

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

NP-010593

Source: CN5 (OSA)

Title: Draft Report of CN5#15, Cancun, MEXICO, 26 - 20 Nov 2001 (N5-011105)

Agenda item: 6.5.1

Document for: Information

3GPP TSG_CN WG 5/Parlay/ETSI SPAN12
 WG 5 Meeting #15, Cancun, Mexico
 26th – 30th Nov 2001

N5- 011107

Source: ETSI OSA Project Leader
Chelo.Abarca@alcatel.fr

Title: Draft report

Agenda item: 1

Document for: APPROVAL

Agenda item	Agenda item title	Tdoc 3GPP N5-00	Title	Source	Result
1	Opening and approval agenda	1100	Proposed agenda	N5 chairman	
2	Allocation of documents	1101	Document allocation	N5 chairman	
3	Reporting				
3.1	CN5/SPAN12/Parlay	918	Report CN5#14 Brighton	ETSI OSA project leader	Everybody is invited to see the changes implemented and send comments until next week Wednesday, when the final Brighton report will be produced.
3.2	Report of all 3GPP OSA related activities	1155		CN5 vice-chair	<p>CN5 vice-chair presents a summary of the work that has taken place in other OSA related groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SA2 VHE/OSA #20: work on GUP not progressing as we expected because the requirements work by SA1/SA2 on this is not finished, so User Profile may be moved to Rel6. SA2 VHE/OSA #20: has discussed our LS (N5-1112) on architectural impacts of requirements and will present us a reply (S2-013055). An update of VHE/OSA stage 2 (Service Architecture) is available. SA1 VHE/OSA: TS 22.141 raised to version 5.1.0; there is now a minimum set of attributes that describe a 3GPP subscribed.

3.3	Parlay Board and TAC meeting Miami.				<p>Richard Stretch summarises the last Parlay Board and TAC meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of the future of the Parlay Group with the current new set of requirements. • Approval of ETSI/Parlay agreement (which has been also approved by the ETSI GA). The agreement says that the material used in the Joint Group (which for the moment excludes PAM and PM) and being released as ETSI spec is now jointly owned by ETSI and Parlay. • The president of Parlay has resigned, the vice-president (Zygmund L) takes his position for the next 6 months. • Some WG charters were described; some have requirements that are included in our req groups. • It was agreed that the Joint group has the right expertise to be in charge of the 3.1 XML spec. • Web services group: same target of joint group of producing an XML version of the spec; clarified that both groups should work together to ensure the proper specs are being produced. Dave adds that the chair of the Web services WG does not believe there is an overlap. • Emergency Telecom Services introduced by Telcordia: decided that for the Hong-Kong meeting we'll concentrate on the CC interface and enhancements on it will be considered for the support of these services. • Parlay 4 requirements document (which will be discussed here): agreed that PAM and PM requirements will not necessarily form part of the document at this moment, and they will be part of the ETSI version 2. This will be incorporated in 3GPP Rel5 (Guda will bring to this meeting the identification of the 3GPP subset of requirements for the PAM spec). • An Annex has been added to the requirements group that contains the requirements that are not for the whole Joint Group (CPL, SCE, ecommerce will not be part of Parlay 4.0: no proposed chair for these groups; tax collection is also in the annex because the impact of this requirement is not clear). Parlay Lite is also in the annex, and there is a need to find out what are the differences with Parlay X. The Joint group is considered to have the right expertise to provide input on this discussion and provide a verbal response to Hong-Kong. Richard has the Parlay X charter and can present it in this meeting. Richard will be given a time slot to present it in the meeting, and an off-line brainstorming for volunteers will be organized. • Hong-Kong meeting (4-8 February, all details in web server now): Richard has negotiated 5 days for the Joint group except plenary times (Tuesday morning and 1st quarter of Thursday afternoon). The Parlay WGs will actually continue on Friday, but the Thursday plenary has already announced in the web so it won't be moved. On Monday there may be a ¼ day TAC meeting. It is Chinese NY, so
-----	-------------------------------------	--	--	--	--

		1125	White Paper on Business Cases, User Cases and Implications on Requirements (Parlay APIs 4.0)	Alcatel	<p>This contribution presents, for information, a white paper that has been sent to the Parlay Board to propose a new activity on business models and use cases, with a two-fold objective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To ensure that the requirements for the new Parlay phase support the desired applicability of the API. • To produce arguments to make the use of the API more attractive to operators and developers. <p>For this purpose the paper studies an example, and shows how a business model view may result in the refinement, or even the withdrawal, of some requirements.</p> <p>The meeting believes this is an important topic to work on, and should start working asap. Chelo volunteers to lead the activity.</p> <p>A charter needs to be written for a formal approval by the Board.</p> <p>Board conference calls are every other week, we can propose to have an email discussion group and have this approved there.</p>	
4	Liaison Statements					

		1110	VASP MMS Connectivity	T2	<p>This LS presents the activities from T2-SWG3 on VASP (Value Added Service Provider) Connectivity to MMS. (MultiMedia Messaging Service).</p> <p>T2-SWG3 has identified a set of functionalities that are required for VASP connectivity to MMS. T2-SWG3 intends to incorporate these functionalities into MMS specifications for Rel.5. They have also decided to define a protocol, at reference point MM7 in MMS architecture, that will connect VASPs to the MMS Relay/Server. As T2-SWG3 sees it, this protocol will only handle unique MMS functions, as it is expected that other functions will be either be handled by the OSA Framework connectivity to VASP, or by other similar mechanisms (SOAP, PAP).</p> <p>Status: last T2 meeting the functionality shown in the table was defined; the structure of messages will be defined in the T2 meeting this week. Next steps are to define the protocol which may be based on SOAP (this is on debate this week: some companies propose SOAP based, some others the protocol used in WAP). T2 writes stage 2 and most of stage 3; stage 3 for the air interface is done by the WAP Forum.</p> <p>The LS requests from CN 5 a review of this and guidance of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which of the mentioned functions are supported in the upcoming OSA specifications? • Are we right in assuming that what we termed “Framework” functionalities, can be supported today by OSA If not, where are our assumptions wrong? • Would it be possible to enhance OSA API’s in order to enable the interoperability of VASP and MMS for post-REL5? <p>A CR was sent to SA1, which was approved.</p> <p>The MM7 protocol is both for signalling and content (see presentation in 1227).</p> <p>T2 would like to have an answer from CN5 before the end of their plenary (Thursday (?)). For more details see 1227</p>	
--	--	------	-----------------------	----	---	--

		1227	Multimedia Messaging Service	Comverse	<p>The protocols (see slide 12) MM1, MM2 and MM4 are already standardised. MM7 is the top priority now. MM5, MM6 and MM3 will probably be delayed for Rel6.</p> <p>Issues for CN5 (as by Comverse bacuse this presentatin has not been formally approved by T2):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reply to the LS • To hold a joint CN5/T2 and maybe also SA2 workshop or ad-hoc on MMS connectivity • Define a WID for MMS integration. <p>This issue will be discussed in a drafting session (Andy, Musa, Mose) this afternoon.</p>	
		1111	LS to GSM-A TWG/SERG "regarding User Profile"	3GPP Joint ad-hoc on Generic User Profile (GUP)	<p>The 3GPP GUP group has sent their specs to the GSM Organisation for information, and with the idea to involve GSM Operators in their requirements process.</p> <p>Musa presents a summary of GUP: it is a collection of data stored and managed by several entities. They affect how the user received his services. The work on GUP will provide a data model and interactions for the user to manage his profile and for user profile related services to be developed. A part of this, the Data specification, could be closely related to our work. Framework This work is on a very early stage so it is likely that it will be part of Rel6.</p> <p>It is interesting to note, for the future, this attempt to involve an operator organisation in a requirements process.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	
		1112	Liaison Statement on SA2 handling of OSA stage 1 requirements	SA2	Postponed to the joint session with SA2 VHE/OSA.	
		1113	LS to CN5: Comments on TS 29.198	SA3	<p>SA3 is the group in 3GPP in charge of Security aspects. They have rad our Framework specifications and have some comments:</p> <p>They find the encryption algorithms that we use outdated and low grade and we're asked to reconsider them; they provide some examples of algorithms they find more state-of-the-art.</p> <p>As a result of this Musa has drafted a CR (1152), which will be dealt with later in the meeting.</p>	

		1114	Liaison Statement on 3GPP Generic User Profile Stage 1	SA1	<p>With this LS the User Profile ad-hoc group informs that that their requirements are ready to be handled back to SA1.</p> <p>What this means for us: we understand that these requirements will be now feed-back to SA1, and if/when approved they will have to be reconsidered by SA1 OSA and SA1 VHE, that will tell us if our requirements need to be modified.</p>	
		1115	Response to Liaison Statement on direction for implementing SA1's OSA and VHE Requirements	SA1	<p>Answer from SA1 to our LS on prioritisation of requirements. SA1 would like everything to be in the spec but they understand the time restrictions. They have provided the following prioritisation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highest priority: MM channel control and presence • Lowest priority: Nw capabilities and user data management (related to user profile) • Anything else is medium priority. <p>Besides SA1 has written a CR on High Level Requirements in OSA stage 1 (S1-011111, agreed by SA 1 but not yet SA approved), which clarifies that OSA does not require that all SCFs, to which OSA provides an API interface, need to be 3GPP standardised entities.</p> <p>It is not clear to the meeting what this CR means. A drafting session will be organized (this afternoon, volunteers Ard-Jan, Musa, Chelo, Andy and Karsten) to study it and prepare a draft LS response (N5-1156).</p>	
		1156	Response to 1115.			
		1116	Response to: 'Liaison Statement on OSA functions for retrieval of Network Capabilities'	SA1	<p>SA2 requested clarification to SA1 on the requirement of retrieval of network capabilities, and this is their answer.</p> <p>SA2's question was Why does the OSA application (in the home network of a subscriber) need to know the capabilities of the serving (visited?) network especially now when in the IMS the only option for the session control is the home network?</p> <p>SA1's answer is that this is a VHE requirement, and it refers to the adaptation of the service to the capabilities of the visited network. Anyway they will write a CR to clarify this requirement if their document.</p> <p>From the time frame in the LS it seems that we cannot handle this for Rel5; anyway from 1115 this requirement has the lowest priority.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	
5	API interfaces OSA version 1.1					

5.1	status 12070					
		1228	Draft updated ES 201 195 part 1	ETSI	Noted.	
		1229	Draft updated ES 201 195 part 2	ETSI	Noted.	
		1230	Draft updated ES 201 195 part 3	ETSI	Noted.	
		1231	Draft updated ES 201 195 part 4	ETSI	Noted.	
		1232	Draft updated ES 201 195 part 5	ETSI	Noted.	
		1233	Draft updated ES 201 195 part 6	ETSI	Noted.	
		1234	Draft updated ES 201 195 part 7	ETSI	Noted.	
		1235	Draft updated ES 201 195 part 8	ETSI	Noted.	
		1236	Draft updated ES 201 195 part 9	ETSI	Noted.	
		1237	Draft updated ES 201 195 part 10	ETSI	Noted.	
		1238	Draft updated ES 201 195 part 11	ETSI	Noted.	
		1239	Draft updated ES 201 195 part 12	ETSI	Noted.	
5.2	General					

		1207	A Package Structure for the APIs	Sun	<p>Proposes adding a package structure hierarchy for the Parlay APIs to section 6.2.</p> <p>The intention is to have a package structure as flat and compact as possible. Most of it (the services part) follows the CORBA IDL structure; for the Framework the structure is a bit different, because of the Access Interfaces. The reason for this difference is that the proposed way is more compact and requires less effort from the developer.</p> <p>Q: how does this impact the IDL? A: It doesn't, we can accommodate for the differences by a mapping. The rationale is an engineering way of packaging the interfaces; the way it is done in the IDL is that there are several package layers with no engineering rationale, but rather a grouping functionality. If a developer wants to implement a FW he could pick and chose a number of packages from the table.</p> <p>Q: doesn't the grouping make sense as a functionality grouping in the specification? Wouldn't a developer benefit from the grouping of access interfaces when developing FW interfaces to different domains? A: yes, but this is a more efficient way of packaging.</p> <p>The current FW spec is written in terms of business models, with the Access interfaces and then the FW-to-App interfaces, the FW-to-Service interfaces, and the FW-to-EntOp interfaces. It is true that this makes the name space longer but it allows a split of interfaces (the Access Interfaces) that will always keep separated. This work was done and a corresponding IDL namespace was generated, so we're not discussing IDL here but rather the way we want the functionality.</p> <p>Contribution agreed with changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to align with current Framework namespace • to remove PAM and PM • to re-phrase the note 1 (remove ETSI). <p>To be updated to 1208.</p>	
		1208		SUN	<p>Update of 1207</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	

		1248	Editorial issues with ETSI ES 201 915	ETSI	<p>During the course of preparation of ES 201 915 for publication, a number of editorial issues were discovered. Many of them do not require the attention of the joint meeting, and are within the remit of the ETSI editors to correct. However some issues are worthy of attention, and others were not modified in this edition but might need to be for future editions.</p> <p>Comment on issue 2: a reference to the LCS Client exists and it will be added. This needs to be changed in the Mobility complete CR (1249).</p> <p>A further issue has come up after this contribution was written: TpAddressPlan in the Common Data types is a numbered set of data elements but it starts in value -1, while the data type is the IDL by definition starts at 0. According to Julian Richards that was changed for Parlay some time ago, but somehow it hasn't been implemented in the joint specs. Ultan will prepare a CR on this and we'll approve it by email (deadline next Thursday).</p> <p>In 3GPP the system also allows Adrian to do this kind of editorial cleaning.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	
5.3	Introduction part					
5.4	Common Data					
		1240	Common Data complete CR	ETSI	<p>Contains all CRs we had agreed so far on the Common Data.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	
5.5	Framework					

		1152	CR: Enhance data type TpEncryptionCapability to include more up to date, higher grade, encryption algorithms to encrypt the challenge that is used to authenticate OSA client applications with the Framework	Lucent	<p>Results from LS from SA3 (N5-113) with remarks about our FW specifications (our encryption algorithms outdated). It proposes to enhance data type TpEncryptionCapability to include more up to date, higher grade, encryption algorithms to encrypt the challenge that is used to authenticate OSA client applications with the Framework</p> <p>In the table TpEncryptionCapability may not be complete and more could be added in the future.</p> <p>It is proposed to send the reply to the LS and attach this for their review. SA3 is meeting this week, but</p> <p>This CR is CN5 approved, except that we'll try to contact SA3 during this week for their comments. A LS will be prepared for SA3 with this purpose: 1158.</p> <p>The CR is considered to be approved by the Joint group, but if SA3 has any opinion then we'll have an email approval process with deadline one week.</p>	
		1158	Liaison Statement on the Support of Up to Date Encryption Algorithms in the OSA Framework	CN5 Vicechair	<p>LS to SA3 for requesting their comments on 1152.</p> <p>A couple of comments are made to improve the text. To be revised into 1159.</p>	
		1159		CN5 Vicechair	Approved.	
		1241	FW complete CR	ETSI	<p>Contains all CRs we had agreed so far on the Framework.</p> <p>Approved.</p>	
5.6	Call Control					
		1136	Removal of time based charging property	Ericsson	<p>Proposes removing the time based charging property.</p> <p>During previous meetings it turned out that time based charging was not implementable. Therefore this capability has been removed from the API. However, in the service properties still time based charging was mentioned.</p> <p>Approved.</p>	

		1137	Making attachMedia() and detachMedia() asynchronous	Ericsson	<p>This CR proposes making attachMedia() and detachMedia() asynchronous, because in the current specification there is no mechanism to return the result of attach- or detachMedia() to the application, but it is crucial to inform the application of the result.</p> <p>Q: cannot this be done in a synch manner using the exceptions or the return value? Why do we want to do it in an asynchronous way? A: currently we can issue a request to attach/detach media but it takes a while in the network so it would be useful to have the asynch way.</p> <p>This will be included in the Reasons for Changes. The text in attachMediaRes will also be re-phrased for clarification. It is also observed that a wrong version of the spec has been used.</p> <p>Revised to 1145.</p>	
		1145		Ericsson	<p>Update of 1137.</p> <p>Agreed with comments. Update approved.</p>	
		1144	Wrong treatment datatype in superviseReq on call leg	Ericsson	<p>In the current specification the data type of the treatment parameter of superviseReq() on call leg (lpCallLeg) is incorrect. It is now representing the treatment of the call and not the call leg.</p> <p>The title will be modified to "Correction of Data Type".</p> <p>Updated into 1146.</p>	
		1146		Ericsson	<p>Update of 1144</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	
		1170	Correction required to description of how Criteria Overlap is determined	Lucent	<p>Correction to description of how Criteria Overlap is determined because its is considered ambiguous.</p> <p>The reason for the current restriction on the criteria is that feature interaction that is not supported in most IN networks. It would be necessary to explain all about single point of control, even adding a sequence diagram. This is related to the multiple points of control discussion we have ongoing, and would better wait for conclusions from this discussion, and maybe a White Paper on multiple points of control.</p> <p>Withdrawn.</p>	
		1242	Complete CC CR	ETSI	Revised into 1250.	

		1250		ETSI	Update of 1242 Agreed.	
		1245	Further corrections to Call Control Data Types	ETSI	Some things were found in CC that needed to be fixed but had no CR. Agreed.	
		1246	CR: Further corrections to Call Control Data Types	ETSI	CR corresponding to 1246. Agreed.	
		1258	CR: Generic Call Control Introduction Issues	FT	The definitions of call object, call leg object, etc... are not only related to generic call control service interface classes, so they are currently in the wrong clause. This contribution proposes to move them to the appropriate place. Approved.	
		1259	CR: Missing exception for CreateAndRouteCallLegReq()	FT	In the definition of the createAndRouteCallLegReq() method it is stated that this method may raise the P_NO_CALL_BACK_ADDRESS_SET exception. This exception doesn't figure in the list of raised exceptions. The contribution proposes to add it. P_NO_CALL_BACK_ADDRESS_SET is part of the Common exceptions, so we don't need to add it. Not approved.	
		1260	CR: Typo in TpCallEventType	FT	Approved. Will be part of the CC global CR.	
		1261	CR: Missing definition of RouteErr()	FT	RouteErr() method for IpAppCallLeg interface description is missing. Comments: should be call leg instead of call; the title should say description instead of definition. To be revised into 1262.	
		1262		FT	Update of 1261. Agreed.	
		1268		FT	Same correction as 1262. Agreed.	
5.7	User Interaction					

		1138	CR: Incorrect description of sendInfoRes()	Ericsson	<p>Proposal to correct two errors in the decription of serndInforRes():</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sendInfoCallReq() is a not existing method. Meant is method sendInfoReq(). - sendInfoRes only informs the Application of the completion of sendInfoReq() and not the start (see also the 'report' parameter of sendInfoRes). <p>Approved.</p>
		1140	CR: Handling of deassign on related object	Ericsson	<p>In the current specification the application can indicate that the UICall object can be released after the final announcement is completed (i.e., by means of P_UI_FINAL_REQUEST). When the application deassigns the related (call or callLeg) object the announcements will continue. However, now the application has to explicitly release the UICall object, even though it already indicated that the announcement resource could be released after the last announcement.</p> <p>The contribution proposes that when the final announcement is already requested (i.e., in state release pending) a deassign should cause the UICall object to be destructed but the announcements should still continue. IpUICall.release() would not be needed</p> <p>Approved.</p>
		1243	UI Complete CR	ETSI	<p>Contains all CRs we had agreed so far on the UI.</p> <p>Approved.</p>
5.8	Mobility				
		1249	Editorials	ETSI	<p>See comment in 1248.</p> <p>Updated to 1251.</p>
5.9	Data Session Control				
		1244	DSC Complete CR	ETSI	Approved.
5.10	Terminal Capabilities				
5.11	Generic Messaging				
5.12	Connectivity Management				
5.13	Account Management				
5.14	Content-based charging				
6	OSA version 1 mapping				
6.1	status of 12075				
6.2	contributions				

7	Joint Meeting with SA2 VHE/OSA Adhoc				This joint session has the following three objectives: - Discussion of the response LS from SA2 on architectural issues. - Release date of specs & continuation of the work (joint work plan). - Presentation of SA2 contributions from previous meeting that influence Joint API work.	

1112

SA2 VHE/OSA sees two sources of impact:

- support of OSA SCF by the underlying network may impact the API
- reqs from TS 22.121 (VHE)

SA2 has identified that SA2 work should be performed for the following OSA stage 1 requirements:

- **User Profile:** the location of the OSA SCS, distribution of user profile information in different places, protocol(s) to access user profile information, authentication/authorisation aspects, VHE and other user profile requirements. The output of the joint User Profile ad-hoc group needs to be taken into account.
- **Charging:** connection to the IMS Charging arch, which is not finished yet, and also IMS service arch
- **Policy Management:** impact if policies need to be shared between different SCS and stored in the network. Should not impact Policy Management SCF definition.
- **Authorisation:** VHE may require mechanisms permitting to authorise an HE-VASP application to request a specific OSA function on a specific user (based on subscription and privacy information stored in the Home Environment)
- **IM Call Control** (there is new material on this already): according to stage 1 requirements, two network entities are the target for OSA: the S-CSCF (e.g. session control) and the MRF (e.g. media channel control, conferencing support).
- **Information Transfer:** is certainly applicable to the IMS as well, and may require specific protocol(s) and architecture. May not impact SCF definition.
- **User Status:** connection to the IMS architecture (how can user status information be retrieved by the OSA SCS?), seems to be related to the HSS. May not impact SCF definition.
- **Terminal Capabilities:** storage of and access to terminal capabilities. We have very limited support of this in previous releases. May also depend on requirements being defined in SA1 for user profile. For the SA2 this week contributions on this have been presented for the first time.
- **Network Capabilities:** SA2 is working on a clarification of these requirements.
- **Information Services:** sharing of information between OSA applications and associated OSA SCS. Storage and access to the information. Relationship to VHE requirements for user discovery of services. CN5 should define the format needed for information services.
- **Presence:** connection to the presence architecture currently being defined by SA2. Latest news from this activity is that some companies have already sent contributions with OSA on them, but there is no agreement on a presence architecture.

		1263	Draft 1.0 of V5 of 3GPP TS 23.127	SA2 VHE/OSA ad-hoc	<p>Interim version, generated this week during the SA2 VHE/OSA ad-hoc, might even still change during this week.</p> <p>Structure: part are VHE aspects and thus not relevant to us; there is then a section on VHE-supporting toolkits, one of which is OSA. The OSA part starts with an introduction that links the SA1 requirements on functionality with the CN5 SCFs. Then come the architectural aspects and the SCFs.</p> <p>VHE part: activities on User Profile are currently on hold (while the GUP ad-hoc is going on), so SA2 VHE/OSA is currently focusing on OSA aspects.</p> <p>OSA as a VHE toolkit: it may be used by the Home Environment, by Value Added Service Providers (VASPs) and Home Environment Value Added Service Providers (HE-VASPs). In the case of the HE-VASP the user subscribes to HE, so there is some info on the user below the OSA API, and this is something that may result on extensions or modifications to OSA. The idea is that the HE_VASP application can request to be notified for any subscriber that is subscribed to this application instead of requesting an explicit notification for a certain address range. Subscription is done in the network of the HE. OSA is here the enabler, because a 3rd Party Application Provider may choose to be an HE-VASP because of the advantages provided by OSA. This is in line with the business models presented in 1125.</p> <p>In the OSA section the work mentioned in the LS (1112) is started (there are many placeholders for further contributions); where each SA1 requirement would fit has been given a guess – SA2 VHE/OSA does not intend to give CN5 as input a mapping between functionality and SCFs, though this can be discussed.</p> <p>OSA in the IMS network: the entities that need to support OSA for MMMPCC are two: the S-CSCF (controls two-party sessions) and the MRF (supports MP and MM sessions). According to SA2 VHE/OSA, “the stage 3 specification of OSA for IMS session control shall take into account this distribution of responsibilities between the S-CSCF and the MRF, by specifying specific OSA SCF(s) or interface(s) for the S-CSCF, and specific OSA SCF(s) or interface(s) for the MRF. This is to permit clear mapping of OSA on the corresponding entities’ functionality, as well as allowing multivendorship.” Note that it is not clear whether the Sr interface will exist, and if not then this would be a case where OSA would be mapped to something not standardised (as referred to in N5-1115).</p> <p>Comment: the structure of the SA2 document follows the split of functionality in SCFs, because SA2 has used CN5 existing specifications to make the link to the new requirements. But this should</p>	
--	--	------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------	---	--

8	Joint meeting with key SA5 delegates regarding OSA Framework and OSA charging				<p>Preparatory, Joint-group-only session on the session with SA5.</p> <p>Reminder of the motivation: after Chelo's introductory presentation to SA5 it became clear that there was a need to provide information to SA5 on OSA Framework management functionality and to have a more detailed technical discussion on OSA Charging. For this purposes a drafting email discussion previous to the meeting has prepared two presentations for the session with SA5, one on the Framework and another on Charging (including both Call Charging and CBC).</p>	
		1169	Framework Presentation for SA5 Joint Session	Lucent	After comments from the preparatory session this is revised into 1171.	

		1171		Lucent	<p>Update of 1169.</p> <p>This is the presentation, prepared by Lucent and reviewed by the Joint group, for the introduction of the management functionality of the OSA Framework.</p> <p>This presentation intends to give a more detailed overview than the one already presented, focused on the Integrity Management interfaces. It presents some use cases to show how these interfaces work.</p> <p>Comment from SA5: SA5 is working on how to manage to integrity of the whole 3GPP network, so it's important to check that everything is being taken into account. Some slides have been prepared for this.</p> <p>Slides from SA5: Subscription management and the relationship with OSA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BT has done an initial analysis and produced a contribution on the management implications of OSA (N5-1118); there is also a contribution from Alcatel on the relationships of OSA APIs to SA5 work on Interoperable Reference Points (N5-1117). • Subscription Management: what do operators have to include in the profile of their customers? Billing addresses, credit history, ... should be part of this profile, and all this should be synchronised and linked into a model within the Operations System. The TMF has produced a process map (eBusiness Telecoms Operations Map). • Service Operations Management should support interfaces to network APIs such as OSA. Storage of the data held in the Subscription Management feature for the User Profile should be studied: who has the ownership of this data? • Business Models: Resale Service Provision, Integrate Service Provision, Manufactures (for terminal configuration for example), Mobile Service Provision (traditional), Mobile Network Provision (the physical network; here there are ownership issues as well), Trusted 3rd Parties. This work is being done in the TMF. • 1118 from BT is a document on discussion. It aims to building the processes between the domains, which may have complicated business models. Important interface between the OS and the SCS: operators want to stop managing their networks, and they want to buy of-the-shelf systems, that support standardised interfaces, which do the management for them. • 1117 from Alcatel is a delta from the BT document, which highlights the need to harmonise the information models. • A question is: should these management interactions take place via the HSS? In the GUP document there are some use cases that could be used for discussion between SA5 and the Joint group. • Suggested to have somebody as a liaison person, or to put together a small group to work jointly. • Suggested that the joint group specifies for each SCF where is 	
--	--	------	--	--------	--	--

		1202		Siemens, Ericsson	After comments from the preparatory session this is revised into 1203.	
		1203		Siemens, Ericsson	Update of 1202. This is the presentation, prepared by Siemens and reviewed by the Joint group, for the introduction of the OSA Charging functionality. The presentation introduces Session Based Charging, CBC, and OSA charging for different business models – the latter includes some suggestions on how to interoperate with SA5. Suggested that SA5 studies this presentation and we continue discussing next meeting. SA5 will have a look at Chelo's presentation for an introduction of OSA. Seems that full coordination may not be possible for Rel5.	
		1117	Relationship of OSA APIs to SA5 IRP work	SA5: Alcatel	See discussion on 1171.	
		1118	Review of the Management implications of OSA	SA5: BT	See discussion on 1171.	
		1126	Notes from the session between the Joint OSA API Group and 3GPP SA5	Alcatel	For Adrian to send to SA5.	
9	Technical discussions OSA version 2					
9.1	ETSI SPAR					
9.1.1	Issues resulting from mapping to SPAR Version 1 requirements.				The document containing ETSI SPAN Version 1 requirements was presented in our Sophia meeting by Frans Haerens and that, according to our agreement last meeting, it will become ETSI 141606 part 1: Open Service Access API Requirements Version 1. It was also agreed that comments should be sent by email, with deadline Friday 23/11, and according to them a final approval would be agreed at the Cancun meeting.	
		1254	Comments to ETSI SPAN Version 1 Requirements	France Telecom	Editorial comments to the ETSI SPAN Version 1 Requirements. Approved. This means that the SPAR version 1 requirements are approved with this modifications.	
9.2	Joint API group requirements					

		1130	Amendments to Requirements Document	BT	<p>This contribution considers some questions the joint group had regarding Requirements from Eurescom, and delivers the answers with suggested changes to the Requirements document. It is a result of discussions in Brighton and input from Eurescom.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balancing of interfaces: there is a contribution on this: 1131 • Framework information model: we needed clarification as to whether or not this referred to Journalling in another part of the Requirements document. Eurescom say that this point refers to data that is stored and collected within the Gateway. This may differ from the journalling requirement in that data maybe stored within the client domain and then accessed by the API. Conclusion: bullet point 5 in section 3.1 of the requirements will be left for the time being. • Framework Management Tool: It appeared from the Requirement box in this section that only SLAs were being considered here. Eurescom has decided that the requirement should be modified here to say that it is not just the SLAs that need addressing. The modified text that now appears within the Requirement document can be found in the contribution. • Data Hosting Interface for User Profile Application Data: the question being asked here was is this section just considering User profile information and therefore overlapping with section 4.5 and 4.6 being, User Data management Requirements and Security Requirements on User Profile Access Management respectively. The answer was that Section 4.7 considers more than just access to User Profile information: it also considers provision of a Database in network, for use by the Application provider so he can download data that is associated with his applications (up to 2Gig access); this can then be referenced using the API. The conclusion is that this is not the same as section 4.5 and 4.6 although there is some overlap. <p>Noted. This means the changes proposed here to the</p>	
--	--	------	-------------------------------------	----	--	--

		1132	Parlay API –Phase 4 Requirements	BT	<p>Thanks to Karsten for lots of input resulting in a much more readable format.</p> <p>Changes from last version are (not visible with revision marks due to format changes):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balancing of interfaces: use cases have been added (contribution 1131 presents a solution to this requirement from Eurescom). • Framework Management tool: the question “Is this a requirement to enhance the Framework-EntOp interfaces, or is it a different API?” still needs to be answered. • Framework Operator Administration Interfaces: some motivation text has been proposed for this requirement. Contributions on use cases are still requested. • Information Services: this has been modified by SA1 – the modifications in the document are theirs. Same for Presence, User Data Management and Security Requirements on User Data Management. • Parlay and SIP statement has been added, as agreed in the Brighton meeting. • Appendix: if there is no champion for CPL, SCE and eCommerce they will not be part of Parlay 4. Parlay Lite: the differences with Parlay X still need to be identified. Tax <p>Next steps: do some editorial cleaning and produce a new version that will be approved as first version of ETSI version 2 requirements.</p>	
--	--	------	----------------------------------	----	---	--

		1201		Siemens	<p>In Brighton we agreed to have SA1 know what we are doing apart from their requirements. Then we discussed by email to have the new requirements feedback to SA1 in the form of a joint contribution by the companies present in the joint group. This contribution is a proposal for this CR, and Siemens volunteers to present it to SA1. For the time being it only contains the CBC requirements; all other requirements in the ETSI version 2 document are already in 3GPP except ETS(*), which will be prepared in a similar way by Telcordia.</p> <p>Comment: the SCF term is not used in the requirements document. Nevertheless it needs to be clear that this is about content based charging, though not mentioning the CBC SCF.</p> <p>Next steps: re-phrasing will be done, and the Siemens SA1 OSA delegate will contact the SA1 delegates of the companies in the Joint group to have a final agreement and collect signatures. It is highlighted that this means that these specifications should be finished by March, for which Siemens has made an initial commitment.</p> <p>Tentatively Alcatel, Lucent and Ericsson seems to be ready to</p> <p>(*) Requirements from Eurescom are not all part of the 3GPP requirements either, but they will not be part of Rel 5 but of Parlay 4.</p>	
		1211	LS to alignment meeting (i.e. CN5) providing Parlay ETS WG update	TelCordia	<p>There is a charter for a Parlay ETS WG. This WG will work on ETS as a Parlay Application, for which they will review our APIs and may come back with suggestions for improvements and/or modifications. They would like to work with the Joint group on the common UML model.</p> <p>This activity has not been approved in 3GPP, but a group in SA1 has been given the job to study if it is possible to do it with existing network mechanisms.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	
9.3	Parlay Content based Charging requirements					

		1197	Support for interactive confirmation	Siemens	<p>N5-011095 at CN#14 (Brighton) introduced the concept of an “interactive confirmation” that that allows the user to confirm or reject a payment before any transaction is carried out. To support the payment engine/authorization engine in performing the confirmation dialogue, this contribution proposes to give “hints” about the user equipment’s capabilities (since the Terminal Capabilities SCF can only provide static information and is very much focused on WAP). In a CBC scenario, the merchant has an interactive dialog with the consumer anyway, so he should have a good knowledge about the equipment utilized by the consumer). This information could be given as hints towards the payment engine/authorization engine.</p> <p>The contribution suggests to utilize the <i>chargingParameters</i> parameter to carry the hint. This is a backwards-compatible way of implementing the requirement.</p> <p>Q: Why not including this in the Terminal Capabilities SCF? A: Same was raised in Brighton and this time a rationale is included in the introduction of the contribution: the Terminal Caps SCF only deals with information available in the network, while a user may change his SIM card to another phone, so the Terminal Caps SCF is not flexible enough.</p> <p>Q: What about evolving the current Term Caps SCF? A: Then there is still the problem of how to implement it.</p> <p>Q: There is a relationship with the User Profile. A: Yes, but the problem is still how to get this information in the User Profile.</p> <p>Comment: this may not be specific for the CBC SCF.</p> <p>To be further discussed whether this informaiton may be obtained from the User Profile, and whether a more generic approach, involving other SCFs, may be used.</p> <p>Not approved.</p>
--	--	------	--------------------------------------	---------	--

		1198	Support for stored confirmation	Siemens	<p>N5-011095 at CN#14 (Brighton) introduced the concept of a “stored confirmation” that that allows the user to confirm or reject a payment before any transaction is carried out. The concept of a “stored confirmation” assumes that a confirmation dialogue has been initiated by the user agent before the merchant application requests a payment. This contribution proposes two enhancements to the content charging SCF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The payment engine/authorisation engine shall indicate the need for a confirmation dialogue via appropriate parameters in the appropriate error message. • The correlation id shall be transported in the charging parameters of the request. <p>Comment: P_CHS_ERR_CONFIRMATION_REQUIRED is not yet a value of TpChargingError. Another contribution is needed to add it.</p> <p>Q: To what extent is user confirmation needed? In the use cases we have the merchant is a trusted party to the operator.</p> <p>A: We have already agreed on this requirement. Besides the idea in OSA is that the 3rd Party may be a non-trusted party (this would be the ASP case in Chelo’s business models); in this scenario a confirmation would be needed. The user does not subscribe to a certain merchant, but the value proposition is that all users of a certain operator are potential users of this 3rd Party, who needs to have a way to charge them.</p> <p>Some editorials, updated to 1204.</p>	
--	--	------	---------------------------------	---------	--	--

		1199	Support for relayed confirmation	Siemens	<p>N5-011095 at CN#14 (Brighton) introduced the concept of an “relayed confirmation” that that allows the user to confirm or reject a payment before any transaction is carried out. How the user signs the confirmation, and how the user’s key pairs are generated and distributed, is not in the scope of OSA. The structure of the confirmation is not in the scope of OSA either. However, we assume that the confirmation will contain the amount the subscriber confirms and the service and merchant for which the confirmation is valid. This contribution focuses on how the confirmation is transmitted to the SCS, no matter how it is structured.</p> <p>The proposal is that the confirmation is carried in the charging parameters. A disadvantage is that the user needs the means within the terminal to sign the contract.</p> <p>Comment: TpOctetSet would be a more suitable type. Agreed.</p> <p>Q: is an error similar to the one in 1198 necessary? A: yes, we could have a mechanism for the merchant to initiate the dialogue and ask the user to sign a contract.</p> <p>Agreed with comment above. It will be updated: 1205.</p>	
		1226	Rating and Rate Synchronization API for the Content Based Charging	Comverse	Revised into 1266.	

		1266		Comverse	<p>Update of 1226.</p> <p>This contribution contains a proposal to specify the interface for synchronisation of Rating tables. Implementation could be based on SyncML, though this is not a requirement.</p> <p>Q: What kinds of applications is this meant for? A: Since this is a performance issue, it is meant mostly for applications that need frequent interaction with the user, like games.</p> <p>Q: rating proxy on the client side is a valid business model, but this means that the merchant controls the rating, so why should the operator hold any rating data? A: Not all the rating is under the control of the application provider. The underlying protocol should include security mechanisms.</p> <p>Q: Would this rating SCF contain the rating methods that are currently in the CBC SCF? A: Yes.</p> <p>Q: Why not using directly SyncML, why do we need an API? A: The intention is to have a standard, and not SyncML proprietary interactions.</p> <p>Q: Is this visible to the application developer? A: No, they don't know if the proxy is in their domain or in the operator's.</p> <p>Q: Then why should this be in the Parlay API? A: This way the application benefits from the synchronisation mechanism.</p> <p>Q: Couldn't this rather be a service development kit. A: It's not the same.</p> <p>Q: Who controls the rating? If it is the operator, how can it trust that the client applies the correct rate? If it is the application then we don't need the API. A: Wrong assumption: the rating proxy is to provide rating information. And there is also the issue of security and trust: we can assume there is some level of trust between them (via the SLA).</p> <p>Q: Would it sever the purpose to enhance the rating SCF so that it supports event notifications? This would not have so big an implication in the business models. A: Yes, it would. The point is not to define a separate SCF but to support this functionality.</p> <p>Conclusion: the use cases will be further elaborated and sequence diagrams would be prepared. The possibility to have an enhancement of</p>	
--	--	------	--	----------	---	--

9.4	Policy Management				Agenda of this session: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Session 1<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Status of Policy Management Specifications<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Overview of Scope• Creating Rules: an example of call flows• Specifications Walk Through• Session 2<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Complete Specifications Walk Through• Discuss Recommendations	
-----	-------------------	--	--	--	--	--

		1157	Policy Management JWG	Lucent	<p>Introductory presentation of the Parlay Policy Management specifications., following the agenda above</p> <p><u>Status of Policy Management Specifications</u> Two documents for review: Policy Management Specifications and Data Definition Document. They have been approved by the Parlay TAC and now they're brought to 3GPP/ETSI to take them ad extend them if desired.</p> <p><u>Overview of Scope</u> See slide; highlighted the Policy Repository that allows a 3rd Party to construct his own policy management.</p> <p>The PM specs are based on a Policy Information Model. They can be used to create specialised Policy Services (remember from Munich the split between Policy Management services and Policy Enabled services.</p> <p><u>Creating Rules: an example of call flows</u> See contribution 1154.</p> <p><u>Specifications Walk Through</u> See contribution 1252.</p> <p><u>Discuss recommendations</u> The presentation includes the following recommendations for extensions to the specifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Free-form and bulk creation of rules • Use of boolean operators • Extend BNF definitions of allowed expressions • Variables in repository • Conflict resolution heuristics • Support policy statistics • Access authorisation <p>Q: what are the implications on backwards compatibility of these extensions? A: yes, it is believed that backwards compatibility will be preserved, for example for the first recommendation, it will still be allowed to have single rule creation.</p> <p>Q: what is the idea about these extensions, will this be worked in the joint group or in Parlay? A: the idea is that the PM work is taken by the Joint Group. There is also the need to define policy-enabled services.</p> <p>Next steps: for 3GPP Rel5, we need (asap, not much time left!) to make a cross-check with the 3GPP requirements, and also to incorporate these specs in our UML model. Sequence diagrams: there are some, though not extensive; there two more documents Parlay is going to hand over</p>	
--	--	------	-----------------------	--------	--	--

		1154	Policy Management Example Sequence Diagram	Lucent	<p>Two examples to clarify the concepts of PM.</p> <p>Example 1: Creation of a Policy Rule. An ASP provides pre-paid services to the subscribers of a certain operator. The ASP discovers that, as part of the business logic of the applications it offers, the prepaid credit of the subscriber needs to be verified with regards to the current charge for the service in order to determine whether the purchase should be allowed or not. Rather than including this credit check in the business logic of each and every application that the ASP has in its service portfolio, the ASP may decide to enable a Policy Rule to be hosted in the Policy Engine of the Network Operator.</p> <p>This example shows how to create a rule within a group within a domain, by means of conditions and actions, that the PM engine will evaluate.</p> <p>Q: what is the difference between Domain and Group? A: Domain is the highest container, semantically equivalent to the encapsulation of the whole PM domain (eg a QoS Domain, a CC Domain). A Group is a way to group together rules by context, it is a local container.</p> <p>Q: when is a rule evaluated? A: when the condition is satisfied, so it depends on how the condition is defined.</p> <p>Q: how can a Policy Engine and an SCF from different vendors work together? Is it possible for a vendor to provide a standalone Policy Engine? A: it should be possible to use anybody's Policy Engine, but this is an implementation issue; the specification is about the interfaces between the Policy Engine and the Applications, and not the Policy Engine and the Network. The current specification is written upon the assumption that the interactions between the policy-enabled services and the Policy Engine do not need to be defined. It needs to be discussed if there need to be any modifications on this. This</p> <p>Q: what is called in this context a policy-enabled service, is it an application or an SCS? A: it could be any of the two. Off-line clarification: it could be an SCS or an application that was developed by a 3rd Party and is hosted by the operator; for applications in the 3rd party domain the way to policy-enable them is internal to the 3rd Party or, in the Parlay model, it could be done by the Enterprise Operator.</p> <p>Example 2: use of the Policy Repository The repository is meant to hold unattached conditions and actions. The</p>	
--	--	------	--	--------	--	--

		1252	Policy Management files	Lucent	Walk through the Parlay 3.0 Policy Management specifications, presented by Peter Heitman from Cisco.	
9.5	PAM					

		1267	Presence and Availability Management presentation	TelTier	<p>Highlites of the presentation and the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Slide 4 contains the subset of existing PAM interfaces that are needed to satisfy Rel5 requirements (according to 1132). Slide 5 raises the issue that a 3GPP requirement (retrieve information about the watcher) requires inclusion of a method, getRegistrations(), which is not in Parlay 3.0. <p>Q: how to ensure alignment between Parlay and 3GPP is not endangered with additions like this? A: Rel5 is based on Parlay 4.0, so there is no hurry from the 3GPP point of view. On the other hand there may be still time to update Parlay 3.1, so it will be attempted as a preferred solution – otherwise the new method will be included in Parlay 4.0.</p> <p>Q: What is the effect of these changes on the PAM Forum specification? A: this is done again with a backwards propagation: PAM 1.1 will take the feedback from Parlay 3.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed ToDo list: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Define schema for required data Additional methods? Naming (Presentity vs. Identity or Agent) Identify the interfaces that are relevant to the requirements subset. <p>Q: how big or small is the subset of Parlay PAM specs that correspond to 3GPP requirements? A: Probably about 30% to 40%.</p> <p>Q: Is it a real subset – can the interfaces taken as they are, or would some methods have to be removed? A: Could be that some methods would need to be removed because the 3GPP requirements indicate that the functionality would better fit somewhere else. Or the interfaces could be left the way they are for the time being.</p> <p>Q: The Joint group did the same for the 3GPP subset of MPCC, where the subsetting is done by means of properties when registering to the Framework. One of the more general properties is the methods that are supported. This way we have the same APIs both in 3GPP and in ETSI/Parlay. Do the PAM specs have a properties mechanism that can be used like this? A: No.</p> <p>Q: In the Parlay PAM specs there are some use cases, and it would be valuable to have also MSCs based on them. A: Yes, this will be added to the ToDo list.</p> <p>Q: What are the milestones and timeline for Rel5? A: The PAM API would be needed ready for adaptation in the HK meeting. This means the following actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service properties </p>	
--	--	------	---	---------	--	--

		1253	Presence and Availability Management Specs	TelTier	See presentation 1267.
9.6	Mapping				
		1153	Comments to N5-010965 SIP Mappings to MPCC	Lucent	<p>Comments to N5-010965 SIP Mappings to MPCC presented in Brighton.</p> <p>Everywhere the modification SIP->ISC is proposed because the final, single mapping document we'll generate is for ISC (we work on SIP now while ISC is getting ready so then we'll just have to do a delta).</p> <p>Most comments are either agreed or no longer relevant (since there is a new version of the mapping document for this meeting: 1141). Comments related to RFC 2543 will be checked.</p> <p>Q: Who is the participant? A: The UA of the subscriber. Figure 0-1 (createCall) will be modified for clarification.</p> <p>We need two mappings, one for the UA SIP side and another for the IMS, because for the IMS we have the S-CSCF, the HSS and the MRF. Besides the IMS is not finished, and there may be modifications coming from different sources (for example the current work on pre-paid). Another problem is that the IETF is also modifying SIP, so pure SIP is also a moving target. But a delta approach would be useful here as well.</p> <p>So we agree to concentrate now on a pure SIP mapping.</p>
		1139	Mapping to IMS Removal of section 12 in 23.218	Ericsson	<p>During 3GPP Rel. 99 and Rel. 4 mappings of the OSA APIs on CAMEL have been produced. Now that the IMS architecture is getting more and more stable, mappings to the relevant reference points in here should be produced.</p> <p>Furthermore, in CN1 it is proposed to remove chapter 12 from the 23.218. However, this chapter is a starting point for the mapping of OSA to IMS.</p> <p>This contribution proposes to add a new subpart to part 4 of our mapping document. This part should describe the mapping of OSA to IMS. As chapter 12 of 23.218 is a starting point for such mapping, the idea is to adopt this work and start working on it.</p> <p>Comment: a peer contribution has been agreed in CN1, under the condition that we agree on this one.</p> <p>Approved.</p>

		1141	MPCC: SIP Mapping Tables	Ericsson	<p>New version of the SIP Mapping document. The format has been modified and it is now a TR with the same format we had for the one for Rel4. It still need some work though in some detailed mappings. An informative Annex has also been included to help understanding. More details have been added. Editor's notes have been included for issues that need clarification. All open issues are collected in contribution 1142.</p> <p>Comment: a definition of what is a participant is necessary. Comment on figure 16 in page 27: is INVITE with no SDP allowed for application initiated call setup? Jurgen and Jane to check it.</p> <p>Figure 4-1 in the Annex will modified. It is suggested to show the SCS as the SCF on one side and the different SIP modes on the other.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	
--	--	------	--------------------------	----------	---	--

		1142	OSA API MPCCS: SIP mapping open issues	Ericsson	<p>The following problems have been identified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Handling of media (SDP) information at application initiated calls, mapping to SIP/ISC (Reason: unspecified behaviour, i.e. undefined mapping will lead to possible malfunctioning). Agreed in 1141 discussion that this will be checked. 2. Call leg control - at call routing when multiple destination are searched due to Forking mechanism in SIP/ISC.(Reason: Ambiguous call leg view – one OSA terminating call leg vs. more destinations invited). The contribution from Eurescom on balancing of interfaces (1131) is related to this point. For further study. 3. Call forwarding presentation, mapping to SIP/ISC (Reason: unspecified behaviour, clarification needed to secure unambiguous treatment). This is already proposed by OSA MPCCS mapping document. Agreed to include this additional explanatory text in the mapping document. 4. Call redirected event report to application, mapping to SIP/ISC (Reason: unspecified behaviour, clarification needed to secure unambiguous treatment). It is proposed that 181 “Call is being forwarded” should map to this P_CALL_EVENT_REDIRECTED event Hereby the redirection address contained in the provisional SIP response 181 is to be reported in the P_CALL_EVENT_REDIRECTED event (ForwardAddress field additional event info) to the application. Agreed. 5. Get last redirected address, mapping to SIP/ISC. (Reason: unspecified behaviour, clarification needed to secure unambiguous treatment). It is proposed that the OSA SCS should return the current address of the destination point in the getLastRedirectedAddress in case no call redirection (call forwarding address available) has occurred (or it is unknown if a call redirection may have occurred). Agreed but with name for the method getCurrentDestinationAddress. 6. Mid call event support, mapping to SIP/ISC (Reason: unspecified behaviour, i.e. undefined mapping will lead to possible malfunctioning). Contributions are invited (note: the “conclusions” in the contribution are a copy&paste error). 	
--	--	------	--	----------	--	--

		1147		Ericsson	CR to CC resulting form 1142	
					Agreed.	

		1143	OSA Multi Media and ISC/SIP mapping: open issues	Ericsson	<p>Based on the work undertaken on MPCCS SIP mapping a number of open issues has been identified. This contribution lists the open issues that are to be resolved for OSA service provision in the IMS, especially related to OSA SCS and the supported ISC interface, and invites contributions to deal with them.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How to transfer service specific semantics over the ISC interface? In the Multi Party Call Control Service (MPCCS) API some methods demand specific service control semantics to be exchanged between the controlling entity (OSA SCS) and the controlled entity (S-CSCF) using the ISC interface. Since ISC is based on SIP, there is no defined way to transport such non-SIP related service control information using the ISC interface. 2. Handling of filtering information – split between controlling and controlled entity? Using SIP for service control on the ISC interface between controlling entity (OSA SCS) and controlled entity (S-CSCF) makes that SIP session control and service control somewhat gets entangled. An OSA SCS supporting ISC includes SIP server session control functionality. In order to cope with this it seems that a kind of split in the handling of filtering information between controlled entity (e.g. S-CSCF) and controlling entity (e.g. OSA SCS) is needed. 3. Pre-selection of operation mode in OSA SCS – what should it be based upon? The OSA SCS includes SIP server session control functionality capable to support a set of different SIP server operation modes (referred to as “tool kit”). The different modes of operation provide a flexible “tool kit” to cope with the diversity of more or less complex applications. Operation in Proxy mode may be very useful for “simple” applications (e.g. call redirection) just requiring to change data or add data on an ongoing session between end-users, e.g. like in a call forwarding service or address translation service. However, the MPCCS supports also more complex service capabilities where the nature of the application demands the controlling entity (here OSA SCS) to take ownership of the call control. Hereby the OSA SCS may be acting using the mechanism Back To Back User Agent (B2BUA). However, it is NOT possible in SIP during an established call/session to change from Proxy into B2BUA mode. Therefore the demanded mode of operation has to be known in advance of the application invocation. 4. OSA service control vs. call/session control handling? The selection of SIP for ISC implies an entanglement of service control with SIP based session call control. Each AS (e.g. OSA SCS) supporting ISC needs to include SIP server session control functionality and, depending on invoked service application, be capable to operate in different modes. The distinction between controlling entity (OSA SCS) 	
--	--	------	--	----------	---	--

9.7	Other contributions to version 2					
		1168	Inter-dependence of UI and Call Control	Lucent & ApEONA	<p>This is an updated contribution, of N5-011021 presented during CN5#14 in Brighton. It is submitted in order to further clarify the issues surrounding the relationship between call-based User Interactions and Call Control, and seek agreement from the joint group to identify and agree on a solution to these issues. The authors believe that the current Call Control and Call Related User Interaction services, do not provide a sufficiently accurate and stable specification base to which either vendors of these service capabilities or application developers can easily support or develop call based user interaction applications or services.</p> <p>The contribution proposes three possible solution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To integrate Call-based User Interaction into Call Control. (single vendor for combined service) • To maintain service separation and define an interface between UI and CC (possibly supplied by different vendors). • To maintain existing separation between UI and CC, define the use and behaviour of the Call Object Reference and application API (implied supply of both services from a single vendor). <p>It is presented for discussion. The last page lists a series of newt steps. What is desired from this meeting is</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An agreement that there is a problem that needs to be addressed, and gather interested parties in a SIG to discuss by email or audio conference, with the HK meeting as target. • Seek clarification from SA1 on whether there is a requirement for these services to be sourceable from different vendors, which is not possible at the moment because of their inter-dependence. <p>Interested in being involved: Andy, Gary and Ard-Jan; Matti has shown a previous interest and will be contacted.</p>	

		1131	Proposal for Enhancements to the Parlay/OSA Specifications	BT	<p>This contribution provides some enhancements to the OSA set of API Interfaces as a result of work undertaken in the Eurescom Project P1110. They are presented here for discussion and as agreed enhancements which are targeted towards the ETSI Release 2.0/Parlay 4.0/3GPP Release 5.0.</p> <p>Many of the OSA/Parlay interfaces are highly asymmetric between application and gateway. Although many of these asymmetries are particularly apparent on SIP networks, many aspects identified in this task will not be restricted to SIP. The proposal on 'Balancing up' of interfaces is aims to identify areas where the asymmetry of OSA may cause limitation in functionality or feature interaction problems. It proposes some modifications in these lines.</p> <p>This document is contributed by T and is not fully agreed in P1110. The contribution aims to trigger an email discussion where the participants in the Eurescom 1110 could be included.</p> <p>Comment: this concept of balanced interfaces is about functional completeness: to be able to have notifications on a certain side for everything that can be initiated at that side. On the other hand it may not be necessary to implement this in the Gateway.</p> <p>Comment: this doesn't seem to be in line with our current model, where each application has its own view of what is happening in the call – if we have two apps running in the network, one need not know what the other is creating. Besides we have a requirement on backwards compatibility and it is not clear if we should change our principles at this stage.</p> <p>Answer: this is input for the improvement of our API, which needs indeed improvement, so we should give it further thought. If there is something lacking in our API we should add it.</p> <p>Way forward: we will prepare an initial response, that Richard will take back, saying that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a specific reason why some interfaces are not symmetric, which is lack of network support - for instance in CC if the GW is based on IN then each application has its own view of the call – but we believe that in future, SIP based networks, this could be accommodated. • More details supporting some of the use cases would be helpful. <p>A group of volunteers (Andy, Ard-Jan and Richard) will go through the contribution and prepare a response for each of the modifications it proposes within a couple of weeks..</p>	
--	--	------	--	----	---	--

		1200	Deprecation Mechanism for OSA SCFs	Siemens	<p>This contribution proposes the following limits in the scope of this issue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Limit backwards compatibility to one release• Backward compatibility only supports outdated clients connecting to an “up-to-date” SCS. There are no measures that support a new client in connecting to an outdated SCS. <p>Then it raises the following issues when changing an SCF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Removal of interfaces or methods needs special treatment• Addition of interfaces or methods on the client side needs special treatment• A new SCS must be able to tell outdated from new clients.• Types can be removed or added silently.• Extending sequence and tagged choice types can always be done. <p>To solve these issues it proposes the following mechanisms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To add a new service property: USE_REL_X.• To define a Deprecated Tag and a New Tag• A duplicate-and-change mechanism using these tags.	
--	--	------	------------------------------------	---------	---	--

		1135	Notes on backward compatibility	Ericsson	<p>This contribution states that a strict backwards compatibility is not desirable because it doesn't allow corrections within the set of methods / parameters of a previous version. It concludes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strict backward compatibility is not completely necessary for Service APIs. In case we need to introduce changes, this should be clearly indicated in the specifications, so that developers can easily see what has been changed. A sort of deprecated mechanism like Java has it would thus be useful. An approach like the one proposed in 1200 would be useful. • For the Framework, strict backwards compatibility is the best solution, and if it really necessary to modify an interface it would be best to give a new name to the modified version. <p>Q: Why are changes acceptable for the service interfaces but not for the Framework? A: Because for services we can have the old and the new running in parallel, whereas we cannot have different Framework implementations running in parallel. Since for services there is a possible smooth migration path then backwards compatibility is not so necessary. Q: The idea of old and new versions running in parallel is not very appealing – software is usually upgraded without the need for new equipment. Q: Doesn't the smooth migration path require overlapping notifications?</p> <p>Conclusion: this issue seems to be more complicated than expected, and there seems to be no more way forward than to analyse each future change independently and carefully, and to agree on a deprecation mechanism.</p> <p>It is noted that since we want the service properties in XML we'll need to change IpRegistration (this is an example case of future modification).</p>	
--	--	------	---------------------------------	----------	--	--

		1192	Proposed UML -> WSDL mapping	Nortel & Lucent	<p>This document proposes an initial mapping from UML model constructs to WSDL language elements. This proposed mapping is to aid in the realisation of an XML over SOAP for the OSA APIs. The proposed mappings are work in progress. This document is intended as a first input to the Web Services Translation Rules document, referred to in N5-011206 in case that Tdoc is accepted. It doesn't address how to deal with callback references.</p> <p>Q: Isn't Parameter Order over-specifying? A: It is optional and we won't use it.</p> <p>Q: Does WSDL support inheritance? A: No.</p> <p>Work on this mapping will continue and it will be sent to the Joint group mailing list for comments within the next two weeks.</p>
		1206	A Unified Approach for Parlay Realisation	Sun	<p>This contribution proposes a framework for the development of a number of technology-specific Parlay realisations from the CORBA UML. If approved, it is proposed that the joint group (Parlay, ETSI, 3GPP and by member companies of the JAIN community) work on this model and that a discussion take place to decide if and how to capture part or all of this material within the OSA documents.</p> <p>Q: Why is there no Analysis UML model? In Brighton we agreed it would be available for educational purposes. A: It is suggested that it is not published but available at the web site.</p> <p>The meeting agrees this describes very well the way we work, and it would be useful to have it somewhere visible. It will be put on the "News" part of the ETSI server and besides in a more permanent place; Chelo will do it.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>
10	Outgoing liaisons				

		1167	[DRAFT] Liaison Statement on Retrieval of Network Capabilities Requirement	Lucent	Based on discussions in Brighton this LS requests from SA1 a clarification for their requirement on Retrieval of Network Capabilities. Two points are raised: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The wording suggests that an application should be able to obtain this information starting from the subscriber. OSA/Parlay already supports a mechanism for applications to select SCS's based on properties Discussion of this document is postponed to the joint session with SA2 VHE/OSA.
		1123	DRAFT LS reply from ETSI SPAN14 to SA1	Alcatel	This LS clarifies how work on OSA requirements is organised in SPAN, for SA1 OSA to know, because they have found out that there is a Work Item on requirements for OSA version 2 in ETSI SPAN14 and have sent them a LS suggesting to do this work jointly. The proposed LS response clarifies that SPAN14 has delegated the work on OSA requirements to SPAN12, and that thus they are part of the activities of the Joint Group, which is taking into account 3GPP OSA requirements. <p>Musa and Chelo to re-phrase it (N5-1257) to make sure that the work process is clear.</p>
		1257		Alcatel	Update of 1123 <p>Agreed.</p>
11	Organizational aspects				
11.1	3GPP OSA Work Item Description	938	Rel5 OSA Stage 3 - Draft Building Block level Work Item Description	MCC	
		1124	Proposed modification to the 3GPP Rel5 OSA Stage 3 - Building Block level Work Item Description approved at CN#13 in Sept 2001	Alcatel	It is agreed by the meeting that it is important to have a clear description of our workflow in order to clarify our interactions with other groups. It is included in the WID because it seems to be the best possible place. We're the only groups having one but believe it would be useful that all of them had it. <p>To be updated to include input from ad-hocs. Chelo volunteers, Adrian will provide the source of the drawing in powerpoint.</p>
11.2	Review of 3GPP OSA workplan	936	3GPP OSA workplan	MCC	
11.3	further work on 12076				
11.4	further work on 12075				
11.5	other				

		1119	List of CN5_CRs_to CN#14 (Version 3.0)	MCC	
		1256	List of CN5_CRs_to CN#14 (Version 4.0)	MCC	
		1247	Call For Experts for STF on Testing OSA	ETSI	<p>ETSI has a separate budget for expert to do specific technical work, working temporarily in Sophia. In this context a Call For Experts has been issued for OSA Testing. The closing date for applications is end of December.</p> <p>The contribution also includes the Terms Of Reference of the STF, explaining that its objective is to write test specifications for conformance to OSA. The STF will produce text descriptions with some sequence diagrams.</p> <p>The Call is looking for 3 people, not full time, and ideally with expertise on OSA/Testing/Application development.</p> <p>It is requested that this Call is taken into account by the Joint group and distributed in the participating companies.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
		1255	CN5 specifications as reflected by the MCC database (status 2001-11-23) - for CN5's Revision	MCC	Noted.
13	Future meetings				<p>Hong Kong, China, February 5-8, co-located with Parlay members meeting.</p> <p>The May Joint CN meeting will be hosted by Ericsson, probably in Europe though not Sweden. There will probably be a Parlay meeting at these dates, so it is suggested that we try to have the CN groups co-located with Parlay, though it is pointed out that Parlay has a rule: three meetings a year, Asia in winter, USA in summer and Europe in autumn.</p> <p>Do we need another meeting before the March plenary, apart from the one in HK? We reserve in our agendas somewhere in the week of 25/2-1/3 for a possible ad-hoc if necessary.</p> <p>We'll need another meeting before May but this we can decide in HK.</p>
14	AOB				

