WG 5 Meeting #08, Scottsdale, Arizona, USA $18^{th} - 20^{th}$ December 2000.

Source: CN 5 Chairman

lucas.klostermann@eln.ericsson.se

Title: PROPOSED DOCUMENT ALLOCATION

Agenda item: 1

Document for: APPROVAL

Agenda item	Agenda item title	Tdoc 3GPP N5-00	Title	Source	Result	
1	Opening and approval agenda	300		CN5 chair	Comments on reporting during last two meetings Agreed to again do more on-line agreement capturing using updates to this document On-line or off-line updates to contributions themselves if applicable, distribute them as updates with new numbers, and capture that decision in this document allocation documen distribute 301 update during meeting	
2	Allocation of documents	301		CN5 chair	updated as 341 after Monday updated as 345 after Tuesday updated as 346 after Wednesday bit more worked out as 347 (final notes)	
3	Reporting					

3.1	CN5	326	MCC	326 including chair comments in revision marks to be updated with clarifications as TD 335 To be provided and E-mail approved still
3.2	CN plenary			report to plenary to be sent around via Email for next CN plenary 336 is report to plenary 337 is liaison on 23.127 maintenance
3.3	SA plenary			OSA stage 1 approved 3 CR's on 23.127 approved by SA plenary working procedure roughly as proposed in N5-242 approved. S1 requirements can go to N5 directly, S2 sometimes intervenes. work item inconsistencies with S1 latest draft. To be investigated S1 concern that N5 does not terminate work in time

3.4	S1 OSA AdHoc	S1- 000060	latest draft 22.127	SA1	Issues identified that require work from N5 for Release 4:	
					work will be done on eCommerce during this meeting	
					work will be done on mobility during this meeting	
					event notifications is a new section in 22.127. It will be clarified in liaison to S1 what is already covered, what is not, and where we require more clarification. Many notifications are already covered in the individual interfaces. It was clarified that S1 does not capture requirements per SCF anymore, since this is more an architectural issue.	
					create call and create PDP context. Mistake? No network support in R4 timeframe. Is it meant as CreateCall/IDP? To be clarified with S1	
					inconsistence in idly/busy within document, to be notified to S1	
					drafting group will look into 22.127 in detail, identify work to be done still, in addition to the work already identified and onoing. Dirk, Ard-Jan, Matti, Lucas. The result should be sent around during the first week of January preferably (second week latest), to give people time to consider and provide technical input for the Helsinki meeting.	
4	Liaison Statements	242	proposed work split	SA2		
		334	liaison on MM messageing	S1 OSA AdHoc		
		338	liaison on R4 requirements	S1	input needed for next S1 AdHoc	
5	API interfaces OSA version 1					
5.1	status 12070					
		284	part 1			
		287	part 2			
		285	part 3			
		250	part 6			

		296	part 4, 5, 7, 8			
5.2	Framework				Make package of all Framework issues to be discussed with the Parlay Framework working group. Ard-Jan volunteers to make this package	
		332	framework working group	Ericsson	parlay working group on Framework in Parlay	
					we would like to include Framework work in the joint 3GPP/ETSI/Parlay work	
					meeting agrees to strive for this, and convey this message in Singapore	
		333	example of registration and discovery	Alcatel	make Message Sequence diagrams based on this contribution	
					Data definitions will be further clarified based on this contribution	
					Service Properties should be further worked on, per SCF	
					serviceTypeName will be taken as SCF name, as also concluded in 321	
					Proposal to include serviceID in the 'getServiceManager' method (not part of this contribution, but concluded during discussion, and also proposed in 321)	
					Further investigate 'supertype' in TpServiceTypeDescription	
		321	SCF and serviceTypeName concepts in the Framework	Nokia	see 323 324	
		323	Using serviceID in the method	Nokia	keep servicePropertyList	
			getServiceManager (CR to 23.127)		Not continued as CR, but included in 12070, and later part of R4	
		324	Using serviceID in the method	Nokia	keep servicePropertyList	
			getServiceManager (CR to 29.198)		Not continued as CR, but included in 12070, and later part of R4	
		331	Framework CR	Ericsson	Agreed	

		290	Framework CR	Nokia	Not continued as CR, but included in 12070, and later	
					part of R4	
		298	Framework CR	Lucent	Not continued as CR, but included in 12070, and later part of R4	
					Clarification on the use of the parameters themselves should be provided still	
5.3	Mobility					
					We discussed the requirements in 22.127 on mobility, in combination with the interfaces UserLocationCamel (part of R99), and UserLocation	
					Conclusion: -UserLocationCamel has some wireless access technoloy specific aspects, in addition to generic geographic information delivery. UserLocation is more generic in the sense that it only considers geographical information, and is therefore network independent. In that sense it could be seen as an evolution of UserLocationCamel -UserLocation interface satisfies the requirements on being notified when entering/leaving a specific geographical area -it was considered that the two interfaces together cover the requirement. However, an extension on the way to define the geographical area (now section of elips or circle with certain radius) could be considered -it was discussed whether these extensions are offered by an extra layer or extra network server, possibly in the application domain	
					S1 will be informed of the state of the discussions At this point we consider the functionality of the two location interfaces as part of Release 4. Whether to combine the two interfaces into one, or keep the interfaces separate as they are now, is still subject for contribution	
5.4	eCommerce					
		302	kick-off of eCommerce discussion	lucent	discussed together with 319. Since 319 is a follow up of 302, 319 has been the basis of discussion.	

agreed on split of interface between account management and charging agreement on both direct payment and reservation/confirmation/subtract are supported Direct payment without reservation is a risk for the application, should be stated in final text as well. Intended for e.g. small amounts, better performance. payment in parts agreed. Roll-back mechanism concern raised, but can be done via exchange of credited/doblited user. But, see discussion below, alternative is update positive/negative amounts. 'bookkeeping', direct transfer between two accounts maintained below the API, is introduced, but not yet agreed. Needed, alternatives possible'? It is not necessary to use the credited/user parameter, can be empty. But anyway, the API should not mandate business model. concern raised on whether additional information should be provided in e.g. updateAccount, which can be used later for e.g. billing (not just that account is empty, but also why it is empty). ServiceInformation in combination with TransactionID? What should be functionality underneath the API? Charging, Billing, Accounting? Only Charging but providing Information to do accounting/billing by other systems? Contributions invited Liaison to Parlay (Gert, Musa, Lucas) will be made, including 302, 319 and summary Liaison to OMG? No responses from RFP on accounting yet. Liaison to Inform them of our activities. Assuming next OMG is after our next meeting in Februari, do it then. OMG is 26"rebruary.1" of March, so OK Agreement to use asynchronous methods for the interface						
reservation/confirmation/subtract are supported Direct payment without reservation is a risk for the application, should be stated in final text as well. Intended for e.g. small amounts, better performance, payment in parts agreed. Roll-back mechanism concern raised, but can be done via exchange of credited/debited user. But, see discussion below, alternative is update positive/negative amounts. 'bookkeeping', direct transfer between two accounts maintained below the API, is introduced, but not yet agreed. Needed, alternatives possible? It is not necessary to use the credited/lest parameter, can be empty. But anyway, the API should not mandate business model. concern raised on whether additional information should be provided in e.g. updateAccount, which can be used later for e.g. billing (not just that account is empty, but also why it is empty). ServiceInformation in combination with TransactionID? What should be functionality underneath the API? Charging, Billing, Accounting? Only Charging but providing information to do accountingfbilling by other systems? Contributions invited Liaison to Darlay (Gert, Musa, Lucas) will be made, including 302, 319 and summary Liaison to OMG? No responses from RFP on accounting yet. Liaison to Inform them of our activities. Assuming next OMG is after our next meeting in Februari, do it then. OMG is 26*February-1** of March, so OK Agreement to use asynchronous methods for the interface			319	comments on 302	siemens	
raised, but can be done via exchange of credited/debited user. But, see discussion below, alternative is update positive/negative amounts. 'bookkeeping', direct transfer between two accounts maintained below the API, is introduced, but not yet agreed. Needed, alternatives possible? It is not necessary to use the credited/user parameter, can be empty. But anyway, the API should not mandate business model. concern raised on whether additional information should be provided in e.g. updateAccount, which can be used later for e.g., billing not just that account is empty, but also why it is empty). ServiceInformation in combination with TransactionID? What should be functionality underneath the API? Charging, Billing, Accounting? Only Charging but providing information to do accounting/billing by other systems? Contributions invited Liaison to Parlay (Gert, Musa, Lucas) will be made, including 302, 319 and summary Liaison to OMG? No responses from RFP on accounting yet. Liaison to OMG? No responses from RFP on accounting yet. Liaison to inform them of our activities. Assuming next OMG is after our next meeting in Februart, do it then. OMG is 26 th February-1 st of March, so OK Agreement to use asynchronous methods for the interface						agreement on both direct payment and reservation/confirmation/subtract are supported Direct payment without reservation is a risk for the application, should be stated in final text as well.
maintained below the API, is introduced, but not yet agreed. Needed, alternatives possible? It is not necessary to use the creditedUser parameter, can be empty. But anyway, the API should not mandate business model. concern raised on whether additional information should be provided in e.g. updateAccount, which can be used later for e.g. billing (not just that account is empty, but also why it is empty). ServiceInformation in combination with TransactionID? What should be functionality underneath the API? Charging, Billing, Accounting? Only Charging but providing information to do accounting/billing by other systems? Contributions invited Liaison to Parlay (Gert, Musa, Lucas) will be made, including 302, 319 and summary Liaison to OMG? No responses from RFP on accounting yet. Liaison to inform them of our activities. Assuming next OMG is after our next meeting in Februari, do it then. OMG is 26 th February-1 st of March, so OK Agreement to use asynchronous methods for the interface						raised, but can be done via exchange of credited/debited user. But, see discussion below,
should be provided in e.g. updateAccount, which can be used later for e.g. billing (not just that account is empty, but also why it is empty). ServiceInformation in combination with TransactionID? What should be functionality underneath the API? Charging, Billing, Accounting? Only Charging but providing information to do accounting/billing by other systems? Contributions invited Liaison to Parlay (Gert, Musa, Lucas) will be made, including 302, 319 and summary Liaison to OMG? No responses from RFP on accounting yet. Liaison to inform them of our activities. Assuming next OMG is after our next meeting in Februari, do it then. OMG is 26 th February-1 st of March, so OK Agreement to use asynchronous methods for the interface						maintained below the API, is introduced, but not yet agreed. Needed, alternatives possible? It is not necessary to use the creditedUser parameter, can be empty. But anyway, the API should not mandate
Charging, Billing, Accounting? Only Charging but providing information to do accounting/billing by other systems? Contributions invited Liaison to Parlay (Gert, Musa, Lucas) will be made, including 302, 319 and summary Liaison to OMG? No responses from RFP on accounting yet. Liaison to inform them of our activities. Assuming next OMG is after our next meeting in Februari, do it then. OMG is 26 th February-1 st of March, so OK Agreement to use asynchronous methods for the interface						should be provided in e.g. updateAccount, which can be used later for e.g. billing (not just that account is empty, but also why it is empty).
Liaison to Parlay (Gert, Musa, Lucas) will be made, including 302, 319 and summary Liaison to OMG? No responses from RFP on accounting yet. Liaison to inform them of our activities. Assuming next OMG is after our next meeting in Februari, do it then. OMG is 26 th February-1 st of March, so OK Agreement to use asynchronous methods for the interface						Charging, Billing, Accounting? Only Charging but providing information to do accounting/billing by other
including 302, 319 and summary Liaison to OMG? No responses from RFP on accounting yet. Liaison to inform them of our activities. Assuming next OMG is after our next meeting in Februari, do it then. OMG is 26 th February-1 st of March, so OK Agreement to use asynchronous methods for the interface						Contributions invited
yet. Liaison to inform them of our activities. Assuming next OMG is after our next meeting in Februari, do it then. OMG is 26 th February-1 st of March, so OK Agreement to use asynchronous methods for the interface						
interface						yet. Liaison to inform them of our activities. Assuming next OMG is after our next meeting in Februari, do it then.
5.5 GCC/MPCC						
	5.5	GCC/MPCC				

327	New Multi Party Call Control	Ericsson	Agreed with the following comments and suggestions for future enhancements:
			questions raised whether some call methods should also be applicable for callLeg Should be separate contribution with further enhancements. This contribution implements agreements already made in principle.
			description of semantics of route(), media not yet attached, should be improved
			Route method, still also question raised of immutable leg or not (need addresses in it or not). Presently the addresses are 'immutable', which means that the addresss and leg are tightly coupled.
			'convenience function' (createAndRouteCallLeg) roll-back in case of failure. Concluded that complete roll-back to the initial situation from before invocation of convenience function should be done. This should be indicated in 12070. The reason is simplicity for application.
			Possibility brought up as well to be able to have more generic mechanism to combine different operations into a combined set with fall-back Should be contributed
			issue raised 3 rd party routing (stimulate end-point to originate a call), in conjunction with route method. Can be new method probably. Already identified that we should clarify with S1, is that what they mean with their requirement?
			continueProcessing rather than continueCallProcessing More explicit mentioning of call processing, what it means. Reference back to notification method description will be sufficient.
			Issue brought up to indicate/assign whether call leg is controlling (not only default that 1 st leg is controlling). Possibility to not have a controlling leg, last leg tears call down Extra parameter? Extra method? Future contribution
			this interface limited to single media stream from application point of view. Can be voice, can be voice plus video, should be distinguished in service properties

	328	improvements on STD	Ericsson	Agreed with following comments:	
				transition from active to application released in case of release on call, it seems no explicit reflection of release on controlling call leg However, this is reflected, release of the controlling leg will result in release of a call, which will be reported via call ended to application on ApCallInterface. Clarification to be added when describing the release on callLeg	
				agreed proposals of 327 not reflected yet, should be combined with these modifications in new STD	

	293	event datatype alignment	Alcatel	line up notifications with events event arming on leg basis
				agreed (already last meeting on principle), but not part of R99.
				However, still discussion whether to adapt event types of GCC for 12070 (OSA Release 1) as well, or complete decoupling, that is, keep GCC as it is with its present data types.
				Three posibilities:
				keep GCC in 12070 with its present data types (data definitions are in separate GCC data definition section), and have different data types for MPCC. So GCC is kept as stable as possible with respect to 3GPP R99 and Parlay 2.1
				keep GCC in 12070 with among other things new data types, align with MPCC
				only have MPCC in 12070, with explanation in GCC section that MPCC can be used with restrictions
				This decision is independent from the contribution presented here, which focusses on MPCC event datatype alignment However, this decision should be taken at the next meeting.
				The proposal is accepted with the following remarks:
				new method createAndRouteCallLeg should be updated to reflect these dataTypes
				It was questions whether CallAppInfo should not be split in two sets of data:
				-a set of data which can be changed by an application, and are thus also part of the route() method -a set of data which is brought up to the application for
				information, which can not be changed, thus not part of the route() method
				Comment was made that route() is applicable for network initiated and application initiated calls, so whether it is not by definition one data set.
				This comment will therefore not be taken into account yet, contribution invited (with example parameters).
				It was agreed that release cause values should defined independent of Q.850 contribution invited for next meeting
				The agreed data type alignment will be implemented at the moment according to option1) above

	294	notification method parameters	Alcatel	RefRef correction in the contribution is not OK, should stay as it is agreed with this comment
	295	notification method renaming	Alcatel	names changed into among others: createNotification reportNotification destroyNotification both include implicit activation/deactivation agreed to also have this convention for other applicable interfaces, like for user interaction, generic messageing, data session control, charging (new at this meeting) contributions will come Agreement on later addition (release 2) of activation/deactivationNotification Detailed contributions will come Updated as 344 (for MPCC only)

329	multiple applications on a call	Ericsson	concerns raised on feature interaction One call object should have control over the call at one point in time
			in INAP/IN discussions on feature interaction (MPC) it is up to the call server underneath to resolve the feature interaction. Call instances invoked in sequence, as if they were implemented in different nodes
			Principle agreed that each application has its own view (already in Bristol, as in figure 1). How the views interact with each other is not within the scope of our work (for the time being). Concatenation (applications invoked in sequence, as described above) is one possibility
			API level additions proposed in this contribution is only a 'callLegCreated' notification method, which is also part of the 'network view of the call', discussed in JAIN alignment context. In support of the addition of this method it was indicated that it is not only applicable in the context of multiple point of control, but also for a network application being aware of the fact that e.g. a SIP client adds a party via SIP signalling. Addition of this method is not accepted for the moment, put on hold, in order to be sure to have a complete solution.
			Other additions at API level to further improve multiple application support are for further contributions.
			More explicit scenarios/rules for controlling versus only monitoring applications could also be further contributed on (These notification options are already supported in the API). Some basic rules in these cases are probably simpler.

		330	UML to IDL/Java mapping	SUN	Discussion only on following issues, as suggested by contributor:
					issue 2 already resolved TpString mapped to Corba string
					issue4 already resolved TpSet mapped to Corba sequence
					issue7 make granularity finer, make exceptions finer at UML level. In ROse there is a field 'exceptions' which can be used. In UML description have one entry per exception. Information can be taken from detailed method descriptions (starting point). Ard-Jan and Ultan will look into this for one interface get the methodology right. Every editor responsible to have it done eventually, for next meeting.
					issue event listeners/call-backs identified that having multiple applications receiving (non-controlling) notifications should be possible. This can be done via both mechanisms in principle, via Call Back e.g. as discussed in 329, or discussed earlier. Contributions invited to further clarify the issue, including use cases.
					This mapping document will be kept at TD level. Agreed and applicable sections will appear in methodology section of 12070 eventually (was there in 29.198, chapter 5, should be added in 12070).
		342	Issue list (update)	ВТ	
5.6	UI				

	320	UI correction, addition of deleteNotification	Siemens	issue raised distinction between mailbox and UI. The goal of the recording (and now also deleting) in GUI interface is to provide a general way to give users/application-users the possibility to customize announcements in applications via a call with user interaction. One can think of e.g. welcome message via a call with user interaction agreed to include in 12070, complement the record message with a delete message in the context of a call
				with user interaction as suggested in the contribution. issue raised that there might be a need to introduce a separate interface for provisioning/management, or to introduce it in the IpUI rather than IpUICall. Contributions invited. not agreed to be part of R99, so no CR, since IDL is kept aligned with Parlay 2.1 Include a question of requirements to S1
	322	Support for separated Call Control	Nokia	not agreed
		and User Interaction SCF		concern raised on userInteractionID as an operator specific string, and that if we further define it, it will require application being knowledgeable of network information
				Suggested as alternative to have IpUICall and IpCall interfaces communicating with each other, in order not to expose network information to the application layer
				Approach in contribution not agreed. Agreement to investigate instead the interaction between IpCall/IpLeg and UiCall. This is a new interface, also the first interface between SCF's. Contributions invited
				It is agreed to further investigate and work on this interface for OSA R5 / Version 2. Some reservations still expressed. It was identified also that this is not only an issue for N5, but an architecture issue as well, to be dealt with by SA2.

5.7	conferencing/MM	221	API for OSA call control issues related to the media channel monitoring	Alcatel	N5-00217-221 file, td17 from package	
5.8	Other interfaces/general					
		325	Parlay 2.1 errors/corrections	ВТ		
6	OSA version 1 mapping					
6.1	status of 12075					
		303	12075 Part 2 Common Data Mapping	Lucent	not available	
		304	12075 Part 3 Framework Mapping	Lucent	not available	
		305	12075 Part 7 Terminal Capabilities Mapping	Lucent	not available	
		306	12075 Part 9 Messaging Mapping	Lucent	not available	
		307	12075 Part 10 Connectivity Management Mapping	Lucent	not available	
6.2	GUI-INAP					
		343	part 5 of 12075 user interaction API to INAP mapping for UI	Alcatel	intended to be distributed earlier as 277 earlier (wrong document sent around at that time)	
6.3	GCC/MPCC-SIP					
6.4	GUI-Megacop					
7	CR for R99					
		332	Framework CR 29.198	Ericsson	agreed, see above	
		323	Framework CR	Nokia	withdrawn, but included in 12070 with changes, see above	

		324	Framework CR	Nokia	withdrawn, but included in 12070 with changes, see above	
		298	Framework CR	Lucent	withdrawn, but included in 12070, see above	
8	Organizational aspects					
8.1	further work on 12070				Soda templates and Rose model should be under version control for traceability (per meeting)	
					Ultan will work with the editors on next versions of 310 and 308 (parts 4 and 5 of 12070), including comments received on 309 and 311, including agreed CR's (on 23.127 and 29.198) and other agreements since the Bristol meeting.	
					In work between editors and Ultan on the different parts of 12070 (all parts), there is no explicit division of tasks, keep that flexible for the moment, depends on editor and task at hand. However, editors are final responsible for implementation of agreements and CR's in 12070.	
					For 3GPP R4 we will extract relevant sections of 12070 and make one big CR to replace 29.198v3 with the new document (including sections originally in 23.127). It was stressed that 3GPP-CN meeting will need a clear indication of what has changed. This can be provided in the history section of the specification. Revision marks will not be possible, will not be provided.	
		308	Draft UML Derived DTS/SPAN-120070- 4, Call Control SCF	ETSI PEX		
		309	Changes introduced and proposed modifications in UML based Call Control document	ETSI PEX		

		310	Draft UML Derived DTS/SPAN-120070- 5, User Interaction SCF	ETSI PEX	Agreed that from now on we work from the model generated document as 120070-5	
		311	Corrections introduced and proposed modifications in UML based User Interaction document	ETSI PEX	noted that user interaction message sequence diagrams are in fact the call control diagrams	
			interaction document		to be checked whether 1.7 and 1.9 need CR to 23.127 still (are corrections).	
					to be checked on capitals (Word autocapitalize)	
					2.3 not agreed as proposed. Should be clarification on method level. Contribution.	
		312	Draft UML Derived DTS/SPAN-120070- 7, Terminal Capabilities SCF	ETSI PEX		
		313	Corrections introduced in the UML based Terminal Capabilities SCF document	ETSI PEX		
		314	Draft UML Derived DTS/SPAN-120070- 8, Data Session ControlSCF	ETSI PEX		
		315	Corrections and Modifications in the UML based Data Session Control SCF document	ETSI PEX		
		316	Draft UML Derived DTS/SPAN-120070- 10, Connectivity Manager SCF	ETSI PEX		
		317	Cover Note to UML based Connectivity Manager SCF document	ETSI PEX		
		318	Latest UML Model	ETSI PEX		
8.2	further work on 12075					
8.3	IDL namespace / base class				promoting of common IDL namespace for Parlay/3GPP/ETSI OSA work ongoing Common name space	
					Common base class (iPOsa)	
					Will be brought up in Singapore meeting in Technical Advisory Committee Lucas will drive this	
9	exploratory discussion on OSA version 2					

10 Ilaisons parlay charging musa, Gert, Lucas will produce liaison reflecting progress based on preliminary report, include the two input documents to this meeting Liaison statement will include intention to do this work jointly (as a minimum sequential progress, 3GPP/ETSI continuing on progress in Parlay and vise versa, later hopefully inclusion of Parlay working group activities in joint Parlay/3GP/ETSI work. Will be sent over Email for approval, one week for comments (1 st week January) parlay framework Ard-Jan and Chelo will produce liaison statement to Parlay on Framework Liaison statement will include agreed changes in this meeting (and CR's from last meeting) Liaison statement will include the print parlay/3GPP/ETSI work S1 OSA AdHoc answer to 336 S1 OSA AdHoc answer to 336 Lucas will produce liaison reflecting progress based on preliminary report (this document) Including issues identified in 22.127 draft Will be sent over Email for approval, one week for comments (1 st week January)		I		•		
parlay charging Musa, Gert, Lucas will produce liaison reflecting progress based on preliminary report, include the two input documents to this meeting Liaison statement will include intention to do this work jointly (as a minimum sequential progress, 3GPP/ETSI continuing on progress in Parlay and vise versa, later hopefully inclusion of Parlay working group activities in joint Parlay/3GPP/ETSI work. Will be sent over Email for approval, one week for comments (1st week January) Parlay framework Ard-Jan and Chelo will produce liaison statement to Parlay on Framework Liaison statement will include agreed changes in this meeting (and CR's from last meeting) Liaison statement will include statement that 3GPP/ETSI/ParlayCC would like to include the Framework working group in the joint Parlay/3GPP/ETSI work S1 OSA AdHoc answer to 338 S1 OSA diloc answer to 338 Lucas will produce liaison reflecting progress based on preliminary report (this document) Including issues identified in 22.127 draft Will be sent over Email for approval, one week for comments (1st week January)						
parlay charging Musa, Gert, Lucas will produce liaison reflecting progress based on preliminary report, include the two input documents to this meeting Liaison statement will include intention to do this work jointly (as a minimum sequential progress, 3GPP/ETSI continuing on progress in Parlay and vise versa, later hopefully inclusion of Parlay working group activities in joint Parlay/3GPP/ETSI work. Will be sent over Email for approval, one week for comments (1st week January) Parlay framework Ard-Jan and Chelo will produce liaison statement to Parlay on Framework Liaison statement will include agreed changes in this meeting (and CR's from last meeting) Liaison statement will include statement that 3GPP/ETSI/ParlayCC would like to include the Framework working group in the joint Parlay/3GPP/ETSI work S1 OSA AdHoc answer to 338 S1 OSA diloc answer to 338 Lucas will produce liaison reflecting progress based on preliminary report (this document) Including issues identified in 22.127 draft Will be sent over Email for approval, one week for comments (1st week January)						
parlay charging Musa, Gert, Lucas will produce liaison reflecting progress based on preliminary report, include the two input documents to this meeting Liaison statement will include intention to do this work jointly (as a minimum sequential progress, 3GPP/ETSI continuing on progress in Parlay and vise versa, later hopefully inclusion of Parlay working group activities in joint Parlay/3GPP/ETSI work. Will be sent over Email for approval, one week for comments (1st week January) Parlay framework Ard-Jan and Chelo will produce liaison statement to Parlay on Framework Liaison statement will include agreed changes in this meeting (and CR's from last meeting) Liaison statement will include statement that 3GPP/ETSI/ParlayCC would like to include the Framework working group in the joint Parlay/3GPP/ETSI work S1 OSA AdHoc answer to 338 S1 OSA diloc answer to 338 Lucas will produce liaison reflecting progress based on preliminary report (this document) Including issues identified in 22.127 draft Will be sent over Email for approval, one week for comments (1st week January)						
parlay charging Musa, Gert, Lucas will produce liaison reflecting progress based on preliminary report, include the two input documents to this meeting Liaison statement will include intention to do this work jointly (as a minimum sequential progress, 3GPP/ETSI continuing on progress in Parlay and vise versa, later hopefully inclusion of Parlay working group activities in joint Parlay/3GPP/ETSI work. Will be sent over Email for approval, one week for comments (1st week January) Parlay framework Ard-Jan and Chelo will produce liaison statement to Parlay on Framework Liaison statement will include agreed changes in this meeting (and CR's from last meeting) Liaison statement will include statement that 3GPP/ETSI/ParlayCC would like to include the Framework working group in the joint Parlay/3GPP/ETSI work S1 OSA AdHoc answer to 338 S1 OSA diloc answer to 338 Lucas will produce liaison reflecting progress based on preliminary report (this document) Including issues identified in 22.127 draft Will be sent over Email for approval, one week for comments (1st week January)						
parlay charging Musa, Gert, Lucas will produce liaison reflecting progress based on preliminary report, include the two input documents to this meeting Liaison statement will include intention to do this work jointly (as a minimum sequential progress, 3GPP/ETSI continuing on progress in Parlay and vise versa, later hopefully inclusion of Parlay working group activities in joint Parlay/3GPP/ETSI work. Will be sent over Email for approval, one week for comments (1st week January) Parlay framework Ard-Jan and Chelo will produce liaison statement to Parlay on Framework Liaison statement will include agreed changes in this meeting (and CR's from last meeting) Liaison statement will include statement that 3GPP/ETSI/ParlayCC would like to include the Framework working group in the joint Parlay/3GPP/ETSI work S1 OSA AdHoc answer to 338 S1 OSA diloc answer to 338 Lucas will produce liaison reflecting progress based on preliminary report (this document) Including issues identified in 22.127 draft Will be sent over Email for approval, one week for comments (1st week January)						
progress based on preliminary report, include the two input documents to this meeting Liaison statement will include intention to do this work jointly (as a minimum sequential progress, 3GPP/ETSI continuing on progress in Parlay and vise versa, later hopefully inclusion of Parlay working group activities in joint Parlay/3GPP/ETSI work. Will be sent over Email for approval, one week for comments (1st week January) Ard-Jan and Chelo will produce liaison statement to Parlay on Framework Liaison statement will include agreed changes in this meeting (and CR's from last meeting) Liaison statement will include statement that 3GPP/ETSI/ParlayCC would like to include the Framework working group in the joint Parlay/3GPP/ETSI work S1 OSA AdHoc answer to 338 Lucas will produce liaison reflecting progress based on preliminary report (this document) Including issues identified in 22.127 draft Will be sent over Email for approval, one week for comments (1st week January)	10	liaisons				
comments (1st week January) Ard-Jan and Chelo will produce liaison statement to Parlay on Framework Liaison statement will include agreed changes in this meeting (and CR's from last meeting) Liaison statement will include statement that 3GPP/ETSI/ParlayCC would like to include the Framework working group in the joint Parlay/3GPP/ETSI work S1 OSA AdHoc answer to 338 Lucas will produce liaison reflecting progress based on preliminary report (this document) Including issues identified in 22.127 draft Will be sent over Email for approval, one week for comments (1st week January)			parlay charging		progress based on preliminary report, include the two input documents to this meeting Liaison statement will include intention to do this work jointly (as a minimum sequential progress, 3GPP/ETSI continuing on progress in Parlay and vise versa, later hopefully inclusion of Parlay working group activities in joint Parlay/3GPP/ETSI work.	
Parlay on Framework Liaison statement will include agreed changes in this meeting (and CR's from last meeting) Liaison statement will include statement that 3GPP/ETSI/ParlayCC would like to include the Framework working group in the joint Parlay/3GPP/ETSI work S1 OSA AdHoc answer to 338 Lucas will produce liaison reflecting progress based on preliminary report (this document) Including issues identified in 22.127 draft Will be sent over Email for approval, one week for comments (1st week January)					Will be sent over Email for approval, one week for comments (1 st week January)	
meeting (and CR's from last meeting) Liaison statement will include statement that 3GPP/ETSI/ParlayCC would like to include the Framework working group in the joint Parlay/3GPP/ETSI work S1 OSA AdHoc answer to 338 Lucas will produce liaison reflecting progress based on preliminary report (this document) Including issues identified in 22.127 draft Will be sent over Email for approval, one week for comments (1 st week January)			parlay framework			
3GPP/ETSI/ParlayCC would like to include the Framework working group in the joint Parlay/3GPP/ETSI work S1 OSA AdHoc answer to 338 Lucas will produce liaison reflecting progress based on preliminary report (this document) Including issues identified in 22.127 draft Will be sent over Email for approval, one week for comments (1 st week January)						
answer to 338 answer to 338 preliminary report (this document) Including issues identified in 22.127 draft Will be sent over Email for approval, one week for comments (1 st week January)					3GPP/ETSI/ParlayCC would like to include the Framework working group in the joint Parlay/3GPP/ETSI	
Will be sent over Email for approval, one week for comments (1 st week January)	_					
comments (1 st week January)					Including issues identified in 22.127 draft	
11 AOB					Will be sent over Email for approval, one week for comments (1 st week January)	
	11	AOB				

work plan / priority topics	3GPP UMTS R4 deadline March 2001 with the following topics:
	Charging (Lucent)
	-Event notification function OSA stage 1 22.127 (Nokia)
	-GCCS choices
	-Call control state diagram alignment (Alcatel/Ericsson)
	-Alignment with Jain concerning event listeners and call back
	-ensuring backwards compatibility with R4 for future releases
	-IDL (ETSI/Ericsson/Siemens)
	-Framework improvements and corrections (Alcatel)
	-Location services: geographic versus cell based (Siemens)
	- Liaison with SA1 (Lucas Klosterman)
	- Liaison with SA2 (Motorola)
	Parlay Phase 2.2 proposal to agree at the April 2001 Parlay meeting
	-multiparty/ multimedia/conference call control alignment of methods and associated parameters
	■ Call ownership
	■ Media stream ownership.
	■ attach/detach
	■ immutable legs
	■ Third party
	■ Property definitions
	■ Convenience function handling and parameters
	Media stream handling to be clarified at the application level.
	It is recommended to provide inputs in time (at least 1 working day.)

meetings		6-8 February Helsinki	
		5-7 March Antwerp	
		next meeting suggested 8 weeks later, in order to keep the agreed once-per-6 weeks frequency	
		Parlay April: North America	
		there is JAIN meeting as well in Europe in March	