**3GPP TSG CN Plenary Meeting #18** **NP-020542**
**4th - 6th December 2002. New Orleans, USA.**

**Source:** **MCC**

**Agenda item:** **6.1.1**

**Document for:** **INFORMATION**

---

# DRAFT Version 1, 18.11.2002

# Meeting Report

# TSG CN WG1# 27
# Bangkok, Thailand

# 11 - 15 November 2002

Chairman: Hannu Hietalahti (Nokia)

Secretary: Per Johan Jorgensen (ETSI/MCC)

Host: Japanese Friends of 3GPP

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

Documents can be found on the 3GPP-server:

http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_cn/WG1_mm-cc-sm/TSGN1_27/Docs/

# Table of contents

# 1 Opening of the meeting. Calls for IPRs

The delegates were welcomed by the host which is the Japanese friends of 3GPP. Therefore it was informed on the history and the situation for this meeting and on the extensive logistics,- breakfast, coffees and lunch and the invitation to the social event wednesday evening including a Thai dance performance.

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

# 2 Agenda and Reports

**N1-022228** : CN1 chairman, Title: Agenda (Bangkok 0211)

***Discussion :*** This will continue as a living document in the document named Bangkok0211.

A joint meeting with SA2 will take place this time, starting Tuesday evening at 18:00. The main issue is to find the priciples for each group to handle the proposed changes to IMS specifications in order to align some SIP parts more towards the IETF RFC.

3 LSs incoming from SA3 were expected to be available, and this will be checked out in a break.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

# 3 Input Liaison Statements

**N1-021888** : S2-022637, To: SA1, CN1, CC: CN2, Type: LS IN, Title: Correction to Emergency call handling in IMS

***Discussion :*** **Forwarded from CN1#26.** Related to SA1 LS in N1-021877. A decision was made some time ago that there shall be no support for emergency calls in the IM CN subsystem for Release 5. The UE should in that case for voice telephony use the CS domain to place emergency calls. The solution described in paragraph 10.4 of TS 22.101 v5.6.0 is incomplete. The Vodafone discussion paper S1-021670 and the SA1 CR S1-021776 proposes an additional mechanism. Because of the importance to handle emergency calls reliable, SA1 would like to state this requirement for Release 5 and Release 6 (although further study is required on the complete Release 6 solution). The linked CRs are in 1906, 1907 and 1908 plus 1958 and 1959 (and late doc 2046). Why is changes recomended from Rel-4 ? Due to the CAMEL problem scenario and that the SGSN could support these numbers for roaming GPRS subscribers on Rel-4 SGSN, so the new emergency feature is not only related with IMS but affects also the GPRS access network. Proposal has been made for going back to R99. This must however be approved in SA1 also. Work should proceed to a complete stage 1, 2 and 3 CR set for the TSG#18 meeting. The proposed emergency numbers downloaded can not be distinguished without user interaction, to tell whether the dialled number was intended for emergency or local service. The terminal manufacturers should figure out how the MMI actually should work. The planned ***LS OUT in 2058 in CN1#26 was withdrawn due to ongoing discussions.*** In CN1#27 it was common understanding that Rel-5 CRs are acceptable, but not for Rel-4. The proposal on the table includes emergency numbers dowloaded also in LU procedure, which which was questioned. The outcome will be a split so that a CR set covers only PS, and the other covers the CS domain. However the need for the CS part needs a SA1 confirmation and it was a proposed LS out in 2431. It was mentioned that no LS seems needed to be sent, since CN1 eventually agreed CRs from this meeting would go to the plenary CN#18 before any WGs could get that LS and influence the situation.

***Conclusion: Noted***

**N1-022111**: S2-022635rev1, To: SA4, RAN2, RAN3, Cc: CN1, Type: LS IN, Title: LS on QoS parameters Maximum bit rate/Guaranteed bit rate

***Discussion :*** **Forwarded from CN1#26.** SA2 clarifies to SA4 the definition of the guaranteed bit rate to mean the maximum rate that can be guaranteed in all radio conditions and the maximum bit rate can not be guaranteed in all situations. The AMR ACS should be set accordingly.

***Conclusion: Noted***

**N1-022183:** N4-021254, To: SA1, CN1, T3, Cc: , Type: LS IN, Title: LS on Questions from the European Numbering Forum

***Discussion*** : **Forwarded from CN1#26bis *for the third question*.** CN4 asks CN1 to look at the third question on publicly managed identifiers for GPRS and UMTS service. This question is from European Numbering forum and GSM association on any potentially foreseen shortage in the identifiers. The 3GPP TS 11.11 points to the unique ID of SIM which is 10 digits except for those operators which are already issuing SIMs with 20 digit IDs. But additionally to this the second question on data-only always-on terminal and emergency calls is related with the CN1 WI for Rel-6, 'PS based emergency calls'. That emergency WID was written for Rel-5 by Ericsson and needs to be updated to cover the situation as of Rel-6. In CN1#27 it was stated that the SIM ID is not used by the protocols under CN1 responsibility. Are the SIM IDs globally co-ordinated or only regionally unique, i.e. is the risk of running out of numbers realistic? CN1 chairman informs CN4 chairman without a LS, that no CN1 problems are identified, and that SIM ID is not used in CN1 specs. Related LS from T3 in 2483.

***Conclusion*: Noted**

**N1-022298** : N4-021320, To: SA2, Cc: CN1, Type: LS IN, Title: LS Response on persistent dialogs for unregistered users

***Discussion :*** CN4 has the opinion that 'REGISTRATION' is the authorisation type which I-CSCF should use towards HSS in initial registration and re-registration. Based on this the HSS assigns a S-CSCF address. CN4 would like to know about the usage of authorisation type 'REGISTRATION_AND_CAPABILITIES' which forces the HSS to return a list of S-CSCF capabilities leaving it up to I-CSCF to assign a S-CSCF. CN1 expects CN4 to get an answer from SA2.

***Conclusion: Noted***

**N1-022299** : S2-023102, To: RAN2, RAN3, CN4, GERAN2, RAN, Cc: CN1, SA, GSMA TWG, Type: LS IN, Title: LS on proposed TR for the architectural aspects of early UE handling

***Discussion :*** SA2 informs the other groups that they have started a 3GPP internal '800' –series TR on the handling of early R99 mobiles. No action for CN1.

***Conclusion: Noted***

**N1-022300** : S4-020567, To: CN1, CN3, Cc: SA2, Type: LS IN, Title: Reply LS on " RTCP overhead in SDP bandwidth parameter "

***Discussion :*** In order to avoid the problems described by CN3 in the LS N3-020733, over-allocation of resources in case RTCP is not used or wrong authorization of bandwidth resource by the PCF, and since SA4 wants to optimise QoS allocation they consider to adopt a new IETF RFC (the RFC number has not yet been assigned) titled "SDP bandwidth modifiers for RTCP" to the Release 5 PSS and IMS specifications,- pending the RFC number is available within remaining time for Rel-5 corrections. It was identified in CN1 that the I-D had progressed far and was awaiting its RFC number,- making this not a critical IETF dependancy. CN1 also pointed out that this actually is affecting CN1 IMS spesifications, since the new parameters need to be documented in 3GPP TSs 24.229 and 24.228.

***Conclusion: LS OUT in 2402 by Miguel***

**N1-022301** : S5-024483, To: SA2, Cc: CN1, CN4, Type: LS IN, Title: LS Response on Inclusion of CCF/ECF addresses on Sh interface

***Discussion :*** SA5 asks SA2 to reconsider the decision not to provide CCF & ECF addresses via Sh.

***Conclusion: Noted***

**N1-022302** : S5-024487, To: CN3, SA2, Cc: CN1, CN4, Type: LS IN, Title: LS on Structure of IMS Charging Identifier (ICID)

***Discussion :*** SA5 replies to the request to clarify the structure of IMS Charging ID, which according to LS S5-024238 and TS 32.225 v5.0.0 shows that the ICID is made up of a 32-bit running count, followed by the IP-address (IPv4 or IPv6) of the node that generated the ICID. They are showing the detailed information in the attachment.

***Conclusion: Noted***

**N1-022364** : S2-023124r2, To: CN1, CN3, CN4, Cc: CN5, Type: LS IN, Title: LS on proposed list of core IMS specifications for Access Independence

***Discussion :*** SA2 asks for confirmation of correctness to the included list of core specifications to make an IMS access independence. What is the role of 24.228 in Rel-6? Low priority, meaning CN1 does nothing now unless some company puts in a contribution. What is the conclusion on the proposed new GPRS access related TS in N1-022197, which was discussed in CN1 #26bis but postponed to this meeting? This is under CN1 control and could be handled accordingly when it comes to the way of documenting the access independancy. More time can be spent before CN1 needs to decide on this TS, and if so what needs to be moved out,- e.g. also the security issues? Additionally to these issues it was informed that PCF has just adopted the new name Policy Decision Function, PDF, which needs to be reflected in CN1 specifications as well. Is there a CR to this meeting to change the PCF to PDF? Yes in 2386 and 2387,- with agreement on condition that CN3 and SA2 CRs are provided to the plenary as well. Also in CN1#26 the agreed CRs in 2079 and 2157 needs to be modified accordingly with the PCF to PDF change.

***Conclusion: LS OUT in 2403 by Keith***

**N1-022389** : S5-024484, To: CN1, Cc: SA2, Type: LS IN, Title: LS Response on 'SDP information in charging records'

***Discussion :*** SA5 reply to N1-022122 that the recording of the final SDP data that are actually applied for a session is intended for charging purposes. There is no intention of recording all SDP data exchanged during session establishment or modification. SA5 will ensure that this is properly reflected in its charging specifications. From SA5's perspective, there is no requirement to store SDP data on the CSCFs/MGCF.

***Conclusion: Noted***

**N1-022401** : T1-020888, To: CN1, Cc: T1 SIG SWG, Type: LS IN, Title: LS on authentication procedure for MS rejecting the network

***Discussion :*** T1 would like CN1 to confirm whether the Rel-5 behaviour if implemented in a R99 terminal is acceptable for R99 conformance. Further if CN1 agrees that it is inappropriate to fail a terminal that does not strictly bar a cell after 2 MAC (or SYNC) failures seeing that this behaviour is surpassed in Rel 5 core specifictions. Also T1 would like CN1 to confirm if a MS is expected to send the AUTHENTICATION AND CIPHERING FAILURE message before the MS aborts the RR connection and the PS signalling connection due to deeming the network as not genuine.

In CN1 it was recalled that due to existing implementations, only Rel-5 was changed to avoid the security flaw. The question to CN1 should only be understood as if Rel-5 behavior is a part of or allowed for R99/Rel-4. E.g. if a third consecutive MAC failure could be tried. Agreed that alternative e) is also allowed as acceptable behavior for a R99/Rel-4 MS, probably without changing anything in 24.008. CRs in Tdocs 2308 and 2309 are provided for this meeting. It was considered that both procedures shown in the CRs were allowed for earlier releases, but that no changes were needed on frozen releases to show this agreement.
Regarding sending or not of the failure message at barring of the cell,- it does not matter much seen functionally. However sending it could give a hint to what caused the MS to bar the cell. But both possibilities seems allowed within the specification. The test should however check if the cell was barred regardless of sending or not the failure message. Again no need to change the CN1 specifications was desired, and the test could state that a message may happen or not with the result being a barred cell.

***Conclusion: LS OUT in 2404 by Chen***

**N1-022450** : N4-021497, To: SA2, Cc: CN1, Type: LS IN, Title: LS on "Proposed TR for the architectural aspects of early UE handling"

***Discussion :*** CN4 came to the conclusion that updating the MAP signalling between MSC/VLRs would not be sufficient for SA2's need to obtain an IMEISV stored in the old VLR at inter-MSC location updating. And that the only way to be certain that the VLR always stores the up-to-date IMEISV is for the MSC/VLR to retrieve the IMEISV from the mobile at every IMSI attach and every "normal" location update.

***Conclusion: Noted***

**N1-022451** : S3-020578, To: CN1, SA1, SA2, CN, SA, Cc: SA4, SA5, CN2,CN3, CN4,CN5, Type: LS IN, Title: Liaison statement on Interoperability Issues and SIP in IMS

***Discussion :*** Since this LS was seen after the joint meeting with SA2 to discuss SIP interoperability issues related to IETF, it was argued that there was no need to deal with this LS further after the decisions made in that joint meeting.

***Conclusion: Noted***

**N1-022452** : S3-020579, To: SA3, Cc: CN1, Type: LS IN, Title: LS on protected 'user authentication failure' messages and unprotected REGISTER messages

***Discussion :*** SA3 informs about late changes that may have impact on the stage 3 specifications. The CR in S3-020555 has a new requirement that if the UE considers the SA no longer active at the P-CSCF, e.g. after receiving no response to several protected messages, then the UE should send an unprotected REGISTER message.And the CR in S3-020558 has a new requirement that mandates the 'user authentication failure' messages to always be sent protected to the UE.

***Conclusion: Forwarded to CN1#28***

**N1-022453** : S3-020580, To: CN1, Cc:, Type: LS IN, Title: IMS: IETF SIP Security Agreement Draft

***Discussion :*** CN1 is asked to review the proposed alternatives described and identify which (if any) of the alternatives is preferred by CN1, should the sip-sec-agree draft not be approved in October. During the CN1#27 meeting it was stated that IETF had approved the sec-agree draft, and no further discussions on the different alternatives as backup was needed. And that no LS to inform this to SA3 was needed.

***Conclusion: Noted***

**N1-022454** : S1-022247, To: CN1, CN4, Cc:, Type: LS IN, Title: Reply to LS on Call Barring for SMS in PS domain

***Discussion :*** SA1 understand that Call Barring for SMS is required regardless of the domain over which it is provided (i.e. it is required for both CS AND PS domains). From the user perspective, there is no awareness of the domain used for SMS transportation. In case of the Call Barring function being active, the SMS transportation should be restricted not only within CS domain but also within the PS domain. SA1 also understand that the SS procedures are required for SMS in PS domain to maintain consistency for Call Barring for SMS.

Call barring for SMS in PS was seen valid from R97. SA1 requirements was not considered to be changed so the inconsistency between stages (1 versus 2/3) will remain. The changes to introduce the service in stage 2 and 3 was proposed to be from Rel-5 onwards. In the LS from SA1 the discussion there seemed to recommend a stage 2/3 introduction in Rel-6. A method to be used to comply with call barring for SMS in PS, without impacting the radio interface,seems to be studied in CN4 now. The requirements now clarified by SA1 will not be implemented in stage 2 and stage 3 specifications on frozen releases up and including Rel-5. However only such an indication of non-support to the frozen specifications could be considered. Contributions will from Rel-6 have to be made by interested companies, hopefully without user control in the SS protocol. Related tdoc numbers to this meeting are 2244 and 2245.

***Conclusion: Noted***

**N1-022482** : N4-021525, To: SA2, CN3, GERAN2, CN1, Cc:, Type: LS IN, Title: Reply LS on CS data services for GERAN Iu-mode

***Discussion :*** Concerning the specification of the various handover scenarios addressed by SA2, CN4 would like to inform SA2 and CN3 that CN4 has introduced a new parameter "GERAN-Classmark" and the related procedure descriptions in the specifications (29.002, 29.010, 23.205, 23.153).

***Conclusion: Noted***

**N1-022483** : T3-020932, To: European Numbering Forum, Cc: CN4, SA1, CN1, Type: LS IN, Title: LS on Questions from the European Numbering Forum

***Discussion :*** It is T3's opinion that E.118 identifiers mentioned in the ENF document are issued and managed by the ITU and no further action will be taken by T3.

***Conclusion: Noted***

# 4 TSG CN WG1 Work Plan

**N1-022400** : MCC, Type: WORKPLAN, Title: Workplan of 18. November 2002 for review

***Discussion :*** The following is the issues to be modified in the next version of the WP:
1652 (Emergency call enhancements) Delay the finnish date to 09-Sept 2003,- including the belonging tasks.
11033 (IMS phase2, Stage 3) Shall use 3 months after stage 2, and therefore delay the finnish date to 09-Sept 2003.
11032 (Interoperability and Commonality between IMS using different "IP-connectivity Networks") has a new WID in N1-022479, which still has end date Sept. 2003. This must be corrected in the WP.
11017, 14002 (Mm interface, Mg interface) Delay the finnish date to 09-Sept 2003.
2503 (Presence stage 3) Delay the finnish date to 04-June 2003, completion rate increased to 40%.
2528 (Emergency calls without UICC/SIM in netw. with IMS, stage 3) Delay the finnish date to 09-Sept 2003.
11030 (Support of the MBMS in CN protocols) Since SA2 now looks for June, CN1 pushes to finnish 09- Sept 2003.
11021 ? (SDP protocols extension to include DSR) 3 mont after stage 2 requires a delay to June 2003.

IMS stage 3 enhancements are built on subtasks, and these 8 tasks could be shown in individual lines.

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022502** : CN1, Type: WORKPLAN, Title: Workplan of 18. November 2002 for review including CN1 comments

***Discussion :*** The changes made online during the review are here marked in cells highlighted with yellow.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

# 5 Joint sessions

## 5.1 CN1 - SA2 joint session on SIP compatibility

All contributions are given in N1 numbering system and stored on the WLAN in the meeting under CN1 folder with a dedicated folder for SA2-CN1 joint documents that is intended to be treated. After the joint meeting the documents referred back to the 2 WGs continue with their respective original Tdocnumbering. A LS back to IETF, or rather CN and SA in the first place, was proposed and is allocated tdocnumber N1-022476.
The intention with the joint session is primarily to establish the principles on the issues raised by IETF in their LS to 3GPP and on the solutions to those issues proposed to this joint session,- like S-CSCF as B2BUA, SDP manipulation in the network, P-CSCF stripping of headers to the UE, Network hiding need and Use of From header by the UE.

**N1-022260** : 24.229v520 CR#258, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: Handling of the SDP by S-CSCF when acting as a B2BUA

***Discussion :*** Treated by CN1 after the discussion document in N1-022268 was concluded in the joint session.

***Conclusion : Withdrawn***

**N1-022261** : 24.229v520 CR#259, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: S-CSCF acting as a B2BUA

***Discussion :*** Treated by CN1 after the discussion document in N1-022268 was concluded in the joint session.

***Conclusion : Withdrawn***

**N1-022262** : 24.229v520 CR#260, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: S-CSCF acting as a B2BUA

***Discussion :*** Treated by CN1 after the discussion document in N1-022268 was concluded in the joint session.

***Conclusion : Withdrawn***

**N1-022263** : 24.229v520 CR#261, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: S-CSCF acting as a B2BUA for MO calls

***Discussion :*** Treated by CN1 after the discussion document in N1-022268 was concluded in the joint session.

***Conclusion : Withdrawn***

**N1-022264** : 24.229v520 CR#262, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: S-CSCF acting as a B2BUA for MT calls

***Discussion :*** Treated by CN1 after the discussion document in N1-022268 was concluded in the joint session.

***Conclusion : Withdrawn***

**N1-022268** : Lucent T., Type: DISCUSSION, Title: S-CSCF as B2BUA

***Discussion :*** To address the 3 general issues identified by IETF in N1-021962 for the S-CSCF, changes should be made in TS 23.218 and TS 24.229 to describe how the S-CSCF shall operate in a B2BUA role. There are two basic approaches to resolve cases of the S-CSCF mixing proxy and UA roles within a dialog. One is to make the S-CSCF strictly follow the SIP proxy behaviors when operating as a proxy within a dialog or standalone transaction, which is not viable due to 3GPP requirements. The other is to make the S-CSCF strictly follow the UA role without behaving as an AS, which results in the need for two UA roles in the B2BUA mode. Also, the examples in TS 24.228 should be updated to reflect the S-CSCF as B2BUA. Actions are also needed in SA2 to have consistent descriptions or duplication removed.

A comment was that with the requirements needed in 3GPP to be enhanced in the standard SIP, it will take a long time to have all settled. Having S-CSCF always behave as B2BUA is proposed instead of what is now in 24.229,- that S-CSCF sometimes behaves as a Proxy and sometimes as a UA. Require header was used as an example showing how the S-CSCF should behave. The B2BUA is representing the SIP endpoints. Too late to introduce the proposed solution in 23.218 and 24.229 including change to headers etc. And the line of 'endpoints' with the solution was not acceptable by some delegates. Many exceptions and new behaviors would need to be standardized, and if that was to be done for Rel-6 the interoperability with Rel-5 would be difficult, unless all nodes were upgraded simultaneously. The protocol issues are in 24.229 where most headers (about 90%) would be passed transparently end to end. To have it end to end on GPRS could be possible, but it was pointed out that IMS is intended to have operator control. A matter of service provisioning? The problem with end to end transparency is not intended solved by this proposed solution. What about operator control by putting AS on every S-CSCF? Proposal to continue to work with IETF to align even better with B2BUA behavior.

The meeting could not agree on the proposed approach to have S-CSCF become always a B2BUA.

Defining indirect requirements via full B2BUA behavior would require that any possible side effects are analysed first, in order to avoid unintended change of existing 3GPP requirements.

B2BUA would break the transparency of the IMS network, and requires (in some cases) that the network is updated before the endpoints can benefit from new services.

***Conclusion : Noted with agreements as above***

**N1-022269** : 23.218v520 CR#032, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: S-CSCF as B2BUA

***Discussion :*** Treated by CN1 after the discussion document in N1-022268 was concluded in the joint session.

***Conclusion : Withdrawn***

**N1-022359** : 24.229v520 CR#278, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: P-CSCF does not strip away headers

***Discussion :*** Treated by CN1 after the discussion document in N1-022396 was concluded in the joint session.
Clear statement is made that the UE shall support the full set of procedures and capabilities for the Via, Route, and Record-Route headers as specificied in RFC 3261 and for the Path header as specified in RFC 3327 and for the Service-Route header as specified in draft-ietf-sip-scvrtdisco in clause 5.1. The UE will add the Supported: path header to the REGISTER request instead of the P-CSCF. P-Service-Route has been replaced by Service-Route throughout and the P-Service-Route header section in clause 7 has been made void and the reference to the draft updated. The P-CSCF will not strip away any SIP header in those SIP messages that are forwarded to the UE. Tables in Annex A have been updated.

It was requested that the UE shall support but not indicate Supported header field containing the option tag "path". Shall the P-CSCF reject the request if "path" is not included ? It does not matter how the error handling is since the UE has many functions to choose from to become 3GPP compliant. Check that the text is there to store the Record-route and the checking,- plus various other comments to check in the next revision of this CR.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2473***

**N1-022473** : 24.229v520 CR#278r1, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: P-CSCF does not strip away headers

***Discussion :*** Comments has been received offline so a new revision is already allocated, but further comments were invited on this document. Operator configuration option? Any changes to this would create inconsistency. Problem with dropping responses with error case on Via.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2487***

**N1-022487** : 24.229v520 CR#278r2, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: P-CSCF does not strip away headers

***Discussion :*** Included changes here due to the already agreed CR238r2, mening changing N1-022463 from agreed to noted. The agreed CR238 in 2124 from Miami is also a part of this inclusion.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2499***

**N1-022499** : 24.229v520 CR#278r3, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: P-CSCF does not strip away headers

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022367** : 23.218v520 CR#038, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: Clarification to use of Service Information

***Discussion :*** Treated by CN1. Basically a CN1 issue for SA2 to be aware of. Clause 6.9.2.5 modified to clarify that Service Information should only be added to REGISTER requests.

Service Information should not be in initial filter criteria for other requests to avoid protocol violation,- only in Register for third party registration. Rephrase with 'shall not' instead of 'shall'. Use UAC.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2475***

**N1-022475** : 23.218v520 CR#038r1, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: Clarification to use of Service Information

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022368** : 24.229v520 CR#236r1, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: Alignment of UE with SIP UA funtions including Path header and Service-Route header support

***Discussion :*** Treated by CN1. No need to deal with this since 2359 covers the issue.

***Conclusion : Withdrawn***

**N1-022370** : 24.229v520 CR#282, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: Clarification on use of the From header by the UE

***Discussion :*** Treated by CN1. Note in clause 5.1.2A.1 modified to state that the contents of the From header are not modified by the network based on any privacy specified by the user, either within the UE indication of privacy or by network subscription.

The UE should not / shall not derive and include some user identity in the contents of the From header, if privacy is requested. But does 3GPP have to specify this or the case where privacy is not requested? What is the appropriate place for a requirement to default on privacy if the user does not indicate privacy is required or not? If agreed, then who would like to implement the changes on 24.228 call flows? The note does not mandate much, but is intended not only for 'small manufacturers' but also for legislators, therefore it is not written as normative text, but as a warning text.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022371** : 24.229v520 CR#246r2, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: S-CSCF procedure tidyup

***Discussion :*** Treated by CN1. CR246r1 agreed in CN1#26. This CR revision is almost editorial, but needs to be revised due to 2447 conflict.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2497***

**N1-022497** : 24.229v520 CR#246r3, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: S-CSCF procedure tidyup

***Discussion :*** CR246r1 agreed in CN1#26 (N1-022147).

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022374** : 24.229v520 CR#284, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: SDP media policy rejection

***Discussion :*** Treated by CN1 after the discussion document in N1-022399 was handled in the joint session. Current procedures for codec and media characteristics flow negotiation are not compliant with RFC 3261 and may introduce interoperability problems when new codecs and media types are introduced or when extensions are made to SDP. Modified clauses 6.2 and 6.3 to have P-CSCF and S-CSCF return 488 UNACCEPTABLE HERE response containing allowed SDP instead of deprecated SDP modification, and Clause 6.1 for UE to handle 488 response.

A request was made to do the CR more detailed, including e.g. a warning code. But warning codes are optional, but if required it can be incorporated. Since the list is positive support, what would some warning give to the UE behavior? Should use a subset of the original offer. 488 belonging only to Request URI? This deviation to IETF was thought an improvement over earlier SDP modification in the network. Media modification in S-CSCF was not acceptable in the joint meeting and could be splitted out in a seperate CR, while the other acceptable part about deletion could be in the second CR. It was requested that more details would be usefull for a complete evaluation. Some argued that 23.228 must be handled first or simultaneously. However a CR to handle the P-CSCF rejection of SDP in CN1 specs are needed, and could be done regardless of change to 23.228. CN4 CRs are also needed.

The proposal could not be agreed in the meeting but some delegations were willing to forward it to TSGN #18 to ask the plenary to make a decision. Two alternatives were thrown out, either to separate the CN1 and SA2 CRs to separate packages for plenary to decide, or ask the interested delegations to contribute directly to the December plenaries.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2474***

**N1-022474** : 24.229v520 CR#284r1, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: SDP media policy rejection

***Discussion :*** The issue is still under discussion in SA2, but this revised contribution has been co-signed by more companies. Which warning codes to use in the 488 response is not indicated due to several options. Why shall the UE verify the received media types and codecs? To be deleted. Should not S-CSCF also take out the codecs as well? Why should P-CSCF in visited network care about media streams, and not only codecs. Problem with the SA2 requirement on modifying media parameters. Proposed to keep the text as is until clarifying decisions comes from SA2. Should not force the UE to make a new request after 488 response.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2491***

**N1-022491** : 24.229v520 CR#284r2, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: SDP media policy rejection

***Discussion :*** It was requested to have the CR go another round and not push it on the fly. So to improve quality and incorporate comments instead of having new CRs to correct mistakes and agreements. Equal SA2 CRs are not agreed, and this change depends on corresponding SA2 CR allowing the principle of not modifying but rejecting an SDP.

***Conclusion : Postponed***

**N1-022396** : Ericsson, Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Stripping of headers at the P-CSCF

***Discussion :*** Same as S2-023308. Discussion paper related with N1-022359 (CR to 24.229), N1-022390 (CR to 24.228) and S2-023320 (CR to 23.228). This document addresses one violation, namely the P-CSCF behaviour with regards to stripping and restoring of SIP headers and values, and proposes a way forward that is compatible with the 3GPP requirements and avoids violations of SIP protocol. The solution is proposed for Release 5. If this solution does not reach Release 5, there will be a future compatibility issue that will not be able to solve in Release 6, because there will be Release 5 UEs out there behaving with the assumption that the P-CSCF is stripping away certain headers. Proposals: 1)The P-CSCF shall not, at any time, strip away any header of any SIP message sent to the UE. The behaviour should be consistent with the proxy procedures defined in RFC 3261 and other SIP RFCs. 2) The UE will receive all the headers, and shall use them according to the procedures for User Agents defined in RFC 3261. 3)The P-CSCF shall enforce a correct usage of the header values. Should a misbehaving UE "forget" to build a proper header in a SIP request, the P-CSCF may reject the request and/or if an operator policy requires enforcing the routes stored in P-CSCF, the P-CSCF shall override that header with the appropriate values.

The P-CSCF are allowed to modify on some headers but not all, and headers can be removed by just doing policing and rejection. 2 issues for compliance to IETFs request is; what belongs to the UE, and what can the P-CSCF do. Hiding requirement belonging to P-CSCF is not a clear requirement and not an issue here. Hiding is only for the UE not to see the CSCF. Security is not an issue since a hacker comes to the information anyway, learning the remote party's IPaddress in order to set up a non-IMS connection,- and stripping does not prevent this.
Interconnect agreement versus roaming agreement is two different issues. Charging the UE where the headers are wrong is possible, but why not reject it if it is a bad user or a malfunctioning UE or a non-compliant one. Should P-CSCF do the checking or not? Or overwrite e.g. the route header from the UE without policy checking? With this proposal to avoid stripping it would make the issue compliant to the IETF. The Service Route header has to be sent to

the UE, but this alone does not cover the IETF issue. The solution needs the whole package proposed, so the UE shall support all the headers listed. Depending a SA2 decision,- if stripping shall not be done (all headers) the policing checking needs to be handled in CN1 on a header by header basis. AWS raised a concern as the only company to not do the stripping from P-CSCF to UE. AWS thought stripping did not violate service transparency, which they supports fully. A proposal was to have the stripping optional, which was found creating a difficult complexity. Nokia can accept the stripping proposal, but on the condition that the detailed CRs to 24.229 and 24.228 (majority of the hundreds of pages) be made by the originators. With all discussions remaining in different WGs (mostly in CN1) it was difficult to see how the Rel-5 deadline by December plenary could be met. However 24.228 could be delayed to TSG#19 in March. The big work would not be worthwile if the chance for rejection is present. Following proposal was made: by getting rid of the stripping could the companies rejecting the SDP proposal reconsider since the considerations to load on the air interface and transparency to the UE are now changed.

Agreed the following decisions:

- The UE shall support Via, Route, Record-Route, Path and Service-Route headers. CN1 to review the CR to implement this in 24.229.
- The proposal that P-CSCF does not remove Via, Route, Record-Route, Path and Service-Route headers in P-CSCF to UE direction was agreed. AWS was concerned that this decision reduces air-interface efficiency.
- The third proposal that it must be possible based on operator preference, that network may enforce the correct use of the headers by the UE according to the operator policy was agreed.
- It was agreed that the third proposal must be considered on header by header basis to ensure that the operator has got the control over all of the necessary headers. CN1 was tasked to study which headers should be policed.
- The reservation from Siemens and Nokia was that even though these principles are acceptable the detailed CRs must be available for TSGN #18 since delaying Rel-5 schedule is unacceptable.
- A variant of the the third proposal where the P-CSCF shall enforce and reject the attempted session in case e.g. the requested routing (by the UE) can not be supported, was also considered but this could not be agreed.

***Conclusion : Noted with agreements as listed above***

**N1-022397** : 23.228v560 CR#232, Ericsson, Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Stripping of headers in the P-CSCF

***Discussion :*** Same as S2-023320. With the principles agreed from 2396, this CR goes back to SA2 to handle.

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022398** : 23.228v560 CR#235, Alcatel, Ericsson, H3G, Nokia, Siemens, Vodafone, Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Clarification on Network Configuration Hiding

***Discussion :*** Same as S2-023337. From the current text in 23.228 the role of network configuration hiding in the stage 2 specification is not clear. This is the source of misunderstandings and concerns, for example those expressed in the IETF liaison on the use of SIP. It is clearified that the I-CSCF (THIG) may be used to provide network configuration hiding.

Question raised why the text is in an informative annex, which is not normative to be implemented? The requirement is in the normative part now being changed, and the annex C is ment to be motivation text. After these changes, what would be the impact on CN1? Having it detailed in the annex, it is now an option as required in chapter 4.4, and no impact to CN1 is foreseen.

Agreed the following decisions:

The principle to make hiding a network option was agreed, and SA2 was asked to review this CR and inform the agreement of it or a revision of it to CN1.

- The support of hiding is mandatory / optional part of the implementation
- If the 23.228 CR or a revision of it is agreed then the foreseen impact on
    - 24.228: No impact at all
    - 24.229: CN1 to review that the spec is in line with the corresponding 23.228 CR (this tdoc)

***Conclusion : Noted with agreements as listed above***

**N1-022399** : 23.228v560 CR#237, Nokia, dynamicsoft, Ericsson, Type: DISCUSSION, Title: SDP manipulation in CSCFs

***Discussion :*** Same as S2-023355. The end-to-end codec negotiation flows currently specified allow CSCFs to tamper with the SDP message bodies of session initiation requests. Concerns have been raised with this function from end-user experience perspective and IETF compliancy perspective. At the same time, the requirement of operators maintaining control over IMS sessions passing through their network has to be fulfilled. The end-to-end codec negotiation flows have been adjusted to ensure end-user friendly and IETF-compliant means of handling sessions.

It was questioned if the solution with the rejection mechanism proposed looked as a B2BUA, or if this change anything at all? The solution for Rel-5 was considered as improved through this proposed CR. The intention is to reject codecs not acceptable to the network, and it was found preferable to indicate what will be allowed to go through instead of listing what is not accepted. The problem with S/MIME encryption breaking the end-to-end transparency is not solved by this solution either. The operators need the control within IMS infrastructure, and rethinking has to be done carefully in order not to loose feature(s) for transparency. The benefits with this CR is that the user gets to know at earliest stage what is not accepted in the media from the network. The discussion on the requirements versus IETF compliance is not triggered by the LS from IETF, but has been evaluated in SA2 for a long time. S/MIME is not a mandatory feature to be implemented and therefore expressed as not a problem. Codecs should be listed as addition to media in a reject reason.

Agreed that the CR is forwarded back to SA2 for continued discussion, considering the following online edited commonly understood points:

- If P-CSCF finds in SDP a media component which it does not allow, then it must modify the SDP / reject the session
- If S-CSCF finds in SDP a media component which it does not allow, then it must modify the SDP / reject the session
- Some delegations were concerned that the proposal would not solve the IETF concern on SDP modification since according to the architecture the AS could still manipulate SDPs.
- The proposal could be seen as an interim step which is not optimized but does not block a more elegant solution in later phases either.
- Deleting media from S/MIME protected SDP would risk that the session setup is rejected without even alerting the user

***Conclusion : Noted and forwarded back to SA2 for further discussions.***

**N1-022416** : Orange, Type: DISCUSSION, Title: CSCF editing SDP

***Discussion :*** Same as S2-023495. The IETF concern regarding SDP editing comes from two requirements that have to be solved by any other technical solution, which shall avoid any interoperability issue with external SIP devices. Those two 3GPP requirements are: 1)Subscribed media home operator control: It is an operator requirement to have the ability to ensure that the media components and/or codecs requested by a UE comply with those authorised for the subscriber , 2)Local policy, home and visited operator contol: It shall be possible for an operator to set upper limits for the resource allocated for a given media, regardless of the subscription.
Orange recommends that the S/P-CSCF should be considered explicitly as User Agents and in this role it can edit the SDP.

A solution with B2BUA in the P-CSCF would put a lot of limitations to service provision. In document 2399 the user is informed and no protocol violation is done. Only a marginal number of calls are going to meet reject, and the solution would not change much to the session establishment time. What is the best to indicate to the UE, not allowed or allowed parameters in order to have a successfull second (or more?) attempt? The use of AS to edit SDP does not permit the local policy control at P-CSCF, and implies additional signalling. Addition of network policy information in SIP message does not fill in the requirements in Release 5 timeframe, and it requires operators to "publish" their network policy to the end terminal. None of the 2 tdocs (2399 and 2416) had enough support to have a go so the issue needs to be continued in SA2. It was thought that the Orange analysis could be continued discussed to find ways to reduce the drawbacks on e.g option 2 with the 4xx errror message.

Agreed that this discussion is forwarded back to SA2, considering the following online edited commonly understood point:

- Which one is more important: SIP session setup time in case a non-subscribed codec is requested first or SIP compliancy?

***Conclusion : Noted and forwarded back to SA2 for further discussions.***

## 5.2 CN1 - CN3 joint session on RTCP and the TR on SIP interworking

It was agreed on Thursday morning to have a joint meeting right after lunch the same day.

**N1-022484** : CN3/CN1 responding to SA4, Type: LS OUT, Title: [DRAFT] Reply LS on RTCP overhead in SDP bandwidth parameter

***Discussion :*** Equals N3-021011. No IETF drafts clarifies if RTCP overhead is included or not in the b-parameter in the SDP. Proposal that b+5% should be used for authorizing the 3GPP media parameter, and maybe without using that value in our b-parameter. If later the IETF decision makes this addition unnecessary we can take away the 5%. The other way is to from now on say that RTCP overhead is not included, which seemed not to be acceptable due to the opinion is that IETF already mandates 5% extra for RTCP when applications requests bandwith. Proposal to submit an informational I-D to next weeks IETF meeting. Milo maybe volounteered to do that.

Is it correct that SA4 takes the decision to adopt the IETF draft? Yes. The final revision of 2484 with finetuned wordings were made online, and given new number N1-022485 which then overrides the agreed LS OUT in 2402.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2485 with CN3 and CN1 as originator of the LS OUT***

**N1-022388** : Ericsson, Nokia, Type: DISCUSSION, Title: TR on SIP interworking

***Discussion :*** This document was ment for agenda item 8.5, but should be handled in the now decided joint meeting with CN3 and this document is distributed there as well as N3-020934. The TR is the basis for future work. The way forward should preferably be decided in this joint sessio. The proposal in this document argues that the responsibility should be moved from CN3 to CN1.

The TR wil not be published in the end since it is expected to be a 9xx specification, but it can also become a 8xx if CN3 decides to do that. The intention is to detect problems and interworking needs in SIP area, and the contents will go into other specifications depending on the solutions. Is it so that the work is nearly finished and CRs can be written? If so the proposal is that the TR goes to SA2 for acceptance on solutions. To have it going to CN#18 it was proposed not to have new ownership discussion of the responsibility or following this TR, just to do the remaining distribution of work. An issue overlooked by this proposal is that CN1 never reviewed the TR properly, and that many holes have been identified. IETF's interest in this TR was also an issue. The originator of the TR had in mind an email approval with also CN1 experts included, and then sent to CN1 for information before going to CN and SA2 for architecture approval. Next CN1 meeting is in February and is the last point for review before CN#19. It was argued that SA2 should have a full stable TR when reviewing, by having the TR content as widely documented as possible, and for that more contributions are needed. That would happen easier if the TR was in CN1 were more SIP expertise is gathered. CN3 proposal now is to bring the TR for CN1 review of details before it can be taken to SA2 and CN#19 approval. However CN3 could bring the TR to CN#18 just for information. Complete agreement that only one group have ownership. SA2 should see it before the TR becomes fully polished, but after the stable layout is obtained,- meaning after CN1 review at least. The TR with options of pros and cons should have a 9xx number for information benefits.
The TR was agreed to stay in CN3 and will be reviewed by CN1 first, not via LS and with mandate to do changes agreed in the CN1#28 meeting. Agreed that CN3 forwards the TR to CN #18 for information and to CN #19 for approval. The TR should be stored on the 3GPP server spec/latest drafts.

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022486** : Siemens, Type: TR, Title: Draft TR on interworking between the 3GPP profile of SIP and external SIP usage

***Discussion :*** The latest draft of the TR in question, provided to CN1 as information.

***Conclusion : Noted***

***Discussion :*** Clarification of the protocol to be used for the transfer of: 1) NAS messages during resource allocation (DTAP or RANAP Direct Transfer), 2) trace related messages, 3) the messages to cancel a subsequent inter-MSC handover/relocation during the resource allocation.

# 6 Corrections to old releases

## 6.1 Rel-4 and older releases

**N1-022230** : Ericsson, Type: DISCUSSION , Title: Cause #8 in Non-combined GPRS Attach and Normal Routing Area Update

***Discussion :*** If a network was to send cause #8 to the MS in non-combined Attach and Normal RAU, the MS will consider the SIM as invalid for both GPRS and non-GPRS services until switching off or removal of the SIM. Blocking the MS from having CS services in such instances is wrong. The proposal is to correct the error in TS 24.008 by removing the use of Cause #8 from section 4.7.3.1.4 'GPRS attach not accepted by the network', and to correct the error in TS 29.010 by removing Cause #8 from the normal 'Routing Area Update' case.

Regardless if CS or PS sent cause#8, the result is the same. But why is it not in Attach as well for 29.010? The opinion by many was that a change of MS behavior to cause#8 would not be acceptable on frozen releases. If the usage of #8 in GPRS procedure is a problem, then it was proposed to do a change in the network rather than the mobile since there are already millions of GPRS mobiles out there which will continue to treat #8 according to R97/98? It was voiced that since 29.010 has only mapping for RAU,- it could be extended with attach. It was said that networks do send cause#8 when IMSI is not known, and that either way of making changes would impact existing MSs implementions to receive or not the cause #8 at attach.

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022231** : 24.008v3d0 CR#711, Ericsson, Type: CR , Title: Cause #8: "GPRS and non-GPRS services not allowed"

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Rejected***

**N1-022232** : 24.008v480 CR#712, Ericsson, Type: CR , Title: Cause #8: "GPRS and non-GPRS services not allowed"

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Rejected***

**N1-022233** : 24.008v550 CR#713, Ericsson, Type: CR , Title: Cause #8: "GPRS and non-GPRS services not allowed"

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Rejected***

**N1-022234** : 23.009v3b0 CR#088, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: Clarification of the protocol to be used on the E-interface

Wether the correction is applicable to clause 7 or not was discussed. A better structure would be a major change on subsequent handovers and the scope of clause 7. DTAP in clause 8.3 was also questioned. Postponed for off-line discussions. Revised to 2405 which was later withdrawn since the first version was acceptable.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022405** : 23.009v3b0 CR#088r1, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: Clarification of the protocol to be used on the E-interface

***Discussion :*** Not available.

***Conclusion : Withdrawn***

**N1-022235** : 23.009v450 CR#089, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: Clarification of the protocol to be used on the E-interface

***Discussion :*** Revised to 2406 which was later withdrawn since the first version was acceptable.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022406** : 23.009v450 CR#089r1, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: Clarification of the protocol to be used on the E-interface

***Discussion :*** Not available.

***Conclusion : Withdrawn***

**N1-022236** : 23.009v520 CR#090, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: Clarification of the protocol to be used on the E-interface

***Discussion :*** Revised to 2407 which was later withdrawn since the first version was acceptable.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022407** : 23.009v520 CR#090r1, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: Clarification of the protocol to be used on the E-interface

***Discussion :*** Not available.

***Conclusion : Withdrawn***

**N1-022237** : 29.108v320 CR#, Siemens, Type: INFORMATION, Title: Clarification of the relocation and trace related messages

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022242**: Ericsson, WI: TEI4, Type: INFORMATION, Title: M3UA for 3GPP Networks

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022243**: Ericsson, WI: TEI, Type: INFORMATION, Title: Potential transition problem when switching MSC revision from R98 to R99

***Discussion :*** There are two concerns that are addressed by this document. 1) The revision level of the BSS must be raised to R99 before the revision level of the MSC can be raised to R99, meaning ensure that the BSS is upgraded to R99, or at least supports the broadcast of the MSCR bit throughout the MSC area. 2) When the revision level of the MSC is raised from R98 to R99, the value of the MSCR bit need to be changed. This change needs to be done in each cell throughout the whole MSC area at the same moment as the change of revision level in the MSC takes place. Ericsson kindly asks the relevant 3GPP working groups (GERAN2 and CN1) to confirm whether they share the same concerns that are expressed by Ericsson in this document. And whether any clarification / solution is required in the R99, and in that case whether it should be placed on MSC or BSS. Since this is a problem that is expected to require special treatment only during a relatively short transition period, Ericsson does not believe that this require any particular change in the 3GPP standards. It should however be noted that this treatment might not be strictly according to either the R98 or the R99 versions of the 3GPP standards.

The CN (both MSC and SGSN) update to R99 must be coordinated with the AN SysInfo update to ensure that the R99 MSs will receive correct information on CN revision. Otherwise the send-sequence numbering from R99 mobiles fail to detect duplications. What about BSC's of pre-R98 with R99 MSC which has not activated the MSCR bits, and then does handover to UMTS? The sequence number should remain as it was in the anchor MSC. The problem of sequence nubers getting out of synchroization then arises at hard handover. At subsequent UMTS handover a duplication will not be detected. No CRs was proposed made to indicate the problem or a mechanism to handle it, but the R99 upgrades need to be well co-ordinated in the network. GERAN will discuss this next week,- related to lower layer. Agreed that no CR impacting 24.007 was needed.

***Conclusion : LS OUT in 2408 by Rouzbeh***

**N1-022270** : 23.009v3b0 CR#081r2, Nortel, Type: CR , Title: MSC_A_HO SDL correction

***Discussion :*** Seen earlier, but now with SDL included.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022271** : 23.009v450 CR#082r2, Nortel, Type: CR , Title: MSC_A_HO SDL correction

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022272** : 23.009v520 CR#083r2, Nortel, Type: CR , Title: MSC_A_HO SDL correction

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022306** : Matsushita, Motorola, Type: DISCUSSION , Title: Discussion on whether support of SMS over GPRS is, or is not mandatory

***Discussion :*** The support of SMS is conditional to support of GPRS, yet there are GPRS networks which fail to provide PS SMS. We need to either: 1)match reality with the current R99 specs, OR 2) define a workaround in Rel-6. DL indication to MS is a candidate solution. From the specifications it is clear that the support of SMS is mandatory in both the MSC and the SGSN, so the MS or UE can decide whether to send mobile orientated short messages via the MSC or SGSN depending on the registration status of the MS or UE. However, there are networks where some SGSNs do not currently support SMS, (or perhaps these SMS capabilities are disabled). This leads to problems for the MS / UE as the specifications do not provide any indication to the MS for the case where an SGSN does not support SMS. Matsushita originally raised this issue, but many other mobile terminal manufacturers are also experiencing the same problem. This was raised at the CN#17 plenary meeting and also in SA#17 plenary meetings, leading to a long debate as to whether or not the support of SMS should or should not be mandatory in the SGSN. The solution appears to be for :- infrastructure manufacturers and operators (SA WG1) to agree whether the support of SMS in the SGSN is mandatory; or - the network to indicate to the MS /UE the possible lack of SMS supported by the SGSN or MSC (CN WG1).

The originators proposal is to have a positive indication from the network. The other view from some delegations is that existing implementations follow the mandatory solution, and that operators that have already paid for the PS SMS feature should not be punished economically by updating that feature with a positive indication. The cause value 69 (functionality not supported) is used already in some networks and could be used. The proposal is then to have a warning note in 09.95/29.095, stating the expanded interpretation of cause#69 for MSs to try the other domain for SMS. Old MSs would not be able to tackle a positive indication or an enhanced meaning of cause#69. The problem is not protocol related, but due to vendors or operators not following the specifications. Various cause values are used today, in some cases even leaaving the MS hanging, and this was identified as a problem. In fact a MS trying SMS over PS and receiving 'any cause value' actually should try CS because of the situation. In future networks a DL indication could be enhanced to even indicate which domain is prefered. Is different subscription for CS and PS domain supported in the specifications? Agreed to have cause#69 or nothing for Rel-6, since a new cause value in Rel-6 would give backward compatibility problem. In Rel-6 it was agreed to have a DL indication of either support or non-support of PS SMS. Use of cause#69 as minimum could be decided in CN1 without a LS to SA1, but enhancing a DL indication with preference for SMS domain load balancing could be sent in a LS to SA1.

***Conclusion : LS OUT in 2414 by Tim***

**N1-022308** : 24.008v3d0 CR#717, Ericsson, Type: CR , Title: Incorrect penalising of MS that choose the preferred handling of Authentication not acceptable

***Discussion :*** Not seen as a justified correction for a frozen releaase but stick to the outcome reported in the LS OUT in 2404. CN1 agreed that the alternative behavior for R99 MS described in this CR was acceptable,- meaning that Rel-5 behavior should not make the MS fail the test in rejecting the network.

***Conclusion : Withdrawn***

**N1-022309** : 24.008v480 CR#718, Ericsson, Type: CR , Title: Incorrect penalising of MS that choose the preferred handling of Authentication not acceptable

***Discussion :*** Not seen as a justified correction for a frozen releaase but stick to the outcome reported in the LS OUT in 2404. CN1 agreed that the alternative behavior for Rel-4 MS described in this CR was acceptable,- meaning that Rel-5 behavior should not make the MS fail the test in rejecting the network.

***Conclusion : Withdrawn***

**N1-022321** : 24.008v3d0 CR#719, CN1 secretary, Type: CR , Title: Correcting errors and making improvements to references

***Discussion :*** With this CR correcting references to undefined references or not R99 series references, all CN1 responsible specifications should now have been updated. It was pointed out problems with text in 2 notes and that the feature refered to in 03.01 about queing was not carried on to 23.101, requiring deletion of that reference as the option.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2417***

**N1-022417** : 24.008v3d0 CR#719r1, CN1 secretary, Type: CR , Title: Correcting errors and making improvements to references

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022322** : 24.008v480 CR#720, CN1 secretary, Type: CR , Title: Correcting errors and making improvements to references

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Revised to 2418***

**N1-022418** : 24.008v480 CR#720r1, CN1 secretary, Type: CR , Title: Correcting errors and making improvements to references

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022323** : 24.008v550 CR#721, CN1 secretary, Type: CR , Title: Correcting errors and making improvements to references

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Revised to 2419***

**N1-022419** : 24.008v550 CR#721r1, CN1 secretary, Type: CR , Title: Correcting errors and making improvements to references

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022393** : 04.08v4n1 (Phase2) CR#A1139, T-Mobile, Type: CR , Title: Clarification on revision level

***Discussion :*** In case of interworking of different releases between MS and network the upward compatibility is not clearly defined. The revision level indicates which release is implemented in the MS. The behaviour of the network if it receives an unknown revision level is not clearly defined. A network shall use in case of unknown revision level signalled from the MS within the MS classmark information 1 and 2 the highest revision level of the network implementation.

This is a real life situation. What shall the network do when the MS sends more than expected, and even if expected behavior that text is not there. Therefore a clarification could be benefitial. Postponed to check some MS behavior.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022394** : 04.08v5i1 CR#A1141, T-Mobile, Type: CR , Title: Clarification on revision level

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022352** : 04.08v6j0 CR#A1135, T-Mobile, Type: CR , Title: Clarification on revision level

***Discussion :*** Proposal that a GSM ph2 network must not fall back to GSM ph1 behaviour if it meets R99 or newer mobile. This one should be Cat F. since Ph. 2 and R96 were added to the set afterwards.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022353** : 04.08v7i0 CR#A1137, T-Mobile, Type: CR , Title: Clarification on revision level

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022354** : 24.008v3d0 CR#722, T-Mobile, Type: CR , Title: Clarification on revision level

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022355** : 24.008v480 CR#723, T-Mobile, Type: CR , Title: Clarification on revision level

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022356** : 24.008v550 CR#724, T-Mobile, Type: CR, Title: Clarification on revision level

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022391** : Nokia, Type: DISCUSSION , Title: Speech codec indication by R99 MS

***Discussion :*** The BC IE has evolved over years and in early versions of the protocol the RCR indication was sufficient to judge whether the MS supports HR and the related GSM HR codec which was the only specified HR codec at the time. Keeping the same logic of looking at RCR for HR support and Speech version indication in octet(s) 3a etc may produce a mismatch since codecs like AMR include both FR and HR codec modes. When AMR is supported, then all codec modes must be supported by the mobile.How does the network deduce that the MS supports GSM HR? How does the network deduce that the MS supports AMR HR modes?

CN1 agreed the following: 1) Old networks supporting GSM FR and possibly GSM HR but no other codecs may use Radio Channel Requirement (RCR) as indication of not only FR / HR channel support but also codec support.
2) Networks which support AMR can safely assume that if a UE indicates AMR support then it must support all AMR codec modes, including HR modes even though the UE does not indicate support for GSM HR in RCR field. 3) The support of AMR mandates the support of all codec modes within is according to 06.71 / 26.071.

***Conclusion : Noted***

# 7 Release 5

## 7.1 Non-IMS Rel-5 corrections

**N1-022229** : 24.008v550 CR#710, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Fullfilling stage 2 requirement on storing of SRES for possible retransmission

***Discussion :*** In 33.102, section 6.3.3. subsection on “Re-Use and re-transmission of (RAND, AUTN)”, it is a requirement that the terminal shall store the RAND and the successful authentication result upon completing an authentication challenge from the network. These parameters are stored so the terminal can check that should the next Authentication challenge from the network containing the same RAND then a response can be provided immediately

with the stored authentication result. From 33.012, section 6.3.3, subsection on “Re-Use and re-transmission of (RAND, AUTN)”, it is clear that the authetication result the mobile has to store is either the RES or the SRES.
However, in 24.008, only the storing of the RES is described. There is no requirement that should the authentication challenge be a GSM authentication challenge, the result returned by the SIM/USIM to the terminal then being SRES, would also have to be stored.

How would a replay or not be detected in a system using GSM authentication ? Problem to see the SA3 requirement for RES also valid for SRES, meaning a CR to stage 2 in 33.102. Therefore mandating the storing of the SRES in case of 2G authentication was not considered feasible now, but on the other hand if some implementation does this based on the stage 2 requirements, it causes no harm either.The SA3 requirement came after CN1 made that part of stage 3 and some wanted more checking on this. But dropping the proposed CR means contradiction between stage 2 and stage 3, which can lead to different implementations. LS OUT in 2415 by Robert.

The document was revisited later in the meeting and became rejected, so the first allocated LS OUT in 2415 by Robert was no longer needed after this.

***Conclusion : Rejected***

**N1-022238** : 23.034v500 CR#007r2, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: Introduction of GERAN Iu-mode

***Discussion :*** Stage 2 specification for the support of HSCSD in GERAN Iu mode is missing.

Editorials will be made offline.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2427***

**N1-022427** : 23.034v500 CR#007r3, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: Introduction of GERAN Iu-mode

***Discussion :*** Together with this CR it was decided to send a LS to GERAN in N1-022432 to tell them about this agreed CR, and to point out an inconsistency between GERAN BSC container in 48.008 and this new stage 2 text.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022239** : 23.009v520 CR#084r3, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: Inter-MSC relocation and intersystem handover for multiple codecs

***Discussion :*** Currently, in 23.009 there is no procedure to allow 3G_MSC-A to indicate to 3G_MSC-B the currently selected codec or available codecs, nor any means for 3G_MSC-B to select another codec and indicate this back to 3G_MSC-A. In REL5 AMR_WB is introduced which should be retained after inter-MSC handover rather than falling back to narrowband in the non-anchor if the non-anchor can support wideband. Further if for some reason the currently selected codec is not the preferred codec then it should be possible to change back to the preferred codec. The 3G_MSC-B needs to know the set of allowed UMTS codecs due to potential subsequent intersystem handover to UMTS within 3G_MSC-B. MSC-A/3G_MSC-A needs to always know the currently used codec for subsequent relocation and charging purposes.

Since this CR had already been seen and endorced in CN4 as secondary responsibel to 23.009,- CN1quickly treated it.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022240** : 29.010v510 CR#078, Siemens, Type: INFORMATION, Title: Interworking between security mode procedure and relocation

***Discussion :*** To be presented this week in CN4 where the spec belongs.

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022241** : 48.008v570 CR#, Siemens, Type: INFORMATION, Title: Interworking between security mode procedure and relocation

***Discussion :*** To be presented next week in GERAN where the spec belongs.

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022244** : NTT DoCoMo, Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Discussion Document on introducing SMS Call Barring in PS domain

***Discussion :*** Believed that in order to simplify the implementation of the SGSN and possibly other core network systems, the SGSN supports only relevant SS operations and requests for SMS CB, and that the MS for both CS and PS domain should do a careful treatment on any SS operations. This document was handled in CN4 already. See 2245.

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022245** : 24.008v550 CR#714, NTT DoCoMo, Type: CR, Title: Introducing SMS Call Barring in PS domain

***Discussion :*** SMS is used in both CS domain and PS domain in the current stage 2 and stage 3 specifications. However, Call Barring for SMS is applied only in CS domain in the current specificaion. From user's point of view, this is not desirable because a short message can be sent or received via PS domain even if the user activate Call Barring for SMS. Therefore, Call Barring for SMS should be introduced to PS domain. The network feature supported IE is modified in this CR in order for the network to notify the UE that the network supports Supplementary Service except for LCS MOLR.

The flag seems to indicate that Call barring is supported or not (actually only generally since it includes all SS except for LCS-MOLR) and not the operations related to call barring which seems to be the SA1 requirement. We should have a discussion paper on the whole solution shown, including the MS behavior on received indications. What about the network center behavior in different scenarios? See also the discussion on the incoming LS from SA1 in 2454 to this meeting.

***Conclusion : Postponed***

**N1-022246** : 24.008v550 CR#715, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: SMS over GPRS disabled

***Discussion :*** Await the SA1 reaction on the LS to be sent about downlink indication in Rel-6, unless a possible solution as this CR from CN1 could be shown to SA1. Not needed as no solution would however be accepted for R99, Rel-4 and Rel-5 by some delegates.

***Conclusion : Withdrawn***

**N1-022247** : 24.011v500 CR#024, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: SMS over GPRS disabled

***Discussion :*** An explanation text has been added indicating that if the support of SMS over GPRS is disabled in the network the MS shall be informed about it during the GPRS attach and routing area updating procedure.

Await the SA1 reaction on the LS to be sent about downlink indication in Rel-6, unless a possible solution as this CR from CN1 could be shown to SA1. Not needed as no solution would however be accepted for R99, Rel-4 and Rel-5 by some delegates.

After offline discussions, and also discussing the LS out in 2414 with related information, it was decided to revise this CR only and not 2246.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2477***

**N1-022477** : 24.011v500 CR#024r1, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: SMS over GPRS disabled

***Discussion :*** Not presented.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2498***

**N1-022498** : 24.011v500 CR#024r2, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: SMS over GPRS disabled

***Discussion :*** An existing error cause #69 is returned by the network if the network does not allow or support the use of GPRS for SMS. The CR mandates the network to send cause #69 when it does not support SMS over GPRS, and clarifies that the mobile upon receipt of cause #69, should not attempt using GPRS for SMS for a period of time based on implementations. During this time, the mobile may attempt to use the circuit switched domain.

The network shall or should send cause#69? Without shall there is no solution to the SA1 requirement. For earlier releases the same change should be considered, but then using 'should send' for the network. It is up to companies to bring in CRs and choose from which release to start.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022273** : 43.068v510 CR#008, Nortel, Type: CR, Title: MS late entry notification

***Discussion :*** During establishment of a railway emergency call, ASCI capable mobiles engaged in an other call receive a notification on the FACCH about this call. When a railway emergency call is ongoing in an area and an user moves into this area via handover (engaged into an other call), this notification on FACCH is not provided.

ASCI is not a WID for Rel-5, and TEI5 can be used since no more CRs anywhere is expected. Some rewording regarding priority and what it refers to is needed.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2428***

**N1-022428** : 43.068v510 CR#008r1, Nortel, Type: CR, Title: MS late entry notification

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022274** : 43.069v510 CR#007, Nortel, Type: CR, Title: MS late entry notification

***Discussion :*** Same as for 2273.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2429***

**N1-022429** : 43.069v510 CR#007r1, Nortel, Type: CR, Title: MS late entry notification

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022303** : 24.008v550 CR#716, Vodafone, Type: CR, Title: Downloading of local emergency numbers to the mobile station

***Discussion :*** Prepares for emergency service handling for Rel-5 IMS. The network may use the ATTACH ACCEPT and ROUTING AREA UPDATE ACCEPT messages to download emergency numbers valid for the PLMN where the UE currently is roaming.

A downloading for Rel-4 is not a closed issue from the originator due to the CS benefits. However several companies objected to any change in Rel-4. 22.101 is now updated to cover both CS and PS side,- for Rel-4 it was a questionmark. For this CN1 meeting it will be only PS modification for Rel-5. It would be benefitial to also do the downloading in the CS domain, but it was not agreeable since the downloading is intended only to move the emergency call to the CS domain. Some understood however that the SA1 requirement is for both CS and PS to download emergency numbers. A situation benefitting CS download is if the MS is not IMS attached but dials an emergency number. The next version of this CR is to include more details on the procedures especially for the UE having the new IE in Attach and RAU,- LU is not a part of this CR. And since only the minmimum part from the SA2 request are fulfilled a response to that SA2 LS is needed. Refering to LS N1-021888.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2430 and LS OUT in 2431 by Duncan***

**N1-022430** : 24.008v550 CR#716r1, Vodafone, Type: CR, Title: Downloading of local emergency numbers to the mobile station

***Discussion :*** No reference to CAMEL or anything, pure Rel-5. Are the notes in clause 10 meant as normative, using the word shall? It is the same elsewhere in the spec. The generic name for the IE to be corrected in tables for messages. Ericsson reserves the right to come back on this due to alignment of CS and PS. Should use the list in addition to the other existing information, -add the words 'addition to'.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2492***

**N1-022492** : 24.008v550 CR#716r2, Vodafone, Type: CR, Title: Downloading of local emergency numbers to the mobile station

***Discussion :*** Ericsson reserves the right to come back on this due to alignment of CS and PS related to Rel-5 and Rel-6. Lucent joined Ericsson in this view. Seperate package for this CR to the plenary.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

## 7.2 Draft specifications and other documents for information

**N1-022248** : Lucent T., Type: INFORMATION, Title: Summary of current IETF documents on SIPPING

***Discussion :*** Not presented.

***Conclusion : Revised to2409***

**N1-022409** : Lucent T., Type: INFORMATION, Title: Summary of current IETF documents on SIPPING

***Discussion :*** The status as for the moment are presented.

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022249**: Lucent T., Type: INFORMATION, Title: Summary of current IETF documents on SIP

***Discussion :*** Not presented.

***Conclusion : Revised to2410***

**N1-022410**: Lucent T., Type: INFORMATION, Title: Summary of current IETF documents on SIP

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022250** : Lucent T., Type: INFORMATION, Title: Summary of current IETF documents on MMUSIC

***Discussion :*** Not presented.

***Conclusion : Revised to2411***

**N1-022411** : Lucent T., Type: INFORMATION, Title: Summary of current IETF documents on MMUSIC

***Discussion :*** Latest information available are here offered.

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022253** : 24.229v520 Lucent T., Type: TS, Title: Unofficial reference version 3GPP TS 24.229 (Release 5) based on CN1#26

***Discussion :*** Revision marked TS just for crosschecking overlapping when writing CRs.

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022357** : Ericsson, Type: INFORMATION, Title: 3GPP R5 Requirements on SIP, Internet Draft

***Discussion :*** The latest submitted version and its progress.

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022358** : Ericsson, Type: INFORMATION, Title: 3GPP SIP P-headers Internet Draft

***Discussion :*** Comments received has been incorporated. This is tentatively approved waiting for one person to comment,- meaning it should be in the process for last call.

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022372** : Dynamicsoft, Type: INFORMATION, Title: CN1 Open Items List

***Discussion :*** Updated since Miami meeting, and will be updated with the results of this meeting. After that this document will not be continued.

***Conclusion : Noted***

## 7.3 IMS Registration

**N1-022254** : 24.229v520 CR#252, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: The use of security association by the UE

***Discussion :*** Requirement that the UE shall send all subsequent non-register requests to the P-CSCF utilizing its existing SA.

The originator intends to make the phrasing stronger if acceptable. Should have a chapter on how the SA was created, and maybe the chapter for initial registration is the proper place. The second registration is not a subsequent non-register but still uses the SA. The intention is that all messages including responses should use the valid established SA. Out of 2 valid SAs during authentication some text on this is needed. SA3 even indicated that up to 3 SAs could exist simultaneously. A re-newed challenge goes to a new secured connection in P-CSCF and the UE uses that. Should it additionally use the old in parallell? Yes, until 200OK.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2433***

**N1-022433** : 24.229v520 CR#252r1, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: The use of security association by the UE

***Discussion :*** The UE shall now delete the new SA if no response were received and revert to the old SA. The numbering is intentionally out of sequence to accomodate changes in other CRs.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022255** : 24.229v520 CR#253, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: UE integrity protected re-registration

***Discussion :*** To ensure that the SIP messages destined for the UE, are transferred to the UE over proper SA, the UE has to specify - in the Contact header - proper information. The source IP address and protected source port associated with the security association is also used in the Contact header.

This is OK for Rel-5 but probably not needed to be stated in the spec. And if SA3 expands on the SA context for Rel-6 it will not longer be true. Anything in the contact as URI would be accepted so the statement is needed for checking. The port is optional. Rewordings are needed.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2434***

**N1-022434** : 24.229v520 CR#253r1, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: UE integrity protected re-registration

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022256** : 24.229v520 CR#254, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: P-CSCF handling of Contact header during registration

***Discussion :*** The UE may specify in the Contact header - maliciously or erroneously - someone else IP address. Consequently, the subsequent messages will be sent to this IP address. The P-CSCF checks that Contact header in the integrity protected register request coincides with packet's source IP address.

Several felt that the text is not needed because a faulty contact from the UE is anyway an error and no signaling response can be obtained due to missing SA. The encoding check was more of interest. CN1 felt that the SA3 spec 33.203 which seems to have a requirement on this was not necessary to be specified in 24.229.

***Conclusion : Rejected and LS OUT in 2435 by Miguel***

**N1-022257** : 24.229v520 CR#255, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title:Handling of default public user identities by the P-CSCF

***Discussion :*** The proposed text specifies the handling of default public user identities by P-CSCF in case of multiple registrations. A related contribution is in 2385 and discussed there.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2436***

**N1-022436** : 24.229v520 CR#255r1, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title:Handling of default public user identities by the P-CSCF

***Discussion :*** Comments offline required a revision.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2490***

**N1-022490** : 24.229v520 CR#255r2, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title:Handling of default public user identities by the P-CSCF

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Revised to 2496***

**N1-022496** : 24.229v520 CR#255r3, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title:Handling of default public user identities by the P-CSCF

***Discussion :*** The only change since revision 1 is that the sentence about implicit registration of public identities is removed from step 12.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022258** : 24.229v520 CR#256, Lucent T., Type:CR, Title: Handling of default public user identities by the S-CSCF

***Discussion :*** The propoed text specifies the handling of default public user identities by the S-CSCF in case of multiple registrations.

Is the default only a pointer or is it an identity that can be registered ? Most of the delegates ment it was a normal user identity that should be registered. Some thought it did not have to be registered. What about many lists as a result of many P-Associated_URIs? The first valid one of the first list lives until it expires and then the next etc. It was agreed that nothing is needed to be written for the S-CSCF.

***Conclusion : Rejected***

**N1-022295** : 24.228v520 CR#090, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Changing tel URL to SIP URI in P-Associated-URI header field

***Discussion :*** Draft-garcia-sipping-3gpp-p-headers-01 only allows inclusion of SIP URI in P-Associated-URI header field. Tel URL has been converted to SIP URI.

Bracket problem, some square ones to be inserted.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2437***

**N1-022437** : 24.228v520 CR#090r1, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Changing tel URL to SIP URI in P-Associated-URI header field

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022296** : 24.229v520 CR#266, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Alignment with draft-ietf-sipping-reg-event-00 and clarification on network initiated deregistration

***Discussion :*** 24.229 needs to be aligned with draft-ietf-sipping-reg-event-00. Additionally it must be possible for the S-CSCF to force the UE to reregister if network initiated deregistration event occurs. Currently UE can only be forced to send new REGISTER if network initiated reauthentication event occurs.

Cover page marking on UICC is not correct. Rewording to make it active. More editorials. Question on which public identities are active. 5.4.2.1.2 to be more general.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2438***

**N1-022438** : 24.229v520 CR#266r1, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Alignment with draft-ietf-sipping-reg-event-00 and clarification on network initiated deregistration

***Discussion :*** Plastic roaming requires that the UE need to keep all public identities, registered or not. This needs to be clarified.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2493***

**N1-022493** : 24.229v520 CR#266r2, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Alignment with draft-ietf-sipping-reg-event-00 and clarification on network initiated deregistration

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022307** : 24.229v520 CR#268, Hutchison3G, Vodafone, Type: CR, Title: Registration Expires Timer Default Setting

***Discussion :*** The UE is specified to use 600000 as the registration expires timer in all registration requests. This allows the network to always set the registration time to the current desired time, allowing the operator to vary this time as required without incurring additional signalling.

Should be written duration of the subscription and not of the registration in the text. SIP specifies that a value need to be higher than the expire value indicated in the response, requiring the text to be revised.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2439***

**N1-022439** : 24.229v520 CR#268r1, Hutchison3G, Vodafone, Type: CR, Title: Registration Expires Timer Default Setting

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022320** : 24.229v520 CR#272, NEC, Type: CR, Title: Clarifications on allocation of a default S-CSCF

***Discussion :*** At CN1 #25, the LS concerning this topic from CN1 was sent to SA2 and CN4. There was reply LS from CN4, but there was no agreement on this topic within SA2 so that reply LS remains for further study. CN4 replies that the current 29.228 fulfils the requirement from CN1.However, there is still ambiguity regarding this topic within 24.229. In 5.3.1.2 and 5.3.2.1, it is added that for initial registration for unregistered user, the I-CSCF shall indicate "registration and capabilities" value as user authorization type IE. For other cases, i.e. re-registration for registerd user, or deregistration, the I-CSCF shall indicate " registration " or " deregistration" value as user authorization type IE .

Problem with I-CSCF gets to know if the registration is for initial registration of unregistered user or it is a re-registration. It was questioned that a HSS requirement should be written in 24.229. If not stated in 29.228 the requirement described here could be brought to CN4.

***Conclusion : Rejected***

**N1-022348** : 24.229v520 CR#251r1, Lucent T., Type:CR, Title: Security association clarifications

***Discussion :*** A new definition item is added, based on a reference back to TS 33.203. Note that SA3 defines a number of security associations, and therefore it is made clear that this is the one related to UE to P-CSCF. Some very minor changes are made in this document to ensure this term is always used.

Since the 33.203 does not show the term properly it was proposed to use the RFC 2828. Or the 2401? Static list is the right terminology. Can this CR be expanded with other missing definitions?

***Conclusion : Revised to 2440***

**N1-022440** : 24.229v520 CR#251r2, Lucent T., Type:CR, Title: Security association clarifications

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022361** : 24.228v520 CR#077r1, Ericsson, Type:CR, Title: Contact header value at registration

***Discussion :*** CR077 agreed in CN1#26. In IETF, the Message draft has progressed. A new version -07 has been made available. The IESG has approved this version, and soon it will become an RFC. This version -07 is characterised of not having any dependency to Caller Preferences. Among other things, it is believed that Caller Preferences may progress slowly towards RFC. Therefore, as 3GPP does not seem to have any extra dependency on Caller Preferences, this indicates that 3GPP should retain this dependency, it is proposed that 3GPP removes the dependency on the Caller Preferences draft. A companion CR is written to remove such dependency from 24.229. Also CR077 in N1-021985 is hereby rejected.

***Conclusion : Rejected, meaning agreed to change the agreed status of CR077 in N1-021985 to rejected***

**N1-022362** : 24.229v520 CR#280, Ericsson, Type:CR, Title: Removal of Caller Preferences dependency

***Discussion :*** The dependency on Caller Preferences is removed. The reference to the MESSAGE method draft is updated.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022369** : 24.228v520 CR#073r3, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: Corrections to the Path and Service-Route headers

***Discussion :*** CR073r2 agreed in CN1#26. The current registration flows do not make usage of the Service-Route header, as required in 24.229. On the other hand, usage of the Path header is not done according to the requirements expressed in 24.229. If 2390 is not agreeable this CR needs to be reopened.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2390***

**N1-022390** : 24.228v520 CR#073r4, Ericsson/Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: Corrections to the Path and Service-Route headers

***Discussion :*** CR073r2 agreed in CN1#26 in N1-022151. The change from the agreed version in CN1#26 is that P-CSCF does not remove Path. Conditional agreement on 2487 or its revision is also agreed.

***Conclusion : Agreed on condition that 2487 is agreed.***

**N1-022385**: 24.229v520 CR#288, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Default URI

***Discussion :*** It is not specified the default public user identity to be used by the network in case the UE does not hint.

Related doc in 2257. In the P-Associated-URI the first one in the list could be used as default public user identity. Other opinion is to have a specific default public ID valid for lifetime of the session (or user?). What about if a random default public user ID expires, which one is the next? The next valid on the list. In P-Associated URI also non-registered identities can be included, and the first registered should be selected. It was felt by some that a default was not needed. The compromise between the 2 alternative CRs is to base a revision on 2257.

***Conclusion : Rejected but text merged to 2436***

## 7.4 IMS Call initiation

**N1-022259** : 24.229v520 CR#257, Lucent T., Type:CR, Title: S-CSCF handling of TEL URL

***Discussion :*** Provided text specifies the action taken by S-CSCF when it receives a request that contains TEL URL in the Request-URI.

Not a proposal that follows the agreed architecture. The solution from SA2 is to use ENUM lookup, and changes to that needs to be taken to SA2. The other change requested is not to modify the URL for internal routing,- both unacceptable.

***Conclusion : Rejected***

**N1-022265** : 24.228v520 CR#072r3, Lucent T., Type:CR, Title: Add charging P-header examples to call flows

***Discussion :*** The comments from last meeting about IP address is now incorporated. In flows 6.2.4 the word globally needs to be deleted in the definition of P-charging vector.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2441***

**N1-022441** : 24.228v520 CR#072r4, Lucent T., Type:CR, Title: Add charging P-header examples to call flows

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022280** : 24.229v520 CR#175r3, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Clarifications of the binding and media grouping

***Discussion :*** Content is in distributed tdoc 2281 due to the originator is mixing two tdocnumbers. Added references to two internet drafts to support the functionality. Clarifications when and how a separate PDP context is required for media is needed in order to get consistant behaviour of the UE from different vendors. Added support for the mentioned internet draft in the profile tables in annex A.3.

Some thought that an alternative CR set to the proposal was needed for the plenary. But since we expect all to run smoothly on the IETF dependancy, the deletion could be done later if this CR is dropped in the plenary. Some text modifications are needed.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2443***

**N1-022443** : 24.229v520 CR#175r4, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Clarifications of the binding and media grouping

***Discussion :*** CN3 is waiting for the decision or an agreed principle on this CR before progressing one of their CRs. Both originating and terminating side have the indication. Sort out what is in the UE and what is in the P-CSCF. CN3 can be informally informed that the principle is agreed in CN1 now.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2494***

**N1-022494** : 24.229v520 CR#175r5, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Clarifications of the binding and media grouping

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022281** : 24.229v520 CR#222r2, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Go related error codes in the UE

***Discussion :*** CR222r1 agreed in CN1#26in N1022105. Content is in distributed tdoc 2280 due to the originator is mixing two tdocnumbers. Go related error indication from GGSN to UE is carried in the Protocol Configuration Options information element. The actual error codes and their usage need to be specified. As all Go error codes identified at present will lead to the same behaviour in the UE, a generic text for all Go cause codes apply. A reference to 29.207 is provided to point to the 3GPP TS describing the actual Go cause codes.

Revised due to several comments e.g. on SDP.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2442***

**N1-022442** : 24.229v520 CR#222r3, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Go related error codes in the UE

***Discussion :*** CR222r1 agreed in CN1#26in N1022105. Wording comments. Should update the other side with UPDATE or re-INVITE, but make it generic by refer to the RFC.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2495***

**N1-022495** : 24.229v520 CR#222r4, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Go related error codes in the UE

***Discussion :*** CR222r1 agreed in CN1#26 in N1022105.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022294** : 24.229v520 CR#265, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Clarification on MGCF behaviour related to tel URL

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Not available***

**N1-022310** : Nortel, Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Proposals for clean-up of 24.229 Pre-conditions procedures

***Discussion :*** Late document.

***Conclusion : Not treated due to time***

**N1-022360** : 24.229v520 CR#279, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Meaning of refresh request

***Discussion :*** The term "refresh request" is introduced and refer to "target refer request", which in turn is defined in RFC 3261.

Could deal with initial request here. Import the definition from 23.218. Replace all instances of refresh as the principle.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2444***

**N1-022444** : 24.229v520 CR#279r1, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Meaning of refresh request

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022363** : 24.229v520 CR#281, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: P-Access-Network-Info clarifications

***Discussion :*** Clarified that the S-CSCF or I-CSCF removes the P-Asserted-Identity when it forwards the SIP request or response outside its own network domain. Clarified also that the P-Access-Network-Info is used by the Application Server. Removed accordingly the unconcrete required actions to act upon.

Need to strip the P-Access-Network-Info off at P-CSCF before sending it to the UE. Or do the stripping in S-CSCF?

***Conclusion :*** **Revised to 2445**

**N1-022445** : 24.229v520 CR#281r1, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: P-Access-Network-Info clarifications

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022365** : 24.229v520 CR#140r3, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Support of non-IMS forking

***Discussion :*** CR140r1 agreed in CN1#26. Align with SA2 who now documented in 23.228 how IMS should support forking done externally to the IMS network. In particular, the handling of the PDP contexts in this case is specified.

The related CR in SA2 was agreed just now across the corridor. A section for P-CSCF could be incorporated. Step 2 in 9.2.5.2 for the UE at subsequent provisional responses is that only higher QoS than the one existing modifies the PDP context. Some rewording on the PDP context to be maintained is needed to say that unnecessary PDP contexts are deleted and the ones that are kept are negotiated to match the final SDP. 'Original' PDP state is not defined.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2446***

**N1-022446** : 24.229v520 CR#140r4, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Support of non-IMS forking

***Discussion :*** CR140r1 agreed in CN1#26in N1-021928. MCC to replace clause with subclause where appropriate.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022378** : 24.229v520 CR#204r2, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: Fix gprs-charging-info definition and descriptions

***Discussion :*** CR204r1 agreed in CN1#26. This version was agreed, and an additional revision is expected in 2426.
***Agreed on condition that 2426 is not agreed. Revised that decision later in the meeting when 2426 was handled.***

***Conclusion : Revised to 2426***

**N1-022426** : 24.229v520 CR#204r3, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: Fix gprs-charging-info definition and descriptions

***Discussion :*** CR204r1 agreed in CN1#26 in N1-022079.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022463** : 24.229v520 CR#238r2, Siemens / Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: P-CSCF shall not save Record-Route of refreshing requestsdescriptions

***Discussion :*** CR238r1 agreed in CN1#26 in N1-022124. Neither this, nor the previous version of the CR needs to be forwarded to CN#18 for approval. The contents of this CR was agreed but the CR does not need to go to TSGN for approval since N1-022499 covers this and many other issues.

***Conclusion : Noted and CR238 r1 is not taken to plenary***

## 7.5 IMS Call clearing

None.

## 7.6 Other IMS issues

**N1-022266** : 24.229v520 CR#263, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: Fixing ioi descriptions

***Discussion :*** The current 24.229 description of IOI says that the MGCF will populate values indicating the associated circuit-switched system. Instead, the MGCF should be inserting values of the network in which the MGCF resides. The MGCF may or may not be in the same network as the S-CSCF, especially for calls to the PSTN/PLMN. Also, the description for inserting term-ioi by the MGCF is missing. Finally, both the S-CSCF and MGCF should follow a simple rule of always including IOI in outgoing messages.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022267** : 24.229v520 CR#264, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: Fix descriptions for ECF/CCF addresses

***Discussion :*** The internet draft that defines CCF and ECF for P-Charging-Function-Addresses has changed to no longer use the numbered instances of CCF and ECF. Also, there are no current procedures to pass ECF/CCF addresses over ISC interface for AS initiated dialogs and standalone transactions. Finally, need to account for including ECF/CCF for 202 responses to SUBSCRIBE requests.

In 5.7.3 we are introducing a limitation with 183 and 202, which could be modified in the future. Should therefore be possible to receive the addresses from the first message carrying the defined header P-Charging-Function-Addresses.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2447***

**N1-022447** : 24.229v520 CR#264r1, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: Fix descriptions for ECF/CCF addresses

***Discussion :*** Due to conflict a revision is needed on 2371.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022275** : 24.008v550, CR#680r3, Nortel, Type: CR, Title: Handling of P-Media-Authorization header

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Withdrawn***

**N1-022276** : 24.229v520 CR#240r2, Nortel, Type: CR, Title: Clarifications to subclause 9.2.5

***Discussion :*** CR240r1 agreed in CN1#26.

***Conclusion : Withdrawn***

**N1-022293** : 24.228v520 CR#089, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Call transfer update

***Discussion :*** RFC 3265 requires an immediate NOTIFY after the subscriptions. Discussions on Replaces header, - probably write void.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2448***

**N1-022448** : 24.228v520 CR#089r1, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Call transfer update

***Discussion :*** Good to se the INVITEs.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022304** : Vodafone, Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Discussion on potential security issues relating to the registration-event subscription

***Discussion :*** Currently in 24.229 it is specified that the network may trigger the UE to do re-authenticating by sending a NOTIFY request, asking the UE to re-register with the network. The current design relies on the fact that the UE will SUBSCRIBE to its own registration event, at the time it first becomes registered with the network (i.e. at switch-on).

This paper wishes to initiate a discussion amongst CN1 delegates as to what should happen in case the UE does not subscribe to its own registration event, thus giving the network no means to send a future NOTIFY request. Vodafone is of the opinion that the sending of a REFER request is not clearly specified for the case where no subscription is made by the UE to the registration event. Vodafone also believes that if the UE successfully registers (and is authenticated) then there should be no need to de-register that UE. It is therefore proposed that (option 2) the network can choose to de-register the UE as and when it believes it is unable to trigger a re-authentication. See 2305.

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022305** : 24.229v520 CR#267, Vodafone, Type: CR, Title: Correction to network initiated re-authentication procedure

***Discussion :*** Add the option for the network to locally de-register a UE that has not subscribed to its registration event package.

Some rewording to avoid dependancy to REFER.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2449***

**N1-022449** : 24.229v520 CR#267r1, Vodafone, Type: CR, Title: Correction to network initiated re-authentication procedure

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022316** : 24.229v520 CR#227r1, NEC, Type: CR, Title: Clarifications of SDP for charging requirement

***Discussion :*** According to reply LS from SA5 (S5-024484), it is clarified that the relevant part of SDP shall be collected for charging purposes and also how the SDP data shall be collected is implementation dependent.

Is relevant data defined in 32.225, and the duration for storing? For online charging is it only AS? Some CR collision with 6.3 and 6.4? Consistent way of introducing this functionality were requested. What about all other data like different headers to be collected apart from SDP? The charging procedures are in 32.225, leaving this CR not needed?

***Conclusion : Revised to 2462***

**N1-022462** : 24.229v520 CR#227r2, NEC, Type: CR, Title: Clarifications of SDP for charging requirement

***Discussion :*** Changing 'shall collect' to 'may collect' does not give the desired restructuring in a common subclause. This CR falls on inconsistency.

***Conclusion : Rejected***

**N1-022317** : 24.229v520 CR#269, NEC, Type: CR, Title: Clarification on Sh interface for charging purposes

***Discussion :*** During the Rel 6 discussion in SA2, there was apparent requirement for 3GPP AAA server, 3GPP Proxy or Presence server need to retrieve the CCF/ECF addresses from HSS to access to CCF/ECF for offline/online charging purposes. For the forward compatibility, it is better to fulfil this requirement for Rel 5.

Procedures for the S-CSCF to receive these data in P-Charging-Function-Addresses header?

***Conclusion : Revised to 2465***

**N1-022465** : 24.229v520 CR#269r1, NEC, Type: CR, Title: Clarification on Sh interface for charging purposes

***Discussion :*** Change to the word retrieve instead of obtain?

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022318** : 24.229v520 CR#270, NEC, Type: CR, Title: Clarifications on the scope

***Discussion :*** CN1 and CN3 are now co-operatively developing and reviewing the Signalling Interworking between the 3GPP Profile of SIP and non-3GPP SIP Usage. However, the current scope in 24.229 does not take into account the latest status on the situation.

It is also possible that a 3GPP IMS UE communicates with a non 3GPP compliant SIP server outside IMS. The insertion of non-3GPP compliance was not acceptable.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2466***

**N1-022466** : 24.229v520 CR#270r1, NEC, Type: CR, Title: Clarifications on the scope

***Discussion :*** Non-3GPP compliant is not removed, and therefore revised.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2500***

**N1-022500** : 24.229v520 CR#270r2, NEC, Type: CR, Title: Clarifications on the scope

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022319** : 24.229v520 CR#271, NEC, Type: CR, Title: Clarifications on the Application Server as UE

***Discussion :*** If an AS behaved like a UE then it would need a UICC to pass authentication.

***Conclusion : Withdrawn***

**N1-022324** : 24.229v520 CR#273, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: Add charging info for SUBSCRIBE

***Discussion :*** Clarify that charging information is not expected for UE and P-CSCF initiated subscriptions to the reg event package. Add procedures to define the clearing of UE and P-CSCF initiated subscriptions to the reg event package when all UE public user identities are deregistered.

It was commented that deleting the CDR would not be according to SA5, but the originator's intention was to have this brought to SA5. Should the P-CSCF send a NOTIFY the UE should consider the subscription cancelled. The problem could be implementation dependant. Use a LS or a company contribution to SA5? The latter.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2467***

**N1-022467** : 24.229v520 CR#273r1, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: Add charging info for SUBSCRIBE

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022346** : 24.229v520 CR#249r2, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: MESSAGE corrections part 1

***Discussion :*** At the last meeting, changes were made to 24.229 to introduce the MESSAGE method for the delivery of application server information between AS and UE, and for the delivery of information between UEs, as required in subclause 5.4.9 of TS 23.228. It is considered that a number of these changes were made in such a manner to cause confusion on the support of other capabilities that are only specified in Annex A. Additionally, material should have been included in Annex A to support this method, and this material was missing from the original CR. In particular, it appears the text dealing with the length of the MESSAGE method is: i) common to the handling of all methods, and not specific to the MESSAGE method; ii) is already specified for all methods within clause 18 of RFC 3261. Rather than duplicating the RFC in this respect, it would appear appropriate to find a general location to provide a pointer to the RFC 3261 text. A new clause 4.2A is proposed to resolve this. This does however introduce a technical change, as the current text within 24.229 specifies the usage of TCP, and the change reverts to the rather more general text in RFC 3261 " the request MUST be sent using an RFC 2914 [43] congestion controlled transport protocol, such as TCP". If both sides support SCTP, then SCTP could be used rather than TCP. The support of TCP by all entities is mandatory so this is the common denominator.

The conditions or maybe the source to reference for the byte length of 1300 with offset of 200 should be introduced. Rewording of the role for S-CSCF. Concern of using TCP for INVITE from UE, but there is no way to avoid that now.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2455***

**N1-022455** : 24.229v520 CR#249r3, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: MESSAGE corrections part 1

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022347** : 24.229v520 CR#250r1, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: MESSAGE corrections part 2

***Discussion :*** Previous CRs that introduced the MESSAGE method provided only a single table within the Annex A profile whose contents were inconsistent with the remainder of the profile. There were also a number of errors, and the proxy role entry was missing altogether. This CR provides a set of tables consistent with the status of the remainder of the Annex A profile.

Still some work remaining on P-headers to complete the work later. Should not the MESSAGE method be optional as of Helsinki meeting, instead of conditional or mandatory carried on in this cleanup. Optionality to send, but mandatory to e.g. transit the method in an AS.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2456***

**N1-022456** : 24.229v520 CR#250r2, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: MESSAGE corrections part 2

***Discussion :*** MCC to correct a spelling.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022366** : 24.228v520 CR#091, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: Addition of Message flows to 24.228

***Discussion :*** 24.229 specifies support for SIP MESSAGE method but there is currently no example flow in TS 24.228.

A clause to show hiding e.g. 'not provided', should be shown. Some editorials like on brackets to be handled.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2457***

**N1-022457** : 24.228v520 CR#091r1, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: Addition of Message flows to 24.228

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022373** : 24.229v520 CR#283, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: Support of comp=sigcomp parameter

***Discussion :*** The IETF has developped a mechanism for which a UA or proxy can express the support and willingness to compress SIP messages. This extension is mandatory for all those SIP proxies and User Agents that implement SIP and Sigcomp.

The refered IETF draft is about to be a RFC now and is in last call,- and progresses the compression dictionary together. Some considered the addition of feature to a frozen release as not acceptable. And besides the P-CSCF already has compression as mandatory. What about the extension being mandatory? The IETF draft does state that supporting Sigcomp requires this parameter to state willingness and capability. Therefore some would not support this draft to be referenced. That could give backwards problems later on by not aligning. It does not cost much or harm to introduce it, and it seems needed for Rel-6 for the terminal to indicate sigcomp capability. The new IETF dependancy was argued as a problem for Rel-5, which could however be left for plenary to decide. The P-CSCF would in Rel-6 have problem to identify the willingness from e.g. a WLAN access and a terminal Rel-5 in the same network if the parameter is not introduced in Rel-5. Instead of support it can be written 'enable' (the usage). It should not be in clause 8, probably in 5.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2458***

**N1-022458** : 24.229v520 CR#283r1, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: Support of comp=sigcomp parameter

***Discussion :*** IESG deadline was 12. November so the I-D is in a well advanced state. The concept of making dependency (the tanbles) was not done correctly but Lucent were willing to help out solving that. Lucent considered this a change to functionality for frozen Rel-5, leaving it a Rel-6 feature, so they objected to the CR alone.

***Conclusion : Rejected***

**N1-022375** : Dynamicsoft, Type: DISCUSSION, Title: SIP compression resynchronisation

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Not available***

**N1-022379** : 24.229v520 CR#285, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Fallback for compression failure

***Discussion :*** There is no recovery mechanism specified for the compression failure cases. Text has been added that both the UE and the P-CSCF are responsible to recover from a compression failure case.

Lucent commented that the proposal could be agreed here now but reserved the right for a possible intervention in the plenary, due to the IETF meeting next week where discussions may take place, e.g. make an informational I-D. Comment that the UE may recover according to a incomplete list,- which can be shown as information only.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2481***

**N1-022481** : 24.229v520 CR#285r1, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Fallback for compression failure

***Discussion :*** Present in a seperate CRpackage to the plenary.

***Conclusion : Agreed conditionally to the outcome of IETF meeting next week***

**N1-022380** : 24.229v520 CR#286, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Compression failure

***Discussion :*** To meet Release 5 deadlines 3GPP should accept a working solution that is compliant to SigComp, and modify 24.229 accordingly. This could also influence the IETF work.

Strange way of presenting a CR,- together with a discussion paper. The related draft in IETF has no decision yet with comments that the I-D may be is not needed. 3GPP can not wait any longer so the dependancy is removed.

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022382** : 24.229v520 CR#287, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: SA related procedures

***Discussion :*** In case of re-authentication, it is not specified how long to use the old derived keys and when to start using the new keys. The sending side uses the new SA but reception can happen on old one(s).

Solve the 5.1.1.4 collisions with other CRs , 2081, 2082 ? What about writing the procedure for the UE to delete the old SA? Not needed since it is UE implementation dependant which one to use. But what about an authentication received during ongoing call? The step 9 could indicate clearer if the UE keeps the old one or switches at that point.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2459***

**N1-022459** : 24.229v520 CR#287r1, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: SA related procedures

***Discussion :*** The cover page is modified not showing what is changed in this CR other than against last revision.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022383** : 24.228v520 CR#092, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: SA related procedures

***Discussion :*** There will be only one SA setup for both UDP and TCP as transport protocols. The examples show two, one for each transport protocol. Parameters for the second SA has been removed.

The text behind flows in some places needs to be removed as well. The frames shall not be deleted. The whole package related to IPsec 05 needs to be taken to plenary, but after WG agreement if possible.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2460***

**N1-022460** : 24.228v520 CR#092r1, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: SA related procedures

***Discussion :*** The CR could be agreed with a comment that styling changes were unintentionally done on base spec.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022384** : Nokia, Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Backup security solution

***Discussion :*** The discussion paper explains the status of Sec-agree draft in IETF, and proposes another alternative solution for Annex H of TS 33.203, which is the extension of HTTP Digest to carry SA attributes; in case the Sec-agree 05 draft may not achieve approval in IETF within 3GPP Rel-5's timeframe.

Later during the meeting it was heard that the draft has been approved and therefore no backup plan is needed.

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022386** : 24.228v520 CR#093, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: PCF to PDF

***Discussion :*** Within SA2 it was agreed to use the Policy Decision Function teminology for compatibiltiy with other access networks (S2-023124Rev2) for all documents from Release 5. Related with LS in N1-022364.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022387** : 24.229v520 CR#289, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: PCF to PDF

***Discussion :*** Within SA2 it was agreed to use the Policy Decision Function teminology for compatibiltiy with other access networks (S2-023124Rev2) for all documents from Release 5. Related with LS in N1-022364.
The definition is in another CR.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022392** : 24.229v520 CR#290, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Emergency Service correction

***Discussion :*** The UE inserts PLMN-id (MCC, MNC) to every INVITE request. This provides the necessary information for the P-CSCF to separate emergency service numbers from others.

Some correction are needed on how the checking of lists are done. Roaming agreements should be replaced with visited country. Some old text to be deleted due to duplication. Could the second list be placed in the S-CSCF having the benefit of home? Stage 2 is accepted and the function stays in P-CSCF.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2461***

**N1-022461** : 24.229v520 CR#290r1, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Emergency Service correction

***Discussion :*** Ericsson made a reservation for a possible seperate CR to the plenary due to further checking of SA2 outcome. To be provided in a seperate CRpackage to the plenary. But all this was later withdawn with the following comment: The concern is that the P-CSCF shall always check the request-URI (even though there may be nothing to check).

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022395** : 24.229v520 CR#241r1, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Corrections on P-CSCF behaviour: handling the Record-Route, Route header fields

***Discussion :*** According to 24.229 and 24.228 the UE does not receive any Record-Route header fields in responses. If the UE follows RFC3261, it sends the subsequent requests to the Contact address of the other party instead of sending it to its outbound proxy (P-CSCF). Therefore it is proposed that P-CSCF address is provided to the UE in Record-Route header field in order to ensure that subsequent requests traverse P-CSCF The P-CSCF address shall be the IP address used in the current security association.

If the principle is agreed the changes can be incorporated into the CR dealing with the stripping of P-headers. The comment on inserting the right IP address at P-CSCF will be taken into account in the merging with 2359. The principle proposed was agreed, and the details merged into the other CR in the revision of 2359.

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022412** : 24.229v520 CR#161r3, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: Clarifications and editorials to SIP profile

***Discussion :*** CR161r2 agreed in CN1#26 in N1-022056. Only changes to references.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022425** : 24.229v520 CR#228r3, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: Clarifications on the use of charging correlation information

***Discussion :*** CR228r2 agreed in CN1#26 in N1-022157.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022471** : 24.229v520 CR#209r2, Lucent T./Nokia, Type: CR, Title: UE Registration

***Discussion :*** CR209r1 agreed in CN1#26 in N1-022081. This change now avoids a collision with another CR. The cover page is modified not showing what is changed in this CR other than against last revision.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022472** : 24.229v520 CR#248r2, Lucent T./Nokia, Type: CR, Title: UE procedure tidyup

***Discussion :*** CR248r1 agreed in CN1#26 in N1-022082. This change now avoids a collision with another CR. The cover page is modified not showing what is changed in this CR other than against last revision.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

## 7.7 Minor IMS issues

**N1-022291** : 24.228v520 CR#083r1, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Clause 17.6 Error handling

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022292** : 24.228v520 CR#088, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Addition of missing "<>" for URIs in chapter 7 and 8

***Discussion :*** The parameter ';lr' needs to be inside the brackets because it is applicable to the URI. UICC shall not be ticked. while other specs lacks ticks on the cover page.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2480***

**N1-022480** : 24.228v520 CR#088r1, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Addition of missing "<>" for URIs in chapter 7 and 8

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022325** : Lucent T., Type: DISCUSSION, Title: An analysis of the requirements for the Accept header

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022326** : Lucent T., Type: DISCUSSION, Title: An analysis of the requirements for the Accept-Encoding header

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022327** : Lucent T., Type: DISCUSSION, Title: An analysis of the requirements for the Accept-Language header

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022328** : Lucent T., Type: DISCUSSION, Title: An analysis of the requirements for the Allow header

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022329** : Lucent T. Type: DISCUSSION, Title: An analysis of the requirements for the Authentication-Info header

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022330** : Lucent T., Type: DISCUSSION, Title: An analysis of the requirements for the Call-Info header

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022331** : Lucent T., Type: DISCUSSION, Title: An analysis of the requirements for the Contact header

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022332** : Lucent T. Type: DISCUSSION, Title: An analysis of the requirements for the Content-Disposition header

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022333** : Lucent T. Type: DISCUSSION, Title: An analysis of the requirements for the Content-Encoding header

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022334** : Lucent T. Type: DISCUSSION, Title: An analysis of the requirements for the Content-Language header

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022335** : Lucent T., Type: DISCUSSION, Title: An analysis of the requirements for the Expires header

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022336** : Lucent T., Type: DISCUSSION, Title: An analysis of the requirements for the MIME-Version header

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022337** : Lucent T., Type: DISCUSSION, Title: An analysis of the requirements for the Organization header

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022338** : Lucent T. Type: DISCUSSION, Title: An analysis of the requirements for the Proxy-Authenticate header

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022339** : Lucent T. Type: DISCUSSION, Title: An analysis of the requirements for the Proxy-Authorization header

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022340** : Lucent T., Type: DISCUSSION, Title: An analysis of the requirements for the Subject header

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022341** : Lucent T., Type: DISCUSSION, Title: An analysis of the requirements for the User-Agent header

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022342** : Lucent T., Type: DISCUSSION, Title: An analysis of the requirements for the Warning header

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022343** : Lucent T., Type: DISCUSSION, Title: An analysis of the requirements for the WWW-Authenticate header

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022344** : 24.229v520 CR#274, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: Profile revisions for RFC 3261 headers

***Discussion :*** Not presented due to some inaccurate references.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2413***

**N1-022413** : 24.229v520 CR#274r1, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: Profile revisions for RFC 3261 headers

***Discussion :*** A number of headers in the SIP profile do not yet have their values fully defined. This CR completes those tables for headers defined in RFC 3261 by completing the contents of the following headers: Accept; Accept-Encoding; Accept-Language; Allow; Authentication-Info; Call-Info; Contact; Content-Disposition; Content-Encoding; Content-Language; Expires; MIME-Version; Organization; Proxy-Authenticate; Proxy-Authorization; Subject; User-Agent; Warning; WWW-Authenticate. Detailed analysis of the requirements for these headers contained in the various SIP RFCs and internet-drafts is contained in Discussion documents N1-022325 - N1-022343. The summary of those documents is given in the summary of change together with other minor changes proposed in that summary of change.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022345** : 24.229v520 CR#275, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: Consistency changes for SDP procedures at MGCF

***Discussion :*** Should the description be inside the tables, which turned out to be difficult. Interaction with the NEC CR?

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022350** : 24.229v520 CR#276, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: Proxy support of PRACK

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022351** : 24.229v520 CR#277, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: Clarification of transparent handling of parameters in profile

***Discussion :*** Not intended as notes inside the tables.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

## 7.8 IMS: 23.218

**N1-022297** : 23.218v520 CR#033, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Addition of Request-URI as SPT

***Discussion :*** Content of any SIP header field can be as SPT but Request-URI is not explicitly mentioned.

Agreed with the comment that no other specification will be affected by this change.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022311** : 23.218v520 CR#030r2, NEC, Type: CR, Title: Clarification on MRFP reference point

***Discussion :*** In the current clause 5.1 (architecture for service provision for IP multimedia system), MRFP-MRFC(Mp) interface and MRFP-bearer (Mb) interface are missing.

Delete text after e.g.. The word 'Note' should not be used, and the figure is normative.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2468***

**N1-022468** : 23.218v520 CR#030r3, NEC, Type: CR, Title: Clarification on MRFP reference point

***Discussion :*** It should be checked in TSGN #18 if the corresponding CN4 CR is available.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022312** : 23.218v520 CR#034, NEC, Type: CR, Title: Clarifications on Annex C (Informative)

***Discussion :*** It is proposed to change the following points in Annex C: 1)The subsequent filter criteria is not supported in Rel 5 so that SPT is not resided in AS. 2)The filter criteria should be changed to initial filter criteria. 3)Other minor editorial should be done.

Why is the last sentence before the figure deleted? It is needed but can be reworded. SPT is already defined.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2469***

**N1-022469** : 23.218v520 CR#034r1 NEC, Type: CR, Title: Clarifications on Annex C (Informative)

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022313** : 23.218v520 CR#035, NEC, Type: CR, Title: Clarifications on definition of Service Point Trigger, etc.

***Discussion :*** The current definition for service key is only considered for the CAMEL, but it is also used for SIP AS. The current definition for Service point trigger (SPT) is unclear for implementing the procedure. Also minor editorial change is neccesary. The current definition for Service platform trigger points (STP) is duplicated with STP and causes users confusion.

It is wrong that SPT may cause the S-CSCF to download the initial filter criteria. The definition of service key? No AS capabilities are needed.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2470***

**N1-022470** : 23.218v520 CR#035r1, NEC, Type: CR, Title: Clarifications on definition of Service Point Trigger, etc.

***Discussion :*** Comments on service key not belonging to the filter criteria, and on CAMEL has not been modified. Either delete Service Platform Trigger Point since there is no support for this in Rel-5 or wait until Rel-6 to introduce functionality at this point.

***Conclusion : Postponed***

**N1-022314** : 23.218v520 CR#036, NEC, Type: CR, Title: Clarifications on subclause 5.2

***Discussion :*** The current subclause 5.2 is not clear in terms of procedure for triggering the initial filter criteria. 1)definition of SPT is not clear for implementing the procedure. 2)number of SPT should be added depending on the operators configuration scenarios. 3)definition of mobile origination and mobile termination is unclear. 4)service key should be stored in the filter criteria for the alignment with CAMEL.

A lot of comments voiced against the editions made. Not acceptable is the operator specific extensions, the changes to Note 1 and inserting Service Key into initial filter criteria.

***Conclusion : Rejected***

**N1-022315** : 23.218v520 CR#037, NEC, Type: CR, Title: Clarification on Sh interface for charging purposes

***Discussion :*** In 6.8 and 9.4.5, it is added that there is a case that Sh interface is used for charging purposes.

Are these transferred as part of or addition to the user profile, which in first case does not require this CR. CN4 spec. 24.229 need to be checked ?

***Conclusion : Revised to 2464***

**N1-022464** : 23.218v520 CR#037r1, NEC, Type: CR, Title: Clarification on Sh interface for charging purposes

***Discussion :*** Only revision to the cover page is made. Sh corresponding CRs are needed in the plenary, so this goes in a seperate package to CN#18.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022381** : 23.218v520 CR#039, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Request URI as SPT

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Not available***

# 8 Release 6 work items

## 8.1 Presence

**N1-022251** : Lucent T., Type: INFORMATION, Title: Summary of current IETF documents on SIMPLE

***Discussion :*** No major changes.

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022252** : Lucent T., Type: TR v030, Title: Draft 3GPP TR 24.841 "Presence based on SIP; Functional models, flows and protocol details"

***Discussion :*** Correct output of the Munich meeting. The rapporteur were asked to systematically edit the figures having problems and delete the related editors/contributors note.

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022277** : TR24.841v030, Nortel, Type: CR, Title: Presence Information Model for a 3GPP Subscriber

***Discussion :*** Define a new 3GPP specific element, which maps to the "Other Markup" attribute of the Presence Tuple. This 3GPP specific element shall contain the following attributes: network status, subscriber provided location and network provided location. 3GPP specific subscriber's status attribute is defined as a child element extension within the <status> element. According to draft-ietf-impp-cpim-pidf-05 it is possible to use the standard namespace-based extensibility rules to define other status values within <status> element. Note that the draft states that in order to maintain interoperability with user agents that do not recognize the new extention, the <basic> status value must also be included.

This proposal differs mainly on subscribers value to the Nokia proposal in 2290. Shall the pictures be included or not? They could be part of the TR but not marked as to be brought forward to 24.229 later on. The scheme is extendable. Table of subscribers status table was proposed deleted, but how would the values be derived then? It should be left general and open, but guidance to the presentity could be given in words. The attribute extensions need to be socialised with IETF. Last note should be changed to editors note. 3GPP subscriber status should not be repeated in every tuple?

***Conclusion : Revised to 2478***

**N1-022478** : TR24.841v030, Nortel, Type: CR, Title: Presence Information Model for a 3GPP Subscriber

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022282** : TR24.841v030, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: CR to 3GPP TR 24.841 V0.3.0: Additions on chapter 7.2

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Not available***

**N1-022283** : TR24.841v030, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: CR to 3GPP TR 24.841 V0.3.0: Update on chapter 6.1.2.1

***Discussion :*** Addition of Record-Route header field to the 200 (OK) responses of the SUBSCRIBE request and NOTIFY requests.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022284** : TR24.841v030, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: CR to 3GPP TR 24.841 V0.3.0: Update on chapter 6.1.3

***Discussion :*** Addition of Record-Route header field to the 200 (OK) responses of the SUBSCRIBE request and NOTIFY requests. An immediate NOTIFY request is also added to 6.1.3.2. An Editor's Note on draft-roach-sip-list-template-00.txt is also added.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022285** : TR24.841v030, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: CR to 3GPP TR 24.841 V0.3.0: Update on chapter 6.1.4.1

***Discussion :*** Similar to 2283 plus a correction to flow 7 and a few editorials. Delete contributor's note and fix the figure accordingly were asked done by the rapporteur, Keith.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022286** : TR24.841v030, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: CR to 3GPP TR 24.841 V0.3.0: Update on chapter 6.2

***Discussion :*** Addition of Editor's Note about the need of updating the PUBLISH flows according to draft-olson-simple-publish-01. Just a reminder of future work.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022287** : TR24.841v030, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: CR to 3GPP TR 24.841 V0.3.0: Update on chapter 6.3.2.1

***Discussion :*** Addition of Record-Route header field to NOTIFY requests. Plus some minor corrections.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022288** : TR24.841v030, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: CR to 3GPP TR 24.841 V0.3.0: Update on chapter 6.3.3.1

***Discussion :*** Addition of Record-Route header field to NOTIFY requests. Again minor corrections.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022289** : TR24.841v030, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: CR to 3GPP TR 24.841 V0.3.0: Update on chapter 6.4

***Discussion :*** Addition of Record-Route header field to NOTIFY requests. Plus small corrections.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022290** : TR24.841v030, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: CR to 3GPP TR 24.841 V0.3.0: Additions on chapter 7.3

***Discussion :*** Refer to 2277 which was the alternative CR to be continued.

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022349** : TR24.841v030, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.841: Documentation of PUBLISH method

***Discussion :*** Since the original documentation for the PUBLISH method, a new version of the draft has been issued (draft-olson-simple-publish-01) which makes various modifications to the headers used by PUBLISH. A number of new headers have been provided in place of existing PUBLISH specific headers, and these are not dealt with in this contribution. In addition a review of a number of headers within the Annex A profile of 24.229 has been conducted, and this contribution makes changes consistent with those proposed in discussion documents N1-022325 - N1-022343.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022376** : TR24.841v030, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: Additions to 24.841 bibliography

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Not available***

**N1-022377** : Dynamicsoft, Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Publish routing issues

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Not available***

**N1-022420** : TR24.841v030, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.841: Clause 6.1.2.1 revisions to include P-CSCF and S-CSCF storage

***Discussion :*** Late document.

***Conclusion : Not treated due to time***

**N1-022421** : TR24.841v030, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.841: Clause 6.1.3.1 revisions to include P-CSCF and S-CSCF storage

***Discussion :*** Late document.

***Conclusion : Not treated due to time***

**N1-022422** : TR24.841v030, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.841: Clause 6.1.3.2 revisions to include P-CSCF and S-CSCF storage

***Discussion :*** Late document.

***Conclusion : Not treated due to time***

**N1-022423** : TR24.841v030, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.841: Clause 6.1.4.1 revisions to include P-CSCF and S-CSCF storage

***Discussion :*** Late document.

***Conclusion : Not treated due to time***

**N1-022424** : TR24.841v030, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.841: Clause 6.4 revisions to include P-CSCF and S-CSCF storage

***Discussion :*** Late document.

***Conclusion : Not treated due to time***

## 8.2 MBMS (Multimedia Broadcast Multicast Services)

None.

## 8.3 IMS Stage 3 enhancements

None.

## 8.4 IMS interoperability

**N1-022278** : Ericsson, Type: WID, Title: Interoperability and Commonality between IP Multimedia Systems using different "IP-connectivity Networks"; stage 3

***Discussion :*** SA2 now seems to head for not making a new specification for access specific issues in Rel-6, but continue as in Rel-5. SA2 situation was said to be different to CN1 as they have more specifications to play with, and it was proposed to delay the decision on what we do in CN1, and that how CN1 does the documentation is entirely a CN1 decision. Some insecurity remains with the development of WLAN and its documentation. This WID proposes to shift as little as possible regarding access dependant parts, and instead create new clauses if deemed necessary.
Keeping the new TS open for the time beeing and not impacting 24.228 was agreeable for access dependant parts.
ME and CN should be ticked as not affected, assuming no implementation impact by seperating GPRS text from IM CN subsystem specifications in one way or another?
Proposed to change the title to Access independance, and to have the acronym as ACCESSI.
The time schedule seen as more realistic now should be December 2003 for stage 3.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2479***

**N1-022479** : Ericsson, Type: WID, Title: Interoperability and Commonality between IP Multimedia Systems using different "IP-connectivity Networks"; stage 3

***Discussion :*** The title change is not done to avoid misalignment with stage 2, and no change done to the time schedule.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

## 8.5 Other Rel-6 issues

**N1-022279** : Ericsson, Type: WID, Title: Emergency Call Enhancements for IP& PS Based Calls

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Not available***

# 9 LS OUT (output liaison statements)

**N1-022402** : Miguel, Type: LS OUT , **To:** SA4, CN3, **Cc:** SA2, Title: Reply LS on " RTCP overhead in SDP bandwidth parameter"

***Discussion :*** Related to LS IN 2300. First agreed and sent only to CN3, which triggered the joint session the day after and there it was discussion on 2484. During the joint session with CN3 the document 2484 were revised with the outcome of 2485 which has also N3 document number and the N3 document is to be distributed.

***Conclusion : Replaced by 2485***

**N1-022403** : Keith, Type: LS OUT , **To:** SA2, **Cc:** CN3, CN4, CN5, Title: LS on proposed list of core IMS specifications for Access Independence

***Discussion :*** Related to LS IN 2364. After the WID discussion yesterday the no impact on 24.228 needs to be shown.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2488***

**N1-022488** : Keith, Type: LS OUT , **To:** SA2, **Cc:** CN3, CN4, CN5, Title: LS on proposed list of core IMS specifications for Access Independence

***Discussion :*** Related to LS IN 2364. After the WID discussion yesterday the no impact on 24.228 needs to be shown.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022404** : Chen, Type: LS OUT , **To:** T1, **Cc:** T1 SIG SWG Title: Reply to LS on authentication procedure for MS rejecting the network

***Discussion :*** Related to 2401. Maybe it should be stated that sending the failure message should not be considered an error case. Not needed to revise the LS for that.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022408** : Rouzbeh, Type: LS OUT, **To:** GERAN2, **Cc:** Title: Potential transition problem when switching MSC revision from R98 to R99

***Discussion :*** Related to 2243. Change on the transition time to indicate 'as short as possible'. No need to state co-ordination between different operators networks.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2489***

**N1-022489** : Rouzbeh, Type: LS OUT, **To:** GERAN2, **Cc:** Title: Potential transition problem when switching MSC revision from R98 to R99

***Discussion :*** Related to 2243.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022414** : Tim, Type: LS OUT , **To:** SA1, **Cc:** Title: LS on SMS support via the SGSN

***Discussion :*** Related to 2306. The loadbalancing feature between PS and CS domain was confirmed to be a Rel-6 issue and can be brought up in SA1 by interesting companies, thereby making this LS unnecessary to send. What about revising this LS, having a change to 24.011 (revision of N1-022247) saying that error cause 69 is the value to be used? Meaning that when received it makes the MS try the CS domain. The proposal is to have this guidance in the Rel-5 spec. But the cause 69 should not be mandated to be sent in the situation of not supporting SMS on PS domain. And if 69 changes the MS to CS it should be clarified that PS could be used again. The switch on MSs mentioned in the email from SA1 chairman;- leaving the user to select domain, was stated as not true for many MSs and not easily accessible.

***Conclusion : Noted***

**N1-022415** : Robert, Type: LS OUT , **To:** , **Cc:** Title:

***Discussion :*** Related to 2229. Not available.

***Conclusion : Withdrawn***

**N1-022431** : Duncan, Type: LS OUT , **To:** SA1, SA2, **Cc:** Title: LS on Downloading of local emergency numbers to the mobile station

***Discussion :*** Related to 2430. Use of different views were considered not propriate and a proposal to not send the LS was made. Instead of companies contributing to SA1 it was proposed that the LS should be modified so CN1 issues get treated and can progress after an answer. It is a Rel-6 work anyway.

***Conclusion : Rejected***

**N1-022432** : Robert, Type: LS OUT , **To:** GERAN2, **Cc:** Title: LS on HSCSD in GERAN Iu mode

***Discussion :*** Related to 2427. How do we handle response from GERAN if negative? Revise the decision after plenary.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

**N1-022435** : Miguel, Type: LS OUT , **To:** SA3, **Cc:** Title: LS on P-CSCF checking IP addresses in Contact header

***Discussion :*** Related to 2256. The checking would include port number. One proposal was to withdraw this LS due to the same checking is done on IPsec. Clarification was however thought to be on the IP address prefix. More time is needed to study how the P-CSCF should perform the IP address (prefix) to contact header matching.

***Conclusion : Postponed***

**N1-022476** : Allan, Type: LS OUT , **To:** , **Cc:** Title: Liaison statement on Interoperability Issues and SIP in IMS

***Discussion :*** Related with the CN1 – SA2 joint session in agenda item 5.1 including the related CRs in CN1 area. Revised before presentation.

***Conclusion : Revised to 2501***

**N1-022501** : Allan, Type: LS OUT , **To:** CN, SA, **Cc:** SA1, SA2, SA3, SA4, SA5, CN2, CN3, CN4,CN5 Title: Liaison statement on Interoperability Issues and SIP in IMS

***Discussion :*** Include the Via and Record-Route header also in the stripping clause. This LS only needs to go to the CN plenary. Should be indication of the status and not what is intended, but this can be left to the plenary to co-ordinate. What is the intended action in plenary? To inform and understand the related CRs, and that SA sends an answer to IETF. Due to many comments an email approval was proposed. The deadline is Wednesday 20. November at 16:00 CET, and the approval is under control of CN1 chairman .

***Conclusion : Revised to 2503***

**N1-022503** : Allan, Type: LS OUT , **To:** CN, SA, **Cc:** Title: Liaison statement on Interoperability Issues and SIP in IMS

***Discussion :*** Deadline for objections ends on the 20th of November 2002 at 16:00 CET.

Any possible objections must be raised on CN1 mailing list with the title clearly indicating “objection against N1-022503”

The chairman will follow the email discussion and declare the result after the deadline.

If no objections are received before the deadline the LS is considered agreed, otherwise it will be rejected.

No changes are allowed during the email approval procedure.

***Conclusion : E-Mail APPROVAL UNTIL 20Nov16:00***

**N1-022485** : Miguel/Juha on behalf of CN1/CN3 Type: LS OUT , **To:** SA4, **Cc:** SA2, Title: Reply LS on " RTCP overhead in SDP bandwidth parameter"

***Discussion :*** Related to LS IN 2300 and the LS sent to CN3 in 2402. After a joint session with CN3 the document 2484 were discussed and online edited with the outcome of 2485.

***Conclusion : Agreed***

# 10 Late and misplaced documents

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

# 11 Any Other Business (AOB)

None provided.

# 12 Closing of the meeting

16:00 Friday 15.11.2002

Review of dates and hosts for future meetings

***The April meeting was seen need for CN1 but has no host. The companies are invited to study if they can host the meeting. It should be considered that the meeting coincides with SA2. The scope of the CN1 meeting should be full agenda. Even though there is collision with other groups like SA2 the dates are tentatively agreed to be 7 - 11 April 2003.***

## Meeting schedule for CN1 in 2002 and 2003

| 3GPP Meeting | Date | Place | Host |
|---|---|---|---|
| N1-SIP-adhoc0102 | 14-18 January 2002 | Phoenix, USA | ATTWS |
| N1#22 | 28 January-1 February 2002 | Sophia Antipolis, France | ETSI |
| N1#22bis | 19-21 February 2002 | Oulu, Finland | Elisa Communications, Finnet, Nokia, Sonera, Viestintävirasto |
| **TSGN#15** | **6-8 March 2002** | **Korea** | **TTA** |
| N1#23 | 8-12 April 2002 | Fort Lauderdale, FL, USA | NA 'Friends of 3GPP' |
| N1-SIPadhoc0204 | 23-25 April 2002 | Madrid, Spain | Telefonica, Ericsson |
| N1#24 | 13-17 May 2002 | Budapest, Hungary | Ericsson |
| **TSGN#16** | **5-7 June 2002** | **Marco Island, FL, USA** | **Motorola** |
| N1#25 | 29.July-2.August 2002 | Helsinki, Finland | Sonera |
| **TSGN#17** | **4-6 September 2002** | **France** | **Alcatel** |
| N1#26 | 23-27 September 2002 | Miami, USA | NA 'Friends of 3GPP' |
| CN1 Rel-6 ad hoc | 22 - 24 October | Munich, Germany | NTT DoCoMo |
| N1#27 | 11-15 November 2002 | Bangkok, Thailand | Japanese Friends of 3GPP |
| **TSGN#18** | **4-6 December 2002** | **New Orleans, Louisiana, USA** | **NA 'Friends of 3GPP'** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| N1#28 | 10 – 14 February 2003 | Dublin, Irland | EF3 (European friends of 3GPP) |
| **CN #19** | **12 – 14 March 2003** | **Birmingham, UK** | **UK Friends of 3GPP** |
| N1#29 | 7 – 11 April 2003 | **Joint CN WG meeting is cancelled, but CN1 decision to held full scope meeting somewhere.** | **Host needed and invitations welcomed. Please note that it is coinciding with the SA2 meeting.** |
| N1#30 | 19 – 23 May 2003 | ? | NA 'Friends of 3GPP' |
| **CN #20** | **4 – 6 June 2003** | **Hameenlinna, FINLAND** | **Nokia** |
| N1#31 | 18 – 22 August 2003 | Sophia Antipolis, France | ETSI |
| **CN #21** | **17 – 19 September 2003** | **GERMANY** | **To be confirmed** |
| N1#32 | 27 – 31 October 2003 | China??? | Japanese Friends of 3GPP and Ericsson China |
| **CN #22** | **10 – 12 December 2003** | **To be confirmed** | **North American & Japanese Friends of 3GPP** |

# Annex A Joint meeting report with SA2 and another joint meeting report with CN3

Please see section 5.1 for the meeting report with SA2, and section 5.2 for the meeting report with CN3.

# Annex B List of participants

**Member of 3GPP (ETSI)**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Mrs. Sophie Aveline<br>+33 1 45 29 60 84 | ORANGE FRANCE<br>sophie.aveline@francetelecom.com | 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) | FR |
| Mr. Gabor Bajko | NOKIA Corporation<br>+36209849259 | 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)<br>gabor.bajko@nokia.com | HU |
| Mr. Tim Beard<br>+44 1635 587776 | MATSUSHITA COMMUNICATION<br>tim.beard@panasonicmobile.co.uk | 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) | GB |
| Mr. Richard Brook<br>+44 1594 836646 | SAMSUNG Electronics<br>richardbrook39@aol.com | 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) | GB |
| Mr. Jürgen Caldenhoven<br>+49 211 533 2850 | Vodafone D2 GmbH<br>juergen.caldenhoven@vodafone.com | 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) | DE |
| Mr. Chen Ho Chin<br>+46-46-23.1537 | ERICSSON L.M.<br>chen.ho.chin@emp.ericsson.se | 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) | SE |
| Mr. Ian Doig<br>+33 4 92 94 48 64 | MOTOROLA S.A.S<br>ian.doig@motorola.com | 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) | FR |
| Mr. Keith Drage<br>+44 1793 776249 | Lucent Technologies N. S. UK<br>drage@lucent.com | 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) | GB |
| Mr. Juergen Ebmeyer<br>+49-711-821-47803 | ALCATEL S.A.<br>j.ebmeyer@alcatel.de | 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) | DE |
| Mr. Miguel Garcia-Martin<br>+358 40 514 0002 | ERICSSON L.M.<br>miguel.a.garcia@ericsson.com | 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) | FI |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Alexandre Harmand | mmO2 plc<br>+44(0)1473605436 | 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)<br>alexandre.harmand@o2.com | GB |
| Mr. Hannu Hietalahti<br>+358 40 502 1724 | NOKIA Corporation<br>hannu.hietalahti@nokia.com | 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) | FI |
| Mr. Andrew Howell<br>+44 7802 364500 | MOTOROLA GmbH<br>andrew.howell@motorola.com | 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) | GB |
| Ms. Jane D Humphrey<br>+44 24 76564232 | MARCONI COMMUNICATIONS<br>jane.humphrey@marconi.com | 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) | GB |
| Mr. Dieter Jacobsohn<br>+49 228 936 3361 | T-MOBILE DEUTSCHLAND<br>Dieter.Jacobsohn@t-mobile.de | 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) | DE |
| Mr. Krisztian Kiss | NOKIA Corporation<br>+358504835363 | 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)<br>krisztian.kiss@nokia.com | FI |
| Mr. Peter Leis<br>+49 89 722 26200 | SIEMENS AG<br>peter.leis@siemens.com | 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) | DE |
| Mr. Peng Li<br>+1 858 658 4967 | QUALCOMM EUROPE S.A.R.L.<br>pli@qualcomm.com | 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) | FR |
| Mr. Georg Mayer<br>+358 504821437 | NOKIA Corporation<br>georg.mayer@nokia.com | 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) | FI |
| Ms. Inmaculada Carrion<br>+358 503806481 | NOKIA Corporation<br>inmaculada.carrion-rodrigo@nokia.com | 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) | FI |
| Mr. Andy McCarthy<br>+44 7811 962 251 | Hutchison 3G UK Limited<br>Andy.McCarthy@hutchison3g.com | 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) | GB |
| Mr. Duncan Mills<br>+44 1635 676074 | VODAFONE Group Plc<br>duncan.mills@vf.vodafone.co.uk | 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) | GB |
| Mr. Atle Monrad<br>+47 372 93 665 | ERICSSON L.M.<br>atle.monrad@ericsson.com | 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) | NO |
| Mr. Roberto Procopio<br>+39 011 228 5061 | TELECOM ITALIA S.p.A.<br>roberto.procopio@tilab.com | 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) | IT |
| Dr. Robert Zaus<br>+49 89 722 26899 | SIEMENS AG<br>robert.zaus@siemens.com | 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) | DE |
| **Member of 3GPP (T1)** | | | |
| Mr. Rouzbeh Farhoumand<br>+1 972 583 8061 | Ericsson Inc.<br>rouzbeh.farhoumand@ericsson.com | 3GPPMEMBER (T1) | US |
| Mrs. Sonia Garapaty<br>+1 972 6855110 | Nortel Networks<br>sonia.garapaty@nortelnetworks.com | 3GPPMEMBER (T1) | US |
| Mr. Milo Orsic<br>+1 630 713 5161 | Lucent Technologies<br>orsic@lucent.com | 3GPPMEMBER (T1) | US |
| Mr. Hugh Shieh<br>+1 425 580 6898 | AT&T Wireless Services, Inc.<br>hugh.shieh@attws.com | 3GPPMEMBER (T1) | US |
| Mr. Andrew Allen<br>+1 9724735507 | Dynamicsoft<br>aallen@dynamicsoft.com | 3GPPMEMBER (T1) | US |
| **Member of 3GPP (TTA)** | | | |
| Mr. Christian Herrero<br>+46 46 231812 | Ericsson Korea<br>christian.herrero@emp.ericsson.se | 3GPPMEMBER (TTA) | SE |
| **Member of 3GPP (TTC)** | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Yukio Kawanami | NEC Corporation<br>+81471857158 | 3GPPMEMBER (TTC)<br>kawanami@cj.jp.nec.com | JP |
| Mr. Kunihiko Taya<br>+81-3-3798-6560 | NEC Corporation<br>taya@bk.jp.nec.com | 3GPPMEMBER (TTC) | JP |
| Mr. Nobuyuki Uda<br>+813 5463 6331 | NTT COMWARE Corporation<br>uda.nobuyuki@nttcom.co.jp | 3GPPMEMBER (TTC) | JP |

**Organisation partner representative (ETSI)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Mr. Per Johan Jorgensen<br>+33 4 92 94 42 31 | Mobile Competence Centre<br>jorgensen@etsi.fr | FR |


# Annex C Agreed CRs

Any agreed CR from CN1#26 which has a revision and became agreed in CN1#27 (i.e. the CR# exists in the list below) shall have the status changed from 'Agreed' to 'Replaced by N1-022xxx ' (xxx is the document number of the next CR revision after CN1#26).

Also the following are changed from agreed to replaced by: CR077 (N1-021985) and CR238r1 (N1-022124) as they were agreed in CN1#26 but superceded with rejection in CN1#27.

| Meeting | TDoc # | Spec | CR # | Rev | CAT | Rel | C_Version | Tdoc Title | WI | Status |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| N1-27 | N1-022352 | 04.08 | A1135 | | A | R97 | 6.19.0 | Clarification on revision level | GSM/UMTS interworking | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022353 | 04.08 | A1137 | | A | R98 | 7.18.0 | Clarification on revision level | GSM/UMTS interworking | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022393 | 04.08 | A1139 | | F | Phase2 | 4.23.1 | Clarification on revision level | GSM/UMTS interworking | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022394 | 04.08 | A1141 | | A | R96 | 5.18.1 | Clarification on revision level | GSM/UMTS interworking | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022270 | 23.009 | 081 | 2 | F | R99 | 3.11.0 | MSC_A_HO SDL correction | TEI | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022271 | 23.009 | 082 | 2 | A | Rel-4 | 4.5.0 | MSC_A_HO SDL correction | TEI | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022272 | 23.009 | 083 | 2 | A | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | MSC_A_HO SDL correction | TEI | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022239 | 23.009 | 084 | 3 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Inter-MSC relocation and intersystem handover for multiple codecs | TRFO-OOB | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022234 | 23.009 | 088 | | F | R99 | 3.11.0 | Clarification of the protocol to be used on the E-interface | GSM/UMTS interworking | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022235 | 23.009 | 089 | | A | Rel-4 | 4.5.0 | Clarification of the protocol to be used on the E-interface | GSM/UMTS interworking | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022236 | 23.009 | 090 | | A | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Clarification of the protocol to be used on the E-interface | GSM/UMTS interworking | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022427 | 23.034 | 007 | 3 | F | Rel-5 | 5.0.0 | Introduction of GERAN Iu-mode | TEI5 | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022468 | 23.218 | 030 | 3 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Clarification on MRFP reference point | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022297 | 23.218 | 033 | | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Addition of Request-URI as SPT | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022469 | 23.218 | 034 | 1 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Clarifications on Annex C (Informative) | IMS-CCR | AGREED |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| N1-27 | N1-022464 | 23.218 | 037 | 1 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Clarification on Sh interface for charging purposes | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022475 | 23.218 | 038 | 1 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Clarification to use of Service Information | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022492 | 24.008 | 716 | 2 | F | Rel-5 | 5.5.0 | Downloading of local emergency numbers to the mobile station | TEI5 | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022417 | 24.008 | 719 | 1 | F | R99 | 3.13.0 | Correcting errors and making improvements to references | TEI | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022418 | 24.008 | 720 | 1 | F | Rel-4 | 4.8.0 | Correcting errors and making improvements to references | TEI4 | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022419 | 24.008 | 721 | 1 | A | Rel-5 | 5.5.0 | Correcting errors and making improvements to references | TEI4 | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022354 | 24.008 | 722 | | A | R99 | 3.13.0 | Clarification on revision level | GSM/UMTS interworking | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022355 | 24.008 | 723 | | A | Rel-4 | 4.8.0 | Clarification on revision level | GSM/UMTS interworking | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022356 | 24.008 | 724 | | A | Rel-5 | 5.5.0 | Clarification on revision level | GSM/UMTS interworking | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022498 | 24.011 | 024 | 2 | F | Rel-5 | 5.0.0 | SMS over GPRS disabled | TEI5 | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022441 | 24.228 | 072 | 4 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Add charging P-header examples to call flows | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022390 | 24.228 | 073 | 4 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Corrections to the Path and Service-Route headers | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022291 | 24.228 | 083 | 1 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Clause 17.6 Error handling | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022480 | 24.228 | 088 | 1 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Addition of missing "<>" for URIs in chapter 7 and 8 | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022448 | 24.228 | 089 | 1 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Call transfer update | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022437 | 24.228 | 090 | 1 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Changing tel URL to SIP URI in P-Associated-URI header field | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022457 | 24.228 | 091 | 1 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Addition of Message flows to 24.228 | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022460 | 24.228 | 092 | 1 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | SA related procedures | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022386 | 24.228 | 093 | | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | PCF to PDF | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022446 | 24.229 | 140 | 4 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Support of non-IMS forking | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022412 | 24.229 | 161 | 3 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Clarifications and editorials to SIP profile | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022494 | 24.229 | 175 | 5 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Clarifications of the binding and media grouping | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022426 | 24.229 | 204 | 3 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Fix gprs-charging-info definition and descriptions | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022471 | 24.229 | 209 | 2 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | UE Registration | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022495 | 24.229 | 222 | 4 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Go related error codes in the UE | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022425 | 24.229 | 228 | 3 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Clarifications on the use of charging correlation information | IMS-CCR | AGREED |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| N1-27 | N1-022497 | 24.229 | 246 | 3 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | S-CSCF procedure tidyup | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022472 | 24.229 | 248 | 2 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | UE procedure tidyup | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022455 | 24.229 | 249 | 3 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | MESSAGE corrections part 1 | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022456 | 24.229 | 250 | 2 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | MESSAGE corrections part 2 | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022440 | 24.229 | 251 | 2 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Security association clarifications | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022433 | 24.229 | 252 | 1 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | The use of security association by the UE | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022434 | 24.229 | 253 | 1 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | UE integrity protected re-registration | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022496 | 24.229 | 255 | 3 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Handling of default public user identities by the P-CSCF | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022266 | 24.229 | 263 | | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Fixing ioi descriptions | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022447 | 24.229 | 264 | 1 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Fix descriptions for ECF/CCF addresses | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022493 | 24.229 | 266 | 2 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Alignment with draft-ietf-sipping-reg-event-00 and clarification on network initiated deregistration | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022449 | 24.229 | 267 | 1 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Correction to network initiated re-authentication procedure | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022439 | 24.229 | 268 | 1 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Registration Expires Timer Default Setting | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022465 | 24.229 | 269 | 1 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Clarification on Sh interface for charging purposes | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022500 | 24.229 | 270 | 2 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Clarifications on the scope | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022467 | 24.229 | 273 | 1 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Add charging info for SUBSCRIBE | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022413 | 24.229 | 274 | 1 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Profile revisions for RFC 3261 headers | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022345 | 24.229 | 275 | | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Consistency changes for SDP procedures at MGCF | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022350 | 24.229 | 276 | | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Proxy support of PRACK | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022351 | 24.229 | 277 | | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Clarification of transparent handling of parameters in profile | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022499 | 24.229 | 278 | 3 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | P-CSCF does not strip away headers | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022444 | 24.229 | 279 | 1 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Meaning of refresh request | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022362 | 24.229 | 280 | | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Removal of Caller Preferences dependency | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022445 | 24.229 | 281 | 1 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | P-Access-Network-Info clarifications | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022370 | 24.229 | 282 | | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Clarification on use of the From header by the UE | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022481 | 24.229 | 285 | 1 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Fallback for | IMS-CCR | AGREED |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | compression failure | | |
| N1-27 | N1-022459 | 24.229 | 287 | 1 | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | SA related procedures | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022387 | 24.229 | 289 | | F | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | PCF to PDF | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022461 | 24.229 | 290 | 1 | C | Rel-5 | 5.2.0 | Emergency Service correction | IMS-CCR | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022428 | 43.068 | 008 | 1 | F | Rel-5 | 5.1.0 | MS late entry notification | ASCI | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022429 | 43.069 | 007 | 1 | F | Rel-5 | 5.1.0 | MS late entry notification | ASCI | AGREED |

## CRs and LSs OUT for e-mail agreement

| Meeting | TDoc # | Status | Source | Tdoc Title | Type | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| N1-27 | N1-022503 | email approval until 20/11 | Allen | Liaison statement on Interoperability Issues and SIP in IMS | LS OUT | Revised from 2476. Related to the result of SA2-CN1 joint |

## Documents Endorsed by N1

None

# Annex D Tdoc list (incl. the status)

| g n da | TDoc # | Tdoc Title | Source | WI | C_Ver sion | Rel | CA T | Spec | CR # | Rev | Type | Comments | Status |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N1-021888 | Correction to Emergency call handling in IMS | SA2 | | | | | | | | LS IN | Forwarded from CN1#26, S2-022637, To: SA1, CN1, CC: CN2 LS OUT in 2058 by Duncan was withdrawn. | NOTED |
| | N1-022111 | LS on QoS parameters Maximum bit rate/Guaranteed bit rate | SA2 | | | | | | | | LS IN | Forwarded from CN1#26, S2-022635rev1, To: SA4, RAN2, RAN3, Cc: CN1 | NOTED |
| | N1-022183 | LS on Questions from the European Numbering Forum | CN4 | | | | | | | | LS IN | Forwarded from CN1#26bis, N4-021254, To: SA1, CN1, T3, | NOTED |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | Cc: | |
| | N1-022228 | Agenda (Bangkok 0211) | Chairman | | | | | | | | AGENDA | | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022229 | Fullfilling stage 2 requirement on storing of SRES for possible retransmission | Ericsson | TEI5 | 5.5.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.008 | 710 | | CR | LS OUT in 2415 by Robert is not needed. | REJECTED |
| .1 | N1-022230 | Cause #8 in Non-combined GPRS Attach and Normal Routing Area Update | Ericsson LM | TEI | | | | | | | DISC | | NOTED |
| .1 | N1-022231 | Cause #8: “GPRS and non-GPRS services not allowed” | Ericsson LM | TEI | 3.13.0 | R99 | F | 24.008 | 711 | | CR | | REJECTED |
| .1 | N1-022232 | Cause #8: “GPRS and non-GPRS services not allowed” | Ericsson LM | TEI | 4.8.0 | Rel-4 | A | 24.008 | 712 | | CR | | REJECTED |
| .1 | N1-022233 | Cause #8: “GPRS and non-GPRS services not allowed” | Ericsson LM | TEI | 5.5.0 | Rel-5 | A | 24.008 | 713 | | CR | | REJECTED |
| .1 | N1-022234 | Clarification of the protocol to be used on the E-interface | Siemens | GSM/UMTS interworking | 3.11.0 | R99 | F | 23.009 | 088 | | CR | REVISED TO 2405 | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022235 | Clarification of the protocol to be used on the E-interface | Siemens | GSM/UMTS interworking | 4.5.0 | Rel-4 | A | 23.009 | 089 | | CR | REVISED TO 2406 | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022236 | Clarification of the protocol to be used on the E-interface | Siemens | GSM/UMTS interworking | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | A | 23.009 | 090 | | CR | REVISED TO 2407 | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022237 | Clarification of the relocation and trace related messages | Siemens | GSM/UMTS interworking | 3.2.0 | R99 | F | 29.108 | | | INFO | | NOTED |
| .1 | N1-022238 | Introduction of GERAN Iu-mode | Siemens | TEI5 | 5.0.0 | Rel-5 | F | 23.034 | 007 | 2 | CR | | REVISED TO 2427 |
| .1 | N1-022239 | Inter-MSC relocation and intersystem handover for multiple codecs | Siemens | TRFO-OOB | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 23.009 | 084 | 3 | CR | | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022240 | Interworking between security mode procedure and relocation | Siemens | TEI5 | 5.1.0 | Rel-5 | F | 29.010 | 078 | | INFO | | NOTED |
| .1 | N1-022241 | Interworking between security mode procedure and relocation | Siemens | TEI5 | 5.7.0 | Rel-5 | F | 48.008 | | | INFO | | NOTED |
| .1 | N1-022242 | M3UA for 3GPP Networks | Ericsson | TEI4 | | | | | | | INFO | | NOTED |
| .1 | N1-022243 | Potential transition problem when switching MSC revision from R98 to R99 | Ericsson | TEI | | | | | | | INFO | | LS OUT in 2408 by Rouzbeh |
| .1 | N1-022244 | Discussion Document on introducing SMS | NTT DoCoMo | | | | | | | | DISC | | NOTED |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Call Barring in PS domain | | | | | | | | | | | |
| .1 | N1-022245 | Introducing SMS Call Barring in PS domain | NTT DoCoMo | TEI5 | 5.5.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.008 | 714 | | CR | | POSTPONED |
| .1 | N1-022246 | SMS over GPRS disabled | Ericsson | TEI5 | 5.5.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.008 | 715 | | CR | | WITHDRAWN |
| .1 | N1-022247 | SMS over GPRS disabled | Ericsson | TEI5 | 5.0.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.011 | 024 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2477 |
| .2 | N1-022248 | Summary of current IETF documents on SIPPING | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | | Rel-5 | | | | | INFO | Not presented. | REVISED TO 2409 |
| .2 | N1-022249 | Summary of current IETF documents on SIP | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | | Rel-5 | | | | | INFO | Not presented. | REVISED TO 2410 |
| .2 | N1-022250 | Summary of current IETF documents on MMUSIC | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | | Rel-5 | | | | | INFO | Not presented. | REVISED TO 2411 |
| .1 | N1-022251 | Summary of current IETF documents on SIMPLE | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | PRESNC | | Rel-6 | | | | | INFO | | NOTED |
| .1 | N1-022252 | Draft 3GPP TR 24.841 "Presence based on SIP; Functional models, flows and protocol details" | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | PRESNC | 0.3.0 | Rel-6 | | 24.841 | | | TR | | NOTED |
| .2 | N1-022253 | Unofficial reference version 3GPP TS 24.229 (Release 5) based on CN1#26 | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | | 24.229 | | | TS | | NOTED |
| .3 | N1-022254 | The use of security association by the UE | Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 252 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2433 |
| .3 | N1-022255 | UE integrity protected re-registration | Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 253 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2434 |
| .3 | N1-022256 | P-CSCF handling of Contact header during registration | Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 254 | | CR | | REJECTED |
| .3 | N1-022257 | Handling of default public user identities by the P-CSCF | Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 255 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2436 |
| .3 | N1-022258 | Handling of default public user identities by the S-CSCF | Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 256 | | CR | | REJECTED |
| .4 | N1-022259 | S-CSCF handling of TEL URL | Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 257 | | CR | | REJECTED |
| .1 | N1-022260 | Handling of the SDP by S-CSCF when | Lucent Technolog | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 258 | | CR | | WITHDRAWN |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | acting as a B2BUA | ies / Milo Orsic | | | | | | | | | | |
| .1 | N1-022261 | S-CSCF acting as a B2BUA | Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 259 | | CR | | WITHDRAWN |
| .1 | N1-022262 | S-CSCF acting as a B2BUA | Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 260 | | CR | | WITHDRAWN |
| .1 | N1-022263 | S-CSCF acting as a B2BUA for MO calls | Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 261 | | CR | | WITHDRAWN |
| .1 | N1-022264 | S-CSCF acting as a B2BUA for MT calls | Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 262 | | CR | | WITHDRAWN |
| .4 | N1-022265 | Add charging P-header examples to call flows | Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.228 | 072 | 3 | CR | | REVISED TO 2441 |
| .6 | N1-022266 | Fixing ioi descriptions | Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 263 | | CR | | AGREED |
| .6 | N1-022267 | Fix descriptions for ECF/CCF addresses | Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 264 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2447 |
| .1 | N1-022268 | S-CSCF as B2BUA | Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson | IMS-CCR | | Rel-5 | | | | | DISC | Agreements are in listed in the minutes. | NOTED |
| .1 | N1-022269 | S-CSCF as B2BUA | Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 23.218 | 032 | | CR | | WITHDRAWN |
| .1 | N1-022270 | MSC_A_HO SDL correction | Nortel Networks/ Sonia Garapaty | TEI | 3.11.0 | R99 | F | 23.009 | 081 | 2 | CR | | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022271 | MSC_A_HO SDL correction | Nortel Networks/ Sonia Garapaty | TEI | 4.5.0 | Rel-4 | A | 23.009 | 082 | 2 | CR | | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022272 | MSC_A_HO SDL correction | Nortel Networks/ Sonia Garapaty | TEI | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | A | 23.009 | 083 | 2 | CR | | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022273 | MS late entry notification | Nortel Networks/ Sonia Garapaty | ASCI | 5.1.0 | Rel-5 | F | 43.068 | 008 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2428 |
| .1 | N1-022274 | MS late entry notification | Nortel Networks/ Sonia Garapaty | ASCI | 5.1.0 | Rel-5 | F | 43.069 | 007 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2429 |
| .6 | N1-022275 | Handling of P-Media-Authorization header | Nortel Networks/ Sonia | IMS-CCR | 5.5.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.008 | 680 | 3 | CR | | WITHDRAWN |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Garapaty | | | | | | | | | | |
| .6 | N1-022276 | Clarifications to subclause 9.2.5 | Nortel Networks/ Sonia Garapaty | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 240 | 2 | CR | CR240r1Sh corresponding CRs are needed in the plenary, so this goes in a seperate package to the CN#18. | WITHDRAWN |
| .1 | N1-022277 | Presence Information Model for a 3GPP Subscriber | Nortel Networks/ Sonia Garapaty | PRESNC | 0.3.0 | Rel-6 | | 24.841 | | | CR | | REVISED TO 2478 |
| .4 | N1-022278 | Interoperability and Commonality between IP Multimedia Systems using different "IP-connectivity Networks"; stage 3 | Ericsson / A Monrad | | | Rel-6 | | | | | WID | | REVISED TO 2479 |
| .5 | N1-022279 | Emergency Call Enhancements for IP& PS Based Calls | Ericsson / A Monrad | EMC1-PS | | Rel-6 | | | | | WID | | Not available |
| .4 | N1-022280 | Clarifications of the binding and media grouping | Ericsson / A Monrad | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 175 | 3 | CR | CRSh corresponding CRs are needed in the plenary, so this goes in a seperate package to the CN#18. | REVISED TO 2443 |
| .4 | N1-022281 | Go related error codes in the UE | Ericsson / A Monrad | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 222 | 2 | CR | CR222r1 agreed in CN1#26. | REVISED TO 2442 |
| .1 | N1-022282 | CR to 3GPP TR 24.841 V0.3.0: Additions on chapter 7.2 | Nokia | PRESNC | 0.3.0 | Rel-6 | | 24.841 | | | CR | | Not available |
| .1 | N1-022283 | CR to 3GPP TR 24.841 V0.3.0: Update on chapter 6.1.2.1 | Nokia | PRESNC | 0.3.0 | Rel-6 | | 24.841 | | | CR | | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022284 | CR to 3GPP TR 24.841 V0.3.0: Update on chapter 6.1.3 | Nokia | PRESNC | 0.3.0 | Rel-6 | | 24.841 | | | CR | | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022285 | CR to 3GPP TR 24.841 V0.3.0: Update on chapter 6.1.4.1 | Nokia | PRESNC | 0.3.0 | Rel-6 | | 24.841 | | | CR | | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022286 | CR to 3GPP TR 24.841 V0.3.0: Update on chapter 6.2 | Nokia | PRESNC | 0.3.0 | Rel-6 | | 24.841 | | | CR | | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022287 | CR to 3GPP TR 24.841 V0.3.0: Update on chapter 6.3.2.1 | Nokia | PRESNC | 0.3.0 | Rel-6 | | 24.841 | | | CR | | AGREED |
| .1 | N1- | CR to 3GPP TR | Nokia | PRESN | 0.3.0 | Rel- | | 24.841 | | | CR | | AGREED |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 022288 | 24.841 V0.3.0: Update on chapter 6.3.3.1 | | C | | 6 | | | | | | | |
| .1 | N1-022289 | CR to 3GPP TR 24.841 V0.3.0: Update on chapter 6.4 | Nokia | PRESNC | 0.3.0 | Rel-6 | | 24.841 | | | CR | | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022290 | CR to 3GPP TR 24.841 V0.3.0: Additions on chapter 7.3 | Nokia | PRESNC | 0.3.0 | Rel-6 | | 24.841 | | | CR | | NOTED |
| .7 | N1-022291 | Clause 17.6 Error handling | Nokia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.228 | 083 | 1 | CR | | AGREED |
| .7 | N1-022292 | Addition of missing "<>" for URIs in chapter 7 and 8 | Nokia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.228 | 088 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2480 |
| .6 | N1-022293 | Call transfer update | Nokia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.228 | 089 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2448 |
| .4 | N1-022294 | Clarification on MGCF behaviour related to tel URL | Nokia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 265 | | CR | | Not available |
| .3 | N1-022295 | Changing tel URL to SIP URI in P-Associated-URI header field | Nokia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.228 | 090 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2437 |
| .3 | N1-022296 | Alignment with draft-ietf-sipping-reg-event-00 and clarification on network initiated deregistration | Nokia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 266 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2438 |
| .8 | N1-022297 | Addition of Request-URI as SPT | Nokia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 23.218 | 033 | | CR | | AGREED |
| | N1-022298 | LS Response on persistent dialogs for unregistered users | CN4 | | | | | | | | LS IN | N4-021320, To: SA2, Cc: CN1 | NOTED |
| | N1-022299 | LS on proposed TR for the architectural aspects of early UE handling | SA2 | | | | | | | | LS IN | S2-023102, To: RAN2, RAN3, CN4, GERAN2, RAN, Cc: CN1, SA, GSMA TWG | NOTED |
| | N1-022300 | Reply LS on " RTCP overhead in SDP bandwidth parameter " | SA4 | | | | | | | | LS IN | S4-020567, To: CN1, CN3, Cc: SA2 | LS OUT in 2402 by Miguel |
| | N1-022301 | LS Response on Inclusion of CCF/ECF addresses on Sh interface | SA5 | | | | | | | | LS IN | S5-024483, To: SA2, Cc: CN1, CN4 | NOTED |
| | N1-022302 | LS on Structure of IMS Charging Identifier (ICID) | SA5 | | | | | | | | LS IN | S5-024487, To: CN3, SA2, Cc: CN1, CN4 | NOTED |
| .1 | N1-022303 | Downloading of local emergency numbers to the mobile station | Vodafone / Duncan Mills | TEI5 | 5.5.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.008 | 716 | | CR | LS OUT in 2431 by Duncan. | REVISED TO 2430 |
| .6 | N1-022304 | Discussion on potential security | Vodafone / Duncan | | | | | | | | DISC | | NOTED |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | issues relating to the registration-event subscription | Mills | | | | | | | | | | |
| .6 | N1-022305 | Correction to network initiated re-authentication procedure | Vodafone / Duncan Mills | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 267 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2449 |
| .1 | N1-022306 | Discussion on whether support of SMS over GPRS is, or is not mandatory | Matsushita, Motorola | | | | | | | | DISC | | LS OUT in 2414 by Tim |
| .3 | N1-022307 | Registration Expires Timer Default Setting | Hutchison 3G / Vodafone | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 268 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2439 |
| .1 | N1-022308 | Incorrect penalising of MS that choose the preferred handling of Authentication not acceptable | Ericsson | TEI | 3.13.0 | R99 | F | 24.008 | 717 | | CR | | WITHDRAWN |
| .1 | N1-022309 | Incorrect penalising of MS that choose the preferred handling of Authentication not acceptable | Ericsson | TEI | 4.8.0 | Rel-4 | A | 24.008 | 718 | | CR | | WITHDRAWN |
| .4 | N1-022310 | Proposals for clean-up of 24.229 Pre-conditions procedures | Nortel Networks/ Sonia Garapaty | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | | 24.229 | | | DISC | | Not treated due to time |
| .8 | N1-022311 | Clarification on MRFP reference point | NEC/Yukio Kawanami | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 23.218 | 030 | 2 | CR | | REVISED TO 2468 |
| .8 | N1-022312 | Clarifications on Annex C (Informative) | NEC/Yukio Kawanami | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 23.218 | 034 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2469 |
| .8 | N1-022313 | Clarifications on definition of Service Point Trigger, etc. | NEC/Yukio Kawanami | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 23.218 | 035 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2470 |
| .8 | N1-022314 | Clarifications on subclause 5.2 | NEC/Yukio Kawanami | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 23.218 | 036 | | CR | | REJECTED |
| .8 | N1-022315 | Clarification on Sh interface for charging purposes | NEC/Yukio Kawanami | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 23.218 | 037 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2464 |
| .6 | N1-022316 | Clarifications of SDP for charging requirement | NEC/Yukio Kawanami | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 227 | 1 | CR | | REVISED TO 2462 |
| .6 | N1-022317 | Clarification on Sh interface for charging purposes | NEC/Yukio Kawanami | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 269 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2465 |
| .6 | N1-022318 | Clarifications on the scope | NEC/Yukio Kawanami | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 270 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2466 |
| .6 | N1-022319 | Clarifications on the Application Server as UE | NEC/Yukio Kawanami | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 271 | | CR | | WITHDRAWN |
| .3 | N1-022320 | Clarifications on allocation of a default S-CSCF | NEC/Yukio Kawanami | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 272 | | CR | | REJECTED |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| .1 | N1-022321 | Correcting errors and making improvements to references | CN1 secretary | TEI | 3.13.0 | R99 | F | 24.008 | 719 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2417 |
| .1 | N1-022322 | Correcting errors and making improvements to references | CN1 secretary | TEI4 | 4.8.0 | Rel-4 | F | 24.008 | 720 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2418 |
| .1 | N1-022323 | Correcting errors and making improvements to references | CN1 secretary | TEI4 | 5.5.0 | Rel-5 | A | 24.008 | 721 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2419 |
| .6 | N1-022324 | Add charging info for SUBSCRIBE | Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 273 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2467 |
| .7 | N1-022325 | An analysis of the requirements for the Accept header | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | | Rel-5 | | | | | DISC | | NOTED |
| .7 | N1-022326 | An analysis of the requirements for the Accept-Encoding header | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | | Rel-5 | | | | | DISC | | NOTED |
| .7 | N1-022327 | An analysis of the requirements for the Accept-Language header | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | | Rel-5 | | | | | DISC | | NOTED |
| .7 | N1-022328 | An analysis of the requirements for the Allow header | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | | Rel-5 | | | | | DISC | | NOTED |
| .7 | N1-022329 | An analysis of the requirements for the Authentication-Info header | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | | Rel-5 | | | | | DISC | | NOTED |
| .7 | N1-022330 | An analysis of the requirements for the Call-Info header | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | | Rel-5 | | | | | DISC | | NOTED |
| .7 | N1-022331 | An analysis of the requirements for the Contact header | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | | Rel-5 | | | | | DISC | | NOTED |
| .7 | N1-022332 | An analysis of the requirements for the Content-Disposition header | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | | Rel-5 | | | | | DISC | | NOTED |
| .7 | N1-022333 | An analysis of the requirements for the Content-Encoding header | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | | Rel-5 | | | | | DISC | | NOTED |
| .7 | N1-022334 | An analysis of the requirements for the Content-Language header | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | | Rel-5 | | | | | DISC | | NOTED |
| .7 | N1-022335 | An analysis of the requirements for the Expires header | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | | Rel-5 | | | | | DISC | | NOTED |
| .7 | N1- | An analysis of the | Lucent | IMS- | | Rel- | | | | | DIS | | NOTED |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 022336 | requirements for the MIME-Version header | Technologies / Keith Drage | CCR | | 5 | | | | | C | | |
| .7 | N1-022337 | An analysis of the requirements for the Organization header | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | | Rel-5 | | | | | DISC | | NOTED |
| .7 | N1-022338 | An analysis of the requirements for the Proxy-Authenticate header | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | | Rel-5 | | | | | DISC | | NOTED |
| .7 | N1-022339 | An analysis of the requirements for the Proxy-Authorization header | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | | Rel-5 | | | | | DISC | | NOTED |
| .7 | N1-022340 | An analysis of the requirements for the Subject header | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | | Rel-5 | | | | | DISC | | NOTED |
| .7 | N1-022341 | An analysis of the requirements for the User-Agent header | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | | Rel-5 | | | | | DISC | | NOTED |
| .7 | N1-022342 | An analysis of the requirements for the Warning header | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | | Rel-5 | | | | | DISC | | NOTED |
| .7 | N1-022343 | An analysis of the requirements for the WWW-Authenticate header | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | | Rel-5 | | | | | DISC | | NOTED |
| .7 | N1-022344 | Profile revisions for RFC 3261 headers | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 274 | | CR | Not presented. | REVISED TO 2413 |
| .7 | N1-022345 | Consistency changes for SDP procedures at MGCF | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 275 | | CR | | AGREED |
| .6 | N1-022346 | MESSAGE corrections part 1 | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 249 | 2 | CR | | REVISED TO 2455 |
| .6 | N1-022347 | MESSAGE corrections part 2 | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 250 | 1 | CR | | REVISED TO 2456 |
| .3 | N1-022348 | Security association clarifications | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 251 | 1 | CR | | REVISED TO 2440 |
| .1 | N1-022349 | CR to 24.841: Documentation of PUBLISH method | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | PRESNC | 0.3.0 | Rel-6 | | 24.841 | | | CR | | AGREED |
| .7 | N1-022350 | Proxy support of PRACK | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 276 | | CR | | AGREED |
| .7 | N1-022351 | Clarification of transparent handling | Lucent Technolog | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 277 | | CR | | AGREED |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | of parameters in profile | ies / Keith Drage | | | | | | | | | | |
| .1 | N1-022352 | Clarification on revision level | T-Mobile | GSM/UMTS interworking | 6.19.0 | R97 | A | 04.08 | A1135 | | CR | | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022353 | Clarification on revision level | T-Mobile | GSM/UMTS interworking | 7.18.0 | R98 | A | 04.08 | A1137 | | CR | | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022354 | Clarification on revision level | T-Mobile | GSM/UMTS interworking | 3.13.0 | R99 | A | 24.008 | 722 | | CR | | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022355 | Clarification on revision level | T-Mobile | GSM/UMTS interworking | 4.8.0 | Rel-4 | A | 24.008 | 723 | | CR | | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022356 | Clarification on revision level | T-Mobile | GSM/UMTS interworking | 5.5.0 | Rel-5 | A | 24.008 | 724 | | CR | | AGREED |
| .2 | N1-022357 | 3GPP R5 Requirements on SIP, Internet Draft | Ericsson/ M. Garcia | | | | | | | | INFO | | NOTED |
| .2 | N1-022358 | 3GPP SIP P-headers Internet Draft | Ericsson/ M. Garcia | | | | | | | | INFO | | NOTED |
| .1 | N1-022359 | P-CSCF does not strip away headers | Ericsson/ M. Garcia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 278 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2473 |
| .4 | N1-022360 | Meaning of refresh request | Ericsson/ M. Garcia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 279 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2444 |
| .3 | N1-022361 | Contact header value at registration | Ericsson/ M. Garcia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.228 | 077 | 1 | CR | CR077 agreed in CN1#26. Meaning also rejected for CR077. | REJECTED |
| .3 | N1-022362 | Removal of Caller Preferences dependency | Ericsson/ M. Garcia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 280 | | CR | | AGREED |
| .4 | N1-022363 | P-Access-Network-Info clarifications | Ericsson/ M. Garcia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 281 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2445 |
| | N1-022364 | LS on proposed list of core IMS specifications for Access Independence | SA2 | | | | | | | | LS IN | S2-023124r2, To: CN1, CN3, CN4, Cc: CN5, | LS OUT in 2403 by Keith |
| .4 | N1-022365 | Support of non-IMS forking | Ericsson / A Monrad | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 140 | 3 | CR | CR140r1 agreed in CN1#26. | REVISED TO 2446 |
| .6 | N1-022366 | Addition of Message flows to 24.228 | dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.228 | 091 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2457 |
| .1 | N1-022367 | Clarification to use of Service Information | Dynamicsoft Andrew Allen | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 23.218 | 038 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2475 |
| .1 | N1-022368 | Alignment of UE with SIP UA funtions including Path header and Service-Route | Dynamicsoft Andrew Allen | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 236 | 1 | CR | | WITHDRAWN |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | header support | | | | | | | | | | | |
| .3 | N1-022369 | Corrections to the Path and Service-Route headers | Dynamicsoft Andrew Allen | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.228 | 073 | 3 | CR | CR073r2 agreed in CN1#26. | REVISED TO 2390 |
| .1 | N1-022370 | Clarification on use of the From header by the UE | Dynamicsoft Andrew Allen | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 282 | | CR | | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022371 | S-CSCF procedure tidyup | Dynamicsoft Andrew Allen | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 246 | 2 | CR | CR246r1 agreed in CN1#26. | REVISED TO 2497 |
| .2 | N1-022372 | CN1 Open Items List | Dynamicsoft Andrew Allen | | | | | | | | INFO | | NOTED |
| .6 | N1-022373 | Support of comp=sigcomp parameter | Dynamicsoft Andrew Allen | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 283 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2458 |
| .1 | N1-022374 | SDP media policy rejection | Dynamicsoft Andrew Allen | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 284 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2474 |
| .6 | N1-022375 | SIP compression resynchronisation | Dynamicsoft Andrew Allen | | | | | | | | DISC | | Not available |
| .1 | N1-022376 | Additions to 24.841 bibliography | Dynamicsoft Andrew Allen | PRESNC | 0.3.0 | Rel-6 | | 24.841 | | | CR | | Not available |
| .1 | N1-022377 | Publish routing issues | Dynamicsoft Andrew Allen | | | | | | | | DISC | | Not available |
| .4 | N1-022378 | Fix gprs-charging-info definition and descriptions | Siemens | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 204 | 2 | CR | CR204r1 agreed in CN1#26. Agreed on condition that 2426 is not agreed. | REVISED TO 2426 |
| .6 | N1-022379 | Fallback for compression failure | Nokia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 285 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2481 |
| .6 | N1-022380 | Compression failure | Nokia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 286 | | CR | | NOTED |
| .8 | N1-022381 | Request URI as SPT | Nokia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 23.218 | 039 | | CR | | Not available |
| .6 | N1-022382 | SA related procedures | Nokia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 287 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2459 |
| .6 | N1-022383 | SA related procedures | Nokia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.228 | 092 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2460 |
| .6 | N1-022384 | Backup security solution | Nokia | | | | | | | | DISC | | NOTED |
| .3 | N1-022385 | Default URI | Nokia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 288 | | CR | | REJECTED |
| .6 | N1-022386 | PCF to PDF | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.228 | 093 | | CR | | AGREED |
| .6 | N1-022387 | PCF to PDF | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 289 | | CR | | AGREED |
| .2 | N1-022388 | TR on SIP interworking | Ericsson, Nokia | | | | | | | | DISC | | NOTED |
| | N1- | LS Response on | SA5 | | | | | | | | LS | S5-024484, | NOTED |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 022389 | 'SDP information in charging records' | | | | | | | | | IN | To: CN1, Cc: SA2, | |
| .3 | N1-022390 | Corrections to the Path and Service-Route headers | Ericsson, dynamicsoft | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.228 | 073 | 4 | CR | CR073r2 agreed in CN1#26. | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022391 | Speech codec indication by R99 MS | Nokia / Hannu Hietalahti | | | R99 | | | | | DISC | | NOTED |
| .6 | N1-022392 | Emergency Service correction | Nokia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | C | 24.229 | 290 | | CR | | REVISED TO 2461 |
| .1 | N1-022393 | Clarification on revision level | T-Mobile | GSM/UMTS interworking | 4.23.1 | Phase2 | F | 04.08 | A1139 | | CR | | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022394 | Clarification on revision level | T-Mobile | GSM/UMTS interworking | 5.18.1 | R96 | A | 04.08 | A1141 | | CR | | AGREED |
| .6 | N1-022395 | Corrections on P-CSCF behaviour: handling the Record-Route, Route header fields | Nokia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 241 | 1 | CR | | NOTED |
| .1 | N1-022396 | Stripping of headers at the P-CSCF | Ericsson | IMS-CCR | | | | | | | DISC | Agreements are in listed in the minutes. | NOTED |
| .1 | N1-022397 | Stripping of headers in the P-CSCF | Ericsson | IMS-CCR | 5.6.0 | Rel-5 | F | 23.228 | 232 | | DISC | | NOTED |
| .1 | N1-022398 | Clarification on Network Configuration Hiding | Alcatel, Ericsson, H3G, Nokia, Siemens, Vodafone | IMS-CCR | 5.6.0 | Rel-5 | F | 23.228 | 235 | | DISC | Agreements are in listed in the minutes. | NOTED |
| .1 | N1-022399 | SDP manipulation in CSCFs | Nokia, dynamicsoft, Ericsson | IMS-CCR | 5.6.0 | Rel-5 | F | 23.228 | 237 | | DISC | Forwarded back to SA2 for further discussions. | NOTED |
| | N1-022400 | Workplan of 18. November 2002 for review | MCC | | | | | | | | WORK PLAN | | NOTED |
| | N1-022401 | LS on authentication procedure for MS rejecting the network | T1 | | | R99 | | | | | LS IN | T1-020888, To: CN1, Cc: T1 SIG SWG | LS OUT in 2404 by Chen |
| | N1-022402 | Reply LS on " RTCP overhead in SDP bandwidth parameter" | Miguel | | | | | | | | LS OUT | Related to 2300. To: SA4, CN3 Cc: SA2 This was sent only to CN3, triggering 2484. | REPLACED BY 2485 |
| | N1-022403 | LS on proposed list of core IMS specifications for Access Independence | Keith | | | | | | | | LS OUT | Related to 2364. To: SA2, Cc: CN3, CN4, CN5, | REVISED TO 2488 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N1-022404 | Reply to LS on authentication procedure for MS rejecting the network | Chen | | | | | | | | LS OUT | Related to 2401. To: T1, Cc: T1 SIG SWG | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022405 | Clarification of the protocol to be used on the E-interface | Siemens | GSM/UMTS interworking | 3.11.0 | R99 | F | 23.009 | 088 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2234. Not available. | WITHDRAWN |
| .1 | N1-022406 | Clarification of the protocol to be used on the E-interface | Siemens | GSM/UMTS interworking | 4.5.0 | Rel-4 | A | 23.009 | 089 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2235. Not available. | WITHDRAWN |
| .1 | N1-022407 | Clarification of the protocol to be used on the E-interface | Siemens | GSM/UMTS interworking | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | A | 23.009 | 090 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2236. Not available. | WITHDRAWN |
| | N1-022408 | Potential transition problem when switching MSC revision from R98 to R99 | Rouzbeh | | | | | | | | LS OUT | Related to 2243. To: GERAN2 | REVISED TO 2489 |
| .2 | N1-022409 | Summary of current IETF documents on SIPPING | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | | Rel-5 | | | | | INFO | Revised from 2248. | NOTED |
| .2 | N1-022410 | Summary of current IETF documents on SIP | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | | Rel-5 | | | | | INFO | Revised from 2249. | NOTED |
| .2 | N1-022411 | Summary of current IETF documents on MMUSIC | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | | Rel-5 | | | | | INFO | Revised from 2250. | NOTED |
| .6 | N1-022412 | Clarifications and editorials to SIP profile | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 161 | 3 | CR | Revised from 1918 and 2056. CR161r2 agreed in CN1#26. | AGREED |
| .7 | N1-022413 | Profile revisions for RFC 3261 headers | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 274 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2344. | AGREED |
| | N1-022414 | LS on SMS support via the SGSN | Tim | | | | | | | | LS OUT | Related to 2306. To: SA1 | NOTED |
| | N1-022415 | ? | Robert | | | | | | | | LS OUT | Related to 2229. Not available. | WITHDRAWN |
| .1 | N1-022416 | CSCF editing SDP | Orange | | | | | | | | DISCUSSION | S2-023495. Forwarded back to SA2 for further discussions. | NOTED |
| .1 | N1-022417 | Correcting errors and making improvements to references | CN1 secretary | TEI | 3.13.0 | R99 | F | 24.008 | 719 | 1 | CR | | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022418 | Correcting errors and making improvements to | CN1 secretary | TEI4 | 4.8.0 | Rel-4 | F | 24.008 | 720 | 1 | CR | | AGREED |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | references | | | | | | | | | | | |
| .1 | N1-022419 | Correcting errors and making improvements to references | CN1 secretary | TEI4 | 5.5.0 | Rel-5 | A | 24.008 | 721 | 1 | CR | | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022420 | CR to 24.841: Clause 6.1.2.1 revisions to include P-CSCF and S-CSCF storage | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | PRESNC | 0.3.0 | Rel-6 | | 24.841 | | | CR | | Not treated due to time |
| .1 | N1-022421 | CR to 24.841: Clause 6.1.3.1 revisions to include P-CSCF and S-CSCF storage | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | PRESNC | 0.3.0 | Rel-6 | | 24.841 | | | CR | | Not treated due to time |
| .1 | N1-022422 | CR to 24.841: Clause 6.1.3.2 revisions to include P-CSCF and S-CSCF storage | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | PRESNC | 0.3.0 | Rel-6 | | 24.841 | | | CR | | Not treated due to time |
| .1 | N1-022423 | CR to 24.841: Clause 6.1.4.1 revisions to include P-CSCF and S-CSCF storage | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | PRESNC | 0.3.0 | Rel-6 | | 24.841 | | | CR | | Not treated due to time |
| .1 | N1-022424 | CR to 24.841: Clause 6.4 revisions to include P-CSCF and S-CSCF storage | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | PRESNC | 0.3.0 | Rel-6 | | 24.841 | | | CR | | Not treated due to time |
| .6 | N1-022425 | Clarifications on the use of charging correlation information | Lucent Technologies / Keith | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 228 | 3 | CR | Revised from 2157. CR228r2 agreed in CN1#26. | AGREED |
| .4 | N1-022426 | Fix gprs-charging-info definition and descriptions | Siemens | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 204 | 3 | CR | CR204r1 agreed in CN1#26. Revised from 2378 | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022427 | Introduction of GERAN Iu-mode | Siemens | TEI5 | 5.0.0 | Rel-5 | F | 23.034 | 007 | 3 | CR | Revised from 2238 | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022428 | MS late entry notification | Nortel Networks/ Sonia Garapaty | ASCI | 5.1.0 | Rel-5 | F | 43.068 | 008 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2273. | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022429 | MS late entry notification | Nortel Networks/ Sonia Garapaty | ASCI | 5.1.0 | Rel-5 | F | 43.069 | 007 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2274 | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022430 | Downloading of local emergency numbers to the mobile station | Vodafone / Duncan Mills | TEI5 | 5.5.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.008 | 716 | 1 | CR | LS OUT in 2431 by Duncan.Revised from 2303. | REVISED TO 2492 |
| | N1-022431 | LS on Downloading of local emergency numbers to the mobile station | Duncan | | | | | | | | LS OUT | Related to 2430. To: SA1, SA2 | REJECTED |
| | N1-022432 | LS on HSCSD in GERAN Iu mode | Robert | | | | | | | | LS OUT | Related to 2427. To: GERAN2 | AGREED |
| .3 | N1-022433 | The use of security association by the UE | Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 252 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2254 | AGREED |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| .3 | N1-022434 | UE integrity protected re-registration | Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 253 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2255 | AGREED |
| | N1-022435 | LS on P-CSCF checking IP addresses in Contact header | Miguel | | | | | | | | LS OUT | Related to 2256. To: SA3 | POSTPONED |
| .3 | N1-022436 | Handling of default public user identities by the P-CSCF | Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 255 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2257 | REVISED TO 2490 |
| .3 | N1-022437 | Changing tel URL to SIP URI in P-Associated-URI header field | Nokia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.228 | 090 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2295 | AGREED |
| .3 | N1-022438 | Alignment with draft-ietf-sipping-reg-event-00 and clarification on network initiated deregistration | Nokia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 266 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2296 | REVISED TO 2493 |
| .3 | N1-022439 | Registration Expires Timer Default Setting | Hutchison 3G / Vodafone | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 268 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2307 | AGREED |
| .3 | N1-022440 | Security association clarifications | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 251 | 2 | CR | Revised from 2348 | AGREED |
| .4 | N1-022441 | Add charging P-header examples to call flows | Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.228 | 072 | 4 | CR | Revised from 2265 | AGREED |
| .4 | N1-022442 | Go related error codes in the UE | Ericsson / A Monrad | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 222 | 3 | CR | CR222r1 agreed in CN1#26. Revised from 2881. | REVISED TO 2495 |
| .4 | N1-022443 | Clarifications of the binding and media grouping | Ericsson / A Monrad | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 175 | 4 | CR | Revised from 2280 | REVISED TO 2494 |
| .4 | N1-022444 | Meaning of refresh request | Ericsson/ M. Garcia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 279 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2360 | AGREED |
| .4 | N1-022445 | P-Access-Network-Info clarifications | Ericsson/ M. Garcia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 281 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2363 | AGREED |
| .4 | N1-022446 | Support of non-IMS forking | Ericsson / A Monrad | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 140 | 4 | CR | CR140r1 agreed in CN1#26. Revised from 2365. | AGREED |
| .6 | N1-022447 | Fix descriptions for ECF/CCF addresses | Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 264 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2267. | AGREED |
| .6 | N1-022448 | Call transfer update | Nokia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.228 | 089 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2293. | AGREED |
| .6 | N1-022449 | Correction to network initiated re-authentication procedure | Vodafone / Duncan Mills | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 267 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2305 | AGREED |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N1-022450 | LS on "Proposed TR for the architectural aspects of early UE handling" | CN4 | | | | | | | | LS IN | N4-021497, To: SA2, Cc: CN1 | NOTED |
| | N1-022451 | Liaison statement on Interoperability Issues and SIP in IMS | SA3 | | | | | | | | LS IN | S3-020578, To: CN1, SA1, SA2, CN, SA, Cc: SA4, SA5, CN2,CN3, CN4,CN5, | NOTED |
| | N1-022452 | LS on protected 'user authentication failure' messages and unprotected REGISTER messages | SA3 | | | | | | | | LS IN | S3-020579, To: SA3, Cc: CN1 | Forwarded to CN1#28 |
| | N1-022453 | IMS: IETF SIP Security Agreement Draft | SA3 | | | | | | | | LS IN | S3-020580, To: CN1, Cc: | NOTED |
| | N1-022454 | Reply to LS on Call Barring for SMS in PS domain | SA1 | | | | | | | | LS IN | S1-022247, To: CN1, CN4, Cc: | NOTED |
| .6 | N1-022455 | MESSAGE corrections part 1 | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 249 | 3 | CR | Revised from 2346. | AGREED |
| .6 | N1-022456 | MESSAGE corrections part 2 | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 250 | 2 | CR | Revised from 2347. | AGREED |
| .6 | N1-022457 | Addition of Message flows to 24.228 | dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.228 | 091 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2366. | AGREED |
| .6 | N1-022458 | Support of comp=sigcomp parameter | Dynamicsoft Andrew Allen | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 283 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2373 | REJECTED |
| .6 | N1-022459 | SA related procedures | Nokia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 287 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2382. | AGREED |
| .6 | N1-022460 | SA related procedures | Nokia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.228 | 092 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2383. | AGREED |
| .6 | N1-022461 | Emergency Service correction | Nokia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | C | 24.229 | 290 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2392. | AGREED |
| .6 | N1-022462 | Clarifications of SDP for charging requirement | NEC/Yukio Kawanami | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 227 | 2 | CR | Revised from 2316. | REJECTED |
| .4 | N1-022463 | P-CSCF shall not save Record-Route of refreshing requests | Siemens / Ericsson | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 238 | 2 | CR | Revised from 2124. CR238r1 was agreed in CN1#26. | NOTED |
| .8 | N1-022464 | Clarification on Sh interface for charging purposes | NEC/Yukio Kawanami | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 23.218 | 037 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2315. | AGREED |
| .6 | N1-022465 | Clarification on Sh interface for charging purposes | NEC/Yukio Kawanami | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 269 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2417. | AGREED |
| .6 | N1-022466 | Clarifications on the scope | NEC/Yukio | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 270 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2418. | REVISED TO 2500 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Kawanami | | | | | | | | | | |
| .6 | N1-022467 | Add charging info for SUBSCRIBE | Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 273 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2324. | AGREED |
| .8 | N1-022468 | Clarification on MRFP reference point | NEC/Yukio Kawanami | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 23.218 | 030 | 3 | CR | Revised from 2311. | AGREED |
| .8 | N1-022469 | Clarifications on Annex C (Informative) | NEC/Yukio Kawanami | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 23.218 | 034 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2312. | AGREED |
| .8 | N1-022470 | Clarifications on definition of Service Point Trigger, etc. | NEC/Yukio Kawanami | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 23.218 | 035 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2313. | POSTPONED |
| .6 | N1-022471 | UE Registration | Lucent Technologies / Nokia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 209 | 2 | CR | Revised from 2081. CR209r1 agreed in CN1#26. | AGREED |
| .6 | N1-022472 | UE procedure tidyup | Lucent Technologies / Nokia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 248 | 2 | CR | Revised from 2082.CR248r1 agreed in CN1#26. | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022473 | P-CSCF does not strip away headers | Ericsson/ M. Garcia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 278 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2359. | REVISED TO 2487 |
| .1 | N1-022474 | SDP media policy rejection | Dynamicsoft Andrew Allen | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 284 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2374. | REVISED TO 2491 |
| .1 | N1-022475 | Clarification to use of Service Information | Dynamicsoft Andrew Allen | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 23.218 | 038 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2367. | AGREED |
| | N1-022476 | Liaison statement on Interoperability Issues and SIP in IMS | Allan | | | | | | | | LS OUT | Related to the result of SA2-CN1 joint meeting. | REVISED TO 2501 |
| .1 | N1-022477 | SMS over GPRS disabled | Ericsson | TEI5 | 5.0.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.011 | 024 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2247. | REVISED TO 2498 |
| .1 | N1-022478 | Presence Information Model for a 3GPP Subscriber | Nortel Networks/ Sonia Garapaty | PRESNC | 0.3.0 | Rel-6 | | 24.841 | | | CR | Revised from 2277. | AGREED |
| .4 | N1-022479 | Interoperability and Commonality between IP Multimedia Systems using different "IP-connectivity Networks"; stage 3 | Ericsson / A Monrad | | | Rel-6 | | | | | WID | Revised from 2278 | AGREED |
| .7 | N1-022480 | Addition of missing "<>" for URIs in chapter 7 and 8 | Nokia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.228 | 088 | 1 | CR | Revised from 2292 | AGREED |
| .6 | N1-022481 | Fallback for compression failure | Nokia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 285 | 1 | CR | Conditionally to IETF result next week. Revised from 2379. | AGREED |
| | N1-022482 | Reply LS on CS data services for GERAN Iu-mode | CN4 | | | | | | | | LS IN | N4-021525, To: SA2, CN3, | NOTED |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | GERAN2, CN1, Cc: | |
| | N1-022483 | LS on Questions from the European Numbering Forum | T3 | | | | | | | | LS IN | T3-020932, To: European Numbering Forum, Cc: CN4, SA1, CN1 | NOTED |
| .2 | N1-022484 | [DRAFT] Reply LS on RTCP overhead in SDP bandwidth parameter | CN3 | | | | | | | | LS OUT | | REVISED TO 2485 |
| | N1-022485 | Reply LS on " RTCP overhead in SDP bandwidth parameter" | Miguel | | | | | | | | LS OUT | Related to 2300. To: SA4, Cc: SA2 Revision of 2402. | AGREED |
| .2 | N1-022486 | Draft TR on interworking between the 3GPP profile of SIP and external SIP usage | Siemens/Thomas | | | | | | | | TR | N3-020963 | NOTED |
| .1 | N1-022487 | P-CSCF does not strip away headers | Ericsson/ M. Garcia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 278 | 2 | CR | Revised from 2359 and 2473. | REVISED TO 2499 |
| | N1-022488 | LS on proposed list of core IMS specifications for Access Independence | Keith | | | | | | | | LS OUT | Related to 2364. To: SA2, Cc: CN3, CN4, CN5, Revised from 2403. | AGREED |
| | N1-022489 | Potential transition problem when switching MSC revision from R98 to R99 | Rouzbeh | | | | | | | | LS OUT | Related to 2243. To: GERAN2. Revised from 2408 | AGREED |
| .3 | N1-022490 | Handling of default public user identities by the P-CSCF | Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 255 | 2 | CR | Revised from 2257 and 2436. | REVISED TO 2496 |
| .1 | N1-022491 | SDP media policy rejection | Dynamicsoft Andrew Allen | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 284 | 2 | CR | Revised from 2374 and 2474. | POSTPONED |
| .1 | N1-022492 | Downloading of local emergency numbers to the mobile station | Vodafone / Duncan Mills | TEI5 | 5.5.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.008 | 716 | 2 | CR | LS OUT in 2431 by Duncan.Revised from 2303 and 2430. | AGREED |
| .3 | N1-022493 | Alignment with draft-ietf-sipping-reg-event-00 and clarification on network initiated deregistration | Nokia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 266 | 2 | CR | Revised from 2296 and 2438. | AGREED |
| .4 | N1-022494 | Clarifications of the binding and media grouping | Ericsson / A Monrad | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 175 | 5 | CR | Revised from 2280 and 2443 | AGREED |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| .4 | N1-022495 | Go related error codes in the UE | Ericsson / A Monrad | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 222 | 4 | CR | CR222r1 agreed in CN1#26. Revised from 2881 and 2442. | AGREED |
| .3 | N1-022496 | Handling of default public user identities by the P-CSCF | Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 255 | 3 | CR | Revised from 2257, 2436 and 2490. | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022497 | S-CSCF procedure tidyup | Dynamicsoft Andrew Allen | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 246 | 3 | CR | CR246r1 agreed in CN1#26. Revised from 2371 | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022498 | SMS over GPRS disabled | Ericsson | TEI5 | 5.0.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.011 | 024 | 2 | CR | Revised from 2247 and 2477. | AGREED |
| .1 | N1-022499 | P-CSCF does not strip away headers | Ericsson/ M. Garcia | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 278 | 3 | CR | Revised from 2359,2473 and 2487. | AGREED |
| .6 | N1-022500 | Clarifications on the scope | NEC/Yukio Kawanami | IMS-CCR | 5.2.0 | Rel-5 | F | 24.229 | 270 | 2 | CR | Revised from 2418 and 2466. | AGREED |
| | N1-022501 | Liaison statement on Interoperability Issues and SIP in IMS | Allan | | | | | | | | LS OUT | Revised from 2476. Related to the result of SA2-CN1 joint meeting. To: CN, SA, Cc: SA1, SA2, SA3, SA4, SA5, CN2, CN3, CN4,CN5 | REVISED TO 503 |
| | N1-022502 | CN1 comments to workplan | CN1 | | | | | | | | WORK PLAN | | AGREED |
| | N1-022503 | Liaison statement on Interoperability Issues and SIP in IMS | Allan | | | | | | | | LS OUT | Revised from 2476. Related to the result of SA2-CN1 joint meeting. To: SA, CN | E-Mail APPROVAL UNTIL 20Nov16:00 |

# Annex E Liaison Statements OUT

| Meeting | TDoc # | Status | Source | Tdoc Title | Type | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| N1-27 | N1-022402 | Sent to CN3 and then after a joint m. Replaced | Miguel | Reply LS on " RTCP overhead in SDP bandwidth parameter" | LS OUT | Related to 2300. To: SA4, CN3 Cc: SA2 Was only sent to CN3 which |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | by 2485 | | | | triggered 2484 |
| N1-27 | N1-022404 | AGREED | Chen | Reply to LS on authentication procedure for MS rejecting the network | LS OUT | Related to 2401. To: T1, Cc: T1 SIG SWG |
| N1-27 | N1-022432 | AGREED | Robert | LS on HSCSD in GERAN Iu mode | LS OUT | Related to 2427. To: GERAN2 |
| N1-27 | N1-022485 | AGREED | CN1,CN3 | Reply LS on " RTCP overhead in SDP bandwidth parameter" | LS OUT | Related to 2300. To: SA4, Cc: SA2 Revision of 2402. |
| N1-27 | N1-022488 | AGREED | Keith | LS on proposed list of core IMS specifications for Access Independence | LS OUT | Related to 2364. To: SA2, Cc: CN3, CN4, CN5, Revised from 2403. |
| N1-27 | N1-022489 | AGREED | Rouzbeh | Potential transition problem when switching MSC revision from R98 to R99 | LS OUT | Related to 2243. To: GERAN2. Revised from 2408 |
| N1-27 | N1-022503 | | Allen | Liaison statement on Interoperability Issues and SIP in IMS | LS OUT | Revised from 2476. Related to the result of SA2-CN1 joint |

# Annex F Ageed Work Items

| Meeting | Status | TDoc # | Source | Tdoc Title | Type | WI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| N1-27 | AGREED | N1-022479 | Ericsson / A Monrad | Interoperability and Commonality between IP Multimedia Systems using different "IP-connectivity Networks"; stage 3 | WID | |

# Annex G Agreed specifications (TS or TR)

None.

# Annex H List of CRs to N1 drafts

| Meeting | TDoc # | Spec | Rel | C_Ver | Tdoc Title | Type | WI | Status |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| N1-27 | N1-022283 | 24.841 | Rel-6 | 0.3.0 | CR to 3GPP TR 24.841 V0.3.0: Update on chapter 6.1.2.1 | CR | PRESNC | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022284 | 24.841 | Rel-6 | 0.3.0 | CR to 3GPP TR 24.841 V0.3.0: Update on chapter 6.1.3 | CR | PRESNC | AGREED |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| N1-27 | N1-022285 | 24.841 | Rel-6 | 0.3.0 | CR to 3GPP TR 24.841 V0.3.0: Update on chapter 6.1.4.1 | CR | PRESNC | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022286 | 24.841 | Rel-6 | 0.3.0 | CR to 3GPP TR 24.841 V0.3.0: Update on chapter 6.2 | CR | PRESNC | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022287 | 24.841 | Rel-6 | 0.3.0 | CR to 3GPP TR 24.841 V0.3.0: Update on chapter 6.3.2.1 | CR | PRESNC | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022288 | 24.841 | Rel-6 | 0.3.0 | CR to 3GPP TR 24.841 V0.3.0: Update on chapter 6.3.3.1 | CR | PRESNC | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022289 | 24.841 | Rel-6 | 0.3.0 | CR to 3GPP TR 24.841 V0.3.0: Update on chapter 6.4 | CR | PRESNC | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022349 | 24.841 | Rel-6 | 0.3.0 | CR to 24.841: Documentation of PUBLISH method | CR | PRESNC | AGREED |
| N1-27 | N1-022478 | 24.841 | Rel-6 | 0.3.0 | Presence Information Model for a 3GPP Subscriber | CR | PRESNC | AGREED |