Source: **CN1 chairman**

Title: **CN1#19bis Meeting Report**

Agenda item: **6.1.1**

Document for: **INFORMATION**

Time slot	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday
9:00 – 10:30 (I)	Agenda (1) LS in (9)	Session initiation (16)	LS out (3?) Revisions (?)
11:00 – 12:30 (II)	Correction (1) Other (5)	Session initiation	Editorials (15)
Lunch break			
13:30 – 15:30 (III)	Registration (8)	Session initiation 23.218 (8)	Editorials Work plan (?)
16:00 - (IV)	Registrationf	23.218	
Extension bit (V)			

Documents for TSG CN WG1 meeting						**Cyan cells indicate an allocated but not available tdoc**	**Yellow cells indicate an available not not yet treated tdoc.**
Agenda item	**Agenda item title**	**Tdoc**	**Title**	**Source**	**Spec.**	**Result**	
1	**Opening** Tuesday (I) 2.10.2001		Disclosure of IPRs?			The attention of the members of this Technical Specification Group is drawn to the fact **that 3GPP Individual Members have the obligation** under the IPR Policies of their respective Organizational Partners to **inform**	

						their respective Organizational Partners **of Essential IPRs they become aware of**.
2	**Agenda & Reports** Tuesday (I) 2.10.2001					
2		N1-011345	Agenda	CN1 chairman		Agreed
3	**Input Liaison statements** Tuesday (I) 2.10.2001		**Only IMS related LSs**			
3		N1-011395	LS response to SA3 on "Using a generic authentication scheme for SIP"	N4		Noted. CN4 has analysed the use of EAP and Diameter NASREQ in the Cx interface. As the authentication point is in the S-CSCF, the standard EAP model breaks in Cx interface. The EAP can be only used to encapsulate the security parameters and download parameters in the EAP format to the S-CSCF. Encapsulating the authentication parameters inside EAP payloads has the advantage of making the Cx interface more generic and it is possible to re-use some of the existing AVPs, e.g. EAP-Payload and NAS-Session-Key AVP, from the NASREQ. CN4 can see, from a protocol point of view, a possibility to transport authentication information on EAP payloads.
3		N1-011396	LS S3-010403 on the use of Network Domain Security for protection of SIP signalling	S2		Noted. SA2 to SA3 on the use of Network Domain Security for protection of SIP signalling

		messages from WG3.		messages from WG3. SA2 has difficulty understanding the security requirements to GTP-U related to IMS
3	N1-011397	Liaison Statement on User Plane for IMS to PSTN Interworking	BT(SA2)	Noted. SA2 outlines the protocol stack for the user plane and asks CN3 to continue to develop the interworking aspects with the user plane protocol stack between the UE and the MGW as a working assumption.
3	N1-011398	Liaison Statement on Signalling Transparency	Nokia	Noted. The source is indicated as Nokia but the LS was approved in SA2 email approval. SA2 inform GERAN that there is no requirement for a signaling translator between IP end users in R5 architecture (e.g. for a multi-media session between two 3GPP IMS users). The Mm interface towards external IP networks is based on SIP. In addition, towards the PSTN the combination of the MGCF and SGW converts SIP over IP transport to SS7 transport for CS domain call control signaling (e.g. ISUP) and vice versa. SA2 also confirm the assumption that control plane signalling transition is transparent to the end systems.
3	N1-011399	Liaison Statement on SIP Signalling and Codec Issues	S2	Noted. CN1 related issue but no answer is needed. Question from SA2/GERAN joint meeting: "In the Optimised Voice service within GERAN, only one codec (and if applicable the AMR Active Codec Set (ACS)) will be the consequence of the SIP negotiation. The meeting asks if the resulting single codec decision, is an IMS restriction."

				SA2 answer:
				SIP allows multiple codecs for a single media stream but for reasons of efficient resource usage the codec negotiation procedure may result in a single codec per media component. SA2 therefore sees the explicit decision to apply a single codec for speech for all SIP session codec negotiations as being a GERAN imposed limitation.
3	N1-011400	Security aspects for IMS related to Authentication	S2	Noted. But presentation is needed. The concept of linking multiple public identities to private identity via service profiles. What happens if public IDs belonging to different service profiles are registered to different S-CSCFs? This would force the UE to support two simultaneous security contexts.
3	N1-011401	Liaison Statement on IMS to IP interworking functions	S2	Forwarded to 24.228 joint session during CN1 #20. SA2 on interworking issues: When standards for interworking have been developed within other groups it is preferential to re-apply and reference these where possible within 3GPP. CN3 should note that SA2 still has to assess what (if any) interworking cases are required to be supported between 3PP IMS UE and non 3GPP IP network based end points.
3	N1-011402	LS to 3GPP S1,2,5, T2, CN1 on IP Based Multimedia Services Framework Report	SerG	Noted. GSM association SERG reply to LS from SA1. SERG consider IP Based Multimedia Services Framework Report (TR 22.941) an important document. 3GPP is encouraged to continue the

						requirements, the architecture and the protocol work in IMS area and SERG member companies promise to give their input to the work (on the TR at least)
	3	N1-011403	LS Response to T2-010617	T2		Noted. T2 expect to provide input to the requirements on including the location information in SIP INVITE message. The T2 interest areas are Privacy and UE functionality split. T2 would like too see the work being progressed and ask SA2 to keep them up to date. CN1 waits for SA2 input in this area.
	3	N1-011407	Network initiated re-registration in the IMS	S3		Noted. Late!
4	**CN1 work plan** Thursday (III) 4.10.2001					**Meeting calendar for 2001:**

15.-19.Jan.2001	CN1 #15, Beijing
7.-8.Feb.2001	Joint SA1-CN1-RAN2-RAN4-GERAN1 idle mode workshop (Nokia, Helsinki/Finland)
13.-15.Feb.2001	CN1-SA2 SIP joint meeting (AT&T, New Jersey/USA
26.Feb-1.Mar. 2001	CN1 #16, CN1-2-3-4 (ETSI, Sophia Antipolis / France)
14.-16.Mar.2001	CN #11, (Palm Springs / USA)

6

					8.-12. Apr. 2002	CN1 #23
					13.-17. May 2002	CN1 #24
					5.-7. Jun. 2002	CN #16 (?)
					29. Jul. – 2. Aug. 2002	CN1 #25 (Sonera, Finland)
					4.-6- Sep. 2002	CN #17 (France)
					23.-27. Sep. 2002	CN1 #26
					11.-15. Nov. 2002	CN1 #27
					4.-6. Dec. 2002	CN #18 (New Orleans)
	4		Latest workplan	MCC		Withdrawn
5	**Void**		**No R98 or older documents are treated in this meeting.**			
6	**Void**		**No R99 documents are treated in this meeting.**			
7	**Void**		**No Rel-4 documents are treated in this meeting.**			
8	**Release 5**					
8.1	Rel-5 corrections Tuesday (II) 2.10.2001		**IMS related documents only**			
	8.01	N1-011366	Support for SIP compression in TS 24.229	Motorola, Andrew Allen	24.229	Revised to N1-011408 Proposal to add SIP compression negotiation between UE and P-CSCF to 24.229.

	8.01	N1-011406	Avoiding B2BUAs	Siemens / Georg Mayer	23.218	Noted. Late!
	8.01	N1-011408	Support for SIP compression in TS 24.229	Motorola, Andrew Allen	24.229	Agreed. Proposal to add SIP compression negotiation between UE and P-CSCF to 24.229. Revision of N1-011366
8.2	TEI 5		**IMS related documents only**			
8.3	IMS: 23.218 Wednesday (III-IV) 3.10.2001					
	8.03	N1-011365	23.218v060 "IP multimedia Session Handling; IP multimedia Call Model"	Motorola, Andrew Allen	23.218	Noted. this version was available on the 3GPP server in the latest drafts before the deadline for the documents to this meeting. So it is not the TS reference version 0.6.0 which is late, only the tdoc to this meeting. Late!
	8.03	N1-011371	CR to 23.218: Pre-paid Service Control Information Flows	Lucent Technologies / Michel Grech	23.218	Rejected New pre-paid service information flows to 23.218 • The transition from proxy mode to B2B UA seems questionable due to the definition of B2B UA in SIP bis draft. • The BYEs are in wrong order • Indicating 200 OKs was seen important to understand the overall procedure • Both this proposal and another contribution from Siemens were discussed and noted in CN2. • CN1 owns 23.218 and maintains it together

					with the other CN WGs but some delegates were concerned that not just CN issues but also architectural ones are involved and the decisions can not be made without SA2. • At least some operators were concerned that it will be difficult to build pre-paid without any service examples
	8.03	N1-011372	CR to 23.218: Information flows for IMS service examples: Call Forwarding Service Control Scenarios	Lucent Technologies / Michel Grech	23.218	Revised to N1-011423 New call forwarding examples to 23.218. • request to align the notation about UE#1, UE#2,... • Is it intention that call forwarding is only allowed while registered to IMS? -> the work is still ongoing in SA2 to handle the forwarding case when the user is not registered.
	8.03	N1-011373	CR to 23.218: Service Triggering at Registration	Lucent Technologies / Xin Chen	23.218	Agreed in CN1 but this part of 23.218 is very much CN2 related so the CR will be forwarded to 23.218 joint session allowing CN2 to review and if possible, endorse it. Revision of Fig. 11.1 in clause 11.1.1 to highlight that the service may be triggered at ISC during registration. AP Hannu: forward this document to the joint session with the same tdoc number.
	8.03	N1-011387	CR to 24.229: Extension of scope of 24.229 to include ISC	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Agreed Proposal to widen the scope of 24.229 to cover the usage of SIP protocol also at ISC but leaving the ISC service level functionality in 23.218.
	8.03	N1-011423	CR to 23.218: Information flows for IMS service examples: Call Forwarding Service Control Scenarios	Lucent Technologies / Michel Grech	23.218	Agreed. Revision of N1-011372
8.4	IMS Registration					

Tuesday (III-IV) 2.10.2001					
8.04	N1-011348	I-CSCF role in Registration and non-hiding case	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.229	Revised to N1-011410 Clarification of the I-CSCF behaviour when it receives a registration request (hiding)
8.04	N1-011349	I-CSCF role in Registration and hiding case	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.229	Revised to N1-011411 Clarification of the I-CSCF behaviour when it receives a registration request (hiding)
8.04	N1-011350	Implicit registration of public IDs	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.228	Rejected. Change of the existing registration flow in clause 6.2 to allow the registration of multiple public IDs in one REGISTER. Related with LS N1-011400.
8.04	N1-011351	Contact in Register	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.228	Withdrawn A followup of N1-011288 which was discussed in CN1 #19 but rejected during email approval. Proposal to put Contact header to all 200 OK messages responding to REGISTER message and that the contents of this header will be the same as received from the UE in the REGISTER. This should apply to both initial registration and re-registration in hiding and non-hiding cases.
8.04	N1-011355	Usage of the Private ID in registration scenarios	Ericsson/Miguel Garcia	24.228	Noted. LS out in N1-011416 to ask for what purpose the other WGs are using the Private ID in the From: header. Proposal to change the way how the private ID is indicated by the UE to the CSCF: 1. To avoid third party registration from the SIP protocol viewpoint both From- and To-field should contain public ID 2. The private ID needed for authentication would be encoded in the user ID field of the

10

					Authentication header
					All registration flows are impacted.
					If we avoid SIP third party registration by putting public identity to both To: and From: headers then is the authentication protocol the right place for the Private identity?
					Private ID is / may be used for charging purposes, not just for authenticating the subscriber
					Third party registration is not within the scope of Rel-5 but we should not inhibit adding it afterwards.
					More time was requested by some delegations to study the full significance of the proposal. There was already some concerns that it might be unnecessary or cause some other problems. Would 24.229 need to change also?
8.04	N1-011360	Use of SUBSCRIBE/NOTIFY for network initiated de-registration	Ericsson/Gautam Talagery	24.228	Revised to N1-011417 Syntactical changes to SUBSCRIBE/NOTIFY for network initiated de-registration procedure
8.04	N1-011404	Network Initiated Re-Registration	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.228	Noted. Call flows to introduce the usage of SUBSCRIBE/NOTIFY for the network initiated re-registration procedure. Which version of 24.228 was used as reference? (is there a mismatch in sections 6.8 and 16.8?) The intention is to use re-registration to do re-authentication. For information.
8.04	N1-011405	Network Initiated De-Registration	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.228	Noted. Substantial rewriting of section 6.7 and the addition of 16.7. For information.
8.04	N1-011410	I-CSCF role in Registration and non-hiding case	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.229	Agreed. Clarification of the I-CSCF behaviour when it receives a registration request (hiding)

					Revision of N1-011348
	8.04	N1-011411	I-CSCF role in Registration and hiding case	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.229	Withdrawn Clarification of the I-CSCF behaviour when it receives a registration request (hiding) Revision of N1-011411
	8.4	N1-011414	Addition of Cell ID to SIP signalling – 24.228, REGISTER messages.	Vodafone / Duncan Mills	24.228	Withdrawn Late!
	8.04	N1-011417	Use of SUBSCRIBE/NOTIFY for network initiated de-registration	Ericsson/Gautam Talagery	24.228	Revised to N1-011429 Syntactical changes to SUBSCRIBE/NOTIFY for network initiated de-registration procedure Revision of N1-011360
	8.04	N1-011429	Use of SUBSCRIBE/NOTIFY for network initiated de-registration	Ericsson/Gautam Talagery	24.228	Agreed Syntactical changes to SUBSCRIBE/NOTIFY for network initiated de-registration procedure Revision of N1-011417
8.5	IMS De-registration					
8.6	IMS Configuration hiding					
8.7	IMS Authentication					
8.8	IMS Call initiation Wednesday (I–III) 3.10.2001					
	8.08	N1-011346	SDP and other requirements for the UE	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.229	Agreed. The requirements for the UE on the usage of SDP. Does the proposed text reflect our current

8.08	N1-011347	Providing the visited domain name to the home network	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.228	working assumptions? Revised to N1-011415 Discussion document which identifies four alternative ways to convey the serving network domain name to the S-CSCF for the home network to decide e.g. whether to perform hiding or not: • Path header • New header in REGISTER message • Cell-ID or other location information containing enough information on the serving network • REGISTER message payload These are proposed as alternatives for the current examples 24.228 which uses the domain name in the contact header. A new IETF defined header would be the ideal solution but if we can not have that we should decide upon the best possible alternative. Comment that Path header is intended to be used for routing and therefore it should not be used for this purpose.
8.08	N1-011352	Call Transfer Procedures update	Nokia/ Krisztian Kiss	24.228	Agreed. discussion on whether the constant part 'sip:token' should be part of the input to tokenisation.
8.08	N1-011353	S-S#3 flows update	Nokia/ Krisztian Kiss	24.228	Agreed. Followup contribution to N1-011316-317 which were agreed in CN1 #19. This one proposes to S-S#3 similar changes which were agreed to MO#1-2, MT#1-2 and S-S#1a and S-S#2.
8.08	N1-011354	S-S#4 flows update	Nokia/ Krisztian Kiss	24.228	Agreed. Similar change as in N1-011353 but on flow S-S#4. Additionally Record-Route passes through BGCF transparently.
8.08	N1-	QoS flows: end-to-end RSVP, no	Ericsson/Migu	24.228	Rejected

		011357	SBLP	el Garcia		Related LS to SA2 in N1-011419 New flow to section 7 to show the interaction of E2E QoS and the SIP signalling. RSVP resource negotiation is shown. N1-011357-358 and 381,383 address similar issues.
8.08	N1-011358	QoS flows: PDP context only, no SBLP	Ericsson/Miguel Garcia	24.228	Revised to N1-011418 New flow to section 7 to show the interaction of E2E QoS and the SIP signalling. No RSVP resource negotiation is shown, just the GPRS interaction. N1-011357-358 and 381, 383 address similar issues. Comment that we are using a lot of pages to indicate the GPRS interaction in a detailed level. So why not include revised call flows but so that only the flows which are relevant for QoS negotiation (11-17) are explained and the others only appear in the arrow diagram but no explanation for them is needed.
8.08	N1-011359	Usage of SDP in 200 OK for INVITE	Ericsson/Miguel Garcia	24.228	Noted with the following comments: Discussion paper proposing that according to the latest SIP draft 200 OK responses to an INVITE must contain SDP. The meeting agreed that the SDP currently missing in 200 OK response to an INVITE in 24.228 message flows deviates from the latest SIP bis draft. The latest bis draft ignores the manyfolks draft in this area. So either 3GPP or IETF should make a change to align the requirements. Syntactically the SDP should be encoded in that 200 OK but semantically it is not needed at that stage of the (3GPP) signalling any more because

| 8.08 | N1-011376 | CR to 24.228: A review of the editor's notes in clause 7.1 | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | 24.228 | the decision on the codec has already been agreed during earlier negotiation.
What is the 200 OK SDP used for in this case?
The delegates were encouraged to involve also the appropriate SIP experts in the discussion.
Agreed the points which are listed below under decisions.
Review of editor's notes in 24.228 session initiation part. Some of these are almost editorial while some others may trigger discussion on the principal level.
Decisions on the items proposed in the document:
1. deleted
2. agreed to revise the editor's note according to the proposal, i.e. to remove the open items regarding 'via', 'route' and 'record-route'.
3. deleted
4. deleted
5. deleted
6. the editor's note was left as it is.
7. the editor's note was left as it is
8. deleted
9. deleted |
| 8.08 | N1-011377 | CR to 24.228: A review of the editor's notes in clauses 7.2 and 17.2 | Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage | 24.228 | Agreed the points which are listed below under decisions.
Review of editor's notes in 24.228 session origination part. Some of these are almost editorial while some others may trigger discussion on the principal level.
Decisions:
1. deleted
2. deleted
3. deleted
4. deleted
5. the editor's note was left as it is. |

					6. deleted
					7. deleted because flow 3 in 7.2.2. was moved to the main body of the TS
					8. deleted because flow 5 in 7.2.2 was moved to the main body of the TS
					9. the editor's note was left as it is.
					10. deleted
					11. the editor's note was left as it is.
					12. deleted because flow 11 in 7.2.2 was moved to the main body of the TS
					13. the editor's note was left as it is.
					14. the editor's note was left as it is.
					12. deleted because flow 36 in 7.2.2 was moved to the main body of the TS
					13. deleted
					14. deleted because flow 3 in 7.2.3 was moved to the main body of the TS
					15: deleted because flow 3 in 7.2.3 was moved to the main body of the TS
					16: the editor's note was left as it is.
					17: deleted
					18: the editor's note was left as it is.
					19: deleted because flow 11 in 7.2.3 was moved to the main body of the TS
					20: the editor's note was left as it is
					21: deleted because flow 36 in 7.2.3 was moved to the main body of the TS
					22: the editor's note was left as it is
					23: the editor's note was left as it is
					24: deleted
					25: deleted because flow 3 in 17.2.2 was moved to the main body of the TS
					26: deleted because flow 7 in 17.2.2 was moved to the main body of the TS

					27: the editor's note was left as it is 28: deleted 29: the editor's note was left as it is 30: deleted 31: deleted because flow 8 in 17.2.2 was moved to the main body of the TS 32: the editor's note was left as it is 33: the editor's note was left as it is 34: deleted because flow 46 in 17.2.2 was moved to the main body of the TS
8.08	N1-011378	CR to 24.228: Flow Update 17.2.2	Lucent Technologies / Xin Chen	24.228	Revised to N1-011420 Earlier discussion document N1-010576 was agreed in CN1-SA2 SIP ad hoc meeting in Sophia Antipolis in April 2001. The originator was asked to implement the agreed principle that P-CSCF modifies the Record Route header instead of the Contact header in a 24.228 CR. Additionally session establishment flows are aligned with registration flows and Contact header is appended at the bottom of the Route header to align with SIP draft (04). This is MO case.
8.08	N1-011379	CR to 24.228: Flow Update 17.4.2	Lucent Technologies / Xin Chen	24.228	Revised to N1-011421 Earlier discussion document N1-010576 was agreed in CN1-SA2 SIP ad hoc meeting in Sophia Antipolis in April 2001. The originator was asked to implement the agreed principle that P-CSCF modifies the Record Route header instead of the Contact header in a 24.228 CR. Additionally session establishment flows are aligned with registration flows and Contact header is appended at the bottom of the Route header to align with SIP draft (04). This is MT case.
8.08	N1-011380	CR to 24.228: QoS flows in Mobile Originating (GGSN is RSVP aware)	Lucent Technologies /	24.228	Withdrawn Late!

8.08	N1-011381	CR to 24.228: QoS flows in Mobile Originating (GGSN is not RSVP aware)	Lucent Technologies / Xin Chen	24.228	Rejected Related LS to SA2 in N1-011419 New flow to section 7 to show the interaction of E2E QoS and SIP signalling in MO case. N1-011357-358 and 381, 383 address similar issues.
8.08	N1-011382	CR to 24.228: QoS flows in Mobile Terminating (GGSN is RSVP aware)	Lucent Technologies / Xin Chen	24.228	Withdrawn Late!
8.08	N1-011383	CR to 24.228: QoS flows in Mobile Terminating (GGSN is not RSVP aware)	Lucent Technologies / Xin Chen	24.228	Rejected Related LS to SA2 in N1-011419 New flow to section 7 to show the interaction of E2E QoS and SIP signalling in MT case. N1-011357-358 and 381, 383 address similar issues.
8.08	N1-011415	Providing the visited domain name to the home network	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.228	Withdrawn Revision of N1-011347
8.08	N1-011418	QoS flows: PDP context only, no SBLP	Ericsson/Miguel Garcia	24.228	Withdrawn New flow to section 7 to show the interaction of E2E QoS and the SIP signalling. No RSVP resource negotiation is shown, just the GPRS interaction. N1-011357-358 and 381, 383 address similar issues. AP: Hannu to add new IMS related agenda item for QoS interaction. Revision of N1-011358
8.08	N1-011420	CR to 24.228: Flow Update 17.2.2	Lucent Technologies / Xin Chen	24.228	Agreed. Revision of N1-011378
8.08	N1-011421	CR to 24.228: Flow Update 17.4.2	Lucent Technologies / Xin Chen	24.228	Agreed. It was found out that the notation of tokenisation parameters is not consistent. The problem occurs

						also outside this contribution and a therefore a further contribution addressing this issue is needed in later meeting. Revision of N1-011379
8.9	IMS Call clearing					
8.10	IMS Abnormal cases and error handling					
8.11	IMS Editorials and other minor issues Thursday (II-III)					
	8.11	N1-011361	24.228 editorials - more consistent notation etc.	Motorola, John O'Hare	24.228	Agreed.
	8.11	N1-011362	Removal of Annex A-1 "Proposed change to table of contents" from TS 24228	Motorola, John O'Hare	24.228	Agreed.
	8.11	N1-011363	24.228v130 "Signalling flows for the IP multimedia call controlbased on SIP and SDP"	Motorola,John O'Hare	24.228	Noted.
	8.11	N1-011364	24.228v140 "Signalling flows for the IP multimedia call controlbased on SIP and SDP"	Motorola,John O'Hare	24.228	Noted.
	8.11	N1-011374	CR to 24.228: General editorial issues	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.228	Withdrawn Late!
	8.11	N1-011375	CR to 24.228: Minor corrections	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.228	Revised to N1-011424
	8.11	N1-011384	CR to 24.228: Editorial Corrections	Lucent Technologies /	24.228	Revised to N1-011425

8.11	N1-011386	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Date header	Xin Chen Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Withdrawn Late!
8.11	N1-011388	CR to 24.229: Editorial corrections	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Revised to N1-011426
8.11	N1-011389	CR to 24.229: Structure of clauses for MGCF and BGCF	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Agreed.
8.11	N1-011390	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Refer-To header and Referred-By header	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Agreed.
8.11	N1-011391	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Alert-Info header	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Rejected
8.11	N1-011392	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Authorization header	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Agreed
8.11	N1-011393	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the In-Reply-To header	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Agreed.
8.11	N1-011394	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Priority header	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Agreed.
8.11	N1-011422	CR to 24.228: Update notation for case where UE#2's network is the same as that for UE#1.	Motorola, Nokia / John O'Hare	24.228	Agreed. Late!
8.11	N1-011424	CR to 24.228: Minor corrections	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.228	Agreed. Revision of N1-011375
8.11	N1-011425	CR to 24.228: Editorial Corrections	Lucent Technologies / Xin Chen	24.228	Agreed. Revised to N1-011384

	8.11	N1-011426	CR to 24.229: Editorial corrections	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Agreed. Revision of N1-011388
8.12	IMS Emergency call 8.12	N1-011409	Support of Emergency Sessions	Motorola, Andrew Allen		Noted. Late!
8.13	Other IMS issues Tuesday (II) 2.10.2001 8.13	N1-011367	Summary of current IETF documents on SIP	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage		Noted. • SIP draft is being reorganised to version 05 during October. • The replaces-draft (to which 3GPP has got a dependency) is not yet an IETF SIP charter item. For information Late!
	8.13	N1-011368	Summary of current IETF documents on SIPPING	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage		Noted. For information Late!
	8.13	N1-011369	Summary of current IETF documents on SIMPLE	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage		Noted. For information Late!
	8.13	N1-011370	Summary of current IETF documents on MMUSIC	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage		Noted. For information Late!
	8.13	N1-011385	Current draft 24.229: "IP Multimedia Call Control Protocol based on SIP and SDP"	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Noted.
1.	8.13	N1-011356	3GPP Requirements on SIP, Internet draft to the IETF	Ericsson/Miguel Garcia		Noted. Two new internet drafts,

						• draft-garcia-sipping-3gpp-reqs contains the 3GPP requirements to SIP • draft-calhoun-sip-aaa-reqs-03-alpha1.txt contains the 3GPP requirements for the interaction between SIP servers and the AAA infrastructure The intention has been to collect 3GPP working assumptions in documents which can be submitted to IETF SIPPING group and discussed there during this same week as CN1 #19bis. • The interested companies will need to provide resources to IETF work to progress the 3GPP reguirements in SIP, MMUSIC and SIPPING working groups. • The goal for Rel-5 is to get IETF approval for those drafts which 3GPP depends on.
	8.13 8.13	N1-011412 N1-011413	Addition of Cell ID to SIP signalling – progressing the work Addition of Cell ID to SIP signalling – Coding of header fields and 3GPP-MIME	Vodafone / Duncan Mills Vodafone / Duncan Mills		Withdrawn Late! Withdrawn Late!
8.14	Void		**No documents on other Rel-5 issues in this meeting**			
9	**Output Liaison Statements** Thursday (I) 4.10.2001 9	N1-011416			Miguel	Revised to N1-011427 Related with N1-011355

	9	N1-011419				Xin	Revised to N1-011428 Related with N1-011357, 381, 383
	9	N1-011427				Miguel	Revised to N1-011430 The revision marks need to be removed before sending the LS. Related with N1-011355 Revision of N1-011416
	9	N1-011428				Xin	Agreed. Related with N1-011357, 381, 383 Revision of N1-011419
	9	N1-011430				Miguel	Agreed. Related with N1-011355 Revision of N1-011427
10	**A.O.B.**						
11	**Closing** Thursday 4.10.2001		**The meeting will be closed by 14:30**				Any meeting document which is not mentioned in this report shall be interpreted as "reserved", i.e. not defined and shall be ignored if received.