

Technical Specification Group Services and System Aspects  
Meeting #11, Palm Springs, CA, USA, 19-22 March 2001

**TSGS#11(01)0176**

Technical Specification Group Services and System Aspects  
Meeting #11, Palm Springs, CA, USA, 19-22 March 2001

**TSGS#11(01)0159**

---

**3GPP TSG S2**  
**26<sup>th</sup> of February to 2<sup>nd</sup> of March, 2001**  
**Gothenburg, Sweden**

**S2-010798r2**

**Title:** Liaison Statement on IMS Service Provision

**Source:** 3GPP TSG SA2

**To:** 3GPP TSG SA, 3GPP TSG SA WG 1, 3GPP TSG CN WGs 1-5

**Cc:**

Contact : Alexander Milinski (Siemens)  
[Alexander.Milinski@icn.siemens.de](mailto:Alexander.Milinski@icn.siemens.de)

---

3GPP TSG SA2 thanks SA, SA1, CN1-4, and CN5 for their LS given in S2-010321 (=SP-000696), S2-010658 (=S1-010248), S2-010303 (=NJ-010107), and S2-010695 (=N5-010089) on IMS Service Provision. SA2 discussed the subject on Service Provision for the IM Subsystem and came to the following conclusion which is brought to the attention of SA, SA1 and CN working groups:

Besides the Cx interface SA2 agreed on a single standardised protocol to be supported by the S-CSCF for service control. Guidelines for further details are summarised in a new chapter to 23.228. This details are given in S2-010797 which is approved by S2 and attached to this LS.

3GPP TSG SA2 will continue to work further on this issue.

**Source: Siemens**  
**Title: Generic Service Provisioning Architecture**  
**Document for: Approval**

---

## Introduction

The subject of Service Provisioning for IMS Services was heavily discussed at SA2#17. This contribution tries to summarise the “commonality” expressed by companies (Alcatel, British Telecom, Ericsson, France Telecom, KPN, Lucent, Marconi, Motorola, Nokia, One2One, Siemens, Vodafone) involved in the discussion (in and/or outside of the meeting).

## Proposals

1) It is proposed to delete the following text from section 4.2.4 of 23.228:

~~Three potential interfaces to provide services were identified:~~

- ~~—CAP: This interface provides CAMEL based services offered on the CAMEL CSE platforms. They are invoked by a Service Switching Function (SSF) and supported by the CAP protocol. A “softSSF” in (or on top of) the CSCF is required for mapping of the SIP state machine in CSCF to the CAMEL BCSM. This interface allows support of legacy CAMEL services.~~
- ~~—SIP: This interface provides all services offered by SIP application servers and SIP based Multimedia service platforms. These services are directly invoked by the CSCF as a SIP server itself. This interface shall not prevent the serving CSCF from retaining control of the call.~~
- ~~—OSA: This interface provides all applications that are independent from the underlying network technology, and are delivered via the use of an open standardised API. When the CSCF to Service Platform interface is between a network and a third party platform, the OSA API can be used as is. Conceptual changes may be needed if OSA has to be used as an interface between two networks, as it was not originally intended for this purpose. For example, the location of the OSA Framework may be impacted or the security mechanisms may be altered. The mapping of the OSA API to the underlying network capabilities is not subject to standardisation.~~

~~Editor's Note: The choice for standardisation of interfaces is FFS.~~

2) It is proposed to introduce a new chapter to 23.228 between 4.2.3 and 4.2.4 giving principle guidelines on the Service Provision Description.

## x.y.z Generic Service Provision Description

The following statements shall guide the further development.

- 1) Besides the Cx interface the S-CSCF supports only one standardised protocol for service control purposes: SIP+
- 2) Guidelines for SIP+ are needed; SIP+ is based on the SIP protocol information with necessary enhancements to allow for service control; controversial enhancements should be avoided.
- 3) The depicted functional architecture does not propose a specific physical implementation.
- 4) Scope of the SIP Application Server: the SIP Application Server may host and execute services. It is intended to allow the SIP Application Server to influence and impact the SIP session on behalf of the services and it uses SIP+ to communicate with the S-CSCF. Further details are needed.
- 5) The S-CSCF shall decide if a SIP session request is subject to inform a service. The decision at the S-CSCF is based on (filter) information received from the HSS (or other sources, e.g. application servers). To identify the service to be informed is based on information received from the HSS.

- 6) The purpose of the IMSSF is to translate SIP+ to CAP and to hold the needed functions to do that.
- 7) The IM SSF and the CAP interface support legacy services only.

The figure below depicts an overall view of how services can be provisioned.

