TSG-SA WG1 #20   **S1-030405**
Seoul, Korea, 7th–11th April 2003   **Agenda Item: 8**

Title:	LS on SA2 LS on IP session control API
Response to:	LS (S1-030373) on LS on IP session control API from SA2
Release:	Release 6
Work Item:	OSA

Source:	**SA1**
To:	**SA2**
Cc:	**SA, CN5**

Contact Person:
  Name: Michel Grech
  Tel. Number: +44 7880 786 678
  E-mail Address: grech@lucent.com

Attachments: S1-030404

1. Overall Description:

TSG SA1 thanks TSG SA2 for their liaison statement in S2-030444 as well as the attachment, a CR to 23.127 in S2-030162. Whilst SA1 generally does not get involved in architectural issues, the assumption made by SA2 on OSA is not completely aligned with the existing premise of OSA. A high level requirement of OSA, as extracted from TS 22.127, states (clause 6) :

- *It is not required that network entities, which provide the implementation of OSA interfaces (SCFs), be mappable to 3GPP standardised functionality, nor that the existence of a standardised interface / protocol to communicate with 3GPP standardized network elements is required.Thus it is permissible to e.g. build a OSA API function into a WAP gateway to retrieve terminal capabilities from terminal supporting the WAP protocol.*
  Note: If the network entity, to which OSA provides an API interface, is a 3GPP standardised entity and if a standardised interface / protocol to communicate with that network entity exists it is recommended that 3GPP defines a mapping of the OSA API functions to that interface / protocol.

OSA capability exists today where there are no standardised access to network elements or indeed network elements, such as Account Management or Content Based Charging. The originators of the requirement have stated they the will resubmit additional contributions addressing the architectural impact. SA1 proposes that until all architectural options are exhausted more time is given to realise the requirement.

TSG SA1 proposes to keep the requirement for the time being, pending further input and discussion in SA2. SA1 will reconsider the requirement pending further input from SA2 on the issue.

2. Actions:

To SA2 group.

ACTION: None, for information only.

3. Date of Next TSG-SA1 Meetings:

  SA1 SWGs #21   12 - 16 May 2003,   San Diego,USA, North American Friends

SA1#21   07 - 11 July 2003,   Sophia Antipolis, hosted by ETSI

Title:	**Comments on OSA Requirement for IP Session Control**
Source:	**Lucent Technologies**
Contact:	**Michel Grech (grech@lucent.com)**

Introduction

The Liaison statement from SA2 (S1-030373) asks SA1 to re-consider the OSA requirement for IP Session Control. This document addresses the issues raised in the liaison statement.

Lucent Technologies submitted a proposal to SA2 to outline the possible architectural solution to realize the solution. In that document, a functional entity, separated from the GGSN (which could potentially be co-located with the GGSN) was show in the architectural solution. In the original discussion document submitted to SA1 (S1-021926) this functionality was shown as residing on the GGSN but a comment in SA1 was made on the performance impact on the GGSN. These issues are, we believe, not for SA1 to make decisions on relating to service requirements.

However, what is significant from a SA1 perspective is the fact that the OSA Stage 1 (22.127) has had for several releases the requirement stated below:

- *It is not required that network entities, which provide the implementation of OSA interfaces (SCFs), be mappable to 3GPP standardised functionality, nor that the existence of a standardised interface / protocol to communicate with 3GPP standardized network elements is required.Thus it is permissible to e.g. build a OSA API function into a WAP gateway to retrieve terminal capabilities from terminal supporting the WAP protocol.*

- *Note: If the network entity, to which OSA provides an API interface, is a 3GPP standardised entity and if a standardised interface / protocol to communicate with that network entity exists it is recommended that 3GPP defines a mapping of the OSA API functions to that interface / protocol.*

This is extracted from TS 22.127 (5.4.0), clause 6. This is not an informative clause, but a normative clause pertaining to the high level requirements for OSA. This has been applied to OSA capabilities of Account Management and Content based charging. Further, the CN documents that deal with the mappings from the OSA gateway to the underlying network capabilities are considered as options for recommendations, since the documentation covering this mapping is a collection of Technical Reports and not Technical Specifications.

Lucent Technologies believes that with a revised submission to SA2, the issue of architectural support mentioned in the SA2 liaison report can be easily addressed. SA2 has to date only given a limited time to explore other options and our recommendation is to allow more discussion time with revised submissions to SA2.

Proposal

Given the above, we propose that SA1 maintains the requirement for the time being, pending further input into SA2 on the subject from the originators of the requirement. A liaison statement to this effect should be sent to SA2. A proposal is provided in S1-030405 for discussion.