3GPP TSG CN Plenary Meeting #18 **NP-020536**
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) **Tdoc N5-021007**
Meeting #21, Dublin, IRELAND, 28 – 31 October 2002

Source: ETSI OSA Project Leader (Chelo.Abarca@alcatel.fr), CN5 Vice Chairman (unmehopa@lucent.com), CN5 Chairman(Ard.Jan.Moerdijk@eln.ericsson.se)

Title: Draft Report of CN5 Meeting #21, Dublin, IRELAND, 28 – 31 October 2002

Agenda item	Agenda item title	Tdoc 3GPP N5-020	Title	Source	Result	
1	Opening and approval agenda					
					Approved. Announced that the JWG might adjourn at 14:30 to join the TAC. Because of a number of absent delegates, each delegate is asked to speak up when an potentially contentious contribution is proposed for discussion.	
2	Allocation of documents					

				N5 vice chairman (Musa Unmehopa, Lucent Technologies)		
3	Reporting					
3.1	CN5/SPAN12/Parlay, Montreal					
				CN5 Chairman (Ard-Jan Moerdijk, Ericsson)		

					3GPP2 preference: Fair amount of objection to delta document. Preference for the time being in R5 timeframe to use delta doc, but from R6 going forward use the full harmonized spec. Delta docs will only exist in R5 timeframe, and as 3GPP2 doc only. Doc will be generated in and by TSGN-OSA, but presented and submitted to JWG. There is a TIA balloting process; current thinking is to possibly have the balloting process in TSGN-OSA as a way out (same people, same companies). Expectation is that TIA might have to reconsider their review process in light of the harmonization activities anyway. In case of technical objections, the company has to propose an alternative. (Ultan) MCC boss, Adrian Scrase: This OSA delta doc is not exceptional w.r.t. TIA balloting process, the same applies to any other 3GPP spec. Liliana: Clarification; we are only balloting the delta document, which is a textual description of the differences, i.e. there will not be a ballot on the technical content of the API specifications. (Ultan) MCC boss, Adrian Scrase: There is such extensive level of common membership between 3GPP and 3GPP2, so it is in anyone's interest to publish specs as widely as possible. So it could be an option to have a flexible copyright agreement to facilitate all this.	
3.2	3GPP CN and SA plenary					
3.3	Parlay BoD and TAC meetings					
					Discussion on B/C in relation to deprecated method (with respect to mandatory and optional methods) has continued in the TAC.	
3.4	ETSI STF 211					

					Draft PICS submitted to this meeting. Approval depending on CRs submitted to this meeting. PICS may or may not be updated during this meeting. There will be budget for next year, Parlay 4.1. Possibly including the application side as well.	
3.5	Other OSA related activities					
					Mostly already covered under document 1009. 3GPP2 TSGN-OSA work plan is included in here. Expectation is that the WG will actually do better than this plan, i.e. by the time of Bangkok they'll be reaching completion. At that time, TSGN-OSA may decide on a way forward with the documentation process, rather than deciding it now. E-mail discussion may continue with smaller scope and less frequent, on certain specific topics. Other interested people are invited to join if interested. Once TSGN-OSA starts submitting 3GPP2 specific parameters, on a case-by-case basis in the JWG we'll discuss whether it fits in the delta doc or in the base text.	
					Emphasized reminder to read the MMS document, even though there is no clear SA1 position yet. No. 21 is done. No. 26 is done. E-mail approvals: 888-898, 904, and 912.	
4	Liaison Statements					

					Response from N1 in Miami (to e-mail from IETF AD's, WG chairs, and IESG). IETF believes that 3GPP SIP is not compatible with IETF SIP. Some concerns were found to be valid, some not. For some valid issues, 3GPP may not be able to change them (e.g. due to regulatory requirements in 3GPP). Some of these discrepancies resulted from the fact that 3GPP views the network as public, whereas IETF views it as private. **3GPP CN3 are writing some "*3GPP* SIP – *vanilla* SIP" interworking specifications, so some problems may go away. (The necessity for this interworking document really proves that there is a compatibility problem). TR ab.cde (version of this doc as output of last week's CN3 meeting) will be put on the server, N5-0211003.** **Similar issues might arise with 3GPP2-profile SIP.** **(Related note: 3pcc draft does not have RFC number yet).** **As the consensus out of CN1 is that they'll not change much, if anything at all (in the Release 5 timeframe), theoretically there will be no impact on our ISC mapping document.**	
					S1-022069 **SA1 points that there is no requirements yet, but work was anticipated, hence the entry in the WID. As soon as there are contributions and requirement text on this, SA1 will notify CN5. No action to CN5.** **SA1 OSA SWG expects to complete the stage 1 in November. If things do not change, this implies that in Bangkok we will have our final set of requirements.**	

					S1-022070 **The 4 questions from CN5 on Information Services were answered by SA1. Most discussions revolve around the answer on question 4. The reply seems to imply that the information needs to be in the network, because the API needs to retrieve it. But that seems to be a circular explanation.** **Were management interfaces considered?** **How frequently would this information change?** **Can this kind of information be handled through the Framework anyway? So there would not be a need for a specific SCS.** **Proposal to send back an LS explaining a scenario where the Framework functionality can be used for this, and then ask for confirmation whether this would fulfil the requirement? Proposal agreed. Andy, Eamonn and Jane volunteer for drafting N5-021109. (Jane will add some text on the possibility for management interfaces)** **After reading the requirement in detail it seems that the requirement talks about actual content info about the applications, and not just a classification of them. Therefore the Framework solution does not apply, nor does our understanding that the use case for this functionality is a kind of application yellow pages stored in the network for use discovery.**	

					S1-022071 **Some concerns were raised on architecture issues w.r.t. OSA and GUP. Remaining question: Is User Data Management requirement in OSA the mapping of GUP on OSA? The statement "*1. It is SA1´s opinion that the OSA stage 1 work on User Data Management requirements is stable enough to continue development in this area by CN5*" is a concern in this respect.** **Concerns on statement that GUP is generic and OSA is not.** **What is the generic part within the Generic User Profile? Confusion on this.** **"GUP is intended to be used by any application, except 3rd party applications" This is confusing, as we assume application data to be part of the GUP. So why cannot this be used by 3rd parties? This seems contradictory.** **Bottom line: we need someone (i.e. SA2) to take GUP and OSA and place this in an architectural context.** **Can we use this SA1 reply to send more information to the SA2 OSA meeting in Bangkok in two weeks? We need to point out to SA1 that, although they feel they provided us with sufficient explanations, we still need additional input from other groups (i.e. SA2).** **Conclusion:** **1) JWG send an LS to SA1/SA stating that we do not agree the UDM work is stable enough to start the stage 3 work, until the GUP relationship is clear. N5-021110** **2) JWG replies to this one (SA1/SA2) elaborating more on the point we do not agree with, but focussing on the architectural issues. N5-021111** **Volunteers: Musa, Ard-Jan, Thingh (for the 1st)**	

		1110			Revised into 1153.	
		1153			Thingh to send it out for email approval.	
		1111			For email approval.	
			out for e-mail approval (due 25th of Oct)		S1-022072 Noted.	
					S1-022073 Confusion that the requirement is in the stage 1, while none of the use cases has been accepted (see 3rd paragraph in LS reply). JWG would like clarification how this requirement can be stable, until the use cases have been approved. It also appears that we made a mistake ourselves in our original LS, causing more confusion. No reply required, as we agree on the original intent.	
5	OSA version 1 / Rel. 4					

					CR on status of methods with the point of view of compliance, like the ones we agreed last meeting, ths time for UI. **4.1 adds general requirements on support of methods; this is necessary for Rel4** **IpUIManager: As usual we pair create and destroy notifications, and leave change and get notifications as optional.** **UI: comment on the phrasing, where "either .. not" seems to be exclusive. Ultan to check what was said in other cases and what's the impact.**	
					Same comment for UICall. **Rest agreed. Update is 1145**	
		1145			**For email approval.**	

					Rel4 CR for Mobility. **Question: IpTriggeredUserLocation inherits from IpUserLocation, so is it enough to support only the former?** **Answer: agreed that it is enough to support only IpTriggeredUserLocation. Agreed as well to indicate that the IpTriggeredUserLocation does not need to implement the mandatory method of IpUserLocation.** **IpTriggeredUserLocation: there is a sentence that says that the minimum requirements of IpUserLocation shall be implemented. This should be changed for the reasons above, because the opposite is the case.** **IpUserLocation Camel: same requirements as IpUserLocation and IpTriggeredUserLocation.** **IpUserLocationEmergecy is not part of 3GPP, so it's not part of this CR.**	
					Same either…or problem as in UI. **Approved except for the change above.**	
		1134			**Update of 1015. For email approval.**	
					Rel4 CR for TermCaps. **Includes editorial change at the beginning (that had already been corrected in Rel5).** **Approved.**	
					Rel4 CR for DSC. **The same approach as in CC has been used.** **Agreed.**	

		1018	CR 29.198-011 Rel-4 Correction of Status of Methods	ETSI STF 211	Rel4 CR for Account Management. Either…or problem. Rest agreed. Update is 1146.	
		1146			For email approval.	
					Rel4 CR for CBC. IpChargingSession: there are several mechanisms to do it: debit/credit, unit based, amount based,… At minimum release() must be supported. Comment: directUnitAmountReq in the last sentence is wrong and should be changed. Question: if charge reservation is supported, so we mandate that it is both used for debit and credit, or do we allow a session that only supports direct credit? Conclusion: we say that one of the possibilities will be supported. Question: if an amount is reserved, should we mandate that something can be done with it? Comment: if resource reservation is not supported, then there shouldn't be a requirement for direct debit only, we can also only do direct debit. Ultan to start an email discussion on this.	
		1137			Update of 1019. For email approval.	
			of Methods		IpUserLocationEmergecy part of UI (not in the CR in 1015 because it's not part of the 3GPP specs). Approved.	

					The IDL for P_INVALID_STATE in Part 2 contradicts the text description of the same data type. The proposal is to correct the IDL. However, changing the Word document is also a valid option. Furthermore, programmers usually look at the IDL. Also pointed out that mostly the symbolic name is used, not the value itself. Ultan checked on the spot that the value does not conflict with what is used in Parlay 2.1 / Rel-99. Agreed to change the word document in stead of the IDL. Updated to 1119.	
		1119			For email approval.	
					Proposal to correct a typo in the IDL. This type might lead to developers starting to correct the error themselves, although the IDL is normative and developers should know that they should not touch it. Gareth (not in the meeting) mentioned before that Correcting the name of the parameter seems not to lead to interoperability problems for CORBA. For WSDL, this might not apply. One option could also be to put a note in the word document that there is a type in the associated IDL and have a comment in the IDL. Conclusion : Ultan will need to find out if the correction does have impact on interoperability.	
		1050	CR 29.198-04 Rel-4 Correction to TpCallEventCriteriaResult in Generic Call Control IDL	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	Mismatch between IDL and word spec. Like 1046, agreed to correct the word spec. Updated to 1121.	
		1121			For email approval.	

			Party Call Control		Mismatch between IDL and word spec for TpReleaseCauseSet definition. Proposal is to correct the word text. Approved.	
			Terminal Capabilities IDL file		Mismatch between order in IDL and word spec for datatype TpTerminalCapabilities. Proposal is to correct the IDL, however agreed to change the word description. Updated to 1123.	
		1123			For email approval.	
					3 Mismatches between IDL and word document. 1st mismatch will be corrected by adding the correct event name to the word description, 2nd and 3rd mismatch will be corrected by changing the word document. Updated to 1125	
		1125			For email approval.	
			TpChargingEventCriteria in Account Management IDL file	ETSI PTCC	Mismatch between IDL and word for 1 datatype (order of elements). Agreed to update the word document. Updated to 1127	
		1127			For email approval.	
			CR 29.198-04 Rel-4 Correction to incorrect Framework references		These changes were already agreed and implemented in some cases for Rel5, but not everywhere. Approved.	

					The description of the Prepaid and Prepaid with Advice of Charge sequence diagrams in Generic Call Control is incorrect. They both indicate that an announcement is played only to party A in a call controlled by a GCC application, when both A and B parties are connected. The announcement will in fact be played to both parties, since there is no means in GCC to separate the two parties in the call. This error has been partially corrected in GCC for Release 5 (N5-020500). This CR introduces the changes made in N5-020500 for Release 4, and completes them. Comment: this is a category F change for Rel4. The feeling of the meeting is that this is still the right time for these changes, because Rel4 is now being implemented. Nevertheless Ultan to check what is allowed for Rel4 – if category F CRs are not allowed or may not be allowed soon we may want to discuss this with the plenary. Approved.	
			User Interaction Prepaid Sequence Diagrams	ETSI PTCC	These are the same changes as in 1064, as UI contains the same sequences. Approved.	
					In the Initial Access sequence diagram in Release-4 of the Framework, the requestAccess() method is shown as being invoked on IpInitial interface (where it doesn't exist), when it should be invoked on IpAPILevelAuthentication. This was inherited from Parlay 2.1 and never changed. Approved.	

					A developer has reported the following error: IpUIManager.getNotification() has P_INVALID_CRITERIA on its exception list. But this method has no parameters, instead it returns a list of notification criteria. This exception can never be thrown, so should be removed from the exceptions list (this is backwards compatible because applications that have code to handle an exception that is deleted will just never get that exception). **Approved.**	
				Ultan Mulligan	**After the charging mechanism was re-worked for Release 4 / Parlay 3.0 in the San Diego meeting, TpCallChargeOrder was no longer used. But it was not removed from the specification.** **Also TpCallChargePlan has an error in the description of its ChargePlan element.** **Summary of changes: remove the TpCallChargeOrder type (this is backwards compatible because it's not used), and correct the description associated with the ChargePlan element of TpCallChargePlan (it is very confusing to developers).** **TpChargePlan: typo in the table, that says "change" where it should say "charge". No need for a new version of this CR, this will be corrected.** **Approved.**	

					Revised contribution from Montreal. It incorporates comments received about Service Registration. For Service Subscription, comments were received which were complicated, so this part has been removed in this version. Discussion: do we need this to be a CR for Rel4? Especially considering that it is a category B CR. Agreement to have this contribution instead for Rel6/Parlay 5. This is OK with the originators, and it will allow to have further comments. Some comments about the relationships in the model were already made in the meeting, and discussions will take place by email. Ard-Jan will start this discussion using the JWG exploder.	
					It is possibly to use call aborted in OSA Release 5 however a fault exists in Release 4. Two alternative fixes are presented for discussion and decision. This document discusses the problem and outlines to possible solutions. One solution is in 1096, the other in 1097.	
					One of the two solutions outlined in 1095, here the proposal is to correct the defintion of session ID so that it may be used to uniquely identify a call. This solution is backward compatible. Approved.	
					One of the two solutions outlined in 1095, here the proposal is to correct the method callAborted and have it with parameter of datatype TpCallIdentifier. DataSessionControl also uses TpSessionID, so it seems more reasonable to correct the UI in stead of Call Control. Furthermore, this change would be non backward compatible. Withdrawn.	

					With current example in the definition of assignmentID, one could assume that the uniqueness is per method, not per interface. Questioned whether the examples are really making the definition more clear, maybe we should remove them. Pointed out that the current definition is not covering all cases anymore. In order to reflect this Eammon will update the contribution, Updated to 1129 (Rel-4) and 1130 (Rel-5).	
		1129			For email approval.	
					Actually this is a Rel-4 CR. DeleteMessageReq : this method was added to Rel-4. Question : what would be the policy for newer methods ? Do we need to be as backward compatible as with older methods ? Would we not inheriting bugs if we don't allow changes ? So if we don't fix it now,we probably will never fix it. Conclusion is to await the results of the discussion on whether parameter name changing leads to interoperability problems, see 1048 The rest is approved.	

					Load Management supports both push and pull mechanisms. Although the APIs define methods on the Framework interface to receive autonomous load notifications from either App or Svc, there is no existing mechanism whereby the Framework can request that this mode of operation take place. The current APIs allow either the App or Svc to request that the Framework operate in this fashion. This contribution proposes to introduce the createLoadLevelNotification and destroyLoadLevelNotification methods to IpAppLoadManager and IpSvcLoadManager. **This mechanism is "half supported", and there are even a couple of methods which are useless because they cannot be used.** **Also a misalignment has been found in the return of reportLoad in IpLoadManager and loadLevelNotification in IpAppLoadManager. Changing this would not be BC.**	
					Discussion will continue off-line, based on an updated contribution that Eamonn will prepare, number 1131.	
		1131			**For email approval.**	
					Sequence 8.1.4.2 in the Framework includes incorrect text that directly contradicts the functionality and description of the suspendNotification load management method. This contribution proposes to correct the sequence diagram by removing the suspendNotification message in the flow, because it is not related to anything else. Approved.	

			OSA 1,2: Consistent behaviour		**As currently specified the behaviour of the UI service with respect to the responseRequested parameter (P_UI_RESPONSE_REQUIRED) is not clearly defined. There appears to be an imbalance between the behaviour of sendInfoRes and sendInfoErr. The behaviour for sendInfoErr may be interpreted that this method is always sent from the SCS to the application in the event of unsuccessful user interaction, irrespective of the value of responseRequested in the original application invocation. Therefore errors are handled differently from successful conditions from the applications perspective. Application programmers may therefore assume that they may be free to release resources because they have not requested a response, whereas SCS developers may assume that they must send an error.** **AePONA propose that the same behaviour that relates to sendInfoRes as controlled by the responseRequested parameter should also apply to the sendInfoErr behaviour, thereby providing a balanced interface to application developers. Therefore when an application sends a final UI message and does not require a response, both applications and gateway SCS are able to free resources.** **In addition, the sendInfoAndCollectReq method, by its very nature must supply a corresponding sendInfoAndCollectRes in order to provide the application with the collected information from the network. In order to provide a balanced interface for this method, the responseRequested P_UI_RESPONSE_REQUIRED setting should be ignored by the SCS, as the application cannot be allowed to use this method and also request that it is not interested in a reply.** **If these decisions are acceptable to the JWG, AePONA have provided documents N5-021089 Rel 4 CR 29.198-05 responseRequested and N5-021090 Rel 5 CR 29.198-05 responseRequested, that outline the resulting changes.**	

					This contribution implements the changes proposed in 88. Also a typo in sendInfoRes has been corrected. **The change proposed in the explanation of sendInfoAndCollectReq need further discussions. The changes on the STD for UI also generated lots of discussions. Since this was a late contribution, and since anyway we're not sending CRs to the next plenary, it is agreed that this contribution is discussed by email and a revised version is prepared for next meeting.**	
					The terminal capabilities class package and IDL does not extend the IpService class and therefore it is not possible to carry out signServiceAgreement and use the service as currently defined. This contribution proposes to correct the class diagram and Interface definition. **This is a non BC change but it is an essential correction.** **Approved.**	

					Highly Available application implementations are restricted to the Application – SCS interface. As a result Application – FW functionality cannot be supported in a highly available fashion with the existing APIs. In the Call Control specification, an application may register multiple callback interfaces to support a highly available application implementation by way of the Parlay APIs themselves. The specs include an example that makes use of multiple invocations of enableCallNotification, but equally the setCallBack method supported on IpService could also be used to provide multiple application callback interfaces for the SCS. Therefore if the application is only using the App-Svc interface, a highly available application implementation may be supported using the additional callback provided. This approach assumes that the application internally provides a copy of SCS interface references and does not rely on any middleware capability to support application availability. **However if the application or framework utilise any Fw-App interfaces as part of normal application operation, the absence of a similar ability to support additional application callbacks from the framework perspective, means that the framework is only ever aware of a single application instance and highly available applications cannot be supported by this means and require further middleware based solutions.** **AePONA suggest that this imbalance in approaches be resolved by introducing the capability for secondary application callback interfaces to also be supported within the framework. It should be possible to restrict the set of interfaces that are required to support this such as Access Session, Event Notification, Integrity Management etc.** **This contribution is presented for agreeing there is an issue, and contributions will be brought to the next meeting.**	
					Agreed on the issue. **Noted.**	

6	OSA version 2 / Rel. 5					
					Equivalent to 14 but for Rel5. Note that the text on generic support requirements is already in the text, but we agreed last meeting to add the requirement on the application. IpUIManager: we added enable and disable notifications in Rel5 IpUI is identical for Rel4 because the interfaces have not changed. Same for IpUICall. Approved (pending the either decision). Update is 1147.	
		1147			For email approval.	
					Rel5 equivalent to 15. The same comment on the inheritance applies as in 15. The same sentence will be changed. Except for this change, approved.	
		1135			Update of 1022. For email approval.	

					Rel5 equivalent to 1016. New changes: a new interface was added for Rel5. Question: can we say an implementation supports a Rel5 TermCaps SCF if it doesn't implement the new interface? Answer: yes, because then everything that is newly added in a new release would automatically become mandatory. Besides in the process of selecting a service, the application will already know that it will not get what it expected, if this is the case, so this is not a case of a backwards compatibility issue. Conclusion: the same approach as for mobility will be adopted. Another question is whether we should make mandatory the support of the common interface, for reasons of BC. Agreed that this is not the case. Conclusion: one of the two interfaces should be implemented as a minimum. The general approach will be the same as in IpUserLocation. Will be updated into 1136.	
		1136			Update of 1023. For email approval.	
					Rel5 equivalent to 1017. A method was deprecated (because some exceptions were missing) which was mandatory and now becomes optional, as agreed. Approved.	
					Rel5 equivalent to 1018. We added two methods, which are added to the choice of methods to be supported. Either…or problem. Rest agreed. Update is 1148.	
		1148			For email approval.	

					Rel5 equivalent to 1019. Same issues apply (to be discussed by email). Besides a method has been added. Suggested in the text that both the old and the new must be supported, but we agreed above that a Rel may be supported with only functionality from the previous one, so this will be changed. Rest approved. Final approval subject to the email discussion of 1019.	
		1138			Update of 1026. For email approval.	
		1027	Parlay 4.1 ULE: Addition of Status of Methods	ETSI STF 211	Rel5 equivalent to 1020, no difference at all. Approved.	
					Update from last meeting, where we couldn't agree on it because of pending on the TAC decision on BC as an optional feature with the exception of initiateAuthentication(), authenticate() on the client and framework side, selectEncryptionMethod() on the Framework side - which though deprecated are also mandatory (this was decided in the TAC-BoD meeting this week). The contribution need now to be updated in line with this decision: - For IpInitial the text needs to be changed. - IpAPILevelAuthentication: the new methods need to be made mandatory so the old authentication mechanism is supported (in line with the decision above). - IpAccess: endAccess() has been deprecated because of security bugs, and there is a new terminateAccess(), but it is agreed this will not be among the exceptions – that is, the method Rel4 mandatory method deprecated in Rel5 will not be mandatory for Rel5 (general rule). Agreed with these changes, will be updated to 1143.	

		1143			Update of 1030, for email approval.	
		1047	CR 29.198-02 Rel-5 Correction to P_INVALID_STATE value in IDL	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	Agreed to change the word document in stead of the IDL, see discussion 1046. Updated to 1120.	
		1120			For email approval.	
			to TpCallError in Common Call Control IDL	ETSI PTCC	See discussion on 1048. Conclusion : Ultan will need to find out if the correction does have impact on interoperability.	
		1051	CR 29.198-04-2 Rel-5 Correction to TpCallEventCriteriaResult in Generic Call Control IDL	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	Mismatch between IDL and word spec. Like 1046, agreed to correct the word spec. Updated to 1122	
		1122			For email approval.	
			Party Call Control IDL		Mismatch between IDL and word spec for TpReleaseCauseSet definition. Proposal is to correct the word text. Approved.	
					Mismatch between order in IDL and word spec for datatype TpTerminalCapabilities. Proposal is to correct the IDL, however agreed to change the word description. The WSDL was correct. There seem to be problems with the scripts to generate the WSDL, see also 1061. Updated to 1124.	
		1124			For email approval.	
		1057	CR 29.198-08 Rel-5 Corrections to IDL&WSDL in Data Session Control	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	See 1056. Updated to 1126	
		1126			For email approval.	
		1059	CR 29.198-11 Rel-5 Correction to TpChargingEventCriteria in Account Management IDL file	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	See 1058, Updated to 1128	
		1128			For email approval.	
		1065	CR 29.198-04-2 Rel-5 Correction to Prepaid Sequence Diagram	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	Mirror to 1064, Approved.	

		1067	CR 29.198-05 Rel-5 Correction to User Interaction Prepaid Sequence Diagrams	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	Mirror to 1066. Approved.	
		1069	CR 29.198-05 Rel-5 Corrections to User Interaction	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	Mirror to 1068, see that discussion.	
		1071	CR 29.918-03 Rel-5 Correction to Initial Access Sequence Diagram	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	Mirror to 1070. Approved.	
		1073	CR 29.198-05 Rel-5Correction to getNotification to remove P_INVALID_CRITERIA exception	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	Mirror to 1072. Approved.	
			to remove unused TpCallChargeOrder	Ultan Mulligan (ETSI PTCC), Joergen Dyst (Appium)	Note that the same typo need to be corrected.	

					If an application that has started several triggered status requests crashes and restarts, and does not consider the requests it had started before the crash, but instead simply restart them, the result is that the 'old' (inactive) requests remain the Parlay gateway. The Parlay gateway does not have an infallible means of judging which requests are old and which are new. As a result, all old trigger requests would accumulate in the Parlay gateway. Eventually this would backfire to the application when system or service level agreement limits are reached. To prevent this scenario, an application must currently be persistent with regards to all requests it has started. This applies not only to triggered user status requests, but also to triggered and periodic user location requests. This CR proposes to add some methods (and their corresponding data types) in order to avoid this need for persistency. **Comment: if an application in a service session has forgotten these requests, then even if the gateway provides this information the application will lack the context to understand it.** **Comment: this is a proposal to solve an application implementation issue in the gateway.** **Answer: but then the same would apply to getCriteria in CC.** **Agreed that this should be done for Terminal Capabilities as well.** **Approved.**	

					OSA Specification describes use of secondary callback interface inconsistently between the different parts which confuses application developers. This contribution proposes to describe that the most recent call back will be used as the callback interface, and that only if this one does not work, the initially provided callback interface is used. This need to be corrected in four parts of the specs, and the changes are proposed in Tdocs 37, 38, 39 and 40. For the change in createNotification we need a CR for Rel4. It will be 1133. Approved.	
		1133			For email approval.	
		1038	Use of Second Callback in MPCC	Ericsson	Approved.	
		1039	Use of Second Callback in DSC	Ericsson	Approved.	
		1040	Use of Second Callback in AM	Ericsson	Approved.	

					At this moment it is not possible to re-obtain a reference to the service manager of an SCF an application is using. However, in case an application has lost the reference to the Service manager e.g. due to a crash, without the SCS being aware of this, it should be possible for the application to re-obtain a reference to the Service manager. One option is that the application stores the references to the Service Managers persistently. Another option is that the application recontacts the FW to re-obtain the references. However, this is at the moment not possible according the current spec. The proposal here is to allow an application to re-obtain a Service Manager. Lucent sent out comments to this proposal, pointing out that it is not known in advance when the application is alife again. If it takes a long time before the application contacts the FW again, it might be the case that the Service Manager has been deleted as the Service might have detected that the application is not up anymore. However, with this proposal the application will contact the FW all over again and the FW contacts the LifeCycleManager that either returns the still existing manager or will create a new one and return the reference to that manager. The outstanding issue is then how can the application know if e.g. the notifications it set are still available in the manager that has been re-obtained. For e.g. Call Control, the application can request the notifications it set, via getNotifications. This is, however, not available in all interfaces. In 1036, the proposal is to add these capabilities to Mobility. With this addition, this functionality is present in all SCFs except TermCaps. The service should not terminate the manager because it can't connect to the application, if its lifetime has not expired (if the SLA is not terminated). Some implementations will do it anyway, but we shouldn't mandate it. Comment: the service manager may not be there	

		1150			Approved.	

					The P_MAX_CALLLEGS_PER_CALL property is defined for the multiparty call control service. The property "Indicates how many parties can be in one call" and is defined as being of the type INTEGER_SET. **The value of this property as used during registration for a camel phase 4 service is defined as {0,6}.** **Because the properties can only be restricted during the creation of a profile, this would mean that only {}, {0}, {6} or {0,6} are possible values in a profile based on a camel phase 4 multiparty call control service.** **Since it is desirable to limit the maximum parties that can used in one call this value should be changed to reflect all the possible values for the maximum number of parties that can be involved in the call.** **Furthermore, it is doubtful what the use is of a maximum value of 0. This would indicate that the application would be able to create a call, but not create any parties in the call.** **Additionally, it is unclear how the value of the property can be enforced on parties that are created by the network. E.g., what should the SCS do when the value of the property is 1 and an IDP on answer is received from the network.** **Additionally, there might be situations where the SCS might want to limit the maximum number of active legs in a call for the network, but this can mean that there is 'temporary' one leg extra in the call in the SCS. E.g., in camel phase 2, there can only be two legs in a call in the network. However, restricting the application to two legs would mean that it would not be possible to create a follow-on call after disconnection of the B-leg, because this is done by creating a new leg, routing this new leg and then continuing the released B-leg leading to a call which temporary 3 legs. Therefore, the rephrase the description of the property to "Indicates the maximum number of legs that represent an active connection to an end-point in the network is proposed. The enforcement of this property is only done when a leg is created or routed by the application".**	

					Update of 1042. The changes in the text are not the ones proposed in the discussion of 1042, because of alignment with the STDs. Not agreed. Final text agreement "… in a call for which a connection to a call party…". Agreed with this change. Update in 1149.	
		1149			Approved.	
		1060	Error in Connectivity Manager IDL	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	Agreed.	
					In compiling a list of IDL and WSDL corrections to align the IDL and WSDL data types with the Word documentations, it was discovered that the order of elements in a WSDL complex type does not always match the order in the IDL or Word descriptions of equivalent struct or union types. Joe McIntire is working on the generation scripts for WSDL and Ultan will give him this feedback. 2nd observation: currently in the WSDL there is no similar mechanism as the union type in IDL. Pointed out that the idea was to use a sequence of elements and one of the elements is the discriminator. Depending on the value of the discriminator, other elements in the sequence contain valid values or not. Also in the IDL we have agreed a while ago to restrict the use of unions. To be further investigated if WSDL supports unions. Noted.	
		1090			Mirror of 89. Also requires further discussions.	
		1098	CR Rel5 Part4-2	Aepona	See 1097 Withdrawn.	
		1099	CR Rel5 Part4-3	Aepona	See 1097 Withdrawn.	

		1130		Aepona	Update from 1100. For email approval.	
		1085	Enable creation/destruction of load level notifications at the request of Framework	AePONA – Eamonn Murray	Mirror of 84, see discussion there. Will be updated to 1132.	
		1132			Update of 1085. For email approval.	
		1087	Incorrect Sequence for Framework – Service load management	AePONA – Eamonn Murray	Mirror of 86. Approved.	
		1089	Correction to UI service responseRequested logic	AePONA – Eamonn Murray	Copy from Musa.	
7	OSA version 3 / Rel. 6					
7.1	Requirements					
7.1.1	Input from SA1					
7.1.2	Parlay					

					The new Parlay 5.0 requirements document. Richard used the TR that was released in SPAN14 as a base and now put in the Parlay 5.0 requirements and the SA1 CRs resulting from the Durango meeting. The reference to the Miami meeting should be changed to Joint meeting #20 in Miami. Chapter 4 : Change the ETSI part to OSA, it is not ETSI Parlay. Suggested not to use ETSI 2.0, but use ETSI OSA phase 2 as there will be not ETSI 2.0 specifications. Some of the requirements still need clarification and Richard aims to indicate in a new version which of the requirements are stable. 5.1.1; Backward compatibility. Discussion in the TAC and BoD took place about backward compatibility, ie what it meas to be compliant to Parlay 4.0, how long we keep deprecated methods. Recommendations on conformance: - No need to support deprecated methods (wrongly described in Martin Cooksons slides) - Use mandatory very conservatively - You can deprecate mandatory components (but try to avoid this) - InitiateAuthentication is a special case. (meaning that this should be mandatory). More information about the issue can be found in 1114, Ultan's presentation on this subject. 5.2.1 Federation: this is not yet agreed by SA1, new version is produced, see Tdoc 1076 and this will be contributed in Korea meeting of SA1. Corrado believes that this might be accepted now. 5.3.1 nothing is identified at the moment. Maybe 1012 can be identified as a requirement for Call Control. 6.1 Information Services. Still waiting clarification from SA1 needed as not to all our questions we got satisfactory answers. 6.2 Information Transfer function. Richard took this	

					Purpose of the contribution is to allow the adoption of Parlay X like APIs in 3GPP. **Comments have been recieved from Lucent and Telcordia. These have been incorporated in an updated document, not in this version. The new update will be submitted to next SA1 meeting.** **Suggested to mention explicitly in the CR that what is requested is the WSDL realisation of the API. Need to check if the WSDL is not already in the 22.127.** **The figure is a bit confusing, suggestion to change the text for the proposed new APIs: standardised higher level OSA APIs.** **How to prevent that somebody comes contributing Parlay X like proposals in our group ?** **Noted that if we expect Parlay X like proposals, we should merge with the Parlay X group.** **Also we should be sure that if we accept the requirement there should be the possibility to accept the Parlay X work. At the moment Parlay X does not fall under the legal agreement with ETSI. We should bring up this up to Parlay. However, the situation is much similar to PAM and Content Based Charging previously.** **Pointed out that the way the requirements are currently phrased, they cannot be satisfied by Parlay X as they don't have a relationship to the OSA/Parlay Framework. Answer: the idea is to have the possibility that applications discover Parlay X like SCSs through the current FW.** **Corrado invites for comments to improve the document and wants to know if there are concerns to bring forward this contribution in Korea. Comments should be sent to Corrado before monday, in order to have the contribution in time for the SA1 meeting.**	

					Updated version of 1074. **Suggested to change the 3rd bullet point to : it should allow applications be triggered by network events.** **Suggested to remove the last sentence as we are already using UML and WSDL for our specifications and furthermore in the document there is a specific addition of WSDL to the technology realisations.**	
					Idea of this proposal is to provide a function (like single sign-on) that autenticates a user that wants to access the application. **In addition the function should support privacy in the sense to allow the identity to be unknown to the application.** **How can an application that needs to deal with non-authenticated users be supported ? Answer: this can be supported, one would just get an answer from the proposed function that this user is authenticated or not and based on this the application could tune it's behaviour.** **First bullit: should on this level really a network address be used ? Answer: it is just an example of an identifier.** **How is this related to Liberty Alliance ? Answer this is related, idea is to allowOSA applications access to this as well.**	

					In different application scenarios it could be useful to set up some relationship between two or more OSA gateways, possibly in different administrative domains. Examples could be network operators belonging to the same group. This contribution proposes extensions to Parlay/OSA to allow one domain to offer it's applications access to the capabilities of another domain. Pointed out that the requirement could be solved by just allowing one SCS to be registered with the Framework in the other domain. The requirement is phrased too much in architecture way, it should be re-phrased to match the usual requirements level (functions) to have a higher probability to get acceptance in SA1. Is the idea to share applications ? Answer, no the idea is to share SCFs.	
7.1.3	ETSI SPAR					
7.2	Presence and Availability Management					
7.3	Call Control					

					At the JWG (CN5#20) meeting in Miami (23-27 September), Lucent Technologies presented contribution N5-020829 for discussion. The proposal of adding QoS reporting functionality to Multi Media Call Control, analogous to Data Session Control, was met with a favourable response. This contribution presents the detailed required changes: ?? **ReportMediaNotification in IpAppMultiMediaCallControlManager: a parameter qualityOfService is added. This is allowed because for more recent APIs we have less strict BC restrictions.** ?? **Same addition in superviseVolumeRes in IpAppMultiMediaCall.** ?? **For IpMultiMediaCallLeg, since it inherits from CC which has more strict BC restrictions, the change has been made embedded in the definition of the data type TpMediaStreamEventType.** **Already in Miami is was considered that the new parameter could be moved to the Common Data Definitions, and its name explained (why it doesn't have a generic name).** **Changes agreed. Next steps: MMCS is already on CR control for Rel5, so this contribution should be made a CR. The change of the data type to Common Data will be addressed in another contribution.**	
					General discussion: to have a document that includes all CRs from one release to another. To be discussed.	

					Update of 1012. **This is the Rel-6 CR.** **Question: does this need a new requirement?** **Answer: no, it's already in section 13.2.1 in the stage 1 document.** **Category will be changed to F by Adrian (no need for an update).**	
					QoS class reporting functionality has been included in Multi Media Call Control, reusing a data type from Data Session Control. This has now become a common data type. This contribution proposes to propote data type definition of TpDataSessionQosClass to the Common Data Types. The name remains unmodified for BC reasons as agreed in 1012. **The description need to be generalized. Updated into 1141, for email approval.**	
		1141			Update of 1115, for email approval.	
					QoS class reporting functionality has been included in Multi Media Call Control, reusing a data type from Data Session Control. This has now become a common data type, and therefore needs to be removed from the Data Session Control specification. This contribution proposes to remove the data type definition form where it was. Approved.	

					While preparing contribution N5-021012 (Adding QoS Reporting Functionality to MMCCS) Lucent Technologies have found a potential issue with the request for notifications and event reporting. An assessment of the current method and parameter descriptions and data type definitions showed that it is currently not possible for an application to request report notifications for a specific event type. This may have been the intention, as to date there were only two event types (i.e. P_MEDIA_STREAM_ADDED and P_MEDIA_STREAM_SUBTRACTED). However, it could be envisaged that an application is only interested in one of the two events. Furthermore, contribution N5-021012 proposed the addition of P_MEDIA_STREAM_QOS_CLASS_CHANGED. In MPCCS this functionality is supported, because TpCallNotificationRequest in createNotification **Two alternative solutions are proposed to the meeting.** **Comment: the solution already existing in MPCC is like alternative 1, and it's better to be consistent.** **Comment: none of the proposals is BC, but this is not an issue yet because this is MMCC.** **Comment: wouldn't it be more useful to have a set, allowing to specify more than one events? In MPCC we have a set.** **Answer: this is OK because there is a set in the request, so adding one more is enough.** **Changed approved. A CR is needed for this; Will be 1140, for email approval.**	
		1140			CR corresponding to 1013, for email approval.	

					A possibility to request optimal routing for mobile to mobile call has been introduced for CAMEL phase 4. The purpose of support for Optimal Routing is to reduce the number of unnecessary inter-PLMN call legs. This contribution proposes to add the same capabilities to OSA Rel6, including a detailed proposal on how to add it. Discussion: the gateway should hide a lot of the IN complexity, and maybe using service properties (so an application can request optimal routing in the SLA) would be a simpler way to incorporate this functionality than the proposed way. Or maybe even it should be a gateway thing, and the gateway would chose optimal routing if it is available – though maybe there are charging implications here. The problem of using the properties is that then it is fixed for all sessions, and cannot be chosen on a session basis. Comment: except when both subscribers are in the same countries, and there is no other service involved (like having international call forwarding), this is very complex. Answer: but the application is not involved in this – the application just wants to turn the capability on/off. Comment: shouldn't this be a new requirement? To be discussed further offline.	

					A significant IN feature namely the support for service filtering as applied in tele-voting type of services is lacking in OSA. This contribution propose to include support for this kind of feature in the Call Control API. The proposal is to add of two new methods named setCallFiltering and reportCallFiltering to the call control management functions of the Multi Party Call Control service. The methods must allow for a mapping to the IN operations ActivateServiceFiltering / ServiceFilteringResponse. However, an aim has been to try to simplify the methods and limit the number of options currently defined for IN, not to replicate the IN operations as is. **Question: are we not extending an SCF in order to support a certain application? And cannot we support it anyway with our existing functionality?** **Answer: the reason is performance.** **Question: do we want to introduce functionality of a particular network technology?** **Question: is it not application level functionality to accumulate statistics, rather than a network functionality.** **Answer: how is this information conveyed to the application? The important point here is the call trigger.** **Question: is this proposal a natural extension of a CC API, or rather a new service? How does it relate to the CC model?** **Question: is this a requirement for this?** **Answer: the requirement is generic – to support IN CSs.** **Comment: what's the use case? What problem are we solving here? We don't define applications, we define service capabilities.** **Needs further discussion.**	

					There have in the past been raised some concern about the criteria overlap definition and the associated restriction not to allow more than one application to control a call or session. The current restrictions we have originate from the single point of control principle as defined ir IN. This contribution proposes to: - add some clarity to the current notification criteria handling, and - to allow control from more than one service/application during call or session processing. This for networks that adhere to the principles of multiple point of control, MPC (a defined IN term for allowing more then one service (application) to have a control relationship with a call at the same point in time). **The changes proposed are all in the text descriptions.** **Question: how can the application know if MPC is supported by the network or not? Could we add a service property for that?** **Answer: MPC network support would not be visible to the application at all. But a service property can indeed be used for advertising this network capability to the application. A use case would be welcome.** **Comments: the text should not mention application servers, because this is an implementation issue.** **Comment: would it be possible to have a summary of the concept of MPC in our specs – not only a reference?** **Answer: agreed, will be added.** **Agreed that text like the one proposed is necessary in our specs. For the service property, contributions are welcome.** **For email approval in order to discuss the details ont the text, once approved will be 1139.**	

					This is an update from a contribution in Miami where there was a request for a use case. **Comment: in the use case, the arrow in step 3 is in the wrong direction.** **Question: shouldn't the floor default to the chairman?** **Answer: agreed. Need to add as well what happens if there is no chairman.** **Question: why is the releaser a return parameter of floorRelease?** **Answer: true, it seems the parameter is not necessary because the application knows which party it is.** **Comment from Miami: if we want to have the new method we need to indicate the interaction with appointSpeaker.** **Answer: this seems to refer to the use of appointSpeaker, with no speaker or chairman, to replace revokeSpeaker.** **Question: how does the chairman recover the floor?** **Question: does appointing a speaker revoke the previous one? Is it possible to have more than one speaker having the floor at the same time – several media like somebody controlling the voice, somebody else the docs?** **Further discussion needed, preferably y email before next meeting.**	
			Interaction	**Michael Walkden, BTexact Technologies**		

					power point presentation of 1045. Idea was to look at the VoiceXML features, interesting for Parlay developers: -play simple announcements without preprovisioning, -play preprovisioned scripts, -play prompt &scripts and return result(s). -dynamically create menu prompt/collect results using application content -ability to link VoiceXML systems with other Parlay Services (idea is to make it part of UI). Key enhancements to UI needed to support the enhancements: 1. extend collectedInfo Parameter to allow multiple outputs. 2. Dynamic script construction. 3. Open up the VoiceASP market to Parlay using a publishing mechanism. Question: is this also offering multi-modal (possibility to use voice and GUI to prompt a user) ? Answer, possibly, not the main focus here. Pointed out that VXML itself will already go along this path, so support for this might come by itself. Pointed out that we should aim not to restrict to VoiceXML only and try to be generic. Michael is looking for feedback and particularly is interested to get views on the actual representation of the parameters (now XML). Needs to be checked to what level the requirements on UI are currentlly described. It might be the case that no CR for SA1 is needed.	
7.3.1	Call Control – UI discussions					

7.4	**Framework**					

					Last meeting in Miami, an initial proposal for extending 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 was discussed. It was concluded that a number of use cases, explaining the desired functionality would be useful in order to assess the proposal. This contribution includes use cases and extra data types with respect to the previous proposal. **Note that this requirement is still under discussion in SA1, and so far has not been approved.** **Two alternative solutions are proposed:** **- the application subscribes to criteria that exist already** **- to define a new criterion P_EVENT_FW_COMPATIBLE_SERVICE_AVAILABLE** **The latter is backwards compatible. For registration there are also two options:** **- The FW compares the service properties with existing SCFs** **- Add service properties like level of BC; in this case the FW does not need to be so intelligent, and this is the preferred option in the contribution.** **Question: why using IpClientAccess?** **Answer: conveying the info that the application should migrate by using this interface ensures that they receive it, because this interface has the lifetime of the access session.** **Comment: we should start extending the notification mechanism with some more information about the new SCF. Then we need to discuss responsibilities in the FW about maintenance, migration etc.** **Comments are welcome by email in order to make progress.**	

7.5	**Policy Management**				**The idea of this session is to agree on the value proposition of the proposals and understand and validate the concepts. Then there is a need for harmonisation of data structures between the Lucent and Telcordia contributions, but this will be done after this meeting.**	
		1029	**Proposed Extensions to Policy Management**	**Musa Unmehopa (Lucent Technologies)**	**Superseded by 1077.**	

					Extensions: ?? **New management methods on a variable: setVariableDeclaration sets a variable name, getVariableDeclaration gets that particular variable and removeVariableDeclaration removes it.** ?? **Management methods supporting policy-evaluation capability: the context against which the information is queried is defined by a list of variables; this is an input and an output list that are defined in the Signature Template. It seems that the name "signature" is confusing and could be changed.** ?? **New interface class IpPolicySignatureTemplate: it specifies the required input and output attributes. that must be included in the signature of any policy evaluation request made via the evalPolicy() – also see createSignatureTemplate() in IpPolicyDomain. The input and output attributes referenced in the signature correspond to variables (attributes) whose names and types have been defined via the setVariableDeclaration method.** ?? **A method for policy evaluation has been added.** ?? **Extensions for condition/action expressions: the grammar in the current version is very restricted. The signature has been kept as general as possible, in order to allow for choice in implementations.** ?? **Data types:** o **TpType: it allows to define nested complex types.** **Telcordia has a proposal on how to deal with the data structures in a template, and offline discussions will continue in order to reach an agreement on the data.** **Comment: we need the introductory text, sequence diagrams, STDs etc before we can introduce this new material in the specs. The idea of Lucent is to agree on the principles and then provide the rest, but the meeting feels it would be easier to**	

				Telcordia	Presented for information. See discussion in 77: offline discussions will take continue to harmonise the two proposals for data structures. The contribution proposes to use XML Schema to describe and validate complex variables and their types. Comment: CORBA has dynamic typing, and facilities to map these types for instance in Java, so maybe it's a better choice to use CORBA so applications don't have to use two technologies. Answer: the CORBA "any" type has an impact on the deployment environment. Also the XML Schema is also a portable technology, so there is no need for two. Answer: nevertheless the use of the XML Schema makes more sense in the WSDL version of PM than in the CORBA version.	
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					

					Proposes an evolution of GM, which has hardly changed since Parlay 1.0 and therefore is very little consistent with the other APIs. Also we now have an SMS requirement. **This contribution just lists some related issues and is intended to kick off the discussion. Some high level changes are proposed, but they are for discussion. These include moving out the SMS functionality from UI.** **SMS: the situation is the currently there is only a mapping for it, and it is in UI; we could leave it there and nevertheless add another mapping, in another API.** **Noted.**	

					The ISUP signalling parameter Nature of Address (NOA) supports a number of values which are marked “Reserved for National Use”. These values can be used by the National SDO to fulfil various regulatory requirements, allocation and use is controlled by the National SDO. The ISUP NOA is carried in CAP and INAP operations within the calling and called party number parameters, it is used in the mapping process between INAP/CAP and the API to determine the appropriate Address Plan indication. Parlay/OSA does not make allowance for national specific numbering plan variants. Although there is the option of using P_ADDRESS_PLAN_ANY however, the disadvantage of using this option is that all the other elements of TP_ADDRESS will be ignored which means that screening and presentation information will not be available. The consequence of not supporting national numbering plan variants is that it will not be possible to trigger and provide services to these numbers. The proposal is to include a new P_ADDRESS_PLAN value. The modifications to the specification are indicated in the contribution for discussion. If this approach is agreed a CR for Release 6 will be prepared. Due to the regulatory environment, not supporting this value means excluding some operators to deploy certain services. Comment: the value assigned in TpAddressPlan is 50 because the usual thing is to take a value at the bottom of the range. But in the IDL it will be translated into 14, which is the next value. It will be changed to 14. Note that this is not really important because the value is invisible to the application. There was a similar contribution in Sophia that was not approved, and was postponed for an email discussion that never happened. A main comment was to come up with a more generic mechanism, and it appears that the contribution to this meeting answers that concern. Need to discuss if this change need to be made for rreleases 4 and 5 as will.	

					Rel5 CR corresponding to 1062 (therefore there is no need for a CR for Rel6, which will be based on Rel5). For email discussion.	
		1152			Rel4 CR corresponding to 1062.	
					Proposal to update the existing Generic Messaging SCS to allow Client Applications to retrieve embedded messages taking advantage of the flexibility offered by protocols such as IMAP4. With the POP3 protocol, a message is considered as a single block. Other protocols such as IMAP4 consider a message as a MIME header with several body parts (a body part can even be an embedded message.) Each part can be accessed separately with protocol commands. The existing standard methods are not designed to allow this granularity of message retrieval and so this contribution proposes a number of new methods that extend the functionality offered. Comment: shouldn't we use and iterator like in other APIs (like in CC for getting all notifications)? Comment: maybe this is too high abstraction, because the application just gets a string that it has to process, which implies duplicating in the application a lot of code that is already in the service. Question: does a message always have at least one body part (like we always have on sub-conference in a conference call)? Discussion to continue by email.	
8	Parlay Opening Plenary					

9	**Discussions on the compliance statements**					
10	**ETSI STF test specs**					

					Comments from reviewing the Test Suite Structure and Test Purposes (TSS&TP) Specification for the Data Session Control SCF. ?? **Test DSC_CM_01: proposed to also check if the TpAssignmentID is no longer valid, i.e. is cleaned up or deassigned.** **Agreed.** ?? **Test DSC_CM_02: What about INVALID_EVENT_TYPE? Should you be more specific as to what is actually invalid about the eventCriteria?** **From discussions last meeting we agreed to be less rigid about which exceptions to return, and P_INVALID_CRITERIA orany other suitable criteria will be allowed.** **Not agreed.** ?? **Same comment for Test DSC_CM_5.** **Not agreed.** ?? **Test DSC_CM_6 : What happens when the Client invokes createNotification for a third time?** **It's not written anywhere in the spec so it cannot be tested, so it will be different depending on the implementor (it is an interoperability problem though not major). In order to be tested it should be said in the specs. Koen** ?? **Test DSC_CM_6 : What happens when the call to the latest IpAppDSCM fails? (Should try the second one.).** **It requires a second test and will be done.** ?? **Test DSC_CM_6 : Why does the invocation of destroyNotification() get rid of the latest IpAppDSCM provided by the Client? There isn't any text to support this in the specification. There doesn't seem to be a**	

					This document is presented for information – it cannot be approved at this meeting because changes resulting from CRs agreed in this meeting need to be implemented. **Reminder: the PICS document include all SCFs, with one annex for each, plus a general one that need to be filled in by the parties using it. It is for Parlay 3. For each method it contains, in table form, the compliance statements we have included in the text of the specs. The master is the text CRs, and according to them this document is changed.** **Comment on the "values" columns in the general annex: we don't have any values so this part can be removed.** **Question: what about the service supplier role – for registration – that has a service supplier ID (since a non-registered service does not yet have a serviceID, and uses the service supplier ID for authentication)?** **Answer: in the spec there is only the domainID, and no explicit distinction; therefore it cannot be further distinguished in the PICS. Besides though the functionality is different there is no real implementation of a service supplier that can be distinguished from a service, so the PICS cannot be different. Besides this PICS has a client view, and does on include which methods can be invoked, so it's all about the Framework side.** **Noted. Will be updated into 1144.**	
		1144			**Update of 1028, for email approval.**	
11	**Parlay Closing Plenary**					
12	**Organizational aspects**					
12.1	**Review of 3GPP OSA Work Plan**					

12.2	3GPP OSA Work Item Description					
12.3	Further work on 201 915					
12.4	Further work on 101 917					
13	Outgoing liaisons					
14	Future meetings					
					Bangkok: January 26-31 March 12-14: 3GPP plenary Need for a date and host for a meeting before or after the may plenary. ETSI is a possible place, to decide asap (as soon as we have the date for the Parlay meeting). May 19-23: CN groups (no meetings between January and this) Parlay USA: May July 14-18, San Francisco, with 3GPP2. August: CN groups in Sophia. Richard to talk to the BoD about the date of the May meeting: to give our restrictions and give the answer back to the group, so we can choose a date and book ETSI.	
15	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 #12 /ETSI OSA project/Parlay meeting, Montreal
3.2 CN and SA plenary
3.3 Parlay Board and TAC meetings.
3.4 ETSI STF 211.
3.5 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, 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 SA1: OSA and VHE requirements

7.1.2 Parlay

7.1.3 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 Parlay opening plenary

See overall Parlay meeting agenda.

9 Discussions on the compliance statements

Last meeting the mandatory/optional status of methods for Framework and Call Control have been determined. The idea here is that we review the outcome of continued contributions on other interfaces.

10 ETSI STF Test specs

Last meeting in Miami the Test Spec for UI was reviewed in detail. After this, the review work for the other parts was divided amongst delegates in the meeting. Here we will discuss the results of the review work.

11 Parlay closing plenary: Thursday afternoon

See overall Parlay meeting agenda

12 Organisational aspects with relation to Joint activities

12.1 Review of 3GPP OSA workplan

12.2 3GPP OSA Work Item Description.

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

12.4 Organization of further work on ETSI TR 101 917

13 Outgoing Liaisons

14 Future meetings : Friday morning

15 AOB : Friday morning

16 Close : Friday morning (12:00)

Annex B: List of Documents

Doc. Name	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status / Abstract
N5-021000	Draft Agenda	JWG Chair		Agenda	Approved
N5-021001	Document Allocation	JWG Chair		Allocation	Noted
N5-021002	report_Monday	JWG Chair		Report	
N5-021003	report_Tuesday	JWG Chair		Report	
N5-021004	report_Wednesday	JWG Chair		Report	
N5-021005	report_Thursday	JWG Chair		Report	
N5-021006	report_Friday	JWG Chair		Report	
N5-021007	Draft Report of CN5#21	JWG Chair		Report	
N5-021008	Report of CN5#21	Joint-API-group		Report	
N5-021009	CN5#20 Miami: 2Do list AP-3: how 3GPP2 can adopt OSA Rel5 (see report, TDocs 879, 880)	MCC (Adrian Zoicas)		Tdoc	
N5-021010	LS copy from N1 to N5 : Liaison statement on Interoperability Issues and SIP in IMS	N1-022160		LS in	Noted
N5-021011	Review Comments of TSS&TP Data Session Control	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)		Tdoc	
N5-021012	MMCCS and QoS Reporting	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)		Tdoc	CR in 1113
N5-021013	Problem with Requesting Event Reports in MMCCS	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)		Tdoc	CR in 1140
N5-021014	CR 29.198-05 Rel-4 Correction of Status of Methods	ETSI STF 211		CR	Update to 1145
N5-021015	CR 29.198-06 Rel-4 Correction of Status of Methods	ETSI STF 211		CR	Update to 1134
N5-021016	CR 29.198-07 Rel-4 Correction of Status of Methods	ETSI STF 211		CR	Agreed
N5-021017	CR 29.198-08 Rel-4 Correction of Status of Methods	ETSI STF 211		CR	Agreed
N5-021018	CR 29.198-11 Rel-4 Correction of Status of Methods	ETSI STF 211		CR	Update to 1146
N5-021019	CR 29.198-12 Rel-4 Correction of Status of Methods	ETSI STF 211		CR	Update to 1137
N5-021020	Parlay 3.3 ULE: Addition of Status of Methods	ETSI STF 211		Tdoc	Agreed
N5-021021	CR 29.198-05 Rel-5 Correction of Status of Methods	ETSI STF 211		CR	Update to 1147
N5-021022	CR 29.198-06 Rel-5 Correction of Status of Methods	ETSI STF 211		CR	Update to 1135
N5-021023	CR 29.198-07 Rel-5 Correction of Status of Methods	ETSI STF 211		CR	Update to 1136
N5-021024	CR 29.198-08 Rel-5 Correction of Status of Methods	ETSI STF 211		CR	Agreed
N5-021025	CR 29.198-11 Rel-5 Correction of Status of Methods	ETSI STF 211		CR	Update to 1148
N5-021026	CR 29.198-12 Rel-5 Correction of Status of Methods	ETSI STF 211		CR	Update to 1138
N5-021027	Parlay 4.1 ULE: Addition of Status of Methods	ETSI STF 211		Tdoc	Agreed
N5-021028	Draft OSA ICS Document	ETSI STF 211		TS	Updated to 1144
N5-021029	Proposed Extensions to Policy Management	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)		Tdoc	Updated to N5-021077

N5-021030	CR 29.198-03 Rel-5 Status of Methods 6.3	ETSI STF 211		CR	Updated to N5-021143
N5-021031	Proposal to add optimal routeing to MPCC	Appium		Tdoc	
N5-021032	Proposal to introduce call / service filtering	Appium		Tdoc	
N5-021033	Proposal to allow multi services in a call session	Appium		Tdoc	Updated to N5-021139
					Last meeting in Miami, an initial proposal for extending 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 was discussed. It was concluded that a number of use cases, explaining the desired functionality would be useful in order . . contribution therefore includes use cases to further explain the steps and details involved.
N5-021035	Evolution of Generic Messaging	Ericsson		Tdoc	
N5-021036	Add methods to mobility	Ericsson		CR	Rel-6 CR Agreed
N5-021037	Use of Second Callback in UI	Ericsson		CR	Rel-5 CR agreed
N5-021038	Use of Second Callback in MPCC	Ericsson		CR	Rel-5 CR agreed
N5-021039	Use of Second Callback in DSC	Ericsson		CR	Rel-5 CR agreed
N5-021040	Use of Second Callback in AM	Ericsson		CR	Rel-5 CR agreed
N5-021041	Allow Application to Resign	Ericsson		CR	Updated to 1150
N5-021042	Correct the incorrect definition of the P_MAX_CALLLEGS_PER_CALL	Ericsson		CR	Updated to N5-021142
N5-021043	CR 29.198-03 Framework Information Model: a first analysis	Telecom Italia		CR	
N5-021044	ETSI/Parlay 5.0 Requirements	Richard Stretch, BT Exact		TS	
N5-021045	Enhancements to User Interaction	Michael Walkden, BTexact Technologies		Tdoc	
N5-021046	CR 29.198-02 Rel-4 Correction to P_INVALID_STATE value in IDL	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Update to N5-021119
N5-021047	CR 29.198-02 Rel-5 Correction to P_INVALID_STATE value in IDL	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Update to N5-021120
N5-021048	CR 29.198-04 Rel-4 Correction to TpCallError in Common Call Control IDL	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	
N5-021049	CR 29.198-04-1 Rel-5 Correction to TpCallError in Common Call Control IDL	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	
N5-021050	CR 29.198-04 Rel-4 Correction to TpCallEventCriteriaResult in	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Update to N5-021121

	Generic Call Control IDL				
N5-021051	CR 29.198-04-2 Rel-5 Correction to TpCallEventCriteriaResult in Generic Call Control IDL	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Update to N5-021122
N5-021052	CR 29.198-04 Rel-4 Correction to TpReleaseCauseSet in Multi Party Call Control	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Agreed
N5-021053	CR 29.198-04-3 Rel-5 Correction to TpReleaseCauseSet in Multi Party Call Control IDL	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Agreed
N5-021054	CR 29.198-07 Rel-4 Correction to TpTerminalCapabilities in Terminal Capabilities IDL file	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Updated to N5-021123
N5-021055	CR 29.198-07 Rel-5 Correction to TpTerminalCapabilities in Terminal Capabilities IDL file	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Updated to N5-021124
N5-021056	CR 29.198-08 Rel-4 Corrections to IDL in Data Session Control	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Updated to N5-021125
N5-021057	CR 29.198-08 Rel-5 Corrections to IDL&WSDL in Data Session Control	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Updated to N5-021126
N5-021058	CR 29.198-11 Rel-4 Correction to TpChargingEventCriteria in Account Management IDL file	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Updated to N5-021127
N5-021059	CR 29.198-11 Rel-5 Correction to TpChargingEventCriteria in Account Management IDL file	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Updated to N5-021128
N5-021060	Error in Connectivity Manager IDL	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		Tdoc	Agreed
N5-021061	Issues with WSDL Complex Types	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		Tdoc	
N5-021062	Support of National Specific Numbering Plans	Marconi Communications		Tdoc	CRs in 1151, 1152
N5-021063	CR 29.198-04 Rel-4 Correction to Sequence Diagrams to remove incorrect Framework references	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Agreed
N5-021064	CR 29.198-04 Rel-4 Correction to User Interaction Prepaid Sequence Diagrams	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Agreed
N5-021065	CR 29.198-04-2 Rel-5 Correction to Prepaid Sequence Diagram	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Agreed
N5-021066	CR 29.198-05 Rel-4 Correction to User Interaction Prepaid Sequence Diagrams	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Agreed
N5-021067	CR 29.198-05 Rel-5 Correction to User Interaction Prepaid Sequence Diagrams	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Agreed
N5-021068	CR 29.198-05 Rel-4 Corrections to User Interaction	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	
N5-021069	CR 29.198-05 Rel-5 Corrections to User Interaction	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	
N5-021070	CR 29.918-03 Rel-4 Correction to Initial Access Sequence Diagram	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Agreed
N5-021071	CR 29.918-03 Rel-5 Correction to Initial Access Sequence Diagram	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Agreed
N5-021072	CR 29.198-05 Rel-4 Correction to getNotification to remove P_INVALID_CRITERIA exception	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Agreed
N5-021073	CR 29.198-05 Rel-5Correction to getNotification to remove P_INVALID_CRITERIA exception	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Agreed

N5-021074	Introduction in OSA of interfaces at different levels of abstractions	Telecom Italia		Tdoc	Updated to N5-021117
N5-021075	Introduction in OSA of network functions to support end-user/application interaction	Telecom Italia		Tdoc	
N5-021076	Introduction in OSA of a Framework Function for Federation	Telecom Italia		Tdoc	
N5-021077	Proposed Extensions to Policy Management - version 2	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)		Tdoc	
N5-021078	Proposed Extension to Generic Messaging - Embedded Messages	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)		Tdoc	
N5-021079	CR 29.198-04 Rel-4 Correction to remove unused TpCallChargeOrder	Ultan Mulligan (ETSI PTCC); Joergen Dyst, Appium		CR	Agreed
N5-021080	CR 29.198-04-1 Rel-5 Correction to remove unused TpCallChargeOrder	Ultan Mulligan (ETSI PTCC); Joergen Dyst, Appium		CR	Agreed
					Floor control provides mechanism for controlling media in multiparty sessions (e.g. who is allowed to send media). In a conducted video a moderator to appoint speakers, and participants to request the floor before speaking.
N5-021082	Alternative approach to N5-021077, use XML Schema	Telcordia Technologies (John-Luc Bakker)		Tdoc	Updated to N5-021094
					Meeting report of the 3GPP2 TSG-N OSA WG meeting held October 22, 2002 in Quebec City, Quebec, Canada
N5-021084	Rel 4 CR29.198-03 Load Mgt	AePONA		CR	Update to 1131
N5-021085	Rel 5 CR29.198-03 Load Mgt	AePONA		CR	Update to 1132
N5-021086	Rel 4 CR29.198-03 Load Sequence	AePONA		CR	Agreed
N5-021087	Rel 5 CR29.198-03 Load Sequence	AePONA		CR	Agreed
N5-021088	UI Response Requested Behaviour	AePONA		Tdoc	
N5-021089	Rel 4 CR29.198-05 responseRequested	AePONA		CR	
N5-021090	Rel 5 CR29.198-05 responseRequested	AePONA		CR	
N5-021091	Rel 4 CR29.198-07 Term Caps Class	AePONA		CR	Agreed.
N5-021092	Additional Callback support in Framework	AePONA		Tdoc	
N5-021093	AUTOMATIC NUMBERING NOW CLOSED - GET NUMBER FROM ULTAN.MULLIGAN@ETSI.FR	Ultan Mulligan			
N5-021094	Updated N5-021082: Alternative approach to N5-021077, use XML Schema	Telcordia Technologies (John-Luc Bakker)		Tdoc	
N5-021095	Call Aborted discrepancy between release 4 and 5	AePONA		Tdoc	

N5-021096	CR 29.198-02 Rel-4 Correction to defintion of sessionID	AePONA		CR	Agreed
N5-021097	CR 29.198-04 Rel-4 Correction to callAborted method	AePONA		CR	Withdrawn
N5-021098	CR 29.198-04-2 Rel-5 Correction to callAborted method	AePONA		CR	Withdrawn
N5-021099	CR 29.198-04-3 Rel-5 Correction to callAborted method	AePONA		CR	Withdrawn
N5-021100	CR 29.198-02 Rel-4 Clarification on uniqueness of assignmentID	AePONA		CR	Update to N5-021129
N5-021101	CR 29.198-02 Rel-5 Clarification on uniqueness of assignmentID	AePONA		CR	Update to N5-021130
N5-021102	Summary of work between meetings #20 and #21	Alcatel (Chelo Abarca)		Tdoc	
N5-021103	Early Draft CN3 SIP Interworking Document	Jane Humphrey		Tdoc	
N5-021104	S1-022069 Response LS on Enhanced User Notification requirement	SA1		LS in	Noted
N5-021105	S1-022070 Clarification of Information Services Requirements	SA1		LS in	Replied to in N5-021109
N5-021106	S1-022071 Clarifications on User Data Management	SA1		LS in	Replied to in N5-021110 (to SA/SA1) and N5-021111 (SA1/SA2)
N5-021107	S1-022072 LS on OSA support for MMS	SA1		LS in	Noted
N5-021108	S1-022073 Clarifications on IP Session Function	SA1		LS in	Noted
N5-021109	Reply to N5-021105	CN5		LS out	
N5-021110	Reply to N5-021106 to SA, SA1	CN5		LS out	Update to 1153
N5-021111	Reply to N5-021106 to SA1, SA2	CN5		LS out	
N5-021112	3GPP2 Plenary Schedule	3GPP2		Tdoc	
N5-021113	CR 29.198-04-4 Rel-6 MMCCS and QoS Reporting	Musa		CR	Agreed. Change to Cat. F
N5-021114	Presentation on Backwards Compatibility issues	Ultan Mulligan		Tdoc	
N5-021115	CR 29.198-02 Rel-6 Moving datatype to Common Data	Musa		CR	Updated to 1141
N5-021116	CR 29.198-08 Rel-6 Moving datatype to Common Data	Musa		CR	Agreed
N5-021117	Introduction in OSA of interfaces at different levels of abstractions - Version2	Telecom Italia		Tdoc	Update of N5-021074
N5-021118	Presentation for Enhancements to User Interaction	Michael Walkden, BTexact Technologies		Tdoc	
N5-021119	CR 29.198-02 Rel-4 Correction to P_INVALID_STATE value in IDL	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Update from N5-021046
N5-021120	CR 29.198-02 Rel-5 Correction to P_INVALID_STATE value in IDL	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Update from N5-021047
N5-021121	CR 29.198-04 Rel-4 Correction to TpCallEventCriteriaResult in Generic Call Control IDL	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Update from N5-021050
N5-021122	CR 29.198-04-2 Rel-5 Correction to TpCallEventCriteriaResult in Generic Call Control IDL	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Update from N5-021051
N5-021123	CR 29.198-07 Rel-4 Correction to TpTerminalCapabilities in Terminal Capabilities IDL file	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Update from N5-021054
N5-021124	CR 29.198-07 Rel-5 Correction to TpTerminalCapabilities in Terminal Capabilities IDL file	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Update from N5-021055

N5-021125	CR 29.198-08 Rel-4 Corrections to IDL in Data Session Control	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Update from N5-021056
N5-021126	CR 29.198-08 Rel-5 Corrections to IDL&WSDL in Data Session Control	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Update from N5-021057
N5-021127	CR 29.198-11 Rel-4 Correction to TpChargingEventCriteria in Account Management IDL file	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Update from N5-021058
N5-021128	CR 29.198-11 Rel-5 Correction to TpChargingEventCriteria in Account Management IDL file	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC		CR	Update from N5-021059
N5-021129	CR 29.198-02 Rel-4 Clarification on uniqueness of assignmentID	AePONA		CR	Update of N5-021100
N5-021130	CR 29.198-02 Rel-5 Clarification on uniqueness of assignmentID	AePONA		CR	Update of N5-021101
N5-021131	Rel 4 CR29.198-03 Load Mgt	AePONA		CR	Update from N5-021084
N5-021132	Rel 5 CR29.198-03 Load Mgt	AePONA		CR	Update from N5-021085
N5-021133	Use of Second Callback in UI	Ericsson		CR	Update from N5-021037
N5-021134	CR 29.198-06 Rel-4 Correction of Status of Methods	ETSI STF 211		CR	Update from N5-021015
N5-021135	CR 29.198-06 Rel-5 Correction of Status of Methods	ETSI STF 211		CR	Update from N5-021022
N5-021136	CR 29.198-07 Rel-5 Correction of Status of Methods	ETSI STF 211		CR	Update from N5-021023
N5-021137	CR 29.198-12 Rel-4 Correction of Status of Methods	ETSI STF 211		CR	Update from N5-021019
N5-021138	CR 29.198-12 Rel-5 Correction of Status of Methods	ETSI STF 211		CR	Update from N5-021026
N5-021139	Proposal to allow multi services in a call session	Appium		CR	Update from N5-021033
N5-021140	Problem with Requesting Event Reports in MMCCS	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)		CR	
N5-021141	CR 29.198-02 Rel-6 Moving datatype to Common Data	Musa		CR	Update from 1115
N5-021142	Correct the incorrect definition of the P_MAX_CALLLEGS_PER_CALL	Ericsson		CR	Update from 1042, Updated to 1149
N5-021143	CR 29.198-03 Rel-5 Status of Methods 6.3	ETSI STF 211		CR	Updated from 1030
N5-021144	Draft OSA ICS Document	ETSI STF 211		TS	Update from 1028
N5-021145	CR 29.198-05 Rel-4 Correction of Status of Methods	ETSI STF 211		CR	Update from 1014
N5-021146	CR 29.198-11 Rel-4 Correction of Status of Methods	ETSI STF 211		CR	Update from 1018
N5-021147	CR 29.198-05 Rel-5 Correction of Status of Methods	ETSI STF 211		CR	Update from 1021
N5-021148	CR 29.198-11 Rel-5 Correction of Status of Methods	ETSI STF 211		CR	Update from 1025
N5-021149	Correct the incorrect definition of the P_MAX_CALLLEGS_PER_CALL	Ericsson		CR	Update from 1142. Agreed.
N5-021150	Allow Application to Resign	Ericsson		CR	Updated from 1041. Agreed
N5-021151	Support of National Specific Numbering Plans	Marconi Communications		CR	Update from N5-021062
N5-021152	Support of National Specific Numbering Plans	Marconi Communications		CR	Update from N5-021062
N5-021153	Reply to N5-021106 to SA, SA1	CN5		LS out	Update from 1110
N5-021154	Proposal to allow multi services in a call session	Appium		CR	Update from N5-021033
N5-021155					
N5-021156					

N5-021157					
N5-021158					
N5-021159					
N5-021160					
N5-021161					
N5-021162					
N5-021163					
N5-021164					

Annex C: List of incoming & outgoing LSs

N1-022160	LS copy from N1 to N5 : Liaison statement on Interoperability Issues and SIP in IMS
S1-022069	LS from S1 to N5 : Response LS on Enhanced User Notification requirement
S1-022070	LS from S1 to N5 : Clarification of Information Services Requirements
S1-022071	LS from S1 to N5 : Clarifications on User Data Management
S1-022073	LS from S1 to N5 : Clarifications on IP Session Function

N5-021010	LS copy from N1 to N5 : Liaison statement on Interoperability Issues and SIP in IMS	N1-022160	LS in	Noted
N5-021104	S1-022069 Response LS on Enhanced User Notification requirement	SA1	LS in	Noted
N5-021105	S1-022070 Clarification of Information Services Requirements	SA1	LS in	Reply in 1109
N5-021106	S1-022071 Clarifications on User Data Management	SA1	LS in	Reply in 1110 (to SA/SA1) and 1111 (SA1/SA2)
N5-021107	S1-022072 LS on OSA support for MMS	SA1	LS in	Noted
N5-021108	S1-022073 Clarifications on IP Session Function	SA1	LS in	Noted
N5-021109	Reply to 1105	CN5	LS out	
N5-021111	Reply to N5-021106 to SA1, SA2	CN5	LS out	
N5-021155	Reply to N5-021106 to SA, SA1	CN5	LS out	Reply to 1105. Update of 1153

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

BAKKER John-Luc	Telcordia Technologies Inc.	US
BENNETT Andy	Lucent Technologies N. S. UK	GB
BUNTING Roger L.	Lucent Technologies	DE
DINALE Liliana	ERICSSON L.M.	SE
DYST Joergen	Appium Technologies	SE
HUMPHREY Jane D	MARCONI COMMUNICATIONS	GB
MEYER Pauline	France Telecom	FR
MULLIGAN Ultan	ETSI Secretariat	FR
MURRAY Eamonn	AePONA LTD	GB
NGUYENPHU Thinh	Nokia Telecommunications Inc.	US
SCHILDERS Koen	ERICSSON L.M.	SE
SCHMITTING Peter	ETSI STF 211	FR
SCHUMACHER Greg	SchlumbergerSema	FR
SHEHRYAR Qutub	Lucent Technologies	US
STRETCH Richard	BT Group Plc	GB
SULLIVAN Kieran	Openwave Systems (N.I.) Ltd	GB

Number of Attendees: 19

Member of 3GPP (ETSI)

Ms. Chelo Abarca	ALCATEL S.A.	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	FR	+33 1307 70469	chelo.abarca@alcatel.fr
Mr. Andy Bennett	Lucent Technologies N. S. UK	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	GB	+44-1793-897915	andybennett@lucent.com
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
Mr. Joergen Dyst	Appium Technologies	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	SE	+46 40 664 29 73	jorgen.dyst@appium.com
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. Eamonn Murray	AePONA LTD	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	GB	+44 28 90269188	e.murray@aepona.com
Mr. Koen Schilders	ERICSSON L.M.	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	NL	+31 161 242 273	koen.schilders@eln.ericsson.se
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. John-Luc Bakker	Telcordia Technologies Inc.	3GPPMEMBER (T1)	US	+1 973 829 5062	jbakker@telcordia.com
Mr. Thinh Nguyenphu	Nokia Telecommunications Inc.	3GPPMEMBER (T1)	US	+1 972 894 5189	thinh.nguyenphu@nokia.com
Mr. Qutub Shehryar	Lucent Technologies	3GPPMEMBER (T1)	US		squtub@lucent.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 STF 211