N5-030507 rev. 1

joint-API-group (Parlay, ETSI Project OSA, 3GPP TSG_CN WG5)

Report of Meeting #25, Bangkok, THAILAND, 27-31 October 2003

Contents

Chair:	Chelo Abarca (Alcatel)
Vice-Chair:	Musa Unmehopa (Lucent Technologies)
3GPP Support:	Adrian Zoicas (ETSI, 3GPP Mobile Competence Centre)
Meeting Host:	"Japanese Friends of 3GPP"
	Fujitsu, J-Phone, Lucent Technology Japan, Matsushita Communication, NEC, Nippon
Ericsson,	*Nippon information Technology Consulting, Nokia Japan, NTT Comware, NTT DoCoMo*
Web Home Page:	http://www.3gpp.org/TB/CN/CN5/CN5.htm
3GPP E-mail Lists:	http://www.3gpp.org/email/lists.htm http://list.etsi.org/
JWG E-mail List:	3GPP_TSG_CN_WG5_JOINTAPIWORK@LIST.ETSI.ORG
Server:	http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_cn/WG5_osa/ ftp://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_cn/WG5_osa/

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

1.1 IPR (Intellectual Property Rights) declarations

N5-030500r2	Agenda of Meeting #25, Bangkok, Thailand, 27-31 October 2003	CN5 Chair

- Tuesday 13:00 PM the VC candidacy nomination will be closed.
- Adrian clarified that the IPR rules have been changed to make them in line with ETSI IPR rules. IPR should be declared with the Organizational Partners, i.e. it doesn't have to be declared anymore in the meeting.

Agenda approved.

2 Allocation of documents to agenda items

N5-030501	Document Allocation	CN5 Vice Chair

This document. Some late reserved documents were received. Also, some late, not reserved, N5-030611/612/613. N5-030611 will be discussed at agenda item 10 on Messaging, N5-030612 is the Parlay meeting calendar, agenda item 17 on Future Meetings, N5-030613 is a REL-5 CR to the part 1 Java Realization rules, agenda item 6 on Release 5.

Noted.

3 Reporting

3.1 JWG meeting, San Francisco

N5-030307r2	DRAFT Report v201 of Meeting #24, San Francisco, USA, 14-18 July 2003	CN5 Chair

Revision 2 contains some tidying up, e.g. e-mail approved documents. Clarification: Work between meetings will be reported in the next meeting report.

San Francisco report approved.

3.2 3GPP

3.2.1 CN plenary

N5-050509r2	DRAFT Meeting Report v1.1.1, 3GPP TSG-CN#21, Frankfurt, Germany. 17-19 September, 2003	CN Chair

- All Java CRs for Rel5 were approved.
- TSG-CN agreed to remove from the Work Plan the Work items "Retrieval of Visited Network Capabilities" and "Enhanced User Privacy in LCS".
- TSG-CN agreed to the use of the term PARLAY X in CN5's specifications.
- Stephen Hayes will make the modifications to the IETF dependency table as requested by CN5.
- Revised version of OSA WID approved (according to WP changes in previous plenary, i.e. another revision is required to reflect the above decisions).

– There was support for identifying dependencies and overlaps in a document, which is maintained by one person or one organization. Later SA#21 agreed that the single point of contact would be Ian Sharp from Nortel Networks (though he's handling dependencies and not overlaps. Reminder: we reported to CN#21 that we didn't have dependencies on OMA, but rather overlaps, and we wanted to discuss them after the 3GPP OMA workshop. This should be raised again next plenary. Discussion in the JWG need to decide what to tell CN#22). It was also agreed in SA#21 that this list of OMA dependencies would be included in the Work Plan.

Noted.

N5-030512	IETF status report & 3GPP IETF Dependencies and Priorities	CN Chair

This version is the one we discussed last meeting so our comments presented to CN#21 have not been taken into account. **ACTION ITEM**: Chelo to talk to Stephen, ensure that our comments are taken into account for next version and distribute the new version.

Noted.

N5-030511	NP-030437 Rev of 350 CN5 presentation to CN#21	CN5 Chair

Not to be confused with WITHDRAWN N5-030511 "Report of WG SA1 to last 3GPP SA meeting"

This zip contains three files:
- A list of the CN5 contributions to CN#21 (already distributed by email before the plenary)
- MSFT access database version of the CN5 CR list
- The CN5 presentation to CN#21 (revised due to some version misalignment which was corrected after the submission deadline).

Noted.

3.2.2 SA plenary

N5-030510r1	Draft Report for meeting SA#21 – version 0.0.5	MCC

3GPP OMA Workshop:
- The major conclusions of the workshop were:

1. Clearly identify the end objectives of the collaboration
   It was noted that as 3GPP do not produce standards (the SDOs produce standards based on the 3GPP specifications), that the text "*Maintain 3GPP/OMA **standards** work so that each can support their own missions ... Minimise the cost of developing **standards** by cooperating*" should read "*Maintain 3GPP/OMA **specification** work so that each can support their own missions ... Minimise the cost of developing **specifications** by cooperating*".
2. Compatibility of release schedules
3. Visibility of each other's WI progress
4. Avoiding additional/unnecessary requirements documents in 3GPP/2
6. Avoiding duplication of work (i.e. understanding OMA/3GPP's respective roles)
7. How to approach any possible work cooperation/transition

- Action 4a, "each organization to inform the other on a periodic basis (e.g. monthly/quarterly) of requirements documents and their current status": from a TSG point of view, an updated 3GPP Work Plan should be transmitted to OMA after each TSG Plenary round. From the WG viewpoint, the communication could be more detailed and regular depending on the cooperation on work between the 3GPP and OMA WGs.

- It was concluded that this could be considered a rough outline for cooperation between 3GPP and OMA. It was generally considered that there should be no real problems with co-operation between

3GPP and OMA. Transfer of work to and from 3GPP would be subject to agreement by the TSGs and endorsement by the PCG. It was agreed that 3GPP should explicitly provide information to OMA of what is needed to be provided to 3GPP for their common work. It was also considered helpful if OMA would provide similar information to 3GPP on their work. **Member contribution was considered essential in order to coordinate the work between the two bodies**.

- **IPR:** Jane Humphrey: There is a difference in IPR handling rules between the OMA and the 3GPP partner organizations. This is still to be resolved. **ACTION ITEM**: Chelo to find out latest discussions on this issue, e.g. PCG.

3GPP OMA PoC discussion:
A joint will take place in this week, Monday 6pm, where OMA delegates will present OMA PoC work to 3GPP delegates. Everybody is welcome.

Reorganization of Charging work:
It was clarified that SA WG5 had improved their resource problems for this work and that no work should be moved into CN until the Rel-6 work is completed. A complete review of the charging work should be carried out in order to arrive at an efficient solution. It was agreed to have a discussion on this over the TSG SA e-mail list.

Freezing date for Rel6

- It was recognized that some flexibility would be needed in the freezing of Rel-6 due to the co-operation needed with other bodies (e.g. OMA) for requirements work.
- It was agreed to freeze the requirements for Rel-6. This means that the acceptance of new requirements into the current Rel-6 work plan from this point forward are not permitted without strong justification. Therefore, in principle, no new requirements would be accepted for Rel-6 from this point. It was clarified that any requirements coming from OMA would be considered on a case-by-case basis and full justification for inclusion would be required and that the work already directed into SA WG1 or SA WG2 by TSG SA, such as PoC, is already allowed.
- It was agreed that with the Stage 1 work frozen, the status of the Stage 2 (and Stage 3) work will be evaluated at the next meeting in order to determine if a Release 6 freeze date can be determined.

Noted.

N5-030513	Presentation of 3GPP Work Plan status at the end of SA#21 (09/2003)	MCC

OSA is on page 56.

Noted.

3.2.3 SA1 activities on OSA Requirements

N5-030511	Report of WG SA1 to last 3GPP SA meeting	3GPP SA1
	WITHDRAWN	

Withdrawn, as there was no specific CN5/OSA content.

3.2.4 SA1 and T2 activities on MMS

N5-030595	Correspondence on MMS between the Chairs of T2 SWG3 and CN5	CN5 Chair

T2 SWG3 said they are unaware that CN5 is doing work in MMS. An e-mail exchange took place to explain. As a first step, CN5 chair has informed chairman of T2 SWG3 of the dates of our Bangkok meeting, and we have proposed to start closer co-operation by writing in Bangkok the LS they are requesting.

Chelo has clarified to them that we have a workflow where we get input from SA1 and SA2

ACTION ITEM: Erwin will draft the outgoing LS for them, number 614.

Noted.

3.2.5 SA2 activities on IP Session Function

3.2.6 SA2 activities on User Data Management

See LS later in the agenda.

3.2.7 SA1, SA2 activities on GUP

N5-030601	GUP activities in other 3GPP groups	CN5 Chair

GUP activities in SA1:
As reported by SA1 to SA#21:

- At the last SA1, it was noticed that the GUP TS needed to be cleaned up a little to ensure that it was clear. This was done and was presented to SA1 the result of which is provided in document SP-030469 and was approved.

Issue for discussion: since SA1 has already finished the GUP stage 1, it's time to go back to them in order to clarify the status of OSA GUP-related requirements.

GUP WI was presented for approval in document SP-030472 (later updated to SP-030553 and approved). It contains a table of affected existing specs. For OSA stage 3 only Terminal Capabilities is included.

Issue for discussion: is this table accurate?

ACTION ITEM: Chelo to draft LS to SA1, asking for latest status SA1 OSA GUP requirements. 615. Include in the LS that the table needs to be cleaned up, i.e. only the TC API is listed as stage 3 impact. LS needs to be copied to SA2.

GUP activities in SA5:
As reported to SA#21: the work so far done on GUP has been analysed and the protocols coming from GUP are planned to be used for a basis for the Subscription Management. It was also reported that the work of OSA has not been considered, as no resource was made available to evaluate their work.

Issue for discussion: do we need to discuss with SA5?

GUP activities in CN4:
As reported to CN#21:

- CN4 started GUP stage 3 based on stage 2 and decided stage 1 needs to be revised.
- Siemens have studied the Stage 2 work on GUP and are concerned that the impacts may be larger than expected. Siemens expects to bring contributions to the next CN4 meeting.
- TS 29.240 is planned to be presented for information in CN#22 and for approval in CN#23.

Noted.

3.2.8 CN1 activities on Access Independence

N5-030590	Report on status of Access Independence and Presence work in CN1	Marconi

The primary purpose of the Work Item IMS Commonality and Interoperability is to isolate IMS and GPRS from each other within the various 3GPP specs. There are to be no technical changes, it is purely editorial.

At the August meeting of CN1 work was initiated and a series of conference calls were arranged to generate a set of CRs to update 24.229. At this meeting a set of 6 CRs against 24.229 (see documents N1-031426 to 431) are submitted for approval by CN1. Changes proposed include new terminology and alignment between 23.228 and 24.229. The terminology changes include the replacement of GPRS with IP-CAN and PDP Context by IP-CAN Bearer.

If these changes are approved then relevant OSA documents need to be reviewed for similar changes. This would mainly apply to the mapping documents. Then again, as these are by definition protocol specific, should those be changed at all? This is what CN5 needs to be reported to the CN plenary. **ACTION ITEM**: Jane volunteers to go through this exercise.

23.218 will also require terminology updates but these changes are unlikely to alter the OSA related sections.

Noted.

3.2.9 CN1 activities on Presence

N5-030590	Report on status of Access Independence and Presence work in CN1	Marconi

The expected completion date for this Work Item has been changed to March '04. Work on TR 24.841 is now considered 80% complete, from this TR a new TS has been created for the presence service, TS 24.141 "Presence service using the IP Multimedia (IM) Core Network (CN) subsystem; Stage 3". The scope of this TS is to provide *"the protocol details for the presence service within the IP Multimedia (IM) Core Network (CN) subsystem based on the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) and SIP Events as defined in 3GPP TS 24.229 [3]. Requirements for manipulation of presence data are defined by use of a protocol at the Ut reference point based on XML Configuration Access Protocol (XCAP) (draft-rosenberg-simple-xcap-00 [4])."*

An early draft of this TS can be found in CN1 document N1-031365 and the current list of presence open issues in CN1 document N1-031367. In addition, as the completion of this Work Item is heavily dependent on a number of RFC specifications being developed by the IETF, a list of these dependencies can be found on the 3GPP web site.

ACTION ITEM: Jane to draft LS to CN1, CN (copy SA2) on clarification Ut reference point to the OSA Gateway. 616.

Noted.

3.2.10 3GPP OMA discussions

See reports from CN#21 and SA#21.

N5-030619	Collection of PoC documents for the 3GPP/PoC joint session	MCC

Noted.

3.3 Parlay

3.3.1 Parlay Board

Discussion on Parlay X specifications, and the copyright issues for the ETSI and 3GPP versions – originally some text in clause 10 (Payment) with a copyright from PayCircle. More in the Parlay X session later in the agenda.

PayCircle has asked for joint Parlay and PayCircle meetings, so far not very massively attended.

Parlay and OMA: we have a Cooperation Agreement allowing for Parlay companies to be observers in OMA meetings and viceversa. Marconi will be a Parlay observer next OMA meeting.

Observers don't pay the OMA meeting fee. Being a Parlay observer means he delegate(s) need to be registered as such, inform Richard as contact for this, state which OMA meetings intended to attend and permission given from the OMA

part (which seems to be just a rubber stamping issue). Not solved yet: access to documentation, so for the moment Richard will be the contact for this. From the Parlay point of view observers attend as supporters of the Parlay initiative in OMA.

Q: how does an observer know what docs are interested?
A: this still to be clarified – the process is not yet implemented. The Parlay Board is working on a set of the documentation that is available to Parlay companies because of the CA with the Parlay Group, and on the work taking place in different OMA WGs for closer cooperation.

Parlay liaison with MSF in place. No special procedure but there is a Parlay mailing list "msf-parlay@msforum.org". MSF setting up an interoperability event next year using MSF platforms, Parlay companies are encouraged to participate. This participation will be discussed in Rome in the Technical Discussion Parlay group, where an MSF representative will attend. Cost is expected to be similar to the one in ETSI interoperability events.

Rome meeting next week: a new Technical Discussion Group. This intends to stimulate technical discussions to enhance Parlay, bring new architectural concepts etc. It gives also members an opportunity to bring new ideas to the Board. Also new areas of work like new APIs – related to this though not necessarily for Rome would be requirements to Parlay version 6, like new network enablers – capabilities in the networks that are reflected at API level, a bottom up approach to new Parlay APIs to add to the usual top down (requirements, use case triggered) we have so far.

3.3.2 Parlay TAC

Not much discussion recently but it's been suggested to discuss in Rome the interfaces that have been passed from Parlay to the JWG (like PAM, PM etc) – there is a suggestion to set up within Parlay some sub-WGs looking at Parlay specific initiatives or development of these interfaces, so they're discussed in Parlay and the result is brought into the JWG for further consideration. So the JWG is "in charge of" agreeing what to put in the 3GPP and ETSI specs, but they would be discussed in Parlay WGs beforehand. This may have a slight impact in the JWG.

Chelo as 3GPP CN5 chair: membership is not the same so anything brought to the JWG will be discussed as contributions. Though good to have a Palay pre-digestion.
Richard: yes, this is the idea.

3.4 ETSI

3.4.1 ETSI SPAN reorganization

N5-030562	OSA report from TISPAN plenary	BT Exact

Within ESTI the two initiatives TIPHON and SPAN have joined and are officially now a single organization called TISPAN. From the JWG perspective: the OSE Project is now part of TISPAN WG1 (Services). All official decisions for the ETSI specifications were taken in the JWG till now; this process has been presented to WG1 and they have agreed we can continue like this: decisions made in the JWG, then verified by the plenary.

All document numbering has now changed. We have 77 WIs (about 50% of SPAN work programs), and all have changed numbers (see TDoc 565).

WG1 meeting agendas have an OSA slot in TISPAN issues. Not expected to have these specific sessions but if they are desired for ETSI only discussions they can take place.

Noted.

N5-030565	Creation of ETSI TISPAN Committee	ETSI PTCC

More details on what's reported in 562.

TIPHON and SPAN have not merged – they're both officially closed. As a consequence all the spec that used to be SPAN are now TISPAN, and same for the web space.

Decision to close was overlaps in NGN standardzation. Bith groups had different way of working but a decision to merge both was taken.

Organization: WGs hold the expertise in different areas, and projects intend to be cross-WG when applicable. They could be very small just to hold a set of WIs, or large and cross WG like ours – projects group sets of WIs that are linked closely together. See 565 for a list of WGs and projects, as well as chairs and vice chairs (all elections have taken place).

All SPAN and TIPHON WIs have been renumbered because they contain the committee name – see 565 for new numbering (in our case the number included a project code). No specs numbers will change, only the WI code which is inside the front cover of the specs (as an internal ETSI code). WIs for anything already published will not changed.

Until now everything except the requirements doc (which used to be SPAN14) was SPAN12. Now everything is WG1 except requirements (WG2) and testing (WG6). For some specs like testing we don't have a number yet – we'll have it when we deliver them.

Impact on the JWG: the intention is that there will be as little as possible since there is recognition in TISPAN that the OSA activities work very well the way they're organized at the moment in the JWG with 3GPP and Parlay. JWG decisions concerning OSA have status of TISPAN WG1 decisions (ie no need to go to WG1 and then plenary, just plenary) as e used to have for SPAN12. This will continue for the core specs. For testing and requirements decisions they will go to the corresponding WGs for an intermediate, pre-plenary approval, though understanding that these will always be decisions from the JWG.

Minor point: the ETSI legal agreement with Parlay needs to be changed because an annex refers explicitly to SPAN (to be done).

Documentation: ETSI SPAN area still operational and was recently updated with latest publications. There is still access, but soon there will be an area in TISPAN available.

No impact on JWG meeting plans, mailing list or meeting document numbering (which continue being 3GPP).

Noted.

3.5 3GPP2

Everything in 3GPP2 is delegated to the JWG.

3.6 Work between meetings

This agenda item aims to review the ToDo list from the previous meeting, plus reporting on any other between-meetings activity, if applicable.

N5-030609	**Results from To Do List from the San Francisco meeting**	**CN5 Chair, CN5 Vice Chair**

- San Francisco documents approved by email: 412-429, 431 (update of 320), 432 (update of 321), 433 (update of 322), 430 (update of 323), 409r1, 410, 411r1.
- Tdocs 391 and 392 was distributed too late for email approval and will be discussed in this meeting (as 591 and 592).

#15: some material ready, will be 618 for agenda item 7.2.1 (FW-HA).

#20: 399 and 400 from Guda need to be updated, and it is unlikely that Guda can do it. Volunteres are requested to do the updates according to the San Francisco report. Ultan volunteers for 399 and 400. Chelo to ask Guda where this comes from (PAM Forum?) and if he intends to participate in the future.

Q: does the PAM Forum still exist?
A: Richard to find out about this (including whether having merged PAM activities in the JWG is still unchanged).

#25, #26: numbers in 609 are not correct. Nevertheless these docs have been prepared by Adrian to be presented to next plenary. 389 and 390 are the right numbers.

Scott's document numbers: 409r1, 411r1 and 410 are the ones that were approved.

Q: what about 398 which is said in the San Francisco report that it is for next meeting?
A: the issue of SIP mapping is on hold, the doc available to San Francisco was informational. But work in presence in 3GPP is based on IETF work, so for this mapping doc we need to be based on the 3GPP (IETF based) work in progress. Guda had volunteered to do this work – if he's not available we need an editor for this mapping: volunteers requested.

Q: 407 from San Francisco was for email discussion or approval, what's the status?
A: no conclusion, it is re-submitted for this meeting. For database: not approved.

Q: 214 and 218 from San Francisco were not discussed.
A: not approved, up to Open API Solutions to decide what to do about them.

Noted.

3.7 Other reporting

4 Input liaison statements

N5-030518	**LS from OMA Requirements Group to 3GPP, 3GPP2 : Introduction to the OMA Activity on Push to talk over Cellular (PoC)**	**OMA REQ**

LS to 3GPP TSGs, and 3GPP2 TSG-S (not for us), from the OMA Requirements WG, informing of the PoC work just started in OMA and asking for proposals for cooperation. Includes the OMA PoC WID as an attachment.

More OMA PoC information on the session this evening.

Adrian to find the evening session documents and give them a JWG number and distribute them; they will be in this report for information. They will be packaged as 619.

Noted.

N5-030519	**LS from OMA Requirements WG to 3GPP SA5, SA1, T2, T3 and 3GPP2 TSG-S on OMA Device Management**	**OMA REQ**

LS to 3GPP SA1, SA5, T2, T3 and 3GPP2 TSG S (not us), from the OMA Requirements WG, with the OMA Device Management Requirements Document for information.

Noted.

N5-030520	**LS from S5 to N1,N2,N3,N4,N5,S1,S2 on possible re-organisation of 3GPP charging specification work**	**3GPP SA5**

This LS was already addressed by email. A CN leaders response was prepared and agreed at CN#21.

Then during SA#21 SA5 reported that the resource problem had been solved and no actions were needed for Rel6, but SA#21 agreed that organization of the charging work would be discussed by email using the SA exploder (see section 3.2.2 of this report).

Noted.

N5-030522	**LS Reply from S2 to N5 (cc: CN, SA, S1) on User Data Management architecture requirement**	**3GPP SA2**

SA1 requested SA2 to review the requirements and to introduce the User Data Management Service Capability Feature (SCF) in TS 23.127.

SA2 would like to inform CN5 that there seems to be no interest in the topic among the companies attending SA2. No contributions were received on the subject even after explicit invitation. Thus SA2 regrets that we cannot provide an update of TS 23.127.

Therefore requests CN5 to adjust work planning accordingly.

This seems to be a proposal to remove User Data Management from the OSA Rel6 requirements. Chelo: to remove this requirement from the WP for next plenary (+ WID needs to be updated accordingly, Adrian will do) and refocus the discussion on GUP.

Revised WID (with this and other changes) will be 617 (Adrian will be in charge of update for next plenary).

Noted.

N5-030523	**LS reply from S2 to S5 (cc: SA,N1,N2,N3,N4,N5,S1) on possible re-organisation of 3GPP charging specification work**	**3GPP SA2**

SA2 response to old issue of TDoc 520.

Noted.

N5-030540	**LS from ETSI OCG EMTEL to All ETSI TBs, relevant WGs, EPPs 3GPP SA, MESA SSG SA (cc: 3GPP2, TIA TR 45, GSC) on EC Requirements on Emergency Telecommunications**	**OCG EMTEL**

5 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 cannot be implemented (SCS and/or application side).

Note that as Parlay 3.2 has been finalized, and backwards compatibility has to be guaranteed, the assumption is that for error corrections in the scope of Parlay 3 / 3GPP Rel.4 only work around and documentation of the errors is allowed.

N5-030560	**Rel 4 CR 29.198-05 Make more explicit when the call control activity timer should be stopped in UI**	**Open API Solutions**

Richard has agreed to present this document.

UI methods may take long. During that time an MPCC timer can expire and cause the call leg to be terminated.

SF notes include an indication that Rene would have an e-mail discussion with Garreth. This e-mail discussion did not take place. Erwin agrees to make sure the discussion will take place. This comment was found in 307, SF documents.

ACTION ITEM: Erwin to make sure the discussion between Erwin and Garreth as found in 307 takes place.

Ultan recommends that an eventual update will shift the text to state description (the sections associated with the state transition diagrams)

ACTION ITEM: Eamonn to discuss issues related to GCC and MPCC offline with Garreth.

Noted

N5-030580	Changing TpOctetSet to mean List of TpOctet	ETSI PTCC

Discussion pertains to REL-5 (TDoc 582) as well

A number of times over the past 6 months, our attention has been brought to the following:

TpOctetSet is defined as "a Numbered Set of Data elements of TpOctet".

A Numbered Set of Data Elements is defined as "a data type which comprises an integer which indicates the total number of data elements in the set (the *number* part), and an **unordered** set of data elements (the *data* part). *Set* data types do not contain duplicate data elements."

A Numbered List of Data Elements is defined as "a data type which comprises an integer which indicates the total number of data elements in the set (the *number* part), and an **ordered** set of data elements (the *data* part). *List* data types can contain duplicate data elements. "

TpOctetSet is , among other things, the type used to carry input or output of our encryption and authentication methods. Clearly, an unordered type which cannot contain duplicate data elements is not suitable for use in this case. In fact, in all cases where TpOctetSet is used in the APIs, TpOctetList, i.e. a Numbered List of TpOctet, should have been used. This is one of the most misleading parts of our specifications as they are currently written.

We could create a new type TpOctetList, defined as a Numbered List of TpOctet, and replace each current use of TpOctetSet with TpOctetList. This would align the specification with other uses of Tp...Set and Tp...List types. But this could introduce many cases of backwards incompatibility in the specifications.

Alternatively, we could redefine TpOctetSet to mean the same as a TpOctetList. To ensure that this type is used correctly, we could also introduce a TpUnorderedOctetSet, which would contain the current definition of TpOctetSet. At present there is no use for this type, but creating it now might prevent a new incorrect use of TpOctetSet (using it where an unordered set is required).

The second proposal has been developed into CRs for part 2 (TDoc 581 for Release 4 and TDoc 582 for Release 5). The only part of the specification that would require changing, under the second proposal above, is part 2, in the Word document. No change is necessary in the IDL or QSDL, and these data types do not exist in the Java code.

Noted.

N5-030581	Correct Description of TpOctetSet	ETSI PTCC

RELATED TO N5-030582 (REL-5)

Rel4 CR for the change proposed in TDoc 580.

The third change is not necessary in REL-6, so only present in this CR.

Add possible note to explain why we introduce a type we do not use.
Add a note to 5.2.3 that there is an exception on unordered.
CR cover page: put a cross in “other affected specs”
CR cover page: field “other specs” mention the REL-5 CR -> N5-030582

New revision in N5-030620.

N5-030620	Revision of N5-030581	ETSI PTCC

Agreed

N5-030591	Re-use of base Reference within an inheritance relationship	Marconi

RELATED TO N5-030592 (REL-5)

This is TDoc 391 from San Francisco, where it was not presented. It is a result of the approval of the discussion document TDoc 372.

Clarified that there is no IDL change, just textual clarification of a possible ambiguity.

Discussion on whether it's OK to submit REL-4 CRs. Clarification that OSA is earlier in the life cycle than the rest of GSM and the likes of e.g. GPRS. Clarification that the CN plenary is well aware of the different audience we address with OSA and we are receiving developer feedback.

Off-line discussions are encouraged to improve the wording.

Revision in N5-030622

N5-030622	Revision of N5-030591	Marconi

Updated front page and text after offline discussion.

Adrian to accept changes in cover page.

Agreed

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

Only essential error corrections can be taken into account. Essential means that without the intended error correction the current spec cannot be implemented (SCS and/or application side).

Note that as Parlay 4.0 has been finalized, and backwards compatibility has to be guaranteed, the assumption is that for error corrections in the scope of Parlay 4 / 3GPP Rel.5 only work around and documentation of the errors is allowed.

N5-030525	Rel-5 feature description document	MCC

This document has already been revised by the JWG chair (Chelo Abarca) during CN#20 (see revision marks) and sent out for comments after the San Francisco meeting (no comments were received).

Actually the reason for the distribution of this document to the 3GPP Leaders list is the fact that there are some points still TBP (To Be Provided); This is not the case for the OSA part, so as far as we are concern this subject is closed.

This is the final version.

Noted.

N5-030542	Overview of 3GPP Release 5, Summary of all Release 5 Features	MCC

This is a different version of TDoc 525. Not clear if it is earlier or later, but anyway the issue is closed. Adrian clarified this was a previous version.

Noted.

N5-030547	Add Java Realization rule to address MPCC name conflicts, REL-5	IBM

RELATED TO N5-030547 (REL-6)

There is a problem that has existed for a while that should be addressed with the Java Realization of the Multi Party Call Control Manager section.

The problem primarily relates to the IpAppMultiPartyCall and IpAppCallLeg interfaces of the Multi Party Call Control SCF. These interfaces contain 4 methods that have the same names. In practice, it is usually desirable to implement an object that implements both of these interfaces. While Java in general allows an object to implement two interfaces that have a method by the same name (and signature), RMI/IIOP and CORBA do not allow methods from two interfaces with the same method names.

The conflicting methods in IpAppCallLeg are:
getInfoErr, getInfoRes, superviseErr, superviseRes.
The associated request methods in IpCallLeg are:
getInfoReq, superviseReq

In order to fix the problem, we recommend modifying the method names in the IpAppCallLeg interface to include "CallLeg" as part of the method name, such as "getCallLegInfoRes", thereby removing the name conflict, and also the IpCallLeg interface for consistency.

This contribution proposes to provide a rule in the Multi Party Call Control section that provides renaming of these problematic methods, in order to avoid the name collisions. The method renaming is done in IpCallLeg and IpAppCallLeg for consistency.

If not approved: there are other solutions to address this problem, however it complicates the application design, and each of these other solutions also have pitfalls and create various other design issues within the J2EE environment. The problems and complexities can be avoided most easily if there was no naming conflict in the interfaces.

This is a Cat C CR.

Eamon presents: "IBM adds rule as required to generate valid J2EE Java". Hence, it is a fix. Meeting agrees to make this Cat. F. The document implements the agreement reached on the exploder.
Adrian makes it F, fixes date and change Title to "rules" and changesAdd in Correct on title

N5-030549	Correct the sequence diagram for Fault Management	Lucent

Correct the sequence diagram for Fault Management, to be in line with method definitions.

Per the current sequence diagram 8.1.4.8, the FWK should use appUnavailableInd() on the service after the client calls svcUnavailableInd() on the FWK. When should the FWK use svcUnavailableInd() on the service?

Correct behaviour should be the following: the FWK calls svcUnavailableInd() on the service after a client calls svcUnavailableInd() on the FWK. In addition, when the client calls appUnavailableInd() on the FWK, the FWK calls appUnavailableInd() on the service. The sequence diagrams needs to be corrected accordingly.

This contribution proposes to replace “appUnavailStatusInd()” method with correct “svcUnavailInd()” method in the sequence diagram for Fault Management.

If not approved, the sequence diagram does not correctly represent the API functionality. Application programmers typically code to the sequence diagrams, resulting in incorrect implementations.

Approved.

N5-030561	Rel 5 CR 29.198-05 Make more explicit when the call control activity timer should be stopped in UI	Open API Solutions
	RELATED TO N5-030560 (REL-4)	

The meeting did not discuss this document, as Gareth has provided no guidance on how to deal with this or who to present.

See 560 for actions.

Noted

N5-030566	Correct description of TpNotificationRequestedSetEntry	ETSI PTCC

RELATED TO N5-030567 (REL-6)

The description of TpNotificationRequestedSetEntry makes reference to a type TpNotificationRequestSet. This type doesn't exist. It should be TpNotificationRequestedSet. This change is backwards compatible, because the UML model, and therefore the IDL, WSDL and Java code, all contain the correct data type.

This contribution proposes to replace TpNotificationRequestSet with TpNotificationRequestedSet in the description of TpNotificationRequestedSetEntry.

If not approved, the description of the data type will conflict with the IDL, WSDL and Java code. Implementations which follow the Word document may not interwork with implementations based exclusively on the code in the specification.

This error was introduced because the orginal CR already had the error, i.e. different names in the text and in the actual data type. As a result, the MS Word document refers to a type that doesn't exist.

Approved.

N5-030572	Correct State Transition Diagram for IpAccess	AePONA

The method names and location of methods in the Framework Access Session API have previously undergone modification and correction. However the State Transition Diagram for IpAccess has not been updated to reflect these changes in a consistent fashion.

This contribution proposes to correct the IpAccess State Transition Diagram to align with the specified interface classes and methods.

If not approved, ambiguous specification may result and implementations will fail to interoperate correctly.

Approved

N5-030573	Correct Framework Availabilty Indication in Fault Management	AePONA

The Fault Management Interfaces have been revised to replace a svcUnavailableInd with a svcAvailStatusInd. This has been done to ensure that when a service becomes available again that an indication can be provided.

The equivalent behaviour cannot be supported for the Framework itself, therefore though it is possible for the framework to indicate that it is no longer available, it is not possible for the framework to indicate when it becomes available again.

The Framework does include a fault report and recovery mechanism, however this represents only a subset of the functionality supported by the availability indication, excluding indication of overload conditions and software upgrade.

This contribution proposes to deprecate the current fwUnavailableInd, fwFaultReportInd and fwFaultRecoveryInd methods from the existing Fault Management interfaces and replace with a fwAvailStatusInd.

If not approved, OSA Fault management functionality for the Framework is not aligned with the fault management capability of other SCFs. The Framework functionality is therefore incomplete.

Q. 8.4.4.2: typo in figure caption: IpFaultManager should be IpFwFaultManager. 10.4.24: typo in section: TFwAvailStatusReason should be TpFwAvailStatusReason
A. yes

Q. typo in CR cover page title: Availabilty should be Availability

A. yes

Q. is this cat. F? Is this broken? Motivation does not reflect that it is broken.
A. The meeting agrees that cat. F is not appropriate. Proposed to make this Rel. 6. Cat. C. Frontpage needs to be updated.

Meeting welcomes release 6 CR.

Updated to 631

N5-030631	Update of 573	AePONA
	NOT AVAILABLE	

For e-mail approval

N5-030574	Correct Correlation Behaviour in Fault Management	AePONA

The genFaultStatsReq/Res/Err methods on the Framework to App and Framework to Svc interfaces are used to ask for and supply fault statistics reports on the operation of parties involved in OSA communication. These methods currently use a time period to control the period for which statistics are to be gathered. There is no restriction on invoking multiple requests or indeed requests with overlapping periods in time. In such cases however, there is no mechanism for correlating the responses uniquely with the requests. Although the res methods include a time period that could be used to match with the corresponding Req, the Err methods do not support any suitable identification.

In addition, in the case of applications that request fault statistics for a list of services, there is no correlation between the fault statistics returned and the service in question.

This contribution proposes to correct the correlation between requests and responses by introducing a unique ID that is generated by the requesting entity. In addition clarify the ordering of information returned to applications when a list of services is used.

If not approved, the fault statistics mechanism of the OSA Fault Management capability cannot be supported.

Q. 7.3.3.1.14 Eamonn's question to the meeting is that this ServiceIDs parameter can be removed from the generateFaultStatisticsRecordErr()
A. The error might occur for a subset of the requested FaultStatisticsRecord request. By removing it one has to assume the entire request has failed rather than the subset. The serviceIDs argument description needs further clarification.

Q. the faultStatistics argument is wrong It should be of type TpFaultStatsErrorList
A. This also requires addition of the type TpFaultStatsErrorList

Q. The contribution has "<<deprecated>> <<new>>" tags for methods that have introduced recently but re proposed to be deprecated. Is this acceptable?
A. The meeting decided to have only the "<<deprecated>>" tag remain in these case; the original "<<new>>" tag will be dropped. This requires no changes to sausage machine.

Q. Musa requests a that a naming convention for "<<new>>" methods is defined. Often, "<<new>>" methods slightly change the method name of the corresponding ><<deprecated>>" method name.
A. Contributions are solicited.

Q. Musa requests that we store the history and motivation for deprecating methods
A. Aemonn responds that the history is captured. The table at the end of the document and the history is captured in deprecated method's "forwarding" text (the text that strongly suggests not to use the method and points to the alternative method).

updated to 632

N5-030632	Update of 574	AePONA
	NOT AVAILABLE	

For e-mail approval

N5-030575	Correct Correlation Behaviour in Load Management	AePONA

The queryLoadReq/Res/Err methods on the Framework to App and Framework to Svc interfaces are used to ask for and supply load statistics reports on the operation of parties involved in OSA communication. These methods currently use a time period to control the period for which statistics are to be gathered. There is no restriction on invoking multiple requests or indeed requests with overlapping periods in time. In such cases however, there is no mechanism for correlating the responses uniquely with the requests.

The res methods include a data type that details a time stamp rather than a unique period, and the err methods use a data type that contains no unique identificiation. (Note the res data type is also capable of returning the error).

This contribution proposes to correct the correlation between requests and responses by introducing a unique ID that is generated by the requesting entity.

If not approved, the load statistics mechanism of the OSA Fault Management capability cannot be supported.

Approved

N5-030582	Correct Description of TpOctetSet	ETSI PTCC

RELATED TO N5-030581 (REL-4)

Rel5 CR for the change proposed in TDoc 580.

The first two comments as for the REL-4 CR need to be implemented as well
CR cover page: cross reference to the REL-4 CR

Revision in N5-030621.

N5-030621	Revision of N5-030582	ETSI PTCC

Adrian to remove release 4 specification from "other specification affected".

Agreed

N5-030592	Re-use of base Reference within an inheritance relationship	Marconi

RELATED TO N5-030591 (REL-4)

This is TDoc 392 from San Francisco, where it was not presented. It is a result of the approval of the discussion document TDoc 372.

Off-line discussions are encouraged to improve the wording.

Revision in N5-030623

N5-030623	Revision of N5-030592	Marconi

Document number and work item code will be corrected by Adrian.

Agreed.

N5-030593	Rel-5 CR 29.198-13 PM Introducing conditionType and actionType	Lucent

RELATED TO N5-030594 (REL-6)

The actual type of condition or action is not yet included as attribute to IpPolicyCondition and IpPolicyAction interfaces.

This contribution proposes to add in one attribute each to IpPolicyCondition and IpPolicyAction interfaces that store the actual type of condition/action, as well as one additional method in each of those interfaces for querying the newly added attribute value. The newly added attributes/methods are listed below:

IpPolicyCondition:
new attribute: ConditionType : TpPolicyConditionType
new method: TpPolicyConditionType getConditionType()

IpPolicyAction:
new attribute: ActionType : TpPolicyActionType
new method: TpPolicyActionType getActionType()

If not approved, it will prevent a client application from obtaining information on the type of condition/action objects that are supported by a policy enabled service. It will adversely impact the ability of a client to interact with the PM SCFs.

Q: there are general get, set methods in PM – don't they apply to these new proposed attributes?
A: these types have static values, not modified during the lifetime of the object. It is possible to use the generic methods but it is more cumbersome because they're static.
Q: what are the three values of the triplet returned by the generic get method in the static case? Or is the spec not complete? Or is this attribute not designed to be accessed by the general methods, in which case a note would be useful?
A: generic methods can be used, it's just more cumbersome.
Comment: then this is not an essential correction.

Discussion whether indeed the generic methods can be used, and what would be the value of the returned triplet, and it is just cumbersome – or whether it is not possible to use the generic methods..

Discussion whether this is not adding functionality (since we're both defining new attributes and how to access to them).

Withdrawn.

N5-030596	Rel 5 CR 29.198-03 Correct Access Session Errors	AePONA
	NOT AVAILABLE	

Section 6 of the Framework specification contains a number of clauses in which the definition of the Framework Access session and intended behaviour is either misleading or lacks sufficient clarity regarding the behaviour intended and the possible uses of the Access session.

This contribution proposes to introduce additional clarifying text and correct misleading statements or references.

If not approved, ambiguity around the intended use of the Framework Access session shall result and give rise to interoperabilty and incompatibility problems for vendors and implementors.

Q. 6.1.1.1 existing text claims that initiateAuthenticationWithVersion is only method. Musa informs that initiateAuthentication is also accepted.

Q. 6.3.1.3.5 for consistency, it is suggested to remove the word "domain" from the introduced text
A. agreed

Q. Eamonn is requested to add the sentence that is in the note on challenge statement as a sentence in the text. Other notes need to be removed.
A. agreed

Revision in 633

N5-030633	Update of 596	AePONA

	NOT AVAILABLE	

For e-mail approval

N5-030613	REL-5 CR to part 1 Correction to Java Realisation Rulebook	AePONA

<needs justification>

Java Realization Rules have never been tested. They are tested now and some rules are not sufficient. The results of testing the Java Realization rules is submitted to the plenary and accepted. The source generated according to the rules documented in this CR (613) can be found in the September release.

Q. front page needs to be updated. Changes are driven by the experience of applying the original rules; no new code is generated, rather the rules now reflect the generated code. This needs to obvious from the front page.

Q. Eamonn reports that he has received feedback from AePONA developers. He will add the feedback and resubmit this material.

Revision in 634

N5-030634	Update of 613	AePONA

Front page updated.

Deferred for e-mail approval. The e-mail approval will include the (brief) motivation per change.

ACTION ITEM: Eamonn to have e-mail approval process initiated.

7 Framework session

7.1 High Availability (HA)

N5-030608	SA1 High Availability Requirements for OSA Rel-6	Ericsson/ IBM/ AePONA

For information: these are the requirements for HA support that are being presented to the 3GPP SA1 meeting this same week in order to allow inclusion of High Availability support in Rel6. The zip includes a document with background information, as well as the CR to OSA stage 1.

N5-030618	Guidelines for realizing High Availability in OSA R5	Ericsson/ AePONA

Agenda interruption on Tuesday 9:00-10:30 to allow the delegates to join the SA1 session on OSA HA.

A short guideline is provided in a normative annex to describe how SCF High Availability may be realized in Parlay/OSA R5 in a way that ensures interoperability between applications and SCFs and that does not modify the APIs. This implements the favorable Release 5 solution, as agreed in San Francisco.

Q: Why normative? This is a guideline.
A: But in release 5 informative is not allowed
Response: Not the case, we can have informative.

Q: Why category F?
A: This was decided in San Francisco.

Q: Why was this guideline preferred over others? There are alternatives. We have not agreed that this is the only option.

A: There might be other ways. But it's up to contributing companies.
Q: But you cannot sell this as essential correction if there are alternative solutions
A: OK, "consequences if not approved" needs to be updated.

Q: In release 5 we can only fix things. So only ambiguities can be clarified using guidelines. Here this is not the case, since there are alternative solutions. Therefore it will be difficult to defend in the CN plenary. Is there are case to be made that different developers take our specs and develop HA solutions in an non-interoperable way?
A: Yes there is such a case to be made according to AePONA. The problem is that the available information is partial.
Response: That's not the IOP issue. The components are there; we just didn't explain it correctly. So if these guidelines are not followed, then the fallback is still the default behavior as already defined in the specs, i.e. the application will just go through the framework handshake again. This is not an IOP problem; it would just be downgraded service. Ericsson agrees. So it cannot be sold to the plenary as a fix.

Lucent/Alcatel: We think this CR is the favorable solution for Release 6.

AePONA: We have a different opinion of IOP. Here is our view: the current spec is open to interpretation on how to implement HA. So even if there is fallback defined in the spec, i.e. the default behavior, it means that HA doesn't work, and therefore IOP issue.

This all comes back to the issue of whether we'd like IOP on a functional level as well as a non-functional level.

Alcatel: True that HA is not symmetrical in our specs, but symmetry has never been an argument. There is no problem with that.

In standards there is a balance between what to specify and what not. And the guideline here is IOP. If there is no IOP issue, then we do not need a fix. That would then be a requirement, and for the time being we do not have the requirement.

There is also the option of removing the HA functionality that is currently in the specification. Then again, does this has to be symmetric.

Minute taker asks the meeting to verify the notes of this discussion for fairness and good representation of the arguments. The Tuesday report will be distributed at the end of the day and uploaded to the external ETSI server.

The meeting has been discussing whether there is an IOP problem here or not. Now we're discussing the level of ambiguity.

Some of the arguments are based on the statement that feedback has been received. One of the problems is that we haven't seen that feedback, nor is the feedback in line with what other companies have received in terms of feedback. Such feedback would allow us to "sell" this to the plenary. The meeting agrees that if there is something to fix, we all want to fix it. So far, there is no agreement in the meeting that there is something to fix.

Ultan clarified that feedback was received in the ETIS plugtest event. This was verbal feedback. The presentation we had on this in San Diego had high-level statements only. It is unclear whether such feedback is public knowledge, nor whether ETSI can share the list of participating companies.

Functionally speaking, nothing should change from the perspective of the application whether the server supports HA or not, or at what level.

We are ending up in circular arguments, going in loops.

ACTION ITEM: Ultan/Erwin to find out whether we can obtain the specific comments from the plugtest event.

N5-030630	OSA/Parlay Interop Event 14-17 April 2003 Report	MCC

Noted

7.2 Integrity Management

N5-030597	Rel 6 CR 29.198-03 Correct Access Session for Service	AePONA

Introduce support for access sessions with a service. Document N5-030364r1 was discussed during CN5#24 in San Francisco outlining possible uses cases for service based access session. The meeting invited contributions outlining the changes required to support this functionality.

This contribution proposes a correct definition and use of TpDomainID, and outline that an optional step following service registration is the creation of service based access session.

If not approved, access sessions will remain restricted to service instances only.

In San Francisco, agreed that the use cases have generated enough interest in the meeting to understand the motivation, and AePONA is welcome to provide the corresponding contributions to Rel6.

These are the first drafts, i.e. not presented as a done deal. There is opportunity for changes are re-submissions.

Q: Parlay 2.1 originally had integrity management done per service ID. They later changed this in Parlay 3.0 to be done by service instance ID and not per service ID. I don't see a value at this point to go back and allow it to be done by service ID again.
A: It is not changing it back; it is now doing it both. Also, in San Francisco there was already great support for the use-cases, we just need to decide on the technical implementation.

Q: Why does the second change starts with “if”.
A: That is because Integrity Mgt is optional.
Q: But can we somewhere add the use-cases that lead the meeting to the conviction that this was necessary? Otherwise we’ve lost the motivation for the change.
A: Can be done.

Q: The consequence listed on the first page is incorrect. For example, ServiceSuppliers will still be able to get access sessions.
A: That’s right. We agree that’s not the only case, but just the motivation behind the use-cases in San Diego/San Francisco. This will be corrected. Also, reason for change should not refer an WG document, rather re-iterate the motivation.

Q: There is a note in the text, asking about backwards compatibility
A: Ultan is afraid this will NOT be B/C. Conclusion is that this particular change is rejected.

DECISION: We remain strict in B/C. Even if we know the name is wrong, we decide to keep it.

Not approved, feedback by e-mail requested

N5-030631	Rel 6 CR 29.198-03 Correct Access Session for Service	AePONA
	NOT AVAILABLE	

for e-mail approval (twice in the report?)

N5-030598	Rel 6 CR 29.198-03 Fault Mgt for Service and Service Instance	AePONA

Define the operation of framework Fault Management for access sessions with either services or service instances.

This document introduces the capability for client application to indicate whether a service or service instance fault management capability is required. A number of method deprecations and new methods are required to introduce this identification. Additional clarifying text is required for a number of other methods where behaviour is modified however no API change is required for these methods.

Consequences if not approved: Fault Management cannot be carried out at a service level.

Eamonn again clarifies that these are not presented as a done deal. They’re to be considered as first draft to implement changes required to support the use-cases that were generally agreed in San Francisco/San Diego.

Q: Can in the title the occurrence of “and” be replaced with “as well as”.
A: Yes.
Q: In “summary of change” add that in some cases the original text wrongly implied that current support is provided at service level. In these cases the opposite change has been made.
A: That’s right.

Q: “consequences if not approved” implies that REL-5 and REL-4 are also faulty. CN plenary will ask this
A: The CR is cat “C”, not essential error correction.
Q: The tile of the CR is missing a verb
A: Agreed to new title “Modify Fault Mgt for support at service level as well as service instance level”
Q: “Summary of change” contains verb “introduce”, we cannot have that.
A: Will be rephrased.

Q: 8.3.4.1 The descriptive text in this section seems different from other similar changes elsewhere in the document.
A: The text is different but has the same intention. Agreed.

Q: This CR is part of a pack of related CRs [597?, 599. 600, ...]. How to most effectively package these CRs for a plenary discussion?
A: the current set is open for discussion

Q: 8.3.4.1.9: FW to APPL introduces new methods which duplicates functionality of old methods for service instance for service. U. suggest not to deprecates original ones. New methods are for service level only

Q: 8.3.4.1.11: would the service ID become discoverable (Musa)
A: This is considered an implementation decision. Eamonn solicits further clarification by reviewers

Note that this CR is related to 575, a release 5 CR. Decisions on 575 needs to be reflected in an update document

Not approved, feedback by e-mail.

N5-030599	Rel 6 CR 29.198-03 Heartbeat Mgt for Service and Service Instance	AePONA

Corresponding update required to Heartbeat managed.

<needs CR text>

No final disposition requested, this is an initial submission for which further feedback is sollicted.

Q: typo's in cover page. Make changes similar to 597, 598, 600?

Not approved, e-mail discussion

N5-030600	Rel 6 CR 29.198-03 Load Mgt for Service and Service Instance	AePONA

Corresponding update required to Load Management. Note for the reviewers: this CR does not reflect the changes proposed in 575.

<needs CR text>

Q. same type of changes in cover page as in 597, 598, 599

Q. problem is in TpLoadStatisticEntityID, not in TpLoadStasticDataList (Ultan) This is a union and can be extended.
A: this way it is consistent with changes in 597-599 documents. Agreed.

Not approved, e-mail discussion

ACTION ITEM:Eamonn to start e-mail discussion on 597-600.

8 TpAttribute session

N5-030539	Document for TpAttribute restructuring discussion	Teltier

Comes from extensive discussion on exploder. Guda made this doc based on some consensus. Discussion continued based on it so John-Luc proposes to note it because it's already taken as baseline and embedded in the rest of the documents.

Noted.

N5-030586	Correct description of TpAttributeType to adequately support possible types	Telcordia

Submitted to San Francisco, conclusion was postponed because of a related document. The related doc was not approved so this doc is submitted again.

Reason for change: two attribute type names found that are not supported in the PAM docs or the general attribute type docs.

Q: is TpPAMAttribute still used after these changes, or TpAttribute?
A: it is a struct containing TpAttribute. The proposal is that changes are only made to TpAttribute.

Some other comments on the text on top of the table. But that text is not a change in the contribution, but existing text. Contributions are welcome.

Q: description in rows 3 and 5 are not consistent.
A: contributions on this are welcome.

Q: naming convention (use of P_ or SP_)? It seems that it may not be consistent.
Conclusion: postpone the decision until we discuss 583.

586 needs to be made dependent on 643 => 645 is the update of 586 for this.

Approved with changes

E-mail (needs bar!)

N5-030583	Extension of datatypes supported by TpAttribute	Telcordia

406 for Part 2 was approved in SF for more flexible typing when using TpAttribute. After SF this CR was not implemented so these changes are not yet in Part 2.

This doc also based on 539 that includes the same functionality and same set of types but has a different structure.

Therefore there is an inconsistency between the approved but not implemented 406 and this 583. If 583 is approved then 406 needs to be withdrawn.

Differences:
- 406 modified TpAttribute to change the notes in the attribute type field
- 406 changed TpAttributeType to add some character string values
- 406 TpAttributeType is replaced by TpAttributeValue
- TpXMLString is not in 406.
- Only bits from 406 remaining are clauses 5.1.25 and 5.1.33 both included.

Q: it's a cat B CR but the reason to change is a portability
A: it will be changed to cat F. There is a new type proposed today by Lucent (568) which is a Boolean currently not supported (not defined in Part 2). This means needing proprietary extensions and thus no portability.
Discussion is: do we need further complexity beyond atomic types? 568 is shown, contains examples at the end showing complex types that are not supported in the current definitions.

Agreed to change to Cat F. Question: don't we need then a Rel5 CR too? Agreed that the problem exists for Rel5 too.
Conclusion: if the Rel6 CR is approved, then we need another for Rel5 (and this one would be Cat A).

Q: other core specs should be filled in.
A: agreed.

Q: TpAttributeType is deleted in 5.1.13, and it is used in the PAM specs. A related CR is needed to fix that, or we have an inconsistency.
A: agreed that we need to study the impacts of the change in TpPAMAttribute.

Q: in 5.1.13 do we have naming conventions for tags?
A: it doesn't matter, we don't have these conventions.

Q: in 5.1.22 the third row says P_CHAR, not consistent with the description.
A: true, this is an inconsistency in 5.1.21, 5.1.22, 5.1.25 that needs to be fixed.

Q: in 5.1.25 there is a double negation that some find confusing.
A: it will be rephrased similarly to the text in TpWChar.

Q: TpWChar could be anything.
A: it is for internationalization and can be used for Web Services, Java etc implementations. Size dependent on the character set chosen. It's not the only case in the spec that may be implementation dependent. Agreed that the original reference will be checked.

Q: what does implementation dependent mean? Does it mean IOP problems? Is this an issue in the remainder of our specs?
A: out of the scope, it is dealt with at the level of ORB interoperability. It's not the only case in the spec (for example floats). The motivation to add of this types is that TpAny support them all.

Q: in 5.1.28,shouldn't it be "signed"?
A: agreed, will be added.

Q: 5.1.33, shouldn't it say "defines" instead of "represents"?
A: agreed, will be changed it.

Q: in 5.1.34, "well-formed XML" or "well-formed XML documents"?
A: the idea is that it may include a ref to an XML scheme somewhere else.

Q: wrong history box.
A: will be corrected.

Agreed with these changes, will be 643 (update of 583) and 644 (new CR against part 14).

After the discussion of this contribution and the others below, it is agreed that 406, which was approved in San Francisco, be withdrawn.

For e-mail approval

N5-030585	Add Service Properties to publish supported attribute types	Telcordia

583 included some newly defined types and a pattern to include support for types defined in IDL. 585 shows which service properties are supported by an implementation of the PAM API.

Q: should it be a Cat F CR? It is a Rel5 issue?

Q: reason for change should not refer to IOP, only that different subsets may be supported.
A: agreed. Plus agreed this is not a Cat F CR but B, and it is not a Rel5 issue.

Conclusion: phrasing for reasons for change to be discussed offline. Consequences if not approved need to be updated accordingly.

Comment: if we bring 583 for Rel5 then we need the change in this CR for Rel5 too.
Agreed that consistency needs to be achieved in the whole package.

Comment: description in row 4 of table is not very clear.
Agreement that it will be rephrasing.

Q: do we in other cases define a minimum service property set?
A: we've done it for CAMEL CC.

Will be updated to 646.

Approved with changes

For e-mail

N5-030568	Notes on Specifications for PM SCFs	Lucent

Lucent's views in some of the issues discussed: attributes vs variables, IOP issues and introduction of XML in our specs. It is summarized as follows: "To summarize, we have described the conceptual differences between attributes and variables in the PM specifications. For emphasis we have included a summary listing (in Appendix A) of all PM interfaces and their associated attributes. It should be clear that there is no compelling reason, at the moment, to include an XML valued attribute type within the PM specifications. Further along we have outlined two key concepts that are needed to ensure IOP. One is covered by the PM specifications and the other requires additional work that is to be undertaken by the PM WG. We have framed, in this paper, the scope of the standardization work for the latter activity. Finally, we have identified the minimally required steps to introduce XML as a variable type such that it is done in a complete, correct, and consistent way."

Questions for clarification from Telcordia are in 640.

Comment: true attributes and variables are different but this doc does not motivate that they should be treated differently.
Response: they should be treated differently because they are not the same thing. The attributes we have don't use XML. Until we have attributes that use XML we don't need to introduce it.
Response: this is the set we have at the moment, can be extended. There are use cases. See later in the presentation of 640 for a reason why a technology like XML is needed. In Appendix A there is the set of currently defined attributes, managed by get and set – and we already identified that some of them cannot be accessed like that (agreed that this need to be addressed). The introduction is of an additional typing system that allows accessing types using XML. The PM is not open – we cannot publish the rule engine capabilities. We cannot document how applications can use an attribute. The normal publishing way – through the FW – does not allow publishing how to populate an attribute. The proposal is using XML because it is a standard.
Response: no answer on how to publish custom attributes, Musa would like to discuss it back home.

Comment: the IOP problem is bigger than the one described here – includes Rel5 issues not in 568. In Appendix A, the second attribute is of type TpStringSet, and in Rel5 there is no way to populate it in an interoperable manner. Same applies to any attribute that is not type NULL, Ent32, string or float.
Agreed that there is this IOP issue (this is covered in 583).

Noted

N5-030640	Comments to 568	Telcordia

Very late document but accepted because it helps the discussion (these are answers to 568).

Main Telcordia issues on 568, also collecting offline and email discussions.

- The XML extension addresses how to make PM's PIM (Policy Information Model) open in a verifiable manner. It enables a standardized documentation format (in principle accessible online and offline) to constrain PIM variables and PIM attributes.

- Standardization of a minimal set of data types and operations, as is deemed required by N5-030568 is not feasible as it may preclude the PM SCF from managing DMTF XML CIM policies, XACML policies, or others (that do not share the same set of types or operations) - unification of XML policy languages is not in our scope.
- To find out the values of the attribute supported by an implementation of a PM SCF currently an application has to sign a SA with that SCF and perform a getAttribute on the IpPolicy interface. It is necessary to iterate to an existing domain (or create a new one). This is undesirable and not conforming to the discovery pattern employed by Parlay/OSA.
- Note 22: agreed.
- Note 23: just a suggestion for the appendix in 568.
- Note 24: XML would allow constraining the values – the difference here is weak and strong typing, and we only use strong typing in our specs, whereas parts of the PM interface are defined in eBNF which is weak typing.
- Note 25: not clear what "varying set of base types" means.
- Notes on footnotes in page 4: "Standardized" is used a lot where it should say "open". The issue is not standardization (and therefore the fact that the Parlay PM WG is working on this is not an argument; also in the JWG we take contributions from 3GPP and ETSI companies as ell, and not only Parlay) but rather solving a problem we do have.
- Note 27: one-many (meaning different vendors) is not supported at the moment, unless assuming that somehow they have a different name (namespaces are not supported in the eBNF). This has been discussed in previous meetings, it is clear that on-many is not supported, the proposed solution solves this problem, and no alternative solution has been proposed. Agreed that through the introduction of XML the one-many relationship, which currently is not supported by PM, is supported.
- Note 28: openness can reduce the IOP concerns.
- Note 211: the FW has mechanisms to discover non standard SCFs (it is open in that respect).
- Note 212: eBNF is not supported in the IETF basis of the PM SCF.

Next is addressing the different minimum conditions expressed by the Lucent doc. The meeting will go through 584 in parallel. When these points are discussed then 636 can be gone through (it is the update of 584).

- Point of typing covered in section 10 of the CR, Specifically, see Service Property "P_SUPPORTED_XML". Agreed this Lucent requirement has been addressed in the solution by Telcordia.
- Point of addressing: no need for an explicit minimum set because this would lock to a specific solution; Besides service property will include the list of acceptable types. Agreed that this is covered.
- Point of allowed operations: agreed it is covered.
- Point of condition/action types: agreed that the proposed solution addresses these issues.
- Points of operational semantics:
    - it is not in the spec that a Boolean result is mandated or reflected in the spec. Nevertheless this is satisfied in the solution.
    - Next set of questions considered speculation, not addressed.

Noted

N5-030584	Extension of standard datatypes supported by TpPolicy	Telcordia

Updated to 636. Since 636 was late, discussion starts with 584, then foes to 636.

Main changes:

- Introduction of service properties: in line with 585 (for PAM).
- TpPolicyTypeInfo: added P_SIMPLE_TYPE which is used on the corresponding Part 2.
- TpPolicyType: Sheryar has found an inconsistency (copy and past problem), John-Luc agrees and has already corrected this in 642 (update of 636).
- 11.3.2: note now consistent with changes made in Part 2.
- 11.5 section added, which is an example- a high level scenario that shows how the XML extensions are tied together.

Q: section 10, 4th table row: replace "attribute" with "variable".
A: agreed.

Q: same row, in the CR for Part 14 we agreed to add an "e.g".
A: agreed.

Q: same section: replace P_SUPPORTED_VARIABLE_TYPES -> P_SUPPORTED_SIMPLE_VARIABLE_TYPES
A: agreed.

Q: same for P_SUPPORTED_ATTRIBUTE_TYPES
A: agreed.

Q: the comment for row 4 applies to row 6 as well (use of “variable” and “attribute”). Also the example comment.
A: agreed.

Q: comment to row 5 is also applicable to row 6.
A: agreed.

Q: first row in TpPolicyType needs to be removed.
A: already fixed in update.

Q: simple, structure and XML types need to be added.
A: already fixed in update.

Q: in 11.5, where is CALL_LEG_PROPERTY_INFO defined?
A: it is pseudo code but the intention was to use something close to reality. Will be checked off line. Agreed that this will not be a reason not to approve this CR.

Q: 11.5: suggested to improve the description of the pseudo XML example to indicate that the schema or schema reference is missing which would define the structure, types and operations in the XML.
A: agreed.

Q: ref at the end of the example need to be typed in, otherwise it doesn’t work.
A: agreed.

Cover page: to be discussed in the last version of this CR.

Noted.

N5-030636	Update of 584	Telcordia

Withdrawn.

N5-030642	Update of 636	Telcordia

Updates to 584 based on comments received by email.

Comment: agreed on change to 5.8.4, this point can be closed.

It is proposed that it could be useful to provide a direction for those who wan to use the “expression” attribute for XML, efficiently. Ultan, John-Luc and Musa to discuss off line whether to add a sentence.

Cover page comments:
- Reason for change: suggested to remove “dreaded”. Agreed.
- Summary of change: proposal to remove “TpPolicyAtomicType was found to restrictive” which is already in the reasons for change. Agreed.
- Check consistency of other specs affected (does this one affect the one for Part 2 or the opposite? What about Rel5?).

Discussion for Rel5 will be off-line, together with the overall consistency of this group of CRs.

Agreed with changes. Will be updated into 647 (Rel 6).

If there are corresponding Rel5 CRs the numbers will be 647-660 (to be used if necessary).

9 Parlay X session

Parlay agrees that the Parlay X Web Services specification should be formatted inline with Parts 1-14. They would like an acknowledgement that Parlay submitted this contribution.

PayCircle is working with ETSI to get an agreement in place. See 602.

PayCircle has allowed the 3GPP document to be submitted without PayCircle IPR claims.

N5-030602	ETSI format Parlay X specification	BT Exact

Ultan informed the meeting that on the issue of Parlay copyright on Parlay X, Parlay agree it would be handled just as with the other joint ETSI/Parlay OSA specifications.

Ultan reported on the status of the agreement between ETSI and PayCircle. This is still the subject of negotiation. PayCircle's initial proposal would not give ETSI the right to modify the specification. (PX or Payment only is not clear - see next)

Ultan informed the meeting that it is the Parlay Boards proposal to (since Parlay X is a single document) to share copyright ***all of*** Parlay X with PayCircle.

Ultan informs that ETSI members have a say in the agreement being established with PayCircle. ETSI should take into account the wishes of its partners in Parlay and 3GPP before negotiating that Paycircle join the JWG.

Parlay X cannot be published by ETSI before the issue of Paycircle copyright is resolved (agreement with Paycircle is signed)

ACTION ITEM: Ultan will provide a document with a list of questions related to the agreement with PayCircle. ETSI members can impact the final PayCircle agreement.

ACTION ITEM: for Richard: is Parlay happy if PayCircle will get copyright over the entire Parlay X spec. and therefore have equal rights over the Parlay X specification.

Withdrawn.

N5-030603	3GPP Parlay X specification	BT Exact

29.199 is the 3GPP number.

PayCircle removed IPR on section 10 such that this document can be submitted to the meeting.

As requested by the Parlay Board, an acknowledgement was added to the document. The acknowledgement was worded by Paul. Richard consulted with Zygmunt and then added PayCircle acknowledgement. The wording of the PayCircle acknowledgement was not approved and requested to be removed.

Q. WSDL files are missing and need to be added.
A. Richard to provide them.

ACTION ITEM: clarify if there is an activity within Parlay to split this document into documents per SCF (Richard)

ACTION ITEM: for Parlay to consider how they would like Parlay X called when it is maintained in parallel phases (aligned with 3GPP releases) (Richard)

Q. Please delete the word "SPECIFICATION" from the title as the name of this document is "Parlay X Web Services" only.

A. agreed

Q. Within Parlay X there is a mapping document produced by Julian Richards. This document might be a source of changes. We need to ensure that change control needs to be applied in this group.
A. contributions are satisfactory as PX will go under change control when Release 6 is released.

Q. The wording of the current PayCircle acknowledgement does not reflect the facts.
A. The meeting agrees to remove this line

Q. Ultan proposes order on title page. Parlay acknowledgement is second section.

Update: 635

N5-030635	Revision of 603	BT Exact

On title page, version should be 0.0.3

Same contents, adding a revision mark version.

Change history section needs to be updated

Adrian to work with Richard to generate the document according to 3GPP rules.

Adrian to make this available as a draft when 3GPP requires.

Update: 639

N5-030639	Revision of 635	BT Exact

For e-mail approval

N5-030641	Parlay X and PayCircle copyright issues	ETSI PTCC

Noted

10 Messaging session

Q. an ad-hoc might be necessary
Q. list all options and allow for company feedback; that would allow us to decide on the scope for the ad-hoc

Q. which reference point is addressed
A. MMS centre to content server: MM7

The options are captured in 637.

ACTION ITEM: Chelo starts and moderates e-mail discussion to discuss options.

ACTION ITEM: Chelo starts e-mail discussion on a messaging focused meeting date and place. The meeting is mandated to choose among one of the 5 options in 637.

ACTION ITEM: There is a MMS/3GPP/2/OMA workshop on Nov. 7. Chelo to ensure that 3GPP contribution include our MMS support

Messaging focused meeting date and place to be discussed

N5-030637	Informative set of notes on messaging session	Chairs

Distributed for information

N5-030543	3GPP TS 29.198-15, New Messaging SCF	Ericsson
	WITHDRAWN	

N5-030545	ES 202 915-9: Correct GMS Messaging Problems, REL-5	IBM

RELATED TO N5-030546 (REL-6)

Noted

N5-030546	ES 202 915-9: Correct GMS Messaging Problems, REL-6	IBM

RELATED TO N5-030545 (REL-5)

Noted

N5-030550	Comments and feedback to GMS Re-architecture proposal	Lucent

Noted

N5-030551	REL-6 CR ES 202 915-9: Correct GMS Messaging Problems	Ericsson

Q. TpMessageFormat defines a few types, i.e. AU and WAVE only. This causes a lot of potential maintenance.
A. This approach was chose for historical reasons (it is in GMS)

Q. is GMS subject to B/C rules
A. yes, as it has not been changed for a long time.
A. there are known implementations; we should keep that in mind
A. if thing are broken we can fix it

Q. We are discussing Scott's document while we decided not to that
A. Erwin prefers to develop a new SCF for Messaging
A. Would like an opportunity to present review results rather than considering to develop new SCF as Musa did prefer the new SCF.

Noted

N5-030569	Review feedback on GMS Extensions in N5-030551	Lucent

Noted

N5-030570	Discussion paper on the GMS Mailbox Locking Mechanism	Lucent

Noted

N5-030611	Collection of GMS Comments	Ericsson

Collection of messages distributed over the mailing list. It also includes personal observations by Erwin.

Simplicity and convenience of GMS comment by Erwin. There are many objects in GMS. It is proposed that when designing the Messaging SCF the number of invocations needed to access messages needs to be limited for reasons of convenience.

Q. Lucent summary: GMS is build around the mailbox paradigm. Specifically, Lucent feels that sendMessageReq should not be part of GMS
A. GMS should have support for SMS and MMS

A. Logica/CMG feels that the mailbox interface is a good starting point; GMS needs major changes.
A. Lucent objects to changing of principles at this stage. The proposal is to add sendMessageReq to UI.

Erwin added sendMessageReq outside the mailbox when comparing the Scott proposal.
Erwin thinks that sendMessageReq on UI is acceptable but must be outside of the session paradigm to avoid that a multicast message can only be sent be requiring 100 sessions for 1 message to be received by 100 subscribers.

Lucent, Logica/CMG, Ericsson support further exploration of this concept.

Ericsson is concerned about confusion for MMS support in UI as it is strictly call related and there is GMS
Lucent says UI is not strictly call related.

Ultan identifies that opening a session for multiple addresses is not is UI paradigm break.

Chelo: What about a new SCF for messaging?
Erwin: In SF it was voiced that we should improve GMS
Musa: a new SCF would cause redundancy between SCFs; the same notification holds for not accepting sendMessageReq on GMS but to have it in UI.

Erwin requests the meeting to consider creating a new SCF is GMS remains as complex as it is.
Logica supports this

Ultan: why splitting support for MMS over two SCFs? That might be confusing.
Logica supports this

Chelo summarizes that messaging is now supported over three SCFs

Ewrin suggest naming the new SCF Direct Messaging to reflect the fact that is does not include mailboxes.

Chelo: asks for a motivation for this split

JL: WAP push also on SCF Direct Messaging? That is redundant with UI.

Erwin: do we want to improve GMS even after introducing DM (new SCF).

Musa: no new SCF as suggested in SF
Chelo: there was no agreement in SF; the agreement was to explore the impact of the approach te reuse existing SCFs.

Noted

11 EntOp APIs session

N5-030552	Discuss Enterprise Operator role (static or dynamic)	Open API Solutions

N5-030552 - This is a general discussion document on whether the enterprise operator role should be static or dynamic, and acts as an overview of related contributions (N5-030553, N5-030554 and N5-030555).
This was noted.

N5-030553	Enterprise Operator should have access to Event Notifications	Open API Solutions

N5-030553 - This proposes to make the event notification mechanism available to enterprise operators.
The events that exist at the moment are for services becoming available or unavailable. These events can be very useful to an Enterprise Operator, potentially more so than to an Application, as the Enterprise Operator has the ability to create a service contract for a new service, so that its applications can use it.
The first part of this contribution was a trivial change of the word service to Framework. Ultan will make the change to the spec himself on this point ensuring that he has the permission of the CN5 chairman and sub-chairman.
The second part was considered to add a new feature and as the contribution did not state a preference the meeting felt this be appropriate to ETSI 3.0 (Parlay 5.0) only.

Agreed

N5-030554	Add events to allow an entop to identify when a client app/service contract/service profile is being used	Open API Solutions

N5-030554 - This proposes to add some enterprise operator-specific events to monitor application/contract/profile status
Questions were raised as to how one would know that it was the ent-op using this event. The answer lies with the TpEnt-Op id which would identify the enterprise operator concerned.

Agreed

N5-030555	Add ability to identify when a client app/service contract/service profile is being used	Open API Solutions

N5-030555 - This adds methods to check on the application/contract/profile status.

This contribution suggested the addition of a field to the client app description returned in describeclientApp indicating whether it is in use or not.
Questions were raised as to whether this was BC or not as it was proposed to add parameters to a structure. The meeting agreed thjat one has to do BC on a case by case basis and as this was not seen as a commonly used interface and given that it was an addition, the meeting did not feel that it was an issue. The advantages far outweigh any cause for concern.

Agreed

N5-030556	Clarify erroneous field in TpServiceProfileDescription	Open API Solutions

N5-030556 - This proposes to correct the erroneous ServiceTypeName field in TpServiceProfileDescription.
The contribution suggested a note to be added to TpService ProfileDesciption. .
As the note was BC and removal of the problem would not have nbeen BC the contribution was accepted.

Agreed

N5-030557	Introduce a ServiceID field to TpServiceProfileDescription	Open API Solutions

N5-030557 - This proposes to add a ServiceID field to TpServiceProfileDescription.

The meeting firstly agreed that this would NOT cause a BC issue, as was decided with 030555.
Comments were made that it appeared to overload the Service Id. It is however possible to have a service profile not specific to a service Id. After clarification from Gareth Carroll the contribution was accepted.

Agreed

N5-030558	Clarify situation with service contracts and profiles	Open API Solutions

N5-030558 - This one attempts to clarify the roles of the service contracts and profiles. As no comments were received by e-mail except some clarification questions from Ultan, this was updated to add additional clarification.

This contribution is postponed to e-mail discussions. N5-030571 from Aepona produced comments against this which could not be considered as Aemon murray from Aepona had to fly home early. Gareth was asked to contact Aepona and stimulate discussion which could be finalized via E-mail with the whole of the JWG. It is hoped that this will result in another updated contribution into the next meeting.

Postponed until next meeting (E-mail discussion to take place between Aepona and API Solutions)

N5-030571	Clarify situation with service contracts and profiles	Open API Solutions/ AePONA

See comments in N5-030558 above.

Postponed until next meeting.

N5-030559	There are unnecessary P_INVALID_ID exceptions in signature	Open API Solutions

N5-030559 - This just proposes to remove a redundant exception from a couple of method signatures (as reported a while back on the e-mail exploder).

Agreed.

12 Other technical discussions OSA version 3 / 3GPP Rel.6

12.1 Requirements

N5-030548	ETSI/Parlay Requirements, draft 0.6, Sept-03	BT

Not to be confused with Withdrawn N5-030548 "Java Realization for MPCC"

This contribution was already available at the end of the San Francisco meeting week, but the meeting was not informed. It is therefore presented for information now, for the JWG to know what is the last version of the ETSI/Parlay requirements document approved by WG2 of TISPAN in ETSI. The document reflects the status as of San Diego. Revision is required, as we've had two CN plenaries in between.

Revision in N5-030624

Noted

N5-030624	Update of N5-030548	BT

Noted

N5-030577	Personal Mobility requirement	Telcordia/NTT

Proposes adding to the requirements document the text "The Mobility APIs are said to be designed for mobile, fixed and "IP" networks. However, the mapping to mobile networks is most intuitive, while the mappings to fixed and "IP" networks is limited. In order to create a feature rich services creation environment for (mobile) "IP" networks where not only terminal mobility but also personal mobility is supported, new User Binding notification functions, which enable applications to know UE binding requests, control and make use of them, must be introduced.
The User Binding notification functions shall exploit standard IP Session binding protocols, i.e. SIP REGISTER.".

Q: Why only to the ETSI requirements document? Being related to IP networks, is this not interesting also for the 3GPP requirements? And if that's the case, couldn't this be presented to SA1 this week?
A: We don't have use case to justify this in 3GPP

Q: Do you propose new methods, new notifications, a notification mapping?
A: That's in the next contribution.

Q: Will there be a stage 3? E.g. compare with the Presence situation for Release 5.
A: N5-030578 proposes a change to the ETSI stage 3, not the 3GPP stage 3.

But doesn't that necessitate a technical solution to have a separate SCF in order to realize the separate 3GPP and ETSI specifications.

Q: Discussion of N5-030578 showed that there is more functionality here that meets the eye
A: Some textual clarifications can be added, especially to clarify that the APL can disallow certain bindings.

For the time being this requirement is not part of the 3GPP specification set, based on the current lack of use cases.

Updated to 626

N5-030626	Revision of N5-030577	Telcordia/NTT

Agreed

12.2 OSA support for 3GPP2 networks

N5-030526	R6 CR OSA API support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 4-1 of OSA Stage 3 (29.198-4-1)	Ericsson
	E-MAIL APPROVED	
N5-030527	R6 CR OSA API support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 4-2 of OSA Stage 3 (29.198-4-2)	Ericsson
	E-MAIL APPROVED	
N5-030528	OSA API support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 4-3 of OSA Stage 3 (29.198-4-3)	Ericsson
	E-MAIL APPROVED	
N5-030529	R6 CR OSA API support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 4-4 of OSA Stage 3 (29.198-4-4)	Ericsson
	E-MAIL APPROVED	
N5-030530	R6 CR OSA API support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 5 of OSA Stage 3 (29.198-5)	Ericsson
	E-MAIL APPROVED	
N5-030531	R6 CR OSA API support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 6 of OSA Stage 3 (29.198-6	Ericsson
	E-MAIL APPROVED	
N5-030532	R6 CR OSA API support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 7 of OSA Stage 3 (29.198-7)	Ericsson
	E-MAIL APPROVED	
N5-030533	R6 CR OSA API support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 8 of OSA Stage 3 (29.198-8	Ericsson
	E-MAIL APPROVED	
N5-030534	R6 CR OSA API support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 11 of OSA Stage 3 (29.198-11)	Ericsson
	E-MAIL APPROVED	
N5-030535	R6 CR OSA API support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 12 of OSA Stage 3 (29.198-12)	Ericsson
	E-MAIL APPROVED	
N5-030536	R6 CR OSA API support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 13 of OSA Stage 3 (29.198-13)	Ericsson
	E-MAIL APPROVED	
N5-030537	R6 CR OSA API support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 14 of OSA Stage 3 (29.198-14)	Ericsson
	E-MAIL APPROVED	
N5-030538	R6 CR OSA API support for 3GPP2 networks in ISC Mapping of OSA Stage 3 (29.998-4-4)	Ericsson
	E-MAIL APPROVED	

12.3 Different abstraction levels for OSA

See Parlay X session (agenda item 9).

12.4 Presence and Availability Management

See agenda item 3.6

N5-030628	REL-6 CR: Add PAM Provisioning to the PAM Specification	ETSI PTCC

This was supposed to be N5-030399

An update of 356 from SF. The number 399 was created.

Inclusion of the Provisioning SCF in Presence Service. Updated change history box. Cleaned up the CR; removed the introductory text. Read change request was isolated.

This CR brings this feature into the spec. Issues against NULL need to be researched and would require new CRs.

Wrong header, this is not an SF document. Title is suggested to include reason for change. Adrian to implement these changes.

Agreed

N5-030629	REL-6 CR: Add PAM service activation and deactivation	ETSI PTCC

Add methods to activate/deactivate PAM services for users.

This was supposed to be N5-030400

An update of 355 from SF. The number 400 was created.

This CR brings this feature into the spec. Issues against NULL need to be researched and would require new CRs.

Wrong header, this is not an SF document. Title is suggested to include reason for change. Adrian to implement these changes.

ACTION ITEM: Clarify with Guda: you are activating and deactivating Presence and Availability Manager and not the Provisioning Manager. Isn't that necessary?

Agreed

12.5 Call Control

N5-030548	Add Java Realization rule to address MPCC name conflicts, REL-6	IBM
	RELATED TO N5-030547 (REL-5)	
	WITHDRAWN	

N5-030563	The role of the activity timer needs to be clarified	Open API Solutions
	Discussion relates to OSA1, OSA2, and OSA3	

Richard has agreed to present this document.

Concern is expressed that timer usage is unclear. A change to MPCC's STD's timer usage is drafted.

We acknowledge that there are grounds to add clarification on the behavior.

Noted

N5-030567	Correct description of TpNotificationRequestedSetEntry	ETSI PTCC
	RELATED TO N5-030566 (REL-5)	

Approved.

12.6 Framework
12.6.1 Migration support mechanism
12.6.2 Framework function for federation
12.7 Policy Management

N5-030594	Rel-6 CR 29.198-13 PM Introducing conditionType and actionType	Lucent

RELATED TO N5-030593 (REL-5)

Withdrawn.

12.8 User data Management and User data security management
12.9 Retrieval of Visited Network capabilities
12.10 Access to IP Session information
12.11 User-application authentication function
12.12 Other APIs

N5-030578	ES 203 915-6 V0.0.1 Add user binding functions	Telcordia/NTT

Q: Why no STDs?
A: The US SCF doesn't haven them either, And by the way, they would be trivial anyway.

Q: triggeredBindingReport is a bit different from our other reports. It is not only a report, but also the request.
A: No. It is not asynchronous. Doing that would include additional overhead.

Q: Shouldn't this be analogous to exiting SCF patterns? E.g. an Err() method
A: Use cases do not foresee in this to happen.

Ok, Err() can be introduced.

Q: But about the general design pattern? Shouldn't we re-use e.g. the US SCF design pattern?
A:

Q: This is not only reporting the binding is it? The APL can also disallow the binding?
A: Yes
Q: But then it is more Call Control related?
A: Yes

Q: Is there a specific method that the APL uses to disallow the binding?
A: No, that is in the out parameter of the report from the GW.

Q: What are the following steps, as this from a 3GPP perspective no follow-on action is required?
A: Needs to be arranged with Richard.

Q: Should bindingSet be bindingList?
A: No.

Q: In 11.7.7 for P_UB_NEW change description to "indicate binding creation attempt"? The reason is because the APL can still disallow the binding, so it is a report of an attempt rather than a report of the binding itself.
A: OK

Reporting to change to requestNotification in the method names.

Binding to chqnge to users to reflect the parameter section in 8.5.2.1

Table column to be added to describe TpBindingEntry

Updated to 625

N5-030625	Revision of N5-030578	Telcordia/NTT

Question on Err methods: is the same naming convention used as in the other methods? What exactly has failed?
A: that something went wrong when subscribing to the trigger.
Comment: this is not clear from the description.
Conclusion: to be discussed off line.

Typo's detected in table for TpBindingEntry.

All changes agreed.

Revised to 638.

N5-030638	Revision of N5-030625	Telcordia/NTT

We are really not sure how this actually relates to User Location. OK, a user wants to use another terminal and may well be in a different place, but no location information is reported, only a notification that the change has taken place (User Status is also in the wrong place, we think). Isn't this more a Terminal Capabilities thing? Isn't it just a change in the user's terminal capabilities (due to it being a different terminal)?

We use types in Mobility, hence its position

approved

N5-030579	Add P_USER_BINDING to TpServiceTypeName	Telcordia/NTT
	Note: This is a Framework CR, though related to N5-030578 discussion	
N5-030579r1	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Add P_USER_BINDING to TpServiceTypeName	Telcordia/NTT

Add the name of the new User Binding SCF to TpServiceTypeName in the Framework to allow the SCF to be discoverable.

Approved.

13 Election of CN-5 Vice Chairman: Proposal to be done on Tuesday afternoon at 13hr00

N5-030576	Nomination of John-Luc BAKKER for 3GPP CN5 Vice-Chair	Telcordia

List of candidates closed, no other candidates so John-Luc is elected as CN5 vice-chair.

The group thanks Musa for his two years as CN5 vice chair. An ETSI medal was presented to him (since 3GPP does not have a rewarding system).

Reminder that there is still one free vice chair position.

14 OSA Testing Activities

N5-030564	Report from ETSI STF 251	ETSI PTCC

There is an interop planned for the third week of January (19-23). Details to be shared during the Parlay meeting.

This document will create implementation conformance statements for Parlay 4. Follow up is announced for February.

Progress reports are made to Richard. Ultan commits to informing the meeting.

In writing the X document we have asked what methods on the SCFs side are actually supported. The analogous question we have recently asked is to report the actual supported IpApp interfaces.

ACTION ITEM: Ultan to initiate an e-mail discussion on IpApp method requirements.

Noted

15 Organizational aspects with relation to Joint activities

15.1 First draft of Parlay X specifications

15.2 Delivery plans for OSA Rel6 and Parlay 5

Which parts for release 6 to bring in December plenary?

Ultan:
Part 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 6, 13 already delivered
We must bring Rel 6 and previous CR affecting that part to plenary
Chelo: December is Rel 4 and Rel 5 CR time

HA requirement seems not accepted for Rel 6.
HA can cause major impact on FW. Hence FW can be presented if HA is not accepted to Rel. 6.
Integrity Mgmt. also impacts FW.

We don't want to present is we expect Rel. 5 impact.

No part to be brought in if there are no CRs against the part.

1: yes
2: yes
3: yes
4.1: yes (it is there)
4.2: yes
4.3: yes (it is there)
4.4: yes (it is there)
5: there are CRs waiting, we need a new base (impact of the outstanding CRs)
6: yes (it is there)
7: yes (Liliana, no further changes expected)
8: yes (Liliana, no further changes expected)
11: yes (Liliana + another, no further changes expected)
12: yes (Liliana, no further changes expected)
13: yes (it is there)
14: yes (many CRs, no further changes expected)
PX: 1.0.0

Conclusion: we bring everything

What do we do for March/June

March we bring nothing (updates to Work Item needed, WI now says delivery in March)
June we bring next set of CRs (caused by PAM SIMPLE mapping), which is likely to end date of Rel 6

When do we deliver Parlay 5.0

ETSI and Parlay also deliver in June (May meeting) as Rel 6 is then delivered
Parlay X will be presented in December and will go under change control in June.

15.3 CR delivery plans for next CN plenaries

N5-030604	**Rel-4 CRs already approved and not yet implemented**	**MCC**

A list of CRs that have WG approval, but have not been yet submitted to the CN plenary, and hence are not implemented yet. The list is up to date up to this meeting (i.e. snap shot of today).

Noted.

N5-030605	**Rel-5 CRs already approved and not yet implemented**	**MCC**

Noted.

N5-030606	**Rel-6 CRs already approved and not yet implemented**	**MCC**

Noted.

N5-030607	**2003-10-24 updated List of N5_24_CRs (including updated&implemeted CRs + CRs already approved and not yet implemented)**	**MCC**

This is the overall list.

Noted.

15.4 Review of 3GPP OSA Workplan
15.5 3GPP OSA Work Item Description

N5-030524	**Rel-6 feature description document**	**MCC**

Work on this is not a priority now. In December a first draft of Release 99 needs to be made available.

Noted

N5-030541	**Rel-6 OSA enhancements**	**MCC**

Our section taken from previous document (524). It is proposed we use this document when updates are necessary.

Noted.

N5-030544	**Release 99 feature description document**	**MCC**

Skeleton for Release 99. It includes OSA section generated by Adrian.

Noted

N5-030543	**3GPP Work Plan filtered on OSA issues (CN5, SA1/2 etc.)**	**MCC**

Our section taken from previous document (544). It is proposed we use this document when updates are necessary. Clarify that Part 1 & 2 in Rel. 99 reflect all APIs (in Part 1) and mapping in Part 2.

ACTION ITEM: Adrian will update the document and distribute on the e-mail for further review

We will remove first table (Don't link CN5 work in SMG), cut the OSA part and remove the billing part.

This work needs to complete before the next plenary.

To be updated to 663

N5-030663	**Update of 543**	**MCC**
	NOT AVAILABLE	

N5-030514	3GPP Work Plan filtered on OSA issues (CN5, SA1/2 etc.)	MCC

Noted

N5-030515	Updated Rel-6 Work Item Description for OSA Stage 3	MCC
N5-030617	Update of 515	MCC

WID inline with Work Description.
User Data Management is removed from SA1 and CN5 requirements
Usually we count two plenary before removing a requirement that sees no progress (from other WG in this case).
Note: ID 15025 and 15037 seem to be the same requirement.

Proposal to remove 15025 and 15037 from work plan (for now).

Proposal accepted. Both are deleted from plenary slides.

Request to update the percentage number per WID.
15026: remains 50% (June '04)
15028: goes to 90% (should have been higher last time) (Dec '03)
15029: goes to 80%, (mapping completion date related to TS): Note needs to say that we are talking about TR (Sept. '04) and the TS needs to be ready (Dec. '03) The date needs to be "to be defined" (for now)
15032: goes to 90% (Parlay X to presented in Dec. v.1.0.0) (completion date June)
15033: remains as is (already supported, CRs not yet presented) (Dec)
15034: remains 0% (-)
15035: request to be removed (-)
15036: (Dec.)
15037: removal

16 Outgoing Liaisons

N5-030614	Clarification on OSA MMS activities	Ericsson

We inform T2 what CN5 is doing on MMS.

Ultan: commends description of our group
Laura: mention PX activities on MMS?
A. not available yet

To T2 only? Yes.

Delete 'formally" from first section

Add "actions" and say "none"

Approved

N5-030615	Request for status update on SA1 OSA GUP requirements	Alcatel
	NOT AVAILABLE	

ACTION ITEM: Chelo to start e-mail approval on this LS.

N5-030616	Request for clarification on the scope of the Ut interface towards the OSA SCS	Marconi

Consider to remove reference "conferencing API" as it is not supported OSA.

Add SA2 to "to" instead of in "cc".

ACTION ITEM: Jane to start e-mail approval on this LS.

Updated to 665

N5-030665	Updated to 616	Marconi
	NOT AVAILABLE	

17 Future meetings

N5-030516	Full 3GPP meeting calendar including workshops	MCC

Noted

N5-030517	SA_SAx_CN_CNx meeting calendar	MCC

We have confirmed with the CN that we would attend at least two CN meetings. The meeting agrees to collocate with Parlay.

Musa notes that one OMA meeting will be held the week before May 3-6 in Zurich and that another OMA meeting will be held Nov 17-18 (which conflicts with CN).

Febr. 16-20, US (CN)
May 3-6 (whole week), Miami (Parlay)
Aug. 16-20, Sophia Antipolis (CN)
Nov. 1-4 (whole week), Zurich (Parlay)

Proposed: "25bis ad-hoc messaging" meeting, January 22-23, Sophia Antipolis (collocated with ETSI Interop Event Parlay/OSA)

ACTION ITEM: Richard to inform the Parlay board of our intentions to attend both of the Parlay meetings in 2004

ACTION ITEM: Ultan to get us a room.

Noted

N5-030612	Parlay meeting calendar	BT Exact

Noted

18 AOB

N5-030587	Deadline for contributions is 5 working days before the meeting starts. Consideration of later contributions cannot be guaranteed	MCC
	NOT AVAILABLE	

N5-030627	List of TSG CN WG5 Specifications (web view of the MCC DB extract) - for updating Rapporteurs	MCC

It is proposed that Chelo will replace all except "Erwin"'s name for Parlay X.

Agreed

18.1 Maturity slides

N5-030521	Parlay Backwards Compatibility/Maturity slides	BT Exact

Withdrawn

N5-030588	Backwards Compatibility in Parlay 5, Option 1	ETSI PTCC

Issue is that we will delete deprecated methods. Inspiration by Java model cited where supposedly methods disappear after 6+ months.

Option 1: do clean up (588)
- suggest per major release
- how long do they stay (how many releases)?

Q. do not reuse method name: we need to make it clear that these methods were once used.
A. it is found in the table at the end of the document.
A. We will have records of what is deleted

Deprecated methods that are mandatory should not be deleted but first made optional if at all.

Q. what about data types?
A. Datatypes seem reusable
Key points: (no BC, less messy, no method reuse, there might be exceptions to rules)
Lucent supports this option

Are we in a lifecycle moment that it makes sense to remove methods? Are we going to have many more releases?

Jane: implementations stay in the network for a long time. Recommends against deleting things.

Chelo: Proposes to postpone this decision

Laura: perhaps now is a good time to do a clean up? As there are not many deployments.

We loose BC while our message is that we have 3 BC releases. This is not inline with our "stability" message.

There are no BC rules for Java and WS realizations; e only have them for Java.

If BC is priority then we need better rules!

Noted.

N5-030589	Backwards Compatibility in Parlay 5, Option 2	ETSI PTCC

Option 2: never delete anything (messy spec., very BC!) (589)

Remove stereotypes only

unused types may be deleted
untidy. Statements are in the spec. that indicates deletion at a future stage is in the spec.

Noted.

Parlay Board is expected to have an opinion

ACTION ITEM: Richard to submit these document to Parlay Rome meeting and come back with feedback

Noted

19 Close

20 Annex A: Agenda

1 Opening of the meeting and approval of the agenda (Monday 9:00 AM)
1.1 Reminder for IPR declaration

2 Allocation of documents to agenda items
3 Reporting
3.1 JWG meeting, San Francisco

3.2 3GPP
3.2.1 CN plenary
3.2.2 SA plenary
3.2.3 SA1 activities on OSA Requirements
3.2.4 SA1 and T2 activities on MMS
3.2.5 SA2 activities on IP Session Function
3.2.6 SA2 activities on User Data Management
3.2.7 SA1, SA2 activities on GUP
3.2.8 CN1 activities on Access Independence
3.2.9 CN1 activities on Presence
3.2.10 3GPP OMA discussions

3.3 Parlay
3.3.1 Parlay Board
3.3.2 Parlay TAC

3.4 ETSI
3.4.1 ETSI SPAN reorganization

3.5 3GPP2

3.6 Work between meetings
This agenda item aims to review the ToDo list from the previous meeting, plus reporting on any other between-meetings activity, if applicable.

3.7 Other reporting

4 Input liaison statements

5 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 3.2 has been finalised, and backwards compatibility has to be guaranteed, the assumption is that for error corrections in the scope of Parlay 3 / 3GPP Rel.4 only work around and documentation of the errors is allowed.

6 Technical discussions OSA version 2 / 3GPP Rel.5
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 4.0 has been finalised, and backwards compatibility has to be guaranteed, the assumption is that for error corrections in the scope of Parlay 4 / 3GPP Rel.5 only work around and documentation of the errors is allowed.

7 Framework session
7.1 High Availability (HA)
7.2 Integrity Management

8 TpAttribute session

9 Parlay X session

10 Messaging session

11 EntOp APIs session

12 Other technical discussions OSA version 3 / 3GPP Rel.6
12.1 Requirements

12.2 OSA support for 3GPP2 networks
12.3 Different abstraction levels for OSA
12.4 Presence and Availability Management
12.5 Call Control
12.6 Framework
12.6.1 Migration support mechanism
12.6.2 Framework function for federation
12.7 Policy Management
12.8 User data Management and User data security management
12.9 Retrieval of Visited Network capabilities
12.10 Access to IP Session information
12.11 User-application authentication function
12.12 Other APIs

13 Election of CN-5 Vice Chairman: Proposal to be done on Tuesday afternoon at 13hr00

14 OSA Testing Activities

15 Organisational aspects with relation to Joint activities
15.1 First draft of Parlay X specifications
15.2 Delivery plans for OSA Rel6 and Parlay 5
15.3 CR delivery plans for next CN plenaries
15.4 Review of 3GPP OSA workplan
15.5 3GPP OSA Work Item Description

16 Outgoing Liaisons

17 Future meetings

18 AOB
18.1 Maturity slides

19 Close

21 Annex B: Documents list

	Document not available				
	Document available, not yet treated				
	Document available late, not yet treated				
	Document treated				
	Document replaced / superseded by a Revised Version				
	CN5#25, Bangkok, THAILAND, 27-31 Oct 2003				
Doc	**Carry-on Docs from previous meeting(s)**	**Source**	**Source**	**Type**	**Abstract/Conclusion**
N5-030307r2	Draft Report of CN5#24, San Francisco, CA, USA, 14-18 July 2003	JWG Chair	n.a.	Report	Approved without change at CN5#25. Updated to 308.
N5-030308	Report of CN5#24	CN5	n.a.	Report	Update of 307r2. Approved.
Doc	**Title**	**Source**	**Source**	**Type**	**Abstract/Conclusion**
N5-030500	Draft Agenda	JWG Chair	1 Agenda	Agenda	Revised.
N5-030500r1	Draft Agenda	JWG Chair	1 Agenda	Agenda	Revised.
N5-030500r2	Draft Agenda	JWG Chair	1 Agenda	Agenda	Approved.
N5-030501	Document Allocation	JWG Chair	2 Tdoc allocation	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030502	report_Monday	JWG Chair	Not applicable.	Report	Noted.
N5-030503	report_Tuesday	JWG Chair	Not applicable.	Report	Withdrawn
N5-030504	report_Wednesday	JWG Chair	Not applicable.	Report	Noted.
N5-030505	report_Thursday	JWG Chair	Not applicable.	Report	Noted.
N5-030506	report_Friday	JWG Chair	Not applicable.	Report	Noted.
N5-030507r1	Draft Report of CN5#25 v101	JWG Chair	Not applicable.	Report	
N5-030508	Report of CN5#25	Joint-API-group	Not applicable.	Report	
N5-030509	Report of last 3GPP CN meeting	MCC	3 Reporting	Report	Revised
N5-030509r1	Report of last 3GPP CN meeting (SP-030503, SP-030537)	MCC	3 Reporting	Report	Revised
N5-030509r2	Report of last 3GPP CN meeting (NP#21_Draft_report_v111)	MCC	3 Reporting	Report	Noted.
N5-030510	Report of last 3GPP SA meeting	MCC	3 Reporting	Report	Revised
N5-030510r1	Report of last 3GPP SA meeting (Draft Report v0.0.5 of TSG SA meeting #21)	MCC	3 Reporting	Report	Noted.
N5-030511	CN5 Report to CN#21 plenary, Sep 2003 (NP-030437)	CN5 Chair	3 Reporting	Report	Noted.
N5-030512	IETF status report & 3GPP IETF Dependencies and Priorities (SP-030504)	TSG CN Chairman	3 Reporting	Report	Noted.
N5-030513	Presentation of 3GPP Work Plan status at the end of SA#21 (09/2003)	MCC	3 Reporting	Report	Noted.
N5-030514	3GPP Work Plan filtered on OSA issues (CN5, SA1/2 etc.)	MCC	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030515	CN5 (OSA Stage 3) Work Item Description(s) - WID(s)	CN#21 (NP-030353)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	WID	Update in 617.
N5-030516	Full 3GPP meeting calendar including workshops	MCC	Future meetings	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030517	SA_SAx_CN_CNx meeting calendar	MCC	Future meetings	Tdoc	Decision: May & Nov 2004 JWG meetings co-located with Parlay.
N5-030518	LS from OMA Requirements Group to 3GPP, 3GPP2 : Introduction to the OMA Activity on Push to talk over Cellular (PoC)	OMA-REQ-2003-0409R02	4 Input LSs	LS in	Noted.
N5-030519	LS from OMA Requirements WG to 3GPP SA5, SA1, T2, T3 and 3GPP2 TSG-S on OMA Device Management	OMA-REQ-2003-0409R02	4 Input LSs	LS in	Noted.
N5-030520	LS from S5 to N1,N2,N3,N4,N5,S1,S2 on possible re-organisation of 3GPP charging specification work	S5-034444	4 Input LSs	LS in	Noted.
N5-030521	Maturity slides	BT (Richard Stretch)	2 Tdoc allocation	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030522	LS Reply from S2 to N5 (cc: CN, SA, S1) on User Data Management architecture requirement	S2-033241	4 Input LSs	LS in	Noted.
N5-030523	LS reply from S2 to S5 (cc: SA,N1,N2,N3,N4,N5,S1) on possible re-organisation of 3GPP charging specification work	S2-033236	4 Input LSs	LS in	Noted.
N5-030524	Rel-6 feature description document	MCC (Alain Sultan)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030525	Rel-5 feature description document	MCC (Alain Sultan)	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030526	R6 CR OSA API Support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 4-1 of OSA	Ericsson (Liliana Dinale)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Email approved on 10 Oct 2003.
N5-030527	R6 CR OSA API Support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 4-2 of OSA	Ericsson (Liliana Dinale)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Email approved on 10 Oct 2003.
N5-030528	R6 CR OSA API Support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 4-3 of OSA	Ericsson (Liliana Dinale)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Email approved on 10 Oct 2003.
N5-030529	R6 CR OSA API Support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 4-4 of OSA	Ericsson (Liliana Dinale)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Email approved on 10 Oct 2003.
N5-030530	R6 CR OSA API Support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 5 of OSA	Ericsson (Liliana Dinale)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Email approved on 10 Oct 2003.
N5-030531	R6 CR OSA API Support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 6 of OSA	Ericsson (Liliana Dinale)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Email approved on 10 Oct 2003.
N5-030532	R6 CR OSA API Support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 7 of OSA	Ericsson (Liliana Dinale)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Email approved on 10 Oct 2003.

N5-030533	R6 CR OSA API Support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 8 of OSA	Ericsson (Liliana Dinale)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Email approved on 10 Oct 2003.
N5-030534	R6 CR OSA API Support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 11 of OSA	Ericsson (Liliana Dinale)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Email approved on 10 Oct 2003.
N5-030535	R6 CR OSA API Support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 12 of OSA	Ericsson (Liliana Dinale)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Email approved on 10 Oct 2003.
N5-030536	R6 CR OSA API Support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 13 of OSA	Ericsson (Liliana Dinale)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Email approved on 10 Oct 2003.
N5-030537	R6 CR OSA API Support for 3GPP2 networks in Part 14 of OSA	Ericsson (Liliana Dinale)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Email approved on 10 Oct 2003.
N5-030538	R6 CR OSA API Support for 3GPP2 networks in 29.998-04-4 of OSA	Ericsson (Liliana Dinale)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Email approved on 10 Oct 2003.
N5-030539	Information document for TpAttribute Restructuring	Teltier (Guda Venkatesh)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	
N5-030540	LS from ETSI OCG EMTEL to All ETSI TBs, relevant WGs, EPPs 3GPP SA, MESA SSG SA (cc: 3GPP2, TIA TR 45, GSC) on EC Requirements on Emergency Telecommunications	ETSI OCG EMTEL	4 Input LSs	LS in	Noted.
N5-030541	OSA in Rel6_features_v_2003_08_20: For JWG review & feedback to MCC	MCC	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030542	Rel5_features_v_2003_09_09: For JWG review & feedback to MCC	MCC	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030543	Initial draft Rel99 features OSA - for review by WG	MCC	3GPP OSA WID	Tdoc	Updated to 663.
N5-030544	Release 1999 feature description document	MCC (Alain Sultan)	3GPP OSA WID	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030545	Correct GMS Messaging Problems	IBM (Scott Broussard)	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Noted.
N5-030546	Correct GMS Messaging Problems	IBM (Scott Broussard)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Noted.
N5-030547	Rel-5 CR29198-01 Add Java Realization rule to address MPCC name conflicts	IBM (Scott Broussard)	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Approved. AZ \to update Cat F CR Correction to JAVA rules
N5-030548	ETSI_Parlay_ Requirements_draft0.6_Sept-03	BT (Richard Stretch)	3 Reporting	Tdoc	Updated to 624
N5-030549	Correct the sequence diagram for Fault Management	Lucent (Musa Unmehopa)	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Approved.
N5-030550	Comments and feedback to GMS Re-architecture proposal	Lucent (Musa Unmehopa)	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030551	Proposed update to GMS	Ericsson	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030552	Discuss Enterprise Operator role (static or dynamic)	Open API Solutions	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	
N5-030553	Enterprise Operator should have access to Event Notifications	Open API Solutions	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	
N5-030554	Add events to allow an entop to identify when a client app/service contract/service profile is being used	Open API Solutions	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	
N5-030555	Add ability to identify when a client app/service contract/service profile is being used	Open API Solutions	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	
N5-030556	Clarify erroneous field in TpServiceProfileDescription	Open API Solutions	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	
N5-030557	Introduce a ServiceID field to TpServiceProfileDescription	Open API Solutions	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	
N5-030558	Clarify situation with service contracts and profiles	Open API Solutions	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4, OSA2 3GPP Rel-5, OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Comments in 571 from AePONA.
N5-030559	There are unnecessary P_INVALID_ID exceptions in signature	Open API Solutions	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	
N5-030560	Make more explicit when the call control activity timer should be stopped in UI	Open API Solutions	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Noted.
N5-030561	Make more explicit when the call control activity timer should be stopped in UI	Open API Solutions	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Noted.
N5-030562	OSA report from TISPAN plenary	BT (Richard Stretch)	3 Reporting	Report	Noted.
N5-030563	The role of the activity timer needs to be clarified	Open API Solutions	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030564	Report from ETSI STF 251	ETSI PTCC (Ultan Mulligan)	3 Reporting	Report	Noted.
N5-030565	Creation of ETSI TISPAN Committee	ETSI PTCC (Ultan Mulligan)	3 Reporting	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030566	Rel-5 CR 29198-04-3 TpNotificationRequesetedSetEntry	ETSI PTCC (Ultan Mulligan)	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Approved. Action: AZ update CR cover.
N5-030567	Rel-6 CR 29198-04-3 TpNotificationRequesetedSetEntry	ETSI PTCC (Ultan Mulligan)	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Approved. Action: AZ update CR cover.
N5-030568	Notes on Specifications for PM SCFs	Lucent (Musa Unmehopa)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Comments in 640 from Telcordia.
N5-030569	Review feedback on GMS Extensions in N5-030551	Lucent (Musa Unmehopa)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030570	Discussion paper on the GMS Mailbox Locking Mechanism	Lucent (Musa Unmehopa)	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030571	Clarify EntOp Contracts and Profiles AePONA Comments	AePONA	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4, OSA2 3GPP Rel-5, OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Comments on 558 from Open API Solutions

N5-030572	Rel-5 CR 29198-03 Correction to IpAccessSTD	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Approved. Action: AZ update CR cover.
N5-030573	Rel-5 CR 29198-03 Correction to Framework Availability Indications	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Updated to 631 as Rel-6 Cat B CR
N5-030574	Rel-5 CR 29198-03 Correction to correlation behaviour in Fault Management	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Updated to 632
N5-030575	Rel-5 CR 29198-03 Correct correlation behaviour in Load Management	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Approved.
N5-030576	Nomination of John-Luc BAKKER for 3GPP CN5 Vice-Chair	Telcordia (3GPP Member /T1)	13 Election of CN-5: Vice Chairman	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030577	Personal Mobility requirement	Telcordia & NTT	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Updated to 626
N5-030578	ES 203 915-6 V0.0.1 Add user binding functions	Telcordia & NTT	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Updated to 625
N5-030579r1	Rel-6 CR 29198-03 Add P_USER_BINDING to TpServiceTypeName	Telcordia & NTT	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Approved.
N5-030580	Changing TpOctetSet to mean List of TpOctet	ETSI PTCC (Ultan Mulligan)	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4, OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030581	Rel-4 CR 29198-02 TpOctetSet Description	ETSI PTCC (Ultan Mulligan)	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Updated to 620
N5-030582	Rel-5 CR 29198-02 TpOctetSet Correction	ETSI PTCC (Ultan Mulligan)	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Updated to 621
N5-030583	Rel-6 CR 29198-02 Extension of datatypes supported by TpAttribute	Telcordia	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Linked to 636. Updated to 643.
N5-030584	Extension of standard datatypes supported by TpPolicy	Telcordia	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 636
N5-030585	Rel-6 CR 29198-14 Add Service Properties to publish supported attribute types	Telcordia	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 646
N5-030586	Rel-6 CR 29198-14 Correct description of TpAttributeType to adequately support possible types	Telcordia	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 645
N5-030588	Backwards Compatibility in Parlay 5, Option 1	ETSI PTCC (Ultan Mulligan)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030589	Backwards Compatibility in Parlay 5, Option 2	ETSI PTCC (Ultan Mulligan)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030590	Report on status of Access Independence and Presence work in CN1	Marconi	3 Reporting	Report	Noted. Action: Send LS to CN1, CN on Presence (616)
N5-030591	N5-030391 Rel-4 CR 29198-02 Re-use of base Reference within an inheritance relationship	Marconi	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Updated to 622
N5-030592	N5-030392 Rel-5 CR 29198-02 Re-use of base Reference within an inheritance relationship	Marconi	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Updated to 623
N5-030593	Rel-5 CR 29198-13 PM Introducing conditionType and actionType	Lucent (Musa Unmehopa)	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Withdrawn
N5-030594	Rel-6 CR 29198-13 PM Introducing conditionType and actionType	Lucent (Musa Unmehopa)	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Withdrawn
N5-030595	Correspondence on MMS between the Chairs of T2 SWG3 and CN5	JWG Chair (Chelo Abarca, Alcatel)	3 Reporting	Tdoc	Noted. Action: Send LS to T2 (614)
N5-030596	Rel-5 CR 29198-03 Correction to Framework Access Session	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Updated to 633
N5-030597	Rel-6 CR 29198-03 Introduce support for Access sessions for Service	AePONA	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Action: Revised CRs for the next meeting
N5-030598	Rel-6 CR 29198-03 Fault Mgt for Service and Service Instance	AePONA	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Action: Revised CRs for the next meeting
N5-030599	Rel-6 CR 29198-03 Heartbeat Mgt for Service and Service Instance	AePONA	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Action: Revised CRs for the next meeting
N5-030600	Rel-6 CR 29198-03 Load Mgt for Service and Service Instance	AePONA	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Action: Revised CRs for the next meeting
N5-030601	GUP activities in other 3GPP groups	JWG chair (Chelo Abarca, Alcatel)	3 Reporting	Tdoc	Noted. Action: Send LS to S1 (615)
N5-030602	ETSI format of Parlay X specification	Rapporteur (Richard Stretch)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	TS	Withdrawn
N5-030603	3GPP format of Parlay X specification	Rapporteur (Richard Stretch)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	TS	Updated to 635
N5-030604	Rel-4 CRs already approved and not yet implemented	MCC	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Noted.
N5-030605	Rel-5 CRs already approved and not yet implemented	MCC	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Noted.
N5-030606	Rel-6 CRs already approved and not yet implemented	MCC	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated to 662
N5-030607	2003-10-24 updated List of N5_24_CRs (including updated&implemeted CRs + CRs already approved and not yet implemented)	MCC	3 Reporting	Tdoc	Updated to 661
N5-030608	SA1 High Availability Requirements for OSA Rel-6	Ericsson/IBM/AePONA	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030609	Results from To Do List from #24 San Francisco meeting (work summary btw #24&#25 Bangkok meetings)	JWG chair (Chelo Abarca, Alcatel) and JWG Vice-chair (Musa Unmehopa)	3 Reporting	Report	Noted.
N5-030611	Collection of GMS comments on the mailing list	Ericsson	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.

N5-030612	Meeting calendar of Parlay for 2004	ETSI member (Richard Stretch)	Future meetings	Tdoc	Decision: Feb & Nov 2004 JWG meetings co-located with Parlay.
N5-030613	Rel-5 CR 29198-01 Correction to Java Realisation Rules	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Updated to 634
N5-030614	LS to T2 on clarifying the CN5 OSA API activities related to MMS	CN5	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	LS out	Triggered by 595. Approved.
N5-030615	LS to S1 (cc: S2) on GUP	CN5	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	LS out	Triggered by 601. Email approved 1 Dec 2003.
N5-030616	LS to CN (cc: S2, S1, CN1) Request for clarification on the scope of the Ut interface towards the OSA-SCS	CN5	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	LS out	Triggered by 590. Updated to 665.
N5-030617	Draft Updated CN5 (OSA Stage 3) Work Item Description (WID)	MCC	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	WID	Updated to 664.
N5-030618	Rel-5 CR 29198-01 Add guidelines for realizing High Availability in OSA R5	Ericsson/AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Action: Provide evidence of the problem the solution is proposed for. 1st Step provide Report of OSA/Parlay Interop Event 14-17 April 2003
N5-030619	Collection of contributions to the joint WGs PoC session 27 Oct 6PM	MCC	3GPP OMA discussion	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030620	Rel-4 CR 29198-02 TpOctetSet Description	ETSI PTCC (Ultan Mulligan)	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Update of 581. Approved.
N5-030621	Rel-5 CR 29198-02 TpOctetSet Correction	ETSI PTCC (Ultan Mulligan)	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Update of 582. Approved.
N5-030622	Rel-4 CR 29198-02 Re-use of base Reference within an inheritance relationship	Marconi	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Approved. Action: AZ update CR cover.
N5-030623	Rel-5 CR 29198-02 Re-use of base Reference within an inheritance relationship	Marconi	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	Approved. Action: AZ update CR cover.
N5-030624	ETSI_Parlay_ Requirements_draft0.6_Sept-03	ETSI TISPAN Project OSA (Richard Stretch)	3 Reporting	Tdoc	Update of 548. Noted.
N5-030625	ES 203 915-6 V0.0.1 Add user binding functions	Telcordia & NTT	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Update of 578. Updated to 638.
N5-030626	Personal Mobility requirement	Telcordia & NTT	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Update of 577. Approved.
N5-030627	List of TSG CN WG5 Specifications (web view of the MCC DB extract) - for updating Rapporteurs	MCC	AOB	Tdoc	Updated & Noted.
N5-030628	Rel-6 CR 29.198-14 Include provisioning SCF in Presence Service (Provisioning SCF added to Presence Service to satisfy 3GPP Presence requirements)	ETSI PTCC (Ultan Mulligan)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated of 356 (Guda). Approved.
N5-030629	Rel-6 CR 29.198-14 Add PAM service activation and deactivation (A proposal for satisfying 3GPP Presence requirements for the ability to activate/deactivate the presence service for a user)	ETSI PTCC (Ultan Mulligan)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Updated of 355 (Guda). Approved.
N5-030630	OSA/Parlay Interop Event 14-17 April 2003; Report (http://www.etsi.org/plugtests/docs/OSA_Parlay/OSA_Parlay_Report.doc)	ETSI Plugtest service	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Report	Provided to help clarify CR in 618. Noted.
N5-030631	Rel-5 CR 29198-03 Correction to Framework Availability Indications	AePONA	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 573 as Rel-6 CR Cat B. Email Approved on 14 Nov.
N5-030632	Rel-5 CR 29198-03 Correction to correlation behaviour in Fault Management	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 574. Email Approved on 14 Nov.
N5-030633	Rel-5 CR 29198-03 Correction to Framework Access Session	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 596. Email Approved on 14 Nov.
N5-030634	Rel-5 CR 29198-01 Correction to Java Realisation Rules	AePONA	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	Update of 613. Email Approved on 11 Nov 2003.
N5-030635	Draft 3GPP TS 29.199 on Parlay X Web Services	Rapporteur (Richard Stretch)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	TS	Update of 603. Updated to 639.
N5-030636	Extension of standard datatypes supported by TpPolicy	Telcordia	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 584. Linked to 643. Updated to 642.
N5-030637	Messaging session presentation	Telcordia	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030638	ES 203 915-6 V0.0.1 Add user binding functions	Telcordia & NTT	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Update of 625. Approved.
N5-030639	3GPP Draft v003 TS 29.199 on Parlay X Web Services	Rapporteur (Richard Stretch)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	TS	Update of 635. Email Approved on 15 Nov.
N5-030640	Comments to 568	Telcordia	OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030641	Parlay X and Paycircle Copyright issues	ETSI PTCC (Ultan Mulligan)	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Noted.
N5-030642	Rel-6 CR 29198-13 Extension of standard datatypes supported by TpPolicy	Telcordia	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 636. Linked to 643. Updated to 647.
N5-030643	Rel-6 CR 29198-02 Extension of datatypes supported by TpAttribute	Telcordia	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 583. Linked to 642. Email Approved on 19 Nov.
N5-030644	Rel-6 CR 29198-14 new	Telcordia	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Linked to 642, 643. Withdrawn. Reason: 644 rolled into 646
N5-030645	Rel-6 CR 29198-14 Correct description of TpAttributeType to adequately support possible types	Telcordia	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 586. Email Approved on 19 Nov.
N5-030646	Rel-6 CR 29198-14 Add Service Properties to publish supported attribute types	Telcordia	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 585. Email Approved on 19 Nov.

N5-030647	Rel-6 CR 29198-13 Correction of standard datatypes supported by TpPolicy - Alignment with 29.198-02	Telcordia	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 642. Email Approved on 19 Nov.
N5-030648	Rel-5 CR 29198-13 Correction of standard datatypes supported by TpPolicy - Alignment with 29.198-02	Telcordia	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Email Approved on 19 Nov.
N5-030661	2003-10-24 updated List of N5_24_CRs (including updated&implemeted CRs + CRs already approved and not yet implemented)	MCC	3 Reporting	Tdoc	Update of 607. Noted.
N5-030662	Rel-6 CRs already approved and not yet implemented	MCC	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	Update of 606. Noted.
N5-030663	Initial draft Rel99 features OSA - for review by WG	MCC	3GPP OSA WID	Tdoc	Update of 543. Email Approved on 11 Nov.
N5-030664	Updated CN5 (OSA Stage 3) Work Item Description (WID)	MCC	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	WID	Update of 617. For email Approval.
N5-030665	LS to CN (cc: S2, S1, CN1) Request for clarification on the scope of the Ut interface towards the OSA-SCS	CN5	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	LS out	Triggered by 590. Update of 616. Email approved 7 Nov 2003.
N5-030666	List of CN5#24&#25 CRs (to go to CN#22, pending CN5 approval, etc.)	MCC	OSA1 3GPP Rel-4, OSA2 3GPP Rel-5, OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	Combination of 661 & N5_25_DocLst

21.1 Liaison Statements

Doc	Title	Source	Source	Type	/Conclusion
N5-030518	LS from OMA Requirements Group to 3GPP, 3GPP2 : Introduction to the OMA Activity on Push to talk over Cellular (PoC)	OMA-REQ-2003-0409R02	4 Input LSs	LS in	Noted.
N5-030519	LS from OMA Requirements WG to 3GPP SA5, SA1, T2, T3 and 3GPP2 TSG-S on OMA Device Management	OMA-REQ-2003-0409R02	4 Input LSs	LS in	Noted.
N5-030520	LS from S5 to N1,N2,N3,N4,N5,S1,S2 on possible re-organisation of 3GPP charging specification work	S5-034444	4 Input LSs	LS in	Noted.
N5-030522	LS Reply from S2 to N5 (cc: CN, SA, S1) on User Data Management architecture requirement	S2-033241	4 Input LSs	LS in	Noted.
N5-030523	LS reply from S2 to S5 (cc: SA,N1,N2,N3,N4,N5,S1) on possible re-organisation of 3GPP charging specification work	S2-033236	4 Input LSs	LS in	Noted.
N5-030540	LS from ETSI OCG EMTEL to All ETSI TBs, relevant WGs, EPPs 3GPP SA, MESA SSG SA (cc: 3GPP2, TIA TR 45, GSC) on EC Requirements on Emergency Telecommunications	ETSI OCG EMTEL	4 Input LSs	LS in	Noted.
N5-030614	LS to T2 on clarifying the CN5 OSA API activities related to MMS	CN5	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	LS out	Triggered by 595. Approved.
N5-030615	LS to S1 (cc: S2) on GUP	Chelo	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	LS out	Triggered by 601. Email approved 1 Dec 2003.
N5-030665	LS to CN, S2 (cc: S1, CN1) Request for clarification on the scope of the Ut interface towards the OSA-SCS	CN5	OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	LS out	Triggered by 590. Update of 616. Email approved 7 Nov 2003.

22 Annex C: Participants list

Chairman

ABARCA Chelo	ALCATEL S.A.	FR

Vice Chairman

UNMEHOPA Musa	Lucent Technologies B.V.	NL

PROJECT_MGR

ZOICAS Adrian	ETSI Secretariat	FR

ATSUSHI Iwasaki	NTT	JP
BAKKER John-Luc	Telcordia Technologies Inc.	US
BUNTING Roger L.	Lucent Technologies	US
HUMPHREY Jane D	MARCONI COMMUNICATIONS	GB
MC QUILLAN Laura	LogicaCMG	IE
MULLIGAN Ultan	ETSI Secretariat	FR
MURRAY Eamonn	AePONA LTD	GB
STRETCH Richard	BT Group Plc	GB
VAN RIJSSEN Erwin	ERICSSON LM	SE

Number of Attendees: 12

Member of 3GPP (ETSI)

Ms. Chelo Abarca	ALCATEL S.A.	(ETSI)	FR	+33 1307 70469	chelo.abarca@alcatel.fr
Ms. Jane D Humphrey	MARCONI COMMUNICATIONS	(ETSI)	GB	+44 24 76564232	jane.humphrey@marconi.com
Miss Laura Mc Quillan	LogicaCMG laura.mcquillan@logicacmg.com	(ETSI)	IE	+353 1 819 3682	
Mr. Eamonn Murray	AePONA LTD	(ETSI)	GB	+44 28 90269188	eamonn.murray@aepona.com
Mr. Richard Stretch	BT Group Plc	(ETSI)	GB	+44 1473 607487	richard.stretch@bt.com
Mr. Musa Unmehopa	Lucent Technologies N. S. UK	(ETSI)	NL	+31 35 687 1684	unmehopa@lucent.com
Mr. Erwin van Rijssen	ERICSSON LM Erwin.van.Rijssen@ericsson.com	(ETSI)	NL	+31161242320	

Member of 3GPP (T1)

Mr. John-Luc Bakker	Telcordia Technologies Inc. jlbakker@research.telcordia.com	(T1)	US	+1 973 829 5062	
Dr. Roger L. Bunting	Lucent Technologies	(T1)	US	+1 630 979 5942	rlbunting@lucent.com

Member of 3GPP (TTC)

Mr. Iwasaki Atsushi	NTT	(TTC)	JP	+81-422-59-6649	iwasaki.atsushi@lab.ntt.co.jp

Organisation partner representative (ETSI)

Mr. Ultan Mulligan	ETSI Secretariat	(ETSI)	FR	+33 4 92 94 43 88	ultan.mulligan@etsi.org
Mr. Adrian Zoicas	Mobile Competence Centre	(ETSI)	FR	+33 4 92 94 42 21	adrian.zoicas@etsi.org

23 History

Document history		
Ver. 1.0.0	14 Nov 2003	N5-030507 DRAFT Report submitted to CN5 for comment and posted at: http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_cn/WG5_osa/TSGN5_25_Bangkok/Report/
Ver. 1.0.1	01 Dec 2003	N5-030507R1 DRAFT Report submitted to CN5 for comment & CN#22 for Information and posted at: http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_cn/WG5_osa/TSGN5_25_Bangkok/Report/
Ver. 2.0.0	31 Jan 2004	N5-030507rx Revised DRAFT Report submitted to CN5 for comment and posted at: http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_cn/WG5_osa/TSGN5_25_Bangkok/Report/
Ver. 3.0.0	20 Feb 2004	N5-030508: Approved Report at CN5#26 and posted at: http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_cn/WG5_osa/TSGN5_25_Bangkok/Report/