

**C5-050208****Joint-Working-Group (Parlay, ETSI Project OSA, 3GPP TSG\_CT WG5)  
Draft Report of Meeting #31, Osaka, JAPAN, 09 – 13 May 2005****Contents**

1	Opening of the meeting and approval of the agenda (Monday 9:00 AM) .....	3
1.1	Reminder for IPR declaration.....	3
2	Allocation of documents to agenda items .....	3
3	Reporting .....	3
3.1	JWG meeting, Barcelona & Austin .....	3
3.2	3GPP .....	4
3.2.1	CN#27 plenary (final one) & New CT#27 plenary.....	4
3.2.2	SA plenary .....	4
3.2.3	SA1 activities on OSA Requirements .....	5
3.2.4	3GPP OMA discussions .....	5
3.3	Parlay .....	5
3.3.1	Parlay Board.....	5
3.3.2	Parlay TAC.....	5
3.4	ETSI.....	6
3.5	3GPP2 .....	7
3.6	Work between meetings .....	7
3.7	Other reporting .....	7
4	Input liaison statements .....	7
5	OSA version 2 / 3GPP Rel.5 .....	8
6	OSA version 3 / 3GPP Rel.6 .....	11
6.1	new WSDL Annexes for OSA Release 6 .....	20
7	OSA version 4 / 3GPP Rel.7 .....	24
7.1	Service Broker.....	26
8	Organisational aspects with relation to Joint activities .....	28
8.1	CR delivery plans for next CT plenaries .....	29
8.2	Review of 3GPP OSA Work Plan.....	29
8.3	3GPP OSA Work Item Descriptions .....	29
8.4	Agreement of revised CT5 ToR .....	29
9	Outgoing Liaisons.....	29
10	Future meetings .....	29
10.1	Convenor election .....	29
11	AOB.....	29
12	Close .....	30
<b>Annex A:</b>	<b>Agenda.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Annex B:</b>	<b>Documents list .....</b>	<b>33</b>
B.1	List of documents for submission to CT#28.....	36
<b>Annex C:</b>	<b>Participants list.....</b>	<b>37</b>
History .....		38

**Convenor:** [Chelo Abarca](#) (Alcatel) for 3GPP CT5  
**Chair:** [Richard Stretch](#) (BT) for ETSI TISPAN Project OSA, Parlay TAC  
**Secretary:** Ultan Mulligan (ETSI PTCC)  
**3GPP Support:** [Adrian Zoicas](#) (ETSI, 3GPP Mobile Competence Centre) (**absent**)  
**Meeting Host:** Paraly/NTT  
**Web Home Page:** <http://www.3gpp.org/TB/CN/CN5/CN5.htm>  
**3GPP E-mail Lists:** <http://www.3gpp.org/email/lists.htm> <http://list.etsi.org/>  
**JWG E-mail List:** [3GPP\\_TSG\\_CT\\_WG5@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_CT_WG5@LIST.ETSI.ORG)  
**Server:** [http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg\\_ct/WG5\\_osa\\_ex-CN5/](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ct/WG5_osa_ex-CN5/)  
[ftp://www.3gpp.org/tsg\\_ct/WG5\\_osa\\_ex-CN5/](ftp://www.3gpp.org/tsg_ct/WG5_osa_ex-CN5/)

**Joint-Working-Group (Parlay, ETSI Project OSA, 3GPP CT5)  
Meeting #31, Osaka, JAPAN, 09-13 May 2005**

C5-050205

**Source:** CT5 Convenor ([Chelo.Abarca@alcatel.fr](mailto:Chelo.Abarca@alcatel.fr))  
**Title:** Report Wednesday

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

### 1.1 Reminder for IPR declaration

The chairman made the following call for IPRs, and asked ETSI members to check the latest version of ETSI's policy available on the web server:

The attention of the members of this Technical Specification Group is drawn to the fact **that 3GPP Individual Members have the obligation** under the IPR Policies of their respective Organizational Partners to **inform their respective Organizational Partners of Essential IPRs they become aware of.**

The members take note that they are hereby invited:

- a) to investigate in their company whether their company does own IPRs which are, or are likely to become Essential in respect of the work of the Technical Specification Group.
- b) to notify the Director-General, or the Chairman of their **respective** Organizational Partners, of all potential IPRs that their company may own, by means of the IPR Statement and the Licensing declaration forms (e.g. see the ETSI IPR forms <http://webapp.etsi.org/Ipr/>).

C5-050200	Agenda	Invitation to CT5 (former CN5) #31 Osaka meeting	Host/Parlay	1 Agenda	Noted.
C5-050201	Agenda	Draft Agenda	JWG Chair	1 Agenda	Withdrawn.
C5-050268	Agenda	Revised agenda	JWG Chair	1 Agenda	Approved.

## 2 Allocation of documents to agenda items

C5-050202r1	Tdoc	Document Allocation	JWG Chair	2 Tdoc allocation	Noted
-------------	------	---------------------	-----------	-------------------	-------

## 3 Reporting

### 3.1 JWG meeting, Barcelona & Austin

C5-050215	Report_in	N5-040708 DRAFT Report_CN5_29_Barcelona	MCC	3.1 Last JWG meeting	The reason to have this report in this meeting is that it was not submitted as a contribution to Austin and therefore has not been officially approved by the WG. Approved.
C5-050216	Report_in	N5-050008 Draft_Report_CN5_30_Austin	MCC	3.1 Last JWG meeting	Approved.

**3.2 3GPP****3.2.1 CN#27 plenary (final one) & New CT#27 plenary**

C5-050209	Report_in	CN5 Report to the CN#27 plenary	MCC	3.2.1 plenary	CN/CT	As usual, already distributed prior to submitting it to CN.  Approved.
C5-050210	Report_in	Report of 3GPP CN#27 meeting	MCC	3.2.1 plenary	CN/CT	Report from the last 3GPP CN Plenary to SA. Highlights: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most of the exceptions (Rel6 items which had not been finished for December 2004) closed, including ours (OSA stage 2 was submitted for approval to the March 2005 plenary). Rest (including GUP) must be ready for next plenary, or it won't be part of Rel6.</li> <li>• 3GPP CN has become 3GPP CT (after merging with 3GPP T), which had its first meeting on March 11. Highlights of this first CT meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Approval of the ToR for CT.</li> <li>○ Election of CT officials as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Chairman: Hannu Hietalahti / Nokia (ETSI)</li> <li>▪ Vice chairs:</li> <li>▪ Akishige Noda / Fujitsu (TTC)</li> <li>▪ Gary Jones / T-Mobil (ATIS)</li> <li>▪ Steve Mecrow /MMO2 (ETSI)</li> <li>▪ MCC support: Kimmo Kymäläinen (MCC)</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ All CT WGs are new WGs (ie need new ToR, new chairs and VCs, and voting lists are reset), where CN5-&gt;CT5.</li> <li>○ All WG chairs have been nominated convenors for the new two meetings, except for CT5 where it is only for the new meetings; chair and VC elections will take place in the London meetings.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Noted.

**3.2.2 SA plenary**

C5-050266	Tdoc	Report of 3GPP SA#27 meeting	MCC	3.2.2 SA Plenary		Of interest to us: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Service Broker requirement: "TD SP-050065 - CR to 22.217 Add Service Broker Requirement (Rel-7). There was an objection that the addition of the proposed text would make the requirements unclear and cause much discussion in other WGs. The CRs were therefore sent back to SA WG1 for</li> </ul>
-----------	------	------------------------------	-----	------------------	--	--

					<p>clarification and SA WG1 were asked to liaise with other impacted groups and return with an agreeable CR.”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Rel7 OSA WID: “TD SP-050076 New WI on Rel-7 OSA enhancements. There was a request to change the title to reflect the changes being made (i.e. Service Brokering). It was considered to be an important functionality so it was revised in TD S3-050183 which was approved.”</li> </ul> <p>What this really means is that, unlike Rel6 where we had a single WI for all OSA Rel6 capabilities, for Rel7 we have, so far, a WI for a single requirement.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

### 3.2.3 SA1 activities on OSA Requirements

C5-050267	Tdoc	Report of last 3GPP SA1 meeting	MCC	3.2.3 SA1 Activities on OSA requirements	<p>This was the SA1 meeting after the SA plenary in the previous report – ie where the OSA Service Broker requirement was sent back for clarification.</p> <p>Of interest to us: CR 76 in SP-050065 sent back to SA1 as it was not clear if the service broker concepts apply also to IMS. The corresponding work item description was approved at SA. It needs some revision in SA1.</p> <p>Document S1-050386 was provided for this. It was noted that the CR was sent to SA as CR 75 and should really be CR 75 rev1 and the version number of the TS is wrong.</p> <p>It was revised to S1-050483 and it was agreed to be sent to SA for approval as CR 76r2.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
-----------	------	---------------------------------	-----	--	---

### 3.2.4 3GPP OMA discussions

### 3.3 Parlay

#### 3.3.1 Parlay Board

The Board had a meeting and discussed the following:

- o Parlay whitepapers already available.
- o Future work areas: need for a convenor and concerns from the Parlay perspective on what happens to the JWG if no convenor is found.
- o Liaison to the OMA.
- o Not much progress on ParlayX 3.
- o A survey was sent out, about the future of the Parlay Group: refreshing the commitment, new working areas.

#### 3.3.2 Parlay TAC

Session of the Technical Group on Thursday where the whole JWG is invited: look at the requirements, have a look at the OMA OSE and PEEM documents. There will be a couple of presentations of two OMA company members (note: they don't represent OMA but themselves). This interchange with OMA will be taken into account to define the future of Parlay.

3.4 ETSI

<p>C5-050232</p>	<p>Tdoc</p>	<p>New ETSI Work Items required for OSA</p>	<p>Ullan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC</p>	<p>3.4 ETSI</p>	<p><b>Summary of contribution:</b>                  In order to continue publication of the joint work between ETSI, Parlay and 3GPP, in the form of ETSI specifications, 3 sets of new ETSI work items are required for Parlay X and Parlay 6. Draft work item sheets for these specifications are included in zip files attached to this contribution. ETSI work items have a 1-1 relationship with published ETSI documents, and should not be confused with 3GPP work items, which cover a larger body of work.</p> <p>ETSI members in the JWG are invited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For Parlay 6:                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to volunteer their companies as supporting members for the Parlay 6.0 work items,</li> <li>• to decide on a rapporteur,</li> <li>• and to approve the creation of these work items</li> </ul> </li> <li>- For Parlay X Rel6:                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to volunteer their companies as supporting members for the Parlay X Rel-6 update work items,</li> <li>• to decide on a rapporteur,</li> <li>• and to approve the creation of these work items</li> </ul> </li> <li>- For Parlay X Rel7:                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to choose a title for the Parlay X Rel-7 ETSI specification</li> <li>• to volunteer their companies as supporting members,</li> <li>• to decide on a rapporteur,</li> <li>• and to approve the creation of these work items.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion:</b>                  "Supporting companies" does not mean an obligation to contribute.</p> <p>BT, IBM, Aepona and Orange support the WIs for the three cases above.</p> <p>Rapporteur: Ullan will continue for Parlay 6.</p> <p>Parlay X Rel6: John-Luc was before, and Julian Richards did most of the work. John-Luc will not continue, but Julian is not from an ETSI company. We can't approve the creation of these WIs because we don't have a rapporteur.</p> <p>Parlay X for Rel7 (equivalent of 3GPP Rel7 PX): we also need a new title because in ETSI we can't have two specs with the same title; for the base APIs we've added the release number. Agreed that the same applies to PX because for each release the corresponding PX is linked to the requirements of that release. Discussion on the "branding", and whether the releases mean something to everybody.</p> <p>We don't have requirements yet – PX requirements are a higher level of abstraction of the APIs of that version, and we haven't yet agreed on the requirement for the next release.</p> <p>Concern that mentioning the base API release may confuse and be understood to imply that a certain version for the base APIs is necessary for building PX</p>
------------------	-------------	---	----------------------------------	-----------------	---

					<p>on top. This needs to be made clear.</p> <p>Damian volunteers to be the rapporteur for Parlay X for both Parlay Rel 6 and Rel7.</p> <p>For the title of the PX specs see later in the agenda (organizational aspects).</p> <p><b>Disposition:</b> Noted.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

### 3.5 3GPP2

### 3.6 Work between meetings

This agenda item aims to review the ToDo list from the previous meeting, plus reporting on any other between-meetings activity, if applicable.

C5-050269	Tdoc	Work between meetings	JWG Chair	3.6 Work between meetings	<p>AI#7: IETF is working on something related, and may address this; we could wait for it.</p> <p>AI#10 pending. <b>Joe and Anders to discuss what to do next.</b></p> <p>AI#21 is addressed in contributions C5-050237, 238, 239, 257 &amp; 258, which provide updated versions of ES 202 391 (Parlay X Web Services) to synchronize with the latest versions of TS 29.199. Noted that these updates correspond to the WI that we have not approved because we don't have a rapporteur – we have the work done but we cannot approved it because we don't have a rapporteur.</p> <p>Noted</p>
-----------	------	-----------------------	-----------	---------------------------	--

### 3.7 Other reporting

SA3 received our LS with a draft CR and agreed on it.

### NOW GOTO 10.1

## 4 Input liaison statements

C5-050212	LS_in	LS from SA2 to CT5 on 3GPP Rel-6 OSA stage 2 specification	S2-050351	4 Input LSs	<p>This is the last of the saga of transferring the OSA stage 2 to CN5/CT5. It just requests the approval of the new stage 2 as a condition for removing the obsolete one. Both things took place smoothly.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
C5-050222	LS_in	LS reply from OMA MWG MMSG to 3GPPSA-LS-Web-Services (SP-040695, NP-040360)	OMA-MMSG-2005-0046 (SP-050011)	4 Input LSs	<p>This LS is NOT addressed to CT5. However, it is submitted by MCC for information.</p> <p>This is the first response from one of the OMA WGs that got the Parlay X LS from 3GPP SA. OMA MWG MMSG has studied this contribution and has reached the conclusion that it is not relevant for use by MMSG, since the scope of the document addresses the VASP network access to the MMS system, which is not specified in OMA but is specified in 3GPP and 3GPP2.</p>

					<p>Conclusion: no overlap with OMA on Messaging Web Services.</p> <p>Note that this is only one of the several responses expected, since the LS was sent to many OMA WGs, and for each the potential for overlaps is not the same.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
C5-050225	LS_in	LS from ITU-R Ad Hoc to 3GPP WGs on Draft contribution for ITU-R WP8F on current 3GPP activities toward IP applications over mobile systems	ITU-R Ad Hoc	4 Input LSs	<p>For each Release 3GPP produces, ITU-T and ITU-R produce a "recommendation" – a map pointing to where the specs are located. This LS talks about Rel6, where in ITU-R (where they deal with the radio aspects) they need to identify where the specs are for IMT-2000. This LS is to tell them what has been done for radio aspects in Rel6.</p> <p>This has been sent to all CT groups but it has nothing to do with us because we don't deal with radio aspects.</p> <p>From the CT5 perspective there is no need to make any changes. <b>Chelo to include this statement in the report to the plenary.</b></p> <p>Noted.</p>

## 5 OSA version 2 / 3GPP Rel.5

Only essential error corrections can be taken into account. Essential means that without the intended error correction the current spec can not be implemented (SCS and/or application side).

Note that as Parlay 4.0 has been finalised, and backwards compatibility has to be guaranteed, the assumption is that for error corrections in the scope of Parlay 4 / 3GPP Rel.5 only work around and documentation of the errors is allowed.

C5-050241	CR	CR Rel-5 29.198-13 Correct references to PCIM RFCs	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	5 OSA2 / 3GPP Rel-5	<p><b>Summary of contribution:</b> Clause 8.8 of the Policy Management SCF contain references to clause 5.4 of the same document, which is clearly incorrect. Clause 5.4 is a sequence diagram entitled "Create and modify domain". These references should refer to clause 5.4 of RFC 3060, the Policy Core Information Model. There is a further incorrect reference to a missing document [8] which should be made to RFC 2591.</p> <p>This contribution proposes to include references to RFC 3060 and RFC 2591 in clause 2, to add abbreviations PCIM and CIM, and to refer correctly to these RFCs in clause 8.8.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> Correct typo DMFT-DMTF.</p> <p><b>Disposition:</b> Approved (with typo corrected).</p>
C5-050242	CR	CR Rel-6 29.198-13 Correct references to PCIM RFCs	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	5 OSA2 / 3GPP Rel-5	<p>Same changes for Rel6.</p> <p>Approved (correct same typo).</p>
C5-050270		Support for Emergency Telecommunications Service	John-Luc Bakker, Telcordia		<p><b>Summary of contribution:</b> CR to the User Interaction API.</p> <p>During the MSF's GMI2004, the OSA Emergency Telecommunications Service (supported by the MPCC API) was successfully tested. During preparation for the tests it was found that the priority / emergency call indication could not be set when communicating with a media resource.</p>

				<p>This CR seeks to add support for priority / emergency call indication between SCS and media resource.</p> <p>This contribution proposes the addition of a Service Property to indicate priority of a user interaction sessions.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <p>Comment: the type is an integer set but the text seems to imply there is only one value. Suggestion to improve the text (which is copied from MPCC). Response: edits agreed online.</p> <p>Clarification: the intention is just to set a priority, there is no way to ensure things will happen like this. Agreed to change the property name to P_PRIORITY to make this more clear.</p> <p>Question: why region specific? Response: there are three different standards for this at the moment (IETF, MEGACO, ATIS), each with a different number of priorities.</p> <p>Question: concern about alignment, since the proposed text description is the same we have in Part 4, and the servic eproperty name is the one we already use. Also the use: in CC the service property is a boolean (to switch on or off the high probability of completion), and here the proposal is a service property related to the instance if the UI SCF (ie for every use of it), which is very different. Answer: this is the intention – the alternative (to have this available in every UI API) would be more intrusive, which is not the case in CC because there this property is in an optional data type.</p> <p>Question: a lot of UI implementations are closely coupled with CC, would it impact that this is treated differently for both? Answer: the alternative is very intrusive changes. This would only apply to the creation of the call, not to the UI methods.</p> <p>Question: does each instance have one value, or more then one – in the latter case, how is this value used? Answer: the intention is that the SCF may be able to support more than one, and the application chooses at service property negotiation (note that this</p>
--	--	--	--	--



					<p>requires implementing the Enterprise Operator APIs). Changes in the text agreed to reflect this.</p> <p>Question: the final selection is still down to the supporting network, which is very region dependent. Offering the whole range is pointless. Answer: this is a mapping issue.</p> <p>Comment: need to a Rel6 mirror CR. Answer: agreed.</p> <p>Question: should it not be Cat B? In which case there is a problem with the Rel5 mirror. Answer: the way it is now it doesn't work – there is no way to assign priority between the application and the media resource.</p> <p>Comment: disagree with consequences if not approved. Answer: there is no way to mark the call as priority; need to check if the requirement refers to the call. The requirement was checked and it is not that detailed.</p> <p>Agreed to change the phrasing of the “consequences if not approved” to mention that this is an unfulfilled ETSI requirement, and the change is needed in 3GPP for alignment purposes.</p> <p>Comment: do we need another service property that shows if this is supported? We can't use “0” for this because the use of “0” is regional specific. Proposal to make the meaning of “0” generic.</p> <p>This may also need to result in a CR to MPCC, to keep the text aligned.</p> <p><b>Disposition:</b> Updated to 288.</p>
288					Update of 270.
289					Approved. Rel 6 mirror of 288.
291		Correct support for Emergency Telecommunications Service	JL		Approved. Rel5 CR to align the text in MPCC to the changes agreed in 288.
292			JL		Mirror of 291 Withdrawn
300					Update of 291 Approved.
301					Update of 292

					Approved.
C5-050240	Tdoc	Availability of ISO 4217:1995	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	3.4 ETSI	<p><b>Summary of contribution:</b></p> <p>During the preparation of the ETSI versions of Parlay 3, 4 and 5 for publication over the past 3 months, the ETSI editing team have pointed out a problem with our references to ISO 4217:1995. In TS 29.198, we make normative dated references to a specific version of this standard: ISO 4217:1995. In ParlayX, TS 29.199, we make undated reference to this standard.</p> <p>ISO 4217:1995 is no longer publicly available from ISO, or any other source. ETSI specifications cannot contain normative references to specifications or documents which are not publicly available. The same rule applies for 3GPP specifications. Therefore this reference to ISO 4217:1995 must be changed.</p> <p>There are two possible options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Make undated reference to ISO 4217, as has been done in ParlayX.</li> <li>o Make a dated reference to ISO 4217:2001</li> </ul> <p>CRs need to be prepared accordingly – Ultan volunteers.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <p>ISO does not provide an end-of-life date, but they withdraw the old one once they have a new one. The problem is that the lifetime of applications is longer. The document has not been available for four years now, and it seems this has not been a problem – the changes do not seem to have had such an impact.</p> <p>Agreement on option 1. Ultan will prepare the CRs for next meeting.</p> <p><b>Disposition:</b> Noted.</p>

## 6 OSA version 3 / 3GPP Rel.6

Only essential error corrections can be taken into account. Essential means that without the intended error correction the current spec can not be implemented (SCS and/or application side).

Note that as Parlay 5.0 has been finalised, and backwards compatibility has to be guaranteed, the assumption is that for error corrections in the scope of Parlay 5 / 3GPP Rel.6 only work around and documentation of the errors is allowed.

C5-050214	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-014 Update IETF Document References	The Parlay Group (Julian Richards)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	<p><b>Summary of contribution:</b></p> <p>Some references are to IETF drafts that expire every 6 months, until approved or withdrawn. This CR provides the latest versions of these drafts and a reference to an active 3GPP document tracking IETF dependencies.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <p>Comment: problem with referencing the 3GPP page is that it is a changing document, and dependencies that are solved disappear. Drafts die when they expire. Other 3GPP WGs wait until they get WG approval and an RFC number (which have a life beyond six months).</p> <p>Comment: IETF drafts are usually copied in the spec.</p> <p>Comment: in ETSI, and published 3GPP specs, the text of the draft is copied and stored locally so the secretariat can provide the text even after the draft disappears. This means references to expired drafts can be used too, because ETSI has them stored.</p> <p>Comment: these references are informative, there are</p>
-----------	----	---	---------------------------------------	------------------------	--

					<p>no key consequences to changing the references.</p> <p>Suggestion to minimize the references to IETF drafts so that the maintenance needed is minimized.</p> <p>Comment: drafts are not yet tested for interoperability, so we need further maintenance for that.</p> <p>Comment: this maintenance is needed every six months, and also to check what has changed in the referred draft.</p> <p>Comment: references can be split into normative (in section 2) and informative (in "Bibliography" – an annex at the end of the specs).</p> <p>Agreement to split the references into normative and informative.</p> <p><b>Disposition:</b> Updated to 295.</p>
295					<p>Update of 214.</p> <p>Needs to be reformatted as a CR, and remove the text in capitals in the "reasons for change", and all text in black. The field "other coments" is not necessary.</p> <p>Updated to 304.</p>
304					<p>Update of 295.</p> <p>Need to remove the last sentence of the "reasons for change". Adrian to do it as an editorial.</p> <p>Approved.</p>
C5-050228	CR	Rel-6 CR29198-15 Clarification of Multi Media Messaging using Sequence Diagrams	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI Secretariat	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	<p><b>Summary of contribution:</b></p> <p>TS 29.198-15 has been developed without including any sequence diagrams. Sequence diagrams are an essential part of the specification, necessary in order to understand how the specification is intended to work. This contribution introduces in clause 5 sequence diagrams for the following scenarios:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sending messages and receiving delivery notification</li> <li>- Sending, and receiving messages in same context</li> <li>- Setting notification of received messages</li> <li>- Using Mailbox functions</li> <li>- Using Mailbox to send and receive</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <p>Typo in #13 of the first sequence diagram.</p> <p>Same type in #28 in the second sequence diagram.</p> <p>Suggestion to change the order: last diagram first (it is the most simple).</p> <p><b>Disposition:</b> Approved with the editorials above.</p>
C5-050231	CR	Rel-6 CR 29198-15 Correction to TpMessageTreatment in IDL	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	<p><b>Summary of contribution:</b></p> <p>The IDL code by convention includes a default Dummy element in Union types, where there are more values in the discriminator than there are elements in the union. This is in order to enable the extraction of the discriminator value, in cases where the discriminator value is not encoded separately. One type in the Multi Media Messaging specification is missing this default: TpMessageTreatment.</p> <p>This contribution inserts a default element, named Dummy, of type short, in TpMessageTreatment.</p> <p>This has no impact on the contents of the text of the document, nor in the Java code (on the J2EE the</p>

					change would probably result in the addition of a useless method to setUndefined).  <b>Disposition:</b> Approved.
C5-050233	Tdoc	DTR-TISPAN-01021-04-01v003 [Mapping of Short Messaging to UI]	The Parlay Group (Julian Richards)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Latest draft mapping (v003) of Parlay X Web Services to Parlay/OSA APIs, Part 4, subpart 1: Short Messaging to User Interaction Mapping  For all mapping documents in this set: they are version 3, and respond to comments made by Aepona and Apium. The contribution contains the comments and what was made about them. At the end of the contribution there is a summary of the changes. These documents have been available for three weeks, agreed not to go through them in detail.  Approved.
C5-050234	Tdoc	DTR-TISPAN-01021-04-02v003 [Mapping of Short Messaging to MMM]	The Parlay Group (Julian Richards)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Latest draft mapping (v003) of Parlay X Web Services to Parlay/OSA APIs, Part 4, subpart 2: Short Messaging to Multi-Media Messaging Mapping  Note the addition of a new section providing a mapping to a mailbox messaging system.  Approved.
C5-050235	Tdoc	DTR-TISPAN-01021-05-01v003 [Mapping of Multimedia Messaging to UI]	The Parlay Group (Julian Richards)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Latest draft mapping (v003) of Parlay X Web Services to Parlay/OSA APIs, Part 5, subpart 1: Multimedia Messaging to User Interaction Mapping  Approved.
C5-050236	Tdoc	DTR-TISPAN-01021-05-02v003 [Mapping of Multimedia Messaging to MMM]	The Parlay Group (Julian Richards)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Latest draft mapping (v003) of Parlay X Web Services to Parlay/OSA APIs, Part 5, subpart 2: Multimedia Messaging to Multi-Media Messaging Mapping  Approved.
C5-050237	Tdoc	Draft ES 202 391-01 v1.1.2 PX Web Services-Common	The Parlay Group (Julian Richards)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Updated version of Part 1 [Common] of the published ETSI specification of Parlay X Web Services to synchronize with 3GPP TS 299.199-01 v6.1.0  A cross reference has been added to refer to the PX mapping documents.  Approved.
C5-050238	Tdoc	Draft ES 202 391-04 v1.1.2 PX Web Services-Short Messaging	The Parlay Group (Julian Richards)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Updated version of Part 4 [Short Messaging] of the published ETSI specification of Parlay X Web Services to synchronize with 3GPP TS 299.199-04 v6.2.0  Approved.
C5-050239	Tdoc	Draft ES 202 391-05 v1.1.2 PX Web Services-Multimedia Messaging	The Parlay Group (Julian Richards)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Updated version of Part 5 [Multimedia Messaging] of the published ETSI specification of Parlay X Web Services to synchronize with 3GPP TS 299.199-05 v6.2.0  Approved.
C5-050244	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-06 Add additional parameters for volume charging	Richard Dawson (CSG Systems - Parlay Member)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	<b>Summary of contribution:</b>  Current volume charging parameters are not sufficient to describe the type of volume being reserved such that a real time rating and charging application is able to correctly rate and reserve a volume.  This contribution adds parameters to ReserveVolume, ReserveAdditionalVolume, ChargeVolumeRequest, and RefundVolume operation.  <b>Discussion:</b>  Question: is it intended to be optional? Answer: yes.  Question: is it Cat F? Agreed to change to Cat C ( <b>Adrian to do the change</b> ).  <b>Disposition:</b>

					Approved with Cat change.
C5-050245	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-07 Change Return single- to multiple-balances to GetBalance operation	Richard Dawson (CSG Systems - Paraly Member)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	<p><b>Summary of contribution:</b></p> <p>Current GetBalance and BalanceUpdate operations use a single balance which is too restrictive. This contribution extends GetBalanceResponse and BalanceUpdate operations to use a set of balances.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <p>Comment: this needs to be aligned reflecting the changes made in the "optional" related contributions. Agreed. Joe and Richard D to produce an update with that.</p> <p>Question: how are these values discovered? Answer: there is no mechanism for that, need to be defined beforehand between the application and the client.</p> <p>Question: would that impact interoperability? Answer: need for an operation, or a service property, to deal with that. That will be included in the update.</p> <p>Agreed Cat should be C.</p> <p>Some typos should be corrected.</p> <p><b>Disposition:</b> Updated to 296.</p>
296					<p>Update of 245.</p> <p>Comment: the set of balance types are not per subscriber but per operator.</p> <p>Comment: need to check if this is supported in the base APIs.</p> <p>Comment: the balance types could be different for each account, so proposed to have account as part of input message.</p> <p>Updated to 308.</p>
308					<p>Update of 296.</p> <p><b>Richard D to send it for email approval, deadline May 27<sup>th</sup>.</b></p>
C5-050246	CR	Rel 6 CR29.199-03 Correct inconsistency in WSDL	Jörgen Dyst (Parlay Member)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	<p><b>Summary of contribution:</b></p> <p>The semantics of the handlexxx methods in the callnotification namespace defined in the WSDL are not defined in the 29.199-03 6.0.0. WSDL . The notifyxxx methods in 29.199-03 are not represented at all in the WSDL, which makes the WSDL for the call notification API inconsistent with the operation definitions in the specification. The WSDL files use incorrect operation names for Call Notification API.</p> <p>This contribution changes all occurrences of operation names "handlexxx" into "notifyxxx" in the WSDL Files: parlayx_call_notification_service_2_0.wsdl and parlayx_call_notification_interface_2_0.wsdl in accordance with TS 29.199-3 clause 8.2 "Interface: CallNotification". (xxx represents: Busy, NotReachable, NoAnswer, CalledNumber).</p> <p><b>This is an error, the result of a typo when generating the WSDL.</b></p> <p><b>Disposition:</b> Approved.</p>
C5-050247	CR	Editorial modification of Presence.	Jin-Young Choi, Yoo-Mi Park, ETRI	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	<p><b>Summary of contribution:</b></p> <p>This contribution corrects some editorial errors in 29.199-14 as follows.</p>

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o clause 4 : User Location -&gt; Terminal Location</li> <li>clause 6 : endSubscriptionNotification -&gt; subscriptionEnded</li> <li>o clauses 8.1.2, 8.1.3 : subscribePresence -&gt; requestSubscription</li> <li>o clause 8.2.2 : endNotification -&gt; endPresenceNotification</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion :</b> Is it Cat D? changing the sequence diagram is a technical change. Agreed to change it to Cat F.</p> <p>For Cat F we need consequences if not approved, for which it is proposed "interoperability problems due to unclear behaviour description because methods identified in the behaviour description do not exist".</p> <p>Comment: change history should be copied from Part 14, without changes.</p> <p>Comments: tags for "Core Network" etc should be "X".</p> <p>Agreed to change "Reason for change" to "TS 29.199-14 refers to method names which do not exist or are incorrect."</p> <p>Comment: change date format.</p> <p><b>Disposition:</b> Updated to 287.</p>
287					<p>Update of 247.</p> <p>The phrasing proposed above was not used due to the report not being available. The proposed text is approved.</p> <p>Approved.</p>
C5-050250	CR	Addition of Announcement flag to MakeCall operation parameter in Third party call.	Yoo-Mi Park, Young-Il Choi, ETRI	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	<p><b>Summary of contribution:</b></p> <p>MakeCall operation in 29.199-2 has no parameter related to announcement. Since a third party call is initiated by an application on the predefined condition, the calling party involved in TPC should wait for the called party to answer while hearing ringback tone without any information about the third party call. The announcement that informs the calling party of the call information would enhance the quality of related 3rd party applications.</p> <p>This contribution introduces the announcement flag in clause 8, especially, 8.1.1.1: - MakeCallRequest.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <p>Comment: if the network works as expected the call setup happens before there is a chance to have an announcement sent. If there are slower networks then it is an implementation issue that depends on the network.</p> <p>Comment: "making a call with announcement" could be a service too, instead of being solved at API level.</p> <p>Comment: a sequence diagram with the participation of a user would be useful to kick off a discussion and understand if this is a service.</p> <p><b>Disposition:</b> Not agreed.</p>
C5-050248	CR	Addition of Announcement flag to Action structure in Call Notification.	Ki-Sook Chung, Byung-Sun Lee, ETRI	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Withdrawn.
C5-050249	CR	Addition of Announcement flag to inviteParticipant operation parameter in Multimedia conference.	Ki-Sook Chung, Jong-Choul Yim, ETRI	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Withdrawn.

C5-050251	CR	Modification of WSDL to describe optional parameters in Common	Sun-Hwan Lim, Sang-Ki Kim, ETRI	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	The changes in this contribution are a subset of the changes in 271. Noted.
C5-050252	CR	Modification of WSDL to describe optional parameters in Payment	Sun-Hwan Lim, Hyun-Joo Bae, ETRI	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	The changes in this contribution are a subset of the changes in 276. Noted.
C5-050253	CR	Modification of WSDL to describe optional parameters in Account management	Sun-Hwan Lim, Kyoung-Soo Kim, ETRI	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	The changes in this contribution are a subset of the changes in 277. Noted.
C5-050256	CR	Rel 6 CR Correct UIAdmin interface for sessionId problem	AePONA	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	<p><b>Summary of contribution:</b></p> <p>The IpUIAdminManager and IpAppUIAdminManager classes use TpSessionID as a parameter, however there is no way to create a session in the current design for these interfaces and therefore these interfaces cannot be used.</p> <p>This contribution removes the existing problematic TpSessionID parameters resulting in an IpUIAdminManager service capability that is applicable to the applications use of this service, and thereby governed by the service level agreement and associated OSA access session. The resulting methods are not session based and are therefore related to the application context that exists between application and SCS according to the SLA.</p> <p>This solution is not binary compatible with the initial publication of this API first introduced in Release 6. However there are a number of justifications for making such a non backwards compatible change at this time, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no technical need for the use of sessions on these interfaces</li> <li>• These interfaces are new in Release 6 and immature.</li> <li>• These interfaces are a separate service capability and in isolation from other service capabilities specified</li> <li>• Not correcting this fault will result in future interoperability problems</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <p>Comment: Scott Brussard from IBM (author of this specs) has expressed his support for this change.</p> <p>Comment: delete the first part of "consequences if not approved" – "The specification is confusing and". <b>Adrian to do it as an editorial.</b></p> <p><b>Disposition:</b> Approved with editorial.</p>
C5-050257	Tdoc	Draft ES 202 391-09 v1.1.2 PX Web Services-Terminal Location	The Parlay Group (Julian Richards)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Updated version of Part 9 [Terminal Location] of the published ETSI specification of Parlay X Web Services to synchronize with 3GPP TS 299.199-09 v6.1.0 Approved.
C5-050258	Tdoc	Draft ES 202 391-14 v1.1.2 PX Web Services-Presence	The Parlay Group (Julian Richards)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Updated version of Part 14 [Presence] of the published ETSI specification of Parlay X Web Services to synchronize with 3GPP TS 299.199-14 v6.1.0 Approved.
C5-050261	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-5 Additional information for Attachments	Telenor	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	<p><b>Summary of contribution:</b></p> <p>This contribution proposes additional information for Attachments, since the adding of attachments and their types are sparsely described..</p> <p>QUESTION: CAT D?</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p>

					<p>Comment: there are more useful ways to include this information in our documents: as something specific to the MMSC, this belongs to the mapping not the spec. Agreed.</p> <p>Comment: this is related to one of the mapping documents that are submitted to this meeting. If we can approve the current version and the change, we can approve the updated mapping doc by email.</p> <p><b>Disposition:</b> Not approved. This change will be made to the mapping document, in contributions 290 and 305 (there are two mapping docs)..</p>
290			Telenor		<b>Withdrawn – no need for this update.</b>
305					For email approval. <b>Gaite to send this email approval, deadline TBD.</b>
C5-050262	CR	Rel 6 CR 29.199-6 Wrong datatype used in Amount Interface	Telenor	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	<p><b>Summary of contribution:</b></p> <p>The Amount interfaces, should be harmonized with the other interfaces, using the charging data type defined in the common part.</p> <p>This contribution changes Amout parameter data type to Charging data type.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <p>Comment: the whole WSDL code needs to be copied in the CR.</p> <p>Comment: the amount element should be mandatory. Answer: agreed, but maybe not all the fields.</p> <p>Comment: description optional in the charging type.</p> <p>Comment: change "amount" to "charge" in ChargeAmountRequest, and change description.</p> <p>Comment: no cat for the CR. Response: it is Cat F.</p> <p>Comment: need more explicit "consequences if not approved".</p> <p><b>Disposition:</b> Updated to 293.</p>
293					<p>Update of 262.</p> <p>The comment that the whole WSDL needs to be copied has not been implemented, so an update is needed.</p> <p>Also in 8.3.2.1 amount has not be changed to charge, and the line in the description has not been removed.</p> <p>Comment: 8.4.1.2: "amount" needs to be change to "charge", and the WSDL "charge" instead of "charging". Same for 8.3.2.1.</p> <p>For the rest, there are many changes, so more time is needed to revise it.</p> <p>Updated to 303.</p>
303					<p>Update of 293, for email approval.</p> <p>Gaite to kick off the email approval, deadline May 27<sup>th</sup>.</p>
C5-050264	CR	Rel 6 CR 29.199-4 Addition of EMS and SmartMessaging	Telenor	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Withdrawn.
C5-050285	CR	Add display name data	John-Luc Bakker, Telcordia		<p><b>Summary of contribution:</b></p> <p>Parlay X Call Notification Web</p>



				<p>Services applications cannot not know the caller display name, when available. This contribution proposes the addition of caller name argument. If not approved, Parlay X Call Notification Web Services applications would have to exploit proprietary means to access caller display name data.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <p>Question: why not having the same changes to the notification methods? They could benefit from the same change.                  Answer: agreed.</p> <p>Comment: is it really a Cat B? It is functionality in the Parlay APIs. Agreed to change to Cat F, and the current “consequences if not approved” are valid.</p> <p><b>Disposition:</b>                  Updated to 294.</p>
294				<p>Update of 285.</p> <p>Agreed to change the title add-&gt;correct. <b>Adrian to do it as an editorial change.</b></p> <p>Approved.</p>
271	CR	Optionals for Part 1	Joe McIntyre, IBM	<p><b>Summary of contribution:</b></p> <p>Presently readers must look in multiple places (descriptive text, field description and/or message part description) to determine if a field or message part is optional or not. This change provides a consistent manner to specify this information which will improve readability of current specifications and future input contributions. In addition, the corresponding WSDL is updated to represent this information (using minOccurs/maxOccurs attributes), which is required to correctly reflect specification intent and ensure interoperability.</p> <p>This contribution proposes to add “Optional” column with “Yes” or “No” values to field types and message parts, and add minOccurs/maxOccurs attributes to WSDL for optional elements.</p> <p>If not approved, how optional elements are represented remains inconsistent and prone to error or misinterpretation. WSDL does not include attributes for optional elements, reducing fidelity</p>

					<p>with specifications and interoperability.</p> <p>This contribution includes Tdoc 251 from ETRI, as well as additional changes.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <p>Why are there changes to the WSDL? Because it didn't previously include minOccurs/maxOccurs.</p> <p>Agreement on the table format to express optionality in all PX specs.</p> <p>Agreement on the optionality choice for each case in this contribution.</p> <p>Comment: missing references to related CRs. <b>Joe to give this information to Adrian to incorporate as an editorial.</b></p> <p>Agreed to create a TR with conventions on managing the name space and maintaining different versions. To be discussed when the TR exist whether we want the contents to be part of Part 1.</p> <p>Since they are very late documents, agreed to present them in the meeting, get a first round of feedback, and have them for email approval after the meeting. Checking the dates we have two weeks for email approvals.</p> <p><b>Disposition:</b> Joe to send it for email approval till May 27<sup>th</sup>.</p>
272	CR	Optionals for Part 2	Joe McIntyre, IBM		<p>Same as previous for Part 2.</p> <p>Joe to send it for email approval till May 27<sup>th</sup>.</p>
273	CR	Optionals for Part 3	Joe McIntyre, IBM		<p>Same as previous for Part 3.</p> <p>Joe to send it for email approval till May 27<sup>th</sup>.</p>
274	CR	Optionals for Part 4	Joe McIntyre, IBM		<p>Same as previous for Part 4.</p> <p>Comment: in 8.1.1.1, there is an "optional" at the right column that should be deleted.</p> <p><b>Adrian to make this editorial change.</b></p> <p>Joe to send it for email approval till May 27<sup>th</sup>.</p>
275	CR	Optionals for Part 5	Joe McIntyre, IBM		<p>Same as previous for Part 5.</p> <p>Joe to send it for email approval till May 27<sup>th</sup>.</p>
276	CR	Optionals for Part 6	Joe McIntyre, IBM		<p>Same as previous for Part 6.</p> <p>Comment: in 8.4.4.1, there is an "optional" at the right column that should be deleted.</p> <p><b>Adrian to make this editorial change.</b></p> <p>Joe to send it for email approval till May 27<sup>th</sup>.</p>
277	CR	Optionals for Part 7	Joe McIntyre, IBM		<p>Same as previous for Part 7.</p> <p>Comment to the change in 8.1.2.2: Nil is not</p>

					interoperable, and the optional column fulfils now its purpose. Joe to send it for email approval till May 27 <sup>th</sup> .
278	CR	Optionals for Part 8	Joe McIntyre, IBM		Same as previous for Part 8. Joe to send it for email approval till May 27 <sup>th</sup> .
279	CR	Optionals for Part 9	Joe McIntyre, IBM		Same as previous for Part 9. Joe to send it for email approval till May 27 <sup>th</sup> .
280	CR	Optionals for Part 10	Joe McIntyre, IBM		Same as previous for Part 10. Joe to send it for email approval till May 27 <sup>th</sup> .
281	CR	Optionals for Part 11	Joe McIntyre, IBM		Same as previous for Part 11. Joe to send it for email approval till May 27 <sup>th</sup> .
282	CR	Optionals for Part 12	Joe McIntyre, IBM		Same as previous for Part 12. Joe to send it for email approval till May 27 <sup>th</sup> .
283	CR	Optionals for Part 13	Joe McIntyre, IBM		Same as previous for Part 13. Joe to send it for email approval till May 27 <sup>th</sup> .
284	CR	Optionals for Part 14	Joe McIntyre, IBM		Same as previous for Part 14. Joe to send it for email approval till May 27 <sup>th</sup> .
297		Namespaces	Joe McIntyre, IBM		<p>This document describes the use of namespaces in Web Services, and how they are applied to the Parlay X Web Services Specifications and their related XML Schema and WSDL documents. This information may be of use for additional specification (29.199 Part 1) content, the creation of a Technical Report or other document form that provides information on namespace use, and for the general interest of the community.</p> <p>Question: does a change in the namespace result in an incompatibility at method level? Answer: it is possible.</p> <p>Comment: some description should be in Part1 with the version numbering scheme and the criteria to change versions.</p> <p>Proposal that the contents of this contribution go to an annex in Part 1.</p> <p><b>Joe to prepare a contribution for this.</b></p> <p>Noted.</p>

**6.1 new WSDL Annexes for OSA Release 6**

C5-050229	Tdoc	Revised WSDL Annex - Conversion Rules	Marconi Communications	6.1 new WSDL Annexes: for OSA Release 6	<p><b>Summary of contribution:</b></p> <p>This contribution describes the approach and rules applied for converting the Parlay 5.0 IDL files to WSDL. It is an attempt to capture lessons learned while performing the conversions and also best practices for creating the WSDL interfaces. The tools used for this conversion are based on IONA's Artix 3.0.</p> <p>The goal is to write clear service definitions that are easy to use and maintain. While most of the</p>
-----------	------	---------------------------------------	------------------------	---	---

					<p>conversion is achieved through the Artix idltowsdl tool, some user intervention is still necessary. A future goal should be to write another tool to minimize these manual modifications to the WSDL in the future.</p> <p>The advantage of this conversion approach is that it allows the interfaces to change (or new ones to be added) and minimizes the amount of effort in creating new WSDL. Especially when a new or modified interface has a dependency on an existing interface. Specific details on this are contained within this document.</p> <p>The WSDL has been tested with a number of platforms and it is believed to be workable.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <p>Comment: in the past, the challenge was not producing the WSDL but the market interest in using it – in the past there was no commercial marketplace for its use. No interest in a commercial deployment has been shown since.          Answer: there was operator support in Barcelona.</p> <p>Discussion on what defines commercial interest. In the past it is reported that the investment made on this did not turn to be profitable, and no growing community could be seen that justified future investment – it was perceived that the interest in web services had been shifted to Parlay X, ie defining the things from scratch as web services.</p> <p>Question: how does this relate to the OMA Web Services?          Discussion whether we should take this into account, or instead the commercial value. Discussion then whether it is in line with the OMA Style Guide (which is the same as the one in Parlay). Explained that the intention was to be as compliant as possible, but could be more. Commented that the style guide is based on mature WSDL, question whether this proposed WSDL is as mature. Explanation that the idea was to be as generic as possible, and ensure compatibility with different tools. Also the mapping is in line with the OMG provided IDL to WSDL mapping. Marconi can provide the information on testing on different platforms.</p> <p>Concern that we don't only follow the OMG mapping but also the WSDL style guide.</p> <p>Question: a key reason to remove this WSDL to begin with was maintenance – is there an intention to provide maintenance resources?          Answer: yes.</p> <p>Proposal to discuss the following points raised in Piscataway (since the discussion was never closed due to removing the WSDL because it was wrong):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of resources working on Parlay WSDL has resulted in PX as only visible set of Web Services, with the net result that PX is not as simple as originally planned or as customers had expected, and confusion regarding the relationship between</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Parlay Web Services and Parlay X exists in the market.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- There may be no need for WSDL within 29.198, and the demand for Web Services may be fulfilled in 29.199 and solely by PX..</li><li>- There is an interest in WSDL realisation of the base APIs, and the issue is one of packaging rather than functionality and abstraction.</li><li>- There was some concern regarding divergence and competition between 29.198 and 29.199 specifications.</li></ul> <p>Comment: there is no confusion between the two sets of WSDLs because the granularity is not the same.</p> <p>Comment: the problem of the FW, which is not all applicable to web services, that have different requirements for infrastructure.</p> <p>Comment: several companies report a market interest in this WSDL.</p> <p>Comment: the production is very much like the one we use for Java, so updates would not be very resource-consuming.</p> <p>Discussion goes back to two main points: compliance with the style guide and toolkits, and how time consuming this was. Marconi and Iona to provide this in Tdoc 299.</p> <p>Back to the potential market confusion between the two WSDL sets. Concern that the confusing increases after having removed the WSDL once. Discussion whether the different granularity is enough to avoid confusion. Comment that this is not a distinction in content of the APIs, but in transport. Concern on a potential confusion in the third party developer community: if the two WSDLs coexist there needs to be a clear differentiation for the developer community, so they know what they need to support – the operator community seems to have a more clear view of this. Concerns on the investment needed at the application side, and the risks for IT vendors. Comment that having something technically possible is not enough. Reaction: this is a technical proposal, we're a standards body and these above are considerations for a company to implement something or not.</p> <p>Comment: we can use the stage 2 to make this clear.</p> <p>Comment: if there is agreement the Rel6 CRs can be submitted to this meeting.</p> <p>Comment: historically we work on requirements for which there is not always a major consensus, but as time evolves some companies that didn't see the business need find it. In this meeting we have a number of companies that feel this is a business requirement, others not at this moment – this is not a viable reason to object to this requirement.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Comment: need for clarifying text to come together with the CRs, and not introduce the second WSDL without making their relationship clear.</p> <p><b>Disposition:</b></p>
C5-050230	Tdoc	New WSDL Annex for 3GPP Release 6 and Parlay 5	Marconi Communications	6.1 new WSDL Annexes: for OSA Release 6	Withdrawn.
299			Marconi Communications		<p>Clarification of some points raised in the discussion of 229.</p> <p>Comment: no answer to the question on compliance to the Parlay Style Guide. there is a response on compliance to the W3C standards bit the style-guide was created because different specs had different understanding of the W3C standards. It helps ensuring interoperability.                  Answer: the style guide is informative. The proposed WSDL has been tested with different tools.                  Comment: the goal of the style guide was interoperability.</p> <p>Comment: there is a requirement to have this, and we have a process in the group to make updates.</p> <p>Proposal: to accept this, put it in the annex and invite contributions to improve it.</p> <p>Comment: the style guide question has not been replied, and need to review this late contribution.</p> <p>Question: the style guide is part of the PX specification.                  Answer: one of the issues why the previous WSDL that we deleted was bad, was lack of conformance with the style guide – the reason being interoperability.</p> <p>Request for more detailed feedback on what is the problem, and what is meant by compliance.</p> <p>Detailed comments:</p> <p>Comments on 1a: no compliance to 3GPP or OMA specs, also contains an IONA copyright, to avoid which it is necessary to wait for WS Address; there are IONA namespaces too, which would be inappropriate in the standard.</p> <p>Comments on 1b: seems not everything is compliant to the WSDL style guide. <b>Joe volunteers to provide a compilation of these cases, and solutions for them.</b> The style guide contains all we've learned until this point.</p> <p>Comments on 3: this is right when everything is working and thus automated, but it takes time to get to this point. The challenge would be to get PAM and PM working.                  Clarified that when done it took a week.</p> <p>Objection to the inclusion of this WSDL until it is consistent in itself and with PX and OMA, but no objection to it once the concerns are addressed.</p> <p><b>Jane to address these comments in an email discussion,</b> aiming at reaching a conclusion at next meeting.</p> <p>Comment: the style guide is now only applied to PX; if we want it applicable to anything else then we need to make it clear.</p> <p>Discussion on how then Annex B of Part 1 would look.                  Answer: same text as clause 12 of PX Part1 adapted for the base APIs.</p>

					<p>Comment: this is then scheduled for after June, since it is not an essential correction, it may be a problem. <b>Chelo to prepare the way to present it to the plenary</b>, asking for an exception based on commercial demand.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

## 7 OSA version 4 / 3GPP Rel.7

C5-050255	Tdoc, TS	Parlay 6 Requirements	Richard Stretch BT Group	7 Rel-7 Requirements	<p>Latest draft of parlay 6.0 Requirements document, updated according to the discussions in Austin (based on the minutes since Richard wasn't there).</p> <p>Section 6.6: there was a comment from Eamonn that this requirement is supported already in Parlay 5, but Richard has not removed it yet. Comment: this requirement is called "content management SCS", and we don't do requirements like that – whether it is an independent SCS is an architectural decision. Agreed. Not clear whether the comment from Eamonn was the requirement is already satisfied. Clarified the comment was to remove the IBM specific text in the diagram, as well as the text that says "The advertisement is in client application domain, and there is no Parlay method/interface to place it in the network." And the corresponding "load announcement" in the diagram</p> <p>Requirements that were originally submitted as PX requirements but agreed in Austin they should not be PX specific are now in sections 6.8 – 6.16 as a placeholder (text needs to be provided). They are also still in the PX requirements section, with their original contents that we agreed in Austin needed improving. Agreed that we need to implement the Austin agreement to move these requirements (both heading and contents) to section 6, and have no PX specific requirements.</p> <p>Question: section 6.4 is empty. Answer: there is text provided in contribution 260.</p>
-----------	----------	-----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	---

C5-050254	Tdoc	A new Parlay X requirement on message broadcasting	Jeong-Hwan Kim, Sang-Ki Kim, ETRI	7 Rel-7 Requirements	<p><b>Summary of the contribution:</b></p> <p>ETRI would like to suggest a "message broadcasting" service capability as a new API requirement. We describe the requirement, usage/scenario, network capability and potential APIs for that suggestion.</p> <p>This contribution contains the requirement, plus the corresponding stage 3.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> Question: is there any reason why this is a PX only requirement? Answer: this is the first go and PX is simpler.</p> <p>Question: this is not an issue for emergency, but for announcements, how is privacy taken into account? How to ensure not to send information that the user has explicitly asked not to be sent? Answer: the user selects channels.</p> <p>Question: how does this relate to the work in OMA Broadcast? We need to be careful with overlaps.</p>
-----------	------	--	--------------------------------------	----------------------	--

					<p>Would we then have a requirement anyway, and point out to the OMA specs?                  Answer: not sure about the latter. Agreed we need to study the potential overlap with OMA Broadcast. The OMA Broadcast requirements are publicly available, John-Luc has sent the link to the list.</p> <p>Jeong-Hwan Kim to start two email discussions on the subjects: is this a PX only requirement, and overlap with OMA.</p> <p><b>Disposition:</b>                  Noted.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

C5-050260	Tdoc	Parlay X Requirement Text	Orange/Christian Nord	7 Rel-7 Requirements	<p><b>Summary of contribution:</b></p> <p>This contribution contains text to be included in the ETSI_Parlay_Requirements6_draft0.10_May 05 (ie contribution 255), filling in some requirements that did not contain any description yet.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <p>Comment on Geodetic Conversion requirement: we have now already several requirements to update OSA Location more in line with MLP – for instance 6.7 and possibly 6.4 in Tdoc 255. Proposal to handle them together instead of MLP-ing OSA Location bit by bit. We need to decide as a group whether OSA Location should be a reflection of MLP, and should be maintained to keep being a reflection of MLP, and if not we should decide what to focus on; this would also help in the discussions with OMA.</p> <p><b>Joe to start an email discussion to track the related requirements and determine the scope of the future work on Location, and propose a requirement to fit the scope.</b></p> <p>Question on Address Book requirement: what's the difference between Address Book and Address List?                  Answer: this is user profile related information, it is a service related to a particular user.                  Question: where does this sit related to the user profile?</p> <p>Comment: OMA also has XML data management, including group data information. It would be useful to study the relationship to this.</p> <p>Comment on Calendar requirement: there are other groups that work on this, we need to see how this is related.</p> <p>Comment on Policy Evaluation requirement: how would this be used? The OSA PM is used for the network side, and PX doesn't have one. Agreed to start an email discussion on this. <b>Sukesh to start an email discussion on this.</b></p> <p>General comment: except the last one, all these requirements if agreed should be OSA/Parlay requirements and not PX requirements, according to our Austin agreement.</p> <p><b>Disposition:</b>                  Noted.</p>
-----------	------	---------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------	---



C5-050298	Tdoc		Joe McIntyre, IBM		<p>Document for discussion with the aim to end up with Rel7 requirements.</p> <p>Question: what are the "QoS aspects"?</p> <p>Answer: for instance knowing that a message was delivered and when. Receipts and QoS are linked, but receipt exists already and QoS is new here.</p> <p>Question: is this meant to be a set of APIs?</p> <p>Answer: from a layering perspective the capability and enablement are likely to be a spec or more, the application layer groups of functions. One concern is having large specs that are not fully implemented, which make it hard to describe what an implementation does to a customer. There could be a Ringtone API for example.</p> <p>Question: is the proposal to re-architect the current SMS/MMS? What about backwards compatibility?</p> <p>Answer: yes, for Rel7. The Rel6 spec could exist indefinitely.</p> <p>Question: how would a requirement for this be phrased?</p> <p>Answer: this does not change the stage 1, it derives in a stage 2 and then stage 3 work; we could have requirements for specific bits of capability.</p> <p>Question: next steps?</p> <p>Answer: if the general approach is acceptable, then a stage 2 type Tdoc will be prepared explaining the approach in more detail, for which the stage 3 can be derived.</p> <p>Agreed to discuss the stage 2 Tdoc as a way to study the proposed approach. <b>Joe to produce it for email discussion.</b> Will be 302.</p>
302			Joe McIntyre, IBM		<b>Joe to send for email discussion</b>

## 7.1 Service Broker

C5-050223	WID	3GPP SA#27 approved WID on Rel-7 OSA Service broker	SP-050183	7.1 Service Broker	<p>This is the OSA Service Broker Rel7 WID approved by last 3GPP SA Plenary as reported (see above).</p> <p>question: if we have another Rel7 requirement, will the corresponding WI be called OSA8 and lose the link to the release number?</p> <p>Comment: we have now a WI and no requirement (the requirement is not yet approved at plenary level).</p> <p>Noted.</p>
-----------	-----	---	-----------	--------------------	--

C5-050213	Tdoc	Service Broker – discussion document	Telcordia (John-Luc BAKKER)	7.1 Service Broker	<p>Working document for the analysis of the Service Broker requirement.</p> <p>It was already discussed on Feb 25 Conference Call and it has been updated accordingly in contribution 218.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
-----------	------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------	--

C5-050219r1	Tdoc	Updated Notes CC Feb 25	MCC/John-Luc Bakker	7.1 Service Broker	Approved.
-------------	------	-------------------------	---------------------	--------------------	-----------

C5-050218	Tdoc	Service Broker – discussion document	John-Luc Bakker	7.1 Service Broker	<p>This document is a revision of N5-050213 service-brokering-RD-and-AD, implementing agreements reached on Feb 25 Conference Call.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
C5-050217	Tdoc	DraftR2-Service-Brokering-RD-and-AD-Rev1	AePONA	7.1 Service Broker	<p>This contribution contains additional material for the VPN &amp; Prepaid use case (section 6.3) of previous contribution.</p> <p>Already discussed in a call, and the outcome is already in the last version of the discussion document.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
C5-050221	Tdoc	Service Broker - discussion document	Peter Bonek, Telekom Austria	7.1 Service Broker	<p>This contribution contains two additional use cases for OSA Service Broker: Application Initiated Call - VPN and VPN - Prepaid.</p> <p>Already discussed in a call, and the outcome is already in the last version of the discussion document.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
C5-050286	Tdoc		Atsuyoshi Shirato, NTT	7.1 Service Broker	<p>Question: what is the proposed change to the existing APIs?  Answer: no change to existing APIs but new functionality. Filter information should be set based on static and dynamic data.</p> <p>Question: this is a service that we normally implement at application level; this proposal seems to bring service creation to a lower level, which would mean it cannot be done by a third party.  Answer: it is intended to be functionality provided at gateway level.  Comment: this requirement is about filter control, which is not application business as said above.</p> <p>Question: sFC (subsequent filter criteria) is not part of 3GPP Rel6, does this contribution introduce an additional element for filter criteria?  Answer: this is a Rel7 requirement.  Response: but the way it is now described would not fit this use case.  Question: is the use of sFC intended to be the same that is not yet standardized in 3GPP?  Comment: after checking 23.218, what is proposed is in line with how things are seen in 3GPP, even if it is not Rel6 functionality.</p> <p>Proposed to change the figures to show not the data (sFC) but the interfaces, and clarify if the current interfaces are sufficient.</p> <p>Comment: not clear whether the proposal is functionality at API level to map to the sCF functionality, or to update the sFC functionality.  Answer: the proposal is to add a new function of Service Broker at API level, that provides filtering of triggers.</p> <p>Agreed there is a requirement for a function that is depicted in the diagram, and as next step is we need a phrasing of the functional requirement.</p> <p>Comment: does the current service broker requirement support this case?</p>

					<p>Answer: not clear now, better to have it explicit in the requirement.</p> <p>Proposal that next steps are to clarify the functional requirement and study the possibility to use the Cx interface as another way to realize this, and to study if the current requirement supports this functionality. Contributions are invited to the discussion document covering this.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
306			NTT		<p>Powerpoint to present 286</p> <p>Noted.</p>

It seems that the minutes of the last confcall, and the last version of the discussion document, have not been distributed or submitted to this meeting, which created some confusion. Eamonn projected the draft notes of the last confcall, which confirm that the Aepona and Telecom Austria contributions can be noted. **JL to upload the latest minutes and latest version of the discussion document as London documents.**

307 Notes of the last Service Broker confcall. Noted.

Next steps: contributions invited, and depending on them they'll be discussed either in confcalls or in London.

## 8 Organisational aspects with relation to Joint activities

C5-050263	Tdoc	Proposal to maintain OSA Stage 3 in a single body (ETSI)	MCC CT5	8 Organisational: aspects with relation to Joint activities	<p>In this contribution MCC CT5 proposes to maintain OSA stage 3 only in ETSI.</p> <p>The meeting believes this is a bad an unsolicited proposal. Consequences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- lose 3GPP visibility</li> <li>- lose ITU-T ratification (some developing countries use the ITU-T spec as a means for achieving funding for infrastructure).</li> <li>- mayor impact in relationship with OMA</li> <li>- lose sausage machine</li> <li>- disconnection to stages 1 and 2 in 3GPP</li> <li>- lose subset/superset relationship between 3GPP and ETSI.</li> </ul> <p>Not approved.</p>
-----------	------	--	---------	---	--

### Title for ETSI versions of Parlay X

Agreed to rename the existing PX to PX2, and the next release will be PX3.

### Plans for Parlay publications (including mappings)

No need to have mapping docs published every 3GPP plenary, but we should synchronize with a 3GPP plenary because thus we keep the ETSI and 3GPP publications synchronized.

Proposal not to have the publication before we have the 3GPP documents on optionality since they impact interoperability. But these are for email approval and will go to the June plenary, and we don't intend to have new mapping documents so soon.

Ultan in Austin pointed out that he doesn't have the resources for more than two updates of the base APIs per year, and that's after the June and December plenaries. Discussion then whether to publish Parlay 5.1 in June, or wait for more CRs and publish it in December. It is believed that from a practical viewpoint no need for it before the end of the year, but it is pointed out that this only applies to those in the meeting, who know what's going on and what is being approved before it is published. Also need to consider whether there is something ongoing we want in 5.1, because we won't have a 5.2 before at least another year. Proposed that the changes approved are published in the Parlay web before they're implemented in a published version of Parlay (especially considering that the 3GPP spec would be available and can be put in a link). Ultan will make a draft available after the 3GPP June plenary, and after the December plenary, and initially the intention is to publish after December (this could be revisited if at that time there is stuff that we really want to have in Parlay 5.1).

There will also be a draft available of 4.3 and 3.5, that will be published at the same time as 5.1 (business as usual).

Same for PX2, and a mapping to the mapping specs if required.

Agreement to tie updates of the PX mapping specs to updates to PX specs (easier and allows being aware of deadlines).

## 8.1 CR delivery plans for next CT plenaries

## 8.2 Review of 3GPP OSA Work Plan

## 8.3 3GPP OSA Work Item Descriptions

## 8.4 Agreement of revised CT5 ToR

C5-050220	Tdoc	Updated CT5 ToR (Revised NP-040425 updated_ToR_CN5)	MCC	8.4 Agreement of : revised JWG ToR	Le roi est mort (CN5), vive le roi (CT5)!" 3GPP is re-organizing itself. See: <a href="http://www.3gpp.org/TB/home.htm">http://www.3gpp.org/TB/home.htm</a> . The New organization will be valid after the March 3GPP TSG plenaries. So until that point in time we are still CN5. After that we will be CT5 (Hence, we need to update our ToR). "  This contribution contains the proposed CT5 ToR.  Approved.
-----------	------	---	-----	------------------------------------	---

## 9 Outgoing Liaisons

## 10 Future meetings

C5-050226	Tdoc	3GPP Meeting Calendar	MCC	10 Future meetings	Noted.
C5-050227	Tdoc	3GPP TSG CT & WGs Meeting Calendar - Planning of JWG (3GPP CT5 OSA Parlay) meetings in 2006	MCC	10 Future meetings	Noted.

Agreed that we keep the London (three days) and Boston (four days) meetings. If there is a reason to cancel London we can do it later, since anyway unfortunately the host has already paid.

London three days will be August 30 to September 1<sup>st</sup>.

Boston three days will be Monday through Thursday because there is an OMA meeting the following week at the other side of the world. Boston days will then be October 10-13.

Elections for chair and VCs are in the next meeting.

### 10.1 Convenor election

Joe will convene the London meeting.

## 11 AOB

C5-050224	Tdoc	future of UML driven process	JWG Chair	11 AOB	This document is created in response to TODO items 19 & 20 in Austin.  The document version is wrong, and does not contain a clear proposal. It is clarified that the proposal is to stop using the UML process for Rel4. The consequences is that CRs to Rel4 will need to include
-----------	------	------------------------------	-----------	--------	---

					<p>full IDL changes as text (since IDL is no longer generated from the UML). The UML model for Rel4 will no longer be maintained, and it would be necessary to remove it as soon as there is a technical divergence (though it would keep accessible in the archives).</p> <p>For future releases the issue is more complicated because they include the Java code with cannot be treated in the same way. A different solution may be needed for Rel5, but it is not discussed now because we still get plenty of changes to Rel5 specs.</p> <p>Proposal agreed. <b>Chelo to report this to the plenary, and point out there is need for the usual MCC support for implementing Rel4 CRs.</b></p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

12 Close

## **Annex A: Agenda**

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

#### **1.1 Reminder for IPR declaration**

### **2 Allocation of documents to agenda items**

### **3 Reporting**

#### **3.1 JWG meetings, Barcelona & Austin**

#### **3.2 3GPP**

##### **3.2.1 CN#27 plenary (final one) & New CT#27 plenary**

##### **3.2.2 SA plenary**

##### **3.2.3 SA1 activities on OSA Requirements**

##### **3.2.4 3GPP OMA discussions**

##### **3.2.5 Others**

#### **3.3 Parlay**

##### **3.3.1 Parlay Board**

##### **3.3.2 Parlay TAC**

#### **3.4 ETSI**

#### **3.5 3GPP2**

#### **3.6 Work between meetings**

This agenda item aims to review the ToDo list from the previous meeting, plus reporting on any other between-meetings activity, if applicable.

#### **3.7 Other reporting**

### **4 Input liaison statements**

### **5 OSA version 2 / 3GPP Rel.5**

Only essential error corrections can be taken into account. Essential means that without the intended error correction the current spec can not be implemented (SCS and/or application side).

Note that as Parlay 4.0 has been finalised, and backwards compatibility has to be guaranteed, the assumption is that for error corrections in the scope of Parlay 4 / 3GPP Rel.5 only work around and documentation of the errors is allowed.

### **6 OSA version 3 / 3GPP Rel.6**

Only essential error corrections can be taken into account. Essential means that without the intended error correction the current spec can not be implemented (SCS and/or application side).

Note that as Parlay 5.0 has been finalised, and backwards compatibility has to be guaranteed, the assumption is that for error corrections in the scope of Parlay 5 / 3GPP Rel.6 only work around and documentation of the errors is allowed.

#### **6.1 New WSDL Annexes for OSA Release 6**

### **7 OSA version 4 / 3GPP Rel.7**

#### **7.1 Service Broker**

## **8 Organisational aspects with relation to Joint activities**

**8.1 CR delivery plans for next CT plenaries**

**8.2 Review of 3GPP OSA Work Plan**

**8.3 3GPP OSA Work Item Descriptions**

**8.4 Agreement of revised CT5 ToR**

## **9 Outgoing Liaisons**

## **10 Future meetings**

## **11 AOB**

**11.1 Convenor election**

## **12 Close**

## Annex B: Documents list

Doc	Type	Title	Source	Agenda	Decision/Comment
C5-050200	Agenda	Invitation to CT5 (former CN5) #31 Osaka meeting	Host/Parlay	1 Agenda	
C5-050201	Agenda	Draft Agenda	JWG Chair	1 Agenda	Updated to 268
C5-050202r1	Tdoc	Document Allocation	JWG Chair	2 Tdoc allocation	Noted
C5-050203	Report_out	report_Monday	JWG Chair	n.a.	Noted
C5-050204	Report_out	report_Tuesday	JWG Chair	n.a.	Noted
C5-050205	Report_out	report_Wednesday	JWG Chair	n.a.	Noted
C5-050206	Report_out	report_Thursday	JWG Chair	n.a.	Noted
C5-050207	Report_out	report_Friday	JWG Chair	n.a.	
C5-050208	Report_out	Draft Report of this CT5 (former CN5) meeting	JWG Chair	n.a.	
C5-050209	Report_in	CN5 Report to the CN#27 plenary	MCC	3.2.1 CN/CT plenary	Noted
C5-050210	Report_in	Report of 3GPP CN#27 meeting	MCC	3.2.1 CN/CT plenary	Noted
C5-050212	LS_in	LS from SA2 to CT5 on 3GPP Rel-6 OSA stage 2 specification	S2-050351	4 Input LSS	Noted
C5-050213	Tdoc	Service Broker – discussion document	Telcordia (John-Luc BAKKER)	7.1 Service Broker	Updated to 218
C5-050214	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-014 Update IETF Document References	The Parlay Group (Julian Richards)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Updated to 295
C5-050215	Report_in	N5-040708 DRAFT Report_CN5_29_Barcelona	MCC	3.1 Last JWG meeting	Approved
C5-050216	Report_in	N5-050008 Draft_Report_CN5_30_Austin	MCC	3.1 Last JWG meeting	Approved
C5-050217	Tdoc	DraftR2-Service-Brokering-RD-and-AD-Rev1	AePONA	7.1 Service Broker	Initial case study contribution covering VPN & Prepaid section 6.3
C5-050218	Tdoc	Service Broker – discussion document	John-Luc Bakker	7.1 Service Broker	This document is a revision of N5-050213 service-brokering-RD-and-AD, implementing agreements reached on Feb 25 Conference Call. Noted
C5-050219r1	Tdoc	Updated Notes CC Feb 25	MCC/John-Luc Bakker	7.1 Service Broker	Agreed.
C5-050220	ToR	Updated CT5 ToR (Revised NP-040425 updated_ToR_CN5)	MCC	8.4 Agreement of : revised JWG ToR	Agreed. For CT#28 Approval
C5-050221	Tdoc	Service Broker - discussion document	Peter Bonek, Telekom Austria	7.1 Service Broker	Document describes 2 use cases for OSA Service Broker: Application Initiated Call - VPN and VPN - Prepaid.
C5-050222	LS_in	LS reply from OMA MWG MMSG to 3GPPSA-LS-Web-Services (SP-040695, NP-040360)	OMA-MMSG-2005-0046 (SP-050011)	4 Input LSS	Noted
C5-050223	WID	3GPP SA#27 approved WID on Rel-7 OSA Service broker	SP-050183	7.1 Service Broker	Noted
C5-050224	Tdoc	future of UML driven process	JWG Chair	11 AOB	This document is created in response to TODO items 19 & 20 in Austin.
C5-050225	LS_in	LS from ITU-R Ad Hoc to 3GPP WGs on Draft contribution for ITU-R WP8F on current 3GPP activities toward IP applications over mobile systems	ITU-R Ad Hoc	4 Input LSS	Noted
C5-050226	Tdoc	3GPP Meeting Calendar	MCC	10 Future meetings	Noted
C5-050227	Tdoc	3GPP TSG CT & WGs Meeting Calendar - Planning of JWG (3GPP CT5 OSA Parlay) meetings in 2006	MCC	10 Future meetings	Noted
C5-050228	CR	Rel-6 CR29198-15 Clarification of Multi Media Messaging using Sequence Diagrams	Ulltan Mulligan, ETSI Secretariat	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Approved. Order to change
C5-050229	Tdoc	Revised WSDL Annex - Conversion Rules	Marconi Communications	6.1 new WSDL Annexes: for OSA Release 6	Noted
C5-050230	Tdoc	New WSDL Annex for 3GPP Release 6 and Parlay 5	Marconi Communications	6.1 new WSDL Annexes: for OSA Release 6	Noted
C5-050231	CR	Rel-6 CR 29198-15 Correction to TpMessageTreatment in IDL	Ulltan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Approved
C5-050232	Tdoc	New ETSI Work Items required for OSA	Ulltan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	3.4 ETSI	Noted.
C5-050233	Tdoc	DTR-TISPAN-01021-04-01v003 [Mapping of Short Messaging to UI]	The Parlay Group (Julian Richards)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Approved
C5-050234	Tdoc	DTR-TISPAN-01021-04-02v003 [Mapping of Short Messaging to MMM]	The Parlay Group (Julian Richards)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Approved



C5-050235	Tdoc	DTR-TISPAN-01021-05-01v003 [Mapping of Multimedia Messaging to UJ]	The Parlay Group (Julian Richards)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Approved
C5-050236	Tdoc	DTR-TISPAN-01021-05-02v003 [Mapping of Multimedia Messaging to MMM]	The Parlay Group (Julian Richards)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Approved
C5-050237	Tdoc	Draft ES 202 391-01 v1.1.2 PX Web Services-Common	The Parlay Group (Julian Richards)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Approved
C5-050238	Tdoc	Draft ES 202 391-04 v1.1.2 PX Web Services-Short Messaging	The Parlay Group (Julian Richards)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Approved
C5-050239	Tdoc	Draft ES 202 391-05 v1.1.2 PX Web Services-Multimedia Messaging	The Parlay Group (Julian Richards)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Approved
C5-050240	Tdoc	Availability of ISO 4217:1995	Ullan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	3.4 ETSI	Noted.
C5-050241	CR	CR Rel-5 29.198-13 Correct references to PCIM RFCs	Ullan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	5 OSA2 / 3GPP Rel-5	Approved editorial update
C5-050242	CR	CR Rel-6 29.198-13 Correct references to PCIM RFCs	Ullan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	5 OSA2 / 3GPP Rel-5	Approved editorial update
C5-050244	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-06 Add additional parameters for volume charging	Richard Dawson (CSG Systems - Parlay Member)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Change to CR Cat C. Approved.
C5-050245	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-07 Change Return single- to multiple-balances to GetBalance operation	Richard Dawson (CSG Systems - Paraly Member)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Updated to 296
C5-050246	CR	Rel 6 CR29.199-03 Correct inconsistency in WSDL	Jorgen Dyst (Parlay Member)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Approved
C5-050247	CR	Editorial modification of Presence.	Jin-Young Choi, Yoo-Mi Park, ETRI	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Updated to 287. Cover page changes.
C5-050248	CR	Addition of Announcement flag to Action structure in Call Notification.	Ki-Sook Chung, Byung-Sun Lee, ETRI	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Withdrawn - needs further work and discussion
C5-050249	CR	Addition of Announcement flag to inviteParticipant operation parameter in Multimedia conference.	Ki-Sook Chung, Jong-Choul Yim, ETRI	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Withdrawn - needs further work and discussion
C5-050250	CR	Addition of Announcement flag to MakeCall operation parameter in Third party call.	Yoo-Mi Park, Young-II Choi, ETRI	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Withdrawn - needs further work and discussion
C5-050251	CR	Modification of WSDL to discribe optional parameters in Common	Sun-Hwan Lim, Sang-Ki Kim, ETRI	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Noted. Subset of 271
C5-050252	CR	Modification of WSDL to discribe optional parameters in Payment	Sun-Hwan Lim, Hyun-Joo Bae, ETRI	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Noted. Subset of 276
C5-050253	CR	Modification of WSDL to discribe optional parameters in Account management	Sun-Hwan Lim, Kyoung-Soo Kim, ETRI	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Noted. Subset of 277
C5-050254	Tdoc	A new Parlay X requirement on message broadcasting	Jeong-Hwan Kim, Sang-Ki Kim, ETRI	7.1 Rel-7 Requirements	Noted
C5-050255	Tdoc, TS	Parlay 6 Requirements	Richard Stretch BT Group	7.1 Rel-7 Requirements	Noted
C5-050256	CR	Rel 6 CR Correct UIAdmin interface for sessionID problem	AePONA	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Correct UIAdmin Interface by removing sessionID
C5-050257	Tdoc	Draft ES 202 391-09 v1.1.2 PX Web Services-Terminal Location	The Parlay Group (Julian Richards)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Approved
C5-050258	Tdoc	Draft ES 202 391-14 v1.1.2 PX Web Services-Presence	The Parlay Group (Julian Richards)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Approved
C5-050259		Late documends below this line			
C5-050260	Tdoc	Parlay X Requirement Text	Orange/Christian Nord	7.1 Rel-7 Requirements	Noted
C5-050261	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-5 Additional information for Attachments	Telenor	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Not approved.
C5-050262	CR	Rel 6 CR 29.199-6 Wrong datatype used in Amount Interface	Telenor	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Updated to 293
C5-050263	Tdoc	Proposal to maintain OSA Stage 3 in a single body (ETSI)	MCC CT5	8 Organisational: aspects with relation to Joint activities	Not approved.
C5-050264	CR	Rel 6 CR 29.199-4 Addition of EMS and SmartMessaging	Telenor	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Withdrawn
C5-050265		ADN Tdoc# reservation closed below this line			
C5-050266	Report_in	TSGS_27_Tokyo draft Report	3GPP SA	3.2.2 SA plenary	Noted
C5-050267	Report_in	TSGS1_28_Beijing draft Report	3GPP SA1	3.2.3 SA1 activities: on OSA Requirements	Noted
C5-050268	Agenda	Revision #1 of Draft Agenda	Chelo Abarca	1 Agenda	Approved
C5-050269	Tdoc	Work between Austin and Osaka meetings	Chelo Abarca	3.6 Work btw meeting	Noted
C5-050270	CR	Support for Emergency Telecommunications Service	Telcordia	5 OSA2 / 3GPP Rel-5	Updated to 288, 289 for Rel-5, Rel-6 CR respectively
C5-050271	CR	Optionals for Part 1	Joe McIntyre	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	For e-mail approval
C5-050272	CR	Optionals for Part 2	Joe McIntyre	6 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	For e-mail approval
C5-050273	CR	Optionals for Part 3	Joe McIntyre	6 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	For e-mail approval

C5-050274r1	CR	Optionals for Part 4	Joe McIntyre	6 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Agreed.
C5-050275	CR	Optionals for Part 5	Joe McIntyre	6 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	For e-mail approval
C5-050276r1	CR	Optionals for Part 6	Joe McIntyre	6 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Agreed.
C5-050277	CR	Optionals for Part 7	Joe McIntyre	6 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	For e-mail approval
C5-050278	CR	Optionals for Part 8	Joe McIntyre	6 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	For e-mail approval
C5-050279	CR	Optionals for Part 9	Joe McIntyre	6 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	For e-mail approval
C5-050280	CR	Optionals for Part 10	Joe McIntyre	6 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	For e-mail approval
C5-050281	CR	Optionals for Part 11	Joe McIntyre	6 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	For e-mail approval
C5-050282	CR	Optionals for Part 12	Joe McIntyre	6 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	For e-mail approval
C5-050283	CR	Optionals for Part 13	Joe McIntyre	6 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	For e-mail approval
C5-050284	CR	Optionals for Part 14	Joe McIntyre	6 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	For e-mail approval
C5-050285	CR	Add display name data	Telcordia	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Updated to 294
C5-050286	Tdoc	Additional function for Service Broker to register event trigger to Filter Criteria in S-CSCF	NTT (Mihoko Kaneko)	7.1 Service Broker	
C5-050287	CR	Editorial modification of Presence.	Jin-Young Choi, Yoo-Mi Park, ETRI	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Update of 247. Approved
C5-050288	CR	Rel-5 CR Support for Emergency Telecommunications Service	Telcordia	5 OSA2 / 3GPP Rel-5	Approved
C5-050289	CR	Rel-6 CR Support for Emergency Telecommunications Service	Telcordia	5 OSA2 / 3GPP Rel-5	Approved
C5-050290	Tdoc	DTR-TISPAN-01021-05-01v003 [Mapping of Multimedia Messaging to UJ]	Telenor	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Withdrawn
C5-050291	CR	Rel-5 CR 29.198-04-3 Correct support for Emergency Telecommunications Service	Telcordia	5 OSA2 / 3GPP Rel-5	Updated to 300
C5-050292	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.198-04-3 Correct support for Emergency Telecommunications Service	Telcordia	5 OSA2 / 3GPP Rel-5	Updated to 301
C5-050293	CR	Rel 6 CR 29.199-6 Wrong datatype used in Amount Interface	Telenor	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Update of 262. Updated to 303
C5-050294	CR	Add display name data	Telcordia	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Update of 285
C5-050295	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-014 Update IETF Document References	The Parlay Group (Julian Richards)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Update of 214 Updated to 304
C5-050296	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-07 Change Return single- to multiple-balances to GetBalance operation	Richard Dawson (CSG Systems - Paraly Member)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Update of 245. Updated to 308
C5-050297	Tdoc	Namespaces	Joe McIntyre	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Noted
C5-050298	Tdoc	Messaging	Joe McIntyre	7.1 Rel-7 Requirements	
C5-050299	Tdoc	Additional Information for new WSDL Annex for 3GPP Release 6 and Parlay 5	Marconi Communications	6.1 new WSDL Annexes: for OSA Release 6	WSDL metrics etc.
C5-050300	CR	Rel-5 CR 29.198-04-3 Correct support for Emergency Telecommunications Service	Telcordia	5 OSA2 / 3GPP Rel-5	Updated from 291. Approved
C5-050301	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.198-04-3 Correct support for Emergency Telecommunications Service	Telcordia	5 OSA2 / 3GPP Rel-5	Updated from 292. Approved
C5-050302	Tdoc	Messaging Stage 2 Information	Joe McIntyre	7.1 Rel-7 Requirements	
C5-050303	CR	Rel 6 CR 29.199-6 Wrong datatype used in Amount Interface	Telenor	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Update of 293. For e-mail approval by 27th of May
C5-050304	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-014 Update IETF Document References	The Parlay Group (Julian Richards)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Update of 295. Agreed.
C5-050305	Tdoc	DTR-TISPAN-01021-05-02v003 [Mapping of Multimedia Messaging to MMM]	Telenor	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	For e-mail approval
C5-050306	Tdoc	NTT Service Broker Slide	NTT (Mihoko Kaneko)	7.1 Rel-7 Requirements	
C5-050307	Tdoc	Service Broker conference call notes	Telcordia	7.1 Rel-7 Requirements	
C5-050308	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-07 Change Return single- to multiple-balances to GetBalance operation	Richard Dawson (CSG Systems - Paraly Member)	6 OSA3 / 3GPP Rel-6	Update of 296. For e-mail approval

**B.1 List of documents for submission to CT#28**

CT Doc	CT5 Doc	Type	Title	Source	Agenda	Decision/Comment
CP-050153	C5-050208	Report	Draft Report of this CT5 (former CN5) meeting	JWG Chair	6.4.1 Status report from CT5	
CP-050154	C5-050220	ToR	Updated CT5 ToR (Revised NP-040425 updated_ToR_CN5)	MCC	11.2 Terms of Reference	Agreed. For CT#28 Approval
CP-050155	C5-050288	CR	Rel-5 CR 29.198-05 Support for Emergency Telecommunications Service	Telcordia	8.2 OSA enhancements [OSA2]	Agreed
CP-050155	C5-050289	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.198-05 Support for Emergency Telecommunications Service	Telcordia	8.2 OSA enhancements [OSA2]	Agreed
CP-050155	C5-050300	CR	Rel-5 CR 29.198-04-3 Correct support for Emergency Telecommunications Service	Telcordia	8.2 OSA enhancements [OSA2]	Updated from 291. Agreed
CP-050155	C5-050301	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.198-04-3 Correct support for Emergency Telecommunications Service	Telcordia	8.2 OSA enhancements [OSA2]	Updated from 292. Agreed
CP-050156	C5-050241	CR	Rel-5 CR 29.198-13 Correct references to PCIM RFCs	ETSI PTCC	8.2 OSA enhancements [OSA2]	Agreed.
CP-050156	C5-050242	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.198-13 Correct references to PCIM RFCs	ETSI PTCC	8.2 OSA enhancements [OSA2]	Agreed.
CP-050157	C5-050256	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.198-05 Correct UIAdmin interface for sessionID problem	AePONA	9.7 OSA Enhancements [OSA3]	Agreed.
CP-050158	C5-050228	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.198-15 Clarification of Multi Media Messaging using Sequence Diagrams	ETSI PTCC	9.7 OSA Enhancements [OSA3]	Agreed.
CP-050158	C5-050231	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.198-15 Correction to TpMessageTreatment in IDL	ETSI PTCC	9.7 OSA Enhancements [OSA3]	Agreed
CP-050159	C5-050294	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-03 Add display name data	Telcordia	9.7 OSA Enhancements [OSA3]	Update of 285
CP-050159	C5-050246	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-03 Correct inconsistency in WSDL	Appium - Parlay Member (Jörgen Dyst)	9.7 OSA Enhancements [OSA3]	Agreed
CP-050160	C5-050244	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-06 Add additional parameters for volume charging	CSG Systems - Paraly Member (Richard Dawson)	9.7 OSA Enhancements [OSA3]	Agreed.
CP-050160	C5-050303	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-06 Wrong datatype used in Amount Interface	Telenor	9.7 OSA Enhancements [OSA3]	Update of 293. E-mail agreed 25 May
CP-050161	C5-050308	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-07 Change Return single- to multiple-balances to GetBalance operation	CSG Systems - Paraly Member (Richard Dawson)	9.7 OSA Enhancements [OSA3]	Update of 296. E-mail agreed 25 May
CP-050162	C5-050287	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-14 Editorial modification of Presence	ETRI (Jin-Young Choi, Yoo-Mi Park)	9.7 OSA Enhancements [OSA3]	Update of 247. Agreed
CP-050162	C5-050304	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-14 Update IETF Document References	Parlay (Julian Richards)	9.7 OSA Enhancements [OSA3]	Update of 295. Agreed.
CP-050163	C5-050271	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-01 Optionals	IBM	9.7 OSA Enhancements [OSA3]	E-mail agreed 25 May
CP-050163	C5-050272	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-02 Optionals	IBM	9.7 OSA Enhancements [OSA3]	E-mail agreed 25 May
CP-050163	C5-050273	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-03 Optionals	IBM	9.7 OSA Enhancements [OSA3]	E-mail agreed 25 May
CP-050163	C5-050274r1	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-04 Optionals	IBM	9.7 OSA Enhancements [OSA3]	Agreed.
CP-050163	C5-050275	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-05 Optionals	IBM	9.7 OSA Enhancements [OSA3]	E-mail agreed 25 May
CP-050163	C5-050276r1	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-06 Optionals	IBM	9.7 OSA Enhancements [OSA3]	Agreed.
CP-050163	C5-050277	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-07 Optionals	IBM	9.7 OSA Enhancements [OSA3]	E-mail agreed 25 May
CP-050163	C5-050278	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-08 Optionals	IBM	9.7 OSA Enhancements [OSA3]	E-mail agreed 25 May
CP-050163	C5-050279	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-09 Optionals	IBM	9.7 OSA Enhancements [OSA3]	E-mail agreed 25 May
CP-050163	C5-050280	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-10 Optionals	IBM	9.7 OSA Enhancements [OSA3]	E-mail agreed 25 May
CP-050163	C5-050281	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-11 Optionals	IBM	9.7 OSA Enhancements [OSA3]	E-mail agreed 25 May
CP-050163	C5-050282	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-12 Optionals	IBM	9.7 OSA Enhancements [OSA3]	E-mail agreed 25 May
CP-050163	C5-050283	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-13 Optionals	IBM	9.7 OSA Enhancements [OSA3]	E-mail agreed 25 May
CP-050163	C5-050284	CR	Rel-6 CR 29.199-14 Optionals	IBM	9.7 OSA Enhancements [OSA3]	E-mail agreed 25 May

## Annex C: Participants list

Name	Organization represented	Status, partner	Ctry	Phone	Email
<b>Guest organisation for 3GPP (OTHER)</b>					
Mr. Kenneth Henriksen	Sprint PCS	3GPPGUEST (OTHER)	US	+1 913 794 3157	
<b>Member of 3GPP (ARIB)</b>					
Mrs. Mihoko Kaneko	NTT	3GPPMEMBER (ARIB)	JP	+81 422 59 4296	
Mr. Atsuyoshi Shirato	NTT	3GPPMEMBER (ARIB)	JP	+81 422 59 4296	shirato_atsuyoshi@lab.ntt.co.jp
<b>Member of 3GPP (ATIS)</b>					
Mr. John-Luc Bakker	Telcordia Technologies	3GPPMEMBER (ATIS)	US	+1-732-699-2694	JBAKKER@TELCORDIA.COM
<b>Member of 3GPP (ETSI)</b>					
Ms. Chelo Abarca	ALCATEL S.A.	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	FR	+33 1307 70469	chelo.abarca@alcatel.fr
Mr. Suresh Garg	France Telecom	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	FR	+16508753040	suresh.garg@rd.francetelecom.com
Mrs. Lucia Gradinariu	Oracle Corporation	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	US	+1 719 964 1446	
Ms. Jane D Humphrey	MARCONI COMMUNICATIONS	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	GB	+44 24 76564232	jane.humphrey@marconi.com
Mr. Joe McIntyre	IBM EUROPE	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	US	+1 512 823 6075	joe@us.ibm.com
Mr. Eamonn Murray	AePONA LTD	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	GB	+44 28 90269188	eamonn.murray@aepona.com
Mr. Christian Nord	ORANGE SA	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	DK		christian.nord@orange.co.uk
Mr. Gaute Nygreen	TELENOR AS	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	NO	+47 992 86 856	gaute.nygreen@telenor.com
Mr. Joakim Nylund	ERICSSON LM	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	SE	+46 730399441	joakim.nylund@ericsson.com
Mr. Damian O'Neill	AePONA LTD	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	GB	+442890275246	damian.oneill@aepona.com
Mr. Avraham Shimor	M-Systems Flash Disk Pioneers	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	IL	+97297645106	avraham.shimor@m-systems.com
Mr. John Storrie	NORTEL NETWORKS (EUROPE)	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	GB	+44 1628 434466	storrie@nortel.com
Mr. Richard Stretch	BT Group Plc	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	GB	+44 1473 607487	richard.stretch@bt.com
Mrs. Heidi Thomson	BT Group Plc	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	GB	+44 1473 606 443	heidi.thomson@bt.com
Mr. Musa Unmehopa	Lucent Technologies N. S. UK	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	NL	+31 35 687 1684	unmehopa@lucent.com
Dr. Martin Yates	BT Group Plc	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	GB	+44 1473 642026	
<b>Member of 3GPP (TTA)</b>					
Mrs. Hyun-Joo Bae	ETRI	3GPPMEMBER (TTA)	KR	+82 42 860 5131	hjbbae@etri.re.kr
Mr. Sang-Ki Kim	ETRI	3GPPMEMBER (TTA)	KR	+82 42 860 6133	kimsang@etri.re.kr
Mr. JeongHwan Kim	ETRI	3GPPMEMBER (TTA)	KR	+82-42-860-5868	ditto@etri.re.kr
Mr. Byeong-Ok Kwak	ETRI	3GPPMEMBER (TTA)	KR	+82-42-860-5378	kwakbok@etri.re.kr
Ms. Yoo-mi Park	ETRI	3GPPMEMBER (TTA)	KR	+82-42-860-6718	parkym@etri.re.kr
<b>Organisation partner representative (ETSI)</b>					
Mr. Ultan Mulligan	ETSI Secretariat	3GPPORG_REP (ETSI)	FR	+33 4 92 94 43 88	ultan.mulligan@etsi.org

## History

Document history		
Ver. 1.0.0	24 May 2005	C5-050208 Draft Report submitted to CT5 for comment and posted at: <a href="ftp://www.3gpp.org/tsg_ct/WG5_osa_ex-CN5/TSGC5_31_Osaka/Report/">ftp://www.3gpp.org/tsg_ct/WG5_osa_ex-CN5/TSGC5_31_Osaka/Report/</a>
Ver. 2.0.0	20 Aug 2005	C5-050208 Report submitted to CT5 for approval
Ver. 3.0.0	31 Aug 2005	C5-050208: Report approved at CT5 plenary