

Agenda item: 6.1.1

Meeting documents by agenda item						Cyan cells indicate an allocated but not available tdoc	Yellow cells indicate an available not yet treated tdoc.
Agenda item	Agenda item title	Tdoc	Title	Source	Spec.	Result	
1	Opening Monday 14.1.2002		Disclosure of IPRs?			The attention of the members of this Technical Specification Group is drawn to the fact that 3GPP Individual Members have the obligation under the IPR Policies of their respective Organizational Partners to inform their respective Organizational Partners of Essential IPRs they become aware of.	
2	Agenda & Reports Monday 14.1.2002 2	N1-020001	Phoenix0201	Chairman		Agreed.	
3	Input Liaison statements (19) Monday 14.1.2002		Only SIP related LSs are treated in this meeting				

3

N1-011979

Response LS on IMS identifiers and ISIM and USIM

S3

Noted.

Regarding the change of terminology USIM vs. ISIM it was decided that CN1 follows SA2 decision on 23.228.

Comment that also IMPU could be stored on ISIM and that we assume that there is no more than one ISIM on a UICC card.

Presentation needed and CN1 action on 24.228 (24.229) may be needed.

Forwarded to this meeting from CN1 #21 SA3 define several security requirements on IMS / IMPI usage.

Different ISIM use cases where the IMS security parameters are derived based on R99 USIM, separate ISIM and USIM or combined USIM incorporating also ISIM functionality. CN1 is expected to compare these against CN1 working assumptions.

- ISIM instead of USIM should be referenced as the storage of IMS security parameters in 23.228 and 24.228.
- Same private user identity can not be duplicated to multiple ISIMs
- The IMS related security algorithms and keys may or may not be the same as the ones in the USIM.
- ISIM application SHALL include (at least) the following: IMPI; Home Network Domain Name; Support for SQNs used in the context of IMS domain; Algorithms and Authentication Key (K).
- FOR FURTHER STUDY (Depends on the final decision on the mechanisms for

3	N1-012010	P-CSCF triggered re-authentication	S3	protecting SIP signalling): Security Keys (CK, IK); data equivalent to the Key Set Identifier; data equivalent to the START parameter; AMF related data.
3	N1-012011	IMS Security requirements and transportation of SIP session keys	S3	Noted. Forwarded to this meeting from CN1 #21 SA3 have adopted the working assumption that P-CSCF triggered re-authentication is not required. Reply in N1-020103 Forwarded to this meeting from CN1 #21 SA3 informs us of the latest security requirements in 33.203 and asks us to tell them if we have any missing security related requirements which block CN1 progress in IMS.
3	N1-020002	Reply LS on “Selection of S-CSCF by I-CSCF based on capability requirements”	SA5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SA3 asks how session keys are transported from S-CSCF to P-CSCF in SIP (EAP?) • The current 24.229 requires that S-CSCF deregisters the user and clears all sessions to it SA3 point out that they have not defined any fixed number of failed authentication attempts to trigger clearing of all sessions and de-registration of the subscriber. The maximum acceptable number of failures should be configurable by the operator.
3	N1-020003	Liaison Statement on Trace Activation Mechanism in SIP	SA5	Noted. SA5 to CN4, SA2, CC CN1. SA5 agrees with SA2 that full multi-vendor operation is required at I-CSCF selection of S-CSCF, but at present cannot see any requirement from SA2 for the standardisation of an internal mechanism for this in the I-CSCF. Reply in N1-020104 Some delegates say that this kind of copying of GSM requirements to IMS is not necessarily needed. As all signalling goes via S-CSCF the

3

N1-02000
4

Prevention of identity spoofing in the IMS

SA3

home network will find out what the subscriber is doing.

SA5 asks us to add Trace parameters in SIP messages.

It must be possible for S-CSCF to activate Trace at the P-CSCF. It is foreseen that new Trace related parameters are required in SIP signalling.

These parameters are as follows:

- Public ID of the subscriber;
- Trace reference (a unique identification of the trace case);
- Trace type (configuration parameter of the trace case);
- Address of the Network Manager (target address for sending the trace records).

Reply in N1-020105

Most companies favoured the first alternative of echoing back all registered IMPUs and the IK from the S-CSCF to P-CSCF so that P-CSCF could match the IMPU with the IK that was used protecting the message.

There was a comment that this is still not a complete solution yet as the UE may send an unprotected REGISTER and then S-CSCF needs to know about this.

Possibility for fraudulent user to avoid charging by setting up sessions under a false identity.

Solutions 2 and 3 seem to be similar in requiring the P-CSCF gets to know the IMPI. CN1 is already enhancing SIP to carry additional parameters and adding IMPI could be done as part of these enhancements.

Possible workarounds have been identified by SA3:

3

N1-020005

Configuration of ciphering

SA3

- S-CSCF indicates to P-CSCF all IMPUs that are related with IK (which is related with IMPI). P-CSCF can then match the IMPU in INVITE from UE to the IK that was used for integrity protecting the message.
- S-CSCF gives to P-CSCF the list of all IMPUs which are related to the registered IMPI during registration. P-CSCF can then match the IMPU from the INVITE to the IMPI.
- UE includes the IMPI in protected part of integrity protected messages. P-CSCF can then match this IMPI with the IK that was used for integrity protecting the message.

Forwarded to CN1 #22

Comment that the attached version of the CR was not approved by TSG-SA but forwarded back to SA3.

CN1 action is needed.

33.102 CR which requires that the UE clears CS and PS connections which are not ciphered. This 33.102 CR is a requirement to make change in CN1 specifications. But before the change can be implemented at least the following issues need to be defined in CN1 specifications:

- What is the criteria for the UE to initiate clearing?
- Does it look like normal call clearing / PDP context deactivation?
- Do the other CS calls / PDP contexts need to be cleared?
- Are new call attempts allowed?
- Does the UE perform CS / PS detach?
- Does the UE perform PLMN selection?

Noted.

SA2 agree our LS saying that currently there is

3

N1-02000

Liaison Statement reply on configuration hiding between S-

SA2

	6	CSCF and MGCF	
3	N1-02000 7	Response Liaison Statement on the definition of Local Services	SA2
3	N1-02000 8	Reply Liaison Statement on SIP Signalling and Codec Issues	SA4
3	N1-02000 9	Liaison Statement on codecs used in IP networks	SA4

no THIG functionality between S-CSCF and MGCF. However, they see that hiding functionality should be applicable at this interface also and 23.228 CR to allow this is attached.

Reply in N1-02106 (but the offline discussion showed that the LS is not needed after all) SA2 thanks SA1 for clarifications on local services. The 23.228 CR resulting from this discussion is attached.

Noted.

SA4 reply to N1-011334.

- SA4 confirm that MIME encoding for AMR ACS parameters in the SDP information is included in TS 26.235 normative annex. The same information is also in Internet draft draft-ietf-avt-rtp-amr-10.txt. The intention is to change the normative annex in TS 26.235 into a reference pointing to IETF RFC number when the RFC number is available.
- There does not exist any special mechanism to enforce (e.g. HR channel compatible) AMR mode. The AMR RTP payload contains in-band codec mode request signalling which can be used for requesting a specific mode within the active codec set. If the AMR modes within the active codec set need to be changed, the only method is the parameter re-negotiation using SIP signalling.

Noted.

SA4 reply to SA2 and CN3 with CC to CN1 on speech and multimedia codec interworking. List of most likely candidate codecs for interworking

3	N1-020090	LS on IMS identifiers and ISIM and USIM	SA2	<p>between H.323 and 3GPP is given. Noted.</p> <p>Proposal to organise a joint meeting on USIM and ISIM issues between SA1-2-3, T2-3 and CN1. SA2 propose two days in Dec-Jan time. It was agreed in TSGN #14 that CN1 can not add those two days in the meeting calendar or allocate two whole days in the already scheduled meetings for the workshop. So the meeting will need to be arranged without CN1 and the companies are requested to take this into account. CN1 will need to be kept up to date on any development in the IUCC IMS identities issue.</p> <p>Late document!</p>																				
4	<p>CN1 work plan Monday 14.1.2002</p>			<p>Meeting calendar for 2002:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1377 842 1691 949">14.-18. Jan. 2002 5 days as necessary 28 Jan.-1 Feb 2002</td> <td data-bbox="1691 842 2004 989">CN1 SIP ad hoc (AWS / Phoenix, USA) CN1 #22 (ETSI / Sophia Antipolis)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1377 989 1691 1101">19 – 22 Feb</td> <td data-bbox="1691 989 2004 1101">CN1 #22bis on Rel-5 open issues (Nokia / Oulu, Finland)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1377 1101 1691 1141">6.-8. Mar. 2002</td> <td data-bbox="1691 1101 2004 1141">CN #15 (Korea)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1377 1141 1691 1181">8.-12. Apr. 2002</td> <td data-bbox="1691 1141 2004 1181">CN1 #23</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1377 1181 1691 1220">13.-17. May 2002</td> <td data-bbox="1691 1181 2004 1220">CN1 #24</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1377 1220 1691 1260">5.-7. Jun. 2002</td> <td data-bbox="1691 1220 2004 1260">CN #16 (?)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1377 1260 1691 1332">29. Jul. – 2. Aug. 2002</td> <td data-bbox="1691 1260 2004 1332">CN1 #25 (Sonera, Finland)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1377 1332 1691 1372">4.-6- Sep. 2002</td> <td data-bbox="1691 1332 2004 1372">CN #17 (France)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1377 1372 1691 1412">23.-27. Sep. 2002</td> <td data-bbox="1691 1372 2004 1412">CN1 #26</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1377 1412 1691 1444">11.-15. Nov. 2002</td> <td data-bbox="1691 1412 2004 1444">CN1 #27 (Malaysia)</td> </tr> </table>	14.-18. Jan. 2002 5 days as necessary 28 Jan.-1 Feb 2002	CN1 SIP ad hoc (AWS / Phoenix, USA) CN1 #22 (ETSI / Sophia Antipolis)	19 – 22 Feb	CN1 #22bis on Rel-5 open issues (Nokia / Oulu, Finland)	6.-8. Mar. 2002	CN #15 (Korea)	8.-12. Apr. 2002	CN1 #23	13.-17. May 2002	CN1 #24	5.-7. Jun. 2002	CN #16 (?)	29. Jul. – 2. Aug. 2002	CN1 #25 (Sonera, Finland)	4.-6- Sep. 2002	CN #17 (France)	23.-27. Sep. 2002	CN1 #26	11.-15. Nov. 2002	CN1 #27 (Malaysia)
14.-18. Jan. 2002 5 days as necessary 28 Jan.-1 Feb 2002	CN1 SIP ad hoc (AWS / Phoenix, USA) CN1 #22 (ETSI / Sophia Antipolis)																							
19 – 22 Feb	CN1 #22bis on Rel-5 open issues (Nokia / Oulu, Finland)																							
6.-8. Mar. 2002	CN #15 (Korea)																							
8.-12. Apr. 2002	CN1 #23																							
13.-17. May 2002	CN1 #24																							
5.-7. Jun. 2002	CN #16 (?)																							
29. Jul. – 2. Aug. 2002	CN1 #25 (Sonera, Finland)																							
4.-6- Sep. 2002	CN #17 (France)																							
23.-27. Sep. 2002	CN1 #26																							
11.-15. Nov. 2002	CN1 #27 (Malaysia)																							

						4.-6. Dec. 2002	CN #18 (New Orleans)
5	Void						
6	Void						
7	Void						
8	Release 5						
8.1	IMS Draft specifications and other documents for information Monday 14.1.2002		These documents may be 3GPP draft TSs or TRs or ones from the outside of 3GPP such as IETF.				
	8.01	N1-02001	Current draft 24.229: "IP Multimedia Call Control Protocol based on SIP and SDP"	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	TS	24.229 file size is still manageable and we do not need to split it right now.
	8.01	N1-02001	Summary of current IETF documents on SIP	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage			For information
	8.01	N1-02001	Summary of current IETF documents on SIPPING	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage			For information
	8.01	N1-02001	Summary of current IETF documents on MMUSIC	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage			For information
	8.01	N1-	Summary of current IETF	Lucent			For information

	8.01	020014 N1-020033	documents on SIMPLE 3GPP TS 23.218 V1.0.0IP Multimedia (IM) Session Handling;IP Multimedia (IM) call model	Technologies / Keith Drage Dynamicsoft,A ndrew Allen	23.218	TS
	8.01	N1-020043	24.228v180 "Signalling flows for the IP multimedia call controlbased on SIP and SDP"	Motorola, John O'Hare	24.228	TS 24.228 has become rather big and heavy to handle in word processor but the meeting decided after discussion that it should be kept in a single document. Issuing every reference version in .pdf format was also discussed but this was not seen necessary now but may be considered again in the future.
8.2	Rel-5 corrections Monday 14.1.2002		Only SIP related Rel-5 corrections, if any, are treated in this meeting			Rel-5 cat. F corrections only
8.3	23.218 Monday 14.1.2002					
	8.03	N1-020017	CR to 23.218: Contact AS failure	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	23.218	Revised to N1-020107 Proposal that S-CSCF is allowed to either clear the connection or take other implementation specific action if no AS can be contacted.
	8.03	N1-020021	CR to 23.218: Example of Filter Triggering	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	23.218	Revised to N1-020108 Example case to informative Annex B: Example of filter criteria triggering assuming two application servers.
	8.03	N1-020022	CR to 23.218: HSS Data Storage	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	23.218	Revised to N1-020109 Block diagram of HSS subscriber related data. Protocol related identity information and AS service related information are separated.

8.03	N1-020024	CR to 23.218: S-CSCF Handles MO and MT	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	23.218	Rejected. If an originating request does not match the initial filter criteria of any AS then the S-CSCF would be allowed not just to forward the message in a proxy role, but also to assume other behaviour (redirect, B2BUA). Mode of operation is already used in 23.218 but it does not seem to be defined in the vocabulary?
8.03	N1-020025	CR to 23.218: S-CSCF Handles Session Release	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	23.218	Revised to N1-020110 S-CSCF behaviour in case of network originated BYE
8.03	N1-020026	CR to 23.218: S-CSCF Not Only Proxy	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	23.218	Rejected. Allowing not just proxy role but also UA, redirect server or B2BUA for an S-CSCF when handling a SIP message which does not interest AS. Definition of 'mode of operation' ?
8.03	N1-020027	CR to 23.218: S-CSCF Operation Modes	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	23.218	Rejected. Defining different roles for S-CSCF for handling different messages (registration, AS is involved, AS is not involved)
8.03	N1-020028	CR to 23.218: Changes to Table 5.1	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	23.218	Revised to N1-020112 Corrections to table 5.1 defining the service interaction with IP multimedia subsystem
8.03	N1-020034	S-CSCF Call Model in 23.218	Dynamicsoft, Andrew Allen	23.218	Revised to N1-020111 Definition of modes of operation of S-CSCF
8.03	N1-020035	Clarification to Filter Criteria in 23.218	Dynamicsoft, Andrew Allen	23.218	Agreed on the condition that if N1-020089 or a revision of it is agreed then this one is not needed. Clarification that also the absence of a header is acceptable criteria for S-CSCF to route the message towards AS. Does the new text change anything at all?

8.03	N1-020036	Review and Cleanup of Editors Notes in 23.218	Dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	23.218	<p>Traditionally the presence of a message element means that a decision will be made based on whether the element is present or not.</p> <p>Agreed the listed points below. Related LS to SA2 in N1-020113. Decided to send a LS to SA2 saying that Sr interface did not happen so they better remove it from their TSs as well.</p> <p>Do we need to get answers from the other groups to any of the questions which remain open?</p> <p>Replacing some of the editor's notes in 23.218 with specification text but many of the editor's notes are still left indicating that more contributions to put in specification text are still needed.</p> <p>Agreed the following points (unless other contributions which are agreed in this meeting change or delete the editor's notes in a different way):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1-8 • 9 on the condition that N1-020089 or its revision is not agreed • 10 – 15 agreed • 16 – 18 were not agreed • 19 -> agreed
8.03	N1-020037	23.218 Cleanup and Editorial Corrections	Dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	23.218	<p>Revised to N1-020114</p> <p>Moving of some definitions of terms to more appropriate place in the TS.</p>
8.03	N1-020051	Functional model for AS in 23.218	Dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	23.218	<p>Revised to N1-020115</p> <p>AS behaviour as transaction stateful proxy, B2BUA, User Agent or redirect server. Also Sh interface between AS and HSS is shown.</p>
8.03	N1-020052	Section 10 of 23.218	Dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	23.218	<p>Rejected.</p> <p>Addition of MM session handling in AS to section 10 of 23.218</p>

8.03	N1-020062	CR to 23.218: Si Interface	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	23.218	Revised to N1-020116 Addition of Si interface between IM-SSF and HSS to MM service architecture.
8.03	N1-020069	Reference to the OSA-SCS in 23.218	Ericsson/M. Garcia	23.218	Agreed
8.03	N1-020071	CR to 23.218: Add Reference to 6.8.2	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	23.218	Agreed. The title of the document is correct but the titles that were given for tdoc list for N1-020071 and N1-020072 are swapped. Proposal that additionally to IP MM calls also the registration and session clearing procedures at AS should be specified.
8.03	N1-020072	CR to 23.218: Add two sections to 9.4	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	23.218	Agreed. The title of the document is correct but the titles that were given for tdoc list for N1-020071 and N1-020072 are swapped. New references to 23.008 and 33.203.
8.03	N1-020073	CR to 23.218 : Subscription Information at AS	H3g	23.218	Revised to N1-020119
8.03	N1-020107	CR to 23.218: Contact AS failure	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	23.218	Agreed. Proposal that S-CSCF is allowed to either clear the connection or take other implementation specific action if no AS can be contacted.
8.03	N1-020108	CR to 23.218: Example of Filter Triggering	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	23.218	Revision of N1-020017 Revised to N1-020128 Example case to informative Annex B: Example of filter criteria triggering assuming two application servers.
8.03	N1-020109	CR to 23.218: HSS Data Storage	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	23.218	Revision of N1-020021 Agreed. Block diagram of HSS subscriber related data. Protocol related identity information and AS

8.03	N1-020110	CR to 23.218: S-CSCF Handles Session Release	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	23.218	service related information are separated. Revision of N1-020022 Agreed. S-CSCF behaviour in case of network originated BYE Revision of N1-020025
8.03	N1-020111	S-CSCF Call Model in 23.218	Dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	23.218	Revised to N1-020137 Reviewed on Tuesday but more time was requested to call home first before asking for approval. Definition of modes of operation of S-CSCF Revision of N1-020034
8.03	N1-020112	CR to 23.218: Changes to Table 5.1	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	23.218	Revised to N1-020129 Corrections to table 5.1 defining the service interaction with IP multimedia subsystem Revision of N1-020028
8.03	N1-020114	23.218 Cleanup and Editorial Corrections	Dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	23.218	agreed (with minor change to title in 9.4 compared to the earlier version of the CR) Moving of some definitions of terms to more appropriate place in the TS. Revision of N1-020037
8.03	N1-020115	Functional model for AS in 23.218	Dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	23.218	Agreed. AS behaviour as transaction stateful proxy, B2BUA, User Agent or redirect server. Also Sh interface between AS and HSS is shown. Revision of N1-020051
8.03	N1-020116	CR to 23.218: Si Interface	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	23.218	Agreed Addition of Si interface between IM-SSF and HSS to MM service architecture. Revision of N1-020062
8.03	N1-020119	CR to 23.218 : Subscription Information at AS	H3g	23.218	Agreed. Revision of N1-020073
8.03	N1-020118	CR to 23.218: Example of Filter Triggering	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	23.218	Revised to N1-020164 Example case to informative Annex B: Example of filter criteria triggering assuming two

	8.03	N1-020129	CR to 23.218: Changes to Table 5.1	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	23.218	application servers. Revision of N1-020108 Revised to N1-020156 Corrections to table 5.1 defining the service interaction with IP multimedia subsystem Revision of N1-020112
	8.03	N1-020137	S-CSCF Call Model in 23.218	Dynamicsoft,Andrew Allen	23.218	Agreed Definition of modes of operation of S-CSCF Revision of N1-020111
	8.03	N1-020156	CR to 23.218: Changes to Table 5.1	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	23.218	Agreed Corrections to table 5.1 defining the service interaction with IP multimedia subsystem Revision of N1-020129
	8.03	N1-020164	CR to 23.218: Example of Filter Triggering	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	23.218	Agreed Example case to informative Annex B: Example of filter criteria triggering assuming two application servers. Revision of N1-020128
8.4	IMS Registration Tuesday 15.1.2002					
	8.04	N1-020020	CR to 24.228: Cx Registration	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	24.228	Agreed. Update of registration and deregistration flows to indicate Cx interface interaction. The editor's note under Fig. 6.7.1-1 does not seem appropriate
	8.04	N1-020038	CR to 23.218 : AS Notification Of Registration Status	H3g	23.218	Rejected Postponed no agreement on whether S-CSCF should use REGISTER or SUBSCRIBE/NOTIFY to inform AS about the UE registration.

8.04	N1-020039	Integrity and Authentication protection for SIP REGISTER	H3g	<p>Two alternative solutions to make the AS aware of the subscriber's registration status. The AS could either subscribe for registration events or get the status from HSS.</p> <p>N1-020038, 047, 056, 063, 099 and 130 are linked.</p> <p>Agreed the proposed principles which will need to be implemented in separate CR documents. It was decided that the outcome of this discussion is communicated to SA3 in LS N1-020105.</p> <p>Discussion, possible LS to SA3 to confirm proposed working assumptions.</p> <p>Questions about authentication:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does every REGISTER need to be authenticated? • Can INVITEs be authenticated? • Is IMPI needed in INVITE?
8.04	N1-020040	CR to 24.229 : Integrity and Authentication protection for SIP REGISTER	H3g	24.229 Revised to N1-020120 Authentication procedure at the UE and at P-CSCF.
8.04	N1-020047	CR to 24.229 : AS Notification Of Registration Status	H3g	24.229 Rejected Postponed no agreement on whether S-CSCF should use REGISTER or SUBSCRIBE/NOTIFY to inform AS about the UE registration. Proposal that AS uses SUBSCRIBE/NOTIFY to learn the registration status of UE. N1-020038, 047, 056, 063, 099 and 130 are linked.
8.04	N1-020048	PDP context activation / P-CSCF discovery cleanup	Ericsson/A. Monrad	24.228 Revised to N1-020121 Modification of existing registration flows to allow either DHCP or PDP context activation related P-CSCF discovery. GPRS attach and PDP context are certainly prerequisite to any IMS access but IMS

8.04	N1-020049	Preconditions for SIP signalling	Ericsson/A. Monrad	24.229	specification should not mandate anything in GPRS area. Let's not specify here when the UE must attach or open a PDP context. Revised to N1-020122 IMS and GPRS interactions. Prerequisite GPRS procedures for IMS registration and GPRS behaviour during IMS signalling.
8.04	N1-020050	Clarifications to clause 5.1.1 in 24.229	Ericsson/A. Monrad	24.229	Revised to N1-020123 Various corrections to UE registration procedures.
8.04	N1-020056	Registration Notification to Application Server	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson		Rejected Postponed no agreement on whether S-CSCF should use REGISTER or SUBSCRIBE/NOTIFY to inform AS about the UE registration. Discussion How does AS get the registration status of a UE? N1-020038, 047, 056, 063, 099 and 130 are linked.
8.04	N1-020057	Implicit Registration	Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic	24.229	Rejected. Adds the public user identity groups to clause 4.2, URL and address assignments.
8.04	N1-020058	P-CSCF Discovery	Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic	24.229	Noted with the request to see which parts of this contribution need to be taken to revision of N1-020049 in tdoc N1-020122. Adds the two alternative methods for the UE to discover the address of P-CSCF to clause 5.1.1.1
8.04	N1-020063	CR to 23.218: The S-CSCF Notifying the AS upon Registration	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	23.218	Rejected Postponed no agreement on whether S-CSCF should use REGISTER or SUBSCRIBE/NOTIFY to inform AS about the UE registration. Proposal to make the AS aware of UE registration status by means of

8.04	N1-020070	IETF advice on SIP	Ericsson/M. Garcia		SUSBScribe/NOTIFY procedure. N1-020038, 047, 056, 063, 099 and 130 are linked. Noted. Discussion
8.04	N1-020099	AS notification of Registration status	Nokia/Krisztian Kiss	23.218	Rejected Postponed no agreement on whether S-CSCF should use REGISTER or SUBSCRIBE/NOTIFY to inform AS about the UE registration. Proposal that S-CSCF indicates the UE registration by sending a third-party REGISTER message to AS after the successfully handling the REGISTER from the UE. N1-020038, 047, 056, 063, 099 and 130 are linked.
8.04	N1-020120	CR to 24.229 : Integrity and Authentication protection for SIP REGISTER	H3g	24.229	Revised to N1-020142 Authentication procedure at the UE and at P-CSCF. Revision of N1-020040
8.04	N1-020121	PDP context activation / P-CSCF discovery cleanup	Ericsson/A. Monrad	24.228	Agreed. Modification of existing registration flows to allow either DHCP or PDP context activation related P-CSCF discovery. GPRS attach and PDP context are certainly prerequisite to any IMS access but IMS specification should not mandate anything in GPRS area. Let's not specify here when the UE must attach or open a PDP context. Revision of N1-020048
8.04	N1-020122	Preconditions for SIP signalling	Ericsson/A. Monrad	24.229	Revised to N1-020157 IMS and GPRS interactions. Prerequisite GPRS procedures for IMS registration and GPRS behaviour during IMS signalling. Revision of N1-020049

	8.04	N1-020123	Clarifications to clause 5.1.1 in 24.229	Ericsson/A. Monrad	24.229	Agreed. Various corrections to UE registration procedures. Revision of N1-020050
	8.04	N1-020142	CR to 24.229 : Integrity and Authentication protection for SIP REGISTER	H3g	24.229	Agreed Authentication procedure at the UE and at P-CSCF. Revision of N1-020120
	8.04	N1-020157	Preconditions for SIP signalling	Ericsson/A. Monrad	24.229	Agreed. IMS and GPRS interactions. Prerequisite GPRS procedures for IMS registration and GPRS behaviour during IMS signalling. Revision of N1-020122
8.5	IMS De-registration Tuesday 15.1.2002					
	8.05	N1-020023	CR to 24.228: Flow Update Annex A-8 6.7.3	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	24.228	Revised to N1-020143 Revising network initiated de-registration call flow to indicate the agreed P-CSCF subscription to state event package.
	8.05	N1-020143	CR to 24.228: Flow Update Annex A-8 6.7.3	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	24.228	Agreed Revising network initiated de-registration call flow to indicate the agreed P-CSCF subscription to state event package. Revision of N1-020023
8.6	IMS Configuration hiding Tuesday 15.1.2002					

IMS Authentication					
Tuesday 15.2.2002					
8.07	N1-020042	CR to 24.229, Clarification of S-CSCFAuthentication	H3g	24.229	Revised to N1-020124 Specifies the message and contents of the more general term 'authentication challenge'
8.07	N1-020068	CR to 24.228: Authentication flows	Lucent Technologies / Brad Owen	24.228	Revised before the meeting to N1-020074
8.07	N1-020074	CR to 24.228: Authentication flows	Lucent Technologies / Brad Owen	24.228	Revised to N1-020125 Adds more details to registration flows, both hiding and non-hiding. Is it worth adding more editor's notes any more? Should we not find some text that could remain in the specification because the next CN1 meeting will have to start deleting editor's notes anyway. Revised before the meeting Revision of N1-020068
8.07	N1-020075	CR to 24.228: Authentication for reregistration failure	Lucent Technologies / Brad Owen	24.228	Agreed.
8.07	N1-020076	CR to 24.228: User authentication failure	Lucent Technologies / Brad Owen	24.228	Revised before the meeting to N1-020092
8.07	N1-020092	CR to 24.228: User authentication failure	Lucent Technologies / Brad Owen	24.228	Revised to N1-020126 Revised before the meeting Revision of N1-020076
8.07	N1-020124	CR to 24.229, Clarification of S-CSCFAuthentication	H3g	24.229	Agreed. Specifies the message and contents of the more general term 'authentication challenge' N1-020094 and 124 are linked Revision of N1-020042
8.07	N1-020125	CR to 24.228: Authentication flows	Lucent Technologies /	24.228	Agreed. Adds more details to registration flows, both

		5		Brad Owen		hiding and non-hiding. Revised before the meeting Revision of N1-020074
	8.07	N1-02012	CR to 24.228: User authentication failure	Lucent Technologies / Brad Owen	24.228	Revised to N1-020144 Revised before the meeting Revision of N1-020092
	8.07	N1-02014	CR to 24.228: User authentication failure	Lucent Technologies / Brad Owen	24.228	Revised to N1-020158
	8.07	N1-02015	CR to 24.228: User authentication failure	Lucent Technologies / Brad Owen	24.228	Revision of N1-020124 agreed. Revision of N1-020144
8.8	IMS Call initiation (27) Wednesday 16.1.2002					
	8.08	N1-02001	CR to 24.228: Correct the mistake in 5.y.1.2	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	24.228	Revised to N1-020131 Clarification to media authorisation on the terminating side of session establishment
	8.08	N1-02001	CR to 24.228: Cx Session Initiation	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	24.228	Agreed. Adds more details about Cx query and a reference to 29.228 to all session initiation call flows
	8.08	N1-02002	CR to 24.229: MGCF Procedures	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	Revised to N1-020132 Proposal to add the so far missing MGCF procedures to 24.229 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CS telephony interworking should be left to CN3 (29.162). • Is REFER method needed (CT)? • 24.229 should not repeat the requirements of IETF RFCs. • Is DTMF needed?
	8.08	N1-	CR to 24.229: MRFC Procedures	Lucent	24.229	Revised to N1-020133

8.08	020030 N1-020031	CR to 24.229: Application Server Procedures	Technologies / Eric Henrikson Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	Proposal to add the so far missing MRFC procedures to 24.229 Revised to N1-020139 Proposed definition of SUBSCRIBE/NOTIFY procedure and usage of it by the AS to find out the registration status of the UE.
8.08	N1-020055	CR to 24.228: Functional split between P-CSCF and PCF	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	24.228	Revised to N1-020134 Highlights the PCF related steps in session setup signalling both on the MO and MT side.
8.08	N1-020059	Hold and Resume	Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic	24.228	Revised to N1-020136 New method of hold and resume by means of using a new 'a=inactive' attribute instead of defining the connection IP address as null in SDP description.
8.08	N1-020060	Three-way SDP negotiation procedure	Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic	24.229	Revised to N1-020138 Detailed definition of end-to-end SDP negotiation in INVITE-183-PRACK
8.08	N1-020131	CR to 24.228: Correct the mistake in 5.y.1.2	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	24.228	Agreed. Clarification to media authorisation on the terminating side of session establishment
8.08	N1-020132	CR to 24.229: MGCF Procedures	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	Revision of N1-020018 Revised to N1-020159 Proposal to add the so far missing MGCF procedures to 24.229
8.08	N1-020133	CR to 24.229: MRFC Procedures	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	Revision of N1-020029 Revised to N1-020160 Proposal to add the so far missing MRFC procedures to 24.229
8.08	N1-020134	CR to 24.228: Functional split between P-CSCF and PCF	Lucent Technologies/ Xin Chen	24.228	Revision of N1-020030 Agreed. Highlights the PCF related steps in session setup signalling both on the MO and MT side.
8.08	N1-020136	Hold and Resume	Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic	24.228	Revision of N1-020055 Revised to N1-020162 New method of hold and resume by means of using a new 'a=inactive' attribute instead of

8.08	N1-020138	Three-way SDP negotiation procedure	Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic	24.229	defining the connection IP address as null in SDP description. Revision of N1-020059 Revised to N1-020161 Detailed definition of end-to-end SDP negotiation in INVITE-183-PRACK Revision of N1-020060
8.08	N1-020139	CR to 24.229: Application Server Procedures	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	Revised to N1-020150 Proposed definition of SUBSCRIBE/NOTIFY procedure and usage of it by the AS to find out the registration status of the UE. Revision of N1-020031
8.08	N1-020150	CR to 24.229: Application Server Procedures	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	Revised to N1-020165 Proposed definition of SUBSCRIBE/NOTIFY procedure and usage of it by the AS to find out the registration status of the UE. N1-020146 and N1-020150 are linked. Revision of N1-020139
8.08	N1-020159	CR to 24.229: MGCF Procedures	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	Agreed. Proposal to add the so far missing MGCF procedures to 24.229 Revision of N1-020132
8.08	N1-020160	CR to 24.229: MRFC Procedures	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	Revised to N1-020163 Proposal to add the so far missing MRFC procedures to 24.229 Revision of N1-020133
8.08	N1-020161	Three-way SDP negotiation procedure	Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic	24.229	Rejected. Detailed definition of end-to-end SDP negotiation in INVITE-183-PRACK Revision of N1-020138
8.08	N1-020162	Hold and Resume	Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic	24.228	Agreed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of 'a=' lines in ACKs must increase to 3 from message 3 onwards. • Message 13: unnecessary route line to be

	8.08	N1-020163	CR to 24.229: MRFC Procedures	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	deleted. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Message 15: the work ACK is missing • Message 22: New method of hold and resume by means of using a new 'a=inactive' attribute instead of defining the connection IP address as null in SDP description. Revision of N1-020136 Rejected.
	8.08	N1-020165	CR to 24.229: Application Server Procedures	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	24.229	Proposed to add the so far missing MRFC procedures to 24.229 Revision of N1-020160 Agreed. Proposed definition of SUBSCRIBE/NOTIFY procedure and usage of it by the AS to find out the registration status of the UE. N1-020146 and N1-020150 are linked. Revision of N1-020150
8.9	IMS Call clearing Wednesday 16.1.2002					
8.10	IMS Abnormal cases and error handling (1) Thursday 17.1.2002					
8.11	IMS Emergency call Thursday 17.1.2002		TSGN #14 decided to ask TSGSA #14 to see if this needs to be moved to Rel-6			

8.12	Other IMS issues (11) Thursday 17.1.2002					
8.12	N1-020015	CR to 24.229: Proposed definitions for inclusion in 24.229	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Agreed. More terms to vocabulary subclause 3.1	
8.12	N1-020016	CR to 24.229: Restructuring of P-CSCF clause to generalise treatment of routeing information	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Revised to N1-020141 The principle should be discussed first before the details of the change. Rearrangement of message handling rules in subclause 5.2 to avoid redundancy.	
8.12	N1-020044	Status of 24.228 technical consistency reviews	Motorola, John O'Hare	24.228	Noted. For information	
8.12	N1-020045	CR to 24.228: 24.228 technical consistency review changes	Mot,Luc,Erics, ATTWS,Siem, Qualc,Nok,Nort,BT	24.228	Agreed with the rapporteurs comment that 17.5.2 must be excluded, the rest is OK to implement. No presentation needed just ask for approval	
8.12	N1-020046	CR to 24.228: Notation updates for branch and loop detection parameters	Motorola, John O'Hare	24.228	Revised to N1-020117	
8.12	N1-020053	CR to 24.229: Minor technical changes and editorial changes to TS24.229	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Agreed. No presentation needed just ask for approval	
8.12	N1-020054	CR to 24.228: Minor technical changes and editorial changes to TS24.228	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.228	Agreed. No presentation needed just ask for approval	
8.12	N1-020064	CR to 24.229: Handling of unknown methods with Record_Route headers at the P-CSCF	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Agreed. Requirement for the P-CSCF to treat an unknown method with path header in the same way as any other method containing path header. This one is according to our current working assumption that the UE gets no record-route. But	

	8.12	N1-020117	CR to 24.228: Notation updates for branch and loop detection parameters (updated N1-020046)	Motorola, John O'Hare	24.228	if an unknown (new) method opens up a new dialogue where a response is expected then this proposal does not work. New methods for standalone transaction and new methods in the middle of an existing dialogue can be handled. What was the decision on N1-020016? Noted.
	8.12	N1-020141	CR to 24.229: Restructuring of P-CSCF clause to generalise treatment of routeing information	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Proposes changes to 24.228 call flow notation in clause 4. Revision of N1-020046 Revised to N1-020151 Rearrangement of message handling rules in subclause 5.2 to avoid redundancy. Revision of N1-020016
	8.12	N1-020151	CR to 24.229: Restructuring of P-CSCF clause to generalise treatment of routeing information	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Agreed. Rearrangement of message handling rules in subclause 5.2 to avoid redundancy. Revision of N1-020141
8.13	IMS Editorials and other minor issues (9) Thursday 17.1.2002					
8.14	Presence Friday 18.1.2002					
9	Output Liaison Statements Friday 18.1.2002	N1-			Dunca	Revised to N1-020154

		02010 3 N1- 02010 4 N1- 02010 5 N1- 02010 6 N1- 02011 3 N1- 02012 7 N1- 02015 4 N1- 02015 5			n Reply to N1-012011 Miguel Revised to N1-020127 Comment that the LS must be sent to also CC: CN4 and incoming LS from SA5 in N1-020003 must be attached. Reply to N1-020003 Kevan Revised to N1-020155 Reply to N1-020004 Andre w Withdrawn, offline discussion with SA2 delegates showed that this is not needed at all. Reply to N1-020007 Andre w Agreed. Related with N1-020036 Miguel Agreed. Incoming LS from SA5 in N1-020003 must be attached. Reply to N1-020003 Revision of N1-020104 Dunca n Agreed Reply to N1-012011 Revision of N1-020103 Kevan Agreed. Reply to N1-020004 Revision of N1-020105
10	Late and misplaced documents (11) TBD		Late documents and documents which were submitted with erroneous or incomplete cover page information		Priorisation within this category will be done during the meeting.
	4	N1-	CN IMS open items	Chairman	Noted.

8.03	02011 8 N1- 02008 2	MESSAGE method as a filtering criteria	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	23.218	Revised to N1-020145
8.03	N1- 02008 9	Corrections to 23.218	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	23.218	Revised to N1-020153
8.03	N1- 02009 6	Subsequent FC	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	23.218	Rejected.
8.03	N1- 02013 0	Notification Of Registration Status to AS	H3g / Kevan Hobbis	23.218	Noted. There are still open items like <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the first diagram could not be agreed because some delegations see that the introduction of AS-Central would have an architectural impact which would need to be defined by SA2. Could not agree to send a LS to SA2 to find out. indication by S-CSCF of user registration to AS
8.03	N1- 02013 5	CR for 23.218: Application Server and MRFC Information Flows	Lucent Technologies / Eric Henrikson	23.218	
8.03	N1- 02014 5	MESSAGE method as a filtering criteria	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	23.218	Withdrawn Revision of N1-020082
8.03	N1- 02015 3	Corrections to 23.218	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	23.218	Agreed. Revision of N1-020089
8.04	N1- 02004 1	CR to 24.228 Integrity and Authentication protection for SIP REGISTER	H3g	24.228	Withdrawn
8.04	N1- 02007	CR to 24.228: Reregistration - failure of reregistration	Lucent Technologies /	24.228	Revised to N1-020091 before presentation

8.04	7 N1-02009 1	CR to 24.228: Reregistration - failure of reregistration	Keith Drage Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.228	Agreed. Revised before presentation Revision of N1-020077
8.04	N1-02009 5	Registration Rejection	Duncan Mills / Vodafone	24.229	
8.04	N1-02010 2	CR to 24.229: Proxy handling of 420 status code in REGISTER response	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	Postponed.
8.07	N1-02009 4	Transport of Integrity Key and Cipherring Key from S-CSCF to P-CSCF	Duncan Mills / Vodafone		Agreed. The meeting favoured alternative 2 implemented so that the security parameters CK and IK should be sent by S-CSCF to P-CSCF coded in the EAP header of 401 UNAUTHORIZED. This will impact the IETF draft defining the contents of the EAP packet. (draft-torvinen-http-eap-01) Discussion N1-020094 and 124 are linked
8.07	N1-02014 0	Notifying the S-CSCF of the need to authenticate 'initial' REGISTER requests.	Duncan Mills / Vodafone		Noted. Discussion
8.08	N1-02006 1	Media stream establishment for UE terminated sessions	Lucent Technologies / Milo Orsic	24.229	Withdrawn
8.08	N1-02006 5	CR to 24.229: Procedures at the UE and P-CSCF for media authorization	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229	
8.08	N1-02007 9	Interworking between 3GPP UE and non-3GPP UE	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.229	Rejected.

8.08	N1-020080	Adding the bandwidth parameter to SDP	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.228	
8.08	N1-020081	Correction to Registration with Authentication call flows	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.228	Rejected.
8.08	N1-020083	The content of the To: header field	Nokia/ Krisztian Kiss	24.228	
8.08	N1-020084	The content of the From: and RPI headers	Nokia/ Krisztian Kiss	24.228	Withdrawn
8.08	N1-020085	Routing of requests in IMS	Nokia/ Krisztian Kiss	24.228	Withdrawn
8.08	N1-020086	Handling of further initial requests in S-CSCF	Nokia/ Krisztian Kiss	24.229	Withdrawn
8.08	N1-020087	Handling of subsequent requests in S-CSCF	Nokia/ Krisztian Kiss	24.229	Withdrawn
8.08	N1-020088	Handling of refresh requests in S-CSCF	Nokia/ Krisztian Kiss	24.229	Withdrawn
8.08	N1-020097	Terminating call to unreg. subscriber	Nokia/ Bajkó Gábor	24.228	
8.08	N1-020098	S-CSCF procedures	Nokia/ Krisztian Kiss	24.229	Revised to N1-020146
8.08	N1-020146	S-CSCF procedures	Nokia/ Krisztian Kiss	24.229	Agreed N1-020146 and N1-020150 are linked. Revision of N1-020098
8.10	N1-02015	Corrections to the section 6.9.1	Nokia	24.228	

		2			
8.12		N1-020066	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Require Header	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229 Revised to N1-020148
8.12		N1-020067	CR to 24.229: Inclusion of the Events draft in profile tables	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229 Withdrawn
8.12		N1-020078	CR to 24.229: More minor technical changes and editorial changes to TS24.229	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229
8.12		N1-020093	Addition of Cell ID to SIP messages	Duncan Mills / Vodafone	Discussion
8.12		N1-020100	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Supported header	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229 Revised to N1-020147
8.12		N1-020101	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Unsupported header	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229 agreed.
8.12		N1-020147	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Supported header	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229 Agreed.
8.12		N1-020148	CR to 24.229: An analysis of the requirements for the Require Header	Lucent Technologies / Keith Drage	24.229 Agreed. Revision of N1-020100
8.12		N1-020149	Outbound Proxy Routing and Smaller Changes to 24.228	many	24.228 Rejected. Revision of N1-020066
11	A.O.B. Friday 18.1.2002				
	11	N1-	Maintenance of IMS in future 3gpp	CN1 chairman	Withdrawn

		02003 2	Releases			
12	Closing Friday 18.1.2002 no later than 18:00 (Hannu's flight is on Saturday)		Did you mark your attendance to this meeting on the participants list?			Any meeting document which is not mentioned in this report shall be interpreted as "reserved", i.e. not defined and shall be ignored if received.