

3GPP TSG CN WG1 meeting #20bis  
 13<sup>th</sup> – 15<sup>th</sup> November 2001, Seattle, USA  
 3GPP TSG CN Plenary Meeting #14  
 Kyoto, Japan, 12th –14th December 2001

Tdoc N1-011630  
 (Seattle0111.rtf)

NP-010637

Source: CN1 chairman  
 Title: CN1#20bis Meeting Report  
 Agenda item: 6.1.1  
 Document for: INFORMATION

Meeting documents by agenda item						Cyan cells indicate an allocated but not available tdoc	Yellow cells indicate an available not yet treated tdoc.
Agenda item	Agenda item title	Tdoc	Title	Source	Spec.	Result	
1	Opening Tuesday 13.11.2001		Disclosure of IPRs?			The attention of the members of this Technical Specification Group is drawn to the fact <b>that 3GPP Individual Members have the obligation</b> under the IPR Policies of their respective Organizational Partners to <b>inform their respective</b> Organizational Partners of <b>Essential IPRs they become aware of.</b>	
2	Agenda & Reports Tuesday 13.11.2001 2	N1-011630	Seattle0111	Chairman		Agreed.	

<b>Input Liaison statements (19)</b> <b>Tuesday 13.11.2001</b>		<b>Only IMS related LSs are treated in this meeting</b>		
3	N1-01163 1	Reply Liaison Statement on SIP Signalling and Codec Issues	N3	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The issue was discussed in CN1 #20 joint session and CN3 forwards the question to SA4: "If AMR is used is there a mechanisms that can enforce the use of an AMR mode that can be carried on a physical HR channel (i.e. AMR 795 or lower) within the RTP for carrying Optimised Voice in GERAN ?"</p>
3	N1-01163 2	Liaison Statement on Signalling Transparency	N3	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Discussion between CN3 and GERAN/SA2 on IMS interworking with the other systems such as PSTN and other IP systems. CN3 confirm that the control plane signaling transition is transparent to the end systems.</p>
3	N1-01163 3	Liaison Statement on PDP Context handling at Inter SGSN RA Update	N4	<p>Forwarded to CN1 #21 (but there is still no CN1 action so it may be noted in Cancun)</p> <p>CN4 has discussed a CR on 29.060 to allow the originating SGSN to define a priority for the PDP contexts to be kept in inter-SGSN RAU if the target SGSN can not handle all of the active contexts. SA2 is asked to study the corresponding stage 2 changes.</p>
3	N1-01163 4	Reply Liaison Statement On the use of Network Domain Security for protection of SIP signalling messages	N4	<p>Noted.</p> <p>CN4 reply to SA3 that GTP-IC is not recommended and when protecting SIP messages end to end solution between UE and P-CSCF is required. Five possible solutions have been looked at but there is not decision in</p>

3	N1-011635	Reply to Liaison Statement on Usage of Private ID	N4	<p>the favour of any of them.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>CN4 answer to CN1 question in our earlier LS. They confirm that S-CSCF will need the private identity in REGISTER message but CN4 does not care which part of the message carries this information. They are also studying whether the private ID will also be needed by the I-CSCF. N1-011635, 638 and 730 are linked.</p>
3	N1-011636	Selection of S-CSCF by I-CSCF based on capability requirements	N4	<p>Noted.</p> <p>CN1 action / opinion may be needed, see the second question below:</p> <p>It is proposed to add more information on S-CSCF capabilities and/or S-CSCF preferences in HSS query result. The reason is that different S-CSCFs may support different capabilities. However, the intention is not to standardise the S-CSCF selection procedure within I-CSCF.</p> <p>Two questions are asked from SA2 and SA5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How does the I-CSCF maintain the status of the available S-CSCFs in the network?</li> <li>• How is I-CSCF supposed to behave if no S-CSCF matching the required capabilities is available?</li> </ul>
3	N1-011637	Response to LS from CN1 (N1-011052) on using a generic authentication scheme for SIP	S3	<p>N1-011731 is the SA2 reply to this LS.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>CN1 action (decision) is required</p> <p>the understanding of SA3 is that the use of neither "<i>407 Proxy Authentication Required</i>" nor the use of "<i>401 Unauthorized</i>" impose any security considerations.</p> <p>The current version of TS33.203 (v060) does specify that "<i>401 Unauthorized</i>" shall be used. SA3 say that no decision between '401' and '407' has been made yet and they will keep 33.203 sufficiently general to allow CN1 to decide</p>

3	N1-011638	Response to LS from CN1 (N1-011430/S3-010452) Liaison Statement on Usage of Private ID	S3	<p>between the two as this is seen as stage 3 protocol decision.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>SA3 say that they see no security problem in changing the current working assumption to encode private ID in the EAP instead of the From field of REGISTER message.</p> <p>Also SA3 agree that where to put IMPI in the REGISTER message is a CN1 stage 3 issue.</p> <p>SA3 is concerned on the security implications of allowing registering on behalf of another subscriber and they would like to be kept up to date on any decisions in this area. SA3 currently understand that registering on behalf of someone else is not part of Rel-5 requirements.</p> <p>N1-011635, 638 and 730 are linked.</p>
3	N1-011639	Response to LS from CN4 (N4-010969) on signalling for user authentication	S3	<p>Noted.</p> <p>SA3 reply to CN4 LS about Authentication and ask for confirmation of their working assumptions.</p> <p>CN1 would like to hear CN4 response in Cancun meeting.</p>
3	N1-011640	Response to SA2 LS on Cell ID in SIP messages	S3	<p>Noted.</p> <p>SA3 share at the moment SA1's opinion that there are no privacy implications related.</p> <p>However, there is need to study the issue further within S3. The privacy requirements will later be covered in TS 33.203.</p>
3	N1-011641	Response to LS S2-012456 from SA2 on Security aspects for IMS related to Authentication	S3	<p>Noted.</p> <p>SA3 say to SA2 that they believe that associating a single public ID to multiple S-CSCFs can be done. This would add the complexity so much that it would risk the Rel-5 schedule.</p>

3	N1-011642	Response to LS S2-012311, LS CN1-011332 on the use of Network Domain Security for protection of SIP signalling messages.	S3
3	N1-011719	Network initiated re-registration in the IMS	S3
3	N1-011727	Liaison Statement to CN1 on Tracking IETF Presence related documents	S2 Presence DraftSession

SA2 reply to this SA3 LS is in N1-011732 Noted.

SA3 have revised their working assumptions as follows:

- It is not a requirement to protect GTP-U in the interfaces between RNC, SGSN and GGSN for the purpose of protecting SIP signalling messages.
- Integrity and, optionally, confidentiality will be provided between the UE and P-CSCF using mechanisms at the SIP or upper IP layer.
- Network Domain Security shall be used to protect SIP signalling in the IMS core network between different network operators' networks.
- the IMS security architecture does not protect the initial registration message between the UE and P-CSCF. The only confidentiality protection for initial registration is provided by RAN encryption in the case of UTRAN access.

Presentation and both decision and reply from CN1 is needed.

SA3 say that the operators need freedom to configure their IMS network to authenticate when chargeable transactions occur and therefore authenticating just registrations and re-registrations is not sufficient.

Noted.

Presentation and both decision and reply from CN1 is needed.

SA2 proposes more IETF SIP related documents for tracking of 3GPP dependency.

- Which tracking document is meant: WID,

3	N1-011728	LS on IMS identifiers and ISIM and USIM	S2
3	N1-011729	Liaison Statement on IM CN Subsystem Roaming	S2
3	N1-011730	Reply to Liaison Statement on Usage of Private ID	S2

WP, IETF summary documents, CN Chairman's IETF dependency tracking document.

- What would be the dependency

AP Hannu: contact Stephen Hayes to ask him to add the proposed dependencies to his 3GPP IETF dependency document  
AP Keith: to add the new dependencies to CN1 IETF summary documents.  
Duncan volunteered to write a proposed outgoing LS in N1-011748  
Presentation and CN1 reply needed  
What IMS related (identity) information does CN1 expect to have stored on UICC?  
Proposal to continue the discussion during CN1 #21 in Cancun. This meeting coincides with SA3 in a more down to earth location and thus a joint meeting with SA3 is not feasible at short notice.  
T3 have discussed the possibility to merge ISIM data fields with USIM to avoid introducing a new UICC application.  
Noted.  
Presentation needed to look at this useful background information which does impact also CN1 protocols.  
SA2 agrees the requirement to allow separate roaming agreements for PS domain and IMS but they make several comments on different error cases.  
Noted.  
Is presentation required?  
SA2 say that registration on behalf of another subscriber is not in Rel-5 requirements and add

3	N1-01173 1	Reply LS on “Selection of S-CSCF by I-CSCF based on capability requirements”	S2	<p>that it is too early to say whether it will be required for some later release.</p> <p>Further on they say that IMPI will be needed by the S-CSCF, the AS and HSS.</p> <p>The only usages for IMPI which are known at the moment are already documented in stage 2 but SA2 say that the discussions on charging issues are still open and whether any other element needs to be aware of IMPI for charging purposes is not known yet.</p> <p>N1-011635, 638 and 730 are linked.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Presentation of useful background information because there are requirements to stage 3 in this LS.</p> <p>SA2 comments on the selection of S-CSCF at I-CSCF.</p> <p>The allocation of 'nearest match' S-CSCF will be visible in CN1 specifications and CN1 would like to hear CN4 response in Cancun meeting.</p> <p>This is SA2 reply to CN4 LS in N1-011636</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>SA2 to SA3 on working assumption in respect to the relationship of the Private User Identifier, the Public User Identifier and the S-CSCF in the IMS.</p> <p>SA2 agreed that for Rel. 5, it is sufficient that all service profiles that contain the same Private User Identifier become assigned to the same S-CSCF. However, the possibility to assign multiple S-CSCFs to a single IMPI via different profiles in the later releases should not be blocked.</p> <p>This is not a problem for CN1 because we never had such a limitation in our working assumptions. But is this possibility covered also</p>
3	N1-01173 2	Response to the LS S2-012896 from SA3 on Security Aspects related to the IMS Authentication.	S2	

					in stage 2? This LS replies to SA3 LS in N1-011641
4	<b>CN1 work plan</b> Tuesday 13.11.2001		<b>The work plan will be reviewed in CN1 #21</b>		<b>Meeting calendar for 2001-2002:</b>  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) 3.-5. Apr.2001      CN1-SA2 SIP joint meeting (ETSI, Sophia Antipolis / France) 3.-4.4 joint, 5.4 CN1. 23.218 could be excluded? 8.-9. May 2001      CN1 R99 and older ad hoc meeting, Nokia candidate host.



14.-18.May 2001	CN1 #17, CN1-2-3-4 (North American friends of 3GPP / Puerto Rico)
13.-15.Jun.2001	CN #12 (Ericsson / Stockholm)
10.-12.Jul.2001	CN1 #18 with 11.7. joint CN1-2-3-4 (Dresden, Germany / D2 Vodafone)
27.-31.Aug.2001	CN1 #19 (Host needed)
19.-21.Sep.2001	CN #13 (China)
2.-4. Oct. 2001	CN1 #19bis Rel-5 IMS only
15.-19.Oct.2001	CN1 #20 (BT, Vodafone, Lucent / UK)
13.-15. Nov 2001	CN1 #20bis Rel-5 IMS only (AWS / Seattle)
26.-30.Nov.2001	CN1 #21 (North American friends of 3GPP / Cancun, Mexico)
12.-14.Dec.2001	CN #14 (Japan)
14.-18. Jan. 2002 5 days as necessary 28 Jan.-1 Feb 2002	CN1SIP ad hoc (AWS / Phoenix, USA) CN1 #22 (ETSI / Sophia Antipolis)
19 – 21 Feb	CN1 #22bis on Rel-5 open issues ( <b>host needed</b> )
6.-8. Mar. 2002	CN #15 (Korea)
8.-12. Apr. 2002	CN1 #23
13.-17. May 2002	CN1 #24
5.-7. Jun. 2002	CN #16 (?)

						29. Jul. – 2. Aug. 2002 4.-6- Sep. 2002 23.-27. Sep. 2002 11.-15. Nov. 2002 4.-6. Dec. 2002	CN1 #25 (Sonera, Finland) CN #17 (France) CN1 #26 CN1 #27 (Malaysia) CN #18 (New Orleans)
5	Void						
6	Void						
7	Void						
8	Release 5						
8.1	Rel-5 corrections Tuesday 13.11.2001		<b>Only IMS related Rel-5 corrections are treated in this meeting</b>				<b>Rel-5 cat. F corrections only</b>
8.2	IMS Draft specifications and other documents for information (7) Tuesday		<b>These documents may be 3GPP draft TSs or TRs or ones from the outside of 3GPP such as IETF.</b>				

	13.11.2001					
	8.02	N1-011643	Current draft 24.229: "IP Multimedia Call Control Protocol based on SIP and SDP"	Lucent Technologies / Keith drage	24.229	Noted. TS
	8.02	N1-011644	Summary of current IETF documents on SIP	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage		Noted. INFO
	8.02	N1-011645	Summary of current IETF documents on SIPPING	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage		Noted. INFO
	8.02	N1-011646	Summary of current IETF documents on SIMPLE	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage		Noted. INFO
	8.02	N1-011647	Summary of current IETF documents on MMUSIC	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage		Noted. INFO
	8.02	N1-011706	24.228v160 "Signalling flows for the IP multimedia call controlbased on SIP and SDP"	Motorola,John O'Hare	24.228	Noted. TS
	8.02	N1-011707	23.218v080 "IP Multimedia (IM) Session Handling"	Motorola,John O'Hare	23.218	Noted. New rapporteur is needed for 23.218. TS
8.3	23.218 (3) Tuesday 13.11.2001					
	8.3	N1-011674	Removal of section 12 in TS 23.218	Ericsson/M. Garcia	23.218	Withdrawn
	8.3	N1-011705	Filtering Criteria and Service Points of Interest	Nokia/ Gábor Bajkó	23.218	Revised to N1-011750
	8.3	N1-011744	CR to 23.218: Session handling in S-CSCF	Lucent Technologies	23.218	Revised to N1-011751
	8.3	N1-	Filtering Criteria and Service Points	Nokia/ Gábor	23.218	Revised to N1-011778

		011750	of Interest	Bajkó		Revision of N1-011705
	8.3	N1-011751	CR to 23.218: Session handling in S-CSCF	Lucent Technologies	23.218	Agreed Revision of N1-011744
	8.3	N1-011778	Filtering Criteria and Service Points of Interest	Nokia/ Gábor Bajkó	23.218	Agreed Revision of N1-011750
8.4	IMS Registration (14) Tuesday 13.11.2001					
	8.04	N1-011654	CR to 24.228: Cx interface in registration flows	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	24.228	Agreed.
	8.04	N1-011661	Usage of the Private ID in registration scenarios	Ericsson/M. Garcia	24.228	Revised to N1-011752
	8.04	N1-011662	Remove Sec. 6.7.1 from TS 24.228 v1.6.0	Ericsson/G. Talagery	24.228	Rejected. Putting the lack of trace of this change aside, what is the intended contents or do we just delete the whole clause?
	8.04	N1-011677	P-CSCF procedures at Registration	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.229	Revised to N1-011754
	8.04	N1-011683	S-CSCF procedures at registration/de-registration	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.229	Revised to N1-011755 N1-011739 – 740 changes the same paragraphs.
	8.04	N1-011688	CR to 24.229: Some proposals for procedures at the UE - registration	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Revised to N1-011757 What was decided in N1-011661 about the encoding of IMPI?
	8.04	N1-	Registration Handling for S-CSCF,	Lucent		Noted

	01169 5	HSS and AS	Technologies / Eric Henrikson		The proposed alternative 1c was supported but some companies also wanted to study alternative 3.
8.04	N1- 01169 6	CR to 24.229: SIP Level Registration Procedures for S-CSCF and AS	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	DISCUSSION Rejected Still discussion on the principle. Do we need NOTIFY (or SUBSCRIBE followed by NOTIFY) which makes the S-CSCF aware of HSS – AS procedures?
8.04	N1- 01169 7	CR to 23.218: Application Level Registration Procedures for S-CSCF, HSS and AS	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	23.218	Rejected.
8.04	N1- 01169 8	CR to 24.229: Registration procedure at P-CSCF	Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic	24.229	Revised to N1-011758
8.04	N1- 01169 9	CR to 24.229: Registration procedure at I-CSCF	Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic	24.229	Revised to N1-011759
8.04	N1- 01170 3	CR to 24.228: Visited network identifier	Lucent Technologies / Xin Chen	24.228	Agreed.
8.04	N1- 01173 9	CR to 24.229: Some proposals for procedures at the S-CSCF - registration	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Revised to N1-011755 N1-011683 changes the same paragraphs.
8.04	N1- 01174 1	CR to 24.229: Some proposals for procedures at the MGCF – registration	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Agreed.
8.04	N1- 01175 2	Usage of the Private ID in registration scenarios	Ericsson/M. Garcia	24.228	Agreed. Revision of N1-011661
8.04	N1- 01175 4	P-CSCF procedures at Registration	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.229	Rejected based on incorrect reference version even though the contents of the contribution was seen to be correct. Revision of N1-011677
8.04	N1- 01175	S-CSCF procedures at registration/de-registration	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.229	Revised to N1-011779 Revision of N1-011683, N1-011739

	8.04	5 N1-01175	CR to 24.229: Some proposals for procedures at the UE - registration	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Revised to N1-011769
	8.04	7 N1-01175	CR to 24.229: Registration procedure at P-CSCF	Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic	24.229	Revision of N1-011688 Revised to N1-011770
	8.04	8 N1-01175	CR to 24.229: Registration procedure at I-CSCF	Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic	24.229	Revision of N1-011698 Agreed.
	8.04	9 N1-01176	CR to 24.229: Some proposals for procedures at the UE - registration	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Revision of N1-011699 Agreed
	8.04	0 N1-01177	CR to 24.229: Registration procedure at P-CSCF	Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic	24.229	Revision of N1-011757 Agreed
	8.04	9 N1-01177	S-CSCF procedures at registration/de-registration	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.229	Revision of N1-011758 Agreed. Revision of N1-011683, N1-011739 Revision of N1-011755
8.5	IMS De-registration (5) Tuesday 13.11.2001					
	8.05	N1-01165	CR to 24.228: Cx interaction in deregistration	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	24.228	Agreed with the comment that it is not an addition of the tables and only the changes that are indicated with revision marks should be implemented.
	8.05	N1-01166	Clarification of scope of network initiated de-registration NOTIFY	Ericsson/G. Talagery	24.229	Revised to N1-011760
	8.05	3 N1-01168	CR to 24.229: Some proposals for procedures at the UE - deregistration	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Revised to N1-011761 What was decided in N1-011661 about the encoding of IMPI?
		9				

8.05	N1-011723	Network initiated De-Registration	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.228	Revised to N1-011753
8.05	N1-011740	CR to 24.229: Some proposals for procedures at the S-CSCF – deregistration	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Revised to N1-011756
8.05	N1-011753	Network initiated De-Registration	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.228	N1-011683 changes the same paragraphs. Agreed. Revision of N1-011723
8.05	N1-011756	CR to 24.229: Some proposals for procedures at the S-CSCF – deregistration	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Revised to N1-011780 N1-011683 changes the same paragraphs. Revision of N1-011740
8.05	N1-011760	Clarification of scope of network initiated de-registration NOTIFY	Ericsson/G. Talagery	24.229	Agreed Revision of N1-011663
8.05	N1-011761	CR to 24.229: Some proposals for procedures at the UE - deregistration	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Agreed Revision of N1-011689
8.05	N1-011780	CR to 24.229: Some proposals for procedures at the S-CSCF – deregistration	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Agreed. Revision of N1-011756
8.6	IMS Configuration hiding (8) Wednesday 14.11.2001				
8.06	N1-011653	CR to 24:228: Representation of tokenisation in notation clause	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	24.228	Rejected N1-011653 and N1-011664-665 are dealing with the same issue.
8.06	N1-011664	An example for tokenising/detokenising of SIP headers in TS 24.228	Ericsson/G. Talagery	24.228	Rejected N1-011653 and N1-011664-665 are dealing with the same issue.
8.06	N1-011665	An example for tokenising/detokenising of SIP headers in TS 24.229	Ericsson/G. Talagery	24.229	Rejected N1-011653 and N1-011664-665 are dealing with the same issue.

8.06	N1-011678	Outbound hiding in I-CSCF	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.229	Rejected The titles of subclauses 9.3.3 and 9.3.4 (inbound / outbound hiding) are not clear enough and the scope of both subclauses need to be clarified.
8.06	N1-011679	Inbound hiding in I-CSCF	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.229	Rejected The titles of subclauses 9.3.3 and 9.3.4 (inbound / outbound hiding) are not clear enough and the scope of both subclauses need to be clarified. Merging of subclauses 9.3.3 and 9.3.4 should be studied as hiding should be applied to outgoing messages irrespectively of whether they are requests or responses.
8.06	N1-011711	CR to 24.228 Replace "Firewall" with "THIG"	Nortel Networks/ Sonia Garapaty	24.228	Agreed
8.06	N1-011712	CR to 24.229 Replace "Firewall" with "THIG"	Nortel Networks/ Sonia Garapaty	24.229	Agreed. The change of terminology is needed but as Annex B was removed by agreeing tdoc N1-011743 this CR does not need to be implemented.
8.06	N1-011717	Open Issues on Network Configuration Hiding	AT&T wireless		Noted DISCUSSION Agreed the following points: 1. for hiding case gateway I-CSCF will always perform the THIG function 2. If the I-CSCF functionality is distributed to several physical nodes then the key management will be implementation specific. Additionally to that, the response will be decrypted in the same place as the initial request. 3. Any I-CSCF must be able to decrypt the headers which have been encrypted in the same network. Therefore key distribution is



8.06	N1-011726	Tokenisation in Hiding Cases	Siemens/ Georg Mayer	24.228	<p>needed.</p> <p>4. It was agreed that an indication of tokenisation is needed.</p> <p>5. The applicability of this scenario to IMS was questioned but it was stated that at least in case of network configuration problem it could happen.</p> <p>Agreed the following principles: Which entities are hidden? -&gt; the home network entities but not the IP address of the UE. And exception to this is that I-CSCF should not hide itself. Which parts of the SIP header should be included in tokenisation? -&gt; All elements of the SIP header should be included in the tokenised string because e.g. different versions later on. The notation of the token? -&gt; Appropriate prefixes should be added to tokenised identities to make them syntactically correct SIP URLs. Only the home network entities are hidden? -&gt; Yes. What was the decision on N1-011653, 664, 665? It was also agreed that there is a need for the network entities to be able to see if a header is tokenised or not.</p>
8.7	IMS Authentication (2) Wednesday 14.11.2001 8.07	Network initiated Re-Authentication	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.228	<p>Rejected.</p> <p>The call flow was in principle agreeable but as it must be revised the originator was asked to bring the next version to CN1 #21 together with a corresponding 24.229 CR.</p>

	8.07	N1-011722	Network initiated Re-Authentication (Hiding)	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.228	Rejected. The call flow was in principle agreeable but as it must be revised the originator was asked to bring the next version to CN1 #21 together with a corresponding 24.229 CR.
8.8	IMS Call initiation (27) Wednesday 14.11.2001					
	8.08	N1-011648	CR to 24.228: A review of the editor's notes in clauses 7.4 and 17.4	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.228	
	8.08	N1-011651	CR to 24.229: Treatment of Record-Route header by CSCFs	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Revised to N1-011762
	8.08	N1-011656	CR to 24.228: Cx interface in session initiation flows	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	24.228	Agreed
	8.08	N1-011657	CR to 24:228: Flow correction for 7.2.2.2, 7.2.2.3, 17.2.2.2 and 17.2.2.3	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	24.228	Revised to N1-011773
	8.08	N1-011667	Alignment with SIP on the usage of SDP in 200 OK to INVITE	Ericsson/M. Garcia	24.228	Agreed.
	8.08	N1-011668	QoS Assured Sessions Coordination with GPRS	Ericsson/A. Monrad	24.228	Revised to N1-011764
	8.08	N1-011669	Introducing support of ENUM into TS 24.228	Ericsson/M. Garcia	24.228	N1-011669 – 670 are linked CRs on 24.228 and 24.229.
	8.08	N1-011670	Introducing support of ENUM into TS 24.229	Ericsson/M. Garcia	24.229	N1-011669 – 670 are linked CRs on 24.228 and 24.229.

8.08	N1-011671	The use of the Call-ID header in TS 24.228	Ericsson/M. Garcia	24.228	Agreed. N1-011671 – 672 are linked CRs on 24.228 and 24.229.
8.08	N1-011672	The use of the Call-ID header in TS 24.229	Ericsson/M. Garcia	24.229	Withdrawn N1-011671 – 672 are linked CRs on 24.228 and 24.229.
8.08	N1-011680	Transactions for sessions initiated by the UE	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.229	Revised to N1-011774
8.08	N1-011682	Routing of any other requests	Nokia/ Krisztian Kiss	24.229	Revised to N1-011765
8.08	N1-011685	Procedures at P-CSCF: Call related requests	Nokia/ Krisztian Kiss	24.229	Agreed.
8.08	N1-011686	Procedures at P-CSCF: Subscription and Notification	Nokia/ Krisztian Kiss	24.229	Revised to N1-011766
8.08	N1-011692	Complex UEs and Record-Route	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	DISC
8.08	N1-011694	CR to 24.229: Using In-Reply-To header to associate SIP call legs between S-CSCF and AS	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	Postponed. More time is needed to study the issue and the delegates are requested to continue solving the problem after the meeting via correspondence. When the AS as B2BUA initiates a new call leg after receiving an INVITE, what is the right way to associate the two call legs: either tying the Call IDs together or using In-reply-to header?
8.08	N1-011700	Handling of the initial INVITE request	Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic		DISC
8.08	N1-011701	CR to 24.229: Ingress I-CSCF	Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic	24.229	Rejected
8.08	N1-	CR to 24.228: Stateful Ingress I-	Lucent	24.228	Revised to N1-011775

	01170 2	CSCF between S-CSCFs in SIP session	Technologies / Xin Chen		
8.08	N1-01170 4	Use of Contact/Request URI in CSCFs	Nokia/ Krisztian Kiss	24.228 24.229	Revised to N1-011772 DISC
8.08	N1-01170 9	Procedures at P-CSCF: Initial INVITE procedures	Nokia/ Krisztian Kiss	24.229	
8.08	N1-01171 3	CR to 24.228 on what the UE should do on alerting	Nortel Networks/ Sonia Garapaty	24.228	
8.08	N1-01171 4	CR to 24.228 on Updates to PSTN-T flow	Nortel Networks/ Sonia Garapaty	24.228	Revised to N1-011749
8.08	N1-01171 6	Record-Route and Via header for handling Spirals	AT&T Wireless		Noted. Agreed to take the action proposed in the discussion paper. SIP draft 05 defines that proxies must add the branch parameter mandatory in via headers. This leads to review and update of the call flows in 24.228. DISC
8.08	N1-01173 6	Discussion document on SDP usage	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage		DISC
8.08	N1-01173 7	CR to 24.229: Some proposals for procedures at the P-CSCF - call initiation	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Revised to N1-011767
8.08	N1-01174 2	CR to 24.229: Some proposals for procedures at the BGCF – call initiation	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	
8.08	N1-01174 9	PSTN-T	Nokia, Nortel/Gabor, Sonia		Revision of N1-011714

8.08	N1-011762	CR to 24.229: Treatment of Record-Route header by CSCFs	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Revised to N1-011771
8.08	N1-011764	QoS Assured Sessions Coordination with GPRS	Ericsson/A. Monrad	24.228	Revision of N1-011651 Agreed Revision of N1-011668
8.08	N1-011765	Routing of any other requests	Nokia/ Krisztian Kiss	24.229	Agreed. Revision of N1-011682
8.08	N1-011766	Procedures at P-CSCF: Subscription and Notification	Nokia/ Krisztian Kiss	24.229	Agreed. Revision of N1-011686
8.08	N1-011767	CR to 24.229: Some proposals for procedures at the P-CSCF - call initiation	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Agreed Revision of N1-011737
8.08	N1-011771	CR to 24.229: Treatment of Record-Route header by CSCFs	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Agreed Revision of N1-011762
8.08	N1-011772	Use of Contact/Request URI in CSCFs	Nokia/ Krisztian Kiss	24.228 , 24.229	Noted. DISC Revision of N1-011704
8.08	N1-011773	CR to 24:228: Flow correction for 7.2.2.2, 7.2.2.3, 17.2.2.2 and 17.2.2.3	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	24.228	Withdrawn Revision of N1-011657
8.08	N1-011774	Transactions for sessions initiated by the UE	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.229	Agreed. Revision of N1-011680
8.08	N1-011775	CR to 24.228: Stateful Ingress I-CSCF between S-CSCFs in SIP session	Lucent Technologies / Xin Chen	24.228	Agreed Revision of N1-011702
8.9	IMS Call clearing Wednesday 14.11.2001				

8.10	IMS Abnormal cases and error handling (1) Wednesday 14.11.2001	8.10 N1-011673	Terminating call to unregistered subscriber	Ericsson/Talagery	24.228	
8.11	IMS Emergency call Thursday 15.11.2001					
8.12	Other IMS issues (11) Thursday 15.11.2001	8.12 N1-011649 8.12 N1-011650 8.12 N1-011691 8.12 N1-01170	CR to 24.228: A review of the editor's notes in clauses 7.5 and 17.5 CR to 24.228: A review of the editor's notes in clauses 10 and 20 CR to 24.229: Application of profile tables to SDP CR to 24.228v160: Summary of changes proposed to 24.228	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage Mot, Luc, Eric, Siem,	24.228 24.228 24.229 24.228	Agreed

	8	following conf call reviews	Qualc, Nok, Nort, BT O'Hare		
8.12	N1-011715	CR to 24.228 on P-CSCF Discovery Mechanism	Nortel Networks/ Sonia Garapaty	24.228	Revised to N1-011776
8.12	N1-011718	Some issues on the Call Flows in 24.228	AT&T Wireless		DISC
8.12	N1-011738	CR to 24.229: Transport mechanisms for SIP	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	
8.12	N1-011743	CR to 24.229: Deletion of Annex B	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Agreed.
8.12	N1-011745	Addition of Cell ID to SIP messages - Proposed solution	Vodafone/ Duncan Mills		Noted. Discussion paper: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What about compromised privacy because the cell ID is revealed? -&gt; the Cell ID information should be kept within the cellular network.</li> <li>• The principle of adding the Cell ID information in a new header was agreed.</li> </ul>
8.12	N1-011746	Addition of Cell ID to SIP messages - Detailed proposal	Vodafone/ Duncan Mills		DISC
8.12	N1-011747	Addition of Cell ID to SIP messages - Updating of REGISTER requests in 24.228	Vodafone/ Duncan Mills	24.228	
8.12	N1-011776	CR to 24.228 on P-CSCF Discovery Mechanism	Nortel Networks/ Sonia Garapaty	24.228	Agreed. There is a mistake in the numbering of the figures in the document and the rapporteur volunteered to correct this when implementing the CR. Revision of N1-011715

8.13

	IMS Editorials and other minor issues (9) Thursday 15.11.2001				
8.13	N1-011652	CR to 24.229: Incorporation of rfc2543bis-05 draft	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Revised to N1-011777
8.13	N1-011675	Alignment of description of the content in the 'contact' field	Ericsson/A. Monrad	24.228	
8.13	N1-011676	Removal of the term TSGW	Ericsson/M. Garcia	24.228	
8.13	N1-011687	CR to 24.229: Editorial and minor technical changes	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	
8.13	N1-011690	CR to 24.229: Minor reorganisation of material in TS 24.229	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Agreed.
8.13	N1-011720	Editorial corrections to TS 24.228 Annex A .11 (clause 5)	BT	24.228	
8.13	N1-011725	User-IDs in Request URI	Siemens /Georg Mayer	24.228	Noted.
8.13	N1-011735	Portrayal of SIP response tables in 24.229	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Noted. DISC
8.13	N1-011777	CR to 24.229: Incorporation of rfc2543bis-05 draft	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Agreed Revision of N1-011652





8.08	N1-011659	UE call initiation procedures	Nokia	24.229	
8.08	N1-011681	Storage of information in P-CSCF	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.228	
8.08	N1-011693	CR to 24.229: Using branch parameter to avoid SIP "via" loops between S-CSCF and AS	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	Withdrawn
8.08	N1-011710	The content of To: and From: header fields	Nokia/ Gábor Bajkó	24.228	
8.08	N1-011733	PSTN-O	Nokia/ Gábor Bajkó	24.228	The tdoc was sent in time but are missing from the server for some reason were not uploaded to the 3GPP server.
8.08	N1-011734	PSTN-T	Nokia/ Gábor Bajkó	24.228	Withdrawn Merged with N1-011714 to a new tdoc N1-011749 The tdoc was sent in time but are missing from the server for some reason were not uploaded to the 3GPP server.
8.09	N1-011660	UE call release procedures	Nokia	24.229	
8.09	N1-011684	Procedures at P-CSCF: Call Release	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.229	

11 A.O.B.  
Thursday

	15.11.2001				
12	<b>Closing</b> Thursday 15.11.2001 no later than 15:00		<b>Did you mark your attendance to this meeting on the participants list?</b>		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.