Joint-API-group (Parlay, ETSI Project OSA, 3GPP TSG_CN WG5) N5-030007
Meeting #22, Bangkok, THAILAND, 27 – 31 January 2003

Source: JWG Chair Team

Title: Draft Report of CN5#22, Bangkok, THAILAND, 27 – 31 January 2003

Agenda item	Agenda item title	Tdoc 3GPP N5-020	Title	Source	Result
1	Opening and approval agenda				
		30000	Proposed agenda	N5 chairman	Approved.
2	Allocation of documents				
		30001	Document allocation	N5 chairman (Ard-Jan Moerdijk, Ericsson)	Approved.
3	Reporting				
3.1	CN5/SPAN12/Parlay, Dublin				
		21007	Draft Report of CN5#21	ETSI OSA Project leader, CN5 vice chairman, CN5 Chairman	Ultan raises a comment on one of Jörgen's documents. N5-0201033 requires two CR revisions in 1139 and 1159. In the current draft 1159 is missing. This needs to be reflected in the report. Updates required to N5-021008, Chelo.
		30071	Summary of work done	ETSI chair, Chelo Abarca	Summary of all documents and discussions approved on the e-mail exploder. There are still some open items, on which we need to decide this meeting how to proceed. For some issues for which no e-mail agreement was reached, documents are submitted to this meeting.
3.2	3GPP CN and SA plenary				

		30009	Draft Report of CN#18	CN	Draft report of CN#18 plenary. There were comments on the CN5 proposal to not produce CRs for each and every plenary, but every other plenary. - From CN plenary: o As we assessed that our APIs are getting more mature and in order to have more stability, our idea was to bring-in only 2-times a year CRs to previous releases. This raised some discussion and we got valid feedback. o It was mentioned that it can be a challenge to synchronise CRs when they impact the same area. o Experience within CN1 learned there are two main problems: 1. How do delegates know that there is already a CR in a certain area, in order to prevent double or overlapping work. 2. One easily creates dependency between CRs (CRs on top of other CRs). This can lead to difficulties if a CR, that was used as base for another, is rejected. o Furthermore, the Organisation Partners in 3GPP (ETSI, ARIB, T1, etc) usually take the outcome of the 3GPP December plenary as snapshots for their releases. Now that we decided not to bring in CRs to the December 2002 plenary the Organisational Partners need to take our stuff from September 2002. o It was also pointed out that a certain level of flexibility is necessary. E.g. when suddenly a lot of essential error corrections are needed we should be able to release them. We responded that this is certainly the way we see it as well. o Finally it was pointed out that in the end it should be CN that decides about this. o During the discussion I raised the idea that we produce after each meeting the overview per specification of all CRs. (These are the CR overview documents Adrian produces for each plenary). This can then be used to check whether there has been a related CR already in a certain area. Of course it then helps that we have very clear titles for CRs. o Conclusion was that in March we need to come with statistics: number of CRs but especially

		30015	Draft Report of meeting #18 - version 0.0.3	SA	Draft report of SA#18 plenary. - From SA plenary: o Concerns on the impact of CR061 (provides detailed requirements as to the capabilities for an OSA application relating to IP Sessions. The subclause that describes the IP Session function is being changed to provide a clear indication of the meaning of an "IP Session". This can be a flow OR a set of flows defined by a source and destination IP address/port and destination) on architecture were raised by Ericsson (and later supported by Nokia) and time for SA WG2 to consider this was requested. The SA WG1 Chairman stated that (for Rel-6) the requirements could be studied by other groups after approval in SA WG1, and removed if not acceptable. There was support for this requirement at the meeting and these CRs were approved. SA WG2 were asked to look into the implications and feasibility of implementation of this requirement at their next meeting and provide feedback to SA WG1 and TSG SA. o Freezing date for Rel-6 functionality: It was considered necessary to have a firm idea of the completion of Stage 1 and Stage 2 specifications and the progress and time needed to then develop the Stage 3 specifications and finalise the details of the specification set. The need for the new Rel-6 features should also be considered in order to choose the optimum timing with respect to stability and content should be analysed from the Market viewpoint. A target date for June 2003 was thought premature with the current progress, and the Work Plan manager undertook to provide estimates of what could be included for different deadlines (June 2003, September 2003, December 2003 and March 2004) in order to be able to make a decision on a preliminary target for Rel-6 at TSG SA meeting #19. It was recognised that the accuracy of the estimates provided are dependent on the accuracy of the timescales provided by the WGs and specifically the Rapporteur for the individual WIs. Members were asked to ensure that accurate and complete information is provided to MCC on the Work Plan.

		30057	List of agreed CRs not implemented	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI	A list of all the technical contributions, which propose modifications to our specifications, which we have agreed in previous meetings, but which have not yet been implemented. We have agreed the changes, we have not agreed when to implement them, i.e. for which plenary. Eamonn: It is difficult to locate the latest version of the IDL, having different versions of the specification, at different version levels. I.e. currently we're not updating non-changed parts, there can be different versions in a single release. Parlay and 3GPP do this differently. Conclusion => Add something to OSA web page (ETSI) to properly identify each part of each release, taking into account the latest version of each. Separate discussion: We need to prove to CN plenary that the number of approved and colliding CRs BEFORE December and AFTER December is zero (0). That implies that the current list in document N5-030057 is not suitable. The data needs to be presented in the following granularity: per paragraph, per specification.
3.3	Parlay BoD and TAC meetings				
		Vocal report		Richard Stretch/John-Luc Bakker	There is a 3GPP requirement for "OSA X", or APIs at a higher level of abstraction. Has Parlay discussed this? There was a Parlay TAC conference call on this in the middle of last year. At the time it was agreed to seek synchronization with the Parlay X WG. However, there was never an agreement whether Parlay X will be submitted as OSA X. This is on the Parlay TAC/BoD/JWG Mgt team meeting agenda for this week (Monday afternoon).
3.4	ETSI STF 211				
		30033			STF report to ETSI leadership, providing project status and accomplishments. Noted.
3.5	Other OSA related activities				

		30027	3GPP2 report	Roger Bunting	N5-030027 proposes a format on how to use the OSA specifications in 3GPP2 TSG-N. These documents are intended to be completed in 3GPP2 TSG-N meeting in two weeks. 3GPP2 intends to publish this as a spec identifying how to use OSA, or what to change when deployed in 3GPP2 networks, i.e. the delta document. The brief summary is: "Nothing needs to change". The specification includes a chapter for each of the OSA SCFs. This applies to Release 5. There are some expected differences in User Location, where there are some CAMEL specific parameters and data types. For now, the delta document states that the CAMEL mappings are not applicable. 3GPP2 experts are now scrutinizing the protocol details. This assessment may result in new requirements, but the intention is to avoid new requirements and to minimize any required changes. The expectation is that the differences, if any, will be implementation differences, rather than API differences. Possible example in UL: cell site vs. sector, or reversing low-to-high bit formatting/encoding. Regarding Release 6, these may end up as an annex to the specs, from a 3GPP point of view. New 3GPP2 requirements, if any, require the support of three companies. If 3GPP2 goes ahead and writes WIN UL APIs, these will not be applicable to 3GPP. It may either become e.g. Part 15, or e.g. a subpart to an existing part, like ULC in UL. Clarification: 3GPP2 requirements only need to go to 3GPP SA1 if they impact existing 3GPP specifications. Requirements can be socialized in the JWG. New 3GPP2 work item is expected to be approved 3rd week in February. Rel-5 discussions will be frozen, and Rel-6 discussions will have commenced. At the end of March, 3GPP2 is expected to have input for the new requirement(s). Timing issues are emphasized and reiterated, as 3GPP SA1 are in the process in finishing their requirements. Discussion: Would it be an idea to introduce a fast track strategy by contributing a new requirement to the stage 1 now stating something like "The set of APIs shall support 3GPP2 networks as well"? This would cover each piece of work. Conclusion: JWG recommends 3GPP2 to discuss in their next meeting this possible fast track solution. The next SA1 meeting is 24-28 Feb (cancelled) or 7-11 April OSA SWG meeting.

4	Liaison Statements				
		30010	LS on proposed list of core IMS specifications for Access Independence	CN1	LS on proposed list of core IMS specifications for Access Independence, a response to LS S2-023124rev2 on LS on proposed list of core IMS specifications for Access Independence from WGx, Rel-6. Work Item: IMS Access Independence and Commonality, Source: CN1, To: SA2, Cc: CN3, CN4, CN5. Noted. No need to send a courtesy LS for confirmation. Jane volunteers to act as lead for this monitoring activity (status reporting).
		30011	LS on proposed list of core IMS specifications for Access Independence	SA2	LS on proposed list of core IMS specifications for Access Independence, Rel-6, Work Item: IMS Access Independence and Commonality, Source: SA2, To: CN1, CN3, CN4, Cc: CN5. No direct impact on CN5 specifications identified. Some impact eventually may result from 23.218. Agreed to monitor the reply from CN1. Noted.
		30012	Liaison statement on Interoperability Issues and SIP in IMS	SA3	Liaison statement on Interoperability Issues and SIP in IMS, Response to: LS S3-020480 (N1-022160) and LS S3-020485 (SP-020627) on Liaison Statement on Interoperability Issues and SIP in IMS, Release 5, Work Item: IMS-ASEC, Source: SA3, Cc'ed to CN5. Noted.
		30013	Clarifications on the User Data Management Function	SA1	Clarifications on the User Data Management Function, Response to: LS (N5-021155/S1-022227) clarification of User Data Management requirements from CN5, Rel 6, Work Item: OSA3, Source: SA1, To: CN5, SA2. Background: This is related to our LS for clarification on UDM to SA1. SA1 has addressed the CN5 concerns, and are requesting SA2 to perform the necessary architecture work to include UDM Function in the overall OSA architecture. Noted.

		30014	Re: LS on OSA support for MMS	T2	Re: LS on OSA support for MMS, Response to: LS (S1-022072, T2-020871) on OSA support for MMS, REL-6, Work Item: OSA3, Source: T2, To: SA1, Cc: CN5. The LS, among other things, questions whether any work needs to be done on this topic at all, considering the efforts in OMA. Given the fact that there is not yet an official liaison relationship between 3GPP and OMA, it is the PCG role to determine if some body of work is performed in our organisation or not. For the time being, we have approved SA1 stage 1 OSA requirements for the support of MMS. The meeting believes it is for SA1 to respond to this LS regarding the organizational and requirements issues. Noted.
5	OSA version 1 / Rel. 4				
		30042	Addition of Support of National Numbering Plans	Marconi	Parlay/OSA does not currently make allowance for national specific numbering plan variants. Although there is the option of using P_ADDRESS_PLAN_ANY however, the disadvantage of using this option is that all the other elements of TP_ADDRESS will be ignored which means that screening and presentation information will not be available. This contribution proposes to add the enumeration P_ADDRESS_PLAN_NATIONAL to TpAddressPlan. This Tdoc was already approved in Dublin, requiring a CR. Approved.

		30048	Correction of status of methods to interfaces in clause 7.3	ETSI STF (Peter Schmitting)	N5-030048 was originally submitted as N5-020869 to CN5#20, Miami. The document was discussed and approved with no changes, as part of a series of similar documents (most of which required updates). An equivalent document for Rel-5, N5-020874, was discussed and approved with no changes. But the Miami meeting report makes no mention of N5-020869. And since the meeting report is now approved, technically the document was never discussed and was therefore never approved. Hence, it is being re-submitted to this meeting for approval. Approved.
		30050	Corrections to User Interaction	ETSI PTCC (Ultan Mulligan)	Introduction document to N5-030051 and N5-030052. In Dublin, there was a proposal to change a parameter name of a method to align it with other similar methods. The question arose as to whether this would introduce a backwards incompatibility, i.e. were parameter names visible across the CORBA interface? Ultan was unable to discover if changing parameter names introduces a backwards incompatibility, and there has been no e-mail discussion on this. This proposal was on one of three proposed changes. The other two present no problems, so these are now re-introduced in N5-030051 and N5-030052.
		30051	Corrections to User Interaction	ETSI PTCC (Ultan Mulligan)	See discussion in N5-030050. Approved.

		30060	Application HA support using callback	Eamonn Murray (AePONA)	TDoc N5-021092 was submitted to CN5#21 in Dublin in order to highlight the limitation within the current API with respect to supporting application high availability by means of additional application instances and additional call-back mechanisms. Additional application call-backs are supported within the SCSs, whereby an application may use setCallBack and notification provisioning mechanisms supported within the API to create a secondary call-back to an identical application instance or image that may be used in the event of application fail over. However no such mechanism for informing the framework of the additional application instance or image is available. This limitation results in a dependency on a purely middleware based approach to ensure highly available applications, and consequently a significant risk of interoperability problems as a consequence of differing middleware behaviour and functionality. Note that although the primary motivation for this proposal is to ensure application high availability, any solution may be equally applicable to ensure support for additional application instances with a view to supporting load sharing between gateway and applications. AePONA propose to rectify this solution by ensuring that the framework may also be made aware of the existence of a secondary application image or instance. The use of a 'setCallBack' style solution as used within the SCSs was considered inappropriate as it could result in many changes to Framework Interface classes. However the obtainInterfaceWithCallBack mechanism, upon which all Framework – Application, and Framework – Service Integrity Management functionality is reliant, does not currently support any client application or service identification. This issue is further described in the related Tdoc submitted to the CN5#22 meeting in Bangkok, N5-030XXX Integrity Management and Service Instance Issue. AePONA believe that this related issue must also be resolved before reaching a final solution to providing support for application high availability. The solution proposed here assumes that existing Application and Framework message sequences are re-used between primary and secondary application instance, with the addition of sufficient identification so that the Framework can reconcile between primary and secondary and allow application recovery. Question: does this make a new requirement necessary?

		30061	Integrity Management and Service Instance Issue	Eamonn Murray (AePONA)	This document is an invitation for further discussion. Framework Integrity Management functionality is supported through interfaces established using the obtainInterfaceWithCallback method. This method is tightly coupled to the client or service access session with the framework rather than using explicit identification. AePONA believes that the current specification is ambiguous and could result in framework and service interoperability problems, or potentially an inability to support Integrity Management functionality. It is believed that this is a fairly significant issue. Federated Frameworks might have even further implications. The basic question is at what level do we need to provide management (fault, load) information. Pointed out if we need to reconsider this such far, then we might consider as well the original requirements and the information that would be really needed here. AePONA would like to propose that the Framework Integrity management is revisited in order to ensure a complete specification. In order to do this AePONA propose the following: 1. Review the Management Model. Agree what management functionality is necessary at a service, service instance, client, client instance and framework (framework instance for federated Frameworks?) is needed. 2. Once the requirements are agreed, resolve the issue of identification. Either agree on unique parameter based identification (Explicit), or continue with a hidden (Implicit) identification mechanism based on the access session. 3. Based on 1 and 2 above make corrections to the API to clarify the functionality of the API and behaviour of the framework, client and service. Suggested that the way forward with the least impact is to have multiple access sessions. However, this document is an invitation for further discussion. Suggested that Andy and Gareth should also be involved as they have been looking into this during the finalisation of Parlay 3.0. Proposed to have drafting session during next meeting.

		30062	Rel 4 CR 29.198-03 report current load	Eamonn Murray (AePONA)	When load notifications are enabled or resumed, currently there is no initial load report. Changes in load subsequently result in load reports in which the current load is reported. In the absence of an initial load report it is not possible to determine whether the load condition is improving or worsening. This contribution proposes to support an initial report on load status in response to enabling or resumption of load requests. For all methods that enable or resume load notifications modify behaviour to ensure that an initial load report is produced in the following way: the loadLevelNotification() method shall be invoked on the application in order to provide a notification of current load status, when load notifications are first requested, or resumed after suspension. Question: wouldn't the first method invocation be the same as the initial value? Answer: no because the model is relative – the method is invoked only when the load changes. Question: how can an app distinguish such a change from the initial one? Answer: the proposal is that the mechanism stays as it is for the applications, but that the framework provides a initial report as well. Question: does this change the way the parameters are used? Answer: no, only the behaviour. Question: is this necessary? A queryLoadReq can be done before calling loadLevelNotification() with the same result. Answer: yes but in the proposed way the app gets a full load report, which is a more complete load management mechanism. Besides the alternative above is not a consistent use of the data types (the response is a list of all statistics, and not just the current load level). Also the Framework needs to provide this info to different entities (applications, services, others,…) and it would be useful to be able to know where the request comes from. Also with the proposal things are simpler for applications. Question: "Consequences if not approved" in the CR is not right, because there is a way to do it (although it is not a well designed solution). Answer: "load management" will be changed to "load level notification".

		75			Update of 62. For email approval.
		30064	Rel 4 CR 29.198-05 correct datatype TpUIEventInfo	Eamonn Murray (AePONA)	The reportNotification method on IpAppUIManager interface uses the TpUIEventInfo parameter to pass the notification data to the application. The current data type restricts this data to a TpString encoding thereby making it unsuitable for USSD or Binary encoded data notifications. This contribution proposes to correct the TpUIEventInfo data type to support flexible User Interaction notification encoding using a TpOctetSet. Question: why a TpOctetSet? Answer: for consistency in UI data types – TpOctetSet is already used in UI. The obvious candidate, TpOctetList, is not used in UI. Question: is there anything in the CORBA marshalling that would result of danger because of using TpOctetSet? Question: what are the reasons why TpString is not suitable for USSD or Binary encoded data notifications? Answer: with TpString there is no guarantee that it will be transmitted untouched (TpString maps to CORBA String, which gets mangled), and TpOctet is defined in CORBA precisely for being transmitted as it is over the wire. Question: wasn't there a related contribution in a previous meeting? In that case, what was the solution agreed? The reason to know is that the proposed change is not BC. Answer: 750 from Montreal, we changed a tag data type where there was no problem to add a new element. Answer: no matter the proposal it will be non-BC, except if we use deprecation. And it seems deprecation is the only way because we need to be BC. Conclusion: Eamonn to revive the discussion by email to try to find a change that is more BC. Revised to 77.
		77			Update of 64. For email approval.

		30093	add TpMultiMediaCallLegIdentifierSet	ETSI PTCC (Ultan Mulligan)	TpMultiMediaCallIdentifierSet is a datatype which is used and referenced in ES 201 915-4, but is not defined in that document, or in any other part of the OSA specification set. The type is present in the IDL and WSDL code, but not in the Word document. The proposal is to Add TpMultiMediaCallIdentifierSet to the list of data types in clause 8.5 (Multi Media Call Control Data Types). This applies to Parlay 3 / Release 4 (but not for the 3GPP documents). Approved.
6	OSA version 2 / Rel. 5				
		30037	OSA2 UML-to-WSDL Scripts	Nortel Networks (David Tweedie)	This document contains the UML-to-WSDL Rational Rose scripts used to generate the OSA WSDL Schemas. Nortel is granting the scripts to JWG royalty free, to use and maintain as they see fit. These scripts are provided as is. Nortel Networks claims no responsibility for these scripts nor provides any form of support. The JWG thanks David Tweedie, and Nortel, for their contribution to this body of work. It is as of yet unclear what the future use of the scripts will be, given the activities in the Parlay WS WG and the WSDL style guide. In Parlay WS WG there is an effort to generate WSDL Style Guide conformant WSDL from the IDL, rather than from the UML, as done in the Nortel scripts. This decision is ultimately up to the Parlay TAC.

		30041	Charge Plan in Generic Messaging	Incomit (Thomas Svensson)	This contribution suggests the addition of a method allowing the application to indicate how much a subscriber should be charged for a message. Is it possible to use existing charging data-types, e.g. TpChargePlan ? At least it should be TpOctetSet. Call control charge plan might be a bit too complex in the messaging case. Suggested to update the description of the chargePlan to indicate that this will only be generated when the message was successfully delivered. How is this mapped to operations in the core network? Answer: it would not be mapped, it is for putting information on CDRs generated locally by the messaging SCF. Wouldn't it be better then to use the Content Based Charging for this functionality? Thomas will investigate this further and will make a revised contribution that can be discussed over e-mail.
		30043	Addition of Support of National Numbering Plans	Marconi	Mirror of N5-030042. Approved.
		30046	Adding the appAvailStatusInd() and svcAvailStatusInd() methods	Incomit (Anders Lundqvist)	N5-030046 was originally proposed as N5-020752. It was an update of N5-020706, presented at CN5#19, Montreal. It was requested for e-mail approval, the document was produced, made available on the last meeting day in Montreal by Anders, but never sent on e-mail approval. It is presented again here for completeness. The only changes in N5-030046 compared with N5-020752 are on the front page: a new header, and a new version number of TS 29.198-03 being referred to. Shouldn't datatype TpSvcUnavailReason not be deprecated? Suggested that the procedure is that when we remove methods data types that are then no longer needed are removed as well. Approved.

		30052	Corrections to User Interaction	ETSI PTCC (Ultan Mulligan)	See discussion in N5-030050, this is the mirror for N5-030051. Approved.
		30055	Promotion of TpDataSessionQosClass dat type definition to the Common Data Types	Lucent	QoS class reporting functionality has been included in Multi Media Call Control, reusing a data type from Data Session Control. This has now become a common data type. More explanation and background is included in N5-030056, release 6. Approved.
		30063	Rel 5 CR 29.198-03 report current load	Eamonn Murray (AePONA)	See discussion on 62. Updated to 76.
		76			Update of 63. For email approval.
		30065	Rel 5 CR 29.198-05 correct datatype TpUIEventInfo	Eamonn Murray (AePONA)	See discussion on 64. Revised to 78.
		78			Update of 65. For email approval.
		30066	Rel 5 CR 29.198-02 Exception Hierarchy align with Java Realizations	Eamonn Murray (AePONA)	CR to correct the Exception Hierarchy in order to align it with Java Realisation. With respect to the change in the last paragraph: at the moment in the IDL the exceptions in TpCommonExceptions are not raised individually as they are only carried as integer and description. Does that have an impact as what is described leads to ungrouping of the existing group in TpCommonExceptions. Further discussion needed over e-mail. Will be updated to 85.
		30085			Update of 66. For email approval.
		30067	Rel 5 CR 29.198-04-4 Correct TpMediaStreamDataTypeRequest	Eamonn Murray (AePONA)	The current datatype TpMediaType is not guaranteed to have a discreet value (since logical 'OR's are allowed) it is therefore unsuitable to be the discriminator in a Tagged Choice of Data Elements, such as TpMediaStreamDataTypeRequest. The change is not backward compatible. However, the maturity level of MMCC is at a lower level than e.g. the MPCC and therefore we can accept this. Approved.

		30068	Java API publication	Eamonn Murray (AePONA)	Information document about the view of AePONA on how the continuation of Java APIs should be handled now that SUN has dropped support for JAIN SPA. The issue has been discussed in the TAC/BoD and the recommendation is that the Java rulebook will be published in part 1 of the specification and in the other parts there will be, instead of a reference to the JAIN SPA APIs, a Java version of the API based on the rules from the Rule book. The exact statement from the TAC/BoD was: "Java APIs for Parlay will use the published Parlay UML. These JAVA APIs will be defined by applying the JAVA API realisation Rules to the UML. The Parlay/OSA API overview document (part 1) will include the 'Rules' produced by the Java Realisation group. The Java APIs will be published through the JWG CR process. Each part of the Parlay/OSA specification will include an annex referencing the published Java API. Initially the Java APIs will be informative." As there were two volunteering companies that would come with the actual contributions and we have explicit requirements for more technology realisations than just CORBA, we agree with the proposal from the TAC/BoD. The discussion next turned to the observation (that we have since long and put forward several times) that there is no real reporting on what has been discussed in TAC/Bod for the Parlay members. Furthermore, there should also be a formal process on reporting on all JWG related issues from the TAC/Bod side to the JWG. What will be the role of the Realisation group when the rule book becomes part of our specifications? Current idea is that the Realisation group will dissolve and we will become responsible for the rules. However, this has to be further discussed when also the status of the Java Realisation group has become more clear at the end of the week. Observation that when now we get more technology realisations, there is a risk that e.g. the Java version gets out of synch. However, we are better off then before as with JAIN SPA being responsible for the Java API, the risk was much higher that we would be out of synch. Noted.

		030094	Add TpMultiMediaCallLegIdentifier		Rel5 CR corresponding to 93. The document name is wrong – it says call leg instead of call. Agreed it is not worth changing. Approved.
7	OSA version 3 / Rel. 6				
7.1	Requirements				

		30035	ETSI Phase 3.0 Third Party API Requirements	BT (Richard Stretch)	New version of the requirements. 5.2.1: Federation of FW has been accepted by SA1 now, this should be reflected. It was mentioned that we already discussed this and the feeling in general was that no changes in the specification are needed. Maybe a sequence in the spec would be sufficient then to implement this. 5.3.1: QoS notifications: we found out that this was already in our requirements and therefore we can remove it from here. 5.3.2: Optimal routing. This was a company proposal. When this was presented there was no consensus. Shouldn't we add an indication on what the status is of a Requirement? Agreed that since there was no follow up for this proposal we remove it. 6.1: Information Services: in Dublin we had some outstanding questions that we have not yet put in a LS. However, as there has been no contribution we feel that we should not spend time on this further for the time being. This relates to the planned LS in 72. The original intention of doc 72, to ask SA1 about the freezing status of the requirements, we withdraw and change to give a status overview and show the gap between the requirements and the actual stage 3 contributions. From the Biarritz SA1 plenary we had the agreement that when after 2 meetings there was no real contribution the requirement could be removed. 6.2 Information Transfer is deleted. 6.5-6.6 User data management: we got clarification in LS 030013 on this requirement and a new description. Suggested that this clarification should be added to the document. It could also be added in the document that there is further clarification pending as the GUP work is done in several groups. We have requested SA1 before on the relation between 6.5 and 6.6 and got clarification on this. This we should also look into and consider to be added in the document. 6.9 This requirement was discussed in SA plenary and it was pointed out that architectural work needs to be done on it. This means that we have to wait for SA2. 6.10 In case Joe does not come with new text, this can be deleted.

7.1.1	Input from SA1				
7.1.2	Parlay				
7.1.3	ETSI SPAR				
7.1.4	Others				
		30053	Introduction in Parlay architecture of Service Coordination Management Function	NTT	See the discussion of 89.

		30089	Presentation of 30053	NTT	Architectural requirements on Service coordination between Network operator and Service Provider. Question: is a Service Component the same as an SCF or can it be part of the application side? Answer: it is comparable to an SCF, but the difference is that it can also be at the application level. The basic idea is to enable one application to use information or functionality from another application. Clarification on slide 6 where it is mentioned that pattern 3 (SPs coordinating with each other) is out of scope: out of scope means here that it is supported to coordinate between different SPs, but than through the NSP. Would this imply that to fulfill this we need to register applications in the Parlay/OSA FW? That would conflict with the philosophy of 3GPP, where the idea is not to standardise applications. Question on whether it is mainly information or functionality that one application needs from another application. Answer, it is functionality. Basically what is sought here is something similar to what JAIN SLEE provides or have applications as SCFs or web services. Shouldn't we also look at feature interaction as one application might be requiring information or functions that another one is working on. Pointed out that in relation to this, operators have requested for functionality that supports plug and play with multiple applications and this seems to be missing in Parlay/OSA. Pointed out as well that the required functionality might be supported through policy management. Invited that the contribution will further be discussed over e-mail and will be carried to the next meeting. The question to be addressed is if the functionality sought for can be solely in the Parlay GW or if more is needed. Furthermore, it was suggested to work out an example or use case. Noted.

7.2	Presence and Availability Management				
			96	Guda	This informative document contains the gap analysis between the 3GPP R5 Presence APIs from CN5 with respect to the 3GPP R6 Presence Requirements. The goal of this document is to encourage further study and invite contributions to address the gaps. (Note: 3GPP TS 22.141 V6.1.0 is the latest version of the 3GPP requirements for Presence as published by SA1). 3GPP TS 29.198-14 is the 3GPP Presence APIs in Release 5 as published by CN5 ETSI ES 202 915-14 is the ETSI 2.0 Presence and Availability Management APIs published jointly with Parlay as Parlay v4.0). Note that there are some requirements for Presence Service that are potentially satisfied by the Framework. Feedback from Framework experts is welcome. This could be an issue to address in the FW ad-hoc, if there is one. Note that the requirement for identity provisioning may already be satisfied by the ETSI 2.0 PAM in the Identity Management APIs which is not included in the 3GPP Presence APIs in the existing specifications. The idea now is to fill in these gaps via contributions. Another PAM pending issue was the mapping. For this a contribution has been approved last SA plenary – a CR to our stage 2 document. The actual protocol mapping needs to wait until the stage 3 work is ready. Jane to monitor the progress of the stage 3 specs in CN1. Guda will have a look at the Presence WID and make sure we're addressing all the issues there. Guda has checked the stage 1 doc and believes there is no need to modify it because the level of detail is not as high as these gaps.
7.3	Call Control				

		30038	Advanced End User Presentation	Telcordia (John-Luc Bakker)	Multi Party Call Control's support for controlling and inspecting public user identity information is limited. The TpAddress structure consists, amongst others, of a name and an address field. The address field's value is used for routing purposes. The name field's value is used for presentation if allowed and mapped. Presently, TR 29.998-04-4 [1] does not map the name field. SIP, ISC, and 3GPP TS 23.228 support a more advanced separation of public (optionally to be exposed to the participants in the call) identity and routing information. Examples are web pages with additional information, iconified pictures, or business cards (for example, in vCard [3] or LDIF [4] formats.). Personalization of services and operator control over this is an important feature. It is felt that the current MPCC service and its derivates do not exploit the full capabilities of personalization of 3G networks. Hence, it proposed to extend the MPCC API. The authors have ensured that the new features can be mapped to SIP/ISC. Question: how would this be used? What use is the information retrieved, which could be proprietary? For example an iconized picture, would it be a URL or what? Answer: deployment depends on what the operator supports; the operator can indicate what properties are available to be set (there is a property to indicate which properties can be set of get). Question: but this proposal is totally open, can be anything and it is not know in advance. How can an application know how it should interpret the values of these properties? Answer: they are straightforward mappings to what is defined in SIP, and only to be used as strings. Question: then it should be explicitly stated. It is not enough if this is in the mapping document, because the proposal is not limited to SIP. Answer: a possibility would be to explicitly define the properties, and indicate what format they're in and whether they are available in this type of network or not. Question: two opposing examples have been given – for instance a "from" property and an "icon/business card" property. Also it needs to be explained how to interpret the value field in the methods. Answer: this is covered by the suggestion above to have a list of properties and their values.

		84			Update of 38. For email approval.
		30054	Completion of Lucent QoS Reporting Additions to MMCC	ETSI PTCC (Ultan Mulligan)	Introduction document. Unlike other SCFs, there is no mechanism in MMCC to request reporting of specific event types. Previously only 2 events could be reported, but with the addition of a third in N5-021113, a mechanism to request a specific event is needed. A proposed solution for this was to be approved by e-mail, but was never produced. Therefore N5-030056 introduces this in order to complete the QoS Reporting changes. Noted.
		30056	Promotion of TpDataSessionQosClass dat type definition to the Common Data Types	Lucent	See also discussion in N5-030055. Agreed. New discussion: CN5 has not yet discussed which plenary we will submit the release 6 CRs to. We will maintain a living document (based on Ultan's xls spreadsheet) to track/log all agreed CRs. This will be a WG internal document. The discussion on release 6 CRs is postponed to agenda item 13, organizational aspects.

		30058	New methods for floor control in CCC	Ericsson (Samer Hawwa)	With the explanation of Samer over e-mail, it becomes clear that we had the assumption that there can be only one speaker in a conference. However, this is not 100% defined in the spec. So, in case there can be more speakers, like Samer is suggesting, we should cleanup the appointSpeaker and define a few conference policies to indicate whether e.g. the floor defaults back to the floor, the number of speakers. These policies then also define the interaction between revokeFloor and appointSpeaker, as was requested in Dublin. Pointed out that in case there is no chair (whether it be an application or a real person) then some of the methods are not applicable. This is at the moment not explicit in the specification. A non chaired conference seems furthermore very similar to a MultiParty Call. Suggested that we also improve the description on the implication of the policy (chaired or non-chaired). Suggested to improve the definition of the conference policies. A policy is needed to indicate what happens with an empty floor, to indicate if the chair always has the floor, and to indicate the number of people that can have the floor. How about selecting a new chair? Or are we assuming that the chair will be the chair for the life-time of the conference. Suggested to further work on a more rigorous definition of how the CCC should be used. The methods as such are ok. To be continued. Updated to 90.
		90			Update of 58. For email discussion.
7.3.1	Call Control – UI discussions				
7.4	Framework				

		30047	Rel-6: continued discussion on event notification extension	Ericsson (Erwin van Rijssen)	In AePONA contribution 61 it is pointed out that there are issues with Service and ServiceInstances. This might have implications to this contribution. However, pointed out that this contribution only deals with Service Registration (on Service Supplier level) and there might be no impact. Discussion on whether the ServiceID is the correct level that is needed here, should it perhaps be ServiceType ? As during registration, the FW returns a ServiceID to the Service that is to be registered, ServiceID is the correct level. Pointed out that in the list 10.2 it still mentions Service Instance ID in stead of Service ID. We forgot to correct it. Is it really useful to inform when Service is not completely backward compatible, in other words only use this for complete backward compatible Services ? Answer, this depends on the operator policy, and as there is also a lifetime for a migration, there is no problem with this. In P_MIGRATION_REQUIRED, fourth paragraph it says 'only one value permitted..' where in fact it is a set. This should be rephrased. Last paragraph in all properties, the statement should be strict and read "shall" in stead of should. Furthermore, needs to be CR, Updated to 30091
		91			Update of 47 in CR form. Changes approved. CR front page needs some corrections (editorial, plus some clauses affected are missing). Updated to 97.
		97			Update of 91. For email approval.

		30069		Telcordia	The TpAuthMechanism description references authenticate where it should reference challenge. Therefore the description of TpAuthMechanism is not correct. A CR is needed, and agreed it is also for Rel5 because TpAuthMechanism is new in Rel5, and since the change proposed is BC and it is wrong, it should be changed. Contents agreed. The Rel 5 CR will be 83.
		83			Update of 69. Note that this is a Rel5 CR. Approved.

		30070		Telcordia	With the introduction of the initiateSignServiceAgreement and the mandatory sequencing of method invocations, state was introduced in the "Service Agreement Management Interface Classes". It is mandated that the application requests the FW to invoke signServiceAgreement() on its "IpAppServiceAgreementManagement" instance through initiateSignServiceAgreement(). Subsequently, the application is allowed to invoke initiateSignServiceAgreement() on the FW's IpServiceAgreementManagement. Such a mandatory sequence is not shown in Section 7.4.2 "Service Agreement Management State Transition Diagrams". This contribution seeks to include such a state transition diagram; as a consequence, the signServiceAgreement() can raise a TpCommonExceptions.P_INVALID_STATE if the FW is not in the correct state for handling the application's signServiceAgreement. The proposed STD proposes that there is a state where the FW is has received the result of the signServiceAgreement invocation on the IpAppServiceAgreementManagement and is now validating the response. If the signature is invalid, the service token is invalidated through transitioning silently to the Invalidate service token state. It also proposes how to deal with the raise condition when signServiceAgreement is invoked before it is allowed. The change proposed is BC, and it is only proposed for Rel6. Question: how does it propose to deal with the raise condition? Answer: if the application invokes signServiceAgreement when the FW is in the Valid Signature State, then the FW raises an exception INVALID_STATE. Comment: the problem addressed in that the application does not know when it is allowed to invoke signs. But the solution proposed is not in line with the way we usually do STD – it introduces very transient states, which are the view of the FW, and not the application as we usually do. - define a specific exception for when the app invokes signServiceAgreement too soon (as the only change, not including the proposed STD), - or introduce another method, equivalent to initiateServiceAgreement, that the FW invokes on the application when invoking signServiceAgreement is allowed.

		82			Update of 70. Note that this is a CR to Rel5. First sentence needs some grammar corrections. Approved.
7.5	Policy Management				Session with Sheryar and Bharat Kumar (both Lucent) on the phone. This session is dedicated to contributions for the new Policy Management Rel6 requirements.
		30080	Background to N5-030045	Lucent	This is a companion document to the main document 'Proposed Extensions to the Parlay Policy Management Specifications, explaining what changes are proposed in the latter and where.

		30045	Proposed Extensions to Parlay Policy Management Specifications	Lucent	Sheryar starts with an introduction to Policy Management. Question: the updates of variables and other updates, are they still under transaction control? Answer: yes. Question: does it make sense to create a new interface for evalPolicy in case there are some future extensions, and also because the entities that do the evaluations are different from those that do the rest? Answer: yes, this is for further discussion. Question: but the way we design we group functionality with commonality and it doesn't seem to be the same here. Answer: willing to discuss if an alternative solution is proposed. Ard-Jan and John-Luc will work together on a proposal for this. Question: there seems to be a discrepancy between the informative document distributed in Dublin and the extensions proposed – how the result is communicated to the application that requested evalPolicy. Answer: evalPolicy is for synch communication, and no relation to event notifications also used in PM. The apparent discrepancy is not really one, will be re-edited. Question: it is sufficient to have only synchronous methods? Answer: some scenarios done show it is, if others are found that need otherwise it will be enhanced. Agreed to see those scenarios for next meeting. Agreed to add asynchronous methods too. Question: there is a typo in the example, where two methods are used which are not introduced in the specs (setGroupNames and setRules). Answer: it is only a supporting example but it could be added to the specs; if so it will be corrected. Question: usage of globalCash - what if two SCFs have the same variable name or type? John-Luc has more comments, and he will send them out by email. Proposal to describe some use cases and also discuss how to separate evaluation from the rest of PM, so they one can be

		30039	Simple and complex data types	TelCordia (John-Luc Bakker)	Telcordia proposes to postpone it for email discussion or next meeting, because already in Dublin the meeting believed that the data types proposal in 39 and 45 should be consolidated. Lucent does not agree because it does not believe consolidation is possible. Therefore the document is discussed. Question: for conditions and expressions this contribution is fine, but it lacks the context for evaluation of policy rules. How can it work together with the rest of the PM specs in terms of evaluating rules, since they would be affected? Answer: will be considered and if any contention is found they will be addressed.
7.6	User data Management and User data security management				
7.7	Network function for MMS				
7.8	Support of LCS User privacy				
7.9	Generic Network Interface function				
7.10	Information Services				
7.11	Retrieval of Visited Network capabilities				
7.12	Common Part				
		30073		Telcordia (John-Luc Bakker)	In the Common Types there are references to a data type called "Numbered List of Data Elements" which is not defined anywhere. Also, there is a difference between Sets of Data Elements and Lists of Data Elements: Sets are unordered and contains no duplicates, where as Lists are allowed to contain duplicates and can assume order. Reminder: this was never defined; we didn't need it until we got PAM and Policy Management. If agreed a CR is needed, and it should be clause 5.2.5 because we usually avoid renumbering clauses, in case somebody refers to them. JL to prepare the CR. Since it is a very late contribution (Monday) discussion will continue on the contents when the CR is available. It will be Tdoc 81.

		81			Update of 73. Note that this is a Rel5 CR. Approved.
7.13	Other APIs				
8	Parlay Opening Plenary				
9	Election of CN5 Chairman				
		30034	Revised Voting List	MCC Adrian Zoicas	Noted.
		30049	Nomination of Chelo ABARCA for the position of chair person of CN5	Alcatel	Chelo was elected. Chelo announced her resignation as ETSI SPAN OSA Project leader, to be made officially next SPAN Management conference call. Call for nominations for ETSI SPAN OSA Project leader is thus open. Call for nominations for second vice chair is also open.
10	Discussions on the compliance statements				
11	ETSI STF test specs				
		30020	Draft DES/SPAN-120088-1	ETSI OSA STF	Test Suite Structure and Test Purposes (TSS&TP) Part 1. If and when these documents are approved, that will close off the activities of the STF. The STF has about a week of funded time left to perform updates, etc. The ICS document has already been approved in the last meeting. At the moment there is no immediate plan to continue this work for Release 5, nor for the application side interfaces. Funding to do this is requested for June, by ETSI SPAN (which will continue to include an OSA Project after the re-organization currently under discussion). The entire batch will go up for ETSI SPAN e-mail approval by correspondence, 3-week period.
		30021	Draft DES/SPAN-120088-2	ETSI OSA STF	Test Suite Structure and Test Purposes (TSS&TP) Part 2 This is an empty dummy, to preserve the part numbering.
		30022	Draft DES/SPAN-120088-3	ETSI OSA STF	Test Suite Structure and Test Purposes (TSS&TP) Part 3 Submitted late.

		30023	Draft DES/SPAN-120088-4	ETSI OSA STF	Test Suite Structure and Test Purposes (TSS&TP) Part 4 Submitted late.
		30024	Draft DES/SPAN-120088-5	ETSI OSA STF	Test Suite Structure and Test Purposes (TSS&TP) Part 5
		30025	Draft DES/SPAN-120088-6	ETSI OSA STF	Test Suite Structure and Test Purposes (TSS&TP) Part 6
		30026	Draft DES/SPAN-120088-7	ETSI OSA STF	Test Suite Structure and Test Purposes (TSS&TP) Part 7
		30028	Draft DES/SPAN-120088-8	ETSI OSA STF	Test Suite Structure and Test Purposes (TSS&TP) Part 8
		30029	Draft DES/SPAN-120088-9	ETSI OSA STF	Test Suite Structure and Test Purposes (TSS&TP) Part 9
		30030	Draft DES/SPAN-120088-10	ETSI OSA STF	Test Suite Structure and Test Purposes (TSS&TP) Part 10
		30031	Draft DES/SPAN-120088-11	ETSI OSA STF	Test Suite Structure and Test Purposes (TSS&TP) Part 11
		30032	Draft DES/SPAN-120088-12	ETSI OSA STF	Test Suite Structure and Test Purposes (TSS&TP) Part 12
12	Parlay Closing Plenary				
13	Organizational aspects				
			Discussion on CRs.		All CRs from this meeting, including those approved by email, go to the March CN plenary. Need to decide when to bring the first Rel6 CRs: we don't need to bring to Rel6 all parts at the same time. We need to take into account that the moment we bring a part to Rel6 we'll have three versions to maintain (the corresponding to releases 4, 5 and 6). Agreement: for existing parts: • March plenary: CRs to releases 4 and 5. Published corresponding Parlay versions. • June: CRs to releases 4, 5 and 6. No published corresponding Parlay versions. • September: no CRs to the plenary. No published corresponding Parlay versions. • December: CRs to releases 4, 5 and 6. Published corresponding Parlay versions including Parlay 5. New parts can have their own schedule. Parlay X: PX1 available 30 days after February 18. If necessary changes to be made next meeting (May 19-23). The June plenary is on June 4-6. John-Luc, Ultan and Martin Yates will discuss what is necessary to do to incorporate Parlay X in 3GPP specifications and whether there is time for the June plenary, and a decision will be reached by email.

		79		Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	The OSA specifications make specific reference to a number of IETF RFCs. A number of them have already been obsoleted.
					
					• Part 1 lists the following RFCs as being referenced in ES 202 915 (Parlay 4, 3GPP Release 5)
					
					  • IETF RFC 822: "Standard for the format of ARPA Internet text messages".
					  • IETF RFC 1738: "Uniform Resource Locators (URL)".
					  • IETF RFC 3261: "SIP: Session Initiation Protocol".
					  • IETF RFC 1994: "PPP Challenge Handshake Authentication Protocol (CHAP)".
					  • IETF RFC 2630: "Cryptographic Message Syntax".
					  • IETF RFC 2313: "PKCS #1: RSA Encryption Version 1.5". .
					  • IETF RFC 2459: "Internet X.509 Public Key Infrastructure Certificate and CRL Profile".
					  • IETF RFC 2437: "PKCS #1: RSA Cryptography Specifications Version 2.0".
					  • IETF RFC 1321: "The MD5 Message-Digest Algorithm".
					  • IETF RFC 2404: "The Use of HMAC-SHA-1-96 within ESP and AH".
					  • IETF RFC 2403: "The Use of HMAC-MD5-96 within ESP and AH".
					  • IETF RFC 2445: "Internet Calendaring and Scheduling Core Object Specification (iCalendar)".
					  • IETF RFC 2778: "A Model for Presence and Instant Messaging".
					
					• Part 2 refers to RFCs 1738, 822, 3261.
					• Part 3 refers to RFCs 1994, 2630, 2313, 2437, 2459, 1321, 2404, 2403.
					• Part 4-2 refers to RFC 3261.
					• Part 13 refers to RFC 2445.
					• Part 14 refers to RFC 2778.
					
					RFC 822 has been obsoleted by RFC 2822.
					RFC 2630 has been obsoleted by both RFC 3369 and RFC 3370.
					RFC 2313 has been obsoleted by RFC 2437 (both of which are used in Part 3).
					RFC 2459 has been obsoleted by 3280
					Should these obsoleted RFCs be replaced, and if so, when?
					
					Chelo will check with CN because they have had some

13.1	Review of 3GPP OSA Work Plan				
		30018	3GPP Work Plan	MCC – Adrian Zoicas	Need to update the completion rates. To be done offline by chairs and Adrian. Noted.
		30019	3GPP Work Plan – CN5 items	MCC – Adrian Zoicas	Noted.
13.2	3GPP OSA Work Item Description				
		74	WID	MCC – Adrian Zoicas	Needs updating considering the newly approved requirements.
13.3	Further work on 201 915				
13.4	Further work on 101 917				

		30044	Removing References to TR 101 917 (ETSI Mapping Document)	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC	Feedback from ETSI editors: ETSI ES 201 915-1 (Parlay 3) and ES 202 915-1 (Parlay 4) both make reference to the ETSI mapping technical report, TR 101 917 (ETSI work item DTR/SPAN-120075). Draft versions of parts of this report have been produced and presented in March to July 2001. But while work progressed on the 3GPP mapping document (TS 29.998), nothing further was done on the ETSI mapping documents. The draft versions have never been presented for approval to the JWG, and at this stage are long out of date compared with the 3GPP version. The latest status of these mapping documents is that they are suspended since September 2002. For most of them, draft versions exist since July 2001. For some, no draft version exists. All draft versions are currently available at: http://docbox.etsi.org/span/Open/Span12/Mapping/ To date, no decision has been taken whether to stop the ETSI work items for the mapping documents, or to produce the documents. Under ETSI Technical Working Procedures, if a work item has not been progressed for 1 year, it is automatically stopped. Exceptionally, we have avoided this automatic stop for these work items, but we cannot continue to do this if there is clearly not going to be any progress. This contribution proposes two actions to clarify the status of the ETSI mapping documents: • Stop the ETSI work item series DTR/SPAN-120075-1 to -12 (TR 101 917-1 to -12). • Make changes to ES 201 915-1 and ES 202 915-1 to remove all references to the ETSI mapping documents. For the parts that exist it is an option to re-edit the 3GPP docs as ETSI docs, but an editor would be needed for this. Agreed.
14	Outgoing liaisons				

		30072	LS to SA1 giving them a status overview and showing the gap between the REL-6 requirements and the actual stage 3 contributions.		For email approval.
15	Future meetings				Re-consider the number of future meetings considering the dates we promised in the WI approved last plenary. Even if Rel6 is delayed and this may mean a change in the WI dates. There is a Parlay/OSA conference in Singapore at the end of April and they have volunteered to host a meeting for us at the same time. Agreed that the location is not convenient. Currently agreed: May 19-23 San Diego (with CN groups and Parlay) July14-18 San Francisco (with 3GPP2) Issues that will most likely require work are Policy Management and Fw (for Java their plan is to submit CRs to the May meeting). For these two ad-hocs may be organize. They must be announced 6 weeks beforehand.
		30016	N5-030016 Full 3GPP meeting calendar including workshops	MCC – Adrian Zoicas	Noted.
		30017	N5-030017 SA_SA5_CN_CN5 meeting calendar	MCC – Adrian Zoicas	Noted.
16	AOB				
		30036	3GPP CR Database (overview of all CN5 CRs for a given release, for a given specification)	MCC – Adrian Zoicas	Noted.
		92	Report from joint SA1/T2 meeting on MMS Rel6 issues.	MCC – Adrian Zoicas	Noted.
		EightyEight		Musa	The JWG thanks Ard-Jan for his work and wishes him the best in his future.

Annex A: AGENDA

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

1.1 IPR (Intellectual Property Rights) declarations

The Chairman reminds the "Article 55: Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) Policy" of the 3GPP Working Procedures:

- Individual Members shall be bound by the IPR Policy of their respective Organizational Partner.
- Individual Members should declare at the earliest opportunity, any IPRs, which they believe to be essential, or potentially essential, to any work ongoing within 3GPP.
- Organizational Partners should encourage their respective members to grant licences on fair, reasonable terms and conditions and on a non-discriminatory basis.
- The PCG shall maintain a register of IPR declarations relevant to 3GPP, received by the Organizational Partners.

The Chairman invites the delegates to declare IPRs - relevant to the 3GPP - they are aware of.
The List of IPR declarations sorted by Organizational Partners can be found at:
http://www.3gpp.org/PCG/IPR_declarations.htm

2 Allocation of documents to agenda items : Monday morning

3 Reporting : Monday morning

3.1 CN5 #21 /ETSI OSA project/Parlay meeting, Dublin
3.2 CN and SA plenary
3.3 Parlay Board and TAC meetings.
3.4 ETSI STF 211.
3.5 Report of all other OSA related activities.
Items to be considered here are all other OSA related activities e.g. in SA1, SA2 and ETSI SPAN

4 Input liaison statements : Monday morning

5 Technical discussions OSA version 1 / 3GPP Rel.4

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 3.2 has been finalised, and backward compatibility has to be guaranteed, the assumption is that for error corrections in the scope of Parlay 3 / 3GPP Rel.4 only work arounds and documentation of the errors is allowed.

6 Technical discussions OSA version 2 / 3GPP Rel.5

After the finalisation of Parlay 4.0 and 3GPP OSA Rel-5, from now on 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 backward compatibility has to be guaranteed, the assumption is that for error corrections in the scope of Parlay 4 / 3GPP Rel.5 only work arounds and documentation of the errors is allowed.

6.1 Presence and Availability Management

6.2 Call Control

6.2.1 3GPP IMS related Call control
6.2.2 Other Call control issues (e.g. potential input from ETS group)

6.3 WSDL / SOAP / XML APIs
6.4 Framework (Framework security)
6.5 Policy Management
6.6 Other APIs

6.6.1 Content Based Charging
6.6.2 Terminal Capabilities
6.6.3 Others

7 Technical discussions OSA version 3 / 3GPP Rel.6

7.1 Requirements

7.1.1 SA1: OSA and VHE requirements

7.1.2 Parlay

7.1.3 ETSI SPAR

7.2 Different abstraction levels for OSA

7.3 Presence and Availability Management

7.4 Call Control

7.4.1 Call Control – UI interworking discussions

7.5 Framework

7.5.1 Migration support mechanism

7.5.2 Framework function for federation

7.6 Policy Management

7.7 User data Management and User data security management

7.8 Retrieval of Visited Network capabilities

7.9 Multi Media Messaging function

7.10 Enhanced user privacy in LCS

7.11 Generic Network Interface function

7.12 Information Services

7.13 Information Transfer

7.14 Access to IP Session information

7.15 User-application authentication function

7.16 Other APIs

8 Parlay opening plenary

See overall Parlay meeting agenda.

9 Election of CN-5 Chairman: Proposal to be done on Tuesday at 14hr00

10 Discussions on the compliance statements

Last meeting in Miami the mandatory/optional status of methods for Framework and Call Control have been determined. The idea here is that we review the outcome of continued contributions on other interfaces.

11 ETSI STF Test specs

Last meeting in Miami the Test Spec for UI was reviewed in detail. After this, the review work for the other parts was divided amongst delegates in the meeting and in Dublin we looked at the DSC. Here we will further discuss the results of the review work.

12 Parlay closing plenary: Thursday afternoon

See overall Parlay meeting agenda

13 Organisational aspects with relation to Joint activities

13.1 Review of 3GPP OSA workplan

13.2 3GPP OSA Work Item Description.

13.3 Organization of further work on ETSI ES 201 915 (Version 2)

13.4 Organization of further work on ETSI TR 101 917

14 Outgoing Liaisons

15 Future meetings : Friday morning

16 AOB : Friday morning

17 Close : Friday morning (12:00)

Annex B: List of Documents

	Document not available				
	Document available, not yet treated				
	Document available late, not yet treated				
	Document treated				
	Document replaced / superseded by a Revised Version				
	CN5#22, Bangkok, THAILAND, 27-31 Jan 2003				
Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Status/Abstract
N5-021007	Draft Report of CN5#21, Dublin, IRELAND, 28-30 Nov 2002	JWG Chair	3. Reporting	Report	Updated to N5-021008
N5-021008	Report of CN5#21, Dublin, IRELAND, 28-30 Nov 2002	JWG	3. Reporting	Report	Approved
N5-030000	Draft Agenda	JWG Chair	1. Agenda approval	Agenda	Approved
N5-030001	Document Allocation	JWG Chair	2 Tdoc# allocation	Tdoc	Approved
N5-030002	report_Monday	JWG Chair	n.a.	Report out	Noted
N5-030003	report_Tuesday	JWG Chair	n.a.	Report out	Noted
N5-030004	report_Wednesday	JWG Chair	n.a.	Report out	Noted
N5-030005	report_Thursday	JWG Chair	n.a.	Report out	Noted
N5-030006	report_Friday	JWG Chair	n.a.	Report out	n.a.
N5-030007	Draft Report of CN5#22	JWG Chair	n.a.	Report out	
N5-030008	Report of CN5#22, Bangkok, THAILAND, 27-31 Jan 2003	JWG	n.a.	Report out	
N5-030009	DRAFT MEETING REPORT v1.0.0. 3GPP TSG-CN#18 New Orleans, USA, 4th - 6th December, 2002	MCC	3. Reporting	Report in	Noted
N5-030010	LS copy from N1 to N5 : proposed list of core IMS specifications for Access Independence	N1-022488	4 Input LSs	LS in	Noted
N5-030011	LS copy from S2 to N5 : proposed list of core IMS specifications for Access Independence	S2-023124rev2	4 Input LSs	LS in	Noted
N5-030012	LS copy from S3 to N5 : Interoperability Issues and SIP in IMS	S3-020578	4 Input LSs	LS in	Noted
N5-030013	LS from S1 to N5 : Clarifications on the User Data Management Function	S1-022338	4 Input LSs	LS in	Noted
N5-030014	LS copy from T2 to N5 : OSA support for MMS	T2-020949	4 Input LSs	LS in	Noted
N5-030015	Draft 0.0.3 Report of meeting 3GPP SA#18, New Orleans, USA, 9-12 December 2002	MCC	3. Reporting	Report in	Noted
N5-030016	Full 3GPP meeting calendar including workshops	MCC	13. Future meetings	Tdoc	Noted
N5-030017	SA_SA5_CN_CN5 meeting calendar	MCC	13. Future meetings	Tdoc	Noted
N5-030018	3GPP post-TSG#18 Work Plan (15 Jan 2003)	MCC	13.1 Review of 3GPP OSA Work Plan	Tdoc	Noted
N5-030019	3GPP post-TSG#18 Work Plan (filtered on SA5 work items)	MCC	13.1 Review of 3GPP OSA Work Plan	Tdoc	Noted
N5-030020	Draft DES/SPAN-120088-1 OSA Test Overview	ETSI STF 211 (Ultan Mulligan)	11. ETSI STF test specs	TS	Noted

N5-030021	Draft DES/SPAN-120088-2 OSA Test Part 2	ETSI STF 211 (Ultan Mulligan)	11. ETSI STF test specs	TS	Noted
N5-030022	Draft DES/SPAN-120088-3 Framework OSA Tests	ETSI STF 211 (Ultan Mulligan)	11. ETSI STF test specs	TS	Noted
N5-030023	Draft DES/SPAN-120088-4 Call Control OSA Tests	ETSI STF 211 (Ultan Mulligan)	11. ETSI STF test specs	TS	Noted
N5-030024	Draft DES/SPAN-120088-5 UI OSA Tests	ETSI STF 211 (Ultan Mulligan)	11. ETSI STF test specs	TS	Noted
N5-030025	Draft DES/SPAN-120088-6 Mobility OSA Tests	ETSI STF 211 (Ultan Mulligan)	11. ETSI STF test specs	TS	Noted
N5-030026	Draft DES/SPAN-120088-7 Term Caps OSA Tests	ETSI STF 211 (Ultan Mulligan)	11. ETSI STF test specs	TS	Noted
N5-030027	Draft changes to the 3GPP 29.198-series as they are adopted for 3GPP2 networks	3GPP2 / Lucent (Roger Bunting)	2 Tdoc# allocation	Tdoc	Noted
N5-030028	Draft DES/SPAN-120088-8 DSC OSA Tests	ETSI STF 211 (Ultan Mulligan)	11. ETSI STF test specs	TS	Noted
N5-030029	Draft DES/SPAN-120088-9 GMS OSA Tests	ETSI STF 211 (Ultan Mulligan)	11. ETSI STF test specs	TS	Noted
N5-030030	Draft DES/SPAN-120088-10 CM OSA Tests	ETSI STF 211 (Ultan Mulligan)	11. ETSI STF test specs	TS	Noted
N5-030031	Draft DES/SPAN-120088-11 Account Mgt OSA Tests	ETSI STF 211 (Ultan Mulligan)	11. ETSI STF test specs	TS	Noted
N5-030032	Draft DES/SPAN-120088-12 Charging OSA Tests	ETSI STF 211 (Ultan Mulligan)	11. ETSI STF test specs	TS	Noted
N5-030033	Report & Output of STF 211	ETSI STF 211 (Ultan Mulligan)	11. ETSI STF test specs	Report in	Noted
N5-030034	Voting list for 3GPP TSG CN WG5 meeting #22	MCC	Organisational issue	Tdoc	Noted
N5-030035	ETSI Phase 3.0 Third Party API Requirements	BT Exact (Richard Stretch)	Rel-6	Tdoc	Updated to 088
N5-030036	3GPP CR database (overview of all CN5 CRs for a given release, for a given specification)	MCC	3. Reporting	Tdoc	Noted
N5-030037	ULM_to_WSDL_scripts	Nortel (David Tweedie)	Rel-5	Tdoc	Noted (Scripts provided by Nortel Networks used to generate wsdl from the OSA UML model.)
N5-030038	Advanced End User Presentation	Telcordia (John-Luc Bakker)	Rel-6	Tdoc	Updated to 084 as CR
N5-030039	Simple and complex data types	Telcordia (John-Luc Bakker)	Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted
N5-030040					
N5-030041	ETSI ES 202 915-09: add Charge Plan in Generic Messaging	Incomit (Thomas Svensson, Anders Lundqvist)	Rel-5	Tdoc	Noted. To be on the agenda of the next meeting (Addition of a method allowing the application to indicate how much a subscriber should be charged for a message).
N5-030042	CR 29.198-02 Rel-4 Addition of Support of National Numbering Plans - former N5-021152	Marconi (Jane Humphrey)	Rel-4	CR	Approved
N5-030043	CR 29.198-02 Rel-5 Addition of Support of National Numbering Plans (mirror of Rel-4 CR in N5-030042) - former N5-021151	Marconi (Jane Humphrey)	Rel-5	CR	Approved

N5-030044	Removing References to TR 101 917 (ETSI Mapping Document)	ETSI PTCC (Ultan Mulligan)	Organisational issue	Tdoc	Approved
N5-030045	Proposed Extensions to Parlay Policy Management Specifications	Lucent (Shehryar Qutub)	Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030046	CR 29.198-03 Rel-5 Adding the appAvailStatusInd() and svcAvailStatusInd() methods	Incomit (Thomas Svensson, Anders Lundqvist)	Rel-5	CR	Approved
N5-030047	Rel-6: continued discussion on event notification extension	Ericsson (Erwin van Rijssen)	Rel-6	Tdoc	Updated to 091 as CR
N5-030048	CR 29.198-04 Rel-4 Correction of status of methods to interfaces in clause 7.3	ETSI STF211 (Peter Schmitting)	Rel-4	CR	Approved
N5-030049	Nomination of Chelo Abarca (Alcatel) for the position of chair person of the 3GPP TSG CN WG5	Alcatel	Organisational issue	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030050	Corrections to User Interaction	ETSI PTCC (Ultan Mulligan)	Rel-4, Rel-5	Tdoc	Agreed
N5-030051	CR 29.198-05 Rel-4 Corrections to User Interactions	ETSI PTCC (Ultan Mulligan)	Rel-4	CR	Approved
N5-030052	CR 29.198-05 Rel-5 Corrections to User Interactions	ETSI PTCC (Ultan Mulligan)	Rel-5	CR	Approved
N5-030053	Introduction in Parlay architecture of Service Coordination Management Function	NTT/Parlay Member (Atsushi Iwasaki, Hideki Shina, Satoru Furukawa, Atsuyoshi Shirato, Tetsuyasu Yamada)	Rel-6	Tdoc	Annex in 089. Noted. To be on the agenda of the next meeting/progress by email.
N5-030054	Completion of Lucent QoS Reporting Addition to MMCC	ETSI PTCC (Ultan Mulligan)	Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030055	CR 29.198-02 Rel-5 Promotion of TpDataSessionQosClass data type definition to the Common Data Types	Lucent (Musa Unmehopa)	Rel-5	CR	Approved
N5-030056	CR 29.198-04-4 Rel-6 Add Mechanism to Request Specific Event Reports in MMCC	Lucent (Musa Unmehopa)	Rel-6	CR	Approved
N5-030057	List of agreed documents not yet implemented	ETSI PTCC (Ultan Mulligan)	Organisational issue	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030058	New methods for floor control in CCC	Ericsson (Samer Hawwa)	Rel-6	Tdoc	Updated to 090.
N5-030059	List of REGISTERED participants to CN5#22	MCC	1. Agenda approval	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030060	Application High-Availability support using callback	AePONA (Eamonn Murray)		Tdoc	Noted. To be on the agenda of the next meeting
N5-030061	Integrity Management and Service Instance Issue	AePONA (Eamonn Murray)		Tdoc	Noted. To be on the agenda of the next meeting
N5-030062	Rel 4 CR 29.198-03 report current load	AePONA (Eamonn Murray)	Rel-4	CR	Updated to 075
N5-030063	Rel 5 CR 29.198-03 report current load	AePONA (Eamonn Murray)	Rel-5	CR	Updated to 076
N5-030064	Rel 4 CR 29.198-05 correct datatype TpUIEventInfo	AePONA (Eamonn Murray)	Rel-4	CR	Updated to 077
N5-030065	Rel 5 CR 29.198-05 correct datatype TpUIEventInfo	AePONA (Eamonn Murray)	Rel-5	CR	Updated to 078
N5-030066	Rel 5 CR 29.198-02 Exception Hierarchy align with Java Realisation	AePONA (Eamonn Murray)	Rel-5	CR	Updated to 085 (not produced). Email approved 15 Feb 2003
N5-030067	Rel 5 CR 29.198-04-4 Correct TpMediaStreamDataTypeRequest	AePONA (Eamonn Murray)	Rel-5	CR	Approved
N5-030068	Publication of OSA/Parlay APIs in Java	AePONA (Eamonn Murray)	Rel-5	Tdoc	Agreed
N5-030069	Invalid referencing of authenticate	Telcordia (John-Luc Bakker)	Rel-6	Tdoc	Updated to 083 as CR
N5-030070	Missing state diagram for Service Agreement Management	Telcordia (John-Luc Bakker)	Rel-6	Tdoc	Updated to 082 as CR
N5-030071	Summary of work done between JWG meetings #22 and #23	JWG Chair (Chelo Abarca)	3. Reporting	Tdoc	Noted
N5-030072	LS to SA1 on clarification regarding self-imposed requirements deadline for Rel-6	JWG Chair (Chelo Abarca)	Rel-6	LS out	
N5-030073	Missing definition of "Numbered List of Data Elements" (29.198-02 Common Types)	Telcordia (John-Luc Bakker)	Rel-6	Tdoc	Updated to 081 as CR
N5-030074	Updated Rel-6 Work Item Description for OSA Stage 3 (NP-020537)	CN5/CN	Rel-6	WID	Noted

N5-030075	CR 29.198-03 Rel-4 Add report current load	AePONA (Eamonn Murray)	Rel-4	CR	Update of 062. Email approved 15 Feb 2003
N5-030076	CR 29.198-03 Rel-5 Add report current load	AePONA (Eamonn Murray)	Rel-5	CR	Update of 063. Email approved 15 Feb 2003
N5-030077	CR 29.198-05 Rel-4 correct datatype TpUIEventInfo	AePONA (Eamonn Murray)	Rel-4	CR	Update of 064. Email approved 15 Feb 2003
N5-030078	CR 29.198-05 Rel-5 correct datatype TpUIEventInfo	AePONA (Eamonn Murray)	Rel-5	CR	Update of 065. Email approved 15 Feb 2003
N5-030079	Update of IETF RFC References in the OSA Specifications	ETSI PTCC (Ultan Mulligan)	Rel-4/5	Tdoc	Noted
N5-030080	Background to N5-030045	Lucent (Musa Unmehopa)	Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted
N5-030081	CR 29.198-02 Rel-5 Invalid referencing of authenticate	Telcordia (John-Luc Bakker)	Rel-5	CR	CR based on 073. Approved
N5-030082	CR 29.198-03 Rel-5 Missing state diagram for Service Agreement Management	Telcordia (John-Luc Bakker)	Rel-5	CR	CR based on 070. Approved
N5-030083	CR 29.198-03 Rel-5 Missing definition of "Numbered List of Data Elements"	Telcordia (John-Luc Bakker)	Rel-5	CR	CR based on 069. Approved
N5-030084	CR 29.198-04-3 Rel-6 Advanced End User Presentation	Telcordia (John-Luc Bakker)	Rel-6	CR	CR based on 038. Email approved 18 Feb 2003
N5-030085	CR 29.198-02 Rel-5 Exception Hierarchy align with Java Realisation	AePONA (Eamonn Murray)	Rel-5	CR	Update of 066 (Email approved 15 Feb 2003). Not produced
N5-030086	3GPP Rel-6 TS 22127-620 Stage 1 Service Requirement for OSA	3GPP SA1	Rel-6	TS	Noted
N5-030087	3GPP Rel-6 TS 23127-600 Stage 2 VHE/OSA	3GPP SA2	Rel-6	TS	Noted
N5-030088	ETSI Phase 3.0 Third Party API Requirements	BT Exact (Richard Stretch)	Rel-6	Tdoc	Update of 035
N5-030089	Annex to 053 (Introduction in Parlay architecture of Service Coordination Management Function)	NTT/Parlay Member (Atsushi Iwasaki, Hideki Shina, Satoru Furukawa, Atsuyoshi Shirato, Tetsuyasu Yamada)	Rel-6	Tdoc	Annex to 053. Noted. To be on the agenda of the next meeting/progress by email.
N5-030090	New methods for floor control in CCC	Ericsson (Samer Hawwa)	Rel-6	Tdoc	Update of 058
N5-030091	CR 29.198-03 Rel-6 : continued discussion on event notification extension	Ericsson (Erwin van Rijssen)	Rel-6	CR	CR based on 047. Updated to 097
N5-030092	DRAFT Report of Joint S1-T2 SWG3 meeting on MMS Rel 6 issues	Chairman Michele Zarri	Rel-6	Report in	Noted
N5-030093	ES 201 915-4 Add missing TpMultiMediaCallIdentifierSet to Multi Media Call Control data types	ETSI PTCC (Ultan Mulligan)	Parlay 3 / Rel-4 (but not for the 3GPP documents)	Tdoc	Approved
N5-030094	CR 29.198-04-4 Rel-5 Add missing TpMultiMediaCallIdentifierSet to data types	ETSI PTCC (Ultan Mulligan)	Rel-5	CR	Approved
N5-030095	Preliminary DRAFT "Updated Rel-6 WID for OSA Stage 3" based on SA1's revised WID from SA#18 (12/2002)	CN5 Chair/MCC	Rel-6	WID	
N5-030096	Gap analysis of 3GPP TS 29.198-14 wrt 3GPP TS 22.141 V6.1.0	Teltier (Guda Venkatesh)	Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted
N5-030097	CR 29.198-03 Rel-6 : continued discussion on event notification extension	Ericsson (Erwin van Rijssen)	Rel-6	CR	Update of 91. Email approved 18 Feb 2003
N5-030098	List of incoming LSs to & outgoing LSs from the present meeting	MCC		Tdoc	Noted
N5-030099					
N5-030100					

Annex C: List of incoming LSs to & outgoing LSs from the present meeting

Tdoc list for your selected
This report contains 5 records

Meeting: N5-22
Target or copy filter: off
Destination filter: off
Done-filter: off

N1-022488	LS copy from N1 to N5 : LS on proposed list of core IMS specifications for Access Independence
S1-022338	LS from S1 to N5 : Clarifications on the User Data Management Function
S2-023124rev2	LS copy from S2 to N5 : LS on proposed list of core IMS specifications for Access Independence
S3-020578	LS copy from S3 to N5 : Liaison statement on Interoperability Issues and SIP in IMS
T2-020949	LS copy from T2 to N5 : Re: LS on OSA support for MMS

Doc	Title	Source	Type	Status
N5-030010	LS copy from N1 to N5 : proposed list of core IMS specifications for Access Independence	N1-022488	LS in	Noted
N5-030011	LS copy from S2 to N5 : proposed list of core IMS specifications for Access Independence	S2-023124rev2	LS in	Noted
N5-030012	LS copy from S3 to N5 : Interoperability Issues and SIP in IMS	S3-020578	LS in	Noted
N5-030013	LS from S1 to N5 : Clarifications on the User Data Management Function	S1-022338	LS in	Noted
N5-030014	LS copy from T2 to N5 : OSA support for MMS	T2-020949	LS in	Noted
N5-030072	LS to SA1 on clarification regarding self-imposed requirements deadline for Rel-6	JWG Chair (Chelo Abarca)	LS out	

Annex D: List of Participants

Chairman		
ABARCA Chelo	ALCATEL S.A.	FR
MOERDIJK Ard-Jan	ERICSSON L.M.	SE
ViceChairman		
UNMEHOPA Musa	Lucent Technologies B.V.	NL
PROJECT_MGR		
ZOICAS Adrian	ETSI Secretariat	FR
BAKKER John-Luc	Telcordia Technologies Inc.	US
BUNTING Roger L.	Lucent Technologies	DE
DINALE Liliana	ERICSSON L.M.	SE
HUMPHREY Jane D	MARCONI COMMUNICATIONS	GB
MULLIGAN Ultan	ETSI Secretariat	FR
MURRAY Eamonn	AePONA LTD	GB
RIJSSEN VAN Erwin	ERICSSON L.M.	SE
STRETCH Richard	BT Group Plc	GB
SULLIVAN Kieran	Openwave Systems (N.I.) Ltd	GB
SVENSSON Thomas	Incomit AB	SE

Number of Attendees: 14

Member of 3GPP (ETSI)					
Ms. Chelo Abarca	ALCATEL S.A.	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	FR	+33 1307 70469	chelo.abarca@alcatel.fr
Dr. Roger L. Bunting	Lucent Technologies	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	US	+1 630 979 5942	rlbunting@lucent.com
Mrs. Liliana Dinale	ERICSSON L.M.	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	SE	+15148026187	liliana.dinale@ericsson.ca
Ms. Jane D Humphrey	MARCONI COMMUNICATIONS	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	GB	+44 24 76564232	jane.humphrey@marconi.com
Dr. Ard-Jan Moerdijk	ERICSSON L.M.	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	NL	+31 161242777	Ard.Jan.Moerdijk@eln.ericsson.se
Mr. Eamonn Murray	AePONA LTD	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	GB	+44 28 90269188	eamonn.murray@aepona.com
Mr. Erwin Rijssen van	ERICSSON L.M.	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	SE	+31161242320	Erwin.van.Rijssen@etm.ericsson.se
Mr. Richard Stretch	BT Group Plc	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	GB	+44 1473 607487	richard.stretch@bt.com
Mr. Kieran Sullivan	Openwave Systems (N.I.) Ltd	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	GB	+44 28 9041 6329	kieran.sullivan@openwave.com
Mr. Thomas Svensson	Incomit AB	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	SE	+46 54 176705	thomas.svensson@incomit.com
Mr. Musa Unmehopa	Lucent Technologies B.V.	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	NL	+31 35 687 1684	unmehopa@lucent.com
Member of 3GPP (T1)					
Mr. John-Luc Bakker	Telcordia Technologies Inc.	3GPPMEMBER (T1)	US	+1 973 829 5062	jbakker@telcordia.com
Organisation partner representative (ETSI)					
Mr. Ultan Mulligan	ETSI Secretariat	3GPPORG_REP (ETSI)	FR	+33 4 92 94 43 88	ultan.mulligan@etsi.org
Mr. Adrian Zoicas	Mobile Competence Centre		FR	+33 4 92 94 42 21	adrian.zoicas@etsi.org