

Source: PCG Chairman

Title: Proposed way forward on IMS and OSA Harmonization

Agenda item: 5

Document for:

Decision	X
Discussion	
Information	

From the PCG Chairman's perspective, I have heard various views within the industry on how best to treat the recommendations formulated at the recently concluded 3GPP/3GPP2 IP CN Harmonization Workshop at Toronto. Support for these recommendations has been virtually unanimous. The 3GPP has the responsibility for building upon these recommendations from the Workshop, while at the same time maintaining the efficiency and focus that are essential to the development of viable specifications without any process oriented delay.

I have years of personal experience in the area of cooperative work among standards organizations. These range from GSM standardization effort between ETSI SMG and Committee T1, to working on various joint standards between Committee T1 and standards groups under TIA. I can speak from experience that the best way to accomplish excellent quality work without any procedural delays and related confusions is to perform the work in a single constituent organization where the experts from the other involved bodies bring in their valuable inputs from their own perspectives. That way the work progresses smoothly and quickly and confusions are avoided.

The alternative to the above process is an effort to set up joint Working Groups etc. between constituent bodies. Such effort, in my experience, always leads to using up valuable time in coming up with new working procedures, guidelines etc. As a current example, at the OP#7 meeting tomorrow we will consider a very valuable and timely contribution from TTC [3GPP/OP#7(02)14] that invites the Partners to consider the 'guidelines' for holding the 3GPP/3GPP2 Workshops in the future. CN5 have also raised this same issue. These discussions themselves may use up time. Then it has to be followed by subsequent draft changes in the Working Procedures document of 3GPP. The draft changes, in turn, have to be approved by PCG/OP and then codified into the Working Procedures document. It is a long drawn process. Imagine how long such an exercise can take when multiple independent organizations are involved?

I do not believe that the industry will allow us the luxury of delaying the implementation of the important outputs of the Toronto IP Harmonization Workshop.

In view of the above I propose that the PCG endorse the following guidelines for dealing with IMS/OSA harmonization between 3GPP and 3GPP2:

General

1. PCG endorses the output of the Toronto IP CN Harmonization workshop. No changes will be made for Release 5 that is about to be finalized.

IMS and Applications built on IMS (for Release 6 and Beyond)

2. IMS harmonization work continues to be housed within the 3GPP. The work endeavors to ensure, as far as technically feasible, that the specifications are independent of the underlying IP transport technology. The work is performed in accordance the 3GPP Working Procedures.
3. 3GPP2 Individual Member (IM) companies with interest in the work participate in 3GPP meetings related to this harmonization effort. Since a very large number of IMs in 3GPP2 are IMs in 3GPP, they are already allowed to take part in this work. A small number of IMs of 3GPP2 that are not IMs in 3GPP are encouraged to become IMs of 3GPP. Otherwise they participate in the work as guests of 3GPP.

Parlay/OSA

4. Parlay/OSA APIs are currently being developed in the Joint API group that is constituted of Parlay, 3GPP(CN5), and ETSI (SPAN). The IMs of 3GPP2 are encouraged to start participating in this group.
5. IMs in 3GPP2 are also welcome to participate in the work of 3GPP CN5 either as IMs of 3GPP or as guests (following the concept described in Item 3 above).

Requirements for IMS and OSA

Requirements work continues to be done in 3GPP SA1. 3GPP2 individual members are encouraged to participate in the meetings of SA1 as IMs of 3GPP or as guests (in line with the concept described in Item 3 above). This will help synchronize the requirements between parent bodies of Joint API group and will make priority setting of the stage 3 work in Joint API group easier. For both IMS and OSA, there is no obvious reason as to why the requirements from 3GPP and 3GPP2 should be different.