joint-API-group (Parlay, ETSI Project OSA, 3GPP TSG_CN WG5) **N5-020180**
Meeting #17, Sophia Antipolis, FRANCE, 8 – 12 April 2002

Source: **JWG Chairs**
Chelo.Abarca@alcatel.fr, Ard.Jan.Moerdijk@eln.ericsson.se

Title: **Draft Report CN5#17**

Agenda item	Agenda item title	Tdoc 3GPP N5-020	Title	Source	Result	
1	**Opening and approval agenda**	**170**	**Proposed agenda**	**N5 chairman**		
1.1	**IPR declarations**				The Chairman reminded the "Article 55: Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) Policy" of the 3GPP Working Procedures: ?? Individual Members shall be bound by the IPR Policy of their respective Organizational Partner. ?? 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. ?? Organizational Partners should encourage their respective members to grant licences on fair, reasonable terms and conditions and on a non-discriminatory basis. ?? The PCG shall maintain a register of IPR declarations relevant to 3GPP, received by the Organizational Partners. The Chairman invited the delegates to declare IPRs - relevant to the 3GPP - they are aware of and there were no declarations. The List of IPR declarations sorted by Organizational Partners can be found at: http://www.3gpp.org/PCG/IPR_declarations.htm	

		212	Make calls for IPRs	MCC	Reminder of the IPR declaration every meeting. Noted.	
2	Allocation of documents	172	Document allocation	N5 chairman		
3	Reporting					
3.1	CN5/SPAN12/Parlay	007	Report CN5#16 Hong Kong	ETSI OSA project leader, CN5 chairman, CN5 vice chairman	Noted.	
3.2	CN#15 Jeju, Korea					
		208	3GPP TSG CN report to SA#15	MCC	All CRs have been approved. We have not automatically converted our docs to Rel5. Some features have been moved to Rel6. SA1 has created a new WI.	
		209	Draft report of 3GPP TSG SA meeting #15	MCC	Extracts of draft version of the SA plenary report. OSA support of Generic NW interface Function and OSA retrieval of IP session information have been removed from Rel5. Automatic upgrade to Rel5, even without added value, is no more compulsory, and we haven't done it.	
		210	Summary of TSG#15 issues of CN5 interest	MCC	?? All CRs had been approved. ?? The JWG proposal to complete OSA Rel-5 work in 06/2002 was accepted by CN and subsequently endorsed by SA. CN, however, requested the JWG to deliver the new parts (PAM, Policy Management and ISC mapping) as version 1.0.0 for Information to the CN exploder after the JWG meeting in April, so that v2.0.0 could be submitted to CN#16 in 06/2002 for Approval. ?? The May CN WGs meeting has been moved from Amsterdam to Budapest. ?? All GUP activities have been moved to Rel6. This activity, which used to be an ad-hoc, is now hosted by SA2.	
		211	CN5 spec list (status after TSG#15)	MCC	Needs to be updated according to the new editors. Adrian will ask to have it updated by MCC. The TRs have not yet been sent for SPAN approval.	

3.3	**SA3, Bristol, UK**					
		249	**Joint Session with SA3 on Security Issues in the Framework**	**Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)**	**On behalf of the JWG, Musa and Chelo attended an SA3 meeting (Bristol, 25/2) where security in in the OSA Framework was discussed. This was the result of previous discussions, where SA3 had proposed that OSA security aspects be dealt by SA3, with the help of JWG OSA experts, and had reserved a slot in the agenda of their Bristol meeting for that.** **During this joint session Chelo first introduced OSA to SA3 using the presentation we have for this purpose. Then four Alcatel SA3 contributions were presented, which identified several OSA security issues. These issues were discussed in the joint session and solutions for them were discussed and assessed, based on security recommendations from SA3 and API backwards compatibility concerns from the JWG. As a result Alcatel contributions were revised, and they are presented to this meeting for discussion (contributions 282-285).**	

3.4	**Parlay BoD and TAC meetings**				**The following documents were reviewed in the last Parlay BoD and TAC meeting (Orlando, March 15):** ?? **ITU document on APIs** ?? **A draft "Beginners Guide to Call Control" by Richard Stretch** ?? **A draft Backward Compatibility Statement by F. Burghardt and K. Luettge** ?? **The Revised Rulebook from Java WG,...version 0.08** ?? **The Hong Kong Survey results compiled by K.Davi** ?? **A draft SIP & Parlay document from Richard Stretch** ?? **The Keynote presentation at the Eurescom 'Parlay & OSA' workshop from Z.Lozinski** ?? **A Member's report about Eurescom's Parlay & OSA workshop** **There might be a joint Parlay-Eurescom meeting in October.** **Most of the meeting was devoted to the discussion on Backwards Compatibility (see later in the agenda).**	
3.5	**Other OSA related activities**					

		263	Report on OSA related 3GPP WG meetings since Hong Kong	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)	This document provides for information a report on all OSA related 3GPP meetings, which took place since the last JWG meeting in Hong Kong. SA1: ?? Only one CR that concerns us: enhancements to Charging capabilities. ?? New features of IP Session Information Retrieval and the Generic Network Interface Function have been postponed to release 6 after considerable debate. ?? A new work item description (WID) has been created for Release 6. Currently this WID includes the Generic Network Interface Function, Enhancements User Interaction, Support of MMS Connectivity, Support of Local Services and Support of Push Service. SA2: ?? Architectural issues on Presence are completed ?? Terminal Capabilities, User Interaction, User Profile Management, Charging and Information Services have low architectural completion. SA may decide to remove some of these features out of R5 based on this decision. Although SA may decide to remove the features, which have low architectural completion, it should be noted that CN5 are able to complete the work on the APIs as there is a requirement that does not mandate the necessary network support. Note that this report is previous to the last SA. These decisions have already been taken.	
4	Liaison Statements					
		202	LS reply to: " Liaison Statement on Confirmation of OSA Support for VASP MMS Connectivity."	SA1	TSG SA1 would like to confirm TSG SA2 assumption that the necessary OSA SA1 service requirements for the support of MMS will be in place at some stage for post-Rel5. Noted.	

		203	Liaison Statement on coordination of data definitions, identified in GUP development	T2	Liaison Statement on coordination of data definitions identified in GUP development. Proposes to have a single group responsible for the coordination of the data definitions, whilst noting that the actual data definition work is the responsibility of the respective working groups. Comment: we're not specifying the GUP data model, we'll use it when it's time for stage 3 for GUP in OSA. Comment: we need to follow this more closely, because these data types could affect ours. Musa will draft a reply, 290. To be sent for email approval.	
		204	Liaison Statement Reply to "Status of the Generic User Profile Work"	SA2	Noted.	
		205	Liaison Statement Reply to "Comments on UP-010141 and relationship of GUP to Subscription Management"	SA2	Noted.	
		206	Response to LS "Clarification of requirements for the VHE"	SA2	This is the answer to an LS from us, because we found a requirement in OSA stage 2 that was not in OSA stage 1. SA1 is asked to check if this requirement should be reflected in the stage 1. See also contributions 226-229, which address this requirement. Noted.	
		207	OUTPUT DRAFT OF THE REFERENCE DOCUMENT ON API/OBJECT INTERFACE BETWEEN NETWORK CONTROL AND APPLICATION LAYER	ITU-T SG11	Our comments seem to have been taken into account, except our suggestion to have rather a list of references than a document. Noted.	

		215	Reply LS on "VASP MMS Connectivity" from T2 (T2-020038)	SA5	SA5 propose that the further activities on ebXML and interfaces IRP 1, IRP 2 and 3 will be best handled as part of two new Work Items that SA5 proposes to establish for Release 6. One of them is Management for OSA, which will include any solution set needs for Subscription Management required by OSA such as IRP 2. Richard and Andy have been involved in talks with SA5, for setting up the basic architecture for management including OSA. Comment: this LS comes from talks between SA5 and T2, who used to lead the work on GUP, that is very linked to subscription management. For us the most important thing in this LS is that this OSA Management WI will be prepared for Rel6, and that work on defining the WID has not started yet, and that we should be involved in its definition. Noted.	
		216	Liaison Statement on co-ordination of data definitions, identified in GUP development	SA5	Response from SA5 to T2 showing their interest to be involved in the work of GUP data definitions. Noted.	
		217	Reply LS on "VASP MMS Connectivity" from T2 (T2-020038)	SA5 (Charging Group)	Reply to the same LS from T2 as 215, this time from the Charging group of SA5. To be discussed by email, Chelo will draft a response, will be 311.	

5	**Backward compatibility discussions**				**Karsten Lutge from Siemens started the discussion on what to do when changes are necessary. He produced a document looking at the different levels of compatibility, and proposed four levels that could be assigned to the OSA interfaces:** **?? 3: any changes can be made to the specification** **?? 0: no changes are allowed.** **?? The others are in between.** **The Parlay TAC and BoD analysed Karsten's document. The concepts were still not clear so Karsten, with Gary and Anders, improved the explanatory text in the document. The BoD produced some slides using this levels. They have delegated this issue on the Joint Group, with the request to review what they've done and then make more detailed explanations of the maturity of different interfaces. Two documents are available from Parlay for our feedback: the BC white paper (TDoc 281) and the maturity statement (TDoc 288).**	

		281	**Backwards Compatibility in Parlay/OSA White Paper**	**SUN (Gary Bruce)**	**This document states how to deal with further developments of the Parlay/OSA specifications. First, the term “Backwards Compatibility (BC)” is discussed. Next it describes, in two scenarios, how backwards compatibility can be supported; either with multiple framework and SCF implementations or with single framework and SCF implementations. For single framework and SCF implementations, the levels of backwards compatibility are defined. Next, the relation between the backwards compatibility scenarios and scheduled Parlay/OSA releases is defined. The rules for changes permitted to the UML and technology realisations for each of the backwards compatibility scenarios are given. Following this, rules for tracking the changes are identified that need to be followed when the specifications are moved to a new release. These rules will ensure that backwards compatibility, to the specified degree, is guaranteed. In addition, guidelines are presented that need to be considered by client or server programmers when implementing a new Parlay/OSA release. Two annexes contain recommendations to be included in the Parlay 4.0 APIs that will enable more seamless backwards compatibility strategies for the future.** **The following levels are defined:** **?? Level 0: Already deployed client applications are not affected at all.** **?? Level 1: Manual intervention (by OAM personnel) is needed on the client side, e.g. to re-connect after a server upgrade. The vendor of the client software is not involved.** **?? Level 2: The vendor of the client software needs to be involved to migrate to an updated server, e.g. client applications need to be re-linked. However, the source code of the client application stays untouched, which limits the effort for the software vendor, keeping the upgrade costs still reasonable.** **Everything beyond level 2, i.e. level 3, means backwards non-compatibility with single Framework or SFC implementations. Either the client software has to be re-written or the network operator has to permit the client application to select a less recent release of Framework or SCF implementation that is level 0, 1 or 2 backwards compatible with the client software.**	

		262	**View Ericsson on Backward Compatibility in Parlay/OSA**	**Koen Schilders (Ericsson)**	**This presentation analyses several BC related issues. It proposes the following conclusions:** ?? **Recommendation to offer backwards compatibility by deploying multiple versions of the Framework and of the Services in parallel.** ?? **Responsibility for offering a backwards compatible solution lies with the vendor.** ?? **Compliance to Karsten's rules is recommended (although not required).** ?? **Backwards compatibility statement important as market message towards the developer community.** ?? **Versioning rules required (semantics of version property need to be defined).**	
		287	**Frame Work version in run-time**	**Incomit**	**The Application can't inform the Framework of its own Framework version. This Contribution contains a backwards compatible solution to the OSA/Parlay Framework API that enables the communication between a framework and different versions of applications to work even if the framework has been changed. The solution proposed is adding a new backwards compatible method in the IpInitial class. This new method handles how an application determines the version and calls and returns the proper interfaces.** **The issue that Ericsson pointed out (one FW implementation running in specific memory space, cannot implement multiple IDL versions that have the same name space) may not be an issue if the FW is allowed to run in different processes.** **Proposed that instead of deprecating initateAuthentication, a new method is defined, so there is no need to deprecate anything.** **Anders is requested to address the issues. The contribution cannot be approved in its current form.**	

		288	**Specification maturity**	**BT**	**Categorisation of three stages in the lifetime of a specification:** ?? **“evolving”: new stuff from new requirements** ?? **“established”: feedback from implementation** ?? **“mature”: completed, rubber stamped, commercial implementations.** **Example: between Parlay 3.0 and 3.1 it was a typical case of two versions within the “established” category.** **Proposed definitions:** ?? **Completeness – according to the editors.** ?? **Maturity - a measure of the position of the specification against its complete lifecycle, i.e. from inception through evolution, implementation and deployment.** **For each of these two concepts, a category is assigned. This way some tables are produced, with the granularity of SCFs. Most of the Framework interfaces are considered mature and level 0.** **We have been requested by the Parlay TAC and BoD to complete these tables.** **Comment: a way to assign a degree of completeness would be to check with the requirements – provided that the requirements don’t change.** **Comment: why level 0? Why issuing a new release with only editorial changes?** **Comment: maturity and compatibility level in the table go very much together.** **Question: who maintains established specifications? Answer: little can be changed, so they’re essentially not maintained.** **Comment: our documentation could be published with a first page containing the information in these tables.** **Richard to organise off-line discussions this week to fill in the tables. An email discussion will be organised, and next meeting the subject will be finished.** **Agreed to have CBC, AM and the three PAM SCFs go to**	

					Notes from the BC drafting session: its purpose is to draft a response to the Parlay TAC and BoD, with two parts: a set of comments to the document as It is, and also an alternative proposal. **Issues to discuss:** **1. Do we really need this? We already have a mechanism in the Fw to handle different versions; and for Fw interfaces we're looking into it independently.** **2. The way we manage our documentation today, there is no way we can have the UML and the IDL having separate lives, so there is no way we can implement the separation between their BC levels.** **3. Comment on the proposed way to track changes: if we use for the interfaces a stereotype that is not "interface", then we won't be able to generate IDL automatically. An alternative solution would be to put the changes in an annex. This has been discussed in Parlay and no decision was taken, so our input would be useful to reach one.** **4. We need to address how long we maintain BC between releases. If we do a level 3 fix to correct a key bug, do we keep the wrong part of the API forever? Or do we allow ourselves new versions, dumping the wrong parts, every now and then?** **5. If we add a new interface or method, does BC apply to it immediately, even though it has not been implemented?** **6. Do we need two "levels" (in a different dimension than the defined levels) of nonBC: 3 (essential bug fixes) and 4 (resulting from specific requirements)?** **7. Can we do any level 0 or level 1 technical changes at all for the IDL? It seems they can only be editorial.** **8. We need a statement about how we handle changes, so that they're always as much BC as possible (e.g. introducing a new method if a change in a parameter is needed). It would be basically a split between "acceptable " and "non-acceptable" changes, for each level.** **9. Do we produce a new version for each SCF, even if we haven't touched it? Will applications be able to find the new versions?**	

6	OSA version 1.1 / Rel. 4					
		181	Logbook of potential errors in 29.198-1, ES 210 915-1		Since Parlay and ETSI don't have a Change Request system, we have created one document per part of the specification that serves as a logbook, where editors can collect the requests for changes coming from implementor's feedback. They're currently empty. Noted.	
		182	Logbook of potential errors in 29.198-2, ES 210 915-2		Noted.	
		183	Logbook of potential errors in 29.198-3, ES 210 915-3		Noted.	
		184	Logbook of potential errors in 29.198-4, ES 210 915-4		Noted.	
		185	Logbook of potential errors in 29.198-5, ES 210 915-5		Noted.	
		186	Logbook of potential errors in 29.198-6, ES 210 915-6		Noted.	
		187	Logbook of potential errors in 29.198-7, ES 210 915-7		Noted.	
		188	Logbook of potential errors in 29.198-8, ES 210 915-8		Noted.	
		189	Logbook of potential errors in 29.198-9, ES 210 915-9		Noted.	
		190	Logbook of potential errors in 29.198-10, ES 210 915-10		Noted.	
		191	Logbook of potential errors in 29.198-11, ES 210 915-11		Noted.	
		192	Logbook of potential errors in 29.198-12, ES 210 915-12		Noted.	
		193	Logbook of potential errors in 29.198-13, ES 210 915-13		Noted.	
		194	Logbook of potential errors in 29.198-14, ES 210 915-14		Noted.	
		195	Logbook of potential errors in 29.998-1, TR 101 917-1		Noted.	
		196	Logbook of potential errors in 29.998-04-1, TR 101 917-04-1		Noted.	
		197	Logbook of potential errors in 29.998-04-4, TR 101 917-04-4		Noted.	

		198	Logbook of potential errors in 29.998-05-1, TR 101 917-05-1		Noted.	
		199	Logbook of potential errors in 29.998-05-4, TR 101 917-05-4		Noted.	
		200	Logbook of potential errors in 29.998-06, TR 101 917-06		Noted.	
		201	Logbook of potential errors in 29.998-08, TR 101 917-08		Noted.	
		236	Clarification of TpSessionID	Ericsson (Koen Schilders)	In Brighton a contribution was agreed that changed TpSessionID; then in Hong Kong it was discovered that this causes some problems. This contribution proposes to replace the description of TpSessionID and go back to its original version. See also 240. Discussion continues there.	
		240	Scope of TpSessionID and TpAssignmentID	Sun (Gary Bruce)	Same issues as 236, detailing the problems with the callAborted() method: this method only provides the TpSessionID, and not a reference to the call object, so with the current definition of TpSessionID, it is impossible to determine which call object is associated with the call session that has just aborted. The contribution proposes to make the scope of the TpSessionID unique within the context of the implementation of the SCF. Also, it is proposed to keep the scope of TpAssignmentID in-line with the scope of TpSessionID. Need for off-line discussion. Back later in the week. Result of this discussion is 305.	
		305			Agreed. Should be a CR, will be sent for email approval.	

		242	**Exception Issues**	**Sun (Gary Bruce)**	**A collection of exception issues, already on the email for about one month. The contribution proposes that all should be immediate 3.1 specification changes.** **Discussion: only essential corrections (i.e. otherwise the spec cannot be implemented) are possible for Parlay 3.1. See text in the agenda, that explains this, and that each case shall be handled independently. Therefore the meeting decides to go case by case, as follows.** ?? **P_APPLICATION_NOT_ACTIVATED: it is defined in several places. The actual exception is only defined in IDL once, in part 2. As Part 6 is the only part that uses it, and it is specific only to Mobility, we should only have the UML definition (whatever text we agree upon) and the IDL exception defined in this part (part 6).** **Discussion: the solution proposed in the contribution means a change to the IDL of Mobility, which is one of the most stable SCFs. There is an alternative solution – to delete the descriptions except the one in part 2 (it's the most complete). This would not change the IDL, it would just be a change in the text.** **Agreed to implement the alternative solution.** ?? **What are the definitions of P_INVALID_SERVICE_ID, P_ILLEGAL_SERVICE_ID and P_UNKNOWN_SERVICE_ID? Or do they all mean the same thing?** **Agreed to keep all of them but clean up the description, for Parlay 4. Text should be provided for this. Contributions are invited.** ?? **P_ID_NOT_FOUND could be deprecated. It is only used in part 5 (User Interaction) where its use is in question. If it means invalid message ID or invalid info ID, this could be stated with a new P_INVALID_MESSAGE_ID or P_INVALID_INFO_ID exception, otherwise it could be stated in the description of this exception that it means either invalid message ID or invalid info ID.**	

		243	Editorial Issues	Sun (Gary Bruce)	Figure numbering: Ultan will contact the ETSI editors to make sure they are corrected for Parlay 4. The rest of the issues are not agreed, and nothing will be changed.	
		244	Use of MIDL	Sun (Gary Bruce)	This is an example of how to realise TpAddressSet in MDL. The contribution proposes to change it to C++. Agreed, and it will be changed for Parlay 4.	
		245	Use of P_ADDRESS_PLAN_MSMAIL	Sun (Gary Bruce)	This contribution asks the following questions: can we deprecate P_ADDRESS_PLAN_MSMAIL from TpAddressPlan and TpAddress in Part 2? It's identical to P_ADDRESS_PLAN_SMTP; it's technology specific; and it causes misalignment with the 3GPP open standards. Discussion: this is inherited from Parlay. We didn't like it so we removed it from the documentation (though not in the ETSI document), but left it in the IDL because otherwise the numbering would have changed, which is not backwards compatible. Agreed to leave things as they are. General suggestion for the headers of contributions: for the WID, it is suggested to use Parlay 3.1 or Parlay 4, which is clearer. When a contribution becomes a CR, MCC will make the necessary conversion.	
		250	Correction to TpCallChargePlan	Ericsson (Koen Schilders)	Updated before the meeting to 267	

		267	**Correction to TpCallChargePlan: update of N5-020250**	**Ericsson (Koen Schilders)**	**Update of 250.** **This contribution raises the issue that it is not possible to select P_CALL_PARTY_ORIGINATING and P_CALL_PARTY_DESTINATION as PartyToCharge in TpCallChargePlan. It proposes to solve it as it is done for other data types: change type of PartyToCharge from union to enum and add a union for PartyToChargeAdditionalInfo.** **This is not a backwards compatible change, but it is an essential correction. It is also in GCC (one of the common data types).** **This will be considered; besides an error is found, also some editorials, so needs an update: 295.**	
		295			**Revision of 267.** **Apart from the revision, it is checked that indeed this is also in GCC.** **Off-line discussions are necessary.** **Not agreed.**	

		265	P_SERVICE_INSTANCE in TpDomainID	Sun (Gary Bruce)	In Hong Kong a contribution was agreed that modified the TpDomain type to refer to an instance ID, instead of a TpServiceId type. But still the element name for P_SERVICE_INSTANCE in TpDomainID is incorrect: it should be ServiceInstanceID, not ServiceID. This is not a backwards compatible change. It Is not an essential correction (the type is correct, even if it is not the clearest name). Not agreed. Discussion whether this should be included in the Log file. It is noted that if we do so, then some developer might change it in their implementation; while us, if we don't change it now, we should never change it. On the other hand having this in the Log file might help solving any possible ambiguity. It is agreed that Logs are for us, in order to keep track of feedback received, and not for publication. Therefore it will be included in the Log, with a clear statement that this will never be changed.	
7	3GPP2 alignment					
		292			Report from Stephen Hayes, from the harmonisation workshop last week, distributed for information. Main outcome for us: the workshop recommends focusing the harmonisation efforts on those areas where synergies already exist. In particular it was agreed that priority will be given to harmonisation in the areas of: - OSA/PARLAY based service APIs - IMS (Referring to the 3GPP IP Multimedia Subsystem and its equivalent in 3GPP2 MMD)	
		275	3GPP2 IP Network Architecture	Betsy Kidwell (3GPP2 TSG-N chair, Lucent)	Updated to 293.	

		293			**Update of 275.** **The 3GPP2 architecture is divided in two domains: Legacy domain and MM (IP) domain.** **3GPP2 is a partnership project between ARIB (Japan), CWTS (China), TIA (USA), TTA (Korea) and TTC (Japan). Started work in 99, completed first NAM (Network Architecture Model) in summer 2000.** **TSG-N does some stage 1 work, plus receives stage 1 input from TSG-S.** **Main objectives for 3GPP2 architecture:** ?? **to define an evolution path** ?? **home service control (as in their legacy systems)** ?? **alignment with 3GPP OSA** ?? **access to applications through the network, from the mobile terminal and from service applications.** **Adoption of OSA, with some extensions for the Legacy domain, trying to reuse as much as possible, plus trying to have as much commonality as possible in the two domains. The changes/extensions required are still to be studied. The following technology realisations are intended: CORBA IDL, JAIN SPA and SOAP/WSDL.** **TSG-N contains a Service Focus Group looking at stage 1. Presence and MM Messaging requirements from 3GPP are being looked at. The idea is to have as much commonality as possible.** **Reminder that the SA1 subgroups (requirements) are meeting this week in Sophia too, so 3GPP2 delegates are welcome to join. SPRINT have been granted a guest status until the end of the , which applies to all 3GPP meetings. Other 3GPP2 companies are also 3GPP companies and therefore can attend these meetings as well.**	
		294	**Parlay/OSA: an open API for service development**	**Alcatel (Chelo Abarca)**	**A shortened version of the OSA/Parlay introductory presentation was given on request from the 3GPP2 delegates.**	

					Discussion: ?? **Question: are there any IPR issues?** **Answer: ETSI and Parlay have a cooperation agreement that gives joint copyrights to both; it makes no reference to patent rights. The ETSI/3GPP patent rules are that individual companies are owners of their patent rights, and they are requested but not obliged to declare their patents. If a patent is blocking (that is, the standard cannot be implemented without it) they're requested to give a fair access (not free) to everybody. For 3GPP2 there is a willingness to work together but the meeting doesn't know well how things stand with regards to IPR issues. We request 3GPP2 to say what they would want exactly – republish specs, or have their own,… The 3GPP2 secretariat are talking with the 3GPP secretariat about this.** ?? **Question: how does document generation work?** **Answer: we use UML, Rational Rose, and then the Soda tool, which is a collection of scripts to generate the documents. This ensures that the technical context (both syntax and semantics) is always the same for ETSI/Parlay and 3GPP specifications. All this is in a part of the ETSI server that is not password protected. We also use the UML model to generate the IDL, which is published as part of the standard and is also used as a quality check on the specification, because it can be compiled. If another standardisation body wants to use the model, we just need setting up a new Soda template for them. Ultan can help with this, and then the new body would be in charge of generating their own documents in the future. For WSDL and Java generation, the UML model has been converted into an Analysis model, which is fully technology independent, and from which the WSDL and Java realisations can be generated using scripts.** ?? **It is pointed out that there is already some joint work between 3GPP and 3GPP2, for example on Management: 3GPP2 is working with SA5 in an informal way, and they're either referring to SA5 specifications or working on a delta to them.** ?? **Question: How can we ensure that if 3GPP2 joins the JWG, then all companies will have the same**	

					Meeting schedule discussion: it is not possible to meet jointly for the next two meetings, because they're already fixed and they happen to be at the same time in different places. In September 3GPP2 TSG N is meeting in Korea; there will be a Parlay member meeting around that time, but it has not been fixed yet (October 28-31, Dublin seems likely). **3GPP2 TSG N will discuss next week if they want to co-locate with the JWG, or the opposite (so that delegates from the Service Focus group can attend both meetings). The JWG will contact the Parlay BoD for more concrete information on the October Parlay meeting, and propose a schedule asap.**	
8	**OSA version 2 / Rel. 5**					
8.1	**Requirements**					
		237	**Parlay API –Phase 4 Requirements**	**BT Exact (Richard Stretch)**	**This new version of the requirements document implements the comments from the Hong Kong meeting.** ?? **The section on Proposals about style has been removed.** ?? **Relinquish control over session and presentation of party info removed from IMS session control, in line with SA1.** ?? **Network controlled modifications requirement added, from SA1.** **Discussion: the section on PAM requirements has been deleted. It needs to be clarified whether this is a wrong interpretation of the text of the meeting report, or if the reason is that PAM is already part of Parlay 3, so there should not be PAM requirements for Parlay 4. Agreement that it is a wrong interpretation.** **Agreement: section 4.4 on PAM will be put back in the document; rest agreed;. To be revised into 296.**	

		296			Update of 237. Section 4.4 has been added again, except the editor's note. Status of this document: from the discussion with SA1 some requirements like Journalling will be removed. We'll wait until the SA plenary agrees with the removal, and then we'll update this document, moving them to an annex or starting a new document.	
8.1.1	Input from SA1: OSA and VHE requirements					
8.1.2	ETSI SPAR					
8.2	PAM					
		238	Parlay3_1_PAM_0_1	Teltier Technologies (Guda Venkatesh)	This is the PAM 3.1 specification. The ETSI and 3GPP documents have already been generated (268 and 269). The discussion is moved to them.	
		268	1st draft ES 201 915-14 (Parlay 4.0 PAM)	ETSI (Ultan Mulligan)	This was generated in the following way: based on the HK version and an UML model from James Chapman, a bit reformatted our way and using IDL generation for checking. Afterwards it was updated based on 238 (sequence diagrams were added, data types modified, method names, parameters and data types were checked though not exceptions or descriptions due to lack of time). Some errors were discovered when generating the IDL but they were not corrected in order to keep the alignment with 238. These errors are collected in 270.	
		269	1st draft 3GPP TS 29.198-14 (Rel-5 PAM)	ETSI (Ultan Mulligan)	Same generation mechanism as the ETSI document (268), for the 3GPP subset as identified in 238.	

		270	**Notes on ETSI/3GPP PAM Documents**	**Ultan Mulligan (ETSI PTCC)**	**Compilation of the list of issues found, but not solved, when generating 268 and 269.** ?? **Both sequence diagrams use IpPAMFramework. New versions of the sequence diagrams are included below which replace IpPAMFramework with the corresponding Manager interfaces.** **Agreed.** ?? **Event Registration and Notification sequence diagram uses IpPAMAgentPresence, so should this be included in the 3GPP document? Should a new sequence diagram be drawn?** **A solution for this is proposed in 291. To be discussed then.** ?? **P_PAM_UNKNOWN_ALIAS exception had been added in James Chapman's UML, and it's not in 238 (this is the only difference between 238 and the generated documents).** **Agreed to have it in all documents.** ?? **In IpPAMAvailability, methods getPreference(), setPreference() uses TpPAMPreference which no longer exists in the data types document.** **In 291 it is renamed as TpPAMPreferenceData. Agreed that the methods will be changed to refer to this new name.** ?? **All Manager Interfaces: all the getAuthToken() methods use TpPAMDataList which no longer exists.** **291 proposes to replace it by TpAttributeList, which is in the common date definitions. Agreed.** ?? **All sequence and tagged type element names, etc. should start with upper case letter, following convention used in the other OSA documents. Sequence element names do not consistently start with an upper case or lower case letter in PAM document (most start with lower case, but some**	

		276	**Rel-5 draft 29.198-14 Presence & Availability Management comments**	**Nokia (Matti Saarenpaa)**	**This contribution raises several PAM issues. These, and others that came up in the discussion, are:** ?? **Use of credentials (already discussed in HK): which are the benefits of having the credentials used in each method? Trusted and non-trusted applications are interfaced with the OSA API, but what is beyond the applications has been out of the scope of 3GPP OSA. In PAM there is an idea that an application (that needs to be obviously a rather trusted one giving reliable asker information) can supply the asker information to the network SCS which provides then credentials regarding this particular asker. These credentials are used in later phases when presence information is handled. Nokia believes that the use of credentials should be an optional feature.** **Discussion: the idea is that the credentials are indeed an optional feature. This is already reflected in 291. The credentials don't do any authentication, but the whole point of PAM is that the info passed depends on who's asking; the idea is to have a single token per asker, so they don't have to be providing data about themselves all the time. It is also clarified that the credentials are to be used by the applications, not the user.** ?? **Using credentials is cumbersome, even if it is intended as an easier way of sending asker data.** **Asker data may come in multiple formats, and it needs to be verified each time. This is way of having it sent just once, and using a token afterwards, makes things simpler.** ?? **Why does the application need to use the credentials, instead of them being restricted to the user?** **Any application that accesses the server needs to provide info about who's asking for this data. It is not enough that the application has authenticated. This is a bit of a special case, because other SCFs always handle data about themselves, who have been already authenticated, while the PAM SCF handles data about the asker.**	

		277	**Rel-5 draft 29.198-14 PAM Event SCF enhancements**	**Nokia (Matti Saarenpaa)**	**This document provides a few enhancements to the PAM Event SCF of the current Presence And Availability Management specification (N5-020238) and proposes also a number of changes to the related data types. The changes have been marked with revisions in the two attached files.** ?? **Some modifications are proposed for TpPAMAttribute.** **Comments: TpPAMAttribute is derived from the common attribute type TpAttribute, but some things are wrong in the contribution: the type associated with Attribute Name is TpString - TpAttributeName doesn't exist; the type associated to Attribute Type is not TpString.** **Matti and Guda will look off-line for a solution to this.** ?? **The interfaces have been renamed according to the OSA style as IpPAMEvent and IpAppPAMEvent.** **Two things are proposed here: one is applying the usual naming convention (same name, one Ip and the other IpApp) and the other is the name itself.** **Agreed to follow the naming convention.** **For the name itself: this is an interface that handles multiple events, and the proposed names are a bit confusing. Now they're called "registration" and "notification".** **Agreed to call them EventHandling.** ?? **Some text about error situations handled by the applications has been removed, because error situations should be handled better by the SCS than by the client side. An error report method is suggested later on.** **Comment: in principle this is true, but in reality this is usually too much to expect from an implementation. On the other hand this is also a lot to expect from applications, when we want to**	

		291	**PAM ES 201 915-14 V0.0.1 Comments on Draft**	**Teltier Technologies (Guda Venkatesh)**	**This contribution proposes a set of editorial suggestions in the text and figures to more correctly reflect the changes made after CN5 #16. A marked up version of the draft, based on 268, with the corresponding changes is attached with this contribution for reference.** **Issues 1, 2 and 6 were already addressed in the discussion of 270, and no further discussion is necessary.** ?? **Page 69. Only one pre-defined context "Communication" is defined in the data definitions. Replace the last two paragraphs to reflect changes in this draft.** **Agreed.** ?? **Page 71. In method getPreference(). Delete the sentences about ability to check preferences outside the server. The latest change allows preferences to be computed outside the service. Third paragraph: change capability to context. In method setPreference() first paragraph, change capability to context.** **Agreed.** ?? **Page 76. IpPAMPresenceAvailabilityManager. Second paragraph, add optionally to use of authentication token to make it unambiguous. This is related to the credentials discussion in 276.** ?? **Page 83. Replace Policy Management SCF with PAM SCFs. This was a cut&paste mistake.** **Agreed.** ?? **Page 85. PAM_MAX_LONGINT not defined in the description of the expiresIn field of TpPAMAttribute and TpPAMAttributeDef.** **Agreed. Guda and Ultan will look for a suitable data type for this.** ?? **Page 96-97. Remove explicitly from "explicitly set"**	

					Conclusions of the PAM discussions: some changes have been approved and will be implemented with the intention to have a document before the end of this week, or next week if not possible, for distribution to the CN plenary. **Other issues have been identified for off-line discussion. Guda, Matti and Ultan will come back to us on thursday morning to tell which issues can be incorporated in the version for the CN plenary, and which will require further email discussion. For the latter some plans will be made to make sure everything can be closed next meeting.**	

		310			**Result of meeting and off-line PAM discussion. Implements all resulting changes in a version proposed for the CN plenary.** **All issues raised in the meeting have been solved. Discussion on all of them has been closed, except some editorials, where the agreement is that they can be handled by email.** **The meeting goes through the document and comments on the changes:** ?? **Exception P_PAM_NOT_SUPPORTED deleted from all methods, because it is in the common exceptions. Agreed.** ?? **In IpPAMAvailability, pContext changed to PAMContext. Agreed.** ?? **In IpPAMPresenceAvailabilityManager, TpPAMDataList changed to TpAttributeList. Agreed.** ?? **As suggested by Nokia, interface names in the Event Management SCF have been changed; type of Event ID has been changed; eventNotifyErr has been added.** **Question: asignmentID has usually a meaning in our interfaces, is the one in PAM consistent with it?** **Answer: yes.** **Question: we use the name Err usually for asynchronous methods, and this does not seem consistent with it.** **Answer: this is now in line with the Terminal Capabilities SCF, after the changes introduced in Hong Kong. To be considered later if we want to change both.** **Question: use of TpAssignmentID in the register and register in the Event Handler interface.** **Answer:** ?? **IpPAMEventHandler** **Remark: registration to events is different from other APIs.** **Answer: the idea in PAM is that an application first registers and next is able to register for events. Do we want to align this? Further observation that assignmentID might not be consistent with other APIs. Conclusion is that the datatype for the clientID parameter should be changed from TpAssignmentID. Contribution needed.** ?? **Interface names have beed redefined as**	

8.3	**WSDL/SOAP/XML APIs**					
		256	**Inclusion of WSDL in the OSA Overview 29.198-1**	**David Tweedie (Nortel Networks)**	**Changes needed in the overview part to include the WSDL over SOAP / HTTP. Contents were already agreed in Hong Kong meeting.** **The WSDL will be informative.** **Reference to JAIN should be updated, this is probably included in 259.** **The WSDL has been tested both against correct XML and also against correct WSDL.** **Approved.**	
		257	**WSDL AnnexB**	**David Tweedie (Nortel Networks)**	**Captures the needed changes to other parts, i.e. a reference to the WSDL file that will be included with the specs.** **Approved.**	

		259	Support for Java API Technology Realisation in Part 1 of OSA	Sun (Gary Bruce)	Due to a number of issues (e.g. Java APIs can only be published in the jcp.org web site.), the proposal is to include a reference in our specifications to the JAIN work. This contribution captures the needed changes in order to include references to the JAIN APIs. Question: why still these copyright issues when there is a rulebook? Answer: the rulebook is not yet 100% error free, it needs more experience. This might take some 6 months still. Furthermore, the rulebook is not within the scope of the Parlay-ETSI agreement. However, in principle we can refer to anything that is publicly available. However, still there is a concern that we don't have any control over the Java version of the APIs as they are owned by SUN. We should avoid confusion among the developer community and make sure that the Java APIs are in line with the specs. In SA5 a similar thing exists with IRPs, that also have different technology realisations. These are treated as separate items. Maybe we can only include the Annex when there is a real Java version out. A table showing how different versions relate to each other will be put on JSR web page, however, it was noted that the table needs more details, not only show the major releases. How to understand the last paragraph about the licensing and IPRs. IPRs should not be a big issue as the rulebook is there. The question remains of what really is implied with this paragraph. What is meant with a local realisation? The version here is a pure Java API, for RMI additional work is needed. In chapter 5, should the sentence "The interfaces are specified in IDL and Java" be changed ? Java will be removed and a new sentence will be added: "Reference is made to the Java specification of the	

		297			Update of 259. Approved. Need a CR, for email approval (as a Budapest contribution, but to be agreed before).	
		260	Support for Java API Technology Realisation in All Parts (except Part 1)	Sun (Gary Bruce)	Agreed to change the last paragraph with text to mention that there will be a table in the JSR page on how to relate to the correct version of the API. Updated to 298	
		298			Update of 260. Approved. Need a CR, for email approval (as a Budapest contribution, but to be agreed before).	
8.4	Policy Management					
		221	Draft ETSI ES 201 915-13 V0.0.2 (2002-02)	ETSI	Not by ETSI but by Lucent. Output from Hong Kong meeting. Noted.	
		222	Notes on Policy Management specification v0.0.2	Lucent (Musa Unmehopa)	Minor additional modifications to agreements in Hong Kong. However, these modifications are in line with the agreements made in Hong Kong. Not clear when Policy Spec will be published. Also it was outspoken in the Parlay TAC / BoD meeting that there will be no additional work in the Parlay 4.0 timeframe coming from the Policy group. At the moment there will still be separate Parlay 3.1 and ETSI/3GPP specs. Approved.	
		248	Policy Management Updates, resolving discrepancies between Parlay and OSA	Lucent (Musa Unmehopa)	Peter Heitman has implemented Hong Kong Changes based on Parlay spec and Musa has done it based on the UML model. Some discrepancies between this and the UML generated version still existed. Approved.	
		251	Data types TpStringList and TpStringSet are not defined in common data	Lucent (Musa Unmehopa)	Add missing data types to common data. Approved.	

		252	**Data type TpStringList to be removed from Connectivity Management**	**Lucent (Musa Unmehopa)**	**Remove data types from Connectivity Management now moved to common data.** **Approved.**	
		253	**Draft ES 201 915-13 v.0.0.3 (UML Derived Policy Doc.)**	**Lucent (Musa Unmehopa)**	**This document is produced by Ultan, based on UML and implements 221 and 222 that have been approved over the e-mail.** **Noted.**	
		264	**Policy Management, attribute is a reserved name in IDL**	**Lucent (Musa Unmehopa)**	**As attribute is reserved tag in IDL, this document proposes to change parameters that are named 'attribute' to 'targetAttribute'** **Approved.**	
		266	**Using TpAttributeSet rather than TpAttributeList in Policy Management**	**Lucent (Musa Unmehopa)**	**Approved.**	

		279	Follow up on Policy management API Questions	Ericsson (Koen Schilders)	Not clear what document this contribution addresses. It seems to target the draft after Hong Kong. Peter Heitman has drafted responses. They are in contribution 299. They're taken into account in the following discussion: Issue 2.1: Additional diagrams are available from the infomation model. Musa will ask Peter for these diagrams. Issue 2.2: Peter quotes a paragraph that clarifies this. Koen will consider off-line if this is enough clarification. Back to this issue before the end of the meeting. Issue 2.3: The answer is no, there is no sharing of Role and Ownership between parent and child. Issue closed. Issue 2.4: is there a suggestion on how to incorporate attributes / properties in our current specs? There is an explanation at the beginning of section 8.15 (interface IpPolicy). The document will be re-organised so that the specification of this interface is at the beginning. Issue closed. Issue 2.5: closed. Issue 2.6: this is already updated. Issue closed. Issue 2.7: closed. Issue 2.8: what is meant by "dynamically updated"? It would be good if an additional remark could be placed that the createVariableSet is there to support proprietary implementation variables. Peter has a suggested replacement for this paragraph. Koen to check it and come back with a conclusion before the end of the meeting. Issue 2.9: Peter has a suggested replacement for this paragraph. Koen to check it and come back with a conclusion before the end of the meeting.	

		299	Response to 279	Musa / Peter Heitmann	See discussion of 299.	
					Conclusion on Policy Management: all of Musa's contributions have been approved. Not all of them are implemented in the UML model at the moment. Koen to come back with last checks before the meeting is over. A draft will be ready to be sent to the CN plenary, based on the model, prepared by Ultan, at the end of this week. Conclusion at the end of the week: Koen agrees with Peter's responses. Therefore agreements from the meeting will be updated in 253 (ETSI document), the 3GPP version will be created, and we'll send it by email as version 1 to the CN plenary. Objective is to do it by Friday next week, otherwise the following week the latest.	
8.5	Call Control					
8.5.1	3GPP IMS related Call Control					
		246	Rel-5 (OSA2) CR 29.998-04-04 Various Changes	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)	Update of the existing mapping work with the most recent insights from IETF, CN1 and CN4. Should we reference IETF drafts in 2 References (RFC 3261) as they have limited life-time.?When the mapping will be released we should check that the draft is still valid. Table 4-2: It is pointed out that the SIP Call-ID could be mapped to both the OSA CallID and the CallSessionID. Discussion will be continued on the mailing list. Table 6-17: P_USER_NOT_AVAILBLE should be P_USER_NOT_AVAILABLE. This will be incorporated by the editor (Musa). Agreed.	

		247	Proposal for New Value in TpReleaseCause, P_UNSUPPORTED_MEDIA	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)	Proposal to add mapping for “Unsupported Media Type” in the release cause. Description of the new release cause seems to indicate that there was a problem with the format of the requested media. It needs to be updated to reflect also the fact that the media was not supported. Updated to 302	
		302			Not available in the meeting.	
		271	More Rel-5 (OSA2) CR 29.998-04-04 Various Changes	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)	More proposed modifications to the mapping to ISC. Approved.	
		274	The use of tel URL in TpAddressPlan	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)	Contribution points out there are ambiguities when it comes to the mapping of address_plan. The preferred solution is to extend the scope of P_ADDRESS_PLAN_URL and P_ADDRESS_PLAN_SIP. The mapping document should also take into account the address plan URL once the description of the address plan in the common data is updated. It was outlined that the ? mark between the SIP: and the address is not allowed. Maybe this could be taken into account when the CR is made. If not a separate contribution is needed. Agreement on the preferred solution, CR will be made to part 2, 303.	
		303	CR		Update of 274. Comment: it is not clear from the table if there are multiple examples. Answer: quotation marks can be edited in, no need for a new CR version. Approved.	

		280	Adoption of Multi-media and conference call control APIs	Ericsson	Question on which version from the ETSI document this is copied from. We should make sure that we use the most recent version. Concern that Multi-media API might not be mature enough for 3GPP. However, it is in our requirements and in 3GPP we have a mechanism of handling necessary updates. Furthermore, all new APIs are not mature as much as the APIs we have been working on before. Putting it in the 3GPP specs also gives the benefit that we get more feedback. A specific case where some work might be needed is how to address the case when new media streams are involved in the session. (In SIP With Re-invite or Update new media can be added.) However, this is applicable to Multi-party and multi-media API and could be addressed in a separate thread. . It is pointed out that maybe we should start with the Multi-media API and leave the Conference API out of scope for the moment. People are invited to come with potential issues in time before the next meeting so that they can also be addressed by means of contributions to next meeting.	
8.5.2	Other Call Control issues					
		142	ETS-disabling 3GPP Release 5	TelCordia (John-Luc Bakker)	Some confusion on whether the intention is that the property value setting should be a SHALL or a COULD as the description talks about CAN. Most likely SHALL is meat. Contribution is targeted to Rel.5. The meeting is not 100 % sure of whether there is support for this in the Rel. 5 network (maybe in IMS). Question to John-Luc to come with a validation on this and address it in next meeting.	

		309			**Update of 142** **CAN changed into COULD.** **Network support: the Internet Drafts referenced, which will be used in Rel5, ensure that no matter whether or not there are SA1 requirements for, ETS, it will be supported by the Rel5 network.** **Comment: but we don't know if these IDs will become drafts, and whether they will be referenced by 3GPP Rel5. This should be checked further.** **The way we use the service properties in this section is to show the network restrictions – thus the property has a definite value. What this contribution is proposing does not give any information, because it depends on what is implemented, so the statement is not needed.** **Not approved.**	

		226	**Support for Network Controlled Notifications MPCC**	**Ericsson (Koen Schilders)**	**Question on terminology of Home-Environment: this might not be so well-known in Parlay /ETSI. Maybe "network" is a better term.** **How to handle applications that are using both mechanisms, e.g. when there are potential overlapping criteria set within the network or set by the application? Also cater the case where there are multiple applications. Or the case that the enableNotifications is used with a NULL value for the manager and there has been a createNotification: what happens with the callback? All of this should be clarified in the specification.** **Is there a significance in the assignmentID? This might not be needed. Furthermore, it should be a return value, not an out parameter.** **Method names might lead to confusion, suggestion to rename them to "enablePreSetNotifications".** **Suggestion to consider a separate interface or manager for this new methods.** **Update will be provided in 306.**	
		306			**Update of 226.** **Sequence diagram not included yet, will be done for next meeting.** **Will be sent for email discussion, with the objective to be approved next meeting.**	

		230	**Support for Distributed Applications MPCC**	**Ericsson (Koen Schilders)**	**When an application is going to receive lots of notifications, it is good to distribute them among different application instancees that could be deployed in different servers. At the moment the only way is call createNot with different callback interfaces, which is not very flexible – notifications are always and only sent to the application instance that requested them. Besides it is very complicated for the Home Environment who, for Parlay V4/OSA R5, can also request notifications.** **The contribution proposes to extend the existing mechanism so that more than two callbacks can be used, and that a service property is used to influence the behaviour of the additional provided callbacks. The solution proposed is backwards compatible.** **Comment: setCallback would be allowed to be called multiple times, but this would imply more than notifications, and there is no reason to allow them to be called allowing this distribution.** **Answer: agreed, this will be changed.** **Discussion: this kind of distribution load balancing should not be done at API level, but rather at application level. Also, the same applies for other mechanisms with callback, not only event notifications on the managers – we would need to extend the mechanism too far. In CORBA it's possible to have multiple objects sitting behind an application. We don't want to burden to application providers with load balancing management.** **Suggestion: a possible alternative would be to do like in the JAIN community, who is developing JAIN SLEE – a set of APIs sitting on top of an enterprise JBC, which deals with all this non functional aspects of the system. It has been released for public review, and so it is publicly available on the Java community process site.** **Not approved.**	

		278	**Make the conference address available for non-reserved conference**	**Ericsson (Kindy Sylla)**	**Approved.**	
		301			**Update of 961 from Brighton. Presented for initial feedback.** **For getNotification, applications get all the notifications from the SCSs, which might be a lot of data, taking long to process and send it back. In Brighton it was proposed to use segmented IIOP, but now we'll have WSDL and RMI as well, so the question is whether we want to rely on the middleware for this. Four solutions are proposed in the contribution.** **Changes with respect to 961: mostly deprecation of getNotification for backwards compatibility. It is not that it is changed, but rather that the contribution is brought back for consideration, due to the conclusions from the discussion on 258.** **Comment: an out parameter is used. This needs to be changed.** **Discussion: for situations where there is a middleware problem, is it really necessary to deprecate the method? The following arguments were on the table:** ?? **It is because otherwise we could not have applications working on multiple types of middleware, or multi-vendor gateways.** ?? **It would be good to keep the method for good ORBs and for local APIs like JAIN SPA, where this problem does not exist.** ?? **But if we keep the existing method, then the application needs to know which one to invoke.** **Discussion is closed for the moment. We'll come back to this issue in Budapest.**	
8.6	**Framework**					

		289		**Telenor (Tonnes Brekne)**	**Feedback from Telenor on Framework security. Dependability was also analysed. This is a first assessment, further ones may come in the future. Done last year in October, some might be outdated.** **What was evaluated: the authentication protocol. The following was found out.** ?? **There is the choice of API level authentication or not. Threat: the underlying mechanisms may not be secure enough.** ?? **Non-existing encryption key management. No format for the public key, and this could endanger interoperability. Bad key management may even affect more than the Framework.** ?? **The authenticationSucceeded() message has no function.** **Comment: slide 14 seems to be based on an outdated version: there are not four but three steps, there is no return of success or failure.** ?? **The protocol does not authenticate B, it merely confirms that B does indeed share a certain secret with A.** ?? **The security of the framework APIs appears to depend heavily on the difficulty of guessing object identifiers.** ?? **Some implicit assumptions that should have been explicit have been identified.** ?? **UML is insufficient for modelling systems of concurrent processes with real-time constraints. Some times this is helped with amendments in the text, but not always. Therefore the protocol is not fully defined, and sometimes it is unclear.** ?? **Conclusions: security is non-existing. Recommendation to complement UML with something else like SDL, for specifying correct behaviour in a strict way.** **Comment: we used to have some SDL work but it was stopped because of lack of contributions.** **Question: does this study imply that OSA should only be used in an intranet?** **A: the scenario considered was that of applications provided by parties that are not necessarily the operator. Even using an intranet external attacks cannot be rules out.**	

		220	**Administration and Maintenance Interfaces**	**ftw (Joachim Zeiss)**	**Re-work of contribution 76, presented to the HK meeting, where the conclusion was that further architectural work was required on this issue, as well as SA5 involvement.** **An email discussion has taken place this week between Joachim and Garreth, and they have decided not to submit their results to this meeting, because they will not be here, but to next meeting.** **The authors are not in the meeting, but the meeting looked at the contribution and compared it with the one presented in HK and concluded that the architectural/high level issues have not been addressed. Even if this has been a Parlay requirement for a long time, it is not clear to the meeting why it is necessary.** **The meeting would like to feed back to the authors that there is a need to provide a rational behind the proposed functionality.** **Not approved.**	
		255	**Comments to N5-020220 Administration and Maintenance Interfaces.**	**Lucent & Open API Solutions**	**Withdrawn (same reasons as 220).**	

		223	**Interface Changes for Keeping Subscription Information Consistent**	**FTW (Ivan Gojmerac, Klaus Umschaden)**	**Re-work of contribution 78, presented to the HK meeting, where the conclusion was that an update would be done indicating the necessary changes in the specification will be outlined.** **Comments:** ?? **Section 12 (Framework exception) has not been updated.** ?? **Neither has the data type section.** ?? **We usually don't put the word "exception" in the name of the exception.** ?? **We don't have other exceptions that include other than TpString.** **Apart from this, the meeting agrees that this is a problem, and also agrees with the proposed solution. A new contribution is necessary just to correct the comments above.** **Andy will set up a dialogue with FTW in order to prepare the new contribution.**	

		285	**Encryption of challenge in CHAP-based OSA authentication**	**Alcatel (Olivier Paridaens)**	**This contribution discusses two issues related to a specific functionality in TS 29.198-3 v4.2.0 which makes the challenge used for CHAP-based authentication to be encrypted when passed from the verifier to the claimant. This is based on a contribution originally discussed at the last SA3 meeting and is expected to reflect these discussions.** **Issue #1: the need for encrypting the challenge. Is there any real security gain in encrypting the challenge string itself? This requires extra management (shared secret key for encryption/decryption between the client and the framework) and processing, while no identified security weakness is solved by this extra encryption process.** **We believe that there is no need to have this challenge encryption phase, which should be removed from the authentication procedure. This view was shared by SA3 delegates during the joint SA3-CN5 meeting held in Bristol on Feb 25th.** **Issue #2: no formatting defined for challenge encryption - the specification lacks details, which makes it unimplementable as is.** **Comment: there is a mistake in the CR: it should be for Rel5, not Rel4.** **Discussion: what about backwards compatibility? Depends on the outcome of the general discussion later. An alternative would be to add text.** **Request to postpone the approval of this contribution for next meeting. Musa and Chelo to propose a way forward for this.**	

		284	**Use of one-way hash function for CHAP in OSA**	**Alcatel (Olivier Paridaens)**	**This contribution identifies an issue in TS 29.198-3 v4.4.0 with regards to the one-way hash function (MD5) to be used to realise CHAP-based authentication. This is based on an initial contribution discussed at the last SA3 meeting and is expected to reflect these discussions.** **Issue #1: use of RFC 1994 packet formats. Because of the lack of detailed reference to RFC 1994 in TS 29.198-3, it is not clear whether CHAP-based OSA authentication must format the challenge and response in packets as described in RFC 1994 or must merely follow the rule given for MD5 processing.** **Proposed solution: it is suggested that the use of the packet format defined in RFC 1994 be clarified. In particular, the value to be used for the Name field of the Challenge and Response packets must be clarified.** **Issue #2: weak use of one-way hash function. The mechanism described in RFC 1994, and hence inherited in OSA authentication, for calculating the input into the one-way hash function MD5 has since then (1996) been shown to present some weaknesses with respect to the level of security. New constructions for one-way hash functions, such as HMAC, have since then been developed to cope with such issues.** **Proposed solution: two new challenge-based authentication mechanisms are proposed: HMAC_MD5_96 and HMAC_SHA1_96.** **Question: if the hashing algorithms aren't secure enough maybe encryption of the CHAP message is justified?** **Answer: not a good idea since this would require further management.** **The CR cannot be approved as it is. The author will be contacted.**	

		282	**Authentication Scheme Negotiation in OSA**	**Alcatel (Olivier Paridaens)**	**This contribution discusses the mechanism defined in TS 29.198-3 v4.4.0 to negotiate the authentication scheme used between the client application and the framework/services. A new mechanism is proposed in this contribution to really implement negotiation of authentication mechanisms between the client and the framework/service.** **Two possible solutions are proposed, and a CR is contributed which implements the second:** ?? **Solution 1: The P_OSA_AUTHENTICATION method is extended to apply to any authentication method defined in OSA, not only CHAP_with_MD5. A new method, selectAuthenticationMethod(), is defined that enables to negotiate which mechanism to use (. This new method is then used after initiateAuthentication(). With this solution, the selectAuthenticationMethod() function can also be used to negotiate, as a second parameter, the signing algorithm for the terminateAccess().** ?? **The authType parameter of the initiateAuthentication() method is modified to carry a list of proposed authentication schemes. The return result must then also contain the scheme chosen by the framework. New authentication types are then defined in table TpAuthType to cover other authentication schemes such as digital signature-based schemes, use of HMAC with MD5 or SHA1 in CHAP, … With this solution, the signing algorithm for the terminateAccess() function cannot be negotiated except if the authentication scheme negotiated is always a digital signature scheme, which would then also apply to the terminateAccess() function. To be able to negotiate the signing algorithm for terminateAccess() separately, the authType parameter must be made compound to contain two lists of proposals: one for initial authentication and one for the signing algorithm of the terminateAccess() function.** **Comment: solution 1 seems to be better from the point of view of backwards compatibility, using deprecation. We could define whole new interfaces solving all these problems** **Comment: the selectAuthenticationMethod() shouldn't**	

		283	Security of terminateAccess() function in OSA	Alcatel (Olivier Paridaens)	Issue#1: no indication of public key/certificate to be used by verifier. A solution could be adding a new parameter to the terminateAccess function, carrying the public key identifier or its certificate. Another solution is to have the digitalSignature field itself carrying the certificate. This can be achieved by using an appropriate digital signature format such as the one defined in Cryptographic Message Syntax (RFC 2630). Issue#2: no anti-replay protection. Proposed solution: a fresh value must be generated by the framework for use as input into the signing algorithm. Issue#3: no negotiation of signature algorithm. Proposed solution: in a separate contribution. Issue#4: specification of signature algorithm. Proposed solution: the list of algorithms must be more precisely defined and can also be extended to other signing algorithms. Comment: syntactically this solution is backwards compatible, but not semantically. A solution to this could be to define a new method and deprecate terminateAccess(). The meeting agrees with the issues identified in the contribution. For the solution, further study is necessary.	
8.7	Other APIs					
8.7.1	Content Based Charging					

		239	**CR: Service Properties CBC**	**Ericsson (Koen Schilders), Siemens (Karsten Luettge)**	**This is the CR format for a contribution agreed in HK. It proposes service properties for the CBC SCF. It includes P_SPLIT_CHARGING, which comes from a different contribution, also agreed, for which a CR had not been done yet: they have been merged.** **Comment: "LIFETIME" in the properties refers to the reservation, and not to the session itself (there is a pending discussion on lifetime handling, that hasn't taken place). This will be clarified in the contribution.** **How to proceed with CBC? We had planned to have in June a single CR with all the changes for Rel5, so how does this relate to this CR? To be discussed off-line by Karsten, Koen, Ard-Jan and Ultan.** **Agreed with the editorial clarification above, to be updated to 300.**	
		300			**Update of 239.** **Approved.**	

		258	Service Property P_MAX_ADDRESSES_PER_QUERY for Account Management	David Tweedie (Nortel Networks)	Proposes a replacement to P_BULK_QUERIES_ALLOWED because there is currently no way to limit the number of addresses which the application can query in one request. Therefore if the request contains a very large number of addresses (i.e. 10,000+), then the corresponding response method would contain a large amount of data (representing the balances of all the addresses) which could adversely impact the performance of the OSA Gateway. Proposal: new service property named P_MAX_ADDRESS_PER_QUERY of type INTEGER_SET, which would indicate the maximum number of addresses which are allowed per queryBalanceRes(). If the value is set to 1, then no bulk queries are allowed. If the value is set greater than 1, then bulk queries are allowed, but the number of addresses are limited by the value. Comment: a similar contribution for CC was discussed in Brighton (961), and the conclusion was that this is a problem that the middleware can solve. This contribution proposed several solutions. This issue needs re-visiting, a contribution for CC will be brought again later in the meeting (301). Comment: in the User Location SCF it is possible to ask for a number of addresses, so it may be useful to have a property like this here too. Comment: in the P_HISTORY_ALLOWED service property there is an indication of a lower start time and an upper stop time. It is suggested that the upper one could be left open. Proposed to modify the text to take this into account. Koen will discuss this with Karsten and may bring a contribution to next meeting. Approved.	
8.7.2	Terminal Capabilities					

		254	Draft ES 201 915-7 v.2.0.1	Ultan Mulligan (ETSI PTCC)	Reflects the implementation of the latest agreements on the Terminal Capabilities SCF. This has been presented already to the CN plenary in March, actually it is at the moment our only Rel5 material. Question on Annex C (Differences between this draft and 3GPP 29.198 R99) and on annex E (Summary of differences between v1.2.1 (Parlay 3.1) and v2.1.1 (Parlay 4.0)). This information is redundant because it is already in the CR control, although it cannot be obtained so easily. Agreed to remove Annex C, and keep Annex B, which contains all the necessary information. This will be done for the next release.	
8.7.3	Journalling					
8.7.4	Information Transfer (Rel. 6)					
8.7.5	Information Services (Rel. 6)					
8.7.6	Others					
		227	Support for Network Controlled Notifications UI	Ericsson (Koen Schilders)	No need to discuss this, since it was already discussed in CC. Not agreed.	
		228	Support for Network Controlled Notifications DSC	Ericsson (Koen Schilders)	No need to discuss this, since it was already discussed in CC. Not agreed.	
		229	Support for Network Controlled Notifications AM	Ericsson (Koen Schilders)	No need to discuss this, since it was already discussed in CC. Not agreed.	
		231	Support for Distributed Applications UI	Ericsson (Koen Schilders)	No need to discuss this, since it was already discussed in CC. Not agreed.	

		232	Support for Distributed Applications DSC	Ericsson (Koen Schilders)	No need to discuss this, since it was already discussed in CC. Not agreed.	
		233	Support for Distributed Applications AM	Ericsson (Koen Schilders)	No need to discuss this, since it was already discussed in CC. Not agreed.	
		234	Semantics of BOOLEAN_SET Properties	Ericsson (Koen Schilders)	Question: the contribution proposes as well that during discovery an application shall not specify the properties it is not interested in. Then what happens if the application includes them anyway? Answer: then there would be an exception of invalid property. Problem: we'd need a new exception (we have no exception regarding a property value), and this would mean changing the method signature, which is not backwards compatible. Agreed solution: looking for a BC solution that makes things easiest for application developers, we'll allow applications to include these values or not; it they do, the values will be discarded by the Framework. This can be achieved by re-phrasing the sentence in desiredPropertyList. Comment: for service properties of type BOOLEAN_SET, the contribution forces applications to specify true or false. Answer: this should not be restricted to BOOLEAN_SET, but in general we should say that for the desired property list, any value that is empty, or containing an illegal value, will be discarded. This contribution will be revised into 307.	

		307			**Revision of 234.** **Comment: The text "The desiredPropertyList only contains service properties that are relevant for the application. If, for instance, an application does not care whether a BOOLEAN_SET type service property is TRUE or FALSE, this service property should not be included in the desiredPropertyList. P_INVALID_PROPERTY is raised when an application includes an unknown service property name or invalid service property value." is a recommendation, and it needs an update to be clearer.** **The contribution will be revised, and sent for email discussion, with the objective to close the subject next meeting.**	
		235	**Addition to TpAddressPlan**	**Ericsson (Koen Schilders)**	**For E164 address plans the numbers should always have an international prefix, and this could cause problems for service numbers, which usually don't have prefixes in the network, so the SCS has to do a mapping. The contribution proposes to include a new type of address plan.** **Comment: this is typical in networks, and what happens is that number type and digits go together: for national numbers there are national types and then a string; for international numbers the digits part includes the country prefix, and this is easy for the SCS to map. We always use international format. If we want to specify a special format, then it would be better to specify a type for, for example, national numbers with a prefix (like the 800 numbers).** **Contribution to be updated in a more generic way, supporting a national numbering scheme.** **To be updated into 308.**	
		308			**Revision of 235.** **To be discussed off-line with Matti and sent it for email discussion.**	

		241	Exception Hierarchy Proposal	Sun (Gary Bruce)	Proposal: It was discussed in Hong Kong to possibly introduce an exception hierarchy. A very common problem when implementing the Parlay specifications is that it is often discovered that methods do not always support the full set of exceptions required for an implementation, i.e. it is realised later that there are missing exceptions in Parlay method signatures. Currently, Parlay supports exceptions by explicitly naming the detailed exceptions in the method signatures. This makes introducing new exceptions very difficult, as newly introduced exceptions have to be added to method signatures, which clearly causes backwards compatibility concerns. By introducing an exception hierarchy the introduction of new exceptions can be made more easily, and interoperability is greatly increased. The exception hierarchy works on the principle that rather than methods throwing multiple (up to eight in places) detailed exceptions, methods throw fewer (three to four is recommended) abstracted exceptions. Thus, if it is later decided that a method can throw an additional detailed exception then, so long as the method already throws an exception that is an abstraction of the additional detailed exception, there is no need to alter the method's signature. All that has to be done is to add the additional detailed exception to the exception hierarchy. The server is then free to throw this detailed exception. The client will catch the abstracted exception and have a mechanism to deal with it, plus, the client "may" have mechanisms for dealing with a number of detailed exceptions. So, raising new detailed exceptions will not cause any backwards compatibility concerns for older clients, they will simply just deal with the abstracted exceptions and with the detailed exceptions that they know about. In addition to providing a better way to introduce “missing exceptions” without compromising backwards compatibility, the introduction of an exception hierarchy provides more elegant API method signatures and a more natural way for programmers to deal with exceptions. Over burdening method signatures with more than 4 exceptions is considered bad practice as it forces the developer to write code to handle all the exceptions, which can lead to messy	

		261	**Proposed update to the General Properties**	**Lucent Technologies (Andy Bennett)**	**According to this contribution, two of the General Service Properties listed and described in section 10.2 of Draft ETSI ES 201 915-3 V0.0.9 are incorrect:** ?? **Service Instance ID: clearly the value of this property cannot be known by the Service Supplier when registering the Service/SCS as it is generated after registration when a Client Application signs a Service Agreement. It is proposed that this property is renamed Service ID and the text updated slightly.** ?? **Service Instance Description: this property is intended to provide a textural description of the Service, not the Service Instance. For that reason it is suggested that the property be renamed.** **Comment: what about backwards compatibility? Can we change names of properties, or should we add new ones instead?** **Answer: this is a category of BC we haven't discussed so far: service properties don't appear in the IDL, but services that have been registered with these properties in existing implementations will not work if the property names change. A possible solution would be to make the changes as clarification in the text, and keep the property names as they are. This is a good case for this kind of solution because there is no way it could have been interpreted in another way – the service instance ID is not know at registration.** **Comment: this is the only place where the service instance ID is interchanged.** **Answer: the service instance ID is for the Framework and SCS; the application does not need it at all.** **Comment: but the service ID is already known by the application, so there is no need to pass it.** **Answer: it would just not be used. It will be deleted. This has no BC consequences.** **Andy will re-work this contribution, including a bit more detailed explanation of the sequence of events, to see if this property is needed.**	

		272	Proposal for Removal of Redundant Type Definition	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)	According to this contribution, the IDL for Generic Messaging contains an exception that is not referenced anywhere within the Generic Messaging specification. This exception is P_GMS_INVAID_MESSAGE_FORMAT. Not only is this exception misspelled and not referenced in the specification, but the specification specifically precludes the use of the exception. The text for IpMailBoxFolder.putMessage() states: "The service will not flag any inconsistencies if the formatting of the message is not correct." The proposal is that this exception is removed from the IDL. As no method in Generic Messaging is stated as throwing this exception, there should be no issue with backwards compatibility. Approved.	
		273	Proposal for Removal of Redundant Type Definition	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)	In contribution N5-010382, presented in San Diego last May, Lucent proposed to change the definition of serviceID from a concatenation of Unique Service Number, Service Name and Service Specialisation to just a simple unique identifying number. This proposal was accepted and TpUniqueServiceNumber was removed from the specification. However, TpServiceSpecString remains (as sub-section 11.1.18 of the FW specification). The problem is that TpServiceSpecString is not referenced anywhere else within the specification, and is therefore unused and redundant. The contribution proposes that this type definition be removed. As it is completely unused, this should not cause any issues with backwards compatibility. Approved. Needs CR.	
		286	CR: Addition of TpInt64	ETSI (Ultan Mulligan)	Newly added part 14 of TS 29.198 refers to TpInt64. However this type is not declared anywhere and should be declared in the Common Datatypes, Part 2. The proposal is to add the TpInt64 declaration. Approved.	
9	Joint with SA1 OSA Adhoc					

		S1-020865	OSA relevant results from 3GPP TSG #15.	Siemens (Manfred Leitgeb)	This contribution contains the slides produced at the TSG#15 CN meeting (Korea). Questions in these slides: GNIF: is it for Rel.5? N,o it is potentially for Rel.6. IP session information retrieval: also potentially for Rel.6 Journalling is removed from Rel.5, postponed. User Profile Management: still regarded as low priority by SA1, but not deleted from Rel.5. Information Services: also regarded as low priority, a proposal to delete it in SA1 OSA Adhoc from Rel.5. For retrieval of Network Capabilities a new Rel. 5 CR is available and was presented. The feature is now called retrieval of Visited Network Capabilities. <u>Outstanding issues:</u> Issue 4: confusion about whether 2 work items exist? The note in the Korea slides should be read as OSA WID called “OSA Rel-6” or “OSA Enhancements 2” Currenlty it is called OSA-Rel-6 enhancements, referred to as OSA-3. Issue 3: Charging requirements alignment: can be closed as all the CBC charging requirements coming originally from Parlay have now been fed into SA1 and agreed. Issue 5: Framework security: this is related to the discussions we have with SA3 on the security mechanisms in the Framework. From SA1 point of view at the moment there is no work needed. Maybe in the future when the contribution by Telenor is further progressed. Issue 6: Journalling. As it is removed from Rel.5, no work is done by SA1 on this anymore. When it will be rediscussed our concerns will be taken into account. It is proposed that in our requirement document this item will be moved to an annex.	

10	**Organisational aspects**					
					Discussion: one big or several CRs to the plenary? **Agreement: from now on, one CR per issue, because it is more clear then to defend them in the plenary. For every part that is common for both 3GPP and ETSI we'll use the 3GPP CR format.** **For stuff already approved but not yet in CR form: Ard-Jan and Ultan will look for them and contact the authors, and these documents will be reviewed next meeting (we expect they're not that many because most contributions have been in CR form).** **Documents that are not yet in CR format will not be approved in meetings: their contents will be approved, but the document will not until it is a CR.**	
					Discussion: email approval process. **Adrian will send us the rules next week, and the possibility that they become our rules, or than some changes are necessary, will be considered.** **Suggestion: a chair or an "issue manager" should conduct the process.**	
10.1	**Review of 3GPP OSA Work Plan**					
		213	**Work plan**	**MCC**	**Part has been reviewed in the joint session with SA1. No need for any further update until after Budapest, to see how far we get, and after next SA1 plenary, to see what they remove from Rel5.**	
10.2	**3GPP OSA Work Item Description**					
10.3	further work on 12076					
10.4	further work on 12075					
10.5	other					
11	**Outgoing liaisons**					
12	**ETSI STF 211**					

		224	**First Draft of PICS for OSA**	**ETSI STF 211 (Ultan Mulligan)**	**Proposed format is one big PIC for all SCFs, with a common part in the beginning as most of the information is the same for all SCFs (e.g. vendor information), then an annex for each SCF.** **Note after table in Annex A: an example will be added. This information should actually be in the specification.** **The Framework part is made mandatory: even if the PIC is applicable for one specific SCF, one has to fill in parts of the Framework because the LifeCycleManager is part of FW.** **It's been assumed that every parameter in every method is mandatory (null values are possible but they cannot be ignored).** **Some issues have been identified:** **<u>General issue</u>:** ?? **Not clear what is mandatory and what is not. It has been assumed that all methods in an interface are mandatory, with some exceptions. It is not clear if all interfaces are mandatory, is there a base set that is mandatory?This should be written in the specification.** **<u>Framework issues</u>:** ?? **What parts of the Framework to Service API, if any, are mandatory: for Framework entity, and for SCF (i.e. what should be implemented by the FW and what should be implemented by an SCS) ?** ?? **Roles have been defined: depending on the role (e.g. FW implementation or SCF implementation) there are different parts in the PICs which are mandatory. (we're currently not interested in the Fw interfaces an application has to support)** ?? **Current assumption: if the framework document is filled for a framework implementation: IpInitial and IpAccess are mandatory, and either IpAPILevelAuthentication or IpAuthentication** **Observation: service discovery might not be mandatory, because the service ID can be obtained without it if the Enterprise Operator interfaces are supported. Only the listSubscribedServices method would then be mandatory in the Discovery interface. But then we would also need a method to describe (not**	

		225	OSA ICS Development Status	ETSI STF 211 (Ultan Mulligan)	Covered in the discussion of 224.	
					STF next plans: the PICS document is almost finished though it may change due to our feedback and comments. At the moment the team is looking at test cases in the following order: first TermCaps and DSC, next FW access, FW to application, FW to Service; just those interfaces indicated in the PICs as mandatory. After that Call Control, UI, etc. Test cases are described as textual description of the steps in the test and sequence diagrams to picture it. Most cases are normal behaviour cases, also some break and destroy cases are being designed. Two Parlay companies specialised in testing have been contacted, and they have confirmed can use the outcome of this work. Question: we have 12 WIs for this, will the PICS document be split in 12 parts? Answer: for the moment it will be one document, so the WIs will have to be changed. Otherwise it seems less likely that this will be used, because it would be too unfriendly. Question (see also discussion on 224): we should consider different PICS for different network environments, though probably not for all APIs. Answer: this can be done if network environments, and their different requirements, are identified in the specs. For CC there is a mapping for the service properties values for the CAMEL Service Environment (Rel4, CAMEL Phase 3). This should be made more specific.	
13	Preparation Rel. 5					
14	Future meetings					
		214	Calendar of meetings	MCC	Noted.	
14	AOB					

			Next meetings.		**13-17 May, Budapest, co-located with CNs** **No meeting in between because the plenary is in 5-7 June.** **8-12 July, co-located with Parlay** **Possibility to meet in NA with the CNs, on September 23-27, and further discuss about meeting with 3GPP2 .** **October 28-31, Dublin, co-located with Parlay (Cork jazz festival the weekend before).**	

Annex A: AGENDA

---

1 Opening of the meeting and approval of the agenda (Monday 9:00 AM)

1.1 IPR (Intellectual Property Rights) declarations

The Chairman reminds the "Article 55: Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) Policy" of the 3GPP Working Procedures:

?? Individual Members shall be bound by the IPR Policy of their respective Organizational Partner.
?? 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.
?? Organizational Partners should encourage their respective members to grant licences on fair, reasonable terms and conditions and on a non-discriminatory basis.
?? The PCG shall maintain a register of IPR declarations relevant to 3GPP, received by the Organizational Partners.

The Chairman invites the delegates to declare IPRs - relevant to the 3GPP - they are aware of.
The List of IPR declarations sorted by Organizational Partners can be found at: http://www.3gpp.org/PCG/IPR_declarations.htm

2 Allocation of documents to agenda items : Monday morning

3 Reporting : Monday morning

3.1 CN5 #16 /ETSI OSA project/Parlay meeting, Hong Kong
3.2 CN #15 / SA#15 plenary meetings, Jeju, Korea
3.3 SA3, Bristol, UK.
3.4 Parlay Board and TAC meetings.
3.5 IP CN harmonization workshop
3.6 Report of all other OSA related activities.

Items to be considered here are all other OSA related activities e.g. in SA1, SA2 and ETSI SPAN

4 Input liaison statements : Monday morning

5 Backward compatibility discussions: Monday

At the Hong Kong meeting discussions with the Parlay TAC and BoD took place around Backward Compatibility. During recent Parlay TAC and BoD meetings this topic has been discussed in further detail. The current status and way to go forward has to be discussed and agreed upon now in the JWG.

6 Technical discussions OSA version 1 / 3GPP Rel.4

Only essential error corrections can be taken into account. Essential means that without the intended error correction the current spec can not be implemented (SCS and/or application side).
Note that as Parlay 3.1 has been finalised, and backward compatibility has to be guaranteed, the assumption is that for error corrections in the scope of Parlay 3 / 3GPP Rel.4 only work arounds and documentation of the errors is allowed. However, this has to be considered on case by case base and is depending on the outcome of 5 Backward compatibility discussions: Monday.

7 3GPP2 alignment : Tuesday morning

A number of delegates from 3GPP2 will attend the meeting. Idea is to present the 3GPP2 architecture and discuss possibilities for adoption of OSA/Parlay by 3GPP2 and future co-orporation.

8 Technical discussions OSA version 2 / 3GPP Rel.5

8.1 Requirements

8.1.1 Input from SA1: OSA and VHE requirements

8.1.2 ETSI SPAR

8.2 Presence and Availability Management

8.3 WSDL / SOAP / XML APIs

8.4 Policy Management

8.5 Call Control

8.5.1 3GPP IMS related Call control

8.5.2 Other Call control issues (e.g. potential input from ETS group)

8.6 Framework (Framework security)

8.7 Other APIs

8.7.1 Content Based Charging

8.7.2 Terminal Capabilities

8.7.3 Journalling (scheduled for Rel.6 now)

8.7.4 Information Transfer (scheduled for Rel.6 now)

8.7.5 Information Services (scheduled for Rel.6 now)

8.7.6 Others

9 Joint meeting with SA1 OSA Adhoc : Thursday afternoon

10 Organisational aspects with relation to Joint activities: Thursday afternoon

10.1 Review of 3GPP OSA workplan
10.2 3GPP OSA Work Item Description (review Rel-5, prepare for Rel-6).
10.3 Organization of further work on ETSI ES 201 915 (Version 2)
10.4 Organization of further work on ETSI TR 101 917

11 Outgoing Liaisons: Thursday afternoon

12 Meeting with ETSI Compliance and Testing STF 211 : Friday morning

Presentation of and discussion on current status of the work by the ETSI STF 211 on OSA Conformance Test Specs.

13 Preparation for 3GPP Rel. 5 : Friday morning

Here we will check whether the PAM, Policy Management and ISC mapping v1.0.0 drafts can be released and sent immediately after the meeting to CN **for Information**. So that v2.0.0 could be submitted to CN#16 in 06/2002 **for Approval.**

14 Future meetings : Friday afternoon

15 AOB : Friday afternoon

16 Close : Friday afternoon (14:00)

Annex B: List of Documents

Filename	Title	Source
N5-020170.zip	Draft Agenda	JWG Chair
N5-020171.zip	Revised Draft Agenda	JWG Chair
N5-020172.zip	Document Allocation	JWG Chair
N5-020173.zip	Revised Document Allocation	JWG Chair
N5-020174.zip	report_Monday	JWG Chair
N5-020175.zip	report_Tuesday	JWG Chair
N5-020176.zip	report_Wednesday	JWG Chair
N5-020177.zip	report_Thursday	JWG Chair
N5-020178.zip	report_Friday (Preliminary Draft Report of CN5#17)	JWG Chair
N5-020179.zip	Draft Report of CN5#17	JWG
N5-020180.zip	Report of CN5#17	JWG
N5-020181.zip	Logbook of potential errors in 29.198-1, ES 210 915-1	Rapporteur
N5-020182.zip	Logbook of potential errors in 29.198-2, ES 210 915-2	Rapporteur
N5-020183.zip	Logbook of potential errors in 29.198-3, ES 210 915-3	Rapporteur
N5-020184.zip	Logbook of potential errors in 29.198-4, ES 210 915-4	Rapporteur
N5-020185.zip	Logbook of potential errors in 29.198-5, ES 210 915-5	Rapporteur
N5-020186.zip	Logbook of potential errors in 29.198-6, ES 210 915-6	Rapporteur
N5-020187.zip	Logbook of potential errors in 29.198-7, ES 210 915-7	Rapporteur
N5-020188.zip	Logbook of potential errors in 29.198-8, ES 210 915-8	Rapporteur
N5-020189.zip	Logbook of potential errors in ES 210 915-9	Rapporteur
N5-020190.zip	Logbook of potential errors in ES 210 915-10	Rapporteur
N5-020191.zip	Logbook of potential errors in 29.198-11, ES 210 915-11	Rapporteur
N5-020192.zip	Logbook of potential errors in 29.198-12, ES 210 915-12	Rapporteur
N5-020193.zip	Logbook of potential errors in 29.198-13, ES 210 915-13	Rapporteur
N5-020194.zip	Logbook of potential errors in 29.198-14, ES 210 915-14	Rapporteur
N5-020195.zip	Logbook of potential errors in 29.998-1, TR 101 917-1	Rapporteur
N5-020196.zip	Logbook of potential errors in 29.998-4-1, TR 101 917-4-1	Rapporteur
N5-020197.zip	Logbook of potential errors in 29.998-4-4, TR 101 917-4-4	Rapporteur
N5-020198.zip	Logbook of potential errors in 29.998-5-1, TR 101 917-5-1	Rapporteur

N5-020199.zip	Logbook of potential errors in 29.998-5-4, TR 101 917-5-4	Rapporteur
N5-020200.zip	Logbook of potential errors in 29.998-6, TR 101 917-6	Rapporteur
N5-020201.zip	Logbook of potential errors in 29.998-8, TR 101 917-8	Rapporteur
N5-020202.zip	LS copy from S1 to N5 : LS reply to: 'Liaison Statement on Confirmation of OSA Support for VASP MMS Connectivity'	S1-020470
N5-020203.zip	LS from T2 to N5 : Liaison Statement on coordination of data definitions, identified in GUP development	T2-020254
N5-020204.zip	LS copy from S2 to N5 : Liaison Statement Reply to 'Status of the Generic User Profile Work'	S2-020886
N5-020205.zip	LS copy from S2 to N5 : Liaison Statement Reply to 'Comments on UP-010141 and relationship of GUP to Subscription Management'	S2-020887
N5-020206.zip	LS from S2 to N5 : Response to LS 'Clarification of requirements for the VHE'	S2-020888
N5-020207.zip	Output Draft of the Reference Document on API/Object Interface between Network Control and Application Layer	ITU-T SG11 TD1-011
N5-020208.zip	3GPP TSG CN report to SA#15	MCC
N5-020209.zip	Draft report of 3GPP TSG SA meeting #15	MCC
N5-020210.zip	Summary of TSG#15 issues of CN5 interest	MCC
N5-020211.zip	CN5 spec list (status after TSG#15)	MCC
N5-020212.zip	Make calls for IPRs	MCC
N5-020213.zip	OSA-related Work_Plan_3GPP_020325	MCC
N5-020214.zip	3GPP&ETSI Calendar of Meetings	MCC
N5-020215.zip	Reply LS copy: CN5 on 'VASP MMS Connectivity' from T2 (T2-020038)	S5-022007
N5-020216.zip	LS to: CN5 on co-ordination of data definitions, identified in GUP development	S5-022017
N5-020217.zip	Reply LS to: CN5 on 'VASP MMS Connectivity' from T2 (T2-020038)	S5-024035
N5-020218.zip	reserved incoming LS	MCC
N5-020219.zip	reserved incoming LS	MCC
N5-020220.zip	Administration and Maintenance Interfaces (reworked N5-020076)	ftw, Parlay member (Sandford Bessler)
N5-020221.zip	ETSI ES 201 915-13 V0.0.2 Policy Management SCF	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)
N5-020222.zip	Notes on the preparation of Policy Management specification	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)
N5-020223.zip	On Keeping Subscription Information in the Parlay Framework Consistent (reworked N5-020078)	ftw, Parlay member (Sandford Bessler)
N5-020224.zip	Draft OSA ICS Document	ETSI STF 211 (Ultan Mulligan)
N5-020225.zip	OSA ICS Development Status	ETSI STF 211 (Ultan Mulligan)
N5-020226.zip	Support for Network Controlled Notifications MPCC	Koen Schilders (Ericsson)
N5-020227.zip	Support for Network Controlled Notifications UI	Koen Schilders (Ericsson)
N5-020228.zip	Support for Network Controlled Notifications DSC	Koen Schilders (Ericsson)
N5-020229.zip	Support for Network Controlled Notifications AM	Koen Schilders (Ericsson)

N5-020230.zip	Support for Distributed Applications MPCC	Koen Schilders (Ericsson)
N5-020231.zip	Support for Distributed Applications UI	Koen Schilders (Ericsson)
N5-020232.zip	Support for Distributed Applications DSC	Koen Schilders (Ericsson)
N5-020233.zip	Support for Distributed Applications AM	Koen Schilders (Ericsson)
N5-020234.zip	Semantics of BOOLEAN_SET properties	Koen Schilders (Ericsson)
N5-020235.zip	Addition to TpAddressPlan	Koen Schilders (Ericsson)
N5-020236.zip	Clarification of TpSessionID	Koen Schilders (Ericsson)
N5-020237.zip	Parlay API –Phase 4 Requirements	Richard Stretch (BT Exact)
N5-020238.zip	Parlay PAM 3.1 Spec Draft 0.1	Guda Venkatesh (Teltier Technologies)
N5-020239.zip	Service Properties CBC	Koen Schilders (Ericsson) / Karsten Luettge (Siemens)
N5-020240.zip	Scope of TpSessionID and TpAssignmentID	Gary.Bruce@Sun.com
N5-020241.zip	Exception Hierarchy Proposal	Gary.Bruce@Sun.com
N5-020242.zip	Exception Issues	Gary.Bruce@Sun.com
N5-020243.zip	Editorial Issues	Gary.Bruce@Sun.com
N5-020244.zip	Use of MIDL	Gary.Bruce@Sun.com
N5-020245.zip	Use of P_ADDRESS_PLAN_MSMAIL	Gary.Bruce@Sun.com
N5-020246.zip	Rel-5 (OSA2) CR 29.998-04-04 Various Changes	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)
N5-020247.zip	Proposal for New Value in TpReleaseCause, P_UNSUPPORTED_MEDIA	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)
N5-020248.zip	Policy Management Updates, resolving discrepancies between Parlay and OSA	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)
N5-020249.zip	Joint Session with SA3 on Security Issues in the Framework	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)
N5-020250.zip	Correction to TpCallChargePlan	Koen Schilders (Ericsson)
N5-020251.zip	Data types TpStringList and TpStringSet are not defined in common data	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)
N5-020252.zip	Data type TpStringList to be removed from Connectivity Management	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)
N5-020253.zip	Draft ES 201 915-13 v.0.0.3 (UML Derived Policy Doc.)	ETSI Secretariat
N5-020254.zip	Draft ES 201 915-7 v.2.0.1	Ultan Mulligan (ETSI PTCC)
N5-020255.zip	Comments to N5-020220 Administration and Maintenance Interfaces	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)
N5-020256.zip	Inclusion of WSDL in the OSA Overview 29.198-1	David Tweedie (Nortel Networks)
N5-020257.zip	WSDL AnnexB	David Tweedie (Nortel Networks)
N5-020258.zip	Service Property P_MAX_ADDRESSES_PER_QUERY for Account Management	David Tweedie (Nortel Networks)
N5-020259.zip	Support for Java API Technology Realisation in Part 1 of OSA	Gary.Bruce@Sun.com
N5-020260.zip	Support for Java API Technology Realisation in All Parts (except Part 1) of OSA	Gary.Bruce@Sun.com
N5-020261.zip	Proposed update to the General Properties	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)

N5-020262.zip	View Ericsson on Backward Compatibility in Parlay/OSA	Koen Schilders (Ericsson)
N5-020263.zip	Report on OSA related 3GPP WG meetings since Hong Kong	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)
N5-020264.zip	Policy Management, attribute is a reserved name in IDL	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)
N5-020265.zip	P_SERVICE_INSTANCE in TpDomainID	Gary.Bruce@Sun.com
N5-020266.zip	Using TpAttributeSet rather than TpAttributeList in Policy Management	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)
N5-020267.zip	Correction to TpCallChargePlan (rev 250)	Koen Schilders (Ericsson)
N5-020268.zip	1st draft ES 201 915-14 (Parlay 4.0 PAM)	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC
N5-020269.zip	1st draft 3GPP TS 29.198-14 (Rel-5 PAM)	Ultan Mulligan (ETSI PTCC)
N5-020270.zip	Notes on ETSI/3GPP PAM Documents	Ultan Mulligan (ETSI PTCC)
N5-020271.zip	More Rel-5 (OSA2) CR 29.998-04-04 Various Changes	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)
N5-020272.zip	Proposal for Removal of Redundant Type Definition	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)
N5-020273.zip	Proposal for Removal of Redundant Type Definition	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)
N5-020274.zip	The use of tel URL in TpAddressPlan	Lucent Technologies (Musa Unmehopa)
N5-020275.zip	3GPP2 IP Network Architecture	Betsy Kidwell, Chair, 3GPP2 TSG-N
N5-020276.zip	Rel-5 draft 29.198-14 Presence & Availability Management comments	Nokia
N5-020277.zip	Rel-5 draft 29.198-14 PAM Event SCF enhancements	Nokia
N5-020278.zip	Make the conference address available for non-reserved conference	Kindy Sylla (Ericsson)
N5-020279.zip	Follow up on Policy management API Questions	Koen Schilders (Ericsson)
N5-020280.zip	Adoption of Multi-media and conference call control APIs	Ericsson
N5-020281.zip	Backwards Compatibility in Parlay/OSA White Paper	Gary.Bruce@Sun.com
N5-020282.zip	Authentication Scheme Negotiation in OSA	Alcatel (Olivier Paridaens)
N5-020283.zip	Security of terminateAccess() function in OSA	Alcatel (Olivier Paridaens)
N5-020284.zip	Use of one-way hash function for CHAP in OSA	Alcatel (Olivier Paridaens)
N5-020285.zip	Encryption of challenge in CHAP-based OSA authentication	Alcatel (Olivier Paridaens)
N5-020286.zip	CR 29.198-2 Addition of TpInt64	Ultan Mulligan, ETSI PTCC
N5-020287.zip	Frame Work version in run-time	Incomit
N5-020288.zip	Specification Maturity Presentation	Parlay Board
N5-020289.zip	Framework Evaluation Presentation	Telenor (Tonnes Brekne)
N5-020290.zip	Reply LS to 203	Musa
N5-020291.zip	Editorial comments on PAM ES 201 915-14	Teltier Technologies (Guda Venkatesh)
N5-020292.zip	Recommendations from April 3-4, 2002 IP CN Harmonization Workshop	3GPP TSG CN Chair
N5-020293.zip	3GPP2 IP Network Architecture (rev of 275)	Betsy Kidwell, Chair, 3GPP2 TSG-N

N5-020294.zip	Parlay/OSA: an open API for service development	Chelo Abarca, Andy Bennett, Ard-Jan Moerdijk, Musa Unmehopa
N5-020295.zip	Correction to TpCallChargePlan (rev of 267)	Ericsson (Koen Schilders)
N5-020296.zip	Parlay API –Phase 4 Requirements (rev of 237)	Richard Stretch (BT Exact)
N5-020297.zip	Support for Java API Technology Realisation in Part 1 of OSA (rev of 259)	Gary.Bruce@Sun.com
N5-020298.zip	Support for Java API Technology Realisation in All Parts (except Part 1) of OSA (rev 260)	Gary.Bruce@Sun.com
N5-020299.zip	Response to 279 (Follow up on Policy management API Questions)	Musa Unmehopa (Lucent) , Peter Heitmann (Cisco)
N5-020300.zip	Service Properties CBC (rev 239)	Ericsson (Koen Schilders)
N5-020301.zip	Service Properties Definition for Content Based Charging (rev N5-010960)	Ericsson (Koen Schilders)
N5-020302.zip	rev of 247	Andy
N5-020303.zip	draft CR 29.198-2 Common Data	Lucent (Musa Unmehopa)
N5-020304.zip	OSA relevant results from 3GPP TSG CN/RAN/T/SA #15 (Tdoc SP-020201), unmodified slides	S1-020865 (Siemens)
N5-020305.zip	Scope of TpSessionID and TpAssignmentID (rev 240)	Gary.Bruce@Sun.com
N5-020306.zip	Support for Network Controlled Notifications MPCC (rev 226)	Ericsson (Koen Schilders)
N5-020307.zip	rev 234	Ericsson (Koen Schilders)
N5-020308.zip	rev 235	Ericsson (Koen Schilders)
N5-020309.zip	ETS-disabling 3GPP Release 5 (rev 142)	John-Luc Bakker (Telcordia Technologies)
N5-020310.zip	PAM specs - proposed revision of #268	Teltier (Guda Venkatesh)
N5-020311.zip	reply to S5 LS (N5-020217)	Chelo

151 Numbers Reserved... (9 Withdrawn)

List of incoming LSs

Doc	Title	Source	Type	Status
N5-020202	LS copy from S1 to N5 : LS reply to: 'Liaison Statement on Confirmation of OSA Support for VASP MMS Connectivity'	S1-020470	LS in	Noted. No reply needed.
N5-020203	LS from T2 to N5 : Liaison Statement on coordination of data definitions, identified in GUP development	T2-020254	LS in	Noted. No reply needed.
N5-020204	LS copy from S2 to N5 : Liaison Statement Reply to 'Status of the Generic User Profile Work'	S2-020886	LS in	Noted. No reply needed.
N5-020205	LS copy from S2 to N5 : Liaison Statement Reply to 'Comments on UP-010141 and relationship of GUP to Subscription Management'	S2-020887	LS in	Noted. No reply needed.
N5-020206	LS from S2 to N5 : Response to LS 'Clarification of requirements for the VHE'	S2-020888	LS in	Noted. No reply needed.
N5-020215	Reply LS copy: CN5 on 'VASP MMS Connectivity' from T2 (T2-020038)	S5-022007	LS in	Noted. No reply needed.
N5-020216	LS to: CN5 on co-ordination of data definitions, identified in GUP development	S5-022017	LS in	Noted. No reply needed.
N5-020217	Reply LS to: CN5 on 'VASP MMS Connectivity' from T2 (T2-020038)	S5-024035	LS in	Noted. No reply needed.

Annex C: List of Participants

Chairman		
ABARCA Chelo	ALCATEL S.A.	FR
MOERDIJK Ard-Jan	ERICSSON L.M.	SE
ViceChairman		
UNMEHOPA Musa	Lucent Technologies B.V.	NL
Guest		
DREILING Larry R	Sprint PCS	US
GUIRGUIS Ihab	Sprint PCS	US
PROJECT_MGR		
ZOICAS Adrian	ETSI Secretariat	FR
BENNETT Andy	Lucent Technologies N. S. UK	GB
BINAR Simon	SIEMENS AG	DE
BREKNE Tønnes	TELENOR AS	NO
BRUCE Gary	Sun Microsystems Ltd	GB
CHEN Xin	Lucent Technologies N. S. UK	GB
DINALE Liliana	ERICSSON L.M.	SE
DYST Joergen	Appium Technologies	SE
FISCHER François	FSCOM	FR
GULLINO Roberto	TELECOM ITALIA S.p.A.	IT
JULIEN Christian	ETSI Secretariat	FR
KIDWELL Betsy	Lucent Technologies	DE
MULLIGAN Ultan	ETSI Secretariat	FR
SAARENPAA Matti	NOKIA Corporation	FI
SCHILDERS Koen	ERICSSON L.M.	SE
SCHMITTING Peter	FSCOM	FR
SCHUMACHER Greg	SCHLUMBERGER	GB
STRETCH Richard	BT Group Plc	GB
TWEEDIE David	NORTEL NETWORKS (EUROPE)	GB
VENKATESH Guda	Teltier Technologies	US
WANG Yong	ZTE Corporation	CN

Number of Attendees: 26

Guest organisation for 3GPP (OTHER)

Mr. Larry R Dreiling	Sprint PCS	(OTHER)	US	+1 913 890 4234	ldreil01@sprintspectrum.com
Mr. Ihab Guirguis	Sprint PCS	(OTHER)	US	+1 913 890 4234	iGuirgo@sprintspectrum.com

Member of 3GPP (CWTS)

Dr. Yong Wang	ZTE Corporation	(CWTS)	CN	+86 25 2870055	wang.yong4@mail.zte.com.cn

Member of 3GPP (ETSI)

Ms. Chelo Abarca	ALCATEL S.A.	(ETSI)	FR	+33 1307 70469	chelo.abarca@alcatel.fr
Mr. Andy Bennett	Lucent Technologies N. S. UK	(ETSI)	GB	+44-1793-897915	andybennett@lucent.com
Mr. Simon Binar	SIEMENS AG	(ETSI)	GB	+49 89 722 29177	Simon.Binar@mch.siemens.de
Dr. Tønnes Brekne	TELENOR AS	(ETSI)	NO	+47 97 13 70 47	tonnes.brekne@telenor.com
Mr. Gary Bruce	Sun Microsystems Ltd	(ETSI)	GB	+44 1 394 386 543	gary.bruce@sun.com
Mr. Xin Chen	Lucent Technologies N. S. UK	(ETSI)	GB	+441793883137	xchen2@lucent.com
Mrs. Liliana Dinale	ERICSSON L.M.	(ETSI)	SE	+15148271208	liliana.dinale@ericsson.ca
Mr. Joergen Dyst	Appium Technologies	(ETSI)	SE	+46 40 664 29 73	jorgen.dyst@appium.com
Mr. Roberto Gullino	TELECOM ITALIA S.p.A.	(ETSI)	IT	+39 011 2287678	Roberto.Gullino@TILab.com
Ms. Betsy Kidwell	Lucent Technologies	(ETSI)	US	+1 630 979 2272	ekidwell@lucent.com
Dr. Ard-Jan Moerdijk	ERICSSON L.M.	(ETSI)	NL	+31 161242777	Ard.Jan.Moerdijk@eln.ericsson.se
Mr. Matti Saarenpaa	NOKIA Corporation	(ETSI)	FI	+358 7180 74666	matti.saarenpaa@nokia.com
Mr. Koen Schilders	ERICSSON L.M.	(ETSI)	NL	+31 161 242 273	koen.schilders@eln.ericsson.se
Mr. Greg Schumacher	SCHLUMBERGER	(ETSI)	GB	+1 978 694 2762	gschumacher@slb.com
Mr. Richard Stretch	BT Group Plc	(ETSI)	GB	+44 1473 607487	richard.stretch@bt.com
Mr. David Tweedie	NORTEL NETWORKS (EUROPE)	(ETSI)	GB	+1-613-763-1725	davidtw@nortelnetworks.com
Mr. Musa Unmehopa	Lucent Technologies B.V.	(ETSI)	NL	+31 35 687 1684	unmehopa@lucent.com
Mr. Guda Venkatesh	Teltier Technologies	(ETSI)	US	+1 732 428 1500	Venk@teltier.com

Organisation partner representative (ETSI)

Mr. Christian Julien	ETSI Secretariat	(ETSI)	FR	+33 4 92 94 43 23	christian.julien@etsi.fr
Mr. Ultan Mulligan	ETSI Secretariat	(ETSI)	FR	+33 4 92 94 43 88	ultan.mulligan@etsi.fr

Mr. Adrian Zoicas	Mobile Competence Centre	(ETSI)	FR	+33 4 92 94 42 21	adrian.zoicas@etsi.fr