3GPP TSG CN Plenary Meeting #14   NP-010592
Kyoto, Japan, 12-14 December 2001

Source:	**CN5 (OSA)**
Title:	**Report of CN5#14, Brighton, UK, 16 - 19 Oct 2001 (N5-010918)**
Agenda item:	**6.5.1**
Document for:	**Information**

3GPP TSG_CN5/Parlay/ETSI SPAN12   **N5-010918**

Meeting #14, Cancun, Mexico, 26 – 30 November 2001

Source:	Chelo Abarca (Alcatel) Chelo.Abarca@alcatel.fr
Title:	**Report of CN5#14 Brighton, UK, 16 - 19 October 2001**
Agenda Item:	**3.1**
Document for:	Approval
Category:	
Work Item ID:	
Doc Summary:	
Specs involved:	

Source:	**ETSI OSA Project Leader** **Chelo.Abarca@alcatel.fr**
Title:	**Final Report from Joint Group meeting #14**
Agenda item:	**1**
Document for:	**APPROVAL**

Agenda item	Agenda item title	Tdoc 3GPP N5-00	Title	Source	Result

1	Opening and approval agenda	911	Proposed agenda	N5 chairman	IPR issues are not solved yet between Parlay and ETSI, so a call is made for companies who are not 3GPP or ETSI but are Parlay, for them to know how the situation stands. It is expected to have some news this week. For the same reason there are not Policy Management or PAM specifications presented this week. It is reminded that the IPR discussion covers copyright, no patent rights, and also nothing about 3GPP. The agenda is approved.
2	Allocation of documents	912	Document allocation	N5 chairman	
3	Reporting				
3.1	CN5/SPAN12/Parlay	736	Report Munich	N5 chairman	Approved.
3.2	CN#13 plenary				The Sophia CRs to align 3GPP OSA 4.1 with ETSI version 1 and Parlay 3 were agreed; so was the WID, with a minor comment (see later in 938 discussion).
3.3	SA#13 plenary				The CRs from OSA SA1 were approved so there is now a new version (5.1.0); Richard already took into account these CRs in the Munich version of the OSA Rel5 requirements.
3.4		992	Informational report from 51st IETF meeting in London, SPIRITS WG	Lucent	SPIRITS looks at services in an IP network that respond to triggers in the PSTN and IN networks. They intend to enable Parlay applications to interact with SPIRITS elements within the IP network, and thereby provide SPIRISTS services. They're looking at a level above INAP. This contribution includes, at the end, two links, to the mapping to INAP and the mapping to Parlay. Question: how similar is this to the Parlay activities? Answer: this is to be elaborated; a difference is that IETF standardizes protocols, while we do APIs. Discussion whether this requires any action from us. Agreed we agree with the direction they're taking.
4	Liaison Statements				
		920	LS from T2 to "SyncML initiative" (cc: SA1, SA2, SA3, SA4, SA5, T3, CN4, CN5) Requesting DevMan Update	T2 (T2-010722)	T2 has been identified as the official link between SyncML and 3GPP, so they request an update on their work. Noted.

		921	Reply LS from T2 to SA5 (cc: SA1, SA2, SA3, SA4, T3, CN4, CN5) on Multiple Aspects of Device Management	T2 (T2-010856)	T2 accept the proposal from SA5 to manage the process of linking to external technology initiatives. See 921 for their first action on SyncML. It is noted that we'll meet this issue again in our discussion about User Profile (if we see it as included in the terminal part). Noted.	
		922	LS to alignment meeting (i.e. CN5) providing JCC update	TelCordia	For information, JCC announces a successful alignment between JCC 1.1 and Parlay 3.0 in the area of MPCC. JCC 1.1 is expected to be started shortly, end date around the end of the year. A more specific date will be given shortly. Noted.	
		923	LS to alignment meeting (i.e. CN5) providing JCAT update	TelCordia	JCAT work has started: a CC related API that will extend JCC 1.1 with capabilities to support Class 5/End Office services. This contribution stresses that the work in JCAT scope does not overlap with the work in the joint group. Question: how can there be no overlap if there are some services that are not well supported by the API as it is – in which case the joint API group should have a look at them too? Answer: if there are conflicting requirements for these extensions; if they come up in the joint group, then they can be discussed. It is agreed that nobody wants diverging APIs; this is the aim of this LS. The joint group would like JCAT to inform of any necessary enhancement, so the API can be kept aligned.	
		924	LS from ITU-T SG7 to All ITU-T SGs / All ETSI Working Groups / All ISO/IEC JTC1 SCs using ASN.1, TSAG on "XML and XSD assistance; OID repository and ASN.1 module database"	ITU-T SG7	ITU-T Study Group 7 is creating XML schemas for ASN.1 and would like to inform that these are the ones that need to be used. Noted.	
5	API interfaces OSA version 1.1					
5.1	status 12070					
5.2	General					
5.3	Introduction part					
5.4	Common Data					

		832	Missing Underlying Technology Exceptions	SUN	Was not presented in Munich. Some exceptions that can be thrown by the underlying technology are not included in the specifications. This CR adds three of them as an example to the Common Data section. Explicit names will be removed, adding some text that explains that depending on the specific technology other exceptions are possible. Updated to 1038.
		1038		SUN	Update of 832. Agreed.
		1014	Common Data Errors	Lucent	Comes from Munich's 815 and 816: a list of errors found in Common Data that Lucent consider should be fixed in release 3.1 of Parlay and equivalent ETSI and OSA releases. It is reminded that this is the last meeting to modify version 1.1, and that the 3GPP December plenary is the last chance for CRs to OSA Rel4, fully in line with Parlay 3.0 and ETSI version 1. So the way forward (for this contribution and also any other coming from 815 and 816) is agreed to be the following: to discuss every change proposed, and decide if it goes for December. For the proposal in this contribution: agreed to have a CR for the Common Data to remove the last sentence of the TpSessionID definition (1012); another to the Framework to clarify the issue of single service manager instance per application (1013).
		1012	CR to Common Data as a result of 1014	Lucent	Agreed.
		1013	CR to the Framework as a result of 1014	Lucent	Agreed.
		1019	Common Data Editorials	Lucent	Comes from Munich's 815 and 816: a list of editorials for the Common Data. The second one is related to a previously approved CR, which was not implemented correctly (518, July meeting). Agreed to produce CRs for ourselves with these editorials (though for the plenary we present a CR per part of the specification), for version 2. This should not require running two models in parallel, so we freeze 1.1 after this meeting and implement the changes for next version – except the second one, which is related to a CR that was already approved.

			1041	TpLongstring vs. TpLongString	Siemens	In the written specification, there is a type TpLongstring. In the corresponding CORBA IDL, the type is named TpLongString (uppercase "S" vs. lowercase "s"). Since the general rule is to capitalize the first letter of separate words in identifiers, the contribution notes that the IDL should be unchanged and the written specification should describe the type "TpLongString". See 1042 for alternative solution. Withdrawn.	
			1042	TpLongstring vs. TpLongString	Siemens	Raises same problem as 1041, but after realising that this type is never used, it proposes the alternative solution of removing the type. The reason why it is not used is because it is for really big strings. It is agreed that if it is not used, then it should be removed. Agreed.	
			1039	Revised sessionID description	SUN	This contribution clarifies the description of TpSessionId, in line with the discussion on Lucent's 1026. The sentence "If there is no requirement to identify sessions…" will be deleted. Discussion to be continued by email.	
5.5	Framework						
			941	Correction Heartbeat Management sequence diagram	Alcatel	This contribution raises the problem that in the Heartbeat Management sequence diagram the text and the figure are not aligned, and that this comes from an incomplete implementation of a previous CR. It also notes that 891 from Huawei, which was approved in Munich, was a partial fix. Agreed. Note that this agreement means that it is not necessary to implement the CR in 891.	

		963	Missing support for multiple applications per SLA	Ericsson	Proposes to allow for a single SLA for all applications from the same ASP, such that the ASP can easily update its portfolio without the need for complicated management to define different ones. To support this it is necessary that an application can contact the framework by supplying the identity of the Application Service Provider and the application, so the contribution proposes to extend TpDomainID in such a way that it also supports a combination of Application Service Provider and application identity. Concern that avoiding these administrative issues then security could also be endangered: applications who know the EntOpID may misbehave. Concerns as well that an ASP and an EntOp are not the same thing, and that what we need is the ASP domain, which is nowhere defined in our specs. Agreed that this needs further work. If it can be wrapped up this week, then it will be for version 1.1, and otherwise (and likely) for version 2. Final conclusion: for next meeting.
		1015	Framework Errors	Lucent	Comes from Munich's 815 and 816: a list of errors in the Framework. First error: it is noted that ServicePropertyMode is never used and should be removed from the specification. It needs to be discussed how to remove ServiceTypePropertyMode as well. Second, third, fourth errors: agreed. Agreed they all become CRs for version 1.1. Two CRs: 1010 with the first three errors, 1011 with the last one.
		1018	Framework Editorials	Lucent	Comes from Munich's 815 and 816: a list of editorial in the Framework. Agreed. Same conclusion as 1019: will be CRs for version 2.
		1028	Broaden the types of clients allowed to use authenticate	Lucent	As a result of alignment with Parlay the range of domains allowed to invoke authenticate is expanded. clientAppID is replaced with domainID, thus allowing the client to be any one from client application, service instance, enterprise operator etc. In other words all domains defined in TpDomainID. Concern that the "Consequences if not approved" could be expanded so that it does not only mention the alignment with Parlay, since there are more reasons, like for instance services could not register. Rest approved. New CR, will be number 1009.

		1009		Lucent	Update of 1028. Agreed.
		1031	Removal of activity test AppIDs from IpFwFaultManager's sequence diagrams	Nokia	Incorrect sequence diagrams for fault management: AppId parameter is used in the diagrams although it was earlier removed from the actual interface classes. This CR proposes to remove AppIDs from IpFwFaultManager sequence diagrams for activity testing (both for framework and application). Agreed.
5.6	Call Control				
		956	CORRECTION to Generic Call Control	BT	This contribution raises that no method or data type uses the data type TpCallAdditionalChargePlanInfo, and proposes to remove it. Agreed.
		957	Correction to ES 201 915-4 and 29.198-4	BT	Within section 6.6.2 of ES201 915_4 the table describing TpCallTreatment does not contain the Sequence Element Name 'calltreatmenttype'. BT believes that this anomaly was spotted at a previous meeting and a CR was produced, and therefore this correction should be made to both 29.198-4 and ES 201 915-4. Also within section 10 the table is repeated in the 'Common Call Control Data Types' section. This should be removed from this section. Discussion: MPCC does use TpCallTreatment, so it should not be removed. Not accepted.
		958	CORRECTION to Generic Call Control	BT	The table defining TpCallAdditionalReportInfo is missing the final (new) tag element value: P_CALL_REPORT_QUEUED. The contribution proposes to add it. Comment: "Consequences if not approved" is not correct and needs to be chaged. Comment: the "Choice Element Type" (TpCallReportType) is not correct and should be changed. Proposals for the change: Null or TpString (the latter can contain an indication of where is the queue the request is). The second proposal is agreed. Agreed with these comments, will be updated to ~~0094~~1094.
		~~0094~~10 94		BT	Update of 958. Agreed.

		959	Correction to ES 201 915-4	BT	This is only for the ETSI document: the introductory paragraph for the CC SCF is copied from the 3GPP document and not valid here. A new paragraph is proposed. The contribution also notes that the scope in Section 1 is a repeat of Section 4, and suggests that section 4 is removed or changes are made to the text as suggested. Discussion on the last paragraph that the contribution proposes to delete: the feeling of the meeting is that it should be kept, but there is discussion on whether we've added new functionality to GCC lately, rather than just allow error corrections. But there is a need to write that this is the last specification including GCC. Agreed with the following changes: the first current paragraph will be deleted, the last paragraph will be re-phrased, the rest will stay, and the proposed text will be added. New number: 1068.
		1060		BT	Update of 959. Agreed.
		961	Changes for getCriteria()	Ericsson	This contribution raises two problems when using the synchronous method getCriteria(), which returns all the criteria that an application has set which could be a very large set: since the size of an IIOP message is limited, not all criteria may fit into it; and also the time required to gather all criteria may exceed the time-out time for an IIOP message. It proposes several solutions for these problems (the 4th being the preferred one), and proposes to apply them only to MPCC. Another solution is proposed: to add the assignmentId to getCriteria. It is also discussed whether this is a real problem, and what are exactly the maximum IIOP message size and the defined time out. It needs to be checked too if there is a one-to-one relationship between object invocation and IIOP message. Not agreed.

		1016	Call Control Errors	Lucent	Comes from Munich's 815 and 816: a list of errors found in Call Control.

Comes from Munich's 815 and 816: a list of errors found in Call Control.

1. In the state description for the IpCallLeg STD it is stated that eventReportReq could be used to request more address digits. It isn't clear how this could be done.

   Not agreed, it will be left as it is. But for version 2 a sequence diagram will be added to show how these digits are collected.

2. There is no redirection sequence diagram as per Lucent's contribution in Sophia (N5-010592).

   Agreed.

3. DisableCallNotification() states that: "the framework will return the error code ...". This is incorrect/misleading as it is the call control manager which returns this error code.

   Agreed.

4. 7.1.3: 20) states that the application can REQUEST a redirection by supplying an original destination address in the route request! This is not the case (see the text for IpAppCallLeg.routeReq()).

   Some re-phrasing needs to be done in the text.

5. The description of createNotification still references the notification type, which has been removed.

   Agreed.

6. DestroyNotification states that: "the framework will return the error code ...". This is incorrect/misleading as it is the call control manager which returns this error code.

   Agreed.

7. All references to assignmentID in this section incorrectly reference generic call control.

   Agreed.

8. ChangeNotification(). The assignmentId parameter description talks about notifications being "disabled", it should say "changed".

   Agreed.

9. References getInfoReq() and superviseReq() but should be referencing

		998	Correct serviceTypeName description	Lucent	Agreed.
		999	The name of changeNotification's second parameter is incorrect	Lucent	Agreed.
		1000	Correct MPCC Data Definitions	Lucent	Still to correct Release_Cause definition; will be updated and sent for email approval.
		1001	Correction of errors in naming P_CALL_MONITOR_MODE_INT ERRUPT	Lucent	Agreed.
		1002	Clarification of release propagation text	Lucent	Agreed.
		1003	Remove references to notification type since this has been deleted	Lucent	Agreed.
		1004	Clarify that redirection is not requested by setting the Original Destination Address	Lucent	Typo, needs correction. Will be updated into 1062.
		1005	Correct references to Framework where CC Manager is the correct reference	Lucent	Agreed.
		1010	Corrections to New SCF Registration text	Lucent	Agreed.
		1011	Correct type defined for service instances in TpDomainID	Lucent	Agreed.
		1020	Call Control Editorials	Lucent	Comes from Munich's 815 and 816: a list of editorials in Call Control. Some issues are agreed to be CR-ed for this release: • 7.6.2 issues (three of them) • typo in the IDL • the one on the monitor mode • the issue on 7.3 The one on section 7 will be removed from the ETSI specification but will stay in the 3GPP specification. For the rest, agreed, and same conclusion as 1019: will be CRs for version 2. One CR will be for the issue in 7.3 (reword the first paragraph to avoid referring to MPCCS enhancing GCCS functionality, or at least make it clear that this doesn't imply inheritance).

| | | 1022 | Leg Session ID required to be passed by chairSelection and floorRequest | Lucent | This contribution proposes that the chairSelection and floorRequest methods provide the leg session ID to indicate which call leg is making the request. It's also proposed that it's not the application's responsibility to return a CallLegId, so the return parameter of these two methods should be changed to "void".

It is observed that the legSessionId was present in these methods in Parlay 2.1, then somehow lost; agreed that this should be corrected.

Suggestion that for the references in both methods to H323 should be removed. Agreed.

Suggestion that the return section should be removed. Agreed.

Agreed with those remarks. New number: 1008. |
| | | 1008 | | Lucent | Update of 1022.

Agreed. |
| | | 1023 | Overlapping INTERRUPT mode notifications in Sequence Diagram | Lucent | The sequence diagram in section 8.1.2 shows two applications getting control of the same call via overlapping notifications. It is proposed that this section is removed, leaving 8.1.1 to illustrate the functionality ("Barring for media combined with call routing, alternative 1") since only one application is used in alternative 1.

Suggestion: it is possible to have the same application doing this instead of two, so the text could be re-phrased to reflect this; but do notifications overlap in this case? To be discussed by email, and for the time being the sequence diagram stays. |
| | | 1025 | Change Call Control STD that still has reference to the Service Factory. | Lucent | The Service Factory has been replaced in Release 4 with Service Lifecycle Manager, so this contribution proposes to update an STD reference to Service Factory.

Comments: some things are missing in the front page of the CR. At least the "Clauses affected" needs to be written (other parts can be automatically corrected).

Agreed with the comments above, new number 996. |
| | | 996 | | Lucent | Update of 1025.

The "current version" field in the front page of the CR is wrong. Adrian will correct it. |

		1026	Remove the ref to call leg provided in createAndRouteCallLegErr	Lucent	The createAndRouteCallLegErr operation is only invoked if a call leg has failed to be created, and therefore in this case providing a reference to the call leg is not useful to the application. This contribution proposes that a TpSessionID is provided to identify the call leg rather than the TpSessionID and IpCallLeg[Ref].
					Question: does the STD say that the call leg object is destroyed? Otherwise the object is still there, and some information could be obtained from it. Answer: in this case there is no use for any call leg, since its creation has failed: this is a convenience function (create, then route) and we agreed that if one step fails then everything fails. Besides, the reference to the call leg object was already returned on creation, so it's not necessary to provide it again.
					Concern that the agreement above for convenience functions is not stated anywhere and should be.
					For email discussion.
		1027	Remove text referring to tariff changes in three method descriptions	Lucent	The text of the descriptions of methods superviseCallRes(), superviseRes() and superviseVolumeRes() indicates that the methods will be invoked if the tariff changes but there is no appropriate call supervision report. This contribution proposes to remove the reference to tariff change in the three methods (currently they are supposed to be invoked also when a tariff switch happens in the network during an active call).
					Comment: this was, and still is, in 3GPP stage 2. If the functionality exists in the network then we could enhance the data type. We need to have a look at the mapping documents for that; Matti will help Andy doing it.
					For email discussion..
		1030	Addition of CAMEL specific description	Nokia	This text was agreed in CN5#11 (San Diego), N5-010301, to be part of the GCCS section, but has been left out for some reason. The text indicated that CAMEL does not fully support the Generic Call Control features.
					Agreed.
		1091	CORRECTION to Generic Call Control	BT	Two of the sequence diagrams in GCCS show objects (IpAppCall) being created by the IpAppCallControlManager. For consistency's sake, and to reflect the regime undertaken in all other sequence diagrams in the GCC section, it is suggested that the objects IpAppCall are shown created by the IpLogic instance and not the IpAppCallcontrolManager.
					Agreed.

		1092	CORRECTION to Generic Call Control	BT	The description of states for the IpCall STD in Sec 6.4.2 describes more than exists within the diagram. The contribution proposes to delete the description of states that are not applicable to this diagram. This is a typical error from Rose document generation. It's been already corrected in the last 3GPP version (4.2.0), but need to be corrected for the ETSI document. Ultan will check if this has been discussed before; anyway it needs to be checked if Nokia's 660, which proposed some text, has been taken into account.
5.7	User Interaction				
		1017	UI Editorials	Lucent	Comes from Munich's 815 and 816: a list of editorials in User Interaction. Agreed that the first two issues need to be in a CR for version 1.1.
		1021	Inter-dependence of UI and Call Control	Lucent	This document is submitted at this stage for discussion, in order to solicit views on the relationship between call-based User Interactions and Call Control: UI has call- and non-call-related parts, and the ones that are call-related require implementing Call Control as well, and maybe an interface between these two SCSs. Several solutions are proposed: • To integrate call-based UI into CC (same as has been done with charging), • To define an interface between them • Rather than passing the object reference when creating the UICall, just to pass the address of the party(ies) that are the target(s) of the interaction. The intention of this document is to start the discussion and make updates for next version. Comment: the last solution proposed might not be sufficient because it's necessary to indicate the call, and not just the party (since the same use may be involved in more then one call at the same time). This is left as food for thought, to be discussed off-line.

		1024	Methods accepting an interface as a parameter need to be able to raise P_INVALID_INTERFACE_TYPE.	Lucent	Methods accepting an interface as a parameter need to be able to raise P_INVALID_INTERFACE_TYPE, so this contribution proposes to have this exception added to the "raises" list of the methods createUI, createUICall and createNotification in User Interaction. Note that the rest of the SCFs have not been checked for the same problems, though it is believed that they don't have them. Needs correcting the cover page, and splitting into a CR for UI (1006) and another for Mobility (1007)
5.8	Mobility				
5.9	Data Session Control				

		991	Corrections and alignment additions to the Data Session Control SCF.	Lucent	One more consequence of 815 or 816 from last meeting: A number of errors still exist in the Data Session Control SCF specification, as well as misalignments with analogous functionality in other Service Capability Feature specifications and definitions. Corrections made: – correction of sequence diagram (address translation with charging) – removal of reference to R99, since applicable to R4 and onward as well – editorial corrections Alignment additions proposed: – addition of deassignDataSession – addition of continueProcessing – method description updates – STD updates Objection to the proposed new table for TpDataSessionReleaseCause, which is inspired in the one for CC, and contains CC related events which are not valid for Data Session Control. Agreed that the table needs to be modified to include what is relevant to CAMEL and GPRS, rather than go back to the previous table. Comment on the note in createNotification (Note that createNotification() is not applicable if the data session is setup by the application): we don't have this functionality. Agreed that this sentence should be removed. ContinueProcessing should be added to the active state of the STD. Rest agreed. Will be updated in 997.
		997		Lucent	Update of 991. For the table on TpDataSessionReleaseCause: it has been changed back to the previous table, since it was found that the CAMEL and GPRS information was not relevant here. Agreed.
5.10	Terminal Capabilties				
5.11	Generic Messaging				

5.12	Connectivity Management				
5.13	Account Management				
		802	Replace erroneous use of incorrect data type TpSessionID by TpAssignmentID in Account Management interface.	Lucent	Was not presented in Munich, it is the CR based on the agreed document 801. Agreed.
5.14	Content-based charging				
6	OSA version 1 mapping				
6.1	status of 12075				
6.2	contributions				
		965	MPCC: SIP Mapping Tables	Ericsson	This contribution is an update of 964. It is based on the IETF SIP as it is today, without 3GPP extensions. It is intended for discussion of a first outline of the SIP mapping for the Multi-party Call Control API. The focus in this first draft has been on the mapping on MPCC method level and SIP message level. Especially the methods identified to have an impact on the SIP signalling have been addressed. Detailed mapping on parameter level has also been worked out. Agreed to update table 2-*** with *** and map it into ***. The mapping is complete in this document (all methods and messages are taken into account, also all relevant SIP messages), but the document will be further elaborated for example for clarity. Also SIP options need to be considered, and SIP call unrelated (presence related, notify, etc) messages. Agreed that those SIP messages not related to CC will be in a different mapping document, one per API, same as in previous releases. Question: how the REGISTER method will be handled, will it be propagated to the SCS? This is related to the filtering information specified in 23.218. It is up to individual companies in SA2 and CN1 to investigate this further. Extensions to IETF SIP by CN1 have not been taken into account, and it should be investigated if it is needed. This means that the current mapping is a mapping to SIP, but not a mapping to the ISC interface. But ISC is intended to be an extension of SIP, so working on SIP now means that in the future we'll only have to work on a delta. The preferred option is to have a single, ISC, mapping document.

7	3GPP CN5 vice-chair election				
		935	Nomination of Musa Unmehopa	Lucent	The candidate is elected as 3GPP CN5 Vice Chair.
8	Technical discussions OSA version 2				
8.1	ETSI SPAR				
8.1.1	Issues resulting from mapping to SPAR Version 1 requirements.	943	Proposal for SPAN requirements	Alcatel	SPAN14 has three OSA related work items: • 141606 part 1: Open Service Access API Requirements Version 1 • 141606 part 2: Open Service Access API Requirements Version 2 • 141606 part 3: Mapping API OSA Version 1 to SPA Requirements The scope of OSA Version 1 has finally become a super-set of the requirements in part 1, but it is well reflected in the current draft for part 3. This contribution proposes the following: • To merge parts 1 and 3 into a single document, re-named part 1. • To modify the dates in the current SPAN work plan to: 30/11 for the draft, 30/12 for the final version. • To agree on taking the current part 3 (N5-010621 from Frans Haerens), briefly presented in the Sophia Joint OSA API meeting, as a draft of this new part 1. • To agree on an email approval process, with deadline as decided by the meeting, for this new part 1. Agreed. Chelo will send next week the document and a proposal for email approval.
8.2	Joint API group requirements				

		990	Overview of OSA requirements for Rel5	SA1 OSA (Lucent)	(This Tdoc comes in ppt and doc forms).
					Status of OSA stage 1: version 5.1.0; additional changes expected after october meeting, expected clarifications but not new features, to be approved in their *** plenary.
					Main new version 5 requirements: • Policy Management (does not cover network management policies) • Journalling (originally called traceability); though could be considered a network function, there was operator interest in having this functionality in OSA. No concrete requirement about this, just that the functionality needs to be supported. The information required is specified in the stage 1 doc. • MM channel control: requirements collected from 22.228 (IP MM subsystem stage 1) and TR 22.941 (IP MM framework stage 0) • Retrieval of network capabilities of the network elements supporting a user; for example the scenario where a user roams to a network, to know what this network supports; also which network access is supported. • Information service function: originally intended as yellow pages for subscribers to find, through the applications, what services are available in the network. OSA applications provide information to the SCS as to the service they provide, and other applications query the SCS to "discover" this applications. • Presence service function (see S1-O01093 in the same pack, which includes the last status of presence requirements). Work in SA2 on presence recently started, not clear to SA1 OSA if SA1 OSA presence and SA1 Presence requirements are enough for CN5 to proceed. Concern on alignment, since Parlay has adopted the PAM specs. • User Profile/Access Management
					SA1 would like feedback from us (next meeting Kobe, Japan, November 15-19 – no SA1 OSA ad-hoc but discussions in SA1 plenary). They understand CN5 may have to prioritise these requirements. SA1 OSA doesn't plan to start stage 1 for Rel6 until end of 2002.
					Question: considering the March deadline for Rel5, would it be possible to have priority guidelines from SA1? Conclusion: CN5 will draft an LS with this and other points raised, that Michel will bring to SA1 OSA. Just guidelines will be requested, keeping in mind that it depends on the implications in the architecture, and thus on the work in SA2 and maybe other groups, whether each requirement can be met for Rel5.

| | | 1093 | | BT | 1st part of document refers to Joint working group requirements. 2nd part (annex) refers to Parlay-only requirements, covering other Parlay working groups. Necessary since this document is the 'Parlay' set of requirements.

3.1: discussion on the style proposals: more than a new requirement is something basic, and the meeting agrees that we should strive to have not only more clear low level examples but also an overview, in text form, that new-comers can read to begin with.

Ard-Jan, Chelo and Andy commit to write a White Paper that could serve as introductory reading, and will start in parallel the process of finding out how to include it as a link in the relevant place in the 3GPP web page and the ETSI Portal.

Proposal on lack of consistency in naming conventions: the meeting believes that at least most of them have been solved.

Proposal on how to find things in the data definitions: this is considered to be very important and should be addressed (for example there are duplicated data types in Call Control).

The editor's note on Deprecation is considered to be a requirement, and it is suggested to be written as such. Karsten commits to provide a proposal for this.

Comment on requirement document structure: it is suggested to have a table format with information like which of the participating bodies was the originator of the requirement. This is postponed until the end off the review of the document, when we'll be in a better position to know if it is suitable.

Comment: we need to state the requirement of backward compatibility. It is noted that there is currently a CR to OSA stage 1 (S1O01099) adding a backwards compatibility requirement. Ard-Jan, Richard John-Luc and Andy commit to study this issue.

3.1.1: text on CPL and XML moved to an annex.

Emergency preparedness: a Parlay focus group was created in Munich, to identify the additions needed and contribute to the relevant WGs. In 3GPP it has been agreed that "the suitability of existing functionality should be investigated first in order to offer a quicker solution for the US FCC requirements, rather than developing a new feature which would take more time and resource" (from the SA report). We leave this requirement from Parlay as a placeholder, and we'll wait for the contributions coming from the expert group.

3.1.2: Eurescom Balancing of interfaces added
This is a requirement to check if it is necessary to have a more symmetric | |

8.3	Parlay Content based Charging requirements				
		1043	Service Properties for Content Charging	Siemens	No Service Properties have been specified for the Content Charging SCF so far. This contribution proposes a number of service properties that shall be supported for CBC. It does not propose the final XML DTD for them (Siemens will prepare it when the service properties that shall be supported by the Content Charging API are agreed). Comment: on the second table, INTEGER and STRING types are used, but we're not using them; besides, for the existing SCF properties (CC and Mobility) in registration these properties are ranges (SET types), to be later restricted. Answer: types will be changed according to the current convention. Agreed with above modification. Will be updated together with 960 (see below).
		960	Service Properties Definition for Content Based Charging	Ericsson	This document proposes a set of service properties for the Content Based Charging SCF. It will be revised with 1043 and a joint contribution will be prepared.
		1044	Requirement for Content Charging: Split Charge	Siemens	New requirements have been identified after the Munich meeting and discussions with the ~~Charging Forum~~Payment Group. This contribution proposes adding the feature of split charging feature (to the SCS - the application can do it locally as well, in which case there is no requirement for OSA), and proposes some text for the requirements document. Agreed.

| | | 1045 | Policy-Enable Content Charging API | Siemens | New requirements have been identified after the Munich meeting and discussions with the Charging Forum. This contribution proposes supporting policy-enabled CBC. This is proposed to be done with an independent policy management component, so it does not affect the current API.

The proposed solution is meant to be an application for the CBC SCF of how to introduce policy management in the whole of the OSA API. See figure in contribution: the current SCF remains untouched, there is a new policy management component for CBC and the CBC SCS, with an internal interface "2" between both; and policy management functionality in the Framework. This contribution intends to make explicit the policies applicable to CBC.

The feeling of the meeting is that it is not desirable to have policy-enabled SCFs as mandatory, but that we need a mechanism to support it if desired.

Proposed to have a use case for a policy-enabled SCF in the Policy Management SCF, instead of a requirement for one or all of the existing SCFs.

Agreed to stop this discussion and strive to use this information for a more general policy management requirement, for all SFCs, in the joint API requirements document. | |
| | | 1046 | Requirement for Content Charging: Tax Handling | Siemens | New requirements have been identified after the Munich meeting and discussions with the Charging Forum. This contribution proposes support of Tax Handling.

Comment that tax handling can be done in a different way: business support systems could deal with it, but can this be done for pre-paid? Answer: true this needs further discussion, and it is intended as a place holder in case we need to implement it.

Comment: not supporting this may put limitations on the use of the CBC for Rel5, so it should be addressed soon.

Comment: if the requirement is not clear, it is not desirable to have it in the joint API requirements document, because we would like it to be an integrated, consistent requirements list.

Agreed to have this requirement in an annex of the joint API requirements document. | |

		1095	Confirmation Categories	Siemens	Proposes for CBC the requirement to support certain fixed confirmation mechanisms or categories; it proposes four of them and lists the associated requirements. There is already some support for confirmation in the current requirements, and it is not intended to extend them; this contribution is for discussion, and presents a first approach to a solution to how confirmations can be addressed. Question: for interactive confirmation, could the existing Terminal Capabilities SCF be used? Answer: the existing Terminal Capabilities SCF is very focused on WAP. Agreed. A contribution will be presented that contains changes to the specification accordingly.
8.4	Policy Management				
8.5	PAM				
		940	PAM overview	PAM group	Noted.
8.6	Other				
		1080	Proof of Concept – Transforming CORBA UML to Analysis and back	Nortel & Sun	This contribution documents the steps taken to transform the current CORBA UML model to an Analysis model and back again. The "before and after" models were then verified as being identical. The transformations have been automated using the Rational Rose Extensibility Interface. Question: has the UML structure been respected? This structure allows generating CORBA IDL. Answer: yes, and IDL can be generated from the model resulting from going to Analysis and back. There is a particular way to structure the data types (for example strucs and unions, the order of elements in enums) in the UML that allows to generate the IDL. There is the danger that those who handle the Analysis model may touch it, and then the resulting UML model would not be useable for generating IDL. This could only be avoided with scripts that would need to have complicated logic, maybe down to each data type. Dave will look into this.

| 1037 | A Unified Approach for Parlay Realisation | Sun | Based on the acceptance of 1080 , on how to provide a language-neutral (Analysis) UML model from the present language-dependent (CORBA) UML model, this contribution proposes a framework for the development of a number of language-dependent models from a single language-neutral model. It proposes to impose backwards compatibility to the technology dependent specifications, while not to the Analysis spec, providing that changes on the Analysis model do not break backwards compatibility for the CORBA, Java or XML deliverables.

With this framework, the contribution expects that further joint Parlay, ETSI and 3GPP group contributions should be made against the Analysis Word docs and the CORBA translation rules. The contribution also proposes to add a requirement for the joint Parlay, ETSI and 3GPP group to publish the Analysis Word docs in addition to the CORBA Word docs and CORBA OMG-IDL already published.

Question: why not publishing the Analysis UML model?
Answer: it is used for internal purposes. Publishing the corresponding Word document is enough for newcomers to write technology neutral contributions. The proposal: to keep the equivalent to today's document – an Analysis Word document – but not have a CORBA Word document at the top of the tree. There are many opinions that having CORBA at the top would not necessarily limit the model, that CORBA is generic enough.

Question: the terms "publish" and "ownership" need clarification.
Answer: they will be made clearer.

We need the CORBA UML model for generating the IDL; we can generate XML directly from the IDL. But for the Java model we need the Analysis UML model: that's the only use of it, but it's necessary because otherwise the result is not very good as a Java model. There are some concerns if the mapping from IDL to XML has similar results, and if this is another case where the Analysis model is necessary.

The following solution is agreed: to apply a script, like the one proposed in Nortel's contribution 1080, to the CORBA UML model, to generate directly the Java model. The Analysis model may be an intermediate step but it would not be used to base further work on, just for educational purposes. Contributions will be done on the CORBA UML model. Then the same solution can be applied to generate the XML model if it is concluded that the one obtained directly from the IDL is not good.

The contribution will be updated implementing the agreed solution: the diagram will be very similar (though no Analysis Word document) but the dynamics behind it will be different, and explained in the new version.

For the annexes it is proposed to see if it's possible to add a reference to the Java and XML specifications, in addition to the IDL. |

		962	Ways to obtain XML support in OSA	Ericsson	This contribution proposes the need for an XML version of the OSA API (already agreed as a requirement in the requirements doc), and it aims to clarify some of the remaining issues and outline how the XML version could be produced. Some of them have already been addressed in the previous discussions in this agenda item. Ard-Jan, , and will update this document to make sure it captures the scope of the joint group, and Richard will bring it to the Parlay Board. The issue of call-back functionality, which is expected to raise some problems, will be discussed off-line and a solution will be brought to Cancun.
9	Outgoing liaisons				
9.1	Response to ITU-T SG11	1058		Marconi	Integrates comments from Alcatel's 751 in Munich and SUN's comments by email. Since there is no liaison with ITU-T, it is proposed to proceed via ETSI. Comment: A4 is no longer valid and should be deleted. Agreed with this and other editorial changes. To be updated to 11059.
		1059		Marconi	Update of 1058. Agreed. Jane will send it to the SPAN chair for approval by SPAN TC, then will be sent by Karl Heinz to ITU-T (Jane will in parallel and informally give it to the rapporteur).
9.2	Response on 742 to SA5/SA2	942	Draft reply to SA5 LS (N5-010742)	Alcatel	We're not defining a charging architecture but an API to the network as a whole (not to a particular network element), but we need to define interfaces with them. We don't define data for charging but we depend on what's provided by the network, so we have some overlap. Note that SA5 is working on Rel4, and it is the SA2-SA5 drafting who, until the end of the year, will be in charge of the IMS work (TR23.815), only handing it over to SA5 at the beginning of next year. Draft updated in the meeting, will be number 944. Still pending decision about Cancun. To be approved by email.
		931	[DRAFT] Liaison Statement on direction for implementing SA1 OSA and VHE Requirements	Ericsson	Comment: if we don't get guidance from SA1 for our November meeting, then it
9.3	Response on 740 to SA1	933			This response is drafted and agreed in the meeting.
		930		Alcatel	An update was drafted in the meeting, number 934.

		934		Alcatel	Update of 930. Will be revised and discussed by email, and sent to SA2 for their next (Kobe) meeting, so we can discuss it with SA2 in a joint session in Cancun.
		1061	LS on security aspects to SA3	BT	SA3 is concerned about the security in the Framework document, and would like to have the opportunity to review it for Rel5. It would be useful to send them an LS with the Framework for them to revise, and possibly, if they have some comments, to invite them to discuss them in one of our meetings. Proposed to give them a presentation like the one for SA5; they're meeting November 27-28 in Sophia (at the same time we meet in Cancun). Richard and Chelo will prepare a LS with an introduction to the Framework and the specs attached.
9.4	Other				
10	Organizational aspects				
10.1	3GPP OSA Work Item Description	938	Rel5 OSA Stage 3 - Draft Building Block level Work Item Description	MCC	
10.2	Review of 3GPP OSA workplan	936	3GPP OSA workplan	MCC	
		937	List of CN5_CRs_to CN#14 (Version 2.0)	MCC	
10.3	further work on 12076				
10.4	further work on 12075				
10.5	Other				
		830	Rollout of 3GPP, ETSI and Parlay specifications	SUN	Was not presented in Munich
11	Future meetings				• **November26-30, Cancun, co-located with SA2, SA5 and CN1-4.** • **February 5-8, Hong Kong, co-located with Parlay (Parlay meets 5-7).**
12	AOB				