

**3GPP TSG CN Plenary Meeting #13  
Beijing, China, 19<sup>th</sup>-21<sup>st</sup> September 2001**

**NP-010461**

**Source:** CN5 (OSA)  
**Title:** Report of CN5#12, Sophia Antipolis, FRANCE, 16 - 19 July 2001 (N5-010476)  
**Agenda item:** 6.5.1  
**Document for:** Information

---

3GPP TSG\_CN WG 5/Parlay/ETSI SPAN12  
 WG 5 Meeting #13, Munich, Germany  
 11<sup>st</sup> –14<sup>th</sup> September 2001

N5- 010476

**Source:** CN5 Vice-chairman  
[Chelo.Abarca@alcatel.fr](mailto:Chelo.Abarca@alcatel.fr)  
 CN 5 Chairman  
[lucas.klostermann@eln.ericsson.se](mailto:lucas.klostermann@eln.ericsson.se)

**Title:** Final version of CN5#12 Meeting Report

**Agenda item:** 1

**Document for:** APPROVAL

Agenda item	Agenda item title	Tdoc 3GPP N5-00	Title	Source	Result
1	Opening and approval agenda	470	Proposed agenda	N5 chairman	Requirements mapping meeting Wednesday afternoon partly joint with SPAR group  Approved
2	Allocation of documents	471	Document allocation	N5 chairman	
3	Reporting				
3.1	CN5/SPAN12/Parlay	256	Report San Diego	N5 chairman	Approved
3.2	CN#12 plenary		Plenary Report		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All CR's were approved by the plenary, i.e. OSA for 3GPP Rel4 was all approved and is now under change control.</li> <li>Updated ToR were approved.</li> <li>Return parameter approach: we informed the plenary of the modification and asked them to approve it without seeing the CR; we got the green light in principle but need to show them the CR.</li> <li>The WID as we proposed was not approved because we need to align with SA1's.</li> <li>Chairman announced resignation and plenary approved election in this meeting.</li> </ul>

4	Liaison Statements				
		480	LS from SA5 to CN5 (cc: SA1(OSA Ad-Hoc), SA2(OSA Ad-Hoc), SPAN12) on OSA Management	SA5	<p>Possible overlap of activities identified</p> <p>Chelo will present our work to their next meeting (September), representing CN5 (Email communication to prepare and announce) At their present meeting a SA1 representative will discuss requirements</p> <p>Chelo will distribute outcome of SA1-visit-to-SA5</p> <p>Frans will prepare draft answer liaison, will be discussed during content-based charging discussion (and outgoing liaisons)</p>
		481	LS reply from SA5 to SA1's LS "regarding User Profile" (cc: SA, SA2, SA3, SA4, T2, T3, CN4, CN5)	SA5	Consolidation of requirements on User Profile ongoing between SA1, SA2, SA3, SA5
		616	LS from SA2 to CN1, CN2, CN5, CN4 (cc: CN3, CN) on ISC (IMS Service Control interface)	SA2	<p>Sent 7/7</p> <p>SA2 has agreed on SIP for the protocol at the ISC interface.</p> <p>No need to act from this LS, but Jane reports from last week's CN1-4 meeting in Dresden: they have a document (23.218) with a section on OSA and, though so far we thought it would just be a link to our specs, it seems they want to include some more contents. They also want a CN5 representative in their meetings.</p> <p>We'll meet together with the CN1-4 groups in October in Brighton. As for the CN5 representative, the meeting proposes Jane to be the contact point between CN5 and the CN1-4 groups. She accepts and we'll see in the Brighton meeting what exactly this representation means.</p> <p>Need to ensure that the OSA-SIP mapping we produce takes into account the SIP discussions (extensions) in 3GPP (CN1). Mapping of CC-APIs to the SIP (comparable to API-to-CAP mapping)</p>

		620	LS from SA2 to SA1, SA3, SA5, CN1, CN3, CN4, RAN3 (cc: SA4, CN5, RAN1, RAN2, T1, T2, T3) on "WI on the End-to-End QoS Architecture for Release 5" (S2-011098)	SA2 (Bonnie CHEN - Motorola)	Sent 11/7  For information for us on the creation of a WI for QoS (work had been going on for months but without a formal WI defined). Report from last week ad-hoc says a relationship with us hasn't been yet identified, but we need to keep an eye because we should be involved in the future.  We need to see whether there is a link with Connectivity Management / Policy Management	
		636	LS from SA3 to CN1 (cc: SA2, SA5, CN4, CN5) on "Progressing the work in SA3 and CN1 on the IP Multimedia core network subsystem" (S3-010404)	SA3 (Mike WALKER - Vodafone)	Sent 11 Jul 2001  Noted. Further coordination in Brighton meeting.  SA2 is our main coordination body concerning architecture, assume SA3 coordinates via SA2 as well	
		637	LS from ETSI SPAN11 WP NAR to ETSI EP M-COMM and 3GPP on Mobile and Electronic Commerce	ETSI SPAN11 WP NAR (Trevor KENT - SPAN11 Chairman)	Sent 11 Jul 2001  Sent to all 3GPP. CN4 last week decided it is an SA1 issue. Not considered part of our activities.	
5	CN5 chairman election					
		483	3GPP CN5 Voting List valid for CN5#12 meeting	MCC		
		484	Nomination of Mr. Ard-Jan Moerdijk (Ericsson) for the position as chairman of the 3GPP TSG CN Working Group 5 (OSA)	Ericsson	Ard-Jan Moerdijk elected new chair of CN5.	
6	API interfaces OSA version 1					
6.1	status 12070					
		482	N5-010482_29198-340-Rel99_status_2001-06.zip	MCC	Packaging problem (wrong IDL module packaged to spec).  Noted.	
		486	N5-010486_29198-Rel4_status_2001-06.zip	MCC	29198-06 updated in N5-010639  Noted.	

		639	29198-06-411-Rel4_status_2001-07 (29198-06-410.zip archive was packaged with the wrong accompanying IDL. zip file, which should be mm.idl and not Call Control IDLs (04).)	MCC	Noted.	
					<p>Next are parts 1 to 12 of the ETSI specs with the out parameter issue fixed: for methods with out parameter the out parameter has been deleted and type has been put as return type of method; name and description are preserved; for every method without out parameter TResult has been changed into "void".</p> <p>Lots of work, thanks to Ultan, Tip and Musa (Lucent) , Corne and Koen (Ericsson) and Bernhard (Siemens).</p> <p>Meeting approves all of them.</p>	
		488	Draft EN 201 915-1 v.0.0.5 - Return parameter changes	Ultan MULLIGAN	Agreed (others as well)	
		489	Draft EN 201 915-2 v.0.0.4 - Return parameter changes	Ultan MULLIGAN		
		490	Draft EN 201 915-3 v.0.0.5 - Return parameter changes	Ultan MULLIGAN		
		491	Draft EN 201 915-4 v.0.0.6 - Return parameter changes	Ultan MULLIGAN		
		492	Draft EN 201 915-5 v.0.0.6 - Return parameter changes	Ultan MULLIGAN		
		493	Draft EN 201 915-6 v.0.0.4 - Return parameter changes	Ultan MULLIGAN		
		494	Draft EN 201 915-7 v.0.0.5 - Return parameter changes	Ultan MULLIGAN		
		495	Draft EN 201 915-8 v.0.0.6 - Return parameter changes	Ultan MULLIGAN		
		496	Draft EN 201 915-9 v.0.0.2 - Return parameter changes	Ultan MULLIGAN		
		497	Draft EN 201 915-10 v.0.0.3 - Return parameter changes	Ultan MULLIGAN		
		498	Draft EN 201 915-11 v.0.0.7 - Return parameter changes	Ultan MULLIGAN		
		499	Draft EN 201 915-12 v.0.0.5 - Return parameter changes	Ultan MULLIGAN		

		500	Draft EN 201 915-12 v.0.0.5 - Return parameter changes	Ultan MULLIGAN		
		561	CR to TS 29.198-1 : Replacing Out Parameters with Return Types in OSA R4	Ultan MULLIGAN	Agreed (all others as well)	
		562	CR to TS 29.198-2 : Replacing Out Parameters with Return Types in OSA R4	Ultan MULLIGAN		
		563	CR to TS 29.198-3 : Replacing Out Parameters with Return Types in OSA R4	Ultan MULLIGAN		
		564	CR to TS 29.198-4 : Replacing Out Parameters with Return Types in OSA R4	Ultan MULLIGAN		
		565	CR to TS 29.198-5 : Replacing Out Parameters with Return Types in OSA R4	Ultan MULLIGAN		
		566	CR to TS 29.198-6 : Replacing Out Parameters with Return Types in OSA R4	Ultan MULLIGAN		
		567	CR to TS 29.198-7 : Replacing Out Parameters with Return Types in OSA R4	Ultan MULLIGAN		
		568	CR to TS 29.198-8 : Replacing Out Parameters with Return Types in OSA R4	Ultan MULLIGAN		
		569	CR to TS 29.198-11 : Replacing Out Parameters with Return Types in OSA R4	Ultan MULLIGAN		
		570	CR to TS 29.198-12 : Replacing Out Parameters with Return Types in OSA R4	Ultan MULLIGAN		
	Common Data	655	CR 29.198-2 : Clarification of common exceptions	Ericsson (Ard- Jan MOERDIJK)	Agreed, with the change of 'user' into 'user identity'  Updated in 658	

		656	CR 29.198-2 : invalid parameter value for SLA violation	Ericsson (Ard-Jan MOERDIJK)	<p>Updated in 659, with agreed changes. (Cover sheet needs to be completed)</p> <p>Updated with P_Unauthorized_parameter_value,</p> <p>And ONLY applicable to SLA violations in the clarification (normal incorrect values captured by underlying system, Corba exceptions)</p>	
		530	Typo in Invalid Address Exceptions	Lucent	Agreed, will be incorporated in 658	
		517	P_ADDRESS_PLAN_ANY Proposal	BT	<p>Intention is to be non-distinctive in address criteria, e.g particular originating address, all destination addresses (all types)</p> <p>Questioned why the requirement can not be covered by the existing address-types using 'star'-wild-cards, using the same address-type of the ANR (in case of non-distinctive BNR)? (SIP address would e.g. cover all telephony application addresses anyway)</p> <p>Not agreed</p>	
		601	P_ADDRESS_PLAN_ANY Proposal	Lucent	<p>Email from Lucent in response to discussion in 517.</p> <p>This has triggered off-line discussions during the meeting week, also involving 523: we need P_ADDRESS_PLAN_ANY? Some think that if the name field is left in TpAddressRange then it is needed.</p> <p>Is there a use case for this P_ADDRESS_PLAN_ANY? One is proposed: gateways in different networks so it is unknown which network the call is originated from.</p> <p>Is it possible to specify a CC with properties such that more than one address plan is supported? In this case P_ADDRESS_PLAN_ANY would be needed.</p> <p>Another problem: a CR implementation issue, and it has been included in ETSI but not 3GPP and will be corrected.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	

6.2	Framework				
		551	Proposal on how to reference the JAIN Community's involvement with respect to the production of the aforementioned specifications	SUN	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>To be rewritten in terms of 10 CRs, one per part, numbers 674-683.</p>
		552	Removal of Ref and RefRef	SUN	<p>Proposed that section 6.7 of part 1 is removed because it deals with implementation issues that should not be addressed in the UML.</p> <p>It is noted that there is one in MM, which should be corrected. Expected to find in some other parts too. Need to prepare corresponding CRs to be approved before the end of the meeting. Concern whether this would be editorials or fundamental changes.</p> <p>Problem: there are cases where there is a type Tp** and a similar Tp**Ref, so just removing Ref would result in two types with the same name. This is found in the Word document but not in the IDL. There are only Ref types for the interfaces because we removed the out parameters. They were kept in the Word document to minimize changes, because they were not used anyway.</p> <p>Only possible way is Gary volunteers to do all the changes for Tuesday morning, to have them agreed for Tuesday evening (they are editorials) so they can be implemented in the ETSI documents. No agreement on such short email approval time, so agreed to leave this for Rel5.</p>



		553	Removal of TpSessionIDs	SUN	<p>TpSessionIDs highlight an implementation issue that should be captured in the IDL as an optional parameter (scalable implementations should not be forced to use TpSessionIDs). TpSessionIDs should not be captured in the UML as the UML is seen to be implementation independent.</p> <p>Proposes to remove the section on TpSessionID and all its occurrences in the documents. There would be session IDs in the UML, and they would be mapped, depending on implementation, in the IDL.</p> <p>Problems: the IDL is generated from the UML, so it's either both or none; also session IDs are used in CBC as a time relationship binding a number of transactions: it is a concept and not an implementation issue; also we don't have a clear idea of the implications of this change.</p> <p>Not agreed.</p>	
		554	Proposal on removing the CORBA bias from the UML	SUN	<p>SA1 has already agreed on similar changes.</p> <p>Objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Deletion of section 1: this is where we have the explanation of the lack of return parameters.</li> <li>- Deletion of section 7: this is where we talk about the namespace.</li> <li>– Bullet point 8: we cannot forget or contradict the fact that we do have an annex with IDLs, which are normative.</li> </ul> <p>Agreed not to include bullet point 8. For the rest, we need a CR where the changes are identified.</p> <p>Attached document from SA1 that is a CR for Rel5, not Rel4. But we do have a problem of external perception of our work, so it would be good to clarify it asap. But the change in SA1 was passed as a functional modification, so it is difficult for us to have a CR category for this.</p> <p>Gary will prepare a CR for approval tomorrow, number 684.</p>	

		684		SUN	<p>CR resulting from 554</p> <p>Out parameters: we have a restriction of one, and the contribution proposes to delete a sentence that explains this. There seems to be no language that allows more than one, so it is agreed that the restrictive sentence is deleted, as proposed in the contribution. On the other hand in some cases, where we wanted more than one thing returned, we've grouped them in a single type, and it would be useful to have a clarification. Besides we need to document that there are no out parameters now in our specification.</p> <p>Agreed to merge sections 6.6 and 6.8. Rest agreed.</p>	
		555	Proposal on adding JAIN SPA APIs as an alternative technology to the OMG-IDL	SUN	<p>Proposes to add an Annex B with some introductory text on JAIN.</p> <p>JAVA APIs are generated from our UMLs, and we get feedback from then. Problem: the whole JAVA spec will not be available at the time the ETSI document is approved. There is a new Parlay WG on JAVA realization, which aims to make the JAVA implementation of Parlay as automatic as possible, so soon it will be produced shortly after the UML is ready.</p> <p>JAIN prefers to have a reference in the ETSI document rather than the contents, so they can be modified only by them. Problem: then the ETSI document would contain a normative reference on which ETSI has no control.</p> <p>Proposed to make a reference to JAIN work, explain what it consists of, but not make it normative. Anyway since this specification does not exist yet, this is out of the scope of 3GPP Rel4 or ETSI version 1 (some parts do exist but they are based on Parlay 2.1). Some similar discussions have taken place in the Parlay board. They will be checked and then the discussion will be resumed.</p> <p>Not agreed.</p>	

		505	How to trust an SCS	Alcatel	<p>Problem: if the first point of entry is IpAccessFactory for a trusted SCS it means that they never identify themselves to the Framework. A solution is to introduce the same ID in the IpAccessFactory as is currently in IpInitial. This would mean that non-trusted SCSs pass this parameter twice, but this overhead is much lighter than imposing authentication for all.</p> <p>CR to be prepared by Ard-Jan on Monday evening to be commented by Gareth and Andy, to reach a decision on Tuesday evening.</p>	
		506	Alignment of Framework Access Session Interfaces	Alcatel	<p>Backwards compatibility issue: we want SCSs to be able to work with FWs when both are from different releases; this is why it is key to have the registration part aligned.</p> <p>This means a complete change in the structure of the FW document. Proposed to have a proposal tomorrow and discuss if it's possible to do them for this version. Document 685.</p> <p>Question: do we need Parlay approval for this? Will find out.</p>	

		685	New structure for Framework document	Alcatel	<p>Problem with namespace: at the moment the FW is split in two: FW-APP and FW-SVC. Access Interfaces should be in a separate namespace, and so should the Enterprise Operator.</p> <p>Gary says JAIN has broken the FW into separate APIs like this. Also observes that the FW has grown a lot and also split into different parties, and suggests to have different documents. Also suggests to say explicitly in the introduction of the Access Session that these interfaces are common.</p> <p>Need to think how to present this to the plenary since there will be no possibility of review marks. But there will be individual CRs to see the changes, and then we can present in the report an outline of the old and new structure. Chelo volunteers to help writing the report to the plenary, and it will be used for a CR, with the whole new FW attached.</p> <p>Agreed the need for this change. To be discussed whether it is feasible in the time we have. For this purpose Chelo will send a concrete proposal tomorrow Friday 20 July before 11am: what STDs and seqdiags need to be changed and how, in Word. Comments till Monday, close of business time.</p> <p>Richard proposes to request from the Parlay board a little more time: two weeks for us to finish, and tell them that we cannot complete work unless they give them to us. The Parlay board will be in ETSI next week, Ultan will report their answer.</p> <p>For the SPAN plenary: output ready in 14 days or less.</p>	
		507		Alcatel	This document number has not been used for the meeting.	
		508	Working Document on Initial Access for trusted and non-trusted clients	Alcatel		
		524	CR 29.198-3 : On the usefulness of abortAuthentication	Ericsson (Ard-Jan MOERDIJK)	Withdrawn.	

		525	Addition of listInterfaces() method	Lucent (Andy Bennett)	Discussion: this is a similar case to 586, where there is available functionality that works; on the other hand it has been available for a long time.  Agreed. For CR, number 695.	
		526	Replacement of disable/enableLoadControl	Lucent (Andy Bennett)	Changes agreed except the deletion of LoadManagerInternal diagram. CR needed, number 686. Musa to ask Andy about LoadManagerInternal diagram.	
		527	Remove the createEntOpAccount method	Lucent (Andy Bennett)	Agreed.	
		528	Introduction of TpSubjectType	Lucent (Andy Bennett)	Proposed to change the description of the value "undefined" into "neither FW nor App".  Agreed. For CR, number 687.	
		529	Addition of listClientAppMembership() method	Lucent (Andy Bennett)	Agreed.	
		573	Addition of listServiceContracts method	Lucent (Gareth CARROLL)	Agreed.	
		574	An addition of listServiceProfiles()	Lucent (Gareth CARROLL)	Agreed.	
		575	List client applications associated with a service profile	Lucent (Gareth CARROLL)	Agreed.	
		576	Addition of IpServiceTypeManagement interface	Lucent (Gareth CARROLL)	Not in the scope of version 1 (interface between FW and FW Operator). Deferred for a next version.	
		577	Contribution on Service Instance Lifecycle Management	Lucent (Gareth CARROLL)	Why not put destroy(), together with factory's create(), in the proposed IpServiceInstanceLifecycleManager?  Agreed. Updated contribution (CR): 703.	
		578	Description of service subscription	Lucent (Gareth CARROLL)	Re-worked into 603.	

		603	Description of service subscription	Lucent	<p>Re-work of 578</p> <p>Comment: application 6 in page 5 is not linked to anything and should be.</p> <p>It is not clear where this new material goes. Go back to this after discussing new FW structure.</p> <p>Comment: in FW introduction in the ETSI document there is no mention of the interfaces to the EntOp. A contribution (633) will be available on Monday.</p> <p>Agreed to have this text as the introduction of the section of FW-EntOp API in the new FW structure.</p>	
		579	Framework Heartbeat Mechanism	Lucent (Gareth CARROLL)	<p>Agreed to change changeTimePeriod into changeHeartBeatInterval (and not as proposed in contribution). Same for 8.3.5 and 4.1.1.</p> <p>Agreed to modify description of enableHeartBeat, from "informs" to "instructs".</p> <p>Rest agreed, to be written in CR form with document number 688.</p>	
		580	Ent. Op. should provide IpAppAPILevelAuthentication	Lucent (Gareth CARROLL)	<p>Approved if alignment is not, and viceversa.</p> <p>Not approved.</p>	
		581	Some methods on the IpApp interfaces should throw exceptions	Lucent (Gareth CARROLL)	<p>IpAppAPILevelAuthentication.authenticate not included because we approved 589, which deleted prescribedMethod.</p> <p>Agreed with above modification. New number, for CR: 696.</p>	
		582	P_SERVICE_ACCESS_DENIED thrown if non-accessable serviceID is provided	Lucent (Gareth CARROLL)	<p>Agreed that P_UNAUTHORIZED_PARAMETER_VALUE is a more suitable exception.</p> <p>Deferred to after discussing the contribution that proposes that Integrity Management is per instance.</p> <p>Agreed. Number for CR: 699.</p>	
		584	Add a releaseInterface() method to IpAccess	Lucent (Gareth CARROLL)	<p>Exceptions: P_ACCESS_DENIED should be P_TASK_REFUSED.</p> <p>Agreed, number for CR 689.</p>	

		585	P_SERVICE_ACCESS_TYPE should be removed	Lucent (Gareth CARROLL)	Agreed. Number for CR: 690.	
		586	Addition of tokenExpired() to IpAppAccess interface	Lucent (Gareth CARROLL)	Meeting agrees that this is an addition of functionality but in this case we do have a basic functionality that works.  Not agreed, deferred for Rel5.	
		587	Removal of serviceID from queryAppLoadReq()	Lucent (Gareth CARROLL)	Agreed, number for CR 691.	
		588	Update to the definitions of svcUnavailableInd	Lucent (Gareth CARROLL)	Agreed.  Number for CR: 534.	
		589	The meaning of prescribedMethod seems confused	Lucent (Gareth CARROLL)	Agreed.  Number for CR: 535.	
		590	A client should only have one instance of a given service	Lucent (Gareth CARROLL)	Agreed.  Number for CR: 536.	
		593	Only one subject per method invocation for fault and load mgmt.	Lucent (Gareth CARROLL)	Agreed.  Number for CR: 537.	
		595	Fault management is missing *Err methods	Lucent (Gareth CARROLL)	Agreed.  Number for CR: 538.	
		596	Issues surrounding the combining of IpSvc/IpApp and IpFw/Ip interfaces	Lucent (Gareth CARROLL)	See 506 for conclusion.  Agreed.	
		597	Methods' consistency on Fault management interfaces	Lucent (Gareth CARROLL)	Agreed.  Number for CR: 539.	
		598	Introduction and use of new Service Instance ID	Lucent (Gareth CARROLL)	It is the Framework which manages the ID values.  Agreed. Number for CR: 697.	

		599	Additional Authentication Sequence Diagrams	Lucent (Gareth CARROLL)	<p>This part of the document was not well documented, and this contribution provides extra sequence diagrams to fix that.</p> <p>Suggested to use the correct UML representation of returns.</p> <p>Not clear what changes are proposed. Needs re-work.</p> <p>Withdrawn.</p>	
		600	Property Matching	Lucent (Gareth CARROLL)	<p>The way it works now, the Fw informs the Application of ALL the possible matches, and the Application does the selection. There is indeed the need for a matching, but the question is to which level of detail?</p> <p>Problem: the contribution proposes some data types, but no place where they are used. We need to change some methods in the Discovery mechanism.</p> <p>Deferred for next version.</p>	
		604	FW – Change the sequence of the Service Access	Stephanie DITHURBIDE (Ulticom)	<p>Problem that the proposed solution does not work with a single-threaded orb, and we're assuming this is usually the case.</p> <p>Another solution is to add a method <code>InitiateSignServiceAgreement</code>, from Appl to FW, and invoke it before <code>signServiceAgreement</code>. Gary to prepare a contribution proposing this solution (672), to be discussed later in the meeting.</p>	
		672	Modification in service access sequence	SUN	<p>Re-work of 604.</p> <p>Cover sheer: change "clauses affected". Rest approved.</p>	
		605	FW – Specify that authentication and signature TpString shall be created using Base64 algorithm.	Stephanie DITHURBIDE (Ulticom)	<p>Proposal for Base64 encoding of authentication data, type TpString.</p> <p>Contribution 643 proposes another solution for same.</p> <p>Withdrawn.</p>	
		643	CR 29.198-3 : TpOctetSets in authentication and access	Ericsson (Ard-Jan MOERDIJK)	<p>For the same problem as 605, proposal to change type from TpString to TpOctetSet.</p> <p>Agreed. Needs revision for CR format reasons, new number 673.</p>	



		644	FW-Svc authentication and TpOctetSet	Ericsson (Ard-Jan MOERDIJK)	Same as 643 but for parts out of the 3GPP scope. Approved.	
		645	Multi-vendor ship in 3GPP OSA	Ericsson (Ard-Jan MOERDIJK)	3GPP multivendorship requirement (a FW from one vendor should be able to work with a service from another) is not actually fulfilled by 3GPP OSA specifications, as shown via two examples in the contribution.  The contribution proposes to incorporate in 3GPP the Parlay interfaces between FW and SCSSs.  Agreed in principle, session tomorrow to discuss what we bring to the plenary.  Discussion later: it will be the same document as we have for ETSI and Parlay, except of the Enterprise Operator.  Need a CR, Ard-Jan to do it, number 705.	
		646	Note on allowed methods	Ericsson (Ard-Jan MOERDIJK)	Deferred for Rel5.	
		657	CR 29.198-3 : Signing algorithm selection	Ericsson (Ard-Jan MOERDIJK)	Need to update CR front page.  Is it an implementation specific thing? No because it aids the case of a same application dealing with two different framework implementations.  Isn't this discussed off-line between application and framework developers?  It is agreed it is a configuration issue.  Not agreed.	
		531	Add missing Service Type Names for new Interfaces	Lucent	Not enough to be valid for the Parlay and ETSI specs, because there are more service types there. Musa to make revision, document number 701.	

		345	Service Properties using XML	Incomit	<p>Presented by John-Luc (Telcordia).</p> <p>The suggestion described in this document is to change the service properties to XML files/streams or strings containing XML.</p> <p>Argued that this is a refinement of existing functionality that works. Also for backwards compatibility reasons new data types, and a new registration interface, need to be defined to support this mechanism.</p> <p>Agreed in principle but not the proposed changes.</p> <p>Not agreed.</p>
6.3	Call Control				
		510	N5-010510Alc1SetChargePlan.zip	Alcatel (Frans HAERENS)	<p>Contentbased charging: no tariff switch functionality agreed</p> <p>Session tariff switching, does it need to be part of content-based-charging functionality? This contribution proposes to include this in content-based charging...</p> <p>Concerns that at this moment difficult to be future proof (SIP charging?)</p> <p>Concerns on complication of tariff switching functionality in call control API (for application developers). If the only possibility is to use the call control API with the full charging API functionality as proposed. Separating charging from call control could be a way out.</p> <p>Proposed to remove chargePerTime and currency for the present release.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>630 is the updated document, <del>need CR.</del></p>

		511	N5-010511Alc2PartyToCharge.zip	Alcatel (Frans HAERENS)	<p>Clarification requested on 'connected'. Will not be always available, who pays in that case? Can it be used by application, is it aware?</p> <p>Translated, concerns, should an application have to worry about number translation taking place later in the call path.</p> <p>agreed, but with originating, destination, special parties only DataType will be restructured still to match convention.</p> <p>Updated in 631, <del>need CR.</del></p>	
		512	N5-010512Alc3AddOnCharge.zip	Alcatel (Frans HAERENS)	<p>To be discussed in version 2</p> <p>Can in principle be done via content-based charging as well, links can be via correlationID. Overhead if only done for add-on charge...</p> <p>Possibly use setChargePlan for it as well?</p>	
		513	N5-010513Alc4ChargeInfo.zip	Alcatel (Frans HAERENS)	To be discussed in version 2	
		514	N5-010514Alc5SetAdvice.zip	Alcatel (Frans HAERENS)	Withdrawn.	
		515	N5-010515-CR29.198-4: Corrections to OSA API Rel 4, Call Control	AePONA	<p>Agreed. However, application-side TpCommon exceptions will be removed</p> <p>Update in 663</p>	
		516	N5-010516-CR29.198-4: Corrections to OSA API Rel 4, Call Control – Missing Exceptions	AePONA	<p>Was agreed in meeting but agreement no longer valid due to approval of 510.</p> <p>Updated to 700.</p>	
		700		AePONA	<p>Update of 516 taking into account the agreements on 510. Exceptions for setCallChargePlan. This seems to be a mistake. 510 was addressing MPCC. The MPCC part in 700 is correct.</p> <p>Needs to be updated: 704. Updates are: restore exceptions for P_INVALID_CURRENCY, P_INVALID_AMMOUNT for the setCallChagePlan method in the GCCS interface IpCall; delete from the method setChargePlan in the interface IpCallLeg in MPCCS. Ultan will do it.</p>	

		520	Clarifications to disarming table in MPCC Data Definitions	Ericsson (Ard-Jan MOERDIJK)	<p>Use of table disputed, can it be captured in STD? See 606</p> <p>Table itself, validity:</p> <p>Answer/alerting events: no originating call leg events, should be corrected</p> <p>Redirecting; also 592. Will NOT be disarmed.</p> <p>Queued event not there in disarming rules, since it should not be disarmed</p> <p>CallAttempt and CallAttemptAuthorized for both legs, include note that both legs are covered</p> <p>CallAttempt, 'trigger' should be 'initial notification'</p> <p>Behaviour agreed with these notes.</p>	
		521	Introduction of Call LEG STDs and action tables	Ericsson (Ard-Jan MOERDIJK)	<p>GetMedia; agreed that this reflects actual state in the network, not only the requested value (via setMedia) when it has not yet been set up in the network. Question on whether getMedia should be removed... to be resolved later this meeting</p> <p>Disarming rules will stay</p> <p>In STD the condition of changing state is NOT whether an event is armed (as indicated in the STD), but whether the event happens in the network (as indicated by the note). If armed, event should be sent up to application.</p> <p>7.4.2.5 setChargePlan on call, dependency on callLeg states?</p> <p>Active state, number of events can occur</p> <p>Table column: eventNotifications in principle superfluous. What is needed to complement the state behaviour is still the dynamic events. Defined already clearly what an application can do.</p> <p>Update to 662.</p>	

		522	MPCC service sequence Diagrams	Ericsson (Ard-Jan MOERDIJK)	<p>Introduction text should be made more generic. A note will be added to indicate that e.g. in case of CAPv3 not the whole MPCC capabilities will be supported. General guideline is that technology specifics should be in mapping documents.</p> <p>Update 664 will be provided, text will be revisited.</p> <p>MSD: Add more info on parameters (e.g. for routeReq) in 7.4.6 (11)</p> <p>Comment on 12 of 7.4.6 ContinueProcessing would be possibility as well, according to the definition of continueProcessing method. In MSD change method to continueProcessing (add note that deassign is possible as well, in case you are not interested in events)</p> <p>Comment on 13 of 7.4.6 Should be removed.</p> <p>Clarify note on 28.</p> <p>Updated in 664.</p>	
		664		Ericsson	Update of 522	
		523	CR 29.198-4 : Storing eventCriteria	Ericsson (Ard-Jan MOERDIJK)	<p>New data type (tpAddressRange) also used in part 5. Should go to commonData</p> <p>Subaddress IS needed still for getCriteria. Name should also stay as criteria? (related to any-name contribution from BT)</p> <p>Suggestion: TpAddress unchanged TpAddressRange change by removing screening and presentation</p> <p>Update to be provided as 665, and to be seen by meeting still</p>	

		665		Ericsson	Update of 523. Approved.
		541	CR 29.198-4 : Corrections to GCC STD	Nokia (Matti SAARENPAÄ)	Change 4.1.1.1, transition to 'finished' state instead Agreed; update 660 Set Advice of Charge in active state also applies to common specification.
		<u>660</u>		<u>Nokia</u>	<u>Update of 541 (minor correction): last sentence of 4.1.1 changed.</u> <u>Approved.</u>
		591	CallNotificationType should not be a part of the event criteria	Lucent (Gareth CARROLL)	DataType indicates on which party the application is acting. For most notifications originating/terminating is already implied by the eventName. In case of common events like CallAttempt(authorized), Released, midCall events, the callNotificationType is needed explicitly to indicate whether the application is interested in terminating or originating party.  Independent service instances can work on originating and terminating parties  Contribution not agreed  Suggested now, after this discussion, to remove the callNotificationType, and make the eventName explicit for terminating/orginating where applicable (see above), e.g. OrginatingCallAttempt  Will be included in the draft resulting from 521/606, and brought back to the meeting (662) (only for MPCC)

		592		Lucent	<p>Agreed not to disarm the 'redirected' event</p> <p>Application initiated call redirection; with immutable legs we agreed that an application creates a new callLeg and routes it.</p> <p>In case of Call Redirection initiated by the network, if the Gateway creates a new CallLeg for such scenarios as well, and an application does not arm the 'redirected' event, the control of the call is lost without the application being aware.</p> <p>This contribution proposes to change only the address on the callLeg, in case of network initiated callLeg redirection. This approach is agreed.</p> <p>Sequence diagram also agreed</p>	
		606	Introduction of the Call Leg STD	Telcordia (John-Luc BAKKER)	Covered with 521	
		607	Missing TpCallAppInfoSet description	Telcordia (John-Luc BAKKER)	Agreed (was in IDL already) , updated to (CR) 543.	
		608	Clarify Redirection support	Telcordia (John-Luc BAKKER)	<p>Application initiated case agreed, with the note changed into:</p> <p>"In case the application intends to redirect a call, rather than to create a new call leg, it should include a value for the field P_CALL_APP_ORIGINAL_DESTINATION_ADDRESS of TpCallAppInfo"</p> <p>Network initiated call forwarding/direrting, not accepted, 1.1.3 and onward, not accepted.</p> <p>Updated to 544 (CR).</p>	
		594	addition of text descriptions to methods enableCallNotification and createNotification	Lucent (Gareth CARROLL)	<p>Proposal to define order as well, first handle pure call notifications before call notifications in interrupt mode</p> <p>This addition not agreed, contribution is agreed</p> <p>532 will be proposal in CR format</p>	
		583	Specify behaviour when call leg times out	Lucent (Gareth CARROLL)	<p>Premature disconnect should refer to call leg as well.</p> <p>Agreed. Needs to be brought into CR format, update in 533</p>	

		609	Removal of FAULTY state	Telcordia (John-Luc BAKKER)	<p>Timer expiry reported via callEnded method, so callFaultdetected method not needed anymore.</p> <p>Question whether TpCallFault still needed for GCC. Yes, it is. Therefore move dataType back to GCC data type section instead of removing it.</p> <p>Agreed with this change. Update in 542.</p>	
		610	Clarification of continueProcessing usage	Telcordia (John-Luc BAKKER)	Covered in discussion already....	
		611	Addition to allowed methods tables	Telcordia (John-Luc BAKKER)	Covered in discussion already...	
		629	Charging Related Issues	Alcatel (Frans HAERENS)	Overview of contributions, done.	
		640	CR 29.198-4 : Final reporting	Ericsson (Ard-Jan MOERDIJK)	Agreed	
		641	CR 29.198-4 : Additional call errors	Ericsson (Ard-Jan MOERDIJK)	Agreed	
		642	CR 29.198-4 : Additional UI errors	Ericsson (Ard-Jan MOERDIJK)	Withdrawn; covered already via resource_unavailable	
		648	CR 29.198-4 : Inclusion of TpMediaType in TS 29.198 - 4	Ericsson (Ard-Jan MOERDIJK)	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Put it in common call control data section (and consequently delete from multimedia section in ETSI document)</p>	



		651	CR 29.198-4 : Exception for multiple address requests	Ericsson (Ard-Jan MOERDIJK)	<p>In brackets not needed</p> <p>Why not use invalid address?  Agreed to use invalid address exception instead?  Or need distinction between invalid address (invalid format) and non-allocated address (no subscriber behind correct number)?</p> <p>After discussion became clear that unknown_subscriber covers more, also application not authorized to use (so made unknown to application)</p> <p>Comment:  Invalid address should be covered in addition where unknown subscriber already is there (if not already there)</p> <p>However, after discussion it became clear that Call notifications are defined only in address ranges rather than explicit addresses (a set of addresses), it will be difficult to identify non-authorized numbers WITHIN that range</p> <p>Contribution therefore withdrawn. Discussion relevant for Mobility however...</p>	
					<p>Next comes a proposal to use streams instead of channels to allow for bi-directionality that is needed (e.g. SIP is by nature bi-directional), by means of a set of contributions going over section 8 and proposing corrections to the different parts in this line.</p>	
		625	Media streams versus channels (Section 8.1 update).	Alcatel	<p>Modifications proposed in the sequence diagrams for support of bi-directional streams. Also createMedia is changed (in line with previously agreed change).</p> <p>In some cases H323 has been deleted and replaced by SIP. The idea is that it is an example, and a SIP example is more suitable. Agreed that a note will be added clarifying this: it will be in the introduction of 8.1.</p> <p>Noted that this allows for going back to the unidirectional case; this will be seen more clearly in later contributions.</p> <p>Agreed, need CR.</p>	

		626	Media streams versus channels (Section 8.2 update).	Alcatel	<p>Same changes as reflected in the class diagrams. Some renaming has been done as well: open/close channel -&gt; add/subtract a media stream.</p> <p>Agreed, need CR.</p>	
		622	Media streams versus channels (Section 8.3 update).	Alcatel	<p>Same changes (channel -&gt; media stream) as reflected in the interface class specifications (sections 8.3, 8.3.1-7).</p> <p>In 8.3.6 one TpChannelSet has been skipped and should be corrected.</p> <p>Other typos (e.g. page 2, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 3<sup>rd</sup> change mark) resulting from copy&amp;paste should be corrected.</p> <p>New version number 632, <del>need CR</del>.</p>	
		624	Handling of Media Stream Notifications.	Alcatel	<p>Addresses changes required in Create/destroyMediaNotification, and the additions changeMediaNotification. Associated changes in types as well, in line with the general proposal described above. Additional text has been included as well.</p> <p>Agreed, need CR.</p>	
		623	Media streams versus channels (Section 8.5 update).	Alcatel	<p>Corresponding changes in data type definitions.</p> <p>Agreed, need CR.</p>	
		627	Corrections to the Conference Call Control Service.	Alcatel	<p>Changes resulting Conference Call Control due to inheritance from MPCC and the changes above. These changes in CCC come automatically in Rose due to inheritance. Also included are minor changes that were not automatic due to name changes.</p> <p>Agreed, need CR.</p>	

		662	Introduction of Call Leg STD and action tables	Ericsson	<p>Based on contributions 520, 521 and 606</p> <p>Remark on the initial notification versus trigger wording Removal of getmedia Keep attach:detachMedia Simplifying disarming table</p> <p>It is also for 3GPP (to be expected because last plenary it was accepted that the behaviour of the API was stable except for this, to be presented next).</p> <p>CR for 3GPP will have document number 694.</p>	
		602	Comments on Redirection contribution 544	Lucent	<p>Email from Andy. Revises the agreements resulting from the discussion on 544, and proposes some text for routeReq and createAndRouteCallLegReq.</p> <p>Approved. CR will be 612.</p>	
6.4	User Interaction					
		652	CR 29.198-5 : Exception for multiple address requests	Ericsson (Ard-Jan MOERDIJK)	Withdrawn.	
6.5	Mobility					
		649	CR 29.198-6 : Additional mobility exceptions	Ericsson (Ard-Jan MOERDIJK)	<p>(note: there used to be another 649, now renumbered to 657).</p> <p>Location info may be requested from several issues and some requests may fail. Exceptions are missing in some cases (statusReportReq and triggeredStatusReportingStartReq).</p> <p>CR front page needs to be modified; also contents to include just there two methods. New number 670.</p>	
		650	Additional exceptions in emergency user location	Ericsson (Ard-Jan MOERDIJK)	<p>Same as the one before but in independent contribution because it's out of the scope of 3GPP.</p> <p>P_PARAMETER_MISSING shouldn't been there because we've deleted this exception. Also descriptions in brackets have been moved to section on exception definition.</p> <p>New version 671.</p>	

6.6	Data Session Control				
		653	CR 29.198-8 : Exception for multiple address requests	Ericsson (Ard-Jan MOERDIJK)	Withdrawn.
6.7	Terminal Capabilities				
6.8	Content-based charging				
		500	N5-010500-CR-Error-Correction-Charging	Ericsson (Koen Schilders)	<p>Objection: only necessary for individual transactions. In creation of session appl description is only for info. TpAppInformation contains additional info (timestamp) =&gt; preference to have the same data type for all appl description; good for backward compatibility if extending.</p> <p>See 549.</p> <p>First change agreed. For second see discussion in 549. New document number 557.</p>
		501	N5-010501-CR-Changed-Semantics-Of-CloseReservation-Paramter	Ericsson (Koen Schilders)	<p>Questions on the CR format: CR category F, needs to be reflected in introduction. "Consequences if not approved" need to be re-phrased too.</p> <p>Check if this change needs to be reflected in STDs.</p> <p>New version 558.</p>
		502	N5-010502-CR-Additional-Errors	Ericsson (Koen Schilders)	<p>Comments on front page: "Current version" should be the last version approved by CN plenary (since it is a 3GPP CR). Also intro need alignment with CR being F.</p> <p>Proposal agreed. New number 559 with changes in CR format.</p>
		503	N5-010503-CR-Move-correlationID-into-TpAppInformation	Ericsson (Koen Schilders)	Withdrawn because of changes in proposal in 500.

		504	N5-010504-CR-Clarification-of-Unit-Reservation	Ericsson (Koen Schilders)	<p>Raises problem of unit consolidation if user does not do reservations, and later credits&amp;debits, in the same unit. Proposal to enhance textual description so that it's clear that the charging service does not do this consolidation.</p> <p>Objection: is this editorial? There is an error associated to this. But for appl developers it's more clear if it is written explicitly in the method description; there is also a unitID type.</p> <p>Agreed that this clarification is necessary, but not located where it is proposed: agreed to have it in section 8 (top of CBC interface class descriptions).</p> <p>Consequences if not approved: interoperability issues. Category should not be editorial.</p> <p>New number 560.</p>	
		548	29.198-12: Supplement to TpCHSParameterSet and TpVolumeSet	Siemens (Karsten Luetzge)	<p>Q: how do percentages deal with units of different types? A: good point, we leave the percentage for rel5, but still proposed to remove P_CHS_PARAM_RESULT.</p> <p>Agreed to re-write with only first proposal, leave second for Rel5. New number 668, needs CR.</p>	
		549	29.198-12: Changes in: Incorporation of TDoc #441, Removal of Out Parameters	Siemens (Karsten Luetzge)	<p>Also from San Diego agreement (see 500) Description+string + appl info elements (keys); also used in debit and credit methods for description of structured info instead of string; only createChargingSession keeps unstructured parameter.</p> <p>Question: the use of it? Use of adding a time stamp to the creation of a charging session? Answer: included for similarity with other methods.</p> <p>Agreed to change at least the parameter name, if not the type (continues as a string). Agreed new name sessionDescription.</p> <p>Second proposal: modify the order of parameters for similarity with rest of methods. Agreed.</p> <p>New version (CR) number 666 (CR number to be assigned by Adrian later).</p>	

		550	29.198-12: Editorial Changes	Siemens (Karsten Luettge)	Two proposal: first name changes on seqdiag (already agreed on Ericson's ***). Second a clarification making more explicit that only a single outstanding request is allowed at a given time. See discussion on 556, this will be included in 667.	
		556	N5-010556-CR-Addition-of-Request-Number-in-Result-Methods	Ericsson (Koen Schilders)	<p>Proposal to add a request number for correlation purposes.</p> <p>Q: is there a req for this number to be unique? A: should be unique within the session. Within one session there can only be one outstanding request (though parallel sessions are possible).</p> <p>Agreed that this is intended to prevent e.g. double debit, then no need to have the parameter added to lifetime management methods.</p> <p>Contribution also proposes a modification of parameter order already agreed in Siemens' contribution.</p> <p>New number 667.</p>	
		654	CR 29.198-11 : Exception for multiple address requests	Ericsson (Ard-Jan MOERDIJK)	<p>Revised into new contribution proposing as well to add P_INVALID_ADDRESS.</p> <p>New number 669.</p>	
6.9	Other Interfaces					
7	Outgoing liaisons					
8	OSA version 1 mapping					
8.1	status of 12075					
		487	N5-010487_29998-Rel4_status_2001-06.zip	MCC		
8.2	contributions					
		540	CR 29.998-4-1 : Updates and corrections to data mapping to CAP	Nokia (Matti SAARENPAÄ)	Agreed.	

		660		Nokia	Update of 541 (minor correction): last sentence of 4.1.1 changed.  Approved.	
		628	API to INAP Mapping for User Interaction Service	Alcatel	Agreed to delete some notes, marked in red in the document, that propose some intended enhancements for which contributions were not made.  To be updated to 706. Frans will send update to Adrian.	
		647	Correction of logical entity in message flows from mapping documents	Ericsson (Ard-Jan MOERDIJK)	The contribution suggests that mapping documents contain message flows where the box in the middle is misleading: it should show an entity having on one side the gsmSCF interface and on the other side the specific SCF interface. This box then conforms to a Service Capability Server on top of the gsmSCF interface.  It recommends a new graphic representation for all message flows.  Suggestion to change SCF->OSA SCF, but it is a lot of modifications in all mapping documents, so it is not discussed to include in the introductions a statement that says that SCFs are OSA SCFs, and SCSs are OSA SCSs.  Agreed that any of these proposed changes are too much work for this version.  Deferred to a future version.	
		307	Mapping for MPCC	Ericsson	Document from San Diego  Based on current mapping for GCC, made to fit the MPCC with the restrictions that CAMEL implies (e.g. two call legs).  It does not take into account recent changes to MPCC, so it need to be revised. Up to Ericsson to decide if they bring it to our next meeting.	

8.3	SPAN OSA version 1 mapping				<p>Ray Forbes (SPAN14 chair) introduces this activity: mapping of the OSA API capabilities into SPAR (Service Provider Access Requirements). SPAR requirements are published in a series of ETSI guides, but some things were lacking and it was also found that the original document was out of date. Frans was invited to do the exercise of checking the API specs with the requirements.</p> <p>It was agreed that the joint group is the one for API related work, so SPAN14 could delegate it and just do a final review.</p> <p>It is intended to have an alignment with the 3GPP requirements for Europe, and that we also have requirements coming from ETSI before the specification for version 2.</p>	
		621	N5-010621Alc6SPAR_API.zip	Alcatel (Frans HAERENS)	<p>The requirements check includes ALL requirements in the initial document.</p> <p>Based on this mapping a number of issues have been identified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The exceptions, routing failure and responses respectively handled by routeReq(), routeErr() and eventReportRes() need to be clarified.</li> <li>2) The event report list should include the call event authorised reports for originating and terminating calls.</li> <li>3) The call legs created for the different notifications by receipt of a reportNotification() need to be defined.</li> <li>4) The charging should be considered with regard to the setChargePlan() method concerning the tariff handling also addOnCharge() and request and report charging information methods needs to be specified</li> <li>5) The semantics of the callAborted() method need to be explained, is a callLegAborted() method not required?</li> </ol> <p>This will be the basis for input for version 2.</p>	
9	Approval off DES/SPAN-120070					



10	Preparation of input draft for creation of STF for DES/SPAN-120070 conformance specification work					
11	Technical discussions OSA version 2					
		509	Overview of Rel5 OSA and VHE requirements	CN5 vice-chair	Just for information. Noted.	
12	Organizational aspects					
12.1	Review of 3GPP OSA workplan					
12.2	3GPP OSA Work Item Description	485	Rel5 OSA Stage 3 - Draft Building Block level Work Item Description	SA5 Vice Chair/ MCC	Discussion on this deferred to next meeting, where WID discussion will take place using also input from SA1 VHE and OSA, not available at the moment.	
12.3	further work on 12076					
12.4	further work on 12075					
12.5	Future meetings				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>September: Munich, four days of 11-14.</li> <li>October: Brighton, 15-18, co-located with CN1-4.</li> <li>December: 3-6, host to be decided, or could be last week of November co-located with CN1-4 (Cancun, Mexico).</li> </ul> Need to discuss whether we need 5-days meeting in the future.	
13	AOB					

		477	LS from ITU-T SG11 on API	TB Officer	<p>A reference document has been created in May on API work in different bodies. Jane was present in the review, where it was agreed that it is best to have limited information in the document and rather links to the specifications of each bodies.</p> <p>The purpose of the LS is that we provide them with both information and feedback on their document.</p> <p>Jane prefers to set up an informative web page rather than a reference document, which is more formal and difficult to keep updated.</p> <p>Jane proposes to have the document read by the meeting participants, and distributed to others in Parlay and JAIN. We can gather comments and prepare a response during next meeting. The deadline for our response is in November.</p> <p>Concerns that this document should not be a recommendation, though understood the need to make this information more widely known.</p> <p>Agreed that we invite comments and proposals for next meeting.</p>	
--	--	-----	---------------------------	------------	---	--