

3GPP TSG CN Plenary Meeting #15  
6th – 8th March 2002. Jeju, Korea.

NP-020032

**Agenda item:** 6.1.1

**Document for:** INFO

---



**18.02.2002**

**Meeting Report**  
**TSG CN WG1# 22**  
**Sophia Antipolis, France**  
**28 January - 01 February 2002**

Chairman: Hannu Hietalahti (Nokia)

Secretary: Per Johan Jorgensen (ETSI/MCC)

Host: ETSI

Joint meeting report CN1-4	Annex A
List of participants:	Annex B
Agreed CRs	Annex C
Tdoc list (incl. the status)	Annex D
Liaison Statements Out	Annex E
Ageed Work Items	Annex F
Agreed specifications (TS or TR)	Annex G
List of CRs to N1 drafts	Annex H

Documents can be found on the 3GPP-server:

[http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg\\_cn/WG1\\_mm-cc-sm/TSGN1\\_22/Docs/](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_cn/WG1_mm-cc-sm/TSGN1_22/Docs/)

## Table of contents

---

1	Opening of the meeting. Calls for IPRs .....	3
2	Agenda and Reports.....	3
3	Input Liaison Statements .....	3
4	Work Plan for TSGN WG1 .....	8
5	Maintenance of R98 and older releases .....	8
6	Maintenance of Release 99 .....	8
7	Maintenance of Release 4 .....	13
8	Release 5 .....	14
8.1	IMS draft specifications and other documents for information .....	14
8.2	Rel-5 corrections .....	15
8.3	CN1-2-3-4 IMS joint session on 24.228 and 23.218 .....	15
8.4	IMS Registration .....	18
8.5	IMS Deregistration .....	24
8.6	IMS Configuration hiding .....	25
8.7	IMS Authentication .....	25
8.8	IMS Call initiation.....	26
8.9	IMS Call clearing .....	30
8.10	IMS Abnormal cases and error handling .....	31
8.11	(IMS Emergency call).....	31
8.12	Other IMS issues.....	31
8.13	IMS Editorials and other minor issues .....	35
8.14	TEI5 .....	35
8.15	IMS: 23.218 .....	37
8.16	Other Rel-5 issues.....	41
9	LS OUT (output liaison statements) .....	43
10	Late and misplaced documents .....	44
11	Any Other Business (AOB) .....	44
12	Closing of the meeting .....	44
	Meeting schedule for CN1 in 2002.....	45
Annex A	Joint meeting report CN1-2-3-4.....	45
Annex B	List of participants .....	45
Annex C	Agreed CRs .....	47
	CRs for e-mail agreement.....	48
	Documents Endorsed by N1 .....	48
Annex D	Tdoc list (incl. the status) .....	49
Annex E	Liaison Statements OUT .....	67
Annex F	Ageed Work Items.....	67
Annex G	Agreed specifications (TS or TR).....	67
Annex H	List of CRs to N1 drafts.....	67

---

## 1 Opening of the meeting. Calls for IPRs

The delegates were welcomed and informed on the logistics.

IPR rights were asked to be disclosed according to respective organizations IPR policies. **Individual Members should declare at the earliest opportunity, any IPRs which they believe to be essential, or potentially essential, to any work ongoing within 3GPP.**

---

## 2 Agenda and Reports

**N1-020166** : CN1 chairman, Title: Agenda (Sophia0201)

*Discussion* : This will continue as a living document in the doc Sophia0201.rtf.

Joint meeting with CN2/3/4/ (CN1 meeting points 8.3) will take place Tuesday after lunch 29/01 at 14:00.

Some moving of documents between agenda items were done before the meeting and during this discussion.

*Conclusion* : **Agreed**

**N1-020354** : MCC, Title: Draft Report for TSG SA meeting #14 - version 0.0.3

*Discussion* :

*Conclusion* : **Noted**

**N1-020355** : MCC, Title: DRAFT STATUS REPORT v1.0.0 3GPP TSG-CN#14

*Discussion* :

*Conclusion* : **Noted**

**N1-020362** : MCC, Title: N1 specification responsibility after TSG#14

*Discussion* : TS & TR that must not be moved to Rel-5:

- 23.063 (PDS stage 2)
- 24.063 (PDS stage 3)
- 44.008 (L3 signalling)
- 23.814 (Separating RR and MM CM)

*Conclusion* :

**N1-020363** : MCC, Title: Meeting Report, TSG CN WG1# 21, Cancun, Mexico, 26-30 November 2001

*Discussion* :

*Conclusion* : **Agreed**

**N1-020370** : Chairman, Title: Meeting Report, TSG CN WG1# SIPadhoc0201

*Discussion* :

*Conclusion* : **Noted**

---

## 3 Input Liaison Statements

**N1-0202005** : S3-010675, To: N1, Cc: T2 , Type: LS IN , Title: Configuration of ciphering

**Discussion :** Forwarded from CN1#SIPadhoc0201. The attached version of the CR was not approved by TSG-SA but sent back to SA3. A 33.102 CR which requires that the UE clears CS and PS connections which are not ciphered. This 33.102 CR is a requirement to make change in CN1 specifications. But before the change can be implemented at least the following issues need to be defined in CN1 specifications according to list agreed in this meeting :

What is the criteria for the UE to initiate clearing? -> RAN WGs must be involved in the decision too.

Does it look like normal call clearing / PDP context deactivation?

Do the other CS calls / PDP contexts need to be cleared?

Are new call attempts allowed?

Does the UE perform CS / PS detach?

Does the UE perform PLMN selection?

What happens to MT SMS?

No technical solution is on the table for this meeting and a LS is needed. New issues at this meeting is eg what happens to SMS retry on error causes. Concern that all the listed issues need more study. Reply to SA3 that the task is acknowledged by CN1 as well (also sent to RAN2 and CN) and can only be completed after March 2002, but still be part of Rel-5. The CR from SA3 is earliest approved by SA#15. WI mandate could be questioned in the LS.

**Conclusion: LS OUT in 371 by Sunil**

**N1-020168** : GP-012661, To: N1, Cc: GERAN, Type: LS IN from GERAN 5 , Title: LS on the ciphering of LLC PDUs in response to a page for a TBF.

**Discussion :** Yes the LS is correct and the answer needs to be sent. GERAN5 asks for the condition when the UE ciphers LLC frames sent as a response to page. This is not clearly defined in 04.64, and depends on what is sent as a reply to page. An empty frame may or may not be ciphered.

**Conclusion: LS OUT in 372 by Apostolis**

**N1-020169** : GP-012704, To: RAN, RAN3, Cc: N1 , Type: LS IN from GERAN 2 , Title: Reply to the LS on GERAN architecture and impacts on the Iu-cs interface

**Discussion :** GERAN2 say to RAN WGs that they would like to define the internal structure of GERAN related containers in RAN messages in GERAN owned TSS.

**Conclusion: Noted**

**N1-020170** : GP-012849, To: CN, N1, Type: LS IN , Title: Introduction of GERAN feature indicator

**Discussion :** Already treated in CN #14 as NP-010690.

**Conclusion: Noted**

**N1-020171** : NP-010698, To: SA, CN, SA3, Type: LS IN from Chairman 3GPP TSG-SA WG3-LI , Title: Liaison to SA, CN

**Discussion :** CN and SA co-operation is sought to handle common lawful interception issues. 23.153 is owned by CN4 and 02.71 is in SA1.

**Conclusion: Noted**

**N1-020172** : R2-012777, To: N1, GERAN, Type: LS IN , Title: LS on Retransmission of Uplink NAS messages

**Discussion :** Does the NAS layer expect the lower layer to retransmit when not acknowledged there ? The lower layers (RR or RRC or ?) should do the retransmission in CS domain. N(SD) bit is CN1 network area, and is all covered in the specs. RAN2 ask 4 specific questions about S(ND):

1. Is N(SD) used in CS or PS domain or both?
2. Which entity handles resending and duplicates?

3. If N(SD) is valid for both RATs then how is inter-RAT HO handled
4. If N(SD) is used in PS domain then inter system change is problematic because there is no corresponding protocol layer to LLC in UMTS.

Agreed answers:

1. CS only
2. The resending mechanism in UE end is somewhat implementation specific but it is expected that the lower layers below CN protocols provides the retransmission.
3. The duplicates which result from retransmissions are detected by the CN entity (see 24.007 subclause 11.2.3.2.3.2.2) and therefore RR/RRC protocols do not need to worry about duplicated messages in inter-RAT HO.
4. Not relevant as N(SD) is not used in PS domain.

**Conclusion: LS OUT in 373**

**N1-020173**: R2-020153, To: SA2 Cc: RAN3, CN1, Type: LS IN , Title: Response to LS (S2-013580) on Multiple RAB Activation Issue

**Discussion** : Only active RABs consume radio resources. N1-020360 from SA2 asks the other groups to stop worrying about multiple RAB activation.

**Conclusion: Noted**

**N1-020174** : S2-013495, To: RAN3 Cc: RAN2, GERAN2, CN1,CN4, Type: LS IN , Title: Reply to reply to LS "Update of Iu-Flex status" TSGR3#24(01) 3067

**Discussion** : IU-FLEX discussion between SA2 and RAN3 with no action to CN1.

**Conclusion: Noted**

**N1-020175** : S2-013580, To: CN1, RAN3, RAN2 Cc:, Type: LS IN , Title: LS response on " Multiple RAB Activation Issue "

**Discussion** : S2 has studied multiple RAB activation and can answer that at the present time 23.060 neither explicitly allows or disallows this feature. SA2 wait for more information on the possible benefits from RAN groups.

**Conclusion: Noted**

**N1-020176** : S2-013582, To: SA4 Cc: CN1, SA1, RAN3, Type: LS IN , Title: Requirements for alternative QoS

**Discussion** : SA2 ask for more information from SA4 on alternative QoS. N1-020176, N1-020181 are linked

**Conclusion: Noted**

**N1-020177** : S2-020275, To: CN1, CN3 Cc:, Type: LS IN , Title: Reply LS on Interworking between 3GPP UE (IPv6 only) and SIP device external to IMS (IPv4 only)

**Discussion** : CN1 and CN3 are kindly asked to give this IPv4 / IPv6 interworking a lower priority until the architectural aspects are finalised by SA2.

**Conclusion: Noted**

**N1-020178** : S2-020277, To: CN1 Cc: CN4, Type: LS IN , Title: Reply LS on Sr interface between Application Server and MRFC

**Discussion** : We have a CR in 346 on the issue, for 23.218, to this meeting. SA2 would like to kindly inform CN1 that it does not plan to perform any further activities on the Sr interface within the Rel-5 timeframe, except that the removal of Sr interface from SA2 specifications will be considered in SA #16.

**Conclusion: Noted**

**N1-020179** : S2-020326, To: T1, T2, SA3, SA5, CN1, CN3 Cc: SA4, CN, T, Type: LS IN , Title: Liaison Statement on "Prefix allocation for IPv6 stateless address autoconfiguration"

**Discussion** : 24.228 need changes to be in accordance with this, and will probably be for next CN1 meeting. Unique IPv6 prefix shall be allocated to every primary PDP context when using the IPv6 stateless address autoconfiguration procedure.

**Conclusion: Noted**

**N1-020180** : S2-020328, To: CN1, CN4 Cc:, Type: LS IN , Title: Liaison statement on the transparent transfer via SGSN of application level information between UE and GGSN

**Discussion** : If possible the IMS information should be transferred in a backward compatible manner. Related docs is 273, 274, 275, 269, 331, 291, 365. What is pre-Rel-5 ? Agreed to be R99 onwards. Is the request for P-CSCF address only in primary PDP context, or could a secondary PDP context request be used as well ? Is different APN allowed or not ? It was expressed support for both views. Backward compatibility seems only possible for primary PDP context. The following would need to be defined to GPRS, preferably in backwards compatible manner.

1. P-CSCF discovery
2. Media authorisation
3. Signalling PDP context

It was agreed to study the backwards compatibility with R99 and later releases only. Full backwards compatibility with no impact on R99 is not possible but some steps can be taken depending on which solution is chosen. Can signalling PDP context be a secondary PDP context?

**Conclusion: LS OUT in 374 by Kevan**

**N1-020181** : S4-010683, To: SA2 Cc: CN1, SA1, RAN3, Type: LS IN , Title: Reply to Liaison Statement on requirements for alternative QoS.

**Discussion** : N1-020176, N1-020181 are linked.

**Conclusion: Noted**

**N1-020182** : S4-010693, To: CN1,T2 Cc: TSG-T, Type: LS IN , Title: Response to liaison Statement on "Introduction Of UMTS\_AMR\_2 into R99 UE's"

**Discussion** : SA4 say that they have included UMTS\_AMR\_2 codec in R99 and both CN1 and T2 are asked to make the related changes to their specs. Rel-4 is OK for CN1, but the R99 issue did not have any contribution to this meeting and it was thought that none was needed. To be checked.

**Conclusion: Noted**

**N1-020183** : S5-010752, To: CN4,SA1 Cc: SA2,CN1, Type: LS IN , Title: Liaison Statement on AMR-WB and Charging

**Discussion** : SA5 acknowledge their task in AMR-WB related charging issues.

**Conclusion: Noted**

**N1-020184** : S5-020013, To: All RANx, GERANx, CNx, Tx and SAx, Type: LS IN , Title: Liaison Statement on Impacts of Subscriber and Equipment Trace

**Discussion** : SA5 is asking from all other groups the list of specifications which will be affected by subscriber and equipment trace. LS was sent from Phoenix in middle of January this year, and CN1 will basically copy CN4 work on Cx. Any new requirements can not be done for Rel-5.

**Conclusion: Noted**

**N1-020185** : S5-020048, To: SA2,CN1 Cc: SA1, Type: LS IN , Title: LS requesting that the IMS Charging ID (ICID) is provided to access network

**Discussion** : SA5 request that IMS Charging ID (ICID) is provided by P-CSCF to GGSN. Discussion doc in 296 and a CR in 265 is related. CN3 should be aware of this if it is for Go. This LS was proposed forwarded for the CN3 attention.

**Conclusion:** Forwarded to CN3.

**N1-020350** : T1-010551, To: T2 Cc: GERAN4, GERAN5, CN1, T, Type: LS IN , Title: Response to LS on SMS testing

**Discussion :** T1 say that they have modified one SMS test case.

**Conclusion:** Noted

**N1-020351** : T2-011178, To: CN1, SA4 Cc: TSG-T, Type: LS IN , Title: LS Response to LS from CN1 on UMTS\_AMR2 Dual-Mode Operation

**Discussion :** Linked to 182. Proposal that CN1 should see if any modifications to 24.008 are needed because of the introduction of UMTS\_AMR\_2 to R99. 24.008 R99 CR will be attempted drafted during this meeting by Robert (**N1-020403**).

**Conclusion:** Noted

**N1-020352** : UP-010122, To: CN4 Cc: CN1, SA1 GUPadhoc, Type: LS IN from 3GPPJointadhoc GUP , Title: Answer to Liaison Statement on Cx User Profile

**Discussion :** 3GPPJointadhoc GUP group sees some common interests with CN4 at Cx interface and seek co-operation. We expect to be informed on the work from CN4.

**Conclusion:** Noted

**N1-020353** : UP-010128, To: SA1, SA2, SA3, SA4, SA5, T2, T3, CN1, CN4, CN5, SA1 GUPadhoc, T2, Type: LS IN from 3GPPJointadhoc GUP, Title: Status of the Generic User Profile Work

**Discussion :** All WGs are asked to review all GUP documents and to provide comments. No online reviewing can be done, and nobody volunteered to do the work.

**Conclusion:** Noted

**N1-020358** : G2-020089 To: SA4 Cc: CN1, GERAN 1, Type: LS IN , Title: LS on Speech Codecs references in GERAN specifications

**Discussion :** GERAN2 would like to inform SA4 that it is about to refer, in GERAN specifications to 3GPP TS 26.103 as a common source for codecs identification, and to write down unambiguous associations between speech versions code-points and corresponding codec names. Comments are requested, are there any from CN1? None in the meeting.

**Conclusion:** Noted

**N1-020359** : N1-0201113 To: SA2 Cc: CN1, CN4, Type: LS IN from N1SIPadhoc0201 , Title: LS on Sr interface between Application Server and MRFC

**Discussion :** For information to the full meeting. The CN1 SIP ad hoc proposed to remove Sr interface because there is no stage 2 for it and no time to wait for it to be drafted. SA2 reply in N1-020178.

**Conclusion:** Noted

**N1-020360** : S2-020307 To: RAN2, RAN3, CN1 Cc: , Type: LS IN , Title: Response to LS (S2-020185) on Multiple RAB Activation Issue

**Discussion :** SA2 recommends CN1, RAN2 and RAN3 not to perform more work on the Multiple RAB activation issue as there seems to be no or minimal benefits to motivate such work. Related LS in N1-020175.

**Conclusion:** Noted

**N1-020361** : S2-020325 To: SA4 Cc: CN1, GERAN1, GERAN2, Type: LS IN , Title: Liaison Statement on ACS negotiation using SIP / SDP

**Discussion :** Maximum number of modes in the Active Codec Set (MACS) and Optimisation Mode (OM) cannot be supported using SDP signalling in ACS negotiation. SA2 asks SA4 to clarify the usage of MACS and OM. We need to await the final decision from SA4 on the need for those 2 parameters.

**Conclusion:** Noted

**N1-020435** : S2-020266, To: SA5, CN1, Type: LS IN , Title: Liaison on Message Information Flows for the Distribution of the Charging Correlation Information.

**Discussion** : Forwarded to CN1 22bis. But the delegations were invited to participate in a discussion (contact: Eric Henrikson / Lucent) before CN1#22bis.

**Conclusion**: Forwarded to #22bis

## 4 Work Plan for TSGN WG1

The Oulo meeting is now 4 days from 19-22 February. Some more IMS working meetings is needed and could be done as eg subgroups. This needs to be discussed during the spring period,- remembering that all IMS drafts is probably turned into TSs with formal CR approval procedure. It was requested that the Oulo meeting needs to handle non-IMS Rel-5 issues as well ? Parallell sessions and 5 days meeting was also requested,- but not agreed. The IMS TSs will be discussed for CN forwarding during the Oulo meeting.

**N1-020167** : Chairman, Title: CN1 IMS open items list

**Discussion** :

**Conclusion** : Noted

**N1-020364** : MCC, Title: Latest workplan for review

**Discussion** : Rapporteurs on all WIs to prepare for comments in the end of this meeting when reviewing is done. IMS status will be handled in CN1#22bis, and rapporteurs give their status to the chairman before CN#15.

**Conclusion** : Not treated due to time

## 5 Maintenance of R98 and older releases

Luckily none provided,- stable ...

## 6 Maintenance of Release 99

**N1-020186** : 23.009v390 CR#064, Alcatel, Type: CR , Title: Sending of RANAP Location Reporting Control on the E Interface

**Discussion** :

**Conclusion** : Not treated due to time

**N1-020187** : 23.009v430 CR#065, Alcatel, Type: CR , Title: Sending of RANAP Location Reporting Control on the E Interface

**Discussion** :

**Conclusion** : Not treated due to time

**N1-020188** : 23.009v500 CR#066, Alcatel, Type: CR , Title: Sending of RANAP Location Reporting Control on the E Interface

**Discussion** :

**Conclusion** : Not treated due to time



**N1-020199** : 29.018v380 CR#026, Siemens, Type: CR , Title: Addition of missing Mobile Station States for UMTS

**Discussion** : According to the standard, the Mobile Station States IE should be included in the MS Information Response message, irrespective of the information requested. The current version of TS 29.018 specifies only values for the GMM states IDLE, STANDBY, SUSPENDED and READY, but not for the PMM states PMM-DETACHED, PMM-CONNECTED and PMM-IDLE; therefore, it is unclear, what to encode in the information element, if the MS is served by a UTRAN. Furthermore, subclause 14.3 is incorrectly referring to a "MS status" IE.

What is the consequence if not implemented was requested as part of the cover page. For implementers using the states this is a frequently occurring error. Can the change impact or make equal changes to other paragraphs where eg IDLE mode is used ? None found.

**Conclusion** : *Agreed*

**N1-020200** : 29.018v420 CR#027, Siemens, Type: CR , Title: Addition of missing Mobile Station States for UMTS

**Discussion** :

**Conclusion** : *Agreed*

**N1-020201** : 29.018v500 CR#028, Siemens, Type: CR , Title: Addition of missing Mobile Station States for UMTS

**Discussion** :

**Conclusion** : *Agreed*

**N1-020208** : 24.008v3a0 CR#538, Siemens, Type: CR , Title: Addition of SM cause #46 to the MS initiated PDP Context Modification procedure

**Discussion** : Use the error code 'semantic error' as described in the text below the cause code list referred to in this CR.

**Conclusion** : *Rejected*

**N1-020209** : 24.008v450 CR#539, Siemens, Type: CR , Title: Addition of SM cause #46 to the MS initiated PDP Context Modification procedure

**Discussion** :

**Conclusion** : *Rejected*

**N1-020210** : 24.008v520 CR#540, Siemens, Type: CR , Title: Addition of SM cause #46 to the MS initiated PDP Context Modification procedure

**Discussion** :

**Conclusion** : *Rejected*

**N1-020211** : 24.008v3a0 CR#541, Siemens, Type: CR , Title: Handling of not existing Ids in the "replace packet filters in existing TFT" operation

**Discussion** : Contradictional text identified.

**Conclusion** : *Rejected*

**N1-020212** : 24.008v450 CR#542, Siemens, Type: CR , Title: Handling of not existing Ids in the "replace packet filters in existing TFT" operation

**Discussion** :

**Conclusion** : *Rejected*

**N1-020213** : 24.008v520 CR#543, Siemens, Type: CR , Title: Handling of not existing Ids in the "replace packet filters in existing TFT" operation

**Discussion** :

**Conclusion** : *Rejected*

**N1-020214** : 24.008v3a0 CR#544, Siemens, Type: CR , Title: Missing 3rd MNC definition

**Discussion** : Failed implementation after the Oxford meeting in 1999.

**Conclusion** : *Agreed*

**N1-020215** : 24.008v450 CR#545, Siemens, Type: CR , Title: Missing 3rd MNC definition

**Discussion** :

**Conclusion** : *Agreed*

**N1-020216** : 24.008v520 CR#546, Siemens, Type: CR , Title: Missing 3rd MNC definition

**Discussion** :

**Conclusion** : *Agreed*

**N1-020217** : 24.008v3a0 CR#547, Siemens, Type: CR , Title: R99 procedures in a pre-R99 network

**Discussion** : The ACTIVATE SECONDARY PDP CONTEXT REQUEST and the MODIFY PDP CONTEXT REQUEST (MS to Network direction) message are introduced in R99. No specific flags were introduced which indicate the support of these procedures by the network, but instead a unique flag indication whether the core network is R99 or older was defined in the GSM system information. Nevertheless it was not specified that the MS shall only start these procedures if the network is R99 or later. If the MS will start the procedure irrespectively the version of the core network, then a R98 or earlier SGSN will perform the error handling defined in sec. 8.xxx. In case of a unknown message type the SM entity shall react with a SM-STATUS message. But for the MS receiving the SM-STATUS it is not defined that the procedure should be aborted. Instead of the immediate abortion the MS will perform a retransmission of the specific message four times until the procedure is aborted.

Is this a frequently occurring error to justify R99 correction ? Different opinions due to possible message repetition(s). No procedure seems defined for the MS on how to behave when receiving STATUS (eg cause #97 "message type non-existent or not implemented"). However some delegates found this CR as purely optimization. Another view was to specify no resending of the procedure in that specific network when STATUS is received. This does not save resources for the first message. Should the MS follow the network revision in all cases or only back off when receiving error cause#97 ?

If the MS handling is changed to option, the handling can not be general but restricted to SM. The CR was rejected due to the current specification already allows the proposed implementation. And it was specifically agreed how to behave.

- It was agreed that even though the MS behaviour upon receiving SM status code #97 is implementation specific, the preferred implementation would be not to resend the request.
- It was also agreed that it is allowed for the MS to look at the CN revision and not initiate the secondary PDP context activation or PDP context modification procedures at all towards a pre-R99 CN.

**Conclusion** : *Rejected*

**N1-020218** : 24.008v450 CR#548, Siemens, Type: CR , Title: R99 procedures in a pre-R99 network

**Discussion** :

**Conclusion** : *Rejected*

**N1-020219** : 24.008v520 CR#549, Siemens, Type: CR , Title: R99 procedures in a pre-R99 network

**Discussion** :

**Conclusion** : *Rejected*

**N1-020248** : 24.008v3a0 CR#552, Ericsson, Type: CR , Title: Restriction of the 0kbits maximum bitrate

**Discussion** :

**Conclusion** : *Not treated due to time*

**N1-020249** : 24.008v450 CR#553, Ericsson, Type: CR , Title: Restriction of the 0kbits maximum bitrate

**Discussion :****Conclusion : Not treated due to time****N1-020250** : 24.008v520 CR#554, Ericsson, Type: CR , Title: Restriction of the 0kbits maximum bitrate**Discussion :****Conclusion : Not treated due to time****N1-020279** : 24.008v3a0 CR#558, Motorola, Type: CR , Title: Conditions for including R97 QoS attributes in the QoS IE

**Discussion :** Although TS 24.008 indicates that the QoS IE is defined to allow backwards compatibility, it does not specify any requirements for ensuring this backwards compatibility. In particular, it does not specify when an MS shall include both the R97 QoS values and the R99 QoS values.

Should not the UMTS MS send the R97 QoS (octets 3 – 5) as well ? This would require a mapping, complicating the MS. It seems as the information only needs to be as accurate as possible and not an exact mapping. N1-020279 and N1-020339 are related.

**Conclusion : Revised to375****N1-020375** : 24.008v3a0 CR#558r1, Motorola, Type: CR , Title: Conditions for including R97 QoS attributes in the QoS IE

**Discussion :** ‘Encoded’ is the correct terminology, not ‘reflected’.

**Conclusion : Revised to 445****N1-020445** : 24.008v3a0 CR#558r2, Motorola, Type: CR , Title: Conditions for including R97 QoS attributes in the QoS IE**Discussion :****Conclusion : Agreed****N1-020282** : 24.008v3a0 CR#559, Siemens, Type: CR , Title: MM behaviour in case of a combined attach reject for the PS service

**Discussion :** In order to avoid misinterpretations it is proposed to distinguish between the case when the MS is not already IMSI attached (typical for a MS with a 'auto attach for the PS service' option enabled) and the case where the PS service is activated after the MS is already IMSI attached for the CS service. For the first case the IMSI attach shall be performed according the conditions described in the MM section. For the second case no IMSI attach is needed and the MS shall only perform a LU if necessary.

Should it be sufficient to only change the test case,- which Siemens intends to ? 4.4.3 seems sufficient for the issue since it is a frozen release. The text as is covers the case if the VLR assumes not attached, and the the MS can go ahead and do an attach if not attached. No MS behavior changes was desired at this stage for R99. Postponed for checking. Due to different implementations the way forward could be to allow different (3) options, and/or only make the needed change to the Rel-5 specification. No change to the network is identified even CN is tagged on the cover page. The LS in 412 is needed to state that both results are agreed in R99/Rel-4.

It was agreed that both behaviours of R99 MS are acceptable. So after receiving partial reject cause #7 or #14 disallowing GPRS services, the MS may either always attempt CS attach or attempt CS attach only if this is required based on the current attach status.

**Conclusion : Rejected and LS OUT in 412 by Roland****N1-020283** : 24.008v450 CR#560, Siemens, Type: CR , Title: MM behaviour in case of a combined attach reject for the PS service**Discussion :****Conclusion : Rejected**

**N1-020284** : 24.008v520 CR#561, Siemens, Type: CR , Title: MM behaviour in case of a combined attach reject for the PS service

**Discussion** : Change category to F and delete CN tag. Send a LS to the test group to allow different interpretation to R99/Rel-4. The goal is to get rid of options in this release. What is the behavior in SGSN/MSC, can it detach the CS service (probably not) ? Do networks need the Location Update to have the Mobile station pageable ?

A MS which is already IMSI attached does not need to perform a new CS attach by means of LU procedure if it receives #7 GPRS services not allowed because in that situation the MS remains CS attached. If there is a Test Case requiring this then the TC is probably wrong. As the problem occurs already in R99 do we need a CR or a LS to T1? Related LS in N1-020412.

**Conclusion** : Revised to 413

**N1-020413** : 24.008v520 CR#561r1, Siemens, Type: CR , Title: MM behaviour in case of a combined attach reject for the PS service

**Discussion** : Not available.

**Conclusion** : Withdrawn

**N1-020335** : 24.008v3a0 CR#562, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: Handling for QoS profile parameter 'transfer delay'

**Discussion** : TS 23.107 specifies a value range for the UMTS bearer service attribute 'transfer delay' (applies for real-time traffic classes 'Conversational' and 'Streaming' only). The lower bound for the value range is 100 ms for the traffic class 'Conversational' and is 250 ms for the traffic class 'Streaming'. The coding of the lower bound for parameter 'transfer delay' in TS 24.008 allows values from 10 ms onwards. Thus, values ranging from 10 ms to 90 ms can be requested though it would be in contrast to the defined value range in 23.107.

Is it enough to have such requirement as a note? Is 23.107 what network should comply with and referred to? The procedure described is quite right but no change to the frozen release is supported. Is it support for Rel-5 CR with the note? No strong objections was raised.

**Conclusion** : Rejected

**N1-020336** : 24.008v450 CR#563, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: Handling for QoS profile parameter 'transfer delay'

**Discussion** :

**Conclusion** : Rejected

**N1-020337** : 24.008v520 CR#564, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: Handling for QoS profile parameter 'transfer delay'

**Discussion** : The meeting agreed that the proposed SGSN behaviour during QoS negotiation is appropriate and that a clarification on Rel-5 would be acceptable. The numbers need to be added for the Notes.

**Conclusion** : Revised to 379

**N1-020379** : 24.008v520 CR#564r1, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: Handling for QoS profile parameter 'transfer delay'

**Discussion** :

**Conclusion** : Agreed

**N1-020339** : 24.008v3a0 CR#566, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: Handling of R97 QoS parameter in R99 and following releases

**Discussion** : A R99 MS has to set the R97/98 QoS parameter in the IE Quality of service in addition to the R99 parameters in the same IE. This is for two reasons: The TS23.107 states: "Air interface Session Management and GTP messages of R99 shall contain the R99 attributes as an extension of the R97/98 QoS Information Element thus unnecessary mapping can be avoided." A MS that does not set the parameters is not conformed to this general rule. The R99 QoS parameter of the IE Quality of service do follow the R97/98 parameters within the IE to ensure backward compatibility (a R97/98 network can in this way ignore the R99 parameters). When the MS does just include padding instead the R97/98 parameter values then this will cause errors during the check of the IE unless

- the R99 is instructed to ignore this parameters and
- the R99 MS does distinguish between R99 and R97/98 networks and sets the QoS parameters accordingly

Both conditions are not standardised yet and so it is proposed to stick to the current understanding that both sets of parameters are provided by the MS.

N1-020279 and N1-020339 are related. No mapping rules should be mandated in the Mobile stations. This was the discussion in SA2 earlier and if needed their new guidance must be asked for. Support for this CR proposal as it follows the earlier assumption and that as accurate information as possible is inserted in both R97 and the R99 part of the QoS IE. Consistent MSs will not be the outcome anyway if new rules are defined since we don't have the mapping rules in the MS, unless 23.107 applies here also.

**Conclusion : Rejected**

**N1-020340** : 24.008v450 CR#567, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: Handling of R97 QoS parameter in R99 and following releases

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Rejected**

**N1-020341** : 24.008v520 CR#568, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: Handling of R97 QoS parameter in R99 and following releases

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Rejected**

**N1-020376**: 24.008v450 CR#570, Motorola, Type: CR, Title: Conditions for including R97 QoS attributes in the QoS IE

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Revised to 446**

**N1-020446**: 24.008v450 CR#570r1, Motorola, Type: CR, Title: Conditions for including R97 QoS attributes in the QoS IE

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Agreed**

**N1-020377** : 24.008v520 CR#571, Motorola, Type: CR, Title: Conditions for including R97 QoS attributes in the QoS IE

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Revised to 447**

**N1-020447** : 24.008v520 CR#571r1, Motorola, Type: CR, Title: Conditions for including R97 QoS attributes in the QoS IE

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Agreed**

**N1-020403** : 24.008v3a0 CR#572, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: Support of UMTS AMR 2 in R99

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Not treated due to time**

**N1-020202** : 24.008v450 CR#535, Siemens, Type: CR , Title: Correction of codec negotiation procedure

*Discussion :*

*Conclusion : Not available*

**N1-020203** : 24.008v520 CR#536, Siemens, Type: CR , Title: Correction of codec negotiation procedure

*Discussion :*

*Conclusion : Not available*

**N1-020266** : 24.011v400 CR#023, NTT Comware, Type: CR , Title: Fixing references to 04.08 and to other GSM TS/TRs

*Discussion :* Correction of references to new TS numbers. There is a typo on page 4 in reference to 44.006.

*Conclusion : Agreed*

**N1-020276** : 44.064v420 CR#005, Motorola, Type: CR , Title: Correction of references

*Discussion :*

*Conclusion : Agreed*

**N1-020277** : 44.064v500 CR#006, Motorola, Type: CR , Title: Correction of references

*Discussion :*

*Conclusion : Agreed*

**N1-020278** : 44.065v410 CR#002, Motorola, Type: CR , Title: Correction of references

*Discussion :* With this change it is only some T1 problem before the 44.008 is ready to be removed for Rel-4.

*Conclusion : Agreed*

## 8 Release 5

### 8.1 IMS draft specifications and other documents for information

**N1-020189** : 24.229v110, Lucent T., Type: TS , Title: Current draft 24.229: "IP Multimedia Call Control Protocol based on SIP and SDP"

*Discussion :*

*Conclusion : Noted*

**N1-020190**: Lucent T., Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Summary of current IETF documents on SIP

*Discussion :* SIP is defined in one completed RFC, and is currently being revised. A number of extensions are also in process of definition. The documentation structure is getting very complex. This contribution represents those IETF RFCs and drafts that have been allocated to the SIP working group half of the original SIP working group.

Several drafts are marked yellow as needed for Rel-5, and a strategy is needed for how to solve late RFCs. Obviously the bis draft can not be delayed without delaying Rel-5. For others the debate needs to start and solutions sought. The IESG last call should not give any surprises. The REFER draft has not made it to the IESG last call yet. It is foreseen

that some IETF drafts which CN1 depends on will not become RFCs by March 2002. If and when this happens 3GPP has got two alternatives, either remove the references or to annex the latest available IETF draft to 3GPP specification.

*Conclusion : Noted*

**N1-020191** : Lucent T., Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Summary of current IETF documents on SIPING

*Discussion* : Nothing major is happening concerning 3GPP in Rel-5 timeframe.

*Conclusion : Noted*

**N1-010192** : Lucent T., Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Summary of current IETF documents on MMUSIC

*Discussion* : Support for IPv6 is now going into the IESG last call.

*Conclusion : Noted*

**N1-020193** : Lucent T., Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Summary of current IETF documents on SIMPLE

*Discussion* : No change to earlier status.

*Conclusion : Noted*

**N1-020280** : 24.228v190, Motorola, Type: TS , Title: 24.228v190 "Signalling flows for the IP multimedia call controlbased on SIP and SDP"

*Discussion* : No issues are needed to be raised.

*Conclusion : Noted*

**N1-020343** : 23.218v110, Dynamicsoft, Type: TS , Title: 3GPP TS 23.218 V1.1.0IP Multimedia (IM) Session Handling;IP Multimedia (IM) call model

*Discussion* :

*Conclusion : Noted*

## 8.2 Rel-5 corrections

**N1-020241** : 24.008v520 CR#550, Siemens, Type: CR , Title: Applicability of CM3 IE Modulation Capability information

*Discussion* : The binary coding of eg E2 was erroneously introduced and only reference to TS 45.005 clause 4.1.1 is needed.

*Conclusion : Revised to 380*

**N1-020380** : 24.008v520 CR#550r1, Siemens, Type: CR , Title: Applicability of CM3 IE Modulation Capability information

*Discussion* :

*Conclusion : Agreed*

## 8.3 CN1-2-3-4 IMS joint session on 24.228 and 23.218

**N1-020234** : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR , Title: CR to 23.218: Filter Triggering in S-CSCF

*Discussion* :

**Conclusion : Withdrawn**

**N1-020228** : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 23.218: HSS Handling MO

**Discussion** : HSS is basically a database, which stores the user's service profile and provides a data retrieve mechanism for the S-CSCF and application servers to download user data.

Related docs are 228, 229 and 285,- all discussed under the tdoc 228. The text of an AS should not turn up in S-SCCF since HSS will use Push mechanism to transfer the needed data automatically when the data is changed,- making the docs 228 and 229 not needed. Another view was that the text in these 2 docs regarding unregistered users was needed. Others thought it being a separate contribution. Can S-CSCF refresh authentication data at any time ? Only during registration and not during the session. How to solve the editors notes in 285 ? Just delete them was one proposal since CN4 will handle these interfaces and CN1 can then refer to them. Another issue in 285 is that the paragraphs 7.4 and 7.5 could be merged to 'Procedures during IP multimedia Sessions'. Was not seen needed. But the Note in 7.1 needs to be removed.

**Conclusion : Rejected**

**N1-020229** : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 23.218: HSS Handling MT

**Discussion** : Related docs are 228,229 and 285,- all discussed under the tdoc 228.

**Conclusion : Rejected**

**N1-020285** : 23.218, Ericsson, Type: CR , Title: CR to 23.218: Functional Requirements of HSS

**Discussion** : 228 and 229 are related. The purpose of this contribution is to add references in chapter 7 of TS 23.218 to TS 29.228. The reason is that part of this information is duplicated/inconsistent with TS 29.228.

Related docs are 228,229 and 285,- all discussed under the tdoc 228. If the contribution is agreed then the joint session should agree on how to cover the action points which are defined in the editor's notes. The editor's notes will be deleted.

**Conclusion : Revised to 390**

**N1-020390** : 23.218, Ericsson, Type: CR , Title: CR to 23.218: Functional Requirements of HSS

**Discussion** : Related docs are 228,229 and 285,- all discussed under the tdoc 228. The 390 will be reviewed by CN1 only. A sentence need to be restored.

**Conclusion : Revised to 448**

**N1-020448** : 23.218, Ericsson, Type: CR , Title: CR to 23.218: Functional Requirements of HSS

**Discussion** : Related docs are 228,229 and 285,- all discussed under the tdoc 228. The 390 will be reviewed by CN1 only.

**Conclusion : Agreed**

**N1-020305** : 23.218, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: CR to 23.218: Usage of Filter Criteria

**Discussion** : This paper proposes a more detailed definition and description of Filter Criteria in 24.228. Especially the following issues are resolved: - initial Filter Criteria are those which are downloaded (at registration time) by the S-CSCF from the HSS, the word "initial" in them has nothing in common with an "initial request" or that they can be evaluated only once (initially) for a specific request. - Filter Criteria are organized in a way that each of them is related to a specific application server, i.e. one filter criteria can only point to one specific application (server). - Service Trigger Points are those parts of a SIP message that can be triggered by a Filter Criteria.

N1-020305 and N1-020317 are related. The Filter Criteria are re-evaluated every time a message is received by the S-CSCF, i.e. they are re-evaluated when a message is sent back from an application (server).

'The Filter Criteria are re-evaluated' was controversial and shall be removed. A delegation expressed that the current SPI was preferred. Only 2 priorities are shown? The figure can go into an annex for example, but still shows the principle now that the filter criterias are used one by one, and not looped. What is not allowed shall then be added as text to the figure. The approach outlined was agreed, but technical details and wordings were addressed for the revised version.



**Conclusion : Revised to 391**

**N1-020391** : 23.218, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: CR to 23.218: Usage of Filter Criteria

**Discussion** : CN4 worked yesterday on User Profile and referenced a part here deleted. Request for postponing this to Oulo to allow more investigation time. Some would accept this as is and do eventual changes in oulo. Rejection is needed now based on procedural matters from two companies.

**Conclusion : Rejected**

**N1-020317** : 23.218, H3g, Type: CR, Title: Applicability and Usage of Filter Criteria

**Discussion** : There has been extensive discussion about the application and use of filter criteria in CN1. This paper presents a view on how filter criteria should be applied and used in IMS. The flow is based on concepts described in RFC 3050 "Common Gateway Interface for SIP", and draft-ietf-iptel-cpl-04.doc. These two documents describe the CGI and CPL scripts for call control. It is proposed that the sequence of events for contact of AS should be as follows :

1. The HSS will send to the S-CSCF the filter criteria. There will be one set of filter criteria per AS. The AS will be prioritised for order of contact.
2. The S-CSCF will apply iFC for highest priority AS and if applicable send the request to that AS.
3. The AS may(or may not) modify the request, and return it to the S-CSCF.
4. The S-CSCF then applies the filter criteria applicable to the next highest priority AS and forwards (or not) to that AS
5. Repeat until all AS on list are exhausted
6. S-CSCF routes the request based on it's now possibly modified contents.

S-CSCF clearly needs to keep track of where in the list it has got to at each step. It is possible that this is recorded in S-CSCF or maybe a header field is modified so that the S-CSCF does not have to keep the state. Clearly this will also require the HSS to indicate filter criteria per AS, in a priority order on the Cx interface, and this needs to be reflected appropriately in 29.228, 29.229 and 23.008.

This step by step guide was well received. Unknown methods handling in S-CSCF needs to be included as well. S-CSCF needs a mechanism to protect for loops, which was explained as part of the step by step list. This CCR will in parts be introduced to 391.

**Conclusion : Merged to 391**

**N1-020327** : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 23.218: Using Diameter on Sh interface

**Discussion** : The Sh interface is the interface between the HSS and the application server. The protocol to be used on this interface needs to be defined. This interface shall be used to transport user service related information from HSS to the application server. These data transfer procedures also need to coordinate with the procedures of the application server which are defined in 23.218. This contribution proposes to use Diameter on the Sh interface. The CR also includes information to support this proposal.

Why is not Private Identity needed ? It is optional in the protocol and needed for identification and charging in the AS. One delegation expressed that Sh interface should not be specified for Rel-5 due to time constraint, but left for Rel-6. This would need all references to Sh to be taken out from many specifications. No decision is done yet in CN4. The reference to 29.229 from 23.218 can be done, leaving the decision to CN4 what is introduced into 29.229. No reference to Cx should be done from 23.218.

**Conclusion : Rejected**

**N1-020342** : 24.228 Siemens, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.228: Media authorisation for mobile terminating call

**Discussion** : Discrepancy to stage 2 TS 23.207, and to call flows in Chapter 7.4. For the mobile terminating call, the authorisation token is transported within the Invite message from P-CSCF to UE, rather than the PRACK message.

The spotted error is correct, and the change has been introduced in the interim meeting in Phoenix of CN1.

**Conclusion : Noted**

**N1-020346** : 23.218, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR , Title: Deletion of references to Sr interface and cleanup of MRF in 23.218

**Discussion** : At the previous meeting in Phoenix it was agreed to remove the Sr interface between the AS and the MRFC from Rel 5 and a LS was sent to SA2 informing them of this. In addition it was suggested during the meeting that 23.218 focus solely on MRFC and that definition of the MRFP and associated interfaces should be removed from the document. This contribution revises TS 23.218 to delete any references to Sr interface and to remove the MRFP and associated interfaces Gi and Mp from the scope of the specification, as these are the responsibility of other groups.

MRF in the document was thought better replaced by MFRC, except in the editors note. The CN1 proposal to delete Sr interface from Rel-5 is already agreed and LS N1-020178 from SA2 reflects this decision.

**Conclusion** : *Revised to 392*

**N1-020392** : 23.218, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR , Title: Deletion of references to Sr interface and cleanup of MRF in 23.218

**Discussion** :

**Conclusion** : *Agreed*

**N1-020367** : 23.218, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR , Title: S-CSCF Handling of Subscription and Notification

**Discussion** :

**Conclusion** : *Not treated due to time*

**N1-020369** : 23.218, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR , Title: Addition of Public User Identity to S-CSCF address resolution function to Sh interface in 23.218

**Discussion** :

**Conclusion** : *Not treated due to time*

**N1-020386** : Nokia, Type: DISCUSSION , Title: S-CSCF change

**Discussion** : In case the subscription of the user is changed, e.g. the user subscribes to new services, it may be possible that new capabilities, which are required from the S-CSCF, are not supported by the current S-CSCF assigned to the user. This paper describes how this issue should be handled in the Cx interface.

Has been presented to CN4 as owner of 29.229. HSS does not understand the capabilities of S-CSCF, which is found by I-CSCF, and therefore do not know when to instruct the S-CSCF to do network initiated de-registration. This was questioned in light of the architecture. The text on this in 23.228 was discussed. The proposal in the paper at hand was thought workable and useful for at least Rel-5 since the HSS does a try towards the S-CSCF which sends the new error code if the capability could not be met. And so on. HSS now becomes a state machine and contradicts the pure database node, was expressed by one delegation but found as an option only by others. Is it acceptable to clear all existing IMS connections due to S-CSCF change? The issue could be a SA2 decision first, - shall HSS do a decision or does it have to be the S-CSCF. No CN4 meeting after the SA2 meeting before the March plenary. The service change itself is a CN1 area. Alternative method would be alarm from S-CSCF to O & M.

The originators are requested to raise contribution to SA2. The main concern was that due to AS interaction the S-CSCF may not be aware of all service capabilities that can be provided.

**Conclusion** : *Noted*

## 8.4 IMS Registration

**N1-020195** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Proxy handling of 420 status code in REGISTER response

**Discussion** : TS 24.229 indicates that a REGISTER request generated by a UE should contain a Require header and a Proxy-Require header with an option-tag of "path". The purpose of this is to provide a warning if the IM CN subsystem

should be left due to Routing errors of the REGISTER request. In summary, the entity that made the routing decision should be required to read the Unsupported header in a response with a status-code of 420.

What shall the UE do with this 420 Bad Extension response? Some deleted words make it agreeable without presentation.

**Conclusion : Revised to 396**

**N1-020396** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Proxy handling of 420 status code in REGISTER response

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Agreed**

**N1-020236** : 24.228, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.228: Cx Registration

**Discussion :** CN4 has agreed the CR for combining S-CSCF registration/deregistration notification procedure and user profile download procedure together for a successful registration, therefore, corresponding changes shall be made to 24.228.

A script should be provided to correct alignment of the references to message content table, or a complete CR.

**Conclusion : Revised to 397**

**N1-020397** : 24.228, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.228: Cx Registration

**Discussion :** The only change from the previous version is alignment of the references to message contents tables due to changed message numbering.

**Conclusion : Agreed**

**N1-020257** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: Registration Notification to AS

**Discussion :** Based on the CN1 meeting #SIPad hoc0201 in Phoenix, there is a working assumption of using the REGISTER method (third party registration) to send notification of UE registration from the S-CSCF to an AS. The contents of the REGISTER were not agreed upon at the drafting session. Specific text needs to be brought into 3GPP TS 24.229 in support of this working assumption (or alternatives that may meet the needs better).

Related to 326 and treated together. To have 0 in the expiration timer response makes S-CSCF like a 'Registrar' and creates risk for everlasting state in an error case. The S-CSCF could be able to create a list of ASs to be contacted based on the Filter Criteria, but this could be left for implementation. The contact header should be included since we are reusing the registration procedure, and it should be set to S-CSCF. One delegation wanted no contact header in order to avoid a state in the AS, and handle it as query. It was expressed that the expires header should be slightly higher than the expiration timer as returned to the UE, but 326 wants it to be the same. If equal, what about impact of refreshing registration by the UE just before the expiration time elapses? Refreshing is not agreed upon and can be left for implementation? The same expiry time as sent towards the UE in 200 OK was agreed. This documentation was agreed to be included/merged into the existing registration and de-registration clauses. How to deal with IMSI/Private ID to AS(s)?

**Conclusion : Revised to 398**

**N1-020398** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: Registration Notification to AS

**Discussion :** For the future always use revision marks for changes.

**Conclusion : Agreed**

**N1-020268** : 23.218, H3g, Type: CR, Title: CR to 23.218 : AS Notification Of Registration Status

**Discussion :** N1-020233 and N1-020268 are not on the same clause but they are about the same issue. Noted with the comment that some of the contents will be merged to N1-020393.

**Conclusion : Partly merged to 393**

**N1-020269** : 24.008v520 CR#555, H3g, Type: CR, Title: PDP Context Signalling Flag

*Discussion :*

*Conclusion : Withdrawn*

**N1-020270** : 24.228, H3g, Type: CR, Title: CR to 23.218 : Clarification to Registration whilst roaming

*Discussion :* Clarification is proposed. It was agreed to take the proposed changes to the main body of 24.228.

*Conclusion : Agreed*

**N1-020273** : Motorola, Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Upgrading GPRS Session Management for Supporting IMS Services

*Discussion :* For efficiently supporting the IP Multimedia services, as defined in 3GPP Release-5 specifications, the GPRS Session Management (SM) procedures and elements of procedures should satisfy a number of additional requirements. This document discusses these requirements and proposes a set of changes for satisfying those requirements. Part of those requirements is also included in the liaison statement in S2-020328.

The IM CN Subsystem signalling flag was introduced later by H3g and thus not included in the CRs from Motorola. The P-CSCF discovery in proposed solution number 1 was agreed as working assumption. If TFT is used then the modification request (MS to network) and accept does not need to be expanded with PCO IE, even it was thought usefull by some to prepare with PCO IE in modification for future flexibility.

The following agreements on working assumptions were made :

- P-CSCF discovery can be done via PCO IE
- SIP Signalling PDP context will be indicated in PCO IE
- PCO IE will be added to secondary PDP context activation request and accept (to allow both indication of signalling PDP context and P-CSCF discovery)
- TFT IE will be used to transfer media authorisation, if necessary, based on the decision in CN3

CRs to implement these principles are in N1-020456 and N1-020442.

*Conclusion : Noted*

**N1-020274** : 24.008v520 CR#556, Motorola, Type: CR, Title: Upgrading PCO for supporting IMS services

*Discussion :* The Protocol Configuration Options IE needs to be enhanced to convey (i) requests for P-CSCF address(es) (from the UE to GGSN) and (ii) one or more P-CSCF addresses (from the GGSN to the UE). The stage-2 requirements are specified in 3GPP TS 23.228, clause 5.1.1.2.

Backward compatibility was thought possible for PDP context messages, but not for secondary and modification. It was stated by some that secondary could be used for conveying the IMS signalling flag, eg in case the PDP context are in use. And 23.228 was interpreted by some that an IMS context can not be used for something else,- meaning that a primary context with secondary for something else than IMS can not be used for IMS. The Motorola contribution was agreed to be the base for further revisions.

*Conclusion : Revised to 404*

**N1-020404** : 24.008v520 CR#556r1, Motorola, Type: CR, Title: Upgrading PCO for supporting IMS services

*Discussion :* The wording for additional list should show that this information is bidirectional. Terminology is IM CN Subsystem. Instead of listing the data to be in the new list a more generic use of it could be stated ? Not good for future proof expansion not to be specific here. Some editorials. For backwards compatibility, when passing a R99/Rel-4 SGSN it means that only PDP Context Request message can be used (not secondary).

*Conclusion : Revised to 441*

**N1-020441** : 24.008v520 CR#556r2, Motorola, Type: CR, Title: Upgrading PCO for supporting IMS services

*Discussion :* Should delete some reference clauses not used,- 95, 96 and 97.

*Conclusion : Revised to 456*

**N1-020456** : 24.008v520 CR#556r3, Motorola, Type: CR, Title: Upgrading PCO for supporting IMS services

*Discussion :*

*Conclusion : Agreed. Provided separate to the plenary.*

**N1-020275** : 24.008v520 CR#557, Motorola, Type: CR, Title: Upgrading TFT for supporting IMS services

*Discussion :* GPRS Session Management needs to provide support for the QoS Resources Authorization and Policy, as specified in 3GPP TS 23.207.

The conditions for TFT is a decision to be made by CN3 on media authorisation, so if negative this CR if agreed does not go to the plenary. Also if agreed in CN1, it must go in a separate plenary tdoc.

*Conclusion : Revised to 405*

**N1-020405** : 24.008v520 CR#557r1, Motorola, Type: CR, Title: Upgrading TFT for supporting IMS services

*Discussion :* What about the E bit if only Binding information is included ? Equal to 1. Binding information coding is according to RSVP,- but why since a flexibility is possible here ? The GGSN needs not understand this Binding information. The order of bits need to be understood. The value used to indicate 'No TFT information' is using a reserved value, but was said to work according to 24.007.

*Conclusion : Revised to 442*

**N1-020442** : 24.008v520 CR#557r2, Motorola, Type: CR, Title: Upgrading TFT for supporting IMS services

*Discussion :* Backward compatibility is still under discussion in CN3. Also authorization token received. This potential need of indication from GGSN to the UE was a concern by several delegates (see also S2-020310). Vodafone and Ericsson stated their reservations against this CR based on the lack of feedback mechanism with TFT. AWS supported their view, and also expressed the preference of the solution to be in one package.

*Conclusion : Agreed. Provided separate to the plenary.*

**N1-020286** : 24.229, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: XML body in SIP messages

*Discussion :* During the discussions in the CN#SIPad hoc0201 in Phoenix, CN1 got an agreement to define an XML body to transport a few parameters that are not carried within SIP messages. This document proposes a formal XML definition of the 3GPP body with a first shot of the elements that are needed within 3GPP networks. Other elements may be added at a later stage by further contributions (e.g., charging-id).

Related to 348. In 9.1 the last 7 words of second sentence was proposed deleted. It was a proposal to take the 'visited network identity' out and put it in Remote party ID header. It was agreed to keep it in the XML body. Together with cell ID it should be possible to indicate the Radio Access Technology. Is this body fixed to a version of the TS, or is backwards compatibility maintained. Partly by the 'version' in the body, but that requires all earlier versions to be supported. What about unknown content? Q1400 gives guidance on compatibility issues. Why is DTD used and not XML-schema? XML-schema was mentioned to be more complicated than what is needed for the body.

*Conclusion : Revised to 399*

**N1-020399** : 24.229, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: XML body in SIP messages

*Discussion :* All elements are optional at the moment, defined in the DTD section. Compatibility issue regarding the except header was mentioned.

*Conclusion : Agreed*

**N1-020290** : 24.229, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Renumber of chapter describing GPRS aspects when connected to IMS

*Discussion :* In the SIP Ad-Hoc in Phoenix, a section describing GPRS aspects when connected to IMS was introduced. This section was introduced as a subchapter to procedures at the UE for application usage of SIP. However, describing GPRS actions in the section intended for application usage of IMS is also found not correct. The CR is included in agenda item 8.4 due to its connection with N1-020291.

Change of GPRS aspects (5.1.1 onwards) to clause 8 instead of 5 was the end of discussion.

**Conclusion : Revised to 408**

**N1-020408** : 24.229, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Renumber of chapter describing GPRS aspects when connected to IMS

**Discussion :****Conclusion : Agreed**

**N1-020291** : 24.229, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Usage of PCO for obtaining P-CSCF IP address

**Discussion :** One option for obtaining the P-CSCF IP address is within the PDP context activation procedure. It is proposed to use the Protocol Configuration Options IE to provide the P-CSCF address(es) to the UE. The coding of the information element as such will be described in 24.008, but the actual usage of this IE is not within the scope of the said TS.

274, 331 and 365 (late) is related. How is secondary PDP context dealt with? Proposed to extend with the PCO IE as was(?) stated in 23.207. This CR should only handle UE aspects, and no 'shall' on GGSN which is defined elsewhere. Depending on the chapter moving in 290 the UE requirements could be there. No counterproposal to where the new GGSN requirements could be written was found. 24.229 scope does not have GPRS interaction written. The push of the P-CSCF address was discussed,- optional or deleted ?

**Conclusion : Revised to 402**

**N1-020402** : 24.229, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Usage of PCO for obtaining P-CSCF IP address

**Discussion :** The network seems to be able to force the UE to select the method is contradictory to the words on free selection.

**Conclusion : Rejected**

**N1-020313** : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: UE and CSCF SIP roles

**Discussion :** This contribution proposes that the 3GPP UE shall only act as a pure 3GPP SIP UE (as discussed during the Cancun meeting);and that the P-CSCF shall act as a SIP UA for Subscribe / Notify; and that the transparent B2BUA functionality of S- and P-CSCF are described in section 5.x of 24.229 – therefore they need not to be mentioned in the general section of the document.

Modifications to the text was proposed, regarding the P-CSCF role as User agent.

**Conclusion : Revised to 409**

**N1-020409** : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: UE and CSCF SIP roles

**Discussion :****Conclusion : Agreed**

**N1-020318** : 24.228, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Corrections to the section 6.9.1

**Discussion :** The section 6.9.1 in TS 24.228 shows the recovery after a failure of the S-CSCF that had been assigned to the subscriber in a previous registration. It shows the possibility to select a new S-CSCF if the previously assigned S-CSCF does not respond to REGISTER message after a timeout. This contribution proposes that this error case is handled in such a way that it is not allowed to select a new S-CSCF but the re-registration is rejected in this case.

Written towards wrong version of the specification. The solution seems to need more investigation, maybe improving it. The UE now seems to get some saying in selecting the S-CSCF which is not according to working assumptions.

**Conclusion : Rejected**

**N1-020323** : 24.229, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: P-CSCF to signal integrity protection of REGISTER to S-CSCF

**Discussion :****Conclusion : Not available**

**N1-020326** : 24.229, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: AS notification of registration status

**Discussion :** It is proposed to add a new sections to chapter 5.4.1 (Procedures at the S-CSCF: Registration and authentication) and 5.7 (Procedures at the Application Server) to describe how to notify Application Servers about the user's registration state.

Related to 257 where the comments are. Merged into 398.

**Conclusion : Noted**

**N1-020331** : Lucent T., Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Discussion Paper on the use of new IPCP options for delivery of P-CSCF address to UE

**Discussion :** It is a requirement that the GGSN be able to deliver the IP address of the P-CSCF to the UE using GPRS control plane. Lucent Technologies believe that it is possible to do this by including in the 24.008 and 29.060 PCO IE transported in the Activate PDP context Request and Create PDP context Request messages a new IPCP option for SIP server IP address configuration. This IPCP option would be targeted as informational IETF RFC using the fastest possible track available. We have drafted two Internet drafts to this effect (one for IPv4 and one for IPv6) and we will submit them shortly to the IETF. In fact, these drafts will be required also to fulfil 3GPP2 requirements and in general for Internet hosts that gain network access using PPP and need to be configured with a P-CSCF IP address.

Since the drafts has not been submitted to IETF yet it was seen difficult in Rel-5 timeframe. As informational draft it is however a different track than normal drafts. Is it only for UE using PPP, and also that the solution needs another protocol for this to be applicable? No.

**Conclusion : Noted**

**N1-020333** : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: P-CSCF registration procedures

**Discussion :** This contribution proposes the following changes to the P-CSCF registration section in 24.229: - editorial line-up, - adds information about parameters for MOC / MTC determination.

Fully routable SIP URL or similar wording would clarify. It was expressed that there is no need to standardize the way to determine MOC/MTC since there is many ways according to standard SIP how to do it. Hints are OK but no mandating is needed.

**Conclusion : Rejected**

**N1-020334** : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: S-CSCF registration procedures

**Discussion :** This contribution changes the registration section for the S-CSCF in 24.229 in the following way: - exceptional procedures added if no path header was included, - exceptional procedures added if authentication / registration fails, - description of authentication behaviour (401 response, HSS interactions), - reflection of current working assumptions regarding multiple public user identities, - addition of MOC indicator to path entry. A lot of information in the S-CSCF Registration section was duplicated, e.g. S-CSCF checks existence of path option tag AND path header – it is sufficient if the path header itself has been received, and the saving of the Path information for later route construction was mentioned twice. The insertion of the S-CSCF entry to the Path header was mentioned twice.

Comments to be made off-line.

**Conclusion : Revised to 410**

**N1-020410** : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: S-CSCF registration procedures

**Discussion :** The steps at REGISTER opened again the discussion if authorization and integrity was OK.

**Conclusion : Rejected**

**N1-020344**: 24.228, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: Use of the Remote-Party-ID for informing the S-CSCF that the Register Request was Integrity Protected

**Discussion :** At the previous meeting in Phoenix it was agreed that a mechanism is needed for the P-CSCF to inform the S-CSCF that the Register Request received by the P-CSCF was integrity protected. This contribution proposes to make use of the Remote-Party-ID header for this purpose and proposes modifications to the registration flows in 24.228 to implement this change.

323 is related. In last meeting a late contribution from Vodafone seems now more mature since the needed proposal from SA3 is on the way in IETF. IK belongs to the Private ID and not to the Public ID as used in this 344. In initial registration the ID relation is not possible. The UE sending the Remote-Party-ID was discussed,- not needed?

**Conclusion : Revised to 411**

**N1-020411**: 24.228, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: Use of the Remote-Party-ID for informing the S-CSCF that the Register Request was Integrity Protected

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Withdrawn**

**N1-020347** : 24.229, mmO2, Type: CR, Title: APN name for IMS

**Discussion :** As stated in TS 23.228, “before the UE can request IM services, a PDP context must be activated to carry IM Subsystem related signalling”. This PDP context must contain an APN in order to select the appropriate GGSN, to allow connection to the IM CN Subsystem. It is proposed to define a Reserved Service Label APN of “IMS” for use with the PDP context carrying the SIP signalling for IMS.

Necessary changes to other specifications as 23.003 (CN4) and GSM Association was discussed. Could other APN than IMS be used, requiring change of shall to should for the UE ? Is this for CN1 to decide ? What about cooperate access? Aligning the words to 23.228 was agreed. No change to 24.228 was needed. The CR to 23.003 for CN4 needs to be done to have a consistent APN name.

**Conclusion : Revised to 406 and LS OUT in 407 by Sunil**

**N1-020406** : 24.229, mmO2, Type: CR, Title: APN name for IMS

**Discussion :** What does separate PDP context mean ? It would be the primary context. The default GPRS APN for IMS should not be defined in CN1 was agreed. The APN name IMS should be registered and a LS returned when done so a reference can be made.

**Conclusion : Rejected**

**N1-020348** : mmO2, Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Coding of Cell Identity Information in SIP

**Discussion :** At the Phoenix meeting, the document N1-020070 indicated the IETF advice on SIP extensions and the recommended solution for transporting additional information used in 3GPP networks within SIP messages. The preferred way is to define in a message body that will be carried within the relevant SIP messages.

Related to 286. Component A should be possible in active state as well. The structure of the cell-ID depends on the RAT, but a more generic method could be discussed. A clear split of the 3 proposed components may be needed.

**Conclusion : Noted**

**N1-020365** : 24.008v520 CR#569, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: IMS Enhancements (Application parameters transfer)

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Withdrawn**

**N1-020383** : 24.228, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: IPv6 address

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Not available**

## 8.5 IMS Deregistration

**N1-020314** : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Network initiated De-registration Procedures at the S-CSCF



**Discussion :** When a network-initiated deregistration event occurs for a public user identity the S-CSCF shall perform the procedures as described in section 5.4.2.1.2 for registration-state event notification.

Some rewordings needed for clarity.

**Conclusion : Revised to 415**

**N1-020415** : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Network initiated De-registration Procedures at the S-CSCF

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Agreed**

**N1-020315** : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: De-Registration Procedures at the P-CSCF

**Discussion :** This contribution proposes to resolve the conflict caused by N1-011984 and N1-011988 in the de-registration section in 24.229.

Several comments done during presentation and off line. Written towards wrong spec version.

**Conclusion : Revised to 416**

**N1-020416** : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: De-Registration Procedures at the P-CSCF

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Agreed**

## 8.6 IMS Configuration hiding

**N1-020311** : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Procedures at the I-CSCF

**Discussion :** Not presented.

**Conclusion : Revised to 378**

**N1-020378** : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Procedures at the I-CSCF

**Discussion :** Many changes proposed to the I-CSCF procedures.

No Route header shall exist in Registration was commented. The Cx interface side of I-CSCF behavior is up to CN4 to specify. What if I-CSCF has not received sufficient information from HSS to properly select a S-CSCF ? This 'no capability' issue will be discussed off line or be included as an editors note.

**Conclusion : Revised to 417**

**N1-020417** : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Procedures at the I-CSCF

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Agreed**

## 8.7 IMS Authentication

**N1-020297** : 24.228, Vodafone, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.228 - Correction to 401 UNAUTHORISED response message tables

**Discussion :** At the last CN1 SIP ad hoc meeting in Phoenix, Tdoc N1-020094 was agreed, resulting in the working assumption that the CK and IK would be transported from the S-CSCF to the P-CSCF as part of the EAP header in the 401 UNAUTHORISED response. The P-CSCF must remove the CK and the IK from the 401 UNAUTHORISED before sending it to the UE with just the RAND and AUTN remaining in the EAP header.

Normative text should not exist in 24.228 (ie remove the 'shall's'),- only in 24.229. Some IETF work ongoing can influence, and also work in SA3 for transfer of IK and CK.

**Conclusion : Rejected**

**N1-020298** : 24.228, Vodafone, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.228 - Removal of Public User Identity from Cx Authentication Request

**Discussion** : The Cx: Authentication procedure does not need to include the Public User Identity.

If it was more than one subscriber profile don't we need it ? No all public identities are already in HSS, which also do the authorization. CN4 change is needed before agreeing this.

**Conclusion : Withdrawn**

**N1-020299** : 24.229, Vodafone, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229 - Authentication procedures

**Discussion** : At the last CN1 SIP ad hoc meeting in Phoenix, Tdoc N1-020094 was agreed, resulting in the working assumption that the CK and IK would be transported from the S-CSCF to the P-CSCF as part of the EAP header in the 401 UNAUTHORISED response. The P-CSCF must remove the CK and the IK from the 401 UNAUTHORISED before sending it to the UE with just the RAND and AUTN remaining in the EAP header. In order to bring 24.229 into line with this new working assumption changes should be made to annex B.

Some clarification to wordings in 5.4.1.2 needs improvement.

**Conclusion : Revised to 418**

**N1-020418** : 24.229, Vodafone, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229 - Authentication procedures

**Discussion** : Unauthorized will be the correct wording,- by the rapporteur.

**Conclusion : Agreed**

**N1-020312** : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Network initiated Re-Authentication - S-CSCF

**Discussion** : This contribution proposes changes and additions to the text for network initiated re-authentication currently available in 24.229. The currently available text was mostly deleted, as the information therein talked about registration and authentication done during registration – this functionality is already described in other S-CSCF sections. The newly proposed text only talks about how the S-CSCF can request reauthentication from the user.

Editorials and wrong reference version.

**Conclusion : Revised to 419**

**N1-020419** : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Network initiated Re-Authentication - S-CSCF

**Discussion** : Numbering collision correction and spellchecking needs to be done by the rapporteur.

**Conclusion : Agreed**

## 8.8 IMS Call initiation

**N1-020197** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Procedures at the UE and P-CSCF for media authorization

**Discussion** : The media authorization draft provides for the inclusion of a Media-Authorization header. At the last meeting, text was inserted concerning the use of the media authorization header. This text assumes that the PCF will always generate a media authorization token. It is our understanding that it is possible that the PCF may decide not to coordinate the bearer streams with the allocated.

Serviced based local policy is the terminology to use. In Rel-6 the protocol between PCO and P-CSCF will be defined.

**Conclusion : Revised to 421**

**N1-020421** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Procedures at the UE and P-CSCF for media authorization

*Discussion :*

*Conclusion : Agreed*

**N1-020237** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Codex and media negotiations

*Discussion :* The new is that the originating UE shall only include SDP in PRACK only when modification is done towards the SDP in 183.

The majority wanted to keep the old requirements. Is it allowed to have more than one codec per media line?

*Conclusion : Rejected*

**N1-020238** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Bandwidth negotiations

*Discussion :* This contribution discusses the bandwidth negotiation procedure and proposes that any entity in the IMS (i.e., the UE, MGCF, P-CSCF, and S-CSCF) that modifies the SDP that has an impact on the bandwidth, must adjust the b= lines in the SDP accordingly.

One RTCP response to every multicast address. Is b-line optional in media ? No it is defined for both session and media level. The total bandwidth used in the network (only ?) shall be included or not ? Proposal to send an LS to SA4 on this. Some terminology needs to be corrected.

*Conclusion : Revised to 422*

**N1-020422** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Bandwidth negotiations

*Discussion :*

*Conclusion : Agreed*

**N1-020239** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: SDP procedures at P-CSCF and S-CSCF

*Discussion :* The last sentence in second paragraph (or the whole) seems to make a procedure that can not pass S-CSCF. Clarification requests and explanations exchanged.

*Conclusion : Revised to 423*

**N1-020423** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: SDP procedures at P-CSCF and S-CSCF

*Discussion :* Change 'local policy' to 'subscription'.

*Conclusion : Revised to 449*

**N1-020449** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: SDP procedures at P-CSCF and S-CSCF

*Discussion :*

*Conclusion : Agreed*

**N1-020240** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: SDP procedures at MGCF

*Discussion :* Should it be a reference to the previous section and state that the MGCF acts as UEA, and later if different requirements make it necessary introduce more text ? A pure duplication was agreed.

*Conclusion : Revised to 424*

**N1-020424** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: SDP procedures at MGCF

*Discussion :* The rapporteur change close to clause.

*Conclusion : Agreed*

**N1-020287** : 24.228, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Terminating flows based on Contact, non hiding

*Discussion :* The terminating flows in 24.228 do not make use of the Contact address registered by the user at registration time. As a result, if two or more users register the same public user identity, and those users make use of the same P-CSCF, the P-CSCF will not be able to determine to which user the signalling must be forwarded. This CR

proposes a solution to the problem. It also corrects several minor editorial errors in the non-hiding Mobile Terminating flows in 24.228.

This contribution aligns to SIP by introducing the Contact header for routing. The examples raised a lot of questions and was agreed to be neglected. But it raised the question if the same public ID can be issued to different private IDs,- sending a LS to SA2 ? Some had problems with the CR also if the example was removed.

- The proposed scenario of the same IMPU being allocated for multiple IMPIs was agreed to be outside of the scope of Rel-5.
- It was commented that despite this the proposed change would still be needed to make the routing at S-CSCF compliant with SIP.

**Conclusion : Revised to 432**

**N1-020432** : 24.228, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Terminating flows based on Contact, non hiding

**Discussion** : Lucent claimed another solution was possible without having such a proposal on the table,- this solution was contradicted by Siemens and Ericsson.

**Conclusion : Rejected**

**N1-020288** : 24.228, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Terminating flows based on Contact, hiding

**Discussion** :

**Conclusion : Revised to 433**

**N1-020433** : 24.228, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Terminating flows based on Contact, hiding

**Discussion** :

**Conclusion : Rejected**

**N1-020289** : 24.229, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: DTMF tones in IMS

**Discussion** : N1-020264, N1-020267 and N1-020289 are related.

**Conclusion : Noted**

**N1-020292** : 24.229, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Usage of user plane and control plane

**Discussion** : The issues of general IP address management are discussed in 23.221. The ability of the User plane and the Control Plane for a single session being able to pass through different GGSNs is not defined in this release.

It is needed to say what the UE must do. The discussion in SA2 is still ongoing and more stability was requested by some. Must UE always use secondary PDP context request with same APN, in order to end up in the same GGSN, if the proposal here is not accepted ? The discussion was proposed to continue in SA2 for 23.228 ? It was agreed that there is a stage 2 requirement in Rel-5 to carry all IMS traffic, both signalling and user data via the same GGSN. This resulted in questioning the fact of SGSN not selecting the same GGSN.

Rejected due to the perception that one APN can not go to different GGSNs. The originator explained that this automatically means that the PDP context carrying IMS signalling must be related with the PDP context(s) carrying the data. This relationship may be either primary / secondary PDP context or several secondary PDP contexts. Additionally there was concern that taking this approach, if confirmed, might be too restrictive for the future releases. This analysis was challenged and therefore no agreement on the principle could be reached.

**Conclusion : Rejected**

**N1-020293** : 24.229, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Compression in the UE

**Discussion** : In 24.229 it is currently stated that compression is optional in the P-CSCF and mandatory in the UE. To cover particular cases, for example UEs with limited processing capabilities (e.g. intended mainly for chat) or decomposed UEs, it is proposed to let the requirements in the UE be less restrictive and open for UEs that do not apply compression. As the P-CSCF at present does not have to apply compression, compression as such is already now not mandated in 3GPP.

293, 281 and 349 are related.

**Conclusion : Noted**

**N1-020296** : 24.228, Vodafone, Type: CR, Title: Addition of the Charging Correlation Vector to SIP messages

**Discussion** : In an LS from SA2, CN1 has been asked to add the Charging Correlation Vector to SIP messages. This document proposes a detailed mechanism of how to achieve this.

265 is related. How many flows it can be to a PDP context is still under discussion. Besides questions it was no objections to the principals and providing further CRs on this issue. Related to 399 and might be partly incorporated into 399 with this as an example.

**Conclusion : Noted**

**N1-020301** : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Determination of Served User and MOC / MTC

**Discussion** : This contribution tries to close the open items for determination of Served User and the MOC / MTC.

100 Trying, and other needed corrections were pointed out. 5.2.6.3.1 1) text is not needed due to weakness, and it is worked on in SA3 now through Ericsson contributions. Editors note were proposed here, while awaiting a solution to securing public identities.

**Conclusion : Rejected**

**N1-020302** : 24.228, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.228: Determination of Served User and MOC / MTC

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Not available**

**N1-020303** : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.228: User Identification Notation in 24.228

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Not available**

**N1-020306** : Siemens, Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Network applied privacy

**Discussion** : During the last meetings it was proposed to change 24.228 in a way that the To and From headers do not appear “encrypted” anymore. This contribution summarizes the current discussion and proposes to recommend (but not to mandate) the usage of “anonymous” in To and From headers.

322 is related. How does the To header work when the network wants to hide? It needs to be hided as well. Could AS provide the service for the ‘few’ cases expected?

**Conclusion : Noted**

**N1-020307** : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Setting of To and From headers

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Not available**

**N1-020308** : 24.228, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.228: Setting of To and From headers

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Not available**

**N1-020319** : 24.228, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Adding the bandwidth parameter to SDP

**Discussion** : 238 is related. Arguments against were among others : -with an RTP stream there is also a RTCP stream that needs to be shared. The counting needs to be closer to reality and that it needs to be shown also for negotiation situations.

**Conclusion : Revised to 425 and LS OUT in 426 by Gabor**

**N1-020425** : 24.228, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Adding the bandwidth parameter to SDP

**Discussion** : Related to a LS to SA4 in 426. Agreed in principal to the changes, but the complete set to needed flows should be provided for the next meeting. Agreed that the script in the CR is not run, and only accept the specified section.

**Conclusion** : *Agreed*

**N1-020320** : 24.228, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Correction to Registration with Authentication call flows

**Discussion** : Couple of inconsistencies has been found in section 6.2 of 24.228v1.8.0, therefore it is proposed to make some changes.

Written towards wrong 24.228 version. Flow 20 and 21 could be in one flow. 397 to be implemented before 429.

**Conclusion** : *Revised to 429*

**N1-020429** : 24.228, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Correction to Registration with Authentication call flows

**Discussion** : 397 to be implemented before 429.

**Conclusion** : *Agreed*

**N1-020321** : 24.228, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Correction to TS 24.228 section 7.4.9.3

**Discussion** : This contribution proposes an enhancement to the section 7.4.9.3 in 24.228 v1.8.0 to address the call case where a unregistered subscriber receives a terminating call. The enhancement relate to the scenario where the subscriber has services related to the unregistered state and there has already been a terminating call(s) related to this state.

The terminating S-CSCF has to run the terminating service belonging to the same profile. 23.228 and SA2 could need to be included in this discussion first.

**Conclusion** : *Rejected*

**N1-020322** : 24.228, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: The content of the To: header field

**Discussion** : This contribution proposes to use the destination's IMPU in the To: header field in 24.228 call flows. The principal for this change has been accepted in N1-011158 (Helsinki meeting) and this contribution provides the actual script in order to implement the change.

306 and 322 are related. Only used for destination and not for routing. Leave it as it is since the To header can be filled with whatever the UE wants. The case for changing from encryption form to something like anonymous was not possible since 306 could not be agreed.

**Conclusion** : *Rejected*

**N1-020324** : 24.228, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Correction to call transfer procedures

**Discussion** :

**Conclusion** : *Not available*

**N1-020454** : 24.228, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Loose routing

**Discussion** :

**Conclusion** : *Not treated due to time*

## 8.9 IMS Call clearing

**N1-020309** : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Network initiated call release

**Discussion** : This contribution provides additional information for 24.229 for the description of network initiated call release. The text is based on the agreement during the 3GPP SIPING ad hoc reached during IETF#52, i.e. the P-CSCF and the S-CSCF are allowed to act as so-called transparent Back to Back User Agents. As the term transparent Back to

Back User Agent is not described in any specification the following text describes the detailed behaviour necessary at a P-/S-CSCF in order to release a call.

Comments should be given to the originator before Oulo meeting, where a renewed contribution is expected.

*Conclusion : Noted*

**N1-020310** : 24.228, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.228: Network initiated call release

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Not available**

## 8.10 IMS Abnormal cases and error handling

**N1-020345** : 24.229, Dynamicsoft, Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Impact of P-CSCF removing Record-Route and Route headers

**Discussion :** At the previous meeting in Phoenix a potential problem was identified with the current IMS P-CSCF behaviour in stripping the Route and Record-Route headers. N1-020064 adequately explained the problem and identified a partial solution to the problem that potentially could prevent future SIP methods and procedures from being properly Record-Routed via an Application Server and therefore could potentially delay the introduction of new services.

*Conclusion : Noted*

## 8.11 (IMS Emergency call)

*Void*

## 8.12 Other IMS issues

Due to time constraint it became a high number of not treated documents in this chapter, and these will have priority in the CN1#22bis meeting if provided (with new Tdocnumber and towards correct draft version).

**N1-020194** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Inclusion of the Events draft in profile tables

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Not treated due to time**

**N1-020196** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Minor technical and editorial corrections to TS24.229

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Not treated due to time**

**N1-020198** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Moving material from Annex B of 24.229 to main body of specification

**Discussion :** Mooving annex to main body.

*Conclusion : Agreed*

**N1-020220** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Server header

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Not treated due to time**

**N1-020221** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Content-Disposition header

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Not available**

**N1-020222** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Editorial and minor technical changes - annex A (profile tables)

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Not treated due to time**

**N1-020223** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Error-Info header

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Not treated due to time**

**N1-020251** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Introductory text giving the status of Annex A

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Not treated due to time**

**N1-020252** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Retry-After header

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Not treated due to time**

**N1-020253** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Valid responses to CANCEL in profile tables

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Not available**

**N1-020258** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: MRFC Tones/Announcements

**Discussion :** Please look at this and give comments to the originator Eric.

**Conclusion : Not treated due to time**

**N1-020259** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: MRFC Ad Hoc Conferencing

**Discussion :** Please look at this and give comments to the originator Eric.

**Conclusion : Not treated due to time**

**N1-020260** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: MRFC Transcoding

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Not treated due to time**

**N1-020261** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: OPTIONS and MRFC

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Not treated due to time**

**N1-020262** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: Call Transfer (REFER) and MGCF

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Not treated due to time**



**N1-020263** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: Hold/Resume with MGCF

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Not treated due to time**

**N1-020264** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: DTMF and MGCF

**Discussion :** To meet the requirement of a SIP signalling method to pass DTMF, there are a couple of methods to consider for carrying the DTMF signalling: INFO and NOTIFY. The INFO method requires less signalling and processing than SUBSCRIBE/NOTIFY. As such, it is the method recommended in this proposal.

N1-020264, N1-020267 and N1-020289 are related.

**Conclusion : Noted**

**N1-020265** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 24.229: Charging Correlation ID

**Discussion :** SA2 has decided that there this is need for an charging identifier that needs to be shared with the IMS network entities, where this identifier will be used to correlate charging records that are generated from each IMS network entity. The charging correlation ID needs to be passed in the SIP signalling that takes place when starting a dialog. This contribution proposes a mechanism to pass the charging correlation ID in SIP messages. It does not discuss how the IMS network entities use the charging ID when generating charging records. Note that there is a liaison from SA5 S5B020043 requesting that the ICID is provided to access network. This LS is calling the charging correlation ID the IMS Charging ID (ICID). Consideration should be given to using the ICID nomenclature. However, passing the ICID over the Go interface should be covered by CN3.

The sequence of what to agree first was discussed, - with respect to chapter 7.6.1. Should SA2 respond to SA5 first ? Any comments on this tdoc should be given to the originator,- Eric.

**Conclusion : Rejected**

**N1-020267** : H3g, Type: DISCUSSION, Title: DTMF Discussion Document

**Discussion :** It is clear from previous papers that transfer of DTMF digits must be supported by IMS. It is also clear that DTMF needs to be treated differently to the voice media stream by the access network (i.e. due to unequal error protection in the radio network). It has also been noted in previous papers that carrying DTMF tones from an IMS terminal out to some other system is required, but there is no identified requirement to carry DTMF digits to an IMS terminal. This document discusses six options for support of DTMF in IMS, and proposes to select one of these options.

IETF is terminal oriented while 3GPP also needs to be some network node centric. A signalling solution seemed to be the preferred direction, and if INFO is rejected in IETF it could be SUSCRIBE/NOTIFY and still be IETF compatibel. But RTP events (different header types without payload ?) was also a well received candidate. RTP over UDP is best effort and not sufficient for signalling ? This was not seen as the case since then rather many packets (repeated) need to be lost.

Kevan is the moderator in the discussion outside and after this meeting.

**Conclusion : Noted**

**N1-020271** : 24.228, H3g, Type: CR, Title: PDP Context Signalling Flows

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Not available**

**N1-020281** : 24.229, Motorola., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: SIP Compression

**Discussion :** Over the past year, much work has been done by the IETF ROHC group on SIP compression. One of the main motivations for this work is to address the need for more compact SIP messages over cellular networks, such as 3SGPP's. The current direction of the ROHC group is to use SigComp. SigComp is a shim (layer) that sits under SIP.

The document makes two main proposals:

- The UE should be able to influence which algorithm is going to be used (performance requirements!)
- Loading algorithms across the radio should be avoided

293, 281 and 349 are related. Downloading the algorithm to the UE was questioned. A problem with default algorithm is which one to use. The pool of algorithms (some or all with IPR rights) in the network will have identifiers connected that have to be specified. The negotiating mechanism needs to be standardized. The spending by downloading the algorithm could well be more than the saving on the request message to be sent by the UE. Distinction is necessary between negotiation on frameworks and on algorithm. It was expressed that more time is needed to work on this compression issue,- also in light of UDVM designed for SIP (the negotiation mechanism is behind in time though).

Questions: Does the UE have to support the capability to compress ? YES. Does the UE have to request for compression for IMS connections ? Does the P-CSCF have to support the capability to compress ? YES.  
Does the P-CSCF have to request for compression for IMS connections ? Is UDVM the framework for compression ? YES. Can UDVM be agreed to be the default ? Are there other possibilities for compression framework ? YES. Does the compression framework apply to a session, to a registration or to something else ? Can compression framework be changed while registered/connected/..?

*Conclusion : Noted*

**N1-020304** : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: PICS and Requirements List

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Not available***

**N1-020328** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Accept header

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Not available***

**N1-020329** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Accept-Encoding header

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Not available***

**N1-020330** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Accept-Language header

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Not available***

**N1-020332** : 24.229, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Removal of INFO from 3GPP parts of specification

***Discussion :***

***Conclusion : Not available***

**N1-020349** : Siemens, Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Discussion paper on signalling compression

***Discussion :*** In 24.229 it is stated that a UE shall indicate the request to apply SIP compression and possible parameter values that are necessary to perform compression. If the P-CSCF is able to apply the indicated compression, it shall apply the compression and indicate which parameter values to use. This document gives an overview of the status on the work within IETF and discusses what needs to be negotiated between UE and P-CSCF.

293, 281 and 349 are related. Probably the UE is not prepared to turn off compression as mandatory. Currently support of compression or requesting compression for all IMS connections is mandatory for UE. Should it be like this in the future? Uncompressed air interface is not desired as that might give SDU sizes that may result in TCP to be required from the UE. IETF currently specifies a so called Universal Decompressor Virtual Machine (UDVM).

*Conclusion : Noted*

## 8.13 IMS Editorials and other minor issues

**N1-020294** : 24.228, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Removal of emergency session from 24.228

**Discussion** : It has been decided that an R5 UE shall use the CS domain for emergency calls. According to CR S2-013555, the P-CSCF shall detect and reject attempts to establish an emergency session, but an example in 24.228 is proposed not included. Due to this, the chapter describing emergency sessions in 24.228 is considered unnecessary at this point in time, and is proposed removed.

It was agreed that the deleted section of the TS will need to be put back (by means of a CR) when a Rel-6 version of 24.228 becomes available.

**Conclusion** : *Agreed*

**N1-020295** : 24.229, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Handling of emergency sessions in IMS

**Discussion** : It has been decided that an R5 UE shall use the CS domain for emergency calls. Due to this, an MS operation mode C terminal cannot connect to emergency services.

The error code to use and other aspects was discussed. SA2 has agreed that P-CSCF shall reject IMS emergency call in Rel-5 and shall reject emergency call destined for emergency centers. This was unclear to many.

**Conclusion** : *Revised to 436*

**N1-020436** : 24.229, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Handling of emergency sessions in IMS

**Discussion** :

**Conclusion** : *Agreed*

**N1-020300** : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Editorial updates

**Discussion** : The editors note was doubtfully agreed to be removed. Wrong reference version used.

**Conclusion** : *Revised to 437*

**N1-020437** : 24.229, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.229: Editorial updates

**Discussion** :

**Conclusion** : *Agreed*

**N1-020366** : 23.218, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR, Title: Cleanup and editorial corrections to TS 23.218

**Discussion** :

**Conclusion** : *Not treated due to time*

**N1-020427** : 24.228, Motorola, Type: CR, Title: CR to 24.228: Treatment of Annex contents before change control (freezing)

**Discussion** : 6.91 is to be kept in the annex, while the rest is agreed to be moved.

**Conclusion** : *Agreed*

## 8.14 TEI5

**N1-020204** : Siemens, Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Setting of Parameter Values in the Backup BC IE

**Discussion** : The BC IE exchanged between MSC/IWF and MS/UE during the set-up of a mobile terminated call is used to identify the requested service. The setting of parameter values in the BC IE is well-defined and has to be complete according to the rules specified in TS 24.008, TS 27.001, and TS 29.007. With this mechanism it is not possible to provide only partial information to the MS/UE. Therefore, it is proposed to introduce a so-called Backup BC IE that re-uses the layout of the BC IE and is able to carry the same information as in the BC IE, but does not need to be

complete in the sense of the BC IE. Nevertheless, also for the Backup BC rules have to be defined for the setting of parameter values. Note that the intention of this proposal is to give the MS/UE and maybe also the called subscriber an indication about the requested service, but not to specify a second service negotiation based on incomplete BC IEs. This paper discusses first the different categories of the parameter values and proposes afterwards a setting of parameter values.

Something like this is needed to make single numbering scheme MT calls work with other information transfer capabilities than speech.

**Conclusion : Noted**

**N1-020205** : 24.008v520 CR#537, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: Mobile terminated call with single numbering scheme

**Discussion :** In 10.5.4.4a octet 1 and 2 the 'backup' is missing. Why is backup BC IE not needed when BC 2 IE is provided ? Then the UE can deduce something. Some editorials. Compatibility checking for BackupBC IE would not be sensible. Delete Note after 10.5.87a as it is not relevant.

**Conclusion : Revised to 438**

**N1-020438** : 24.008v520 CR#537r1, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: Mobile terminated call with single numbering scheme

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Agreed**

**N1-020206** : 27.001v500 CR#068r2, Siemens, Type: INFO, Title: Mobile terminated call with single numbering scheme

**Discussion :** Has been agreed in CN3.

**Conclusion : Noted**

**N1-020207** : 29.007v500 CR#041r2, Siemens, Type: INFO, Title: Mobile terminated call with single numbering scheme

**Discussion :** Has been agreed in CN3.

**Conclusion : Noted**

**N1-020242** : 23.009v500 CR#067, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Support for Access Rights handling in the (3G\_)MSC-B

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Not available**

**N1-020316** : 24.008v520 CR#520r1, NTT DoCoMo, Fujitsu, NTT Software, Type: CR, Title: P-TMSI allocation in Attach procedure

**Discussion :** The condition where P-TMSI reallocation is needed is not clear for Attach and Routing Area Updating procedure. It might cause an implementation that does not reallocate a P-TMSI although it is required.

Is it mandatory for the network to use P-TMSI ? Yes according to 03.60 or 23.060. The UMTS case is probably needed. But it was expressed no need for changing P-TMSI for changing SGSN, if the SGSN finds the old P-TMSI as acceptable. Thus saving Attach complete message. Other delegations found changing P-TMSI at inter-SGSSN as acceptable.

**Conclusion : Revised to 381**

**N1-020381** : 24.008v520 CR#520r2, NTT DoCoMo, Fujitsu, NTT Software, Type: CR, Title: P-TMSI allocation in Attach procedure

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion : Agreed**

**N1-020338** : 24.008v520 CR#565, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: SM STATUS(#81) during PDP Context Modification or Deactivation procedure

**Discussion** : The SM STATUS with cause #81 is the reaction on a modify PDP context request or deactivate PDP context request when these are identified by a transaction identifier that is currently not related to a PDP context as defined in 24.008 Section 8.3.2. "Whenever any session management message except ACTIVATE PDP CONTEXT REQUEST, ACTIVATE SECONDARY PDP CONTEXT REQUEST, or SM-STATUS is received by the network specifying a transaction identifier which is not recognized as relating to an active context or to a context that is in the process of activation or deactivation, the network shall send a SM-STATUS message with cause #81 "invalid transaction identifier value" using the received transaction identifier value including the extension octet and remain in the PDP-INACTIVE state." The reaction on the SM STATUS is implementation dependent as defined in 24.008 section 6.1.3.6. This may lead to the case that a SM instance does ignore the SM STATUS and continues the handling specified for PDP context modification or deactivation. This leads to the repetition of the request messages (and SM STATUS) and in case of PDP context modification to the case that the PDP context is not released as it should be done since the peer entity does not hold the corresponding instance.

Check what happens when a linked PDP context is inactivat with the same TI ? Should the text for the network and MS be the same?

**Conclusion** : Revised to 382

**N1-020382** : 24.008v520 CR#565r1, Siemens, Type: CR, Title: SM STATUS(#81) during PDP Context Modification or Deactivation procedure

**Discussion** : Cause# 81 is only defined for modification and deactivation, but since this new section is moved the complete picture seems too vague. A revision back to the proper procedure section was requested.

**Conclusion** : Rejected

**N1-020356** : 24.007v410 CR#045, Fujitsu, Type: CR, Title: Clarification of V(SD) handling when message transmission fails

**Discussion** : It is specified that V(SD) shall be incremented when each message is sent. If the message is not successfully transmitted to the network because of any problem in the radio interface, V(SD) shall not be incremented because the lastly received N(SD) value in the MSC has not yet been updated. This CR clarifies the reaction when the error indication of message transmission is reported from the lower layer of Layer 3.

**Conclusion** : Rejected

**N1-020357** : Fujitsu, Type: DISCUSSION, Title: Reaction after T3230 Expiration

**Discussion** : It was agreed that the network shall discard any message whose N(SD) is not incremented by one from the lastly received value. This paper discusses the strategy taken by an MS in case T3230 (Awaiting CM Service Request procedure to complete) is expired.

It is recently clarified that the next in sequence is expected. What is the problem with alternative 1 where the N(SD) value is repeated ? No relation between MM level N(SD) and the timer expiry towards the RR level was argued. But MM level should expect the transmission and retransmissions or error indication properly handled by lower layers. Changing this in Rel-5 is not needed. At radio failure the connection is released and a new connection made.

**Conclusion** : Noted

## 8.15 IMS: 23.218

**N1-020224** : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 23.218: S-CSCF handling Registration

**Discussion** : 224 and 325 affect the same issue. 368 is also related and will be treated together with this even 368 is late. IMSI should be transferred from S-CSCF to the AS was supported from 2 delegations. However it was argued that User Identity be referenced for this. IMSI was intended for supporting legacy services. IMSI may be part of User ID, but not necessarily. However the 24.229 should keep the details, not the 23.218. IMSI is needed for eg CAMEL, but not to all AS'ers and not always. The S-CSCF does not know what kind of AS it is contacting. The requirement on expiry timer can be deleted. Discussion on UE refreshing after half the time, but stated as an IETF 'should' which is only a recommendation. Registration of 3<sup>rd</sup> party was discussed, and it was urged that AS also subscribe to the registration event package. 368 will be revised and incorporate parts from 224 and 325.

**Conclusion : Merged to 385**

**N1-020225** : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 23.218: S-CSCF handling unknown methods

**Discussion** : When the S-CSCF receives a request with an unknown method, the behaviour of the S-CSCF shall be left to the operator. Standards shall not restrict it and close the door for implementation. But since a request with unknown method might match the filter criteria, therefore some text is needed in 23.218.

Seems the text proposed is not in line with standard SIP behavior of passing unknown methods.

**Conclusion : Rejected**

**N1-020226** : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 23.218: S-CSCF Downloading upon Request

**Discussion** : It is possible that upon receiving a request, based on the filter criteria the S-CSCF might need to instantly access the HSS for user data. This contribution proposes to add some text on this behaviour.

Is not already the user data available? The case was for unregistered users. Based on filter criteria was questioned, and also the HSS push service was mentioned.

**Conclusion : Rejected**

**N1-020227** : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 23.218: HSS Handling Registration

**Discussion :****Conclusion : Not treated due to time**

**N1-020230** : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 23.218: AS Handling MO

**Discussion** : In Phoenix meeting, the functional mode of AS is agreed, this CR proposes some text for AS handling MO based on this agreed mode.

Was seen unnecessary for Rel-5 by a delegation. While others found the details done in this CR propiate for the specification in question. Different paragraphs was seen as mandating the implementation and should more be described like 'examples', seeing the AS from the ISC and inside the AS accordingly. A proposal was to introduce a paragraph indicating the functionality and not implementation to be described. Another view was that there is no interest to see how the AS does the handling, and that only the last paragraph is kept. The picture becomes a duplication, and could be referenced only.

**Conclusion : Revised to 387**

**N1-020387** : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 23.218: AS Handling MO

**Discussion** : Disagreement on the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph about maintaining dialogues which the AS acting as B2BUA, beeing redundant text.

**Conclusion : Agreed**

**N1-020231** : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 23.218: AS Handling MT

**Discussion** : It was desired to merge the 2 chapters, and another approach was to keep the heaading as is.

**Conclusion : Agreed**

**N1-020232** : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 23.218: AS Handling Session Release

**Discussion** : Some rewording proposed for the starting text on the 3 different release methods by the AS. Applying the service logic simultaneously with sending the 200 OK after BYE or stating that BYE is terminated in AS to avoid possible duplication also in S-CSCF ? This case was preferred deleted instead,- from 2 delegates.

**Conclusion : Revised to 388**

**N1-020388** : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 23.218: AS Handling Session Release

**Discussion** : Can proxy mode be applied for AS ? The procedure is as described but the word proxy can be deleted for now.

**Conclusion : Revised to 450**

**N1-020450** : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 23.218: AS Handling Session Release

**Discussion :****Conclusion : Agreed**

**N1-020233** : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 23.218: AS Handling Registration

**Discussion :** In Phoenix meeting, a lot of contributions were trying to find the solution that how the application gets notified when the user is registered. The outcome of the discussion was that the S-CSCF will generate a 3<sup>rd</sup> Party REGISTER message to the application server when the user is registered. This contribution proposes to include this solution in the section for application server handling registration.

N1-020233 and N1-020268 are not on the same clause but they are about the same issue.

**Conclusion : Revised to 393**

**N1-020393** : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 23.218: AS Handling Registration

**Discussion :** Spellchecker is needed at implementation.

**Conclusion : Agreed**

**N1-020235** : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR to 23.218: Delete 6.7

**Discussion :** Even if the S-CSCF needs to receive SUBSCRIBE or generate NOTIFY, it is just a method that the S-CSCF has to use to fill the task required in other sections of section 6.

If the section is empty when going to formal approval the missing clauses are agreed to be deleted anyway. Some support for this CR but not enough.

**Conclusion : Rejected**

**N1-020254** : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 23.218: MRFC Tones/Announcements

**Discussion :** The MRFC communicates with the Application Server (AS) via the S-CSCF to provide tones/announcements, conference bridging and transcoding. There are currently no call flows in 23.218 describing these interactions. This contribution proposes to introduce a call flow for the AS (acting as B2BUA) interactions with the MRFC to provide tones and announcements. There are also some high-level procedural descriptions for the MRFC.

No relation between 25 and 26 flows. It was argued that this is not needed as an example flow since we are 'in the AS'. The interleaving transactions are not defined in SIP, but was seen as used in this CR. The flows were seen needed for the part which is needed to be defined in 24.229. The intention was to have the CR flows as examples in either way, eg also as an informative annex B.

**Conclusion : Revised to 389**

**N1-020389** : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 23.218: MRFC Tones/Announcements

**Discussion :** 'in this release' needs to say 'in this specification'. The message body of the INVITE shall be changed.

**Conclusion : Revised to 451**

**N1-020451** : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 23.218: MRFC Tones/Announcements

**Discussion :****Conclusion : Agreed**

**N1-020255** : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 23.218: MRFC Ad Hoc Conferencing

**Discussion :** The MRFC communicates with the Application Server (AS) via the S-CSCF to provide tones/announcements, conference bridging and transcoding. There are currently no call flows in 23.218 describing these interactions. This contribution proposes to introduce a call flow for the AS (acting as B2BUA) interactions with the MRFC for providing ad hoc conferences. There are also some high-level procedural descriptions for the MRFC.

3<sup>rd</sup> party call flows are incorporated in a way not in line with the IETF draft.

**Conclusion : Revised to 394**

**N1-020394** : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 23.218: MRFC Ad Hoc Conferencing

**Discussion** : Same changes as for the other similar CR.

**Conclusion : Revised to 452**

**N1-020452** : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 23.218: MRFC Ad Hoc Conferencing

**Discussion** :

**Conclusion : Agreed**

**N1-020256** : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 23.218: MRFC Transcoding

**Discussion** : The MRFC communicates with the Application Server (AS) via the S-CSCF to provide tones/announcements, conference bridging and transcoding. There are currently no call flows in 23.218 describing these interactions. This contribution proposes to introduce a call flow for the AS (acting as B2BUA) interactions with the MRFC for providing transcoding. There are also some high-level procedural descriptions for the MRFC.

Same comments as for 255. This CR may not be needed due to a new interworking and transcoder TR now under development by CN3. No interworking is expected within 3GPP network. What about codec mode changes due to handover, since not all AMR modes may be supported by GERAN ? A joint session with CN3 was proposed but not agreed.

**Conclusion : Revised to 395**

**N1-020395** : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 23.218: MRFC Transcoding

**Discussion** : Same changes as for the other similar CR. MRFC supporting two-way and three-way handshake is to be changed with defined terms.

**Conclusion : Revised to 453**

**N1-020453** : 23.218, Lucent T., Type: CR, Title: CR for 23.218: MRFC Transcoding

**Discussion** :

**Conclusion : Agreed**

**N1-020272** : 23.218, NEC, Type: CR, Title: Clarifications and correction to 23.218

**Discussion** : According to the section 4.2.3 in TS 23.228, there are two scenarios to provide services, i.e. via the service platform in the Home Network or via an external service platform (e.g. third party or visited network). In TS 23.218, Figure 6.8.1.3-1 shows Application triggering architecture. However, in this figure iFC and sFC are not SIP message or Cx interface, but information downloaded to the S-CSCF. Other correction is inclusion of SCIM (Service Capability Interaction Manager) in this Figure. SCIM may control the download of sFC instead of Service Platform Trigger Points. Service Platform Trigger Points are not function, but information related to request for services.

This changes filtering based on the version until tdoc principles in 305 was agreed. Besides there was several issues that was unclear towards the architecture level as eg SP GW.

- SP and SP GW impact the architecture
- Comment that the service triggering architecture which is proposed for deletion is actually correct
- negotiation and modification of filter criteria is against the current working assumption
- It was also considered that the proposed SP may be outside the scope of the 3GPP specification and thus not against the Rel-5 architecture

Because of these comments the originator was requested to raise the issue in SA2, if necessary. A new WI could be proposed in SA2 for Rel-6, but CN1 found this work within Rel-5 as difficult. OSA is the existing architecture gateway to external platforms.



**Conclusion : Rejected**

**N1-020325** : 23.218, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: AS notification of registration status

**Discussion** : 224 and 325 affect the same issue in 6.3. 368 is also related and will be treated together with this even 368 is late. 368 will be revised and incorporate parts from 224 and 325. N1-020257, N1-020268, N1-020325 and N1-020326 are related.

**Conclusion : Merged to 385**

**N1-020368** : 23.218, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR , Title: S-CSCF handling Registration

**Discussion** : 224 and 325 affect the same issue. 368 is also related and will be treated together with this even 368. Should S-CSCF send notify to AS? No was expressed.

**Conclusion : Revised to 385**

**N1-020385** : 23.218, Dynamicsoft, Type: CR , Title: S-CSCF handling Registration

**Discussion** : 224 and 325 affect the same issue. 368 is also related and will be treated together with this even 368.

**Conclusion : Agreed**

**N1-020384** : 23.218, Nokia, Type: CR, Title: Filtering criteria

**Discussion :****Conclusion : Not available**

## 8.16 Other Rel-5 issues

**N1-020243** : TR 23.972v300 CR#001, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Service change and fallback for UDI/RDI multimedia multimedia calls

**Discussion** : Not presented.

**Conclusion : Revised to 430**

**N1-020430** : TR 23.972v300 CR#001r1, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Service change and fallback for UDI/RDI multimedia multimedia calls

**Discussion** : Addition of a description for service change and fallback for UDI/RDI multimedia calls.

Clear Mode codec was contributed to ITU-T in February, but when is it going to be approved there ? This work depends on Q765 codec to be completed. This dependency makes it conditional for eventual approval in the March plenary. Some editorials were pointed out. This feature is not going to be supported when FNUR 32 kBit/s is decided by CN3,- was informed. So it was asked what the actions should be in that case, when used by the mobile station ? The terminal may choose to request confirmation from the user when MODIFY is received, was discussed in light of privacy. A default could be defined. The document references R99 etc. and should be corrected. This TR only exists in R99 (listed in the spec database for Rel-4 ?) which seems to mean that we need to create not just Rel-5 but also Rel-4 version.

Also the WI was requested as input to the plenary indicating the work remaining etc.

**Conclusion : Revised to 439**

**N1-020439** : TR 23.972v300 CR#001r2, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Service change and fallback for UDI/RDI multimedia multimedia calls

**Discussion** : Agreed with condition that a LS sent to SA1 leads to confirmation that service requirements for the feature exist and that the proposed codec Q765.5 can be standardised by ITU-T in time for Rel-5. N1-020439 and 440 need to be presented to the plenary in separate document.

**Conclusion :** *Agreed conditionally, depending the LS sent to SA1 in 455 leads to confirmation that service requirements for the feature exist and that the proposed codec Q765.5 can be standardized by ITU-T in time for Rel-5. 439 and 440 goes separate to the plenary.*

**N1-020244** : 24.008v520 CR#551, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Service change and fallback for UDI/RDI multimedia multimedia calls

**Discussion :** Not presented.

**Conclusion :** *Revised to 420*

**N1-020420** : 24.008v520 CR#551r1, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Service change and fallback for UDI/RDI multimedia multimedia calls

**Discussion :** Allow service change and fallback for UDI/RDI 3G.324M multimedia calls. The support for multimedia calls is updated : - A service change and fallback procedure between UDI/RDI multimedia and speech is added ; - In order to support mobiles without service change/fallback capability, a new Repeat Indicator value is needed. Additionally, the sections 5.3.6.3.1, 5.3.6.3.2, 5.3.6.3.3, 5.3.6.3.3.1 and 5.3.6.3.3.2 were removed as they are redundant with the "changing the call mode" procedure in 5.3.4.3.

The Repeat indicator preceding the associated BC was requested stated somewhere? By deletion of some chapters, does it affect the old behavior ? It is redundant text since modify is described 2 places. What happens with unallocated values in the Repeat indicator (old problem due to a CR changing 11) ? Old MSC implementation would reject all values after 0011 ? It was pointed out that 5.3.6.1 had some misleading text.

**Conclusion :** *Revised to 440*

**N1-020440** : 24.008v520 CR#551r2, Ericsson, Type: CR, Title: Service change and fallback for UDI/RDI multimedia multimedia calls

**Discussion :** R98 had the proposed new code point for service change and fallback in Repeat indicator as reserved. Is it only the IE or the message that is discarded ? The message since Repeat indicator is Conditional (see section 8.7.2 first sentence in R98),- and therefore the call establishment fails when a R98 and older implementation ignores the message (SETUP) containing the faulty IE.

**Conclusion :** *Agreed conditionally, depending the LS sent to SA1 in 455 leads to confirmation that service requirements for the feature exist and that the proposed codec Q765.5 can be standardized by ITU-T in time for Rel-5. 439 and 440 goes separate to the plenary.*

**N1-020245**;, Ericsson, Type: INFO, Title: Adding of the clear mode codec to Q/765.5

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion :** *Noted*

**N1-020246** : 29.007v500 CR# , Ericsson, Type: INFO, Title: Service change and fallback for UDI/RDI multimedia multimedia calls

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion :** *Revised to 400*

**N1-020400** : 29.007v500 CR# , Ericsson, Type: INFO, Title: Service change and fallback for UDI/RDI multimedia multimedia calls

**Discussion :** Has been agreed in CN4.

**Conclusion :** *Noted*

**N1-020247** : 27.001v500 CR# , Ericsson, Type: INFO, Title: Service change and fallback for UDI/RDI multimedia multimedia calls

**Discussion :**

**Conclusion :** *Revised to 401*

**N1-020401** : 27.001v500 CR# , Ericsson, Type: INFO, Title: Service change and fallback for UDI/RDI multimedia multimedia calls

*Discussion* : Has been agreed in CN3.

*Conclusion* : *Noted*

## 9 LS OUT (output liaison statements)

**N1-020371** : Sunil, Type: LS OUT , **To:SA3 Cc:CN, RAN2** , Title: [DRAFT] Reply to Liaison Statement on Configuration of ciphering

*Discussion* : Linked to 005. Different issues needs too be included.

*Conclusion* : *Revised to 444*

**N1-020444** : Sunil, Type: LS OUT , **To:SA3 Cc:CN, RAN2 , T2** Title: Reply to Liaison Statement on Configuration of ciphering

*Discussion* : Linked to 005.

*Conclusion* : *Agreed*

**N1-020372** : Apostolis, Type: LS OUT , **To:GERAN5 Cc:GERAN** , Title: Reply Liaison Statement on “The ciphering of LLC PDUs in response to a page for a TBF”

*Discussion* : Linked to 168.

*Conclusion* : *Agreed*

**N1-020373** : Chen-Ho, Type: LS OUT , **To:RAN2, GERAN** Title: [DRAFT] Reply LS on Retransmission of Uplink NAS messages

*Discussion* : Linked to 172. What about retransmission for ‘Supplementary services’ now used for Location Services ? We do not have N(SD) mechanism on PS side to guard retransmissions on PS side. Inter RAT solutions can be left for implementation.

*Conclusion* : *Revised to 414*

**N1-020414** : Chen-Ho, Type: LS OUT , **To:RAN2, GERAN** Title: Reply LS on Retransmission of Uplink NAS messages

*Discussion* : Linked to 172.

*Conclusion* : *Agreed*

**N1-020374** : Kevan, Type: LS OUT , **To: SA2, Cc: CN4, CN3** Title: [DRAFT] Liaison statement on the transparent transfer via SGSN of application level information between UE and GGSN

*Discussion* : Linked to 180. Modify could be expanded with PCO IE for future proof without being mentioned in this LS. Modifications were needed from several comments.

*Conclusion* : *Revised to 428*

**N1-020428** : Kevan, Type: LS OUT , **To: SA2, Cc: CN4, CN3** Title: [DRAFT] Liaison statement on the transparent transfer via SGSN of application level information between UE and GGSN

*Discussion* : Linked to 180. Objected due to wrong terminology.

*Conclusion* : *Revised to 431*

**N1-020431** : Kevan, Type: LS OUT , **To: SA2, Cc: CN4, CN3** Title: Liaison statement on the transparent transfer via SGSN of application level information between UE and GGSN

*Discussion* : Linked to 180.

**Conclusion : Agreed**

**N1-020407** : Sunil, Type: LS OUT , **To:** CN4 **Cc:** TSG CN , GSMA SERG, Title: [DRAFT] Liaison Statement on Reserved Service Label for "IMS "APN

**Discussion :** Linked to 347. Not needed after the 406 discussion.

**Conclusion : Withdrawn**

**N1-020412** : Roland, Type: LS OUT , To: GERAN 5 Title: Liaison Statement on MS behaviour in case of a combined attach reject with cause values #7 or #14

**Discussion :** Linked to 282.

**Conclusion : Agreed**

**N1-020426** : Gabor, Type: LS OUT , **To:** SA4 **Cc:** CN3, Title: Bandwidth parameter in SDP payload on session level

**Discussion :** Linked to 425.

**Conclusion : Agreed**

**N1-020434** : Atle, Type: LS OUT , **To:** SA2, **Cc:** CN3, CN4, Title: [draft] Liaison statement on the question whether IMS shall use the same GGSN both for media and control signalling

**Discussion :** Linked to 292. Rejected to be dealt with by Keith/Lucent due to saving meeting time for contributions that were delivered in time had been dealt with first.

**Conclusion : Postponed**

**N1-020443** : Rouzbeh, Type: LS OUT , Title: Service change and fallback of UDI/RDI multimedia calls

**Discussion :** Linked to 439 and 440.

**Conclusion : Revised to 455**

**N1-020455** : Rouzbeh, Type: LS OUT , To:SA1, CN, Title: Liaison Statement on Service Change and Fallback for UDI/RDI Multimedia Calls

**Discussion :** Linked to 439 and 440.

**Conclusion : Agreed**

## 10 Late and misplaced documents

This agenda item is for the chairmans temporary placement during the meeting, while in this document those not handled are mostly marked 'Not treated due to time' as conclusion, but could also be concluded with 'Not available'.

## 11 Any Other Business (AOB)

None provided.

## 12 Closing of the meeting

14:00 Friday 01.02.2002

Review of dates and hosts for future meetings

## Meeting schedule for CN1 in 2002

3GPP Meeting	Date	Place	Host
N1-SIP-adhoc0102	14-18 January 2002	Phoenix, USA	ATTWS
N1#22	28 January-1 February 2002	Sophia Antipolis, France	ETSI
N1#22bis On Rel-5 open issues.	19-21 February 2002	Oulo, Finland	Elisa Communications, Finnet, Nokia, Sonera, Viestintävirasto
<b>TSGN#15</b>	<b>6-8 March 2002</b>	<b>Korea</b>	<b>TTA</b>
N1#23	8-12 April 2002	USA	?
N1#24	13-17 May 2002	Sophia Antipolis, France	ETSI
<b>TSGN#16</b>	<b>5-7 June 2002</b>	<b>Marco Island ?, FL, USA</b>	<b>Motorola</b>
N1#25	29.July-2.August 2002	Helsinki, Finland	Sonera
<b>TSGN#17</b>	<b>4-6 September 2002</b>	<b>France</b>	<b>Alcatel</b>
N1#26	23-27 September 2002	USA	?
N1#27	11-15 November 2002	Penang, Malaysia ?	?
<b>TSGN#18</b>	<b>4-6 December 2002</b>	<b>New Orleans ?, USA</b>	<b>NA 'Friends of 3GPP'</b>

---

## Annex A Joint meeting report CN1-2-3-4

Please see section 8.3.

---

## Annex B List of participants

Mr. Andrew Allen                      dynamicsoft Inc.    3GPPMEMBER (T1)    +1 972 473 5507    aallen@dynamicsoft.com

Mrs. Sophie Aveline                      France Telecom    3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)    +33 1 55 22 23 10 +33 1 55 22 26 24  
sophie.aveline@rd.francetelecom.com

Mr. Gabor Bajko                      NOKIA Corporation    3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)    +36209849259    +3612167684  
gabor.bajko@nokia.com

Mr. Mark Beckmann                      SIEMENS AG    3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)    +49 5341 906 1814    +49 5341 906 2011  
mark.beckmann@sal.siemens.de

Mr. Jürgen Caldenhoven                      Vodafone D2 GmbH    3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)    +49 211 533 2850 +49 211 533 3804  
juergen.caldenhoven@d2vodafone.de

Ms. Inmaculada Carrion Rodrigo                      NOKIA Corporation    3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)    +358503806481    +3587 180 29 005  
inmaculada.carrion-rodriago@nokia.com

Mr. Xin Chen                      Lucent Technologies N. S. UK    3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)    +441793883137  
+441793883234    xchen2@lucent.com

Mr. Chen Ho Chin                      ERICSSON L.M.    3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)    +46-46-23.1537    +46-46-19.4177  
chen.ho.chin@emp.ericsson.se

Mr. Wooyong Choi                      SK Telecom    3GPPMEMBER (TTA)    +82-11-293-4561    +82-31-710-5299  
wychoi@sktelecom.com

Mr. Sunil Chotai mmO2 plc 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) +44 1 473 605603+44 1 473 623794  
sunil.chotai@O2.com

Mr. Keith Drage Lucent Technologies N. S. UK 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) +44 1793 776249 +44 1793  
883244 drage@lucent.com

Mr. Rouzbeh Farhoumand Ericsson Inc. 3GPPMEMBER (T1) +1 972 583 8061 +1 972 583 7846  
rouzbeh.farhoumand@ericsson.com

Mrs. Sonia Garapaty Nortel Networks 3GPPMEMBER (T1) +1 972 6855110 +1 972 684 3775  
sonia.garapaty@nortelnetworks.com

Mr. Miguel Garcia-Martin ERICSSON L.M. 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) +358 40 514 0002+358 9299 3052  
miguel.a.garcia@ericsson.com

Mr. Stephen Hayes Ericsson Inc. 3GPPMEMBER (T1) +1 972 583 5773 +1 801 409 6319  
stephen.hayes@ericsson.com

Mr. Eric Henrikson Lucent Technologies 3GPPMEMBER (T1) +1 425 497 2442 +1 425 497 2445  
ehenrikson@lucent.com

Mr. Hannu Hietalahti NOKIA Corporation 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) +358 40 502 1724+358 7180 47222  
hannu.hietalahti@nokia.com

Mr. Kevan Hobbis Hutchison 3G UK Limited 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) +44 7790 771069 +44 1628 765001  
Kevan.Hobbis@hutchison.com

Mr. Andrew Howell MOTOROLA GmbH 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) +44 1256 790 170+44 1256 790 190  
andrew.howell@motorola.com

Ms. Jane D Humphrey MARCONI COMMUNICATIONS 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) +44 1202 853757 +44 1202  
853405 jane.humphrey@marconi.com

Mr. Daisuke Igarashi NTT DoCoMo Inc. 3GPPMEMBER (TTC) +81 468 40 3370 +81 468 40 3781  
igarashi@nw.yrp.nttdocomo.co.jp

Mr. Dieter Jacobsohn Deutsche Telekom MobilNet 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) +49 228 936 3361 +49 228 936  
3329 Dieter.Jacobsohn@t-mobil.de

Mr. Per Johan Jorgensen Mobile Competence Centre 3GPPORG\_REP (ETSI) +33 4 92 94 42 31+33 4 93 65 28 17  
jorgensen@etsi.fr

Mr. Zdravko Jukic ERICSSON L.M. 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) +49 173 299 5889+49 2407 575 477  
zdravko.jukic@eed.ericsson.se

Mr. Vikki Kapoor STMicroelectronics 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) +65-8709281 +65-3410016  
viskv@cw.c.nus.edu.sg

Ms. Eiko Kato ERICSSON L.M. 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) +46 46 231295 +46 46 231650  
eiko.kato@emp.ericsson.se

Mr. Yukio Kawanami NEC Corporation 3GPPMEMBER (TTC) +81471857158 +81471856890  
kawanami@cj.jp.nec.com

Mr. Krisztian Kiss NOKIA Corporation 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) +358504835363 +358718035264  
krisztian.kiss@nokia.com

Mr. Peng Li QUALCOMM EUROPE S.A.R.L. 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) +1-858-658-4967 +1 858  
658 2113 pli@qualcomm.com

Mr. Georg Mayer SIEMENS AG 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) +49 89 722 33114+49 89 722 622 50  
georg.mayer@icn.siemens.de

Mr. Duncan Mills VODAFONE LTD 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) +44 1635 676074 +44 1635 234445  
duncan.mills@vf.vodafone.co.uk

Mr. Atle Monrad ERICSSON L.M. 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) +47 372 93 665 +47 372 94 058  
atle.monrad@ericsson.com

Mr. Alex Moukalled Lucent Technologies 3GPPMEMBER (T1) +1 630 979 2946 +1 630 224 0069  
aim5@lucent.com

Mr. John O'Hare MOTOROLA S.A. 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) +353 21 429 0061 +353 21 435 7635  
oharej@cork.cig.mot.com

Mr. Milo Orsic Lucent Technologies 3GPPMEMBER (T1) +1 630 713 5161 +1 630 713 1921  
orsic@lucent.com

Mr. Miika Peltonen NOKIA Corporation 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) +358 40 727 6423 +358 10 505 7222  
miika.peltonen@nokia.com

Mr. Martti Perala NOKIA Corporation 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) +358 40 559 7034  
martti.perala@nokia.com

Mr. Andreas Quett ALCATEL SEL AG 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) +49-711-821-37603 +49-711-821-41177  
a.quett@alcatel.de

Dr. Apostolis Salkintzis MOTOROLA GmbH 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) salki@motorola.com

Mr. Frank Schramm SIEMENS AG 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) +49 30 386 29 371 +49 30 386 25305  
frank.schramm@icn.siemens.de

Mr. Hugh Shieh AT&T Wireless Services, Inc. 3GPPMEMBER (T1) +1 425 580 6898 +1 425 580 6811  
hugh.shieh@attws.com

Mr. Kunihiko Taya NEC Corporation 3GPPMEMBER (TTC) +81-3-3798-6560 +81-3-3798-4626  
taya@bk.jp.nec.com

Mr. Haluk Tekbulut NOKIA Corporation 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) +358 50 546 5932 +358 71 806 8080  
Haluk.Tekbulut@nokia.com

Mr. Arnaud Thierry NEC Technologies (UK) LTD 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) +33 4 92 83 52 79  
arnaud.thierry@mdc.nec.fr

Mr. Nobuyuki Uda NTT COMWARE Corporation 3GPPMEMBER (TTC) +813 5463 6331 +81 43 211 5161  
uda.nobuyuki@nttcom.co.jp

Mr. Moto Wakaki J-Phone Co., Ltd. 3GPPMEMBER (TTC) +81 3 4288 2291 +81 3 4288 2342  
wakaki@j-phone.com

Mr. Fumihiko Yokota Fujitsu Limited 3GPPMEMBER (TTC) +81 44 754 4198 +81 44 754 4148  
yokota.fumihiko@jp.fujitsu.com

Dr. Robert Zaus SIEMENS AG 3GPPMEMBER (ETSI) +49 89 722 26899 +49 89 722 62661  
robert.zaus@icn.siemens.de

## Annex C Agreed CRs

Spec	CR #	Rev	Rel	Tdoc Title	CA T	C_Ver sion	TDoc #	Status	WI
23.972	001	2	Rel-5	Service change and fallback for UDI/RDI multimedia multimedia calls	C	3.0.0	N1-020439	AGREED	SCUDIF
24.008	520	2	Rel-5	P-TMSI allocation in Attach procedure	F	5.2.0	N1-020381	AGREED	TEI5
24.008	537	1	Rel-	Mobile terminated call with	B	5.2.0	N1-020438	AGREED	TEI5

			5	single numbering scheme					
24.008	544		R99	Missing 3rd MNC definition	F	3.10.0	N1-020214	AGREED	TEI
24.008	545		Rel-4	Missing 3rd MNC definition	A	4.5.0	N1-020215	AGREED	TEI
24.008	546		Rel-5	Missing 3rd MNC definition	A	5.2.0	N1-020216	AGREED	TEI
24.008	550	1	Rel-5	Applicability of CM3 IE Modulation Capability information	F	5.2.0	N1-020380	AGREED	GPRS
24.008	551	2	Rel-5	Service change and fallback for UDI/RDI multimedia multimedia calls	C	5.2.0	N1-020440	AGREED	SCUDIF
24.008	556	3	Rel-5	Upgrading PCO for supporting IMS services	B	5.2.0	N1-020456	AGREED	IMS-CCR
24.008	557	2	Rel-5	Upgrading TFT for supporting IMS services	B	5.2.0	N1-020442	AGREED	IMS-CCR
24.008	558	2	R99	Conditions for including R97 QoS attributes in the QoS IE	F	3.10.0	N1-020445	AGREED	QoS
24.008	564	1	Rel-5	Handling for QoS profile parameter 'transfer delay'	F	5.2.0	N1-020379	AGREED	QoS
24.008	570	1	Rel-4	Conditions for including R97 QoS attributes in the QoS IE	A	4.5.0	N1-020446	AGREED	QoS
24.008	571	1	Rel-5	Conditions for including R97 QoS attributes in the QoS IE	A	5.2.0	N1-020447	AGREED	QoS
24.011	023		Rel-4	Fixing references to 04.08 and to other GSM TS/TRs	F	4.0.0	N1-020266	AGREED	TEI4
29.018	026		R99	Addition of missing Mobile Station States for UMTS	F	3.8.0	N1-020199	AGREED	GS M/UMTS interworki n
29.018	027		Rel-4	Addition of missing Mobile Station States for UMTS	A	4.2.0	N1-020200	AGREED	GS M/UMTS interworki n
29.018	028		Rel-5	Addition of missing Mobile Station States for UMTS	A	5.0.0	N1-020201	AGREED	GS M/UMTS interworki n
44.064	005		Rel-4	Correction of references	F	4.2.0	N1-020276	AGREED	TEI4
44.064	006		Rel-5	Correction of references	A	5.0.0	N1-020277	AGREED	TEI4
44.065	002		Rel-4	Correction of references	F	4.1.0	N1-020278	AGREED	TEI4

## CRs for e-mail agreement

None.

## Documents Endorsed by N1

None.



## Annex D Tdoc list (incl. the status)

A g e n d a	TDoc #	Tdoc Title	Source	Spec	WI	C_V e r s i o n	Rel	C A T	CR #	Re v	Type	Commen ts	Status
3	N1-020005	Configuration of ciphering	SA3								LS IN	S3-010675, To: N1 Cc: T2 Forwarded to CN1#22	LS OUT in 371
2	N1-020166	Sophia0201	Chairman								AGE NDA		AGRE ED
4	N1-020167	CN1 IMS open items list	Chairman								WO RK PLA N		NOTE D
3	N1-020168	LS on the ciphering of LLC PDUs in response to a page for a TBF.	GERAN WG5								LS IN	GP-012661, To: N1 Cc: GERAN	LS OUT in 372
3	N1-020169	Reply to the LS on GERAN architecture and impacts on the lu-cs interface	GERAN WG2								LS IN	GP-012704, To: RAN, RAN3 Cc: N1	NOTE D
3	N1-020170	Introduction of GERAN feature indicator	GERAN								LS IN	GP-012849, To: CN, N1	NOTE D
3	N1-020171	Liaison to SA, CN	Chairman 3GPP TSG-SA WG3-LI								LS IN	NP-010698, To: SA, CN, SA3	NOTE D
3	N1-020172	LS on Retransmission of Uplink NAS messages	RAN2								LS IN	R2-012777, To: N1, GERAN	LS OUT in 373
3	N1-020173	Response to LS (S2-013580) on Multiple RAB Activation Issue	RAN2								LS IN	R2-020153, To: SA2 Cc: RAN3, CN1	NOTE D
3	N1-020174	Reply to reply to LS "Update of lu-Flex status" TSGR3#24(01) 3067	SA2								LS IN	S2-013495, To: RAN3 Cc: RAN2, GERAN2, CN1,CN4	NOTE D
3	N1-020175	LS response on " Multiple RAB Activation Issue "	SA2								LS IN	S2-013580, To: CN1, RAN3, RAN2 Cc:	NOTE D

3	N1-020176	Requirements for alternative QoS	SA2								LS IN	S2-013582, To: SA4 Cc: CN1, SA1, RAN3	NOTE D
3	N1-020177	Reply LS on Interworking between 3GPP UE (IPv6 only) and SIP device external to IMS (IPv4 only)	SA2								LS IN	S2-020275, To: CN1, CN3 Cc:	NOTE D
3	N1-020178	Reply LS on Sr interface between Application Server and MRFC	SA2								LS IN	S2-020277, To: CN1 Cc: CN4	NOTE D
3	N1-020179	Liaison Statement on "Prefix allocation for IPv6 stateless address autoconfiguration"	SA2								LS IN	S2-020326, To: T1, T2, SA3, SA5, CN1, CN3 Cc: SA4, CN, T	NOTE D
3	N1-020180	Liaison statement on the transparent transfer via SGSN of application level information between UE and GGSN	SA2								LS IN	S2-020328, To: CN1, CN4 Cc:	LS OUT in 374
3	N1-020181	Reply to Liaison Statement on requirements for alternative QoS.	SA4								LS IN	S4-010683, To: SA2 Cc: CN1, SA1, RAN3	NOTE D
3	N1-020182	Response to liaison Statement on "Introduction Of UMTS_AMR_2 into R99 UE's"	SA4								LS IN	S4-010693, To: CN1,T2 Cc: TSG-T	NOTE D
3	N1-020183	Liaison Statement on AMR-WB and Charging	SA5								LS IN	S5-010752, To: CN4,SA1 Cc: SA2,CN1	NOTE D
3	N1-020184	Liaison Statement on Impacts of Subscriber and Equipment Trace	SA5								LS IN	S5-020013, To: All RANx, GERANx, CNx, Tx and SAx Working Groups Cc:	NOTE D
3	N1-020185	LS requesting that the IMS Charging ID (ICID) is provided to access network	SA5								LS IN	S5-020048, To: SA2,CN1 Cc: SA1	Forwarded to CN3
6	N1-	Sending of RANAP Location	Alcatel	23.009	TEI	3.9.0	R99	F	064		CR		Not



6	N1-020201	Addition of missing Mobile Station States for UMTS	Siemens	29.018	GS M/UMTS interworking	5.0.0	Rel-5	A	028		CR		AGREED
7	N1-020202	Correction of codec negotiation procedure	Siemens	24.008	TRFO-OOB	4.5.0	Rel-4	F	535		CR		Not available
7	N1-020203	Correction of codec negotiation procedure	Siemens	24.008	TRFO-OOB	5.2.0	Rel-5	A	536		CR		Not available
8.14	N1-020204	Setting of Parameter Values in the Backup BC IE	Siemens		TEI5						DISC		NOTED
8.14	N1-020205	Mobile terminated call with single numbering scheme	Siemens	24.008	TEI5	5.2.0	Rel-5	B	537		CR		REVISED TO 438
8.14	N1-020206	Mobile terminated call with single numbering scheme	Siemens	27.001	TEI5	5.0.0	Rel-5	B	068	2	INFO		NOTED
8.14	N1-020207	Mobile terminated call with single numbering scheme	Siemens	29.007	TEI5	5.0.0	Rel-5	B	041	2	INFO		NOTED
6	N1-020208	Addition of SM cause #46 to the MS initiated PDP Context Modification procedure	Siemens	24.008	GPRS	3.10.0	R99	F	538		CR		REJECTED
6	N1-020209	Addition of SM cause #46 to the MS initiated PDP Context Modification procedure	Siemens	24.008	GPRS	4.5.0	Rel-4	A	539		CR		REJECTED
6	N1-020210	Addition of SM cause #46 to the MS initiated PDP Context Modification procedure	Siemens	24.008	GPRS	5.2.0	Rel-5	A	540		CR		REJECTED
6	N1-020211	Handling of not existing Ids in the "replace packet filters in existing TFT" operation	Siemens	24.008	GPRS	3.10.0	R99	F	541		CR		REJECTED
6	N1-020212	Handling of not existing Ids in the "replace packet filters in existing TFT" operation	Siemens	24.008	GPRS	4.5.0	Rel-4	A	542		CR		REJECTED
6	N1-020213	Handling of not existing Ids in the "replace packet filters in existing TFT" operation	Siemens	24.008	GPRS	5.2.0	Rel-5	A	543		CR		REJECTED
6	N1-020214	Missing 3rd MNC definition	Siemens	24.008	TEI	3.10.0	R99	F	544		CR		AGREED
6	N1-020215	Missing 3rd MNC definition	Siemens	24.008	TEI	4.5.0	Rel-4	A	545		CR		AGREED
6	N1-020216	Missing 3rd MNC definition	Siemens	24.008	TEI	5.2.0	Rel-5	A	546		CR		AGREED
6	N1-020217	R99 procedures in a pre-R99 network	Siemens	24.008	GPRS	3.10.0	R99	F	547		CR		REJECTED
6	N1-020218	R99 procedures in a pre-R99 network	Siemens	24.008	GPRS	4.5.0	Rel-4	A	548		CR		REJECTED
6	N1-020219	R99 procedures in a pre-R99 network	Siemens	24.008	GPRS	5.2.0	Rel-5	A	549		CR		REJECTED
8.12	N1-020220	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Server header	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		Not treated due to time
8.12	N1-020221	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Content-Disposition header	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		Not available
8.12	N1-020222	CR to 24.229: Editorial and minor technical changes -	Lucent Technologies	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		Not treated

		annex A (profile tables)	es / Keith Drage										due to time
8.12	N1-020223	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Error-Info header	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		Not treated due to time
8.15	N1-020224	CR to 23.218: S-CSCF handling Registration	Lucent Technologies/Xin Chen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		Merged to 385
8.15	N1-020225	CR to 23.218: S-CSCF handling unknown methods	Lucent Technologies/Xin Chen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		REJECTED
8.15	N1-020226	CR to 23.218: S-CSCF Downloading upon Request	Lucent Technologies/Xin Chen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		REJECTED
8.15	N1-020227	CR to 23.218: HSS Handling Registration	Lucent Technologies/Xin Chen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		Not treated due to time
8.03	N1-020228	CR to 23.218: HSS Handling MO	Lucent Technologies/Xin Chen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		REJECTED
8.03	N1-020229	CR to 23.218: HSS Handling MT	Lucent Technologies/Xin Chen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		REJECTED
8.15	N1-020230	CR to 23.218: AS Handling MO	Lucent Technologies/Xin Chen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		REVISED TO 387
8.15	N1-020231	CR to 23.218: AS Handling MT	Lucent Technologies/Xin Chen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		AGREED
8.15	N1-020232	CR to 23.218: AS Handling Session Release	Lucent Technologies/Xin Chen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		REVISED TO 388
8.15	N1-020233	CR to 23.218: AS Handling Registration	Lucent Technologies/Xin Chen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		REVISED TO 393
8.03	N1-020234	CR to 23.218: Filter Triggering in S-CSCF	Lucent Technologies/Xin Chen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Not available.	WITHDRAWN
8.15	N1-020235	CR to 23.218: Delete 6.7	Lucent Technologies/Xin Chen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		REJECTED
8.04	N1-020236	CR to 24.228: Cx Registration	Lucent Technologies/Xin Chen	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.9.0	Rel-5				CR		REVISED TO 397
8.08	N1-020237	CR to 24.229: Codex and media negotiations	Lucent Technologies / Milo	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		REJECTED

			Orsic										
8.08	N1-020238	CR to 24.229: Bandwidth negotiations	Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		REVISED TO 422
8.08	N1-020239	CR to 24.229: SDP procedures at P-CSCF and S-CSCF	Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		REVISED TO 423
8.08	N1-020240	CR to 24.229: SDP procedures at MGCF	Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		REVISED TO 424
8.02	N1-020241	Applicability of CM3 IE Modulation Capability information	Siemens	24.008	GPRS	5.2.0	Rel-5	F	550		CR		REVISED TO 380
8.14	N1-020242	Support for Access Rights handling in the (3G_)MSC-B	Ericsson/Zdravko	23.009	TEI5	5.0.0	Rel-5	C	067		CR		Not available
8.16	N1-020243	Service change and fallback for UDI/RDI multimedia multimedia calls	Ericsson	23.972	SCUDIF	3.0.0	Rel-5	C	001		CR	Not presented.	REVISED TO 430
8.16	N1-020244	Service change and fallback for UDI/RDI multimedia multimedia calls	Ericsson	24.008	SCUDIF	5.2.0	Rel-5	C	551		CR	Not presented.	REVISED TO 420
8.16	N1-020245	Adding of the clear mode codec to Q/765.5	Ericsson		SCUDIF						INFO		NOTE D
8.16	N1-020246	Service change and fallback for UDI/RDI multimedia calls	Ericsson	29.007	SCUDIF	5.0.0	Rel-5	C			INFO	Revised due to approval of 246 in CN3	REVISED TO 400
8.16	N1-020247	Service change and fallback for UDI/RDI multimedia calls	Ericsson	27.001	SCUDIF	5.0.0	Rel-5	C			INFO	Revised due to approval of 247 in CN3	REVISED TO 401
6	N1-020248	Restriction of the 0kbits maximum bitrate	Ericsson	24.008	GPRS	3.10.0	R99	F	552		CR		Not treated due to time
6	N1-020249	Restriction of the 0kbits maximum bitrate	Ericsson	24.008	GPRS	4.5.0	Rel-4	A	553		CR		Not treated due to time
6	N1-020250	Restriction of the 0kbits maximum bitrate	Ericsson	24.008	GPRS	5.2.0	Rel-5	A	554		CR		Not treated due to time
8.12	N1-020251	CR to 24.229: Introductory text giving the status of Annex A	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		Not treated due to time
8.12	N1-020252	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Retry-After header	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		Not treated due to time
8.12	N1-020253	CR to 24.229: Valid responses to CANCEL in profile tables	Lucent Technologies / Keith	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		Not available

			Drage									
8.15	N1-020254	CR for 23.218: MRFC Tones/Announcements	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	REVISED TO 389
8.15	N1-020255	CR for 23.218: MRFC Ad Hoc Conferencing	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	REVISED TO 394
8.15	N1-020256	CR for 23.218: MRFC Transcoding	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	REVISED TO 395
8.04	N1-020257	CR for 24.229: Registration Notification to AS	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	REVISED TO 398
8.12	N1-020258	CR for 24.229: MRFC Tones/Announcements	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Not treated due to time
8.12	N1-020259	CR for 24.229: MRFC Ad Hoc Conferencing	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Not treated due to time
8.12	N1-020260	CR for 24.229: MRFC Transcoding	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Not treated due to time
8.12	N1-020261	CR for 24.229: OPTIONS and MRFC	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Not treated due to time
8.12	N1-020262	CR for 24.229: Call Transfer (REFER) and MGCF	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Not treated due to time
8.12	N1-020263	CR for 24.229: Hold/Resume with MGCF	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Not treated due to time
8.12	N1-020264	CR for 24.229: DTMF and MGCF	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	NOTED
8.12	N1-020265	CR for 24.229: Charging Correlation ID	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	REJECTED
7	N1-020266	Fixing references to 04.08 and to other GSM TS/TRs	NTT Comware	24.011	TEI4	4.0.0	Rel-4	F	023		CR	AGREED
8.12	N1-020267	DTMF Discussion Document	H3g		IMS-CCR		Rel-5				DISC	NOTED
8.04	N1-020268	CR to 23.218 : AS Notification Of Registration Status	H3g	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Partly merged to 393
8.04	N1-020269	PDP Context Signalling Flag	H3g	24.008	TEI5	5.2.0	Rel-5	B	555		CR	WITHDRAWN

8.04	N1-020270	Clarification to Registration whilst roaming	H3g	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.9.0	Rel-5				CR		AGREED
8.12	N1-020271	PDP Context Signalling Flows	H3g	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.9.0	Rel-5				CR		Not available
8.15	N1-020272	Clarifications and correction to 23.218	NEC (Yukio Kawanami)	23.218	IMS-CCR	V1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		REJECTED
8.04	N1-020273	Upgrading GPRS Session Management for Supporting IMS Services	Motorola / Apostolis								DISC	Decisions done, see the minutes.	NOTED
8.04	N1-020274	Upgrading PCO for supporting IMS services	Motorola / Apostolis	24.008	IMS-CCR	5.2.0	Rel-5	B	556		CR		REVISED TO 404
8.04	N1-020275	Upgrading TFT for supporting IMS services	Motorola / Apostolis	24.008	IMS-CCR	5.2.0	Rel-5	B	557		CR		REVISED TO 405
7	N1-020276	Correction of references	Motorola / Apostolis	44.064	TEI4	4.2.0	Rel-4	F	005		CR		AGREED
7	N1-020277	Correction of references	Motorola / Apostolis	44.064	TEI4	5.0.0	Rel-5	A	006		CR		AGREED
7	N1-020278	Correction of references	Motorola / Apostolis	44.065	TEI4	4.1.0	Rel-4	F	002		CR		AGREED
6	N1-020279	Conditions for including R97 QoS attributes in the QoS IE	Motorola / Apostolis	24.008	QoS	3.10.0	R99	F	558		CR		REVISED TO 375
8.01	N1-020280	24.228v190 "Signalling flows for the IP multimedia call control based on SIP and SDP"	Motorola, John O'Hare	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.9.0	Rel-5				TS		NOTED
8.12	N1-020281	CR to 24.229: SIP Compression	Motorola, John O'Hare	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		NOTED
6	N1-020282	MM behaviour in case of a combined attach reject for the PS service	Siemens	24.008	GPRS	3.10.0	R99	F	559		CR		REJECTED
6	N1-020283	MM behaviour in case of a combined attach reject for the PS service	Siemens	24.008	GPRS	4.5.0	Rel-4	A	560		CR		REJECTED
6	N1-020284	MM behaviour in case of a combined attach reject for the PS service	Siemens	24.008	GPRS	5.2.0	Rel-5	A	561		CR		REVISED TO 413
8.03	N1-020285	CR to 23.218: Functional Requirements of HSS	Ericsson	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		REVISED TO 390
8.04	N1-020286	XML body in SIP messages	Ericsson/M. Garcia	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		REVISED TO 399
8.08	N1-020287	Terminating flows based on Contact, non hiding	Ericsson/M. Garcia	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.9.0	Rel-5				CR		REVISED TO 432
8.08	N1-020288	Terminating flows based on Contact, hiding	Ericsson/M. Garcia	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.9.0	Rel-5				CR		REVISED TO 433
8.08	N1-020289	DTMF tones in IMS	Ericsson/M. Garcia	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		NOTED
8.04	N1-020290	Re-number of chapter describing GPRS aspects when connected to IMS	Ericsson/A. Monrad	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		REVISED TO 408
8.	N1-	Usage of PCO for obtaining	Ericsson/A.	24.229	IMS-	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		REVIS



04	020291	P-CSCF IP address	Monrad		CCR								ED TO 402
8.08	N1-020292	Usage of user plane and control plane	Ericsson/A. Monrad	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5					CR	REJECTED
8.08	N1-020293	Compression in the UE	Ericsson/A. Monrad	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5					CR	NOTED
8.13	N1-020294	Removal of emergency session from 24.228	Ericsson/A. Monrad	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.9.0	Rel-5					CR	AGREED
8.13	N1-020295	Handling of emergency sessions in IMS	Ericsson/A. Monrad	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5					CR	REVISED TO 436
8.08	N1-020296	Addition of the Charging Correlation Vector to SIP messages	Duncan Mills / Vodafone	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.9.0	Rel-5					CR	NOTED
8.07	N1-020297	CR to 24.228 - Correction to 401 UNAUTHORISED response message tables	Duncan Mills / Vodafone	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.9.0	Rel-5					CR	REJECTED
8.07	N1-020298	CR to 24.228 - Removal of Public User Identity from Cx Authentication Request	Duncan Mills / Vodafone	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.9.0	Rel-5					CR	WITHDRAWN
8.07	N1-020299	CR to 24.229 - Authentication procedures	Duncan Mills / Vodafone	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5					CR	REVISED TO 418
8.13	N1-020300	CR to 24.229: Editorial updates	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5					CR	REVISED TO 437
8.08	N1-020301	CR to 24.229: Determination of Served User and MOC / MTC	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5					CR	REJECTED
8.08	N1-020302	CR to 24.228: Determination of Served User and MOC / MTC	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.9.0	Rel-5					CR	Not available
8.08	N1-020303	CR to 24.228: User Identification Notation in 24.228	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.9.0	Rel-5					CR	Not available
8.12	N1-020304	CR to 24.229: PICS and Requirements List	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5					CR	Not available
8.03	N1-020305	CR to 23.218: Usage of Filter Criteria	Siemens / Georg Mayer	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5					CR	REVISED TO 391
8.08	N1-020306	Network applied privacy	Siemens / Georg Mayer									DISC	NOTED
8.08	N1-020307	CR to 24.229: Setting of To and From headers	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5					CR	Not available
8.08	N1-020308	CR to 24.228: Setting of To and From headers	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.9.0	Rel-5					CR	Not available
8.09	N1-020309	CR to 24.229: Network initiated call release	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5					CR	NOTED
8.09	N1-020310	CR to 24.228: Network initiated call release	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.9.0	Rel-5					CR	Not available
8.06	N1-020311	CR to 24.229: Procedures at the I-CSCF	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5					CR	REVISED TO 378
8.	N1-	CR to 24.229: Network	Siemens /	24.229	IMS-	1.1.0	Rel-5					CR	REVIS

07	020312	initiated Re-Authentication - S-CSCF	Georg Mayer		CCR													ED TO 419
8.04	N1-020313	CR to 24.229: UE and CSCF SIP roles	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5							CR				REVISED TO 409
8.05	N1-020314	CR to 24.229: Network initiated De-registration Procedures at the S-CSCF	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5							CR				REVISED TO 415
8.05	N1-020315	CR to 24.229: De-Registration Procedures at the P-CSCF	Siemens, Nokia	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5							CR				REVISED TO 416
8.14	N1-020316	P-TMSI allocation in Attach procedure	NTT DoCoMo, Fujitsu, NTT Software	24.008	TEI5	5.2.0	Rel-5	F	520	1				CR				REVISED TO 381
8.03	N1-020317	Applicability and Usage of Filter Criteria	H3g	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5							CR				Merged to 391
8.04	N1-020318	Corrections to the section 6.9.1	Nokia/Bajkó Gábor	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.9.0	Rel-5							CR				REJECTED
8.08	N1-020319	Adding the bandwidth parameter to SDP	Nokia/Bajkó Gábor	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.9.0	Rel-5							CR				REVISED TO 425
8.08	N1-020320	Correction to Registration with Authentication call flows	Nokia/Bajkó Gábor	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.9.0	Rel-5							CR				REVISED TO 429
8.08	N1-020321	Correction to TS 24.228 section 7.4.9.3	Nokia/Bajkó Gábor	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.9.0	Rel-5							CR				REJECTED
8.08	N1-020322	The content of the To: header field	Nokia/Krisztian Kiss	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.9.0	Rel-5							CR				REJECTED
8.04	N1-020323	P-CSCF to signal integrity protection of REGISTER to S-CSCF	Nokia/Bajkó Gábor	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5							CR				Not available
8.08	N1-020324	Correction to call transfer procedures	Nokia/Krisztian Kiss	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.9.0	Rel-5							CR				Not available
8.15	N1-020325	AS notification of registration status	Nokia/Krisztian Kiss	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5							CR				Merged to 385
8.04	N1-020326	AS notification of registration status	Nokia/Krisztian Kiss	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5							CR	Merged to 398			NOTED
8.03	N1-020327	CR to 23.218: Using Diameter on Sh interface	Lucent Technologies/Xin Chen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5							CR				REJECTED
8.12	N1-020328	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Accept header	Lucent Technologies / Xiao Yan He	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5							CR				Not available
8.12	N1-020329	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Accept-Encoding header	Lucent Technologies / Xiao Yan He	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5							CR				Not available
8.12	N1-020330	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the	Lucent Technologies	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5							CR				Not available



	020350	testing																IN	010551, To: T2 Cc: GERAN4, GERAN5, CN1, T	D
3	N1-020351	LS Response to LS from CN1 on UMTS_AMR2 Dual-Mode Operation	T2															LS IN	T2-011178, To: CN1, SA4 Cc: TSG-T	NOTE D
3	N1-020352	Answer to Liaison Statement on Cx User Profile	3GPPJoint adhoc GUP															LS IN	UP-010122, To: CN4 Cc: CN1, SA1 GUPadho c	NOTE D
3	N1-020353	Status of the Generic User Profile Work	3GPPJoint adhoc GUP															LS IN	UP-010128, To: SA1, SA2, SA3, SA4, SA5, T2, T3, CN1, CN4, CN5, SA1 GUPadho c, T2 GUPadho c Cc:	NOTE D
2	N1-020354	Draft Report for TSG SA meeting #14 - version 0.0.3	MCC															REP ORT		NOTE D
2	N1-020355	DRAFT STATUS REPORT v1.0.0 3GPP TSG-CN#14	MCC															REP ORT		NOTE D
8.14	N1-020356	Clarification of V(SD) handling when message transmission fails	Fujitsu	24.007	TEI-5	4.1.0	Rel-5	F	045									CR		REJE CTED
8.14	N1-020357	Reaction after T3230 Expiration	Fujitsu															DISC		NOTE D
3	N1-020358	LS on Speech Codecs references in GERAN specifications	GERAN 2															LS IN	G2-020089 To: SA4 Cc: CN1, GERAN 1	NOTE D
3	N1-020359	LS on Sr interface between Application Server and MRFC	N1SIPadho c0201															LS IN	N1-0201113 To: SA2 Cc: CN1, CN4	NOTE D
3	N1-020360	Response to LS (S2-020185) on Multiple RAB Activation Issue	SA2															LS IN	S2-020307 To: RAN2, RAN3, CN1 Cc:	NOTE D
3	N1-020361	Liaison Statement on ACS negotiation using SIP / SDP	SA2															LS IN	S2-020325 To: SA4 Cc: CN1,	NOTE D

												GERAN1, GERAN2		
2	N1-020362	N1 specification responsibility after TSG#14	MCC									REP ORT	TSs/TR not moved to Rel-5: 23.063, 24.063, 44.008, 23.814.	AGRE ED
2	N1-020363	Meeting Report, TSG CN WG1# 21, Cancun, Mexico, 26-30 November 2001	MCC									REP ORT		AGRE ED
4	N1-020364	Latest workplan for review	MCC									WO RK PLA N		Not treated due to time
8.04	N1-020365	IMS Enhancements (Application parameters transfer)	Nokia	24.008	IMS-CCR	5.2.0	Rel-5	B	569			CR		WITH DRAW N
8.13	N1-020366	Cleanup and editorial corrections to TS 23.218	Dynamics of t, Andrew Allen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5					CR		Not treated due to time
8.03	N1-020367	S-CSCF Handling of Subscription and Notification	Dynamics of t, Andrew Allen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5					CR		Not treated due to time
8.15	N1-020368	S-CSCF handling Registration	Dynamics of t, Andrew Allen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5					CR		REVIS ED TO 385
8.03	N1-020369	Addition of Public User Identity to S-CSCF address resolution function to Sh interface in 23.218	Dynamics of t, Andrew Allen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5					CR		Not treated due to time
2	N1-020370	Minutes from Phoenix	Chairman									REP ORT		NOTE D
9	N1-020371	[DRAFT] Reply to Liaison Statement on Configuration of ciphering	Sunil									LS OUT	Linked to 005. To:SA3 Cc:CN, RAN2	REVIS ED TO 444
9	N1-020372	Reply Liaison Statement on "The ciphering of LLC PDUs in response to a page for a TBF"	Apostolis									LS OUT	Linked to 168. To:GERAN 5 Cc:GERAN	AGRE ED
9	N1-020373	[DRAFT] Reply LS on Retransmission of Uplink NAS messages	Chen-Ho									LS OUT	Linked to 172	REVIS ED TO 414
9	N1-020374	[DRAFT] Liaison statement on the transparent transfer via SGSN of application level information between UE and GGSN	Kevan									LS OUT	Linked to 180. To:SA2, Cc: CN4, CN3	REVIS ED TO 428
6	N1-020375	Conditions for including R97 QoS attributes in the QoS IE	Motorola / Apostolis	24.008	QoS	3.10.0	R99	F	558	1		CR	Revision of 279	REVIS ED TO 445
6	N1-020376	Conditions for including R97 QoS attributes in the QoS IE	Motorola / Apostolis	24.008	QoS	4.5.0	Rel-4	A	570			CR		REVIS ED TO

													446
6	N1-020377	Conditions for including R97 QoS attributes in the QoS IE	Motorola / Apostolis	24.008	QoS	5.2.0	Rel-5	A	571		CR		REVISED TO 447
8.06	N1-020378	CR to 24.229: Procedures at the I-CSCF	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Revised from 311	REVISED TO 417
6	N1-020379	Handling for QoS profile parameter 'transfer delay'	Siemens	24.008	QoS	5.2.0	Rel-5	F	564	1	CR	Revised from 337	AGREED
8.02	N1-020380	Applicability of CM3 IE Modulation Capability information	Siemens	24.008	GPRS	5.2.0	Rel-5	F	550	1	CR	Revised from 241	AGREED
8.14	N1-020381	P-TMSI allocation in Attach procedure	NTT DoCoMo, Fujitsu, NTT Software	24.008	TEI5	5.2.0	Rel-5	F	520	2	CR	Revised from 316	AGREED
8.14	N1-020382	SM STATUS(#81) during PDP Context Modification or Deactivation procedure	Siemens	24.008	TEI-5	5.2.0	Rel-5	C	565	1	CR	Revised from 338	REJECTED
8.04	N1-020383	IPv6 address	Nokia/Bajkó Gábor	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.9.0	Rel-5				CR		Not available
8.15	N1-020384	Filtering criteria	Nokia/Bajkó Gábor	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR		Not available
8.15	N1-020385	S-CSCF handling Registration	Dynamicsoft, Andrew Allen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Revised from 368	AGREED
8.03	N1-020386	S-CSCF change	Nokia		CSCF-HSS						DISC		NOTE D
8.15	N1-020387	CR to 23.218: AS Handling MO	Lucent Technologies/Xin Chen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Revised from 230	AGREED
8.15	N1-020388	CR to 23.218: AS Handling Session Release	Lucent Technologies/Xin Chen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Revised from 232	REVISED TO 450
8.15	N1-020389	CR for 23.218: MRFC Tones/Announcements	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Revised from 254	REVISED TO 451
8.03	N1-020390	CR to 23.218: Functional Requirements of HSS	Ericsson	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Revised from 285	REVISED TO 448
8.03	N1-020391	CR to 23.218: Usage of Filter Criteria	Siemens / Georg Mayer	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Revised from 305	REJECTED
8.03	N1-020392	Deletion of references to Sr interface and cleanup of MRF in 23.218	Dynamicsoft, Andrew Allen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Revised from 346	AGREED
8.15	N1-020393	CR to 23.218: AS Handling Registration	Lucent Technologies/Xin Chen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Revised from 233	AGREED
8.15	N1-020394	CR for 23.218: MRFC Ad Hoc Conferencing	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Revised from 255	REVISED TO 452

8.15	N1-020395	CR for 23.218: MRFC Transcoding	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Revised from 256	REVISED TO 453
8.04	N1-020396	CR to 24.229: Proxy handling of 420 status code in REGISTER response	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Revised from 195	AGREED
8.04	N1-020397	CR to 24.228: Cx Registration	Lucent Technologies/Xin Chen	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.9.0	Rel-5				CR	Revised from 236	AGREED
8.04	N1-020398	CR for 24.229: Registration Notification to AS	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Revised from 257	AGREED
8.04	N1-020399	XML body in SIP messages	Ericsson/M. Garcia	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Revised from 286	AGREED
8.16	N1-020400	Service change and fallback for UDI/RDI multimedia calls	Ericsson	29.007	SCUDIF	5.0.0	Rel-5	C			INFO	Revised from 246 due to approval of 246 in CN3	NOTE D
8.16	N1-020401	Service change and fallback for UDI/RDI multimedia calls	Ericsson	27.001	SCUDIF	5.0.0	Rel-5	C			INFO	Revised from 247 due to approval of 247 in CN3	NOTE D
8.04	N1-020402	Usage of PCO for obtaining P-CSCF IP address	Ericsson/A. Monrad	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Revised from 291	REJECTED
6	N1-020403	Support of UMTS AMR 2 in R99	Siemens	24.008	OoBTC	3.1.0	R99	F	572		CR		Not treated due to time
8.04	N1-020404	Upgrading PCO for supporting IMS services	Motorola / Apostolis	24.008	IMS-CCR	5.2.0	Rel-5	B	556	1	CR	Revised from 274.	REVISED TO 441
8.04	N1-020405	Upgrading TFT for supporting IMS services	Motorola / Apostolis	24.008	IMS-CCR	5.2.0	Rel-5	B	557	1	CR	Revised from 275.	REVISED TO 442
8.04	N1-020406	APN name for IMS	Sunil / mmO2	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Revised from 347	REJECTED
9	N1-020407	[DRAFT] Liaison Statement on Reserved Service Label for "IMS "APN	Sunil								LS OUT	Linked to 347. To: CN4 Cc: CN, GSMA SERG	WITH DRAW N
8.04	N1-020408	Re-number of chapter describing GPRS aspects when connected to IMS	Ericsson/A. Monrad	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Revised from 290	AGREED
8.04	N1-020409	CR to 24.229: UE and CSCF SIP roles	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Revised from 313	AGREED
8.04	N1-020410	CR to 24.229: S-CSCF registration procedures	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Revised from 334	REJECTED
8.	N1-	Use of the Remote-Party-ID	Dynamics of	24.228	IMS-	1.9.0	Rel-5				CR	Revised	WITH

04	020411	for informing the S-CSCF that the Register Request was Integrity Protected	t,Andrew Allen		CCR										from 344. Not available.	DRAWN
9	N1-020412	Liaison Statement on MS behaviour in case of a combined attach reject with cause values #7 or #14	Roland										LS OUT	Linked to 282. To: GERAN 5	AGREED	
6	N1-020413	MM behaviour in case of a combined attach reject for the PS service	Siemens	24.008	GPRS	5.2.0	Rel-5	F	561	1		CR	Revised from 284. Not available.	WITHDRAWN		
9	N1-020414	Reply LS on Retransmission of Uplink NAS messages	Chen-Ho										LS OUT	Linked to 172. Revised from 373. To: RAN2, GERAN	AGREED	
8.05	N1-020415	CR to 24.229: Network initiated De-registration Procedures at the S-CSCF	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5					CR	Revised from 314	AGREED		
8.05	N1-020416	CR to 24.229: De-Registration Procedures at the P-CSCF	Siemens, Nokia	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5					CR	Revised from 315	AGREED		
8.06	N1-020417	CR to 24.229: Procedures at the I-CSCF	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5					CR	Revised from 378	AGREED		
8.07	N1-020418	CR to 24.229 - Authentication procedures	Duncan Mills / Vodafone	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5					CR	Revised from 299	AGREED		
8.07	N1-020419	CR to 24.229: Network initiated Re-Authentication - S-CSCF	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5					CR	Revised from 312	AGREED		
8.16	N1-020420	Service change and fallback for UDI/RDI multimedia multimedia calls	Ericsson	24.008	SCUDIF	5.2.0	Rel-5	C	551	1		CR	Revised from 244	REVISED TO 440		
8.08	N1-020421	CR to 24.229: Procedures at the UE and P-CSCF for media authorization	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5					CR	Revised from 197	AGREED		
8.08	N1-020422	CR to 24.229: Bandwidth negotiations	Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5					CR	Revised from 238	AGREED		
8.08	N1-020423	CR to 24.229: SDP procedures at P-CSCF and S-CSCF	Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5					CR	Revised from 239	REVISED TO 449		
8.08	N1-020424	CR to 24.229: SDP procedures at MGCF	Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5					CR	Revised from 240	AGREED		
8.08	N1-020425	Adding the bandwidth parameter to SDP	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.9.0	Rel-5					CR	Revised from 319	AGREED		
9	N1-020426	Bandwidth parameter in SDP payload on session level	Gabor										LS OUT	Linked to 425. To:SA4 Cc:CN3	AGREED	
8.	N1-	CR to 24.228: Treatment of	Motorola,	24.228	IMS-	1.9.0	Rel-5					CR		AGREED		



13	020427	Annex contents before change control (freezing)	John O'Hare		CCR													ED
9	N1-020428	[DRAFT] Liaison statement on the transparent transfer via SGSN of application level information between UE and GGSN	Kevan										LS OUT	Linked to 180. To:SA2, Cc: CN4, CN3 Revised from 374				REVISED TO 431
8.	N1-08020429	Correction to Registration with Authentication call flows	Nokia/Bajkó Gábor	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.9.0	Rel-5						CR	Revised from 320				AGREED
8.	N1-16020430	Service change and fallback for UDI/RDI multimedia multimedia calls	Ericsson	23.972	SCUDIF	3.0.0	Rel-5	C	001	1			CR	Revised from 243 due to CN4 comments.				REVISED TO 439
9	N1-020431	Liaison statement on the transparent transfer via SGSN of application level information between UE and GGSN	Kevan										LS OUT	Linked to 180. To:SA2, Cc: CN4, CN3 Revised from 428				AGREED
8.	N1-08020432	Terminating flows based on Contact, non hiding	Ericsson/M. Garcia	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.9.0	Rel-5						CR	Revised from 287				REJECTED
8.	N1-08020433	Terminating flows based on Contact, hiding	Ericsson/M. Garcia	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.9.0	Rel-5						CR	Revised from 288				REJECTED
9	N1-020434	[draft] Liaison statement on the question whether IMS shall use the same GGSN both for media and control signalling	Atle										LS OUT	Linked to 292. To: SA2, Cc: CN3, CN4				POSTPONED
8.	N1-13020436	Handling of emergency sessions in IMS	Ericsson/A. Monrad	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5						CR	Revised from 295				AGREED
8.	N1-13020437	CR to 24.229: Editorial updates	Siemens / Georg Mayer	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5						CR	Revised from 300				AGREED
8.	N1-14020438	Mobile terminated call with single numbering scheme	Siemens	24.008	TEI5	5.2.0	Rel-5	B	537	1			CR	Revised from 205				AGREED
8.	N1-16020439	Service change and fallback for UDI/RDI multimedia multimedia calls	Ericsson	23.972	SCUDIF	3.0.0	Rel-5	C	001	2			CR	Revised from 430. Conditions, see the minutes.				AGREED
8.	N1-16020440	Service change and fallback for UDI/RDI multimedia multimedia calls	Ericsson	24.008	SCUDIF	5.2.0	Rel-5	C	551	2			CR	Revised from 420. Conditions, see the minutes.				AGREED
8.	N1-04020441	Upgrading PCO for supporting IMS services	Motorola / Apostolis	24.008	IMS-CCR	5.2.0	Rel-5	B	556	2			CR	Revised from 404.				REVISED TO 456
8.	N1-04020442	Upgrading TFT for supporting IMS services	Motorola / Apostolis	24.008	IMS-CCR	5.2.0	Rel-5	B	557	2			CR	Conditionally agreed,- see minutes. Revised from				AGREED

												405.Provi ded separate to the plenary.	
9	N1-020443	Service change and fallback of UDI/RDI multimedia calls	Rouzbeh									LS OUT	REVIS ED TO 455
9	N1-020444	Reply to Liaison Statement on Configuration of ciphering	Sunil									LS OUT	AGRE ED  Linked to 005. To:SA3 Cc:CN, RAN2, T2. Revised from 371
6	N1-020445	Conditions for including R97 QoS attributes in the QoS IE	Motorola / Apostolis	24.008	QoS	3.10.0	R99	F	558	2	CR	Revision from 375	AGRE ED
6	N1-020446	Conditions for including R97 QoS attributes in the QoS IE	Motorola / Apostolis	24.008	QoS	4.5.0	Rel-4	A	570	1	CR	Revised from 376	AGRE ED
6	N1-020447	Conditions for including R97 QoS attributes in the QoS IE	Motorola / Apostolis	24.008	QoS	5.2.0	Rel-5	A	571	1	CR	Revised from 377	AGRE ED
8.03	N1-020448	CR to 23.218: Functional Requirements of HSS	Ericsson	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Revised from 390	AGRE ED
8.08	N1-020449	CR to 24.229: SDP procedures at P-CSCF and S-CSCF	Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic	24.229	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Revised from 423	AGRE ED
8.15	N1-020450	CR to 23.218: AS Handling Session Release	Lucent Technologies/Xin Chen	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Revised from 388	AGRE ED
8.15	N1-020451	CR for 23.218: MRFC Tones/Announcements	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Revised from 389	AGRE ED
8.15	N1-020452	CR for 23.218: MRFC Ad Hoc Conferencing	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Revised from 394	AGRE ED
8.15	N1-020453	CR for 23.218: MRFC Transcoding	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	23.218	IMS-CCR	1.1.0	Rel-5				CR	Revised from 395	AGRE ED
8.08	N1-020454	Loose routing	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.228	IMS-CCR	1.9.0	Rel-5				CR		Not treated due to time
9	N1-020455	Liaison Statement on Service Change and Fallback for UDI/RDI Multimedia Calls	Rouzbeh									LS OUT	AGRE ED  Revised from 443.To:S A1, CN
8.04	N1-020456	Upgrading PCO for supporting IMS services	Motorola / Apostolis	24.008	IMS-CCR	5.2.0	Rel-5	B	556	3	CR	Revised from 441.Provi ded separate to the plenary.	AGRE ED

## Annex E Liaison Statements OUT

TDoc #	Status	Source	Tdoc Title	Type	Comments
N1-020372	AGREED	Apostolis	Reply Liaison Statement on "The ciphering of LLC PDUs in response to a page for a TBF"	LS OUT	Linked to 168. To:GERAN 5 Cc:GERAN
N1-020412	AGREED	Roland	Liaison Statement on MS behaviour in case of a combined attach reject with cause values #7 or #14	LS OUT	Linked to 282. To: GERAN 5
N1-020414	AGREED	Chen-Ho	Reply LS on Retransmission of Uplink NAS messages	LS OUT	Linked to 172. Revised from 373. To: RAN2, GERAN
N1-020426	AGREED	Gabor	Bandwidth parameter in SDP payload on session level	LS OUT	Linked to 425. To:SA4 Cc:CN3
N1-020431	AGREED	Kevan	Liaison statement on the transparent transfer via SGSN of application level information between UE and GGSN	LS OUT	Linked to 180. To:SA2, Cc: CN4, CN3 Revised from 428
N1-020444	AGREED	Sunil	Reply to Liaison Statement on Configuration of ciphering	LS OUT	Linked to 005. To:SA3 Cc:CN, RAN2, T2. Revised from 371
N1-020455	AGREED	Rouzbeh	Liaison Statement on Service Change and Fallback for UDI/RDI Multimedia Calls	LS OUT	Revised from 443.To:SA1, CN

## Annex F Ageed Work Items

None.

## Annex G Agreed specifications (TS or TR)

None.

## Annex H List of CRs to N1 drafts

Spec	TDoc #	C_Ver sion	Tdoc Title	Type	WI	Rel	Status
23.218	N1-020231	1.1.0	CR to 23.218: AS Handling MT	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
23.218	N1-020385	1.1.0	S-CSCF handling Registration	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
23.218	N1-020387	1.1.0	CR to 23.218: AS Handling MO	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
23.218	N1-020392	1.1.0	Deletion of references to Sr interface and cleanup of MRF in 23.218	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
23.218	N1-020393	1.1.0	CR to 23.218: AS Handling Registration	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
23.218	N1-020448	1.1.0	CR to 23.218: Functional Requirements of HSS	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
23.218	N1-020450	1.1.0	CR to 23.218: AS Handling Session Release	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
23.218	N1-020451	1.1.0	CR for 23.218: MRFC Tones/Announcements	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
23.218	N1-020452	1.1.0	CR for 23.218: MRFC Ad Hoc	CR	IMS-	Rel-5	AGREED

			Conferencing		CCR		
23.218	N1-020453	1.1.0	CR for 23.218: MRFC Transcoding	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.228	N1-020270	1.9.0	Clarification to Registration whilst roaming	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.228	N1-020294	1.9.0	Removal of emergency session from 24.228	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.228	N1-020397	1.9.0	CR to 24.228: Cx Registration	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.228	N1-020425	1.9.0	Adding the bandwidth parameter to SDP	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.228	N1-020427	1.9.0	CR to 24.228: Treatment of Annex contents before change control (freezing)	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.228	N1-020429	1.9.0	Correction to Registration with Authentication call flows	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020198	1.1.0	CR to 24.229: Moving material from Annex B of 24.229 to main body of specification	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020396	1.1.0	CR to 24.229: Proxy handling of 420 status code in REGISTER response	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020398	1.1.0	CR for 24.229: Registration Notification to AS	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020399	1.1.0	XML body in SIP messages	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020408	1.1.0	Renumber of chapter describing GPRS aspects when connected to IMS	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020409	1.1.0	CR to 24.229: UE and CSCF SIP roles	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020415	1.1.0	CR to 24.229: Network initiated De-registration Procedures at the S-CSCF	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020416	1.1.0	CR to 24.229: De-Registration Procedures at the P-CSCF	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020417	1.1.0	CR to 24.229: Procedures at the I-CSCF	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020418	1.1.0	CR to 24.229 - Authentication procedures	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020419	1.1.0	CR to 24.229: Network initiated Re-Authentication - S-CSCF	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020421	1.1.0	CR to 24.229: Procedures at the UE and P-CSCF for media authorization	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020422	1.1.0	CR to 24.229: Bandwidth negotiations	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020424	1.1.0	CR to 24.229: SDP procedures at MGCF	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020436	1.1.0	Handling of emergency sessions in IMS	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020437	1.1.0	CR to 24.229: Editorial updates	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED
24.229	N1-020449	1.1.0	CR to 24.229: SDP procedures at P-CSCF and S-CSCF	CR	IMS-CCR	Rel-5	AGREED