3GPP2 to adopt OSA Rel5: either to continue like in 879, resulting in CRs (which may have problems at the plenary); or to have a 3GPP2 delta document; or 3GPP2 owning an own template and re-using the UML model – the latter has the problem of the copyright issues on our UML. Apart from the legal aspects there are also the practical issues like having an editor for the document and somebody responsible for the template.** **Note that for IMS the way chosen by 3GPP2 is to contribute to the requirements in 3GPP.** **Revived discussion on tuesday: another possibility would be to have an annex in the 3GPP explaining the terms for PP2. This has been done in the SA5 documents: S.S0028, "OAM&P for cdma2000". Tdoc**	

		886			See 879, This is an example of how a specific annex for 3GPP2 looks like.	
7.2	Presence and Availability Management					
					Presence WID approved last plenary. Changes made during the plenary by Musa, which have not been seen by the JWG: ?? The sentence "For WG CN5, an API-to-Protocol mapping recommendation for the PAM API to Presence Protocol needs to be created. As a result, discrepancies between functional support in the API and in the Protocol may become apparent, requiring modifications to the PAM API specification in 3G TS 29.198-14" has been added to the Expected Output section. ?? OSA documentation added to New Specifications and Affected Existing Specifications tables. Comment: there is a mistake in the Comments column in the Affected Existing Specifications: the document is the API itself, and not the mapping. Since this is a WID approved by CN and not owned by us, and this is rather a cosmetic modification, we conclude we will not make any modification.	
					This is version 1 of 23.141 - the Presence stage 2 from SA2, presented to the last plenary for approval, so it is now version 6 (note that Presence was moved from Rel5 to Rel6) though MCC is still working on it so version 6 is not available yet on the drafts section of the 3GPP server. This means the Presence stages 1 and 2 are ready to do our assessment that may result in modifications to the PAM APIs. Guda volunteered to work on the mapping, but it needs to be clarified if he also volunteered to do the assessment.	
7.3	Call Control					

					This contribution shows the possible changes that would be required in order to bring the Multi Media Call Control API in line with the QoS support functionality of the Data Session Control API. The contribution is presented for discussion, the see whether the meeting considers this a valuable addition to our specification set. **No changes have been proposed in the reportNotification as this method is inherited from the MPCC and MPCC should sustain as backward compatible is as. A possibility could be to make a specific reportNotification for MMCC. However, during the discussion we found out that the needed change most likely is backward compatible as it is just adding an event to the enumeration.** **The proposed change is non-backward compatible, but this is allowed based on the maturity level matrix.** **Suggestion to see if there is a way to further improve the proposed mechanism and also look if we can have event reporting on session basis (e.g. via eventReport).** **Musa will further investigate this and come with new contribution in Dublin.**	

					The specified methods for Floor control are missing two main functionalities, releasing and revoking the floor. **Suggestion that the revoking of the floor can be achieved with AppointSpeaker with no speaker indicated. Furthermore, what would happen if the floor is released without appointing a new speaker. Might be indicated through a conference policy.** **If we want to have the new method we need to indicate the interaction with AppointSpeaker.** **ReleaseRequest: is it a request or is it a notification? The description is in contradiction. The method would be useful when there is no real human chair, but an application that controls the floor.** **More clarification about when these methods should be used (in conjunction with a certain conference policy) is necessary. Suggested to come up with some use cases in the form of sequences that can then also be used in the spec. Would be useful to have discussion over the e-mail before the Dublin meeting.**	
7.3.1	**Call Control – UI discussions**					

					This contribution serves to inform the JWG of the activities of the sub-team formed to investigate the Call Control/User Interaction interdependence issue. **At the moment there is a dependency between Call Control and UI. Over the past discussions have taken place to remove the dependency. Recently the discussion restarted.** **The group concluded that Option 3 (clarification of behaviour when Call Control and UI are used together) was the alternative that would most likely be proposed but we didn't want to close off Option 2 (interface between UI and CC API to be defined) until some further investigation work had been carried out. Option 1 (Move Call UI into Call Control service) was rejected considering that the impacts on the current UI and CC APIs would be too great.** **Would it be possible to define a new SCF that combines UI and Call Control? This does not violate Backward compatibility. If we also improve the description in the existing SCFs (Option 3) then we have the best situation most likely.** **What about the mated SCF proposal? Do we really need this or in other words are there more occasions than just the Call Control and UI interdependence? If this is really the case than we made a mistake and we strongly suggest that we don't work on such a mechanism.** **Conclusion: the meeting suggest the group to look at the possibility to combine UI and Call control into one new SCF and wants to know from the group if there are more cases considered where mated SCFs are needed. If the latter is not the case than we suggest to not work on a mated SCF mechanism.**	

7.4	**Framework**					
7.5	**Policy Management**					
7.6	**User data Management and User data security management**					
7.7	**Network function for MMS**					

					This paper is intended to provoke some discussion on the topic of OSA support for Multimedia Messaging Service (MMS). In particular the issue whether the MMS content should pass through the OSA Gateway or not. **Two options are explored. The first option, where MMS content passes through the OSA Gateway, would violate the architectural principle of passing control information only. The second option (not use OSA for MMS messages) raises the question why the VASP would use OSA at all, and not some alternative technology.** **Where is the rule that OSA is only for control? Pointed out that we started from this principle, and it seems to be stuck in some minds. However, it is nowhere written in stone and furthermore in the Generic Messaging for instance also content passes over the API.** **It might also be due to the fact that we once thought that there was a limitation with large CORBA messages, but later on we found this not to be true.** **Another thread might be that we thought it lead to Performance / efficiency limitations of the gateway. However, it was pointed out that the content eventually passes over the air, so a Gateway surely should not be a limitation.** **Suggestion that we use this paper as a basis for a document towards SA1 to indicate what we can offer. Explore all options and the architectural implications. This document can also be used towards T2 and SA5 where we can also point out that even though they pointed out that we should wait with looking at MMS we have requirements in this area.** **We should, however, synchronise with MMS activities in Parlay X in order to avoid incompatible work.**	

7.8	**Support of LCS User privacy**					
7.9	**Generic Network Interface function**					
7.10	**Information Services**					
7.11	**Retrieval of Visited Network capabilities**					

			RESUBMISSION OF “Initial		This paper attempts to provide an initial draft of a possible Network Capabilities SCF. The intention of such an initial proposal is to kick-off the discussions in order to ensure completion of this SCF in the Release 6 timeframe. The rationale behind the requirement is that although applications are in the home domain, it is useful to find out the capabilities or restrictions on functions that apply when a user is in a visited domain. E.g. one could have a UMTS subscription but when a user is in a visited network that has no UMTS support the application could fallback to another ‘mode’. This requirement seems to violate our principle to keep applications network agnostic. Question whether this has been discussed in SA1? Pointed out that there is a big scale when it comes to being network agnostic. It might be that this functionality is used to “re-tune” the application, e.g. suppose it is using Multi-Media call control and some mumi capabilities are not supported when in a visited network. However, how can one obtain these capabilities. With CAMEL it might be possible as the HLR is updated, but what about the rest? Maybe we need to get SA2 involved here as it requires architectural work. Even if there is support to get the capabilities in a visited network, it might be that restrictions apply within e.g. the roaming agreements. Conclusions: we should request via LS SA1 and SA2 for more clarification about the requirement, mainly on the network agnostic principle. And the fact that we are not sure on how to be able to obtain this information. (Later consultation with Rogier Noldus (CN2) confirmed that there is network support at least when it comes to CAMEL, however it is not clear yet how it relates to restrictions within roaming agreements).	
					We need to make sure that we are not re-iterating the discussion we already had with them. Drafting	

7.12	Other APIs					
					During SA1#17 that took place at Durango, Ericsson proposed to add a requirement to extend the Framework event notification mechanism to allow the Framework to inform applications about new SCSs and their level of Backward compatibility with respect to a previous SCS version. This document was contributed as S1-021583 and due to lack of time it has been only briefly introduced and is deferred to the next SA1 meeting. However, in order to speed the work, this is an initial proposal on how to address the requirement. Andy has reviewed it and has some minor comments and a main a concern with supplying a Service Manager as this might interfere with the already existing process for signing a SLA. Suggested to contact Andy for this. Suggested to separate the two different paths: the advertisement and the migration path. The one for immediate migration should perhaps be in the ServiceAgreement interface. It should be described what will happen with the already existing notifications and sessions currently in progress. Backward compatibility level: where does this information come from? It should come from the SCS, but somehow this was missed in the contribution. Conclusion: it is suggested to have use cases and further work this out and provide this via e-mail before Dublin.	

					This contribution contains a letter from the Board chairman of LIF (Location Interoperability Forum). It introduces LIF as a standards influencing organisation, aimed to define and promote an interoperable location services solution that allows user appliances and internet-based applications to obtain location information from the wireless networks independent of their air interfaces and positioning methods. **LIF will be absorbed in OMA in November. LIF is a standards influencing body and they want their APIs to be used in various standards fora. Furthermore, they suggest that their LIF specs could be integrated in our APIs. After November they want to come with contributions.** **Pointed out that this is not actually a letter. Furthermore, LIF is a Liaison Body and cannot really contribute. It should go via the member companies.** **Pointed out that our User Location and LIF are from the same source where LIF made basically an XML version of our UL API.** **We will study their API and have a look on how in LCS it is dealt with contributions coming from LIF. A LS to them is a bit too early as they are dissolving themselves at the moment.**	

					The presentation aims to provide a comparison of Web Services and Parlay solutions from the architectural point of view. The comparison will mainly consider the following points: **- the functions implemented by the two architectural models;** **- the different interaction types between application and service components;** **- the impacts of the business models on the characteristics of the two architectural models.** **Slide 14: what actually is meant by dynamic publication, is this really missing in the Parlay FW?** **Slide 15: Shouldn't 1 and 2 be the same.** **Pointed out that there is a general misconception that Parlay X will replace current Parlay/OSA. Parlay X addresses a different developer community. Applications that need to work with real-time session in the network are better programmed with our current APIs.** **Conclusion: we will ask Corrado to present this again in the Dublin meeting.**	
8	**Organizational aspects**					
8.1	**Review of 3GPP OSA Work Plan**	**812**	**Review of the Work Plan at Plenaries #17**	**MCC**	**Noted.**	
8.2	**3GPP OSA Work Item Description**				**Needs to be updated before the December plenary with the new requirements from SA1, approved in the Biarritz plenary.** **Noted.**	
8.3	further work on 12076					
8.	further work on 12075					

8.5	Other					
9	**Outgoing liaisons**					
					This version was drafted during the drafting session. **Item nr. 3: we should be explicit in whom to address. In this case it should be both SA1 and SA2. Also make it more explicit that when it will be independent of the exact data definition, the result will be a generic data retrieval API.** **Updated to 910.**	
		910			**Update of 899.** **Approved.**	
		900	**MMS**		**Not drafted for the time being.**	
					Security for location services. We sent a LS to SA1, SA2 and LIF explaining the support we currently have, asking SA1 whether there are extra requirements for security and privacy for location services. There is a reply to our LS but we haven't received it officially, but we found that it was approved in Durango as S1-021717. **Based on this LS this is a draft response LS that was agreed in the drafting session.** **Two spelling corrections needed, updated to 911.**	
		911			**Update of 902.** **Approved.**	

					To be discussed tomorrow. Questioned whether we are not asking an obvious question? Even though this might be the case, we feel still important to point out that we might face a shift in our paradigm. However, pointed out that we have the Terminal Capabilities also that allows applications to be network non-agnostic. Agreed that we can ask the second question about the relation between the information and the roaming agreements at a later stage when there is more concrete stage 3 work. This LS is withdrawn.	
					It has been checked that nothing has been done before. We need to write an LS. Chelo will draft it and sent it on monday.	
					Agreed draft in drafting session. Pointed out that originally the requirement was the way we believe it should be, but that it was turned around as there was a worry in SA1 that applications would be able to get an IP address in the network. Suggestion to request a use case from SA1. Suggestion to rephrase and ask for a use case and indicate that the other way around is also useful and should be considered. Also add that we have mechanisms in OSA in place that make it possible to only have authorised applications allowed to retrieve this information. Update needed, 912, will be discussed further over the e-mail.	
		912			To be discussed and approved over e-mail	

		906	Enhanced User Notification	Chelo	Agreed draft in drafting session. Approved.	
10	Discussions on the compliance statements				The contributions in this section are CRs that add text for two purposes: ?? text that identifies clearly for implementers what is required, the purpose being test specifications, ?? text for applications what is the minimum that will always be available from the Framework and SCFs – a common denominator among all vendors. This has been discussed in two audio-conferences, one for the Framework and one for Call Control, and the CRs below are the result of them. Plans for these changes, when approved: they will be added to a set of other changes already approved that should eventually become Parlay 3.3. In order to have Parlay 3.x and 4.x synchronised, these changes will not be sent to the December plenary, but to the following one, where Parlay 3.3 and Parlay 4.1, both outcome of the Bangkok meeting, could be presented to the plenary. These plans should be told to the December plenary, so they know them in advance. Anyway note that it's already been announced to the CN Management team that CN5 input will come in 6-months intervals.	

					The following changes are proposed in this contribution: ?? **Part of the text added was already added to Rel5 last meeting, but never to release 4. It says that supporting a method means supporting the functionality behind it – otherwise the METHOD_NOT_SUPPORTED exception should be raised.** ?? **Besides this text already in Rel5, more text has been added saying that the SCS or Fw should always be able to call any method on the application side without an exception being raised even if the method is not supported – that is, the complete stub should be compiled.** ?? **Minimum requirements written for the CCManager: the manager shall be supported, and also either application initiated calls or the notification method (that is, either createCall or enable/disableCallNotification).** ?? **IpCall shall be implemented, and as a minimum routeReq, release and deasigned.** ?? **Application side minimum requirements are beyond the scope of this document.** **Comment: some text needs to be added about parameter support (as done for Rel5). Also proposed that the text proposed in the first change be put in its own section, in order to make it more visible.** **Rest of changes approved. Updated to 888.**	
		888			**Update of 868.** **For email approval.**	

					Not in CR format because it is for MMCC **Changes:** ?? **MMCCManager shall be supported, and (on top of the requirements to MPCC, from which MMCC inherits) create/destroyMediaNotification shall be supported.** ?? **IpMultimediaCall: its only method is optional.** ?? **IpMultiMediaCallLeg (see doc).** ?? **IpMultiMediaStream: its only method is mandatory.** **Proposal: since the introductory text about method support will have now its own section, as proposed in the discussion of 868, we could have this section in every document, and then for CC and for UI that section could be used for highlighting the fact that when there is an inheritance relationship between SCFs, then the compliance requirements are also inherited. On the other hand for MMCall there is only a method and it is optional, but since it inherits from MPCall then all the requirements from the parent apply, and this is an argument to have this statement in any interface, and not only in a separate introduction.** **For IpMultiMediaStream a change in the text is proposed to allow possible growth in the numer of methods.** **Rest of changes approved, to be updated in 889.**	
		889			**Update of 870.** **For email approval.**	

					Changes proposed: ?? **Conference Call Control Manager shall be implemented, plus either createConferece or reserve/freeResources (direct creation of the conference or resource reservation). Plus of course those requirements that come from inheritance (this should be highlighted).** ?? **IpConfCall shall be implemented, plus both get/createSubConference** ?? **IpSubConfCall shall be implemented, plus as a minimum eother removeCallLeg ot both split/mergeSubConf combined. The motivation is that if there is no control over the participants, and they cannot be moved from one subconference to another, then why using CCC?** **Question: CCC inherits from MPCC, and also from MMCC in principle, but it could be possible to have a conference call implemented without MM aspects. Therefore what about the compliance requirements?** **Answer: it is not a problem for the moment, but if we enhance MMCC with further methods it could become a problem. Therefore for the requirements it seems more advisable to inherit from MPCC – in particular for the CCCManager. A good introductory paragraph is necessary to clarify this.** **With the addition of the clarification in a separate section, the rest is approved. Updated to 890.**	
		890			**Update of 871.** **For email approval.**	

					This together with 873 form the Rel5 equivalent to part 868. **For Rel5 only a statement on the application side was missing, so this is the only change proposed in this contribution.**	
					In line with the comment for Rel4 (868), this will be made a separate section. Approved with this change, updated in 891.	
		891			**Update of 872.** **For email approval.**	
					This together with 872 form the Rel5 equivalent to part 868. **GCC has not changed from Rel4 to Rel5, so the changes proposed are exactly the same ones as in 868.** **Approved.**	
					This is the Rel5 equivalent of 869. ?? **MPCallControlManager shall be implemented. Minimum is either crateCall or create/destroyNotification, as in Rel4, and for Rel5 a third option is support of enable/disableNotifications.** ?? **The rest are the same requirements as for Rel4.** **Approved.**	
					This is the Rel5 equivalent of 870. **Note that for Rel5 this is in CR format. The changes proposed are the same as for Rel4.** **Approved with the same comments as 870. Updated in 892.**	

		892			**Update of 875.** **For email approval.**	
					This is the Rel5 equivalent to 871. **Note that the title is wrong and this is for Parlay 4.1. Changes proposed are the same as in 871, except that for IpConfCall there was an addition of method getConferenceAddress in Parlay 4 and this is proposed to be added to the minimum set.** **With the same updates as proposed for 871, rest approved. Updated to 893.**	
		893			**Update of 876.** **For email approval.**	

					Proposed changes to the Rel4 Framework. The approach for the application side methods is not the same as for CC (see later) and some minimum has been mandated. **Changes are:** ?? **IpClientAPILevelAuthentication: all methods shall be supported. The interface itself is optional, since it is an option to have API level authentication.** **Comment: better to list all methods, in case there are more in the future and not all of them are in the minimum set.** ?? **IpClientAccess and its method shall be supported.** **Same comment as for previous change.** ?? **IpInitial and its method shall be supported.** **Same comment as for previous change.** ?? **One of IpAuthentication or IpAPILevelAuthentication interfaces shall be implemented by a Framework. The requestAccess method shall be implemented in each.** ?? **IpAPILevelAuthentication: if implemented, all methods shall be implemented.** **Same comment as for previous change.** ?? **IpAccess: shall be implemented by a Framework. As a minimum requirement the obtainInterface() and obtainInterfaceWithCallback() methods shall be implemented.** **Question: what about endAccess? Since it's the only way to end the access session, shouldn't it be in the minimum set?** **Answer: this method has been deprecated in Rel5, the reason being that there was a security hole, so it's a bit strange to mandate it for Rel4. For Rel5 it has been replaced by a method that is proposed to be in the minimum set (see Rel5 contribution). On the other hand true that there is no other way for the application to terminate the access session, so it has to be maintained by the application.** **Discussion on whether or not this method needs to be in the minimum set, independently**	

		894			**Update of 820.** **For email approval.**	

					Rel4 changes for App-Fw interfaces. **Changes are:** ?? **IpServiceDiscovery shall be implemented, minimum list/describe/discoverServiceTypes.** ?? **IpAppServiceAgreementManagement shall be supported – note that this is one case where we have a requirement on the application side.** ?? **IpServiceAgreementManagement shall be supported, as well as all its methods. Comment again that it's more future proof to list the methods explicitly.** ?? **IpAppFaultManager – this requirement will be changed in line with CC in an update of this contribution.** **Discussion: a useful future addition (though not proposed here) is to have way to send a list of method supported per interface, so applications can know what the Fw supports (we have a mechanism for the SCFs, but not for the Fw).** ?? **IpFaultManager is optional, but if implemented at least one of its methods shall be implemented. If a Req method is supported, then so shall be the corresponding Res and Err.** ?? **IpAppHeartBeatMgmt is optional, but if implemented then as a minimum enableHeartBeat() and disableHeartBeat() shall be implemented.** ?? **IpAppHeartBeat is optional, but if If an Application is capable of invoking IpHeartBeatMgmt.enableHeartBeat(), it shall implement IpAppHeartBeat and the pulse() method.** ?? **If the IpHeartBeatMgmt interface is implemented by a Framework, as a minimum enableHeartBeat() and disableHeartBeat() shall be implemented.** ?? **If a Framework is capable of invoking IpAppHeartBeatMgmt.enableHeartBeat(), it shall implement IpHeartBeat and the pulse() method** ?? **If the IpAppLoadManager interface is implemented by an Application, at least one of the methods shall be implemented as a minimum requirement. If load level notifications are supported, then loadLevelNotification() shall be implemented. If an Application is capable of invoking the IpLoadManager.queryLoadReq()**	

		895			**Update of 821.** **For email approval.**	

					Framework requirements for Rel4 Fw-Service interfaces. Note that if claiming an OSA compliant Framework or SCF, the Fw-Service interfaces shall be implemented. ?? **IpFwServiceRegistration shall be supported, and at least announceServiceAvailability(), unregisterService() and unannounceService() – this is the minimum necessary to make services discoverable by applications.** ?? **IpServiceInstanceLifecycleManager shall be implemented, as well as all its methods.** ?? **IpFwServiceDiscovery shall be implemented, and at least listServiceTypes(), describeServiceType() and discoverService().** ?? **IpFwFaultManager is optional; if implemented, at least one of its methods shall be. And if a Req is implemented, so shall the corresponding Res and Err be.** ?? **Same for IpSvcFaultManager.** ?? **IpFwHeartBeatMgmt is optional; is supported as a monimum enableHeartBeat() and disableHeartBeat() shall be implemented.** ?? **If a Framework is capable of invoking IpSvcHeartBeatMgmt.enableHeartBeat(), it shall implement IpFwHeartBeat and the pulse() method.** ?? **Same for the Service side HeartBeat interfaces.** ?? **IpFwLoadManager: same requrrement as for the corresponding Fww-App interface.** ?? **IpSvcLoadManager is optional; if implemented, at least one of its methods shall be. And if a Req is implemented, so shall the corresponding Res and Err be.** ?? **OAM interfaces both sides are optional, as well as their methods.** ?? **If Event Notifications are supported by a Framework, the IpFwEventNotification interface and all its methods shall be supported.** ?? **If Event Notifications are supported by a Service, the IpSvcEventNotification interface and all its methods shall be supported.** **Note that there are some differences between the Service side and the Application side because at the Service side exceptions can be thrown; also it makes sense to have fewer requirements on an**	

		896			Update of 822. For email approval.	
			requirements for supporting methods for Rel5	(Peter Schmitting)	Includes changes at the end were not in the proposed changes for Rel4, but should be added. Approved.	

					Rel 5 equivalent to 820. **Note that for IpInitial, since we deprecated the only method (which was mandatory for Rel4), in order to support backwards compatibility, it seems that the deprecated method should also be mandatory for Rel5. At the moment the proposal for Rel5 is that either one or another be implemented. Discussion on whether compliance to Parlay 4 can be claimed if only the deprecated method is implemented; agreement that the new method should be mandatory as well. How about the deprecated one, should a new vendor be mandated to implement all that is there because of backwards compatibility even it he didn't have a product based on a previous version? Is backwards compatibility mandatory? There seems to be an agreement in the meeting that the whole idea of BC is that it be mandatory – and also that compliance to a certain release cannot be claimed if only the methods in the previous versions are supported.** **Proposal to involve the TAC in this discussion, in order to know if they share our view that we need to mandate the methods we deprecate – that is, if we mandate support of backwards compatibility. The discussion should clearly separate the cases that are related to authentication. Also there is a need to address the problem that in some cases methods are deprecated because of having found a security hole, and with the currently proposed rule these methods would still be mandatory in a later version, for BC.** **The partial conclusion would be that both methods shall be supported.** **Other changes:** ?? **IpClientAPILevelAuthentication: abortAuthentication() and authenticationSucceeded() mandatory since depending on which one is chosen then one way of authentication or another are implemented. It is proposed that either authenticate() or challenge() shall be implemented (authenticate() is deprecated, challenge() is new for Rel5). After the**	

					IpAppServiceAgreement contains a requirement on the application side. For all the rest the same rule has been followed as in CC: no changes are suggested at the application side. Requirements on all interfaces are the same as in Rel4 (in some cases there is a deprecated method but it was optional in Re4 and it stays optional for Rel5). Approved with editorial change of listing methods explicitly. Updated to 897.	
		897			Update of 884. For email approval.	
		885	Correction of status of methods to interfaces in clause 8.3 for Rel5	ETSI STF211 (Peter Schmitting)	Approved with editorial change of listing methods explicitly. Updated to 898.	
		898			Update of 885. For email approval.	
11	ETSI STF test specs					

					UI is the only version of the test specs that includes the sequence diagrams, so it is chosen as the one to be used for discussion in the meeting. **Tests are limited to what can be visible externally from the tested device. Only realistic situations are tested, and not every single value of every sequence. The test tool plays the role of an application, and it is the SCFs that are tested. Some mechanisms are needed to trigger the SCF for the testing. Only the mandatory methods will be tested, and then tests will be written for the behaviour of the optional methods. What values are accepted for the different parameters needs to be said by the companies testing. For each test sequence diagrams have been created with the purpose of understanding the test better (though they don't include additional information, they just help visualise the test).** **Note that it is not clear whether the tests that result in the exception P_INVALID_NETWORK_STATE are possible, because it implies that there is a mandatory sequence in the STDs.** **Note that sendInfoReq in IpUICall has not been tested because this interface inherits from IpUI – in cases like this tests have not been duplicated.** **In future versions a grouping might be added classifying the tests in valid an invalid cases. More work on the conditions under which exceptions are raised is also for the future. As a result of these testing specs we're forcing those who run them to implement the exceptions correctly, and not just throw a generic one. The motivation is that a good use of the exceptions gives the application more information of what has gone wrong.** **Q: are the sequences of events in the STDs mandatory – that is, should they be tested as well? This should be discussed in the mailing list, so that those not in the meeting can also express their opinion. At least we should have tests for the sequence of events that are in the STD – what is unclear is whether we need tests for other possible paths as well.**	

		851	TSS&TP Framework V0.2.1 FFI	ETSI STF 211	Andy and Chelo will review.	
		852	TSS&TP Call Control	ETSI STF 211	Ard-Jan will review.	
		854	TSS&TP Mobility	ETSI STF 211	Richard will review.	
		855	TSS&TP Terminal Capabilities	ETSI STF 211	Musa will review.	
		856	TSS&TP Data Session Control	ETSI STF 211	Musa will review.	
		857	TSS&TP Generic Messaging	ETSI STF 211	Koen or Ard-Jan will review.	
		858	TSS&TP Connectivity Management	ETSI STF 211	Ultan will review.	
		859	TSS&TP Account Management	ETSI STF 211	Greg will review.	
		860	TSS&TP Charging	ETSI STF 211	Greg will review.	
12	Future meetings					
					We have meetings planned until February. Pointed out that we need to be early to indicate which CN group meetings we would like to attend. Pointed out that we should check when and where other groups like SA1, SA2, SA5, T2 are meeting. In Dublin we should decide whether we need to collocate with another group. Needs to be further discussed in Dublin.	
					At the moment the 3GPP2 OSA group has only had phone conferences, there might be 1-2 hours discussions during the 3GPP2 meetings on this topic. However, the aim is to be in the JWG meetings.	
13	AOB					

Annex A: AGENDA

1 Opening of the meeting and approval of the agenda (Monday 9:00 AM)

1.1 IPR (Intellectual Property Rights) declarations

The Chairman reminds the "Article 55: Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) Policy" of the 3GPP Working Procedures:

?? Individual Members shall be bound by the IPR Policy of their respective Organizational Partner.
?? 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.
?? Organizational Partners should encourage their respective members to grant licences on fair, reasonable terms and conditions and on a non-discriminatory basis.
?? The PCG shall maintain a register of IPR declarations relevant to 3GPP, received by the Organizational Partners.

The Chairman invites the delegates to declare IPRs - relevant to the 3GPP - they are aware of.
The List of IPR declarations sorted by Organizational Partners can be found at: http://www.3gpp.org/PCG/IPR_declarations.htm

2 Allocation of documents to agenda items : Monday morning

3 Reporting : Monday morning

3.1 CN5 #19 /ETSI OSA project/Parlay meeting, Montreal
3.2 CN #17 and SA #17 plenary
3.3 Parlay Board and TAC meetings.
3.4 Parlay X adhoc meeting Ipswitch
3.5 ETSI STF 211.
3.6 Report of all other OSA related activities.

Items to be considered here are all other OSA related activities e.g. in SA1, SA2 and ETSI SPAN

4 Input liaison statements : Monday morning

5 Technical discussions OSA version 1 / 3GPP Rel.4

Only essential error corrections can be taken into account. Essential means that without the intended error correction the current spec can not be implemented (SCS and/or application side).
Note that as Parlay 3.2 has been finalised, and backward compatibility has to be guaranteed, the assumption is that for error corrections in the scope of Parlay 3 / 3GPP Rel.4 only work arounds and documentation of the errors is allowed.

6 Technical discussions OSA version 2 / 3GPP Rel.5

After the finalisation of Parlay 4.0 and 3GPP OSA Rel-5 last meeting, from now on only essential error corrections can be taken into account. Essential means that without the intended error correction the current spec can not be implemented (SCS and/or application side). Note that as Parlay 4.0 has been finalised, and backward compatibility has to be guaranteed, the assumption is that for error corrections in the scope of Parlay 4 / 3GPP Rel.5 only work arounds and documentation of the errors is allowed.

6.1 Presence and Availability Management
6.2 Call Control

6.2.1 3GPP IMS related Call control
6.2.2 Other Call control issues (e.g. potential input from ETS group)

6.3 WSDL / SOAP / XML APIs
6.4 Framework (Framework security)
6.5 Policy Management
6.6 Other APIs

6.6.1 Content Based Charging
6.6.2 Terminal Capabilities
6.6.3 Others

7 Technical discussions OSA version 3 / 3GPP Rel.6

7.1 Requirements

7.1.1 Input from SA1: OSA and VHE requirements

7.1.2 ETSI SPAR

7.2 Presence and Availability Management

7.3 Call Control

7.3.1 Call Control – UI interworking discussions

7.4 Framework

7.5 Policy Management

7.6 User data Management and User data security management

7.7 Network function for MMS

7.8 Support of LCS User privacy

7.9 Generic Network Interface function

7.10 Information Services

7.11 Retrieval of Visited Network capabilities

7.12 Other APIs

8 Organisational aspects with relation to Joint activities

8.1 Review of 3GPP OSA workplan

8.2 3GPP OSA Work Item Description.

8.3 Organization of further work on ETSI ES 201 915(Version 2)

8.4 Organization of further work on ETSI TR 101 917

9 Outgoing Liaisons

10 Discussions on the compliance statements

After the initial discussions we had on the mandatory/optional status of methods in each interface, as proposed by STF 211 in some CRs at our last meeting a number of phone conferences took place. The idea here is that we review the outcome of the phone conferences and continue the discussions.

11 ETSI STF Test specs

Initial drafts of the Test specs produced by the ETSI STF have been presented in Montreal. Now we will continue with looking at them.

12 Future meetings : Friday afternoon

13 AOB : Friday afternoon

14 Close : Friday afternoon (12:00)

Annex B: List of Documents

	CN5#20, Miami, FLORIDA, USA, 23 - 27 Sep 2002				
Doc. Name	**Title**	**Source**	**Allocations**	**Type**	**Status/Abstract**
N5-020557	Draft report CN5_19 Montreal	Joint-API-group	3 Reporting	Report	Approved.
N5-020800	Draft Agenda	JWG Chair	1 Agenda	Agenda	Approved.
N5-020801	Document Allocation	JWG Chair	2 Tdoc# allocation	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-020802	report_Monday	JWG Chair		Report	Noted.
N5-020803	report_Tuesday	JWG Chair		Report	Noted.
N5-020804	report_Wednesday	JWG Chair		Report	Noted.
N5-020805	report_Thursday	JWG Chair		Report	Noted.
N5-020806	report_Friday	JWG Chair		Report	Not needed.
N5-020807	Draft Report of CN5#20	JWG Chair		Report	Approved
N5-020808	Report of CN5#20	Joint-API-group		Report	
N5-020809	List_of_CN5_CRs_approved_at_CN_17.xls	MCC	3 Reporting	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-020810	NP-020438 Rel-6 WID OSA Stage 3	CN#17 (Sep 2002)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	WID	Noted.
N5-020811	NP-020491 Rel-6 WID Presence affecting OSA Stage 3	CN#17 (Sep 2002)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	WID	Noted.
N5-020812	NP-020332 3GPP Work Plan Presentation at CN#17 (Sep 2002)	MCC (Alain SULTAN)	3 Reporting	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-020813	NP-020483 CN 2003 Meeting Schedule	CN#17 (Sep 2002)	Future meetings	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-020814	NP-020334 IETF Status Report	CN#17 (Sep 2002)	3 Reporting	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-020815	SP-020538 Approved SA2's Rel-6 TS 23.141 Presence Service: Architecture and Functional Description (to become v600)	SA#17 (Sep 2002)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	TS	Noted.
N5-020816	SP-020598 Rel-6 CRs 22.127 on OSA Stage 1 (from SA1 approved at SA#17)	SA#17 (Sep 2002)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-020817	SP-020595 Rel-6 WID Multimedia Messaging Service (MMS) Enhancements addressing OSA (from T2/T approved at TSG#17)	SA#17 (Sep 2002)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-020818	LS from T2 to N5 : LS on Joint Meeting SA5/CN5/T2 on MMS charging	T2-020755	4 Input LSs	LS in	Noted.
N5-020819	LS from S5 to N5 : LS on Joint Meeting SA5/T2 on MMS charging	S5-024339	4 Input LSs	LS in	Noted.
N5-020820	CR 29.198-03 Rel-4 Addition of status of methods to interfaces in clause 6.3	ETSI STF 211	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	updated to 894
N5-020821	CR 29.198-03 Rel-4 Addition of status of methods to interfaces in clause 7.3	ETSI STF 211	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	updated to 895
N5-020822	CR 29.198-03 Rel-4 Addition of status of methods to interfaces in clause 8.3	ETSI STF 211	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	updated to 896
					During SA1#17 that took place at Durango, Ericsson proposed to add a requirement to extent the Framework event notification mechanism to allow the Framework to inform applications about new SCSs and their level of Backward compatibility with respect to a previous SCS version. This document was contributed as

					S1-021583 and due to lack of time it has been only briefly introduced and is deferred to the next SA1 meeting. However, in order to speed the work, Ericsson would like to already show an initial proposal on how to address the requirement.
N5-020824	Resubmission of "Initial Proposals for Network Capabilities SCF to Kick-off discussions"	Lucent (Musa Unmehopa)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-020825	Overview of OSA Requirements for Release 6	Lucent (Musa Unmehopa)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-020826	Draft 29198-03-460	MCC	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	TS	Noted.
N5-020827	Draft 29198-04-450	MCC	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	TS	Noted.
N5-020828	Draft 29198-05-450	MCC	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	TS	Noted.
N5-020829	Discussion Paper - Proposal to add QoS notifications to Multimedia Call Control	Lucent (Musa Unmehopa)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	
N5-020830	Draft 29198-08-450	MCC	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	TS	Noted.
N5-020831	Draft 29198-01-510	MCC	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	TS	Noted.
N5-020832	Draft 29198-02-510	MCC	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	TS	Noted.
N5-020833	Draft 29198-03-510	MCC	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	TS	Noted.
N5-020834	Draft 29198-04-1-510	MCC	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	TS	Noted.
N5-020835	Draft 29198-04-2-510	MCC	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	TS	Noted.
N5-020836	Draft 29198-04-3-510	MCC	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	TS	Noted.
N5-020837	Draft 29198-04-4-510	MCC	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	TS	Noted.
N5-020838	Draft 29198-05-510	MCC	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	TS	Noted.
N5-020839	Draft 29198-06-510	MCC	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	TS	Noted.
N5-020840	Draft 29198-07-520	MCC	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	TS	Noted.
N5-020841	Draft 29198-08-510	MCC	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	TS	Noted.
N5-020842	Draft 29198-11-510	MCC	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	TS	Noted.
N5-020843	Draft 29198-12-510	MCC	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	TS	Noted.
N5-020844	Draft 29198-13-510	MCC	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	TS	Noted.
N5-020845	Draft 29198-14-510	MCC	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	TS	Noted.
N5-020846	Discussion Paper on OSA for MMS	Lucent (Musa Unmehopa)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	
N5-020847	NP-020420 Chairman's report from CN5 to CN#17 (Sept 2002)	CN5 Chair	3 Reporting	Report	Noted.
N5-020848	CN#17 Draft_report_v100 (Sept 2002)	MCC	3 Reporting	Report	Noted.
N5-020849	Deadline for contributions is 5 working days before the meeting starts (i.e. 13 Sep 2002). Consideration of later contributions cannot be guaranteed	MCC			
N5-020850	Proposal to add two (2) new methods for floor control in CCC	Ericsson	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	
N5-020851	Draft Test Specifications for Framework	ETSI STF 211	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	TS	Noted.

N5-020852	Draft Test Specifications for Call Control	ETSI STF 211	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	TS	Noted.
N5-020853	Draft Test Specifications for User Interaction	ETSI STF 211	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	TS	Noted.
N5-020854	Draft Test Specifications for Mobility	ETSI STF 211	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	TS	Noted.
N5-020855	Draft Test Specifications for Term Caps	ETSI STF 211	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	TS	Noted.
N5-020856	Draft Test Specifications for Data Session Control	ETSI STF 211	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	TS	Noted.
N5-020857	Draft Test Specifications for Generic Messaging	ETSI STF 211	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	TS	Noted.
N5-020858	Draft Test Specifications for Connectivity Mgr	ETSI STF 211	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	TS	Noted.
N5-020859	Draft Test Specifications for Account Management	ETSI STF 211	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	TS	Noted.
N5-020860	Draft Test Specifications for Charging	ETSI STF 211	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	TS	Noted.
N5-020861	LS copy N5 : 3GPP SA Response to IETF LS (NP-020393) on Interoperability Issues and SIP in IMS	SP-020627 SA#17 (Sep 2002)	4 Input LSs	LS in	Noted.
N5-020862	Handling of IETF SIP interoperability issues	Stephen Hayes (3GPP TSG-CN Chair)	4 Input LSs	LS in	Noted.
N5-020863	Stage 1 service architecture requirements v0.8	3GPP2 TSG-S	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-020864	Comments on stage 1 service architecture requirements	3GPP2 TSG-N	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-020865	LIF (Location Interoperability Forum) - an “OMA Affiliate” - possible commonalties with the OSA Mobility APIs	Chelo Abarca (Alcatel)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-020866	Released stage 1 service architecture requirements v1.0	3GPP2 TSG-S	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-020867	3GPP2 TSG-N OSA WG meeting summaries	3GPP2 TSG-N OSA WG Chair	3 Reporting	Report	Noted.
N5-020868	CR 29.198-04 Rel-4 Correction of status of methods to interfaces in clause 6.3	ETSI STF 211	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	updated to 888
N5-020869	CR 29.198-04 Rel-4 Correction of status of methods to interfaces in clause 7.3	ETSI STF 211	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	
N5-020870	Parlay 3.3: Correction of status of methods to interfaces in clause 8.3	ETSI STF 211	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	Tdoc	updated to 889
N5-020871	Parlay 3.3 Correction of status of methods to interfaces in clause 9.3	ETSI STF 211	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	Tdoc	updated to 890
N5-020872	Rel-5 CR 29.198-04-1 Correction to Application's requirements for supporting methods	ETSI STF 211	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	updated to 891
N5-020873	Rel-5 CR 29.198-04-2 status of methods GCC	ETSI STF 211	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Approved.
N5-020874	Rel-5 CR 29.198-04-3 status of methods MPCC	ETSI STF 211	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Approved.
N5-020875	Rel-5 CR 29.198-04-4 status of methods MMCC	ETSI STF 211	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	updated to 892
N5-020876	Parlay 4.2 status of methods Conf Call Control	ETSI STF 211	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	updated to 893
N5-020877	Do NOT reserve Tdoc# from this point on with ADN but bring the contribution to the meeting	MCC (Adrian Zoicas)			
N5-020878	OSA3 (3GPP Rel-6 / Parlay 5 / ETSI OSA 3) Parlay/OSA and Web Services: an architectural comparison	Telecom Italia (Corrado Moiso)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-020879	3GPP2 digested 29198-01-431	3GPP2	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-020880	3GPP2 digested 29198-02-440 (chk.ref)	3GPP2	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-020881	Report on CCandUI Subgroup Status	Lucent (Musa Unmehopa)	3 Reporting	Report	Noted.
N5-020882	Rel-5 CR29198-03 Correction to Application's requirements for supporting	ETSI STF 211	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Approved.

	methods				
N5-020883	Rel-5 CR29198-03 Correction of status of methods to interfaces in clause 6.3	ETSI STF 211	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	TAC consultation needed (Update in Dublin)
N5-020884	Rel-5 CR29198-03 Correction of status of methods to interfaces in clause 7.3	ETSI STF 211	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	updated to 897
N5-020885	Rel-5 CR29198-03 Correction of status of methods to interfaces in clause 8.3	ETSI STF 211	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	updated to 898
	3GPP2's S.S0028-0_v3.0: OAM&P for cdma2000 (3GPP Delta Specification) - 3GPP2 TSG-S is referencing 3GPP SA5's TSs in its specification, which also documents some exception areas (e.g. network resource model for cdma2000)	MCC	8 Organisational	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-020887	Rel-6 TS 22127-610 (SA1's OSA Stage 1)	MCC	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	TS	Noted.
N5-020888	CR 29.198-04 Rel-4 Correction of status of methods to interfaces in clause 6.3	ETSI STF 211	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	update of 868. Email approved 9 Oct.
N5-020889	Parlay 3.3: Correction of status of methods to interfaces in clause 8.3	ETSI STF 211	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	Tdoc	update of 868. Email approved 9 Oct.
N5-020890	Parlay 3.3 Correction of status of methods to interfaces in clause 9.3	ETSI STF 211	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	Tdoc	update of 868. Email approved 9 Oct.
N5-020891	Rel-5 CR 29.198-04-1 Correction to Application's requirements for supporting methods	ETSI STF 211	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	update of 868. Email approved 9 Oct.
N5-020892	Rel-5 CR 29.198-04-4 status of methods MMCC	ETSI STF 211	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	update of 868. Email approved 9 Oct.
N5-020893	Parlay 4.2 status of methods Conf Call Control	ETSI STF 211	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	update of 868. Email approved 9 Oct.
N5-020894	Rel-4 CR 29.198-03 Addition of status of methods to interfaces in clause 6.3	ETSI STF 211	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	update of 868. Email approved 9 Oct.
N5-020895	Rel-4 CR 29.198-03 Addition of status of methods to interfaces in clause 7.3	ETSI STF 211	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	update of 868. Email approved 9 Oct.
N5-020896	Rel-4 CR 29.198-03 Addition of status of methods to interfaces in clause 8.3	ETSI STF 211	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	update of 868. Email approved 9 Oct.
N5-020897	Rel-5 CR29198-03 Correction of status of methods to interfaces in clause 7.3	ETSI STF 211	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	update of 868. Email approved 9 Oct.
N5-020898	Rel-5 CR29198-03 Correction of status of methods to interfaces in clause 8.3	ETSI STF 211	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	update of 868. Email approved 9 Oct.
N5-020899	DRAFT LS_out_User Data management	JWG	9 Outgoing LSs	LS out	updated to 910
N5-020900	Incoming & Outgoing LSs during year 2001 & 2002 (YTD)	MCC	9 Outgoing LSs	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-020901	3GPP2 Plenary 2003 calendar - as of Sept 02	3GPP2	Future meetings	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-020902	DRAFT LS_out_Enhanced User privacy	JWG	9 Outgoing LSs	LS out	updated to 911
N5-020903	DRAFT LS_out_Network Capabilities	JWG	9 Outgoing LSs	LS out	Withdrawn
N5-020904	LS from N5 to S1 : on Information Services	JWG	9 Outgoing LSs	LS out	Email approved 9 Oct.
N5-020905	DRAFT LS_out_IPSessionFUnction	JWG	9 Outgoing LSs	LS out	updated to 912
N5-020906	LS from N5 to S1 : on EnhancedUserNotification	JWG	9 Outgoing LSs	LS out	Approved.

N5-020907	VOID				VOID
N5-020908	VOID				VOID
N5-020909	LS from S1 to N5 : LS reply (to N5-020564) on Support of LCS enhanced user privacy in OSA	S1-021717	4 Input LSs	LS in	Noted.
N5-020910	LS from N5 to S1, S2 : on User Data management	JWG	9 Outgoing LSs	LS out	update of 899. Approved.
N5-020911	LS from N5 to S1 : on Enhanced User privacy	JWG	9 Outgoing LSs	LS out	update of 902. Approved.
N5-020912	LS from N5 to S1 : on IPSessionFUnction	JWG	9 Outgoing LSs	LS out	Email approved 10 Oct.
N5-020913					

Annex C: List of incoming & outgoing LSs

S1-021717 LS from S1 to N5 : Support of LCS enhanced user privacy in OSA

S5-024339 LS from S5 to N5 : LS on Joint Meeting SA5/T2 on MMS charging

SP-020627 LS copy from Sp to N5 : Response to IETF LS on Interoperability Issues and SIP in IMS

T2-020755 LS from T2 to N5 : LS on Joint Meeting SA5/CN5/T2 on MMS charging

N5-020818	LS from T2 to N5 : LS on Joint Meeting SA5/CN5/T2 on MMS charging	T2-020755	LS in	Noted.
N5-020819	LS from S5 to N5 : LS on Joint Meeting SA5/T2 on MMS charging	S5-024339	LS in	Noted.
N5-020861	LS copy N5 : 3GPP SA Response to IETF LS (NP-020393) on Interoperability Issues and SIP in IMS	SP-020627 SA#17 (Sep 2002)	LS in	Noted.
N5-020862	Handling of IETF SIP interoperability issues	Stephen Hayes (3GPP TSG-CN Chair)	LS in	Noted.
N5-020909	LS from S1 to N5 : LS reply (to N5-020564) on Support of LCS enhanced user privacy in OSA	S1-021717	LS in	Noted.
N5-020904	LS from N5 to S1 : on Information Services	Chelo Abarca (Alcatel)	LS out	Email approved 9 Oct.
N5-020906	LS from N5 to S1 : on EnhancedUserNotification	JWG	LS out	Approved.
N5-020910	LS from N5 to S1, S2 : on User Data management	JWG	LS out	update of 899. Approved.
N5-020911	LS from N5 to S1 : on Enhanced User privacy	JWG	LS out	update of 902. Approved.
N5-020912	LS from N5 to S1 : on IPSessionFUnction	Musa Unmehopa (Lucent)	LS out	Email approved 10 Oct.

Annex D: List of Participants

Chairman		
ABARCA Chelo	ALCATEL S.A.	FR
MOERDIJK Ard-Jan	ERICSSON L.M.	SE
ViceChairman		
UNMEHOPA Musa	Lucent Technologies B.V.	NL
PROJECT_MGR		
ZOICAS Adrian	ETSI Secretariat	FR
BUNTING Roger L.	Lucent Technologies	DE
DINALE Liliana	ERICSSON L.M.	SE
HAYES Stephen	Ericsson Inc.	US
HUMPHREY Jane D	MARCONI COMMUNICATIONS	GB
MEYER Pauline	France Telecom	FR
MINOKUCHI Atsushi	NTT DoCoMo Inc.	JP
MULLIGAN Ultan	ETSI Secretariat	FR
NGUYENPHU Thinh	NOKIA Corporation	FI
SCHMITTING Peter	ETSI Secretariat	FR
SCHUMACHER Greg	SchlumbergerSema	FR
STRETCH Richard	BT Group Plc	GB
SULLIVAN Kieran	Openwave Systems (N.I.) Ltd	GB

Number of Attendees: 16

Member of 3GPP (ETSI)					
Ms. Chelo Abarca	ALCATEL S.A.	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	FR	+33 1307 70469	chelo.abarca@alcatel.fr
Dr. Roger L. Bunting	Lucent Technologies	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	US	+1 630 979 5942	rlbunting@lucent.com
Mrs. Liliana Dinale	ERICSSON L.M.	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	SE	+15148271208	liliana.dinale@ericsson.ca
Ms. Jane D Humphrey	MARCONI COMMUNICATIONS	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	GB	+44 24 76564232	jane.humphrey@marconi.com
Mrs. Pauline Meyer	France Telecom	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	FR	+33 1 4529 4953	pauline.meyer@rd.francetelecom.com
Dr. Ard-Jan Moerdijk	ERICSSON L.M.	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	NL	+31 161242777	Ard.Jan.Moerdijk@eln.ericsson.se
Mr. Thinh Nguyenphu	NOKIA Corporation	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	US	+1 972 894 5189	thinh.nguyenphu@nokia.com
Mr. Greg Schumacher	SchlumbergerSema	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	GB	+1 978 694 2762	gschumacher@slb.com
Mr. Richard Stretch	BT Group Plc	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	GB	+44 1473 607487	richard.stretch@bt.com
Mr. Kieran Sullivan	Openwave Systems (N.I.) Ltd	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	GB	+44 28 9041 6329	kieran.sullivan@openwave.com
Mr. Musa Unmehopa	Lucent Technologies B.V.	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	NL	+31 35 687 1684	unmehopa@lucent.com
Member of 3GPP (T1)					
Mr. Stephen Hayes	Ericsson Inc.	3GPPMEMBER (T1)	US	+1 972 583 5773	stephen.hayes@ericsson.com
Member of 3GPP (TTC)					
Mr. Atsushi Minokuchi	NTT DoCoMo Inc.	3GPPMEMBER (TTC)	JP	+49-89-56824-203	minokuchi@docomolab-euro.com
Organisation partner representative (ETSI)					
Mr. Ultan Mulligan	ETSI Secretariat	3GPPORG_REP (ETSI)	FR	+33 4 92 94 43 88	ultan.mulligan@etsi.fr
Mr. Peter Schmitting	ETSI Secretariat	3GPPORG_REP (ETSI)	FR	+33 4 93 95 82 93	peter.schmitting@fscom.fr
Mr. Adrian Zoicas	Mobile Competence Centre	3GPPORG_REP (ETSI)	FR	+33 4 92 94 42 21	adrian.zoicas@etsi.org