3GPP TSG-CN Meeting #23 **NP-040066**
10th - 12th March 2004. Phoenix, USA.

Source:	**CN5**
Title:	**Draft Report of CN5#26, Atlanta, USA, 16-20 Feb 2004**
Agenda item:	**6.5.1**
Document for:	**INFORMATION**

N5-040007 v1.0.0

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

Report of Meeting #26, Atlanta, USA, 16-20 February 2004

Contents

Chair:	Chelo Abarca (Alcatel)	for 3GPP CN5
	Richard Stretch (BT)	for ETSI TISPAN Project OSA
CN5 Vice-Chair:	John-Luc Bakker (Telcordia Technologies Inc.)	
3GPP Support:	Adrian Zoicas (ETSI, 3GPP Mobile Competence Centre)	
Meeting Host:	The "North American Friends of 3GPP"	
	AT&T Wireless, Cingular Wireless, Ericsson, InterDigital Communications, Lucent, Nokia, Nortel Networks, Sharp Laboratories, Skyworks Solutions, T-Mobile, TruePosition	
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/

joint-API-group (Parlay, ETSI Project OSA, 3GPP TSG_CN WG5) N5-040007
Meeting #26, Atlanta, GA, USA, 16-20 February 2004

Source: **CN5 Chair (Chelo Abarca) and CN5 Vice Chair (John-Luc Bakker)**

Title: **Draft Report of CN5#26, Atlanta, USA, 16-20 Feb 2004**

1 Opening of the meeting and approval of the agenda (Monday 9:00 AM)
1.1 IPR (Intellectual Property Rights) declarations

N5-040000	Agenda of Meeting #26, Atlanta, USA, 16-20 February 2004	CN5 Chair
N5-040079	Revised Agenda of Meeting #26, Atlanta, USA, 16-20 February 2004	CN5 Chair

Updated to 102. Agreed.
Updated to 109. Agreed.

2 Allocation of documents to agenda items

N5-040001	Document Allocation	CN5 Vice Chair

3 Reporting
3.1a JWG meeting, Bangkok

N5-040035	DRAFT Report v100 of Meeting #25, Bangkok, Thailand, 27-31 October 2003	CN5 Chair

Revision 2 of 507 (draft report of BK meeting), with some tidy up.

Approved.

3.1b JWG meeting, Sophia-Antipolis

N5-040105	Notes from Meeting #25Bis, Sophia-Antipolis, France, Jan 29-30	CN5 Chair

Noted.

3.2 3GPP
3.2.1 CN plenary

N5-040010	DRAFT Meeting Report v1.1.0, 3GPP TSG-CN#22, Maui, Hawaii 10-12 December, 2003	CN Chair

See 551: we need to provide a Rel6 mirror CR. **Chelo to send a comment to the CN report to highlight that the issue has been noted and will be taken into account, but to request the re-phrasing of the report because we are contribution driven.**

See 556: this document is not implemented – there were contradictions, and a correction has been resubmitted to this meeting (TDoc 54).

The report is noted.

N5-040019	IETF Status REPORT - by CN Chair	CN Chair

Noted.

N5-040012	IETF status report & 3GPP IETF Dependencies and Priorities	CN Chair

Same as 19. Noted.

N5-040009	NP-030540 CN5 presentation to CN#22	CN5 Chair

Noted.

3.2.2 SA plenary

N5-040011	Draft Report for meeting SA#22 – version 0.0.7rm	MCC

Noted.

N5-040013	Review of the Work Plan at Plenaries #22	MCC

Final version of the WP prepared by MCC and updated during the #22 plenaries.

The cleanup of unwanted requirements inherited from Rel5 has finished. Anyway the stage 1 document still needs to be updated.

Noted.

3.2.3 SA1 activities on OSA Requirements

See agenda item 4 Input Liaison Statements.

3.2.4 SA1 and T2 activities on MMS

See agenda item 4 Input Liaison Statements.

3.2.5 SA1, SA2 activities on GUP

See agenda item 4 Input Liaison Statements.

3.2.6 CN1 activities on Access Independence

N5-040051	Access Independence - Terminology Changes	Marconi

Summary of contribution:

At the Bangkok meeting of CN5 it was reported that as a result of SA2 agreeing terminology changes to make the IMS specifications Access Independent the same changes had been proposed to the IMS specifications under the control of CN1 to align the specifications. These terminology changes have now been agreed by CN. The changes are as follows:

- GPRS is replaced by IP-CAN
- PDP Context is replaced by IP-CAN bearer

The specifications under the control of CN5 have now been reviewed to see if the same terminology changes are required. Two specifications currently refer to GPRS:

- TS 29.198 Part 8 Data Session Control. There are 2 references to GPRS; Section 4 in a footnote to figure 1 and section 8 1st paragraph. The relevant extracts are attached to this contribution. In both instances the reference is just an example of an access technology implying that other methods are possible and can be supported. It is therefore proposed that the terms GPRS and PDP Context when used in this context should not be changed.
- TR 29.998 Part 8 Data Session Service Control mapping to CAP. The purpose of this TR is to describe a mapping to the CAP protocol when used to support GPRS based services. In view of this no changes are proposed.

As a result of the above analysis no changes to the specifications under the responsibility of CN5 are proposed. It is recommended that the CN5 aspect of the Access Independence Work Item (IMSCOOP) should now be closed.

Discussion and conclusion:
Agreed that no changes are necessary in CN5 specifications.

The Access Independence WI belongs to CN1, and we got a plenary action point for that. **Agreed that this will be reported next plenary, and we'll request to close the subject (AI for Chelo)**.

Approved.

3.2.7 CN1 activities on Presence

Reported verbally by Jane: CN1 are following what IETF are doing (see dependency table). CN1 have a base document, not complete yet, expected to be ready for freeze in the June plenary.

We need to produce a mapping document to these specifications. CN1 have already presented their doc to the plenary, so we could start doing something.

Jane to write an email summarizing the status and necessary link, and requesting volunteers for this work.

Chelo to include this request in the presentation to next plenary.

3.2.8 3GPP OMA discussions

N5-040091	Actions from joint meeting SA1 + OMA Requirements	JWG chair

Doc on Actions from joint Req SA1

OSA and OMA Web services

ACTION 9: SA1 to consider, coordinating with the relevant 3GPP groups to communicate to OMA a list of functionalities provided by OSA Rel-6 as Web Services

ACTION 10: OMA to consider to provide to 3GPP a list of Web Services that have been developed in OMA

Discussion

Chelo, Musa: there are no 3GPP documents that list our web services except stage 3, so there is no way for 3GPP to study overlaps.

Joe: any relationship with the activityes of presentations to OMA?
Chelo: this is another channel – the 3GPP-OMA overlap channel, instead of company presentations.

Chelo: proposes to include this in the stage 2, that needs to be improved anyway. Thus, when the 3GPP-OMA process is ready, we have the material.

Chelo to find out what's the process and next steps for working on these, and communicate it to the JWG.

Chelo to remind companies in the JWG to contribute to improve our stage 2, including Parlay X Web Services.

Chelo to include this information in the presentation to the plenary, so CN and SA are aware that there will be this material soon available for this overlap from our stage 2 document.

Noted.

3.3 Parlay

3.3.1 Parlay Board and Parlay TAC

1) There has been a requirement to have a SIP SCF – possibly due to a misunderstanding of the OSA APIs. Discussion took place on this, and conclusion was that a clarification in the IMS specification was needed to highlight that OSA can be used both for operator and for 3rd party services.

Jane: is the Parlay Board aware of the contents of the 23.228 and 23.218 specs?
Chelo: had same comment but agrees that 23.228 stresses that OSA is the standard for 3rd party access, which may give the wrong impression that OSA is not for operator internal services.
Jane: yes but 23.218 describes all the options.

Richard to propose the Board to see if 23.228 and 23.218 already contain the desired information, or some change is still needed.

2) Change of dates of Miami Parlay Member meeting: the reason was that the hotel reservation was not closed, another meeting did, and thus another hotel had to be found. As agreed in the Sophia meeting, Chelo has forwarded to the Parlay Board the concern that we were not asked before closing the agreement with the hotel for a different date.

3) Clarification that the JWG will not have to pay a fee for the Miami meeting. JWG attendants are encouraged to register to the 3GPP and the Parlay sites. Those who want to attend other Parlay meetings will have to pay. An invitation will be sent out soon, as soon as details are agreed with the Parlay Board.

4) Possible new Parlay WGs, no chairs identified yet. Contributors to Parlay 6 requirements are encouraged to fill in the text and volunteer as chairs, otherwise there will not be a new WG and the requirement removed from the document.

Erwin: in the list of Parlay 6 requirements there is a big overlap with OMA.

Musa: is there a document with these proposal? How can member companies support or not the creation of these groups?
Richard: the Parlay 6 requirements document sent out to the Parlay Members list. Comments have been requested in these list, some members may oppose some requirements. There is a new technical discussion forum in Parlay where this is discussed.

Joe: some of these requirements will naturally result in new WGs, some will be extensions of existing work (for instance may turn into CRs to existing specs).

Chelo: how can the activities of the new Parlay technical discussion forum be followed, and how can members participate? Is there a mailing list?
Richard: there has been nothing off line since the Rome Parlay Member meeting except the distribution of requirements. The mailing list used is the Parlay Members list.

Ultan: is there any concern in a possible deviation with ETSI and 3GPP specs, like they were in PAM for instance? We have spent a lot of time in aligning everything.
Richard: he has stressed in the group that we aim to try to ensure an alignment. It's possible that due to the special relationship between ETSI and Parlay, some Parlay material is published by ETSI and not 3GPP.
Chelo: as a member of 3GPP and ETSI does not agree.
Richard: it is not desirable, just wants to list all the options.
Ultan: the only interface Parlay has with ETSI is the JWG.

Musa: as a JWG member does not agree that things are worked in a private group. How are we going to do with 3GPP requirements? Are we going to do with new contributions as we used to do feedbacking requirements to SA1?

Chelo: that process was based on agreement in the JWG.
Musa: if we allow ideas to be developed in a smaller focused group then it is likely that they don't see the bigger picture, and for instance overlaps.
Jane: companies that have a broader view should ring their concerns to Parlay, not in the JWG.
Chelo: but the problem is that this is one more group to participate in – at the same time as we're spending so much time and effort trying to reduce overlaps with other organizations, we're building a new process where there is a new group that may diverge.
Richard: he can confidently say that there are a couple of areas that will be worked on, rest probably not.
Joe: suggests to report to the JWG the contributions for this new work, and the JWG would give feedback.
Chelo: how is this going to work? For instance DRM (that is in the list of potential Parlay 6 requirements) has already been transferred from 3GPP to OMA, that's feedback we can give right now. Would like to have a clear process before giving feedback. We can never meet with this group because we meet in parallel with them.
Joe: our feedback could be that we don't see DRM a suitable activity for further work in Parlay. The JWG could host a joint meeting to discuss the feedback.
Richard: will pass these comments to the Parlay Board. Proposes to have a joint meeting on Monday.

Richard to organize this.

Adrian: we still don't have a process.
Chelo: we're planning to invest a lot on this – personal time to review and comment, JWG meeting agenda time to discuss this. It would be good to have a process to know what will be the outcome of this.
Richard: the idea is to remove requirements for which there is no consensus.

5) Parlay Web Services harmonization was discussed, as proposed by Joe. Some in the Parlay Board thought that this would mean increasing the size of PX interfaces, with a 1-to-1 mapping between OSA/Parlay ←→ Parlay X. To be discussed later in the agenda.

Ultan: did the Parlay Board decide anything on Backwards compatibility?
Richard: that was discuss in the Parlay Board and nobody disagreed with the proposal;
Ultan: the proposal consisted of two conflicting options, and we didn't decide which one.
Richard: see later in the agenda, there is a matrix contributed to this meeting.
Ultan: just wants to know if any decision was made by the Parlay Board.
Richard: the decision was the matrix.
Agreed to see later in the agenda (TDoc 103).

3.4 ETSI

TISPAN is taking the work of all NGN inside ETSI, and intends to adopt 3GPP IMS. There is a proposal to create a partnership project, like 3GPP, for NGN. The idea is not to duplicate the work of 3GPP, but ensure that a fixed network can use IMS.

Jane: there may be some impact in OSA because there will be other aspects to take into account.
Chelo: but we always had a fixed side.
Jane: there may be other considerations, like support of XDSL.
Ultan: this is new, has just started.

Chelo: could we have in the future a contribution with the report from TISPAN?
Ultan: will do, and also this time from the ETSI Board.

Richard: last TISPAN there were questions on user binding. Will be done offline.

3.4.1 ETSI PlugTest OSA Interoperability event

N5-040077	**Report on The second OSA/Parlay PLUGTEST**	**NTT**

Atsushi proposes to discuss this document as a technical contribution, not as reporting. Will be moved to agenda item 9 (this summary will be presented before the first CR on this).

Verbal report from Ultan: the event took place and attendance was very good.

3.5 3GPP2

Nothing to report.

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.

Submit minutes from Sophia meeting (105).

N5-040089	**Results from To Do List from the Bangkok meeting**	**CN5 Chair, CN5 Vice Chair**

The following documents were approved by email between JWG meetings #25 and #26: 615, 616, 631r1, 632r1, 633r1, 634, 597-600, 643, 645-648, 639, 663.

Erwin reports on item 10: agreed with Gareth that activity timer is needed both in the call and in the call leg, as opposed to what we agreed in San Francisco last July. No final outcome to the discussion on the state models, but a change in our specs may be required.

Erwin to bring a contribution on this to next meeting.

Chelo reminds everybody to include a deadline in the email approvals.

Noted.

3.7 Other reporting

4 Input liaison statements

N5-040027	**LS on OSA Rel-6 Requirements resulting from GUP Rel-6 Requirements**	**3GPP SA2**

Summary of contribution:

SA2 would like to thank CN5 for their LS on OSA Rel-6 Requirements resulting from GUP Rel-6 Requirements. SA2 would like to inform CN5 that SA2 have been working on GUP stage 2 architecture specification that has been approved as TS 23.240 in June 2003.

SA2 do not consider the User Profile Management related OSA requirements in OSA stage 1 TS 22.127 directly related to 3GPP Generic User Profile. Those requirements have been set before the work on Generic User Profile started in 3GPP. The relationship between User Profile Management in OSA and 3GPP Generic User Profile is up for further contributions.

No actions required.

Conclusion:
No action required, we cannot work on stage 3 since our stage 2 and stage 1 are not ready at all. Discussion contrinues later, in the response from SA1.

Noted.

N5-040028	**Reply LS to CN5 on Request for clarification on the scope of the Ut interface towards the OSA-SCS**	**3GPP SA2**

Summary of contribution:

N5-030665 LS on Request for clarification on the scope of the Ut interface towards the OSA-SCS

According to SA2, the purpose of the Ut interface is to provide a means for the client on the UE to manage the application on the AS. SA2 does not foresee any need for the OSA API to support Ut.

No actions required.

Discussion:
Chelo: we got the same response from the CN plenary, and we agreed there that then the figure should be corrected.

Agreed to reply to SA2 that the figure should be corrected.

Jane to prepare the reply to this LS (TDoc 106).

Noted.

N5-040029	LS on "Extended MM7 and Messaging Integration Broker"	3GPP T2

Summary of contribution:

Contains two documents from T2:

T2-030638 explains that member companies of T2 have identified several enhancements on the MM7 interface (VASP-MMS Relay Server), extending current MM7 features with new capabilities. Similarly, CN5 has committed to present enhancements (within Release 6 timeframe) on MMS support by OSA. Even though T2 did not come to a conclusion regarding the appropriateness of all the enhancements provided in T2-030590, T2 would like to make CN5 aware of this document submitted regarding VASP and MMS Relay Server interaction (see T2-030590), so that CN5 could take this input into consideration when specifying MMS APIs and accomplishing MMS OSA implementation.

T2-030590, which was only presented on a very high level, was not discussed in detail and was not approved by T2 but noted, is the CR mentioned in T2-030638. They ask us to give feedback and comments on this.

Discussion:
Erwin: T2 agreed that they were not the right group to address this. The contributing companies were asked to come to CN5 and discuss their contributions here. Companies wanted a messaging web service interface, introducing the Messaging Integration Broker in the MMS architecture and define a northbound interface. T2 discussed whether this should be part of MMS (the figure suggests it could go beyond because it talks for instance to WAP), also value added applications are not in the scope of T2, and the conclusion was to refer this material to CN5 for consideration.

Joe: are the goals here consistent with what we've been doing? Are the expectations for the Messaging integration Broker similar to our specs under discussion?
John-Luc: this looks like a good contribution to our stages 1 and 2 that we did in Sophia.
Erwin: the extended MM7 is very much a web service API. We could answer them that we're working in this area, two solutions (MMS and PX). The Messaging Integration Broker could be part of the functionality of the OSA gateway.

Erwin to prepare a reply LS (TDoc 107). T2 is meeting this week, we'll prepare the response for their meeting this week (Adrian to tell T2 to expect it).

John-Luc and Chelo to contact the T2 chairs and the LS originator to ask if they want to contribute and explain them how.

N5-040031	LS on OSA Rel-6 Requirements resulting from GUP Rel-6 Requirements	3GPP SA1

Response to our LS to SA1/2 on OSA Rel-6 Requirements resulting from GUP Rel-6 Requirements.

Summary of contribution:

As suggested by CN5, SA1 modified the GUP WID (attached) as follows: The table "Affected existing specifications" is now referring to TS 29.198-xy (instead of only to part 7, Terminal Capabilities).

SA1 is still working on OSA GUP related requirements and is hoping to provide CRs to 22.127 at the next SA1 meeting.

Attached is the GUP WID with the changes indicated.

No actions required.

Discussion:

Participants in the JWG are not aware of any contributions intended on this. Since SA1 is not meeting again until May, agreed to try to find a shortcut talking to the SA1 officials and see if contributions will come.

Agreed that GUP may have architectural implications, so it is essential that SA2 is involved.

No decision to postpone GUP to Rel7 for the moment, wait until we get a response from SA1.

Chelo to summarize this situation in the plenary report.

Noted.

Conclusion:

N5-040032	LS on High Availability requirement for OSA	3GPP SA1

Summary of contribution:

An SA1 CR (S1-031232) on “High availability for OSA” was discussed in the latest SA plenary meeting. It was expressed that the requirement was not clearly understood and it was sent to CN5 for advice. SA1 has now discussed and clarified this requirement in the attached CR (S1-040241) and kindly asks CN5 to investigate whether this requirement is already supported and, if it is not, to implement it in Rel-6.

Actions: investigate whether the requirement in the attached CR is already supported and, if it is not, implement this requirement in Rel-6.

Attached is the CR to the OSA stage 1 approved in SA1, adding the requirement “OSA shall allow Service Capability Features to communicate with backup instances of an application in the case where the primary application instance is not responding. This shall be possible also when the primary and backup instances of the application are physically located in different locations.”

Discussion:
Musa: what was the sequence of activities? CN5 provided a clarification as asked by SA. Now SA1 is replying, unrelated to our response LS.
Chelo: the CR attached does not address the issues we clarified in our LS, as requested.
Joe: this may not be part of the same discussion thread since the changes are not as specific and comprehensive as would be expected from our clarification LS.
Musa: this could be the result of one of the earlier threads – SA1 have had clarification discussions, which resulted on this CR, and may still study our clarification LS and come back with yet a different kind of requirements.
Joe: this CR is clearly based on the earlier, and not latest discussions (related to the application instance and the SCS instance, and how they relate to each other in the case of failure. Not what’s the relationship btw the interface and its implementation), so it’s possible anything we do now may be revisited.
Erwin: comparing with the original text, this is a reduction of scope, for example geographical redundancy is not there anymore.

Eamonn: proposes to try to find consensus on this requirement in JWG, instead of having this discussion in a group where there is not the same OSA expertise. Proposes to do that in the context of his contribution (TDoc 44). Agreed to try when discussing 44.

Noted.

N5-040067	LS on Completion of stage2 work related to OSA Rel 6 High Availability requirement	3GPP SA1

Summary of contribution:

According to the LS, SA1 has approved OSA Release 6 requirement, concerning High Availability support in OSA Rel 6. This requirement was approved by SA1 in the SA1 #22 meeting, 27-31 October 2003, and included in TS 22.127. SA2 has analysed this requirement and has come to the conclusion that it does not impact the OSA architecture defined in TS23.127v6.0.0. Therefore SA2 would like to inform CN5 that CN5 can start the stage3 work for the OSA Rel 6 High Availability requirement.

Discussion:

Adrian raised in an offline email discussion the misalignment between this LS from SA2 and the previous one from SA1. The SA2 LS contact person clarified that "`The SA2 LS was sent before the last SA plenary. The SA1 LS has been sent after the last SA plenary, so SA1 LS is the latest input to be taken into account I would assume for this feature.`"

No response to SA2 needed.

Noted.

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.

N5-040066	Release 4 CR 29.198-03 Correct TpServiceProfileDescription	Open API Solutions

See discussion on 58-59.

Approved.

N5-040078	Correction of Digital Signature with NO signing algorithm	NTT / Fujitsu

RELATED TO N5-040096 (REL-5)

RELATED TO N5-040097 (REL-6)

Summary of contribution:

Correction of Digital Signature with NO signing algorithm. This contribution discusses about the digital signature if the signing algorithm is not used. At the 2nd Parlay/OSA Plug Test, we encountered the problem that the making mechanism of the digital signature and the validity logic of the digital signature differ with each vendor in case of no signing algorithm. The current specification does not mention about which string should be passed as the digital signature and how it should be checked when signing algorithm is not required. The Framework and the client can just ignore the digital signature, but also can verify it regardless of the signing algorithm. From the point of security, we propose to add some description in order to create the digital signature which contains the service token and agreement text whether the signing algorithm exists or not, and to confirm it each other. If not approved, there may be IOP problems.

Discussion:

Ultan: the description of what is signed has changed in Rel5, and we may decide not to implement this change there.

Agreed to put this contribution on hold and go first to 96.

During discussion of 96 it was agreed that the contents of 78 can be approved

Approved.

N5-040098	Correction of continueProcessing method for Generic Call Control Service (GCCS)	NTT / Fujitsu / Incomit

RELATED TO N5-040099 (REL-5)

RELATED TO N5-040101 (REL-6)

See discussion in 101.

Approved.

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.

N5-040045	Correct Java Rulebook to support API design pattern introduced by PAM SCS	AePONA

Summary of contribution

This contribution proposes to Correct the Java Rulebook to support API design pattern introduced by PAM SCS: the PAM SCS introduced in Release 5 introduces an API pattern not evident in other SCSs. The SCS may invoke methods on the application in which the application may return a type to the SCS. The Java rulebook requires modification in order to accommodate this API behaviour. The change proposed is a correction of the callback rule in the Java rulebook. If not approved, existing J2SE rulebook cannot be used to support Java realisation of PAM.

All SCSs don't exhibit the same behaviour. There is a callback design patter already suported but the current wording restircts the applicability. The new wording corrects this limitation.

Discussion:

Chelo: the PAM SCSs and the rulebook were both intriduced but Rel6, so this is not becase we added new functionality.
Eamonn: this was an error.

Adrian: what about Rel6?
Ultan: we ened a mirror. It will be 119.

AI: Eamonn to distribute 119 for email approval.

Approved.

N5-040046	Correct Java Code to conform with Java Rulebook	AePONA

Summary of contribution

Following the introduction of the Java code, errors in code production and misalignment with the published rules were identified. Corrections to the code to align with the rulebook have been carried out and introduced in the equivalent ETSI specifications. The code in the 3GPP specification needs updated to ensure alignment. No changes are required to the specification itself. If not approved, the existing J2SE code package shall be inconsistent with the published Java rulebook and will not be aligned with the equivalent ETSI specifications.

This and the rest of the Java CRs below are part of a block with the same kind of changes. Since the Java code was produced in September no CRs have been made resulting from feedback

Discussion:

John-Luc: understand this is alignment between 3GPP and ETSI. What is the content of the zip file.
Eamonn: J2SE Java code. The code generation process executes on the UML model.
John-Luc: what version of the UML was used?
Eamonn: the December version.
John-Luc: then it is claimed that the 3GPP and ETSI versions are now aligned. Telcordia has spotted inconsistencies between the 3GPP and ETSI versions. The current zip is not yet aligned

Chelo: the reason for change is not alignment with ETSI, it is that there were errors to correct (that were corrected in the ETSI specs but not in the 3GPP specs).

Ultan explains the process: realizations are the last thing we do when we do a specs update – first the UML model, then the test specs, then the IDL, compile it, generate the WSDL, then give the UML to Joe and Eamonn for the two Java codes. In September we made Rel5 CR to bring Java code to all 3GPP specs, and we didn't update the ETSI specs then. After (October) Joe and Eamonn refined the process and we approved changes to the rule book. Accordingly we made CRs to some 3GPP parts in December. But for those parts that didn't have a CR in December there was no way to change the code.

John-Luc: we have two issues – improving the process while we don't have a mature rule book yet, and the fact that we have now 4 versions of the Java realization, and all are different. Probably the ETSI version is the most mature yet, but the version in these CRs, together with the December version, are not the same as the ETSI version.
Ulta: the September version correspond to an old version of the specs – that makes one less. Another point: if we wait for the June plenary for implementing the CR, then the java version will correspond to yet a different version of the specs.
John-Luc: would like to see a consistent Java version for the December UML document, and this is not achieved with these CRs. The contents of these CRs will not make it to newt release, but they don't correspond to the current release either. Suggests to have the CRs resubmitted with correct Java content, which is the same as the one in ETSI. Telcordia has sent this information on inconsistencies to Aepona.
Eamonn: happy to provide a new, consistent J2SE package. But he needs to understand the CR process.
Ultan: do we want to ensure that we have totally aligned and correct Java code asap in the current released, r are we just interested in having correct Java code for the December release?
John-Luc: wants to see a CR that contains correct, aligned Java code. If as well it's possible to correct the December release then fine, but he's not asking that.
Eamonn: we need to define a good process. He's not sure if tying it to a CR is the best idea.

Adrian: apart from this word document the plenary will not see anything else. No revision marks in all the files, so no change.
Ultan: it is the attachment (that is an integral part of the spec) that changes. The "clause affected" in the CR front is the one that has a reference to that part.
Adrian: why using a CR and not MCC doing editorials, if the plenary doesn't see the changes/
Ultan: we need traceability for developers.
Chelo: this is an integral part of the specs. We use the CR system as for any other part of the specs.
Eamonn: not sure if the CR process is the best for this case. Do we really want to provide people with visibility of our process?
Adrian: in T2 for MMS they have a subdirectory called "schema" where they store all XML schemas. SA5 they're starting to do the same.
Ultan: our code is an integral part of the spec. It's not in the word document because some times it gets modified automatically by word.
Chelo: suggests not to continue this discussion.

Chelo: asks Eamonn why
Eamonn: it is an error in the implementation. The easiest way is to re-create the Java packets but then the problem is how to inform the Java community.

John-Luc: but the error was fixed in December. What we face now is a misalignment in the sausage machine? How do we trigger re-creation in old parts? If it can be done through an editorial he'd be happy. But we wants to discuss if we want to trace the consequences of fixing the error.

Chelo: JL is asking for a single
John-Luc: would want to see the December UML model with an equivalent Java code for ETSI and 3GPP.
Eamonn: can provide that, the question is if we want to use the CR process, which has been the reason of the misalignment.
Chelo: then Eamonn seems to propose that the use of the CR process is behind the problem, and would like to solve it without using the CR process.

Ultan: is this only for the J2SE code? Do we leave the J2EE untouched, since nobody seems to be using it?
Eamonn: same process could be used.

Chelo: does this mean no plenary visibility?
John-Luc: we give visibility if there are errors in the production process (errors in the rulebook).
Chelo: what about traceability for developers?
Ultan: once we get this aligned we expect to have some quality control.

Ultan: this block of CRs are to solve the problem that this part of the spec had not been implemented for a while. Are there other parts where there are bugs in the code?
Everybody invited o bring this feedback.

Ultan: is anybody looking at the Rel6 Java code? If not suggests that we leave them as they are, and we update them as we update Rel6.
Agrees.

AI: Eamonn to provide the URL to the mailing list with one week review time.

AI: Ultan to apply the corresponding editorials to the spec.

Adrian: need to decide what we explain the plenary of this process.

AI: Adrian to find out what is the process followed in T2.

Withdrawn.

N5-040047	Correct Java Code to conform with Java Rulebook	AePONA

Withdrawn.

N5-040048	Correct Java Code to conform with Java Rulebook	AePONA

Withdrawn.

N5-040049	Correct Java Code to conform with Java Rulebook	AePONA

Withdrawn.

N5-040050	Correct Java Code to conform with Java Rulebook	AePONA

Withdrawn.

N5-040056	Correct alignment between ETSI/Parlay version of OSA and the 3GPP OSA, by adding ability to identify when a client app/service contract/service profile is being used	Open API solutions

RELATED TO N5-040057 (REL-6)

Summary of contribution:

This came as Parlay only changes to the equivalent to Rel5. All data types are common between ETSI and 3GPP, even if they're not use in 3GPP, so they should also be applied to the 3GPP specs.

Approved.

N5-040058	Correct alignment between ETSI/Parlay version of OSA and the 3GPP OSA, by clarifying erroneous field in TpServiceProfileDescription	Open API solutions

RELATED TO N5-040059 (REL-6)

Same situation as 56.

Approved.

N5-040060	Correct alignment between ETSI/Parlay version of OSA and the 3GPP OSA, by introducing a ServiceID field to TpServiceProfileDescription	Open API solutions

RELATED TO N5-040061 (REL-6)

Same situation as 56.

Approved.

N5-040064	Rel-5 CR 29998-04-4-500 Update references to IETF specifications	MCC

RELATED TO N5-040065 (REL-6)

Summary of contribution:

See discussion of N5-040065

Some references to IETF specifications are wrong. This contribution proposes corrections to them.

Discussion:

Conclusion:

Noted

N5-040096	Correction of Digital Signature with NO signing algorithm	NTT / Fujitsu

RELATED TO N5-040078 (REL-4)

RELATED TO N5-040097 (REL-6)

Same change as 78 for Rel5.

Discussion:

Ultan: for the service agreement signing mechanism we introduced a new method in Rel5 that allows to select the hash algorithm used for the signing, called selectSigningAlgorithm – uses the same data types as Rel4 so there is still the option of using "none", but when signing the service agreement we have clearly defined what the structure of the digital signature (which is not the case in Rel4). It is a bit simplistic to define the digital signature as in this proposal. This also affects the decision for Rel4 (Tdoc 78) because we could have a solution that fits both.

Eamonn: if both sides decide not to sign anything, then it doesn't matter which signature algorithm is used. What is then the point of mandating this arbitrary text? What is the motivation for proposing using the service token and the agreement text?
Ultan: the reason is that some implementations, in spite of not requiring a signing algorithm, still assumed a certain format.

The meeting agrees that these issues do not prevent approving the Rel4 CR in 78.

Eamonn: "calculated and created" in the definition of digitalSignature doesn't seem to fit with not using a signing algorithm. Proposes to start the definition with "if a digital algorithm is required…" and then add "if it is not required…".

Agreed to solve this offline in these lines.

Update to 115, to be approved by email.

AI: Atsushi to send 115 for email approval

N5-040099	**Correction of continueProcessing method for Generic Call Control Service (GCCS)**	**NTT / Fujitsu / Incomit**
	RELATED TO N5-040098 (REL-4)	
	RELATED TO N5-040101 (REL-6)	

See discussion in 101.

Approved.

7 Parlay X Web Services and WSDL Realization session

N5-040070	**Web Services Realization Update**	**IBM**

Sumary of the contribution:

This document provides an update on the current status of the Web Services realization, and the work that is being done to update the Web Services realization for the Parlay/OSA interfaces.
The Web Services WSDL realization currently provided is informative, reflecting the initial work effort around Web Services that was undertaken. Subsequent to this initial effort, the following activities have occurred,

- Publication of the WSDL Style Guide by The Parlay Group, providing a comprehensive guide for defining WSDL that has been used in the Parlay X Web Services definition, and which includes information suitable for application also to the Web Services realization.
- Definition of Parlay X Web Services, incorporating broader knowledge of the application of Web Services and broad support for tools
- Implementations of updated WSDL reflecting interim updates by two vendors, providing verification and input on patterns to apply for services
- Publication of the WS-I Basic Profile, providing guidance on the use of WSDL and SOAP for interoperability

Working with this variety of input sources, companies are working on updates to the current Web Services realization, with the expected result to include,

- WSDL definitions that are compliant with the WSDL Style Guide and WS-I Basic Profile
- Appropriate use of patterns applied to the Parlay/OSA specifications, based on experience with implementations and Parlay X Web Services experience
- Translation of data types and exceptions to reflect pattern usage and use with XML Schema

An attached powerpoint presentation gives more detailed information on these issues.

From slide 14 on, the WSDL realization refers to the new, proposed one, and not the existing one.

A detailed proposal for alignment is described in the slides:

- OSA Call Control is a general purpose interface, PXWS is specific to application function (e.g. makeACall). Therefore they should be different web services interfaces.
- Same for UI.
- For Location: large overlap, and they basically satisfy the same functional requirements.
- TermCaps, DSC, Policy Management don't have PX equivalents.
- Generic Messaging: existing requirements for PX MMS seem at this point to lean towards an abstraction on top of GMS, using specific technologies.
- Account Management and Charging: large overlap too.
- PAM: Presence is a new area proposed for PX2. It could be another case where PAM is a general purpose API, and PX an abstraction layer on top.
- Other services may be part of PX2 that are not part of OSA/Parlay APIs.

Discussion:

John-Luc: elimination of race conditions – don't they come from the UML, and therefore are present in any realization?
Joe: expectation that web service developers will have less control of the middleware, and will be able to do less with it than CORBA developers can, so more attention to race condition possibilities is needed.

Chelo: isn't the initial WSDL Style Guide independent of WS-I? The slides seem to imply that conformance to the WSDL Style Guide bring conformance to WS-I.
Joe: a new version of the WSDL Style Guide has been available to the Parlay WS WG. It is compatible with WS-I. It has not been made available yet to the JWG.

Chelo: since the WSDL Style Guide is both in Parlay and 3GPP, how is coordination done?
Joe: it's an IBM contribution with IPRs involved. It is maintained as an independent document, where derivatives are submitted as company contributions to each forum, taking into account the IPR rules of each. Each forum selects a subset to use, and little contributions with changes have been made. There are few differences between the OMA and Parlay versions, but they don't differ in the core.
Chelo: what if somebody proposes a change that results in a divergence?
Joe: there doesn't seem to be much interest in maintaining the document by other companies. There is always a risk, but it doesn't seem to be an issue now. A comment from WS-I that the style guide was overly prescriptive, when the context was explained to them, resulted in their comment that then this is probably interesting for others.

Chelo: from what slide 12 says, can we conclude the 80-20 rule, which was an original motivation for PW, is not true?
Joe: there were several motivations for PX, for instance simplification of data types. We have received feedback for instance for Location asking for additional functionality. His personal view is that people will start with PX and if they want the rest of the function they will migrate to the full web service interface. Today we don't have a consistent set of patterns between both, so this contribution is proposing to have it. It is true that there is feedback that seems to imply that some may not be satisfied with the abstraction.

Chelo: last bullet item of slide 19 seems to imply that functional harmonization is proposed to be done by modifying the OSA/Parlay APIs, and not the PX APIs. Concern that this implies a change in functionality independent of our requirements process.
Joe: from the style guide point of view there is much to learn from the PX work. From the functional alignment point of view, agreed that we should not circumvent the requirements work.

John-Luc: what does "merging" UI and PX mean?
Joe: one of the motivations of PX was to address some dissatisfaction with the API, that was related to the CORBA realization. One of the goals of this activity is that the web services realization meets the needs of the web services developers. "merge" means we don't need two APIs for the same thing.

Erwin: does “merge” select one of the two?
Joe: there will be no PX new specs for the cases where there are no PX specs yet and we agree that we should be the same thing – just CRs to the OSA/Parlay APIs (including requirements if needed). The analysis has been done between PX 1.0 and the requirements for PX2, to see which interfaces are migrating towards OSA/Parlay level of functionality – those are the candidates for harmonization.

Musa: does “merge” mean the same as removing the PX part (that is 29.199)?
Joe: if the PX requirement is met by the OSA/Parlay WSDL realization then there is no need for two specs. 199 will not contain parts that are repetitions of 198.

Jane: is the proposal that the OSA/Parlay GW becomes a superset?
Joe: for where the is alignment, there is alignment; and where not then it’s up to the vendor.
Musa: with the proposal we end up with less PX web services.

Ultan: is it intended that the WSDL is developed using the UML model, and not handcrafted as PX is today? Will it be easy to track developments in the base APIs specs? This is today a problem with PX.
Joe: yes, a big part will be automated, it is expected that it is similar to the Java realization.

Ultan: one of the advantages of having a PX spec is that we have a unique documentation for PX web services. With Java we have the Javadoc, what will be done for web services?
Joe: WSDL provides documentation is a similar way to Java, we could use it.
Ultan: it has to be an easy to update as the rest.

John-Luc: is there a definite list of PX APIs that may be candidates for merging?
Joe: in the slides - Location and Status, Account Management, Payment.
Ultan: PayCircle partly own the PX Payment APIs, and if there is a proposal to merge it may not be possible, they will have to be distinct APIs.
John-Luc: he has not seen the reasoning that there is the overlap in requirements – may be but has not seen the argument.

Erwin: if somebody asked what web services interfaces we have, we’d have to show parts of 198 and parts of 199. The ones in 198 have been deigned assuming an OSA FW, and the ones in 199 not.
Joe: somebody looking at the services layer should see uniformity in all – same patterns, not giving the feeling that they have different origins. For the FW, in the WS scenario, when using WS-Sec, it’s exactly the same for 198 and 199. The use of WS technology would be the same.

Eamonn: what about Part3, the FW?
Joe: the expectation is that the FW will be replaced by a WS FW functionality. Some parts of the FW may not be applicable to the WS environment.
Chelo: is it taken into account that the current WS technologies do not provide all that operators want? We should compare our FW with what WS provides today, we should aim at a carrier grade FW functionality.

Erwin: there is a marketing problem if we have some web services in 199 and some in 198.
Chelo: we have marketed all this is the following way: we said we had the WSDL realization as a “patch” solution to use web services with OSA FW functionality. We said we were providing a set of WSDL realizations of the APIs that were interoperable with that FW but were not web services, and that the “real” web services were PX. Now we’ll have to say that some of them were indeed web services, and that some of the web services of the first 199 draft will be removed.

Erwin: PX 1.0 is published, and we may have divergencies because there will be always for instance a PX 1.0 Account Management. We should have a more fundamental discussion: whether the PX activity should continue in Parlay or be part of the JWG.
Eamonn: the view of the Parlay Board is that there is a commitment to continue working on the Parlay APIs, and that there should be no duplicate with PX.
Richard: the Board feared that there would be a 1to1 mapping.

Eamonn: this is a question of packaging but it also impacts the publishing. We need all three bodies involved to reach an agreement on this. He supports much of the contents of this contribution but doesn’t believe we can reach a decision, but believes we should have a decision before Miami.
Ultan: if it is considered that it is suitable to brand our base APIs as having a web service version, not just WSDL, then it’s easy to agree on this proposal. Anything else needs to be discussed in the Parlay X.

Joe wants feedback from the JWG on this because from now to next meeting there will be discussions in PX on this, and in May he will bring the CRs. In order to progress work, he's requesting by email feedback on the proposal of the use of patterns; anything about the content of the Framework.

Joe to start this email discussion.

Musa: has the meeting agreed that the style guide related changes are the good way to go?
Chelo: this contribution was submitted for discussion, not approval. Joe will raise a summary of points in the email discussion.
Ultan: we can do the updates to the current WSDL independently of the harmonization discussion.
Chelo: we had some time ago a Parlay company raising some concerns about the suitability of our UML being the way to generate web services. It would be good if we got feedback that the changes proposed satisfy these concerns.

Noted.

N5-040042	Clarification of the behaviour of methods for sending SMS	Telecom Italia

Sumary of the contribution:
Clarification of the behaviour of methods for sending SMS. The contribution proposes enhancing the description by specifying the originator number of the message, because the current description leaves this aspect unspecified. If not approved, the specification would be ambiguous and would allow proprietary solutions. It is also mentioned that this change may be applied to clause 9.2.1 too (Send a Multimedia Message).

Discussion:
A CR format is not necessary.

The contribution raised many questions for clarification, that are summarized below:

- What is the definition of "Large" account number? Even without the "large", what is account number?
- If account number is a destination people can send messages to, what is the relationship with the originating number?
- There is no originating number as a parameter anywhere.
- What is the value of this text to implementors of the API? It doesn't say anything related to the sendSms operation.

Comment: if similar changes are desired for clause 9.2.1, then they need a contribution.

Contribution not approved.

8 Messaging session

N5-040040	Design considerations for the Messaging SCF	Ericsson

Summary of contribution:

This contribution analyses a number of "design questions" and proposes certain design choices, taking into account the list of requirements/design considerations listed in the Sophie meeting. The following design questions are discussed:

1. How can the identified functionality be best classified in SCFs?

Some functions are traffic related, other management relate (like UI and UIAdmin we already have). There are two stakeholders involved. Three SCFs are proposed:

- Messaging SCF for traffic related functionality
- Messaging User Management SCF
- Messaging Operator Management SCF

There was no agreement in Sophia for Management capabilities support; so this contribution proposes this split so that the need for the two last proposed SCFs can be discussed; the contribution focuses on the first one proposed.

Discussion:

Erwin: some very basic user management functionality is included in the proposed traffic SCF.

Joe: doesn't like the term "user management" for something that is not about managing user or user profiles.
Erwin: agreed, the name is not the best.
Ultan: there are no contributions for the "user management" SCF so we don't need to discuss it now.

Chelo: from the Sophia minutes, we excluded the operator administration, not the user management functionality.
Musa: agreed.

Chelo: the only thing we need to discuss from this contribution is the proposed traffic SCF.
Musa: in this contribution there is simple user management in the traffic SCF. Doesn't agree with that.
Joe: agrees, traffic should be separated.
Erwin: proposes to continue, and when we get to the methods we can decide on a case by case basis.

2. What messaging traffic interfaces should be distinguished?

In Sophia we agreed on:

- Need for limited network interaction - the Messaging SCF will often be separated from the network elements, that is GW and mailbox may be separate. Therefore it is preferred to limit the number of nested interface levels, so that the network interaction is minimized.
- Support for asynchronous interfaces, also because of the remote use of the SCF, because of the delay between requests and responses may lead to timeouts.
- Increase convenience for the application, not making it open and close many objects to get to the method it needs.

This contribution concludes then that we need to limit the number of object levels in the SCF, and proposes to define two object levels: Messaging Manager (used to send messages, create notifications etc) and Mailbox (to cache messages, in order to allow the application to retrieve the message at its own convenience). Physically the mailbox could be a unified messaging mailbox that is located in the operator's network and that is accessed by the application via the OSA Gateway.

Discussion:

Musa: is there a reason for "two" object levels?
Erwin: the idea is as few as possible, and he believes these two are needed.

Musa: in Sophia we agreed on the need for a session based messaging, where would that be?
Erwin: in the Mailbox – an app opens a session, does everything needed with a mailbox, and then closes the session.
Eamonn: does not what he believes was discussed in Sophia about session based messaging, but rather a way to correlate operations. Does not see clearly message delivering within the message manager.
Musa: session based messaging and mailbox messaging are related. In this proposal it is not possible to have session based messaging in and out of the mailbox. Wants both session and not session based messaging within the mailbox paradigm and out of it.
Erwin: could be an extension of the proposal, above our APIs.
Musa: does not believe this is what we agreed in Sophia.

Erwin: can we agree on the need for both interfaces proposed, as a minimum set, and then see if there is something else needed.
Musa: agreed to build the API gradually, but the contribution seems to put a limit of two levels, so how can we extend it?
Eamonn: he can agree that the number of object levels can be grown. But this proposal is also about how the functionality is distributed in these two object levels.

Agreement: have at least two object levels, keeping in mind that we want to keep it at a minimum.

Discussion on functionality split continues below.

3. Is there a need for "open mailbox" and "close mailbox" as part of the traffic interfaces?

The reason for not implementing these methods is that Open Mailbox and Close Mailbox are not needed in the OSA API for the application to be able to access the messages in the underlying mailbox. But if not implementing them in the API results in a more inefficient interaction between the OSA Gateway and the mailbox. It is therefore proposed to include the Open Mailbox and Close Mailbox methods in the Messaging Manager interface to reduce the amount of network interaction between the OSA Gateway and the mailbox.

Discussion:

Joe: doesn't this make an implementation assumption? This function is not required for accessing message stores, and there is no assumption that the OSA GW maintains connections with mailboxes over time. There is also the assumption that the implementation does not perform cashing, whereas in Internet messaging cashing is an implicit functionality. The scenario presented is not a typical scenario in internet messaging.
Erwin: how is all the network interaction avoided?
Joe: open and close mailbox is not necessary if there is message cash.
Eamonn: agrees that the network protocol issues need to be left open. We should concentrate on what we want to provide as an application API.

Erwin: is it necessary then to convey authentication info in every interaction?
Joe: in a generic internet mail scenario there is a logon and a session of limited duration during which a security channel is open to there is no need. He has problems with the semantics, not necessarily with the inclusion of the method.

Conclusion: need to define the semantics from the application perspective, and a variety of implementations should be supported.

4. What is the adequate level of content structuring?

A conclusion was reached because the meeting agreed that this had been agreed in the meeting in Sophia (it is included in the list of agreed functionality).

5. What support is needed for message header retrieval to ensure convenience to the application?

Already agreed to support the functionality for the application to retrieve separate parts of the message. One such part is the headers of the message. In order to provide the application with a convenient way to retrieve message headers, it is proposed to support at least the method getMessageHeaders that results in the retrieval of all headers. In addition we can consider a method that allows the application to retrieve one or more specified headers (e.g. with an enumerated list). It is therefore proposed to adopt a method to retrieve all headers at once (getMessageHeaders) and to discuss what a useful method for selective header retrieval should look like.

Another point raised in the adhoc meeting was whether we need to specify a datatype with a list of header names and values (i.e. TpMessageHeaderField in N5-040041), or whether we should only define a "generic header" datatype (with a generic header name and value) and refer for header semantics to RFC2822 (i.e. TpGenericHeaderField in N5-040041)). We believe that the answer to this question is that we need to support both:

- The TpMessageHeaderField enables the application to understand immediately the semantics of a header. In other words, the OSA Gateway already parses the header for the application. This provides convenience to the application, comparable to the ability to retrieve message parts instead of just the entire message as "one piece of unparsed data".
- The TpGenericHeaderField allows the application to receive headers that could not be interpreted by the OSA Gateway.

The behaviour of the OSA Gateway can be such that the headers it recognises are provided in the specific header fields in TpMessageHeaderField, while the rest of the headers are returned in TpGenericHeaderField.

It is therefore proposed to support both the detailed list of header fields, as well as the generic header field in the Messaging SCF.

Discussion:

First point:

Joe: the term “headers” is used but we really need to talk about headers and body parts.
Erwin: the reason for distinguishing the headers is that body parts can be nested structures, which is not the case for the headers, so retrieving headers is done differently.
Ultan: the proposal is to have a method that allows to retrieve all headers at once (we’re not discussing the technical content of the method), and there seems to be no disagreement on that.

Agreed to have a method that allows to retrieve all headers at once.

Second point: more information and a use case are considered necessary to see if the functionality in the second bullet item is needed. The first bullet item is agreed.

6. How can the messaging functions best be allocated to the SCFs and interfaces?

The CN5 Messaging adhoc meeting agreed on a list of functionality. As part of the stage 3 work we need to decide how to allocate the functions to the identified interfaces. This contribution assumes that there will be two interfaces in the Messaging SCF (i.e. the traffic part), which are Messaging Manager and Mailbox. In deciding what functions to include in the Messaging SCF and what functions to allocate to the Management SCFs, the goal kept in mind has been to design a Messaging SCF that works very efficient for sending and receiving/retrieving messages. Very elementary “management” operations such as Delete Message are seen as part of the traffic-oriented Messaging SCF, but other operations on the mailbox (e.g. moving folders within the mailbox) are seen as typical management functions that can be better kept outside the Messaging SCF. With all this in mind a table is provided that suggests how to allocate the functions to SCFs, interfaces and methods.

The left of the table is exactly the functionality that we listed and agreed in Sophia, the table is the mapping to SCFs, interfaces and methods.

Discussion:

Joe: start notification is missing, and is a cause of race condition.
Agreed to postpone the discussion on this point for later.

Musa: Lucent’s contribution 71 has a different proposal.

Musa: some message functionality is proposed in the management level, while Lucent’s proposal has a message interface. The reason behind is Ericsson’s motivation to reduce traffic. Lucent does not believe introducing a messaging interface impacts traffic.

Ultan: suggests to continue presenting this contribution, present also 71, and during 71 discuss differences with 40.

Agreed to finish presenting this contribution, postpone detailed discussion, break for lunch and continue in the afternoon with Lucent’s contributions.

7. Which functions can be best implemented as asynchronous and which as synchronous methods?

The contribution proposes that asynchronous methods be supported for most interfaces, and in some cases synchronous too.

Discussion:

Musa: what’s the diff between report notification and report notification error?
Erwin: that an error is associated in the mailbox.

Joe: delete message should not be asynchronous. Additional motivation is needed for it.
Point noted, no discussion continues on this (we haven’t yet agreed on method names even).

8. How to deal with message flags?

In the Sophia meeting the need for message flags was discussed, but no conclusion was reached. One opinion expressed was that the Messaging SCF should be convenient to use by the application for SMS/MMS purpose, and should therefore not be designed to become an "IMAP API for e-mail transactions".

Based on the expressed opinions and the explained usefulness of flags, the following approach is proposed for the Messaging SCF: when the application retrieves a list of messages contained in a mailbox/folder, or a list of folders contained in a mailbox/folder, the total number of messages and the total number of unread messages are shown to the application; furthermore the basic information shown to the application (from, to, subject etc.) can also include a flag that indicates whether the message has been read already or not.

Discussion:

Agreed not to go into this level of detail for the time being.

This contribution is noted.

N5-040071	GMS SCF Re-Architecture Stage-3 discussion	Lucent

Summary of contribution:

Given the work done during the Sophia meeting and the agreement to pursue Stage 3 work at Atlanta, this contribution provides a view of functional elements considered important from the standpoint of the GMS SCF as Stage 3 work progresses. This information is being provided as input to discussion and to help bring-up and resolve issues as appropriate.

The term Communications or Comm SCF is used to distinguish the new SCF from the existing GMS definition.

The main elements across various proposals for incorporation into the new GMS SCF are listed in the contribution. A list of issues for discussion is also given, as well as other issues to be taken into account.

It is requested that these and related issues be discussed and factored into the design of the new Comm SCF as Stage 3 work continues.

Discussion:

Erwin: in the issue for discussion #1, what does "break encapsulation" mean?
Musa: tries to be aligned to the patterns used in other SCFs.
Erwin: we should look at the way applications are going to use the SCF. An important use case is that an application can do a one shot sending of a message. To support it he believes that send message should be supported at the manager interface.
Joe: sees no reason why. The manager interface is for notification management. Believes that there should be a discoverable interface that deals with send an with notifications related to the send activity.
John-Luc: how often did we use this pattern in other SCFs, and why did we not use it when we didn't?
Erwin: insists that sending messages can be a one shot activity, where we don't know when the next will happen, so there is no point in having something like a session. He believe there is no need for a separate interface for send message.
Musa: true that this use case is better supported with the Ericsson proposal, but there are also session based use cases where the Lucent proposal is more suitable, and we should support all. The use case Ericsson mentions can support all.
Erwin: if we want our APIs to be used for SMS/MMS kind of functionality then we need to support this use case. Ericsson's proposal can also support IM kind of use cases.
John-Luc: IpAccountManager includes method for retrieving transaction history.

Ultan: what's the relationship with the session in Lucent's proposal?
Musa: that's one of the issues they have listed for discussion.

Joe: in our existing SCFs we have inconsistent use of management interfaces. IBM prefers the isolated interfaces. It is otherwise confusing, for a person seeing things for the first time, to see the relationship between the different functionality in the same interface.
Ultan: but it is still called a management interface. Maybe the term is not so important.
Musa: 72 proposes the management interface to be a true management interface.

Musa: going back to the issue of easy access to the send method – how is it related to having it in the first interface that is discovered.
Musa: how does having the send method in the management interface support IM use cases?
Erwin: still hasn't heard an argument why we need to have send message in a separate interface. The original argument was not breaking the encapsulation. Still has not understood what causes that.

Ultan: in order to conclude on this we need to see in Ericsson's proposal how session based messaging is supported, and in Lucent's proposal how easy send message is supported.
Chelo: proposes to leave this discussion on hold, since we cannot reach an agreement. Proposes to continue with 71, see what issues we can agree on today, and then invite focused contributions on the issues we haven't agreed for next meeting.

Erwin: issue for discussion #6, what does "true message object" mean and why is it needed?
Mark: in the existing GMS there is no def of what a message is. Proposal is to define a message with associated parameters.
Erwin: why a data type for message is not enough, instead of a separate object?
Musa: the idea is define properties for this object, and operations on it.
Joe: we discussed that in Sophia, didn't agree on anything.
Erwin: there was a proposal from Appium but no strong preference.

Joe: an important use case is forward, and we don't want to lose the information from the message store to the send.

Chelo: we are discussing the open issues, and not the proposals in 71. Proposes to discuss the first part of the document.
Ultan: agrees and proposes to see if we can close any of the open issues as well.

Agreed. The meeting continues discussing the first six item proposed by Lucent.

Erwin: we did not agree that supporting IM would imply introducing the session concept at the API level, but item #2 seems to imply it.
Mark: no need to read too much in the session support.
Erwin: agrees we need to support SMS, MMS and IM, but not to the wording in 71.
John-Luc: this comes back to the support of the IM use case.
Erwin: not against the support of discrete and correlated interactions, but not agree with imposing correlated interactions for the discrete case.
Eamonn: this is a mapping issue.
Erwin: proposes to reword #2 as "support for SMS, MMS, WAP and IM", with no indication of how this support is done.
Ultan: #2 is not about how to support it. "session mode" does not mean "session based interfaces".
Erwin: ok then, just wants to make sure that #2 does not talk about sessions.

#2 is agreed.

Ultan: what does "Use of one manager SCF for all messaging capabilities seems appropriate" mean in #5?
Mark: means having one messaging manager interface for all the types of supported messaging.

Joe: asks for clarification on #4.
Mark: the existing GMS spec has these locking schemes.
Agreed that nobody is proposing then for the new SCF, so agreed that locking schemes will not be included in the non administrator SCFs.

Conclusion: all 6 points in 71 agreed.

The meeting now continues going through the set of 8 issues for discussion in 71.

#1 has been discussed above and not agreed.

Erwin: what does #2 imply?
Mark: the idea is that the interface is easy to follow. A separate interface for send message is easy to implement, but the parameters for the different types of messages are les clear. This is something we need to discuss.
Erwin: does it mean one send message for both mailbox and not mailbox paradigm, or is the proposal that there is send message in every interface? 72 proposes the latter, but on the other hand does not want it in the manager interface because it is redundant.
Mark: the alternatives are to have one or two interfaces for mailbox and not mailbox.
Joe: does not want a different send message in mailbox and not mailbox. A draft is first retrieved and then sent – outside the mailbox interface, there is no send message in the mailbox interface.

#2 is closed, with the agreement that only one send message method is needed, and it will be outside the mailbox interface.

Erwin: a question for clarification on #3 - when notifications are created, are they not always independent of the message ID? They indicate the willingness of the app to receive notifications in general, but not from a certain message.
Ultan: we're talking about different notifications: message delivery notifications, or notifications related to other things (errors, new inbound messages, etc). This is what #3 and #4 say.
Musa: in Sophia we acknowledge the difference.
Erwin: is #3 an issue at all?

Agreed that #3 is not an issue.

Ultan: on #4, have we agreed to support a cancel delivery method?

#4 is closed. Agreed to remove cancelDelivery.

Joe: #4 and #5 are about making sure that our interfaces are flexible and things are done in an intelligent way, not issues in particular or something we need to pay attention too.

Mark: the proposal intends that all the functionality that was included in the UI is included here too.

#5 is closed. Agreed to add a queryStatus method on the PendingID (it was agreed in Sophia).

#6 is closed. Agreement that a "true message object" is proposed to be a data structure (translating into for example a struc), common for any kind of message. Agreement on this.

#7 is withdrawn because of the agreement on #6.

#8 is closed. Agreed that it's up to the GW to handle properly the situation (it could throw an exception but it's not the preferred choice, but rather combining CC and BCC).

On the "Other work items" proposed in this contribution: no need for agreement, the lists given are example lists.

A further agreement coming from an offline discussion, and agreed later in the meeting: the concept of session in the discussion of session based vs single shot messaging is not the same as CC or UI sessions, because there is no need for a session ID, or to retain specific info related to that session, the GW does not need to correlate the messages in the dialog. At API level there is no correlation between subsequent messages, every sent message is unrelated to anything sent before.

Another issue coming from an offline discussion: there may or may not be a difference in the send message depending on whether the mailbox is open or not. If there is that distinction then there is the same whether having send message in the manager interface or in a separate interface.

This contribution is noted.

N5-040072	GMS SCF Re-Architecture Stage-3 method-level discussion	Lucent

Summary of contribution:

This contribution provides a high-level abstracted view of the API capabilities and structure as input to discussions. This contribution may be considered as a companion contribution to N5-040071

The contribution is presented including changes based on the agreements earlier in the discussion.
Discussion:
This contribution is very much related to 40. Proposal to go through the left part of the table in 40 (which is the list of functionality agreed in Sophia), decide whether we need a method, whether it would be part of the Messaging SCF that is not management, and where it should be, based on contributions 40 and 72. If the meeting agrees that a certain point is management, then it is not further discussed.

- Mailbox security: agreed that it is management.
- Create folder: it is considered part of the management SCF in 40 but part of the traffic folder in 72. No agreement.
- Change folder name: it is not part of the traffic SCF in 40, and it is part of setInfoProperties in 72. No agreement.
- Delete folder: it is not part of the traffic SCF in 40, and it is in IpMaibox in 72. No agreement.
- Get folder name: it's traffic in 40, and in IpMailbox in 72. Agreement in SCF and interface.
- Get folder info: it is getInfoProperties in 72. Agreement in SCF and interface.
- Create message: after the discussion today after putting a draft then it is send as an SMS, so Erwin proposes the delivery part in 40 is no longer necessary. Agreement that this method is needed but not in which interface. In 40 it is in an interface that Lucent agreed to remove.
- Get message: agreement in SCF and interface.
- Get message parts (Eamonn: the wording of the requirement assumes a certain implementation): Erwin believes that in spite of appearances there is no agreement because 40 sees a message as having a header and a body that can be a nested structure of body parts, whereas 72 sees the header as the first part of the message. There is agreement on the interface.
- Update message: overlap with setMessageProperties not clear. It is management for 40, not for 72. No agreement on SCF.
- Set message flags: it is management for 40, not for 72. No agreement on SCF.
- Move message: could be putMessage in 72, which was removed. No agreement on SCF.
- Delete message: agreement on SCF, possibly on interface (since it was in an interface in 72 that will change).
- Get message information: agreement on SCF and interface.
- Get subfolders: agreement on SCF and interface.
- Support of subfolders: agreement on SCF and interface.
- Open and close the mailbox: agreement in SCF and interface.
- Create notification: agreement on though different paradigm to sort out afterwards.
- Start notification: agreement on though different paradigm to sort out afterwards.
- Stop notification: agreement on though different paradigm to sort out afterwards.
- Message received: agreement on SCF and interface (although there is no such method in 72 but they agre with 40)
- Notification error: no proposal from Lucent.
- Message delivered: no proposal from Lucent.
- Notification error: no proposal from Lucent.
- Send message: agreement on SCF, no agreement on interface.
- Send and store message: agreement that it won't be implemented as a standalone method.
- Get message delivery status: agreement on SCF, not agreement on interface.

Chelo proposes as way forward: invite focused, vertical contribution explaining the semantics of the methods in detail, and the use cases supported where relevant.
Eamonn: we discussed requirements at a very high level, we need use cases and sequence diagrams to ensure that all are supported.
Chelo: also to show how a proposal supports a use cases. This should address some of the issues; Others, like what is / is not management, need to be addressed differently. In most cases we have an idea of why we don't agree, so it is not difficult to write contributions addressing that.
Musa: proposes to take things home and reflect on the discussions today.
Erwin: also we need to discuss if we need an adhoc meeting. Even if Rel6 is delayed we should have a stable draft after the Miami meeting.

Agreed to have email discussion on this and possibly conference calls. Agreed to select a date for a meeting in case it is necessary. The meeting will be announced, if necessary, within the dates required by 3GPP rules, and may be cancelled if considered not necessary. Dates to be discussed later in the agenda, in the meeting dates agenda item (including conference calls dates).

Eamonn proposes to start the email discussion with sequence diagrams for the use cases we want to support. Agreed.

Erwin to start this email discussion with a contribution with some sequence diagrams, setting a two weeks deadline and if no comments then it is agreed.

N5-040041	Proposed stage3 for the Messaging SCF	Ericsson

Withdrawn.

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

N5-040065	Rel-6 Mirror CR 29998-04-4-600 Update references to IETF specifications	MCC

RELATED TO N5-040064 (REL-5)

Summary of contribution:

Some references to IETF specifications are wrong. This contribution proposes corrections to them.

Discussion:

This CR requires no plenary approval and will be implemented by Adrian. It was presented in CR format for convenience.

Q: where can we find the correct references?
A: we can find these RFCs on the IETF site.
A: document 12 has the reference; we can copy 3PCC ref there.

AI: John-Luc will provide the references and title

After resolving the AI AZ will apply the changes without needing a CR

Conclusion:

Noted

N5-040036	Missing Rel-6 Mirror CRs for the already CN#22-approved & subsequently implemented Rel-5 CRs 29.198-xyz	MCC

Tracks some missing mirror CRs as identified in the meeting in Hawaii. The documents are available, and listed in this contribution.

Noted.

9.1 Requirements

N5-040076	ETSI/Parlay Requirements, draft 0.8	BT

This version of the requirements doc is the output from the Bangkok meeting, taking into account the discussions there: the changes from SA1 (removal of requirements) and the new requirement from Telcordia/NTT.

The section on High Level Requirements from SA1 stage 1 has been put back in this document (remember that this is a delta document for this release, and not an accumulative requirements document like SA1 stage 1) because of the last paragraph added for HA.

Agreed that the HA requirement has not yet been approved by SA. This will be taken into account for the last version of this document.

Noted.

9.2 OSA support for 3GPP2 networks

No contribution to this agenda item.

9.3 Different abstraction levels for OSA

See Parlay Web Services session.

9.4 Presence and Availability Management

N5-040043	Correction of introduction of PAM Provisioning Interfaces	ETSI

Presentation of contribution/

When Ultan implemented the PAM CRs (in particular the one about introducing the provisioning interface) he noticed that we could still not use the provisioning interfaces: the service properties forbid it, and the text says they're out of scope.

Changes proposed:

- Add text in clause 4 referring to creation and use of identities, which was removed from the Release 5 PAM specification since the interfaces for creation of identies were out of scope of Release 5
- Modify the service properties in clause 10 to remove some of the restriction on what interfaces to use in 3GPP.
- All the PAM Provisioning interfaces are now within the scope of 3GPP, so there is no need to explicitly list all interfaces as obtainable: listing them would in fact require all interfaces to be obtainable.
- Likewise for the events: Release 5 PAM both permitted and required the use of 3 events - many more are applicable for Release 6, but listing them has the effect of requiring their support, which might not be desirable.
- The description of TpPAMAttributeDef in clause 11 referred to it's being unused in the 3GPP specification - this is no longer the case with the introduction of the PAM Provisioning interfaces.

Discussion

Musa: does this text originate from the ETSI specs? Is the text now identical both in the 3GPP and ETSI specs?
Ultan: yes it does originate, but it's not identical: the PAMAgentPresence and text with references to agents (the agent presence interface has not been introduced in 3GPP) are not present.

Musa: we split PAM in three SCFs because we didn't want Provisioning in 3GPP. Now that it is, there is no reason for the split. Are we keeping it? He supports keeping it, just wants to make sure there is no intention to make changes.
Ultan: no intention to.

Adrian: not necessary to mention alignment with ETSI here.
Chelo: agrees, no need to mention ETSI, the problem we're correcting is that the service properties are wrong. We already introduced the Provisioning interfaces from ETSI, no need to mention it as a reason for change – if anybody wants a deeper explanation it can be given verbally.

Changes agreed.

Revised to 110 in order to make the above changes in the front page.

N5-040110	Update of 43	ETSI

Approved.

9.5 Call Control

N5-040021	Introduce New P_INVALID_TOKEN_RATE exception	China Unicom

Nobody to present these contribution. Musa asked for clarifications but didn't receive an answer. Ultan volunteers to present them and we'll try to address them.

Summary of contribution:
The current specification does not provide the means to express exception of token bucket parameter.
The contribution is a proposal to satisfy the token bucket based overload control methods requirements.
To support P_INVALID_TOKEN_RATE exception in token bucket based overload control. The change proposed is a new P_INVALID_TOKEN_RATE exception introduced in clause 5.4.4.

Discussion:

John-Luc: would like to see the use of this.
Ultan: the use is in the next two documents.

Agreed to move on to the next ones then before closing on this contributions.

After discussing the rest of the contributions in the subject, the meeting believes that it cannot be approved since the other contributions were not approved.

Updates of these contributions are welcome taking into account the issues raised in the discussion.

Not approved.

N5-040022	Add Token-bucket data definition in order to o satisfy the token bucket based overload control methods requirements	China Unicom

Summary of contribution:

This contribution proposes to add `Token-bucket` data definition in order to o satisfy the token bucket based overload control methods requirements. If not approved, token-bucket algorithm in overload control cannot be supported.

Discusion:

Ultan: the type `TpCallLoadControlTokenBucket` has not been defined and need to.

Ultan: we don't have a TpInteger data type.

Ultan: for both new data types there is a "service type" that could be confusing with our concept of Service Type; Also our service type would never be an integer.

Not approved.

N5-040023	Add token-bucket based overload control methods in IpCallControlManager interface	China Unicom

Summary of contribution:

This is the first of the two 23 where we see the use of the token bucket. The current specification does not provide the means to control overload using token-bucket algorithm. The contribution is a proposal to satisfy the overload control requirements. Current setCallLoadControl method only support callgapand percent algorithm and can not support token-bucket algorithm. The contribution proposes to introduce two new methods into clause 6.1.

Discussion:

John-Luc: 23 should be linked to 22. That's not clear from the front page. Also we cannot implement 23 since 22 is not approved.

Musa: we don't make changes in GCC.

Ultan: we need more description than the one provided. The types TpLeakyBucketRSet and TpServiceArrivalRateInfoSet do not exist. Why does serviceArrivalRateInfoReport, which is called in the IpCallControlManager interface, provides a reference for that interface? There is no indication of how this mechanism can be correlated to our existing setCallLoadControl mechanism, , for which changes have been proposed in the previous contributions.

Not approved.

N5-040024	Add token-bucket based overload control methods in IpMultiPartyCallControlManager interface	China Unicom

Summary of contribution:

Same change as 23, for MPCC.

Discussion:

Same comments apply (all except the one about not making changes to GCC).

Musa: would like to see use cases for this.

Not approved.

N5-040037	Correction of description in superviseRes - Align with Rel-5	Open API Solutions

Summary of contribution:

Rel6 mirror to a CR that we already agreed (one of the missing mirror CRs in Tdoc 036 above).

The description of superviseRes is incorrect. It states that the method "… is invoked as a response to the request also when a tariff switch happens in the network during an active call." There is no appropriate value in TpCallSuperviseReport to indicate any tariff change, only to indicate that the supervision timer has expired, the call has ended, a warning tone has been applied, or UI has completed. The corresponding superviseReq method also does not mention tariff change notification. It is proposed that the text in superviseRes that references tariff changes should be removed - this is easier than introducing a new value into TpCallSuperviseReport and makes the superviseRes correspond closer to the description given in superviseReq.

This change has already been approved for Rel5.

Discussion:

Adrian: the change seems to be applied to an obsolete version.
Ultan: agreed, needs to be fixed.

Changes approved.

Will be updated to 112.

N5-040112	Update of 37	ETSI

Approved.

N5-040038	Correction of description in superviseVolumeRes - Align with Rel-5	Open API Solutions

Summary of contribution:

Rel6 mirror to a CR that we already agreed (one of the missing mirror CRs in Tdoc 036 above).

Discussion:

Same header change is necessary as in 37.

Changes agreed.

Will be updated to 113.

N5-040113	Update of 38	ETSI

Approved.

N5-040039	Correction of method references in MMCC - Align with Rel-5	Open API Solutions

Summary of contribution:

Rel6 mirror to a CR that we already agreed (one of the missing mirror CRs in Tdoc 036 above).

Discussion:

Same header change is necessary as in 37.

Changes agreed.

Will be updated to 114.

N5-040114	Update of 39	ETSI

Approved.

N5-040073	Interoperability problem with GCC and MPCC Service Properties	ETSI

Summary of contribution:

This results from several questions from different parties asking for Ultan's understanding on a problem relating to the definition, use of and relationship between the service properties P_ADDRESSPLAN and P_TRIGGERING_ADDRESSES, in both Generic and Multi-Party Call Control.

The JWG is requested to identify what the intended definition and use of these service properties is.
Only once this is identified can CRs be developed to correct the specifications.

The following questions are raised in the contribution:

1. What is the relationship between the service property type ADDRESSRANGE_SET and the type TpAddressRange?

2. Is a Call Control SCS permitted to register with more than one value of property P_ADDRESSPLAN?

3. What is the relationship between the values of property P_ADDRESSPLAN and property P_TRIGGERING_ADDRESSES?

Only once answers to these questions are established, can any CRs be written to correct this problem.

Note that the P_ADDRESSPLAN service property is also used in parts 8, 11 and 12, and the P_TRIGGERING_ADDRESSES service property is also used in parts 5, 8 and 11. In each case they have the same definition as in Call Control. Any answers to the above questions should also be coherent with the use of these service properties in other parts of OSA.

Discussion:

Musa: Lucent has reviewed this and proposes the following replies to the questions:
1- string representation of the values found on TpAddressRange with deliminators
2- multiple

Eamonn: is this the only property that needs to be extended?
Ultan: every service property type that we have is a set. This one is our biggest problem because it is the only one that cannot be mapped into an atomic type.

Eamonn: when registering a service type with service properties, and wishing to support different flavours, there is an implicit order in the properties.
Ultan: Lucent's proposal is to include the address plan info into P_TRIGGERING_ADDRESSES. Otherwise we do have an implicit order issue.
Eamonn: we need consistency.
Ultan: we have one case, in the Rel6 CR related to registering a new upgrade of an SCF, where we do introduce an explicit ordering in the service properties. But with Lucent's proposal there would be no issue.
Eamonn: agreed.

Lucent's proposals agree agreed. Question 3 is no longer an issue considering the proposed solutions to the others.

Ultan: what about BC? Do we have a BC issue if we do the changes for Rel6?
Agreed to deprecate the old service property (otherwise the IOP problem does not dissapear). Ultan volunteers to write the CR.

Ultan to write the CR resulting from 73.

Noted.

N5-040080	Add missing Supervise Report value to support QoS parameter change reports	Lucent

Sumary of contribution:

Supervise Report value to support QoS parameter change reports is missing. The contribution proposes to add missing Supervise Report value to support QoS parameter change reports. If not approved: IpAppMultiMediaCall.superviseVolumeRes() method is invoked when a QoS level changes. However, TpCallSuperviseReport, in the Common Call Control Datatypes (part 4-1), doesn't have a value which corresponds to this type of report, and no other currently available value of this type is suitable. So, despite what is written in the description of this method, the behaviour will never occur, because it cannot be implemented coherently.

We introduced this in DSC, then we found it useful also for CC but didn't get the data types right so it could work.

Discussion:

Adrian: what about Rel5?
Ultan: no because the QoS change is a Rel6 requirement.

Approved.

N5-040077	Report on The second OSA/Parlay PLUGTEST	NTT

This document is based on the result of interoperability test between NTT and other participants which executed the test with NTT in the Plugtest. It first shows test scenarios, and then reports major misunderstandings of the implementation. Some CRs (see below) have also been submitted to suggest modification of specification in Framework and CC.

the major misunderstandings of specification which NTT encountered with over at least two vendors in above test items are:

- For the Framework: Misunderstanding of the digital signature from application to Gateway when application used NO signing algorithm at the test item for Framework 4.1.20 signServiceAgreement in table 1.
- For Call Control:
    1. Misunderstanding whether application should pass a originating address or not, when application call first routeReq() in the test item 1.1.2 for GCC(Third Party Call) in table 2.
    2. Misunderstanding how to handle the interrupt mode at the test item 1.1.5 for GCC(Number translation) in table 3.
    3. Misunderstanding how IpAppCallRef was passed to Gateway at the test item 1.1.2 for MPCC(Number translation)

Discussion:

John-Luc: for the two questions for which there are CRs below, suggests to wait for the CRs. Asks for feedback on the other two.

Ultan: for issue #1 is CC: didn't the existing text in the specs help?
Atsushi: during the event they couldn't find this text, only later.

John-Luc: is this text in the specification enough?
Musa: where is the explanation, is it visible enough?
Ultan: in the description of routeReq.
The meeting agrees that in this specific case, this is visible enough.

Ultan: on issue #3 in CC, what was the misunderstanding – related to tehe whole CC model, or on the sequence of events?
Atsushi: the timing of events.

The meeting agrees that text to clarify this has been added in GCC (in 6.2.1), but not in MPCC. Also the text to be added in MPCC could be more clear (and we could consider whether to correct the one in CGG).

Contributions are welcome.

Noted.

N5-040101	Correction of continueProcessing method for Generic Call Control Service (GCCS)	NTT / Fujitsu / Incomit

RELATED TO N5-040098 (REL-4)

RELATED TO N5-040099 (REL-5)

Summary of contribution:

Correction of continueProcessing method for Generic Call Control Service (GCCS). Currently it is not clear in the GCCS specification how the application resumes the call processing after receiving the notification or event of interrupt mode. In addition to that, there are some problems in the following cases:-

- The application specifies the interrupt mode to the answer event of the routeReq() method to transfer the incoming call, and the applicatoin may just want to continue the call processing after some application's processes at the answer event without calling such as another routeReq() or deassignCall(). However the current specification does not allowed.
- The enableCallNotification() can be set both P_EVENT_GCCS_ADDRESS_COLLECTED_EVENT and P_EVENT_GCCS_ADDRESS_ANALYSED_EVENT as intterupt mode. Even if the application request both events as intterupt mode and the gateway can detect both trigger, the application can only receive one or other of two events since the application have to call routeReq() method to continue the processing.

To solve this problem, it is proposed to introduce continueProcessing() method to GCCS as well as MPCCS, and add some text to the Active State of State Transition Diagrams for IpCall for clarification of the way to resume the call processing from the interrupted status. We believe that there is no difference in the idea about interrupt mode between GCCS and MPCCS. In order to further clearify the usage of continueProcessing, methods that implicitly continues processing, i.e routeReq, releaseCall and deassignCall, should state this.

Discussion:

Musa: agrees this is a problem, and with the way it is proposed to solve. But this is a change proposed to GCC, that we have agreed not to change.
John-Luc: GCC is used in test plans and problems have been found with the specs. Do we fix problems?
Eamonn: agrees this is a problem. We could interpret that our decision not to modify GCC is related to adding nex functionality, and this is a fix. Or we could say we don't touch GCC at all and don't fix it.
Musa: same, not clear what we decided.
Jane: we used the word "maintenance", and this is maintenance.

Approved.

9.6 Framework

9.6a HA session

N5-040044	Recommendation on HA Changes	AePONA

Summary of contribution:

This is mainly for discussion but also for decision on the direction of further work.

Problem description:

The current OSA API specifications exhibit limitations with respect to adequately supporting HA deployments. Examples of such limitations (not exhaustive) include:

- It should be possible to run multiple identical application images. Those SCS service managers that support event criteria allow 2 callbacks to be registered. The framework however does not support an equivalent view.
- It is not currently possible to reset or refresh application callbacks related to event criteria, in the event of an application crash and restart.
- In the event of failure and restart of certain SCSs, recovery of the SCS may result in excessive messaging to indicate failure of individual sessions.

Whilst some of the limitations highlighted may be reduced through the use of appropriate middleware high availability solutions, the design and logic of the API itself presents problems that a purely middleware based solution cannot address, and therefore enhancements or clarifications to the API are required.

Motivation for non-middleware capabilities:

The middleware discussion above does not consider the integrity of the OSA conceptual model (Framework, Application Client, SCS) nor the defined behaviour of the API, rather only the ongoing communications.

In the case of the OSA model, considering that it is likely that communication between Framework and Application, and Application and Gateway may take place at differing frequencies, then failure of an application may result in loss of synchronisation between all three parties. For example the middleware may resolve the application failure from the SCS perspective to an alternate object, however the Framework may be resolved to yet another object.

Suggested API modifications to support HA:

- Visibility of multiple applications instances: two approaches are proposed, resulting in different amount of changes to the API (the second requires changes to ensure the integrity of the OSA model).
- Application Failure and Recovery – Refresh existing notification callbacks
- Service failure recovery – session abort
-

Discussion:

Musa: Lucent's comments and ideas are collected in TDoc 111.

Erwin: what is the goal we intend to achieve today? Find if different issues require API changes?
Musa: we have a proposal from Eamonn to establish the lines on which we'll have further technical contributions (if the requirement is approved by SA).
Erwin: would like to minute if/when for any issue there is an agreement that there is a need for an API level solution.
Eamonn: Aepona does not want a wide rage API solution – current functionality is not likely to be removed. Their main problem is the ability for applications to set up multiple callbacks. There is an inconsistency in the specifications. 5.1 assumes that we keep what we have. If the requirement is rejected we may consider contributions to delete the functionality that now implements that in an inconsistent way.

The meeting agrees to proceed with the presentation of 111, then discuss. Decision on 44 is therefore left on hold.

Noted.

N5-040111	Design Considerations for Parlay HA Solutions	Lucent

Summary if the contribution:

The proposed new HA requirement, which refers solely to SCFs communicating to client applications, is largely met by the existing APIs through the setCallbackWithSessionID() method. However, we do concede that there is a need for further clarification about how HA should be accomplished in general including Client/Framework and Client/Service interactions.

The contribution defends that it is the principle of simplicity for applications that motivates having into a single Access Session for a Client, a single Service Session for each service used by said Client, and a single registration between each Service and the Framework. This solution yields the highest degree of interoperability because neither the client applications nor the service make any assumptions about HA. They interact in the same way regardless of whether the underlying gateway supports HA or not. The complexities of the underlying implementations remain hidden from each

entity by the single interfaces. This implies that the responsibility of ensuring appropriate session and state information for each entity is shared across its sub-components resides completely within the implementation space of that entity.

Proponents of a middleware-based solution to the HA problem feel that existing tools and capabilities can yield interoperable HA solutions within the existing APIs and that the standard already contains constructs and patterns to support HA. They would argue that this ideal is not unrealistic and can be realized now or in the near future.

Lucent advocates the position of a middleware-based HA solution in conjunction with capabilities in the existing APIs. It is an area where gateway vendors can provide product differentiation and at the same time maintain interoperability by developing creative solutions that provide HA within the confines of existing technologies.

The rest of the contribution contains comments on current and past CN5 proposals from AePONA and IBM and contain some comments and recommendations on reconciling existing differences of opinion.

The contribution contains the following summary: “The Parlay standards already contain constructs and patterns in which HA solutions can be implemented. These capabilities can be augmented by vendor-specific capabilities that provide further HA capabilities while remaining interoperable and continue to allow vendors opportunities to differentiate their implementations. Shortcomings that arise in particular SCFs, such as SCFs with interrupt mode notifications, and that require changes in the API, should be dealt with on a case-specific basis and not with a general pattern that is applied ubiquitously across the standard. And by no means should a change proposed to the API require or even imply a particular implementation choice. Applying such changes to the APIs to support functions like HA sets a dangerous precedent. One could make a similar argument that changes are needed to support load balancing for high capacity SCFs. Methods could be added to support various schemes for distributing load across SCSs to meet particular implementations, but again the API is not the place for these details and there are existing constructs for managing load within Integrity Management. How could this and subsequent changes for other implementation related issues be refused as additions to the API if changes were made to accommodate HA solutions? The door would be open for large-scale complication of the basic interfaces and the responsibility and complexity of the Framework would increase substantially.”

Discussion:

John-Luc: the 111 zip contains a contribution from IBM, and there is no IBM delegate in the room.
Chelo: the recommendations from IBM have been summarized by Lucent in 111.
John-Luc: anyway for the sake of time proposes to focus the discussion on the part related to 44.

Erwin: reading this contribution he deduces that Lucent agrees with the need to support HA, the debate is whether this is necessary at API level.
Chelo: that’s always been the point.
Musa: agrees. Lucent wants HA.
Erwin: but we’re debating on a requirement.
Chelo: because only functionality visible at API level should be in the stage 1 document. This was agreed at the plenary.
Erwin: then we need to discuss what are the non-API possible solutions, in order to see if there are limitations.
John-Luc: already in San Francisco we discuss exploring this and having a white paper.

Eamonn: if we allow for vendor specific solutions then the application developers need to choose between many vendors, and we may have a problem with application portability. There have been no contributions showing how middleware can solve the issues. The discussion so far has been: one position backed with technical details, and another without explicit technical solution. Therefore no way to know if there can be an interoperable solution. Would welcome an email discussion where both positions are backed with technical details.
Erwin: we’re trying to break down the problem in smaller issues, and for each case where a company claims that there is a non-API solution, he would want to see it.

Dietmar: for an application vendor, is it much more to do depending on whether this is solved at API level or not?
Eamonn: the complexity for applications will vary depending on how much an application wants to obtain from the middleware, as 111 explains.

Dietmar: believes that for an application provider it is simpler to have a standard solution.
Chelo: but there is also less vendor differentiation, therefore less choice for the application providers.
Eamonn: disagrees. An open interoperable does not necessarily mean that there is no differentiation – there are other considerations like performance.

Ultan: believes there is some agreement between 44 and 111: agreement that something is necessary for recovery of notifications, and maybe for aborting sessions. Primary disagreement is whether something should be done at API level.

44 says we have a partial solution with multiple callbacks, and that doesn't combine well with vendor independent solutions. Isn't it true that it would be easier if we didn't have that?
Musa: agrees.
Eamonn: that's one of the options in Aepona's 44, but not the end of the problem. He still would like to see some validation of the non-API solution that is not vendor specific – either open middleware capabilities, or a roadmap of how for instance OMG is planning to solve that.
John-Luc: would that be a solution without referring to a certain implementation?
Eamonn: it was not the intention of 44 to be limited to a certain implementation.

Ultan: we should explore beyond the assumption that the limited HA behaviour will stay there. It might be possible to remove it cleanly.
Musa: would be open to consider that. It might solve some of Lucent's issues, and they would re-assess the problem.
Eamonn: Aepona also willing to try that. Of the three issues raised by 44 the one that remains is the integrity of the OSA conceptual model, for which three possible solutions are proposed:

- current APIs plus extensions
- current APIs. Minus callback functionality
- fully middleware based.

The middleware argument needs to be backed by technical contributions.
Musa: vendors won't come with contributions that explain how they solve this issue.
Chelo: we could find a way around it asking ourselves what makes our APIs have special needs? SA5 is working closely with the Telemanagement Forum, that uses CORBA. What is special in our APIs that prevents us from relying on CORBA too? We got the comment in the SA plenary that all 3GPP systems should support HA, and the question of why we need the requirement at API level if others don't have it.
Erwin: set callback was introduced for a purpose, so we need to be sure that if we take it out we show that there are alternative (non API) solutions that apply and don't introduce IOP problems.
Ultan: what makes our specs special – multidomain, which results in IOP requirements.
Chelo: agrees, but we're not the only ones with IOP solution – management systems are not monolithic, at functional level we all need IOP and we don't have special IOP requirements.

Erwin: in section 3.1.3, what does "*vendor proprietary solutions are appropriate and can be implemented within the confines of each functional entity so that their proprietary nature is only visible to their own sub-components and not external entities*" mean?
Chelo: it's explained later – it means that each side can solve the problems in their own domain.
Musa: you can separate things – if the application wants to be highly available, it's no concern of the gateway side.

Eamonn: the purely middleware solution needs to be further described.
Erwin: contributions showing the non API solution are necessary.
Ultan: companies who do not support the API solution would not contribute with their proprietary solutions.
Chelo: proposes to see what are, if any, the special requirements of the OSA APIs compared to other parts of the 3GPP system that use for instance CORBA.
Erwin: there may be IOP issues.
Musa: no – it can be solved independently at both sides of the API.

Ultan: proposes to delete the callback functionality and see what remains of the problem.

Eamonn: would like more time to respond to Lucent's 111 and take it back to the experts in his company. Volunteers to write some detailed scenarios describing problems that CORBA doesn't solve.

Eamonn to respond by email to issues in Lucent's 111.

Eamonn to provide detailed scenarios describing problems that CORBA doesn't solve.

Musa to start an email discussion on the HA implications of removing the callback functionality.

Chelo: at the moment we're scheduled to present our LS to SA. Does the group want to discuss an update that reflects the latest discussions?
Eamonn: would like to have the opportunity to provide comments.

Chelo to re-submit the LS to the JWG list and ask for feedback.

Noted.

9.6b Other Framework contributions

N5-040097	Correction of Digital Signature with NO signing algorithm	NTT / Fujitsu

RELATED TO N5-040078 (REL-4)

RELATED TO N5-040096 (REL-5)

See discussion on 96.

Updated to 116, for email approval.

AI: Atsushi to send 116 for email approval

N5-040057	Correct alignment between ETSI/Parlay version of OSA and the 3GPP OSA, by adding ability to identify when a client app/service contract/service profile is being used	Open API solutions

RELATED TO N5-040056 (REL-5)

See discussion on 56.

Approved.

N5-040059	Correct alignment between ETSI/Parlay version of OSA and the 3GPP OSA, by clarifying erroneous field in TpServiceProfileDescription	Open API solutions

RELATED TO N5-040058 (REL-5)

See discussion on 58.

Approved.

N5-040061	Introduce a ServiceID field to TpServiceProfileDescription	Open API solutions

RELATED TO N5-040060 (REL-5)

See discussion on 60.

Approved.

N5-040062	Add events to allow an entop to identify when a client app/service contract/service profile is being used	Open API solutions

Similar to the previous ones except that, although this is a data type that the 3GPP specs do use, they do not use the events added for the ETSI specs.

Approved.

9.6.1 Migration support mechanism

9.6.2 Framework function for federation

9.7 Policy Management

9.8 User data Management and User data security management

9.9 User-application authentication function

9.10 Other APIs

N5-040052	Correct List vs Set semantics in User Interaction	IBM

Summary of contribution:

We agreed to add some data types to part 5 to handle speech recognition and synthesis. When implementing them Ultan realized that two data types should be sets rather than lists because the semantics are unordered:

- The TpUIWordOverrideList should be TpUIWordOverrideSet.
- The TpUIRecognitionPropertyList should be TpUIRecognitionPropertySet

Discussion:

Jane: does not agree with the consequences if not approved.
Ultan: it would work but lead to confusion in understanding the specs and problems in maintenance.
Agreed to remove the last sentence of the consequences if not approved.

John-Luc: 11.33 the original wording was better. Suggests to remove the word “objects”.
Agreed.

Agreed with the changes above. Will be updated 117.

N5-040117	Update of 52	ETSI

Approved.

N5-040055	Correct Java Rulebook to introduce UI service naming rule	Aepona

Summary of contribution:

The release 6 User Interaction service introduces additional UI Admin interfaces and functionality. The Java realisation rules require additional rules to cope with the UI modifications and to prevent naming collisions of methods and events. The contribution proposes to modify service specific rules in J2SE Java realisation for UI service. If not approved, existing Java rules cannot cope with Rel 6 UI service without a significant repackaging of the classes in UML.

Approved.

N5-040053	Contribution with delta correction changes made in the approved Rel-6 change request N5-030336 (against Rel-6 29.198-11)	IBM

Summary of contribution:

This document describes the delta correction changes made in the approved Rel-6 change request N5-030336, which were found to be necessary to correct mistakes and oversights observed when implementing the change request. This contribution describes what was the problem. The corrected CR is Tdoc 54.

Revision marks are differences between the original and the updated CR (they are not visible in 54).

Changes agreed.

Noted.

N5-040054	Account Management missing needed features	IBM

This is the CR corresponding to the changes in Tdoc 53.

Approved.

N5-040094	Remove P_FIXED, TpFixed	Telcordia

Summary of contribution:

This is a problem found when compiling the IDL. When implementing the changes agreed in Bangkok, P_FIXED couldn't be used because OMG IDL P_FIXED is a template type. The contribution proposes to remove P_FIXED and TpFixed, and proposes alternatives. If not approved, the IDL does not compile.

Approved.

N5-040095	Add user binding data types	Telcordia

Summary of contribution:

This is the same case as the Open APIs CRs approved above – same changes in data types are needed in the 3GPPs specification too.

Discussion:

Adrian: title is "add" while cat is F (correction). Also we cannot continue misgiving alignment with Parlay as the only consequence if not approved.
Ultan: this doesn't add functionality, it adds a data type for correcting alignment with 3GPP, which is one of our requirements. We have a clear mandate to keep alignment.

Agreed to change Parlay -> ETSI/Parlay in the consequences if not approved. Agreed to change the title to "Correct alignment between ETSI/Parlay OSA and the 3GPP OSA by adding…".

Will be updated to 118.

N5-040118	Update of 95	Telcordia

Approved.

10 OSA Testing Activities

N5-040088	Report from ETSI STF 251 - OSA Test Specifications	ETSI STF 251

Maria Medina from Telefonica Moviles expressed an interest in our testing work and is attending this session. For her sake Ultan explains we started 1.5 years ago to developed testing specs that are only ETSI documents, but are applicable to 3GPP specs because they're the same APIs. We have

- A PICS doc – a check list of all mandatory and optional features in the specs, with a single entry per interface and method). It is a template that can be filled in for a particular implementation. The first version has already been published. It's then down to each vendor to be conformant to the specs, we don't do regulation but we give the description of what are the minimum conditions for conformance.
- A test specification: in OSA we have the principle to allow multiple implementation options, and for Rel5 and Rel6 we have IDL, WSDL and Java realizations. We don't want to have test specs that is limited to one of these realizations (since test specs should never add requirements to the specs). So we don't use TTCN code and instead we only develop test purposes (test scenarios); then whoever uses the testing specs can write the TTCN.

We got feedback in the test specifications, and we know the PICS doc is used by some vendors in their documentation for RFQs. We know the test specs have been implemented without much cost.

This is done by a STF paid by ETSI, and their work is supervised by this group.

Maria: in Telefonica Moviles, they're asking trials with several vendors, and they don't have any info on test specifications.
Chelo: would like to get feedback on this test material.

Ultan: wants to stress the value of the PICS doc, that goes to the level of interfaces and methods. Volunteers to help Maria find all the documentation.

Proposal to continue this discussion off line.

Feedback is also requested for the other comments below.

Noted.

N5-040074	Draft Parlay 3 ICS v2	ETSI PTCC

Presented for information.

Noted.

N5-040075	Draft Parlay 4 ICS	ETSI PTCC

Presented for information.

Noted.

N5-040081	Draft TISPAN-06005-05v001 Parlay 3 UI TSS&TP	ETSI STF 251

Presented for information.

Noted.

N5-040082	**Draft TISPAN-06005-06v003 Parlay 3 MM TSS&TP**	**ETSI STF 251**

Presented for information.

Noted.

N5-040083	**Draft TISPAN-06005-03v007 Parlay 3 TC TSS&TP**	**ETSI STF 251**

Presented for information.

Noted.

N5-040084	**Draft TISPAN-06005-08v003 Parlay 3 DSC TSS&TP**	**ETSI STF 251**

Presented for information.

Noted.

N5-040085	**Draft TISPAN-06005-09v001 Parlay 3 GMS TSS&TP**	**ETSI STF 251**

Presented for information.

Noted.

N5-040086	**Draft TISPAN-06005-11v002 Parlay 3 AM TSS&TP**	**ETSI STF 251**

Presented for information.

Noted.

N5-040087	**Draft TISPAN-06005-12v002 Parlay 3 CS TSS&TP**	**ETSI STF 251**

Presented for information.

Noted.

11 Organizational aspects with relation to Joint activities

N5-040020	Changes in work planning accuracy after SA#22 Dec 2003 (based on SA_22_Draft_Rep_v007rm and SP-030750)	MCC

Summary of contribution:

CN groups are presenting WIDs to show delays to the plenary, where the WID substance doesn't change, only the dates; These delays should be reflected in the work plan. Proposal is that only SA1 owns features, and the rest owns tasks. Only the feature owner has absolute deadlines, the rest relative.

Other changes to improve management. It does not affect us much since we're not feature owners.

Dicussion:

Jane: when Alain Sultan notices that a group has failed to meet a deadline, what will he do?
Adrian: cannot do much. WGs go to parent body to ask for dates shift, and MCC implements the new plans.
Chelo: it helps for instance in that we don't need to keep on changing the WID if SA1 or SA2 have delays.

Noted.

11.1 Delivery plans for OSA Rel6 and Parlay 5

No contributions to this agenda item.

11.2 CR delivery plans for next CN plenaries

We're not bringing anything to next plenary.

N5-040034	CN5 specs Release version matrix	MCC

None of our specs (except mapping) need automatic upgrades.

Eamonn: existing mapping contributions, do they need to be synchronized with latest releases?
Musa: there has been no mapping effort for more than one year. Suggests we don't bring them to Rel6.

Agreed to note this suggestion and think about this when we bring Rel6.

Noted.

11.3 Review of 3GPP OSA Workplan

11.4 3GPP OSA Work Item Description

N5-040014	3GPP Work Plan filtered on OSA issues (CN5, SA1/2 etc.)	MCC

Changes agreed to the workplan:

- MMS: no changes.
- Policy Management: 100%.
- PAM: change to 50% (specs 100% done, mapping 0% done).
- PX Web Services: no changes, except in comment: the end of the sentence changed to "will be submitted at the date of Rel6 freeze to be decided.
- Rest unchanged.

Noted.

N5-030515	Updated Rel-6 Work Item Description for OSA Stage 3	MCC

Version approved in December. Section 15 shows the work progress. f we only update the completion work

Chelo: why the completion table? It's going to be outdated in March.
Adrian: for visibility.
Jane: would rather not have it visible since for instance the percentage for the SIP mapping is not true.

Chelo: good to have a list of the requirements that proposes to have only the first two columns. Because since we finished the requirements cleanup we don't need to show 0% completion for requirements that nobody supports.
Adrian: proposes to have this information in 10, and delete part 15.

Agreed. This means we have the dynamic parts in the work plan, and the static in the WID.

Update will be 121.

AI: Adrian to send out the updated WID.

11.5 Agreement of revised JWG ToR

N5-040030	**Draft update of CN5 ToR for submission to CN#23 for approval**	**MCC**

No need to change ToR from 3GPP point of view, but SPAN has disappeared. Adrian is proposing some improvements as well.

Edits done on line, updated to 122.

N5-040122	**Update of 30**	**MCC**

Approved.

12 Outgoing Liaisons

N5-040106	Reply LS to SA2 on Request for clarification on the scope of the Ut interface towards the OSA-SCS	**Marconi**

Approved.

N5-040107	**Response to LS on "Extended MM7 and Messaging Integration Broker"**	**Ericsson**

Musa: proposes to be more explicit that we do confirm that this is in the scope of our work on Messaging.

Agreed that since this material is out of the T2 scope, so no more interaction is needed with T2. We will send out this response asap to close the subject, and encourage companies in T2 to participate in the discussion.

Approved.

N5-040026	**LS on Clarifications concerning OSA High Availability discussion**	**CN5**
	E-MAIL APPROVED	

13 Future meetings

N5-040016	Full 3GPP meeting calendar including workshops	MCC

Agreed to confirm the dates/venue for the August meeting in NJ.

AI: John-Luc to arrange the meeting.

Conference call the week of March 22nd (week 13)

Week 17 (starting April 19). Agreed to schedule the meeting for this week, which may become a conference call or nothing.

AI: Chelo to ask by email what is the preferred date/time for the confcalls.

AI: Ultan to check ETSI meeting room availability.

AI: Adrian to announce the meeting on time.

Noted.

N5-040017	SA_SAx_CN_CNx meeting calendar	MCC

Noted.

14 AOB

N5-040025	Overview of 3GPP Release 99 -- Summary of all Release 99 Features -- v.1.0 **Note: DRAFT FOR PRESENTATION AT TSG # 22 For 'high-level' review -- Version 4th December 2003**	MCC

Noted.

N5-040018	other services in the Sophia Antipolis area, edition 2004	MCC

Noted.

N5-040063	Deadline for contributions is 5 working days before the meeting starts. Consideration of later contributions cannot be guaranteed	MCC
	NOT AVAILABLE	

N5-040090	ADN Closed	MCC
	NOT AVAILABLE	

N5-040068	22127-640 Service Requirement for the Open Services Access (OSA): Stage 1	MCC

Noted.

N5-040069	23127-600 Virtual Home Environment (VHE) / Open Service Access (OSA): Stage 2	MCC

Noted.

N5-040103		BTExact

Feedback from Parlay on the BC discussion.

Discussion :

Not clear whether this feedback chooses option 1 or 2 from Bangkok (resubmitted respectively in docs 92 and 93).

Never to remove deprecated methods, or remove them with a certain timetable. Here it is suggested that a method is not deprecated until it shows as such in two major releases. The practical consequence is that we don't remove anything until Parlay 6.0.

Ultan proposes to make an update to this document to make it into the format of 92 and 93, and for issues where there is no preference include the proposal in 92. Proposal agreed.

Discussion to continue by email, in order to reach a final decision. The decision should be taken at the Miami meeting the latest.

AI: Ultan to kick-off this email discussion.

AI: Chelo to give Parlay feedback on our decision when it is taken.

Noted.

N5-040092	Backwards Compatibility in Parlay 5, Option 1	ETSI PTCC

Resubmission of Bangkok contribution to help focus discussion of 103.

Noted.

N5-040093	Backwards Compatibility in Parlay 5, Option 2	ETSI PTCC

Resubmission of Bangkok contribution to help focus discussion of 103.

Noted.

15 Close

Annex A: Agenda

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

1.1 Reminder for IPR declaration

The chairman made the following call for IPRs, and asked ETSI members to check the latest version of ETSI's policy available on the web server:

The attention of the members of this Technical Specification Group is drawn to the fact **that 3GPP Individual Members have the obligation** under the IPR Policies of their respective Organizational Partners to **inform their respective** Organizational Partners **of Essential IPRs they become aware of**.

The members take note that they are hereby invited:

a) to investigate in their company whether their company does own IPRs which are, or are likely to become Essential in respect of the work of the Technical Specification Group.

b) to notify the Director-General, or the Chairman of their **respective** Organizational Partners, of all potential IPRs that their company may own, by means of the IPR Statement and the Licensing declaration forms (e.g. see the ETSI IPR forms http://webapp.etsi.org/Ipr/).

2 Allocation of documents to agenda items

3 Reporting

3.1 JWG meeting, Bangkok

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 SA1, SA2 activities on GUP

3.2.6 CN1 activities on Access Independence

3.2.7 CN1 activities on Presence

3.2.8 3GPP OMA discussions

3.3 Parlay

3.3.1 Parlay Board

3.3.2 Parlay TAC

3.4 ETSI

3.4.1 Plugtest OSA Interoperability event

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 Parlay X Web Services and WSDL Realization session

8 Messaging session

9 Other technical discussions OSA version 3 / 3GPP Rel.6
9.1 Requirements

9.2 OSA support for 3GPP2 networks
9.3 Different abstraction levels for OSA
9.4 Presence and Availability Management
9.5 Call Control
9.6 Framework
9.6.1 Migration support mechanism
9.6.2 Framework function for federation
9.7 Policy Management
9.8 User data Management and User data security management
9.9 User-application authentication function
9.10 Other APIs

10 OSA Testing Activities

11 Organisational aspects with relation to Joint activities
11.1 Delivery plans for OSA Rel6 and Parlay 5
11.2 CR delivery plans for next CN plenaries
11.3 Review of 3GPP OSA workplan
11.4 3GPP OSA Work Item Description
11.5 Agreement of revised JWG ToR

12 Outgoing Liaisons

13 Future meetings

14 AOB

15 Close

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

Doc	Title	Source	Allocations	Type	Go to CN#23	Decision/Comment
N5-040000	Draft Agenda	JWG Chair	2 Tdoc allocation	Tdoc	n/a	Revised to 079
N5-040001	Document Allocation	JWG Chair	2 Tdoc allocation	Tdoc	n/a	Noted.
N5-040002	report_Monday	JWG Chair	n/a	Report out	n/a	Noted.
N5-040003	report_Tuesday	JWG Chair	n/a	Report out	n/a	Noted.
N5-040004	report_Wednesday	JWG Chair	n/a	Report out	n/a	Noted.
N5-040005	report_Thursday	JWG Chair	n/a	Report out	n/a	Noted.
N5-040006	report_Friday	JWG Chair	n/a	Report out	n/a	Not used
N5-040007	Draft Report of this CN5 meeting	JWG Chair	n/a	Report out	**Yes**	Noted.
N5-040008	Report of this CN5 meeting	JWG	n/a	Report out	n/a	
N5-040009	CN5 Report to the last CN plenary	MCC	3 Reporting	Report in	n/a	Noted.
N5-040010	Report of last 3GPP CN meeting	MCC	3 Reporting	Report in	n/a	Noted.
N5-040011	Report of last 3GPP SA meeting	MCC	3 Reporting	Report in	n/a	Noted.
N5-040012	3GPP IETF Dependencies and Priorities (http://www.3gpp.org/TB/Other/IETF.htm)	MCC (SP-030734)	3 Reporting	Report in	n/a	Noted.
N5-040013	Presentation of 3GPP Rel-6 Work Plan status	MCC (SP-030791)	3 Reporting	Report in	n/a	Noted.
N5-040014	3GPP Rel-6 Work Plan filtered on OSA issues (CN5, SA1/2 etc.)	MCC	3 Reporting	Report in	n/a	Noted.
N5-040015	CN5 (OSA Stage 3) Rel-6 Work Item Description - WID	MCC (NP-030558)	3 Reporting	WID	n/a	Revised to 121
N5-040016	Full 3GPP meeting calendar including workshops	MCC	13 Future meetings	Tdoc	n/a	Noted.
N5-040017	SA_SAx_CN_CNx meeting calendar	MCC	13 Future meetings	Tdoc	n/a	Noted.
N5-040018	Preferential ETSI conditions for accommodation and other services in the Sophia Antipolis area, edition 2004	MCC (ETSI CL 2300)	13 Future meetings	Tdoc	n/a	Noted.
N5-040019	IETF Status REPORT - by CN Chair	MCC (SP-030734)	3 Reporting	Report in	n/a	Noted.
N5-040020	Changes in work planning accuracy after SA_22 Dec 2003 (based on SA_22_Draft_Rep_v007rm and SP-030750)	MCC	11 Organisational: aspects with relation to Joint activities	Tdoc	n/a	Noted.
N5-040021	Rel-6 CR 29.198-02-600 Add P_INVALID_TOKEN_RATE Exception in order to satisfy the token bucket based overload control methods requirements	China Unicom	9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	n/a	Not Agreed. Clarifications needed.
N5-040022	Rel-6 CR 29.198-04-1-610 Add Token-bucket data definition in order to o satisfy the token bucket based overload control methods requirements	China Unicom	9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	n/a	Not Agreed. Clarifications needed.
N5-040023	Rel-6 CR 29.198-04-2-600 Add token-bucket based overload control methods in IpCallControlManager interface	China Unicom	9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	n/a	Not Agreed. Clarifications needed.
N5-040024	Rel-6 CR 29.198-04-3-610 Add token-bucket based overload control methods in IpMultiPartyCallControlManager interface	China Unicom	9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	n/a	Not Agreed. Clarifications needed.
N5-040025	Overview of 3GPP Release 99 -- Summary of all Release 99 Features -- v.1.0 -- DRAFT FOR PRESENTATION AT TSG # 22 For 'high-level' review -- Version 4th December 2003	MCC	3 Reporting	Tdoc	n/a	Noted.
N5-040026	LS from CN5 to SA (cc: SA1) on Clarifications concerning OSA High Availability discussion	CN5	12 Output LS	LS out	**Yes**	Email approved on 9 Jan 2004
N5-040027	LS from SA2 to CN5, SA1 on OSA Rel-6 Requirements resulting from GUP Rel-6 Requirements	S2-040410	4 Input LSs	LS in	n/a	Noted.

N5-040028	Reply LS from SA2 to CN5 on Request for clarification on the scope of the Ut interface towards the OSA-SCS	S2-034363	4 Input LSs	LS in	n/a	Reply in 106.
N5-040029	LS from T2 on Extended MM7 and Messaging Integration Broker	T2-030638	4 Input LSs	LS in	n/a	Reply in 107.
N5-040030	Draft update of CN5 ToR for submission to CN#23 for approval	MCC	11 Organisational: aspects with relation to Joint activities	ToR	**Yes**	Revised to 122
N5-040031	LS from SA1 on OSA Rel-6 Requirements resulting from GUP Rel-6 Requirements	S1-040124	4 Input LSs	LS in	n/a	Noted.
N5-040032	LS from SA1 on High Availability requirement for OSA	S1-040147	4 Input LSs	LS in	n/a	Noted.
N5-040033	CN1-5 SA2 Atlanta Invite	Host	1 Agenda	Tdoc	n/a	Noted.
N5-040034	CN5 specs Release version matrix	MCC	11 Organisational: aspects with relation to Joint activities	Tdoc	n/a	Noted.
N5-040035	N5-030507r2 Draft v200 Report of Meeting #25, Bangkok, THAILAND, 27-31 October 2003	MCC	3 Reporting	Report in	n/a	Approved.
N5-040036	Missing Rel-6 Mirror CRs for the already CN#22-approved & subsequently implemented Rel-5 CRs 29.198-xyz	MCC	9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	n/a	Noted.
N5-040037	29.198-04-3 Rel-6 Cat F CR 020 Correction of description in superviseRes - Align with Rel-5 (revised N5-030349)	open API solutions	9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	n/a	Revised to 111
N5-040038	29.198-04-4 Rel-6 Cat F CR 015 Correction of description in superviseVolumeRes - Align with Rel-5 (revised N5-030350)	open API solutions	9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	n/a	Revised to 112
N5-040039	29.198-04-4 Rel-6 Cat F CR 016 Correction of method references in MMCC - Align with Rel-5 (revised N5-030351)	open API solutions	9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	n/a	Revised to 113
N5-040040	Design considerations for the Messaging SCF	Ericsson	8 Messaging	Tdoc	n/a	Noted.
N5-040041	Proposed stage3 for the Messaging SCF	Ericsson	8 Messaging	Tdoc	n/a	Noted.
N5-040042	29.199-101 (Parlay X) Clarification of the behaviour of methods for sending SMS	Telecom Italia	7 Parlay X: Web Services and WSDL Realization session	Tdoc	n/a	Not Agreed. Clarifications needed.
N5-040043	Rel-6 CR 29.198-14 Correction of introduction of PAM Provisioning Interfaces	ETSI PTCC	9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	n/a	Revised to 110
N5-040044	Recommendation on HA Changes	AePONA	9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	n/a	Noted.
N5-040045	Rel-5 CR 29.198-01 Correct Java Rules to support PAM realisation	AePONA	6 OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	**No**	Agreed.
N5-040046	Rel-5 CR 29.198-04-1 Correct Java code in line with Java rulebook	AePONA	6 OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	n/a	Rejected.
N5-040047	Rel-5 CR 29.198-06 Correct Java code in line with rulebook	AePONA	6 OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	n/a	Rejected.
N5-040048	Rel-5 CR 29.198-07 Correct Java code in line with rulebook	AePONA	6 OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	n/a	Rejected.
N5-040049	Rel-5 CR 29.198-08 Correct Java Code in line with rulebook	AePONA	6 OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	n/a	Rejected.
N5-040050	Rel-5 CR 29.198-11 Correct Java code in line with rulebook	AePONA	6 OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	n/a	Rejected.
N5-040051	Access Independence - Terminology Changes	Marconi	9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	**Yes**	Agreed. No changes in CN5 specs needed. Action: Report to CN#23.
N5-040052	Rel-6 CR 29.198-05 Correct List vs Set semantics in User Interaction	IBM	9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	n/a	Revised to 117
N5-040053	Background to Rel-6 CR 021 to 29.198-11	IBM	9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	n/a	Noted.
N5-040054	Rel-6 CR 29.198-11 CR021r1 Account Management missing needed features	IBM	9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	**No**	Agreed.
N5-040055	Rel-6 CR 29.198-01 Correct Java Rulebook for UI service naming rule.	AePONA	9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	**No**	Agreed.
N5-040056	Rel-5 CR 29.198-03 Add App Profile and Contract Status	Open API Solutions	6 OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	**No**	Agreed. Rel-6 Mirror CR in 057.
N5-040057	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Add App Profile and Contract Status	Open API Solutions	6 OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	**No**	Rel-6 Mirror CR of 056. Agreed.
N5-040058	Rel-5 CR 29.198-03 Correct TpServiceProfileDescription	Open API Solutions	5 OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	**No**	Rel-5 Mirror CR of 066. Agreed.
N5-040059	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Correct TpServiceProfileDescription	Open API Solutions	5 OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	**No**	Rel-6 Mirror CR of 066. Agreed.
N5-040060	Rel-5 CR 29.198-03 Add ServiceID to TpServiceProfileDescription	Open API Solutions	6 OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	**No**	Agreed. Rel-6 Mirror CR in 061.
N5-040061	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Add ServiceID to TpServiceProfileDescription	Open API Solutions	6 OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	**No**	Rel-6 Mirror CR of 060. Agreed.
N5-040062	Rel-6 CR 29.198-03 Add Ent Op specific Events	Open API Solutions	9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	**No**	Agreed.
N5-040063	Late contribtions start from here. Consideration cannot be guaranteed	Late Tdocs	Late Tdocs	MCC	n/a	

N5-040064	Rel-5 CR 29998-04-4-500 Update references to IETF specifications	MCC	6 OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	n/a	Noted. Action: MCC to update IETF references
N5-040065	Rel-6 Mirror CR 29998-04-4-600 Update references to IETF specifications	MCC	6 OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	n/a	Noted. Action: MCC to update IETF references
N5-040066	Rel-4 CR 29.198-03 Correct TpServiceProfileDescription	Open API Solutions	5 OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	**No**	Agreed. Rel-5/6 Mirror CRs in 058, 059.
N5-040067	LS from SA2 to CN5 on Completion of stage 2 work related to OSA Rel-6 High Availability requirement	S2-034385	4 Input LSs	LS in	n/a	Noted.
N5-040068	22127-640 Service Requirement for the Open Services Access (OSA): Stage 1	MCC	9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	TS	n/a	Noted.
N5-040069	23127-600 Virtual Home Environment (VHE) / Open Service Access (OSA): Stage 2	MCC	9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	TS	n/a	Noted.
N5-040070	Web Services Realization Update	IBM	7 Parlay X: Web Services and WSDL Realization session	Tdoc	n/a	Noted.
N5-040071	GMS SCF Re-Architecture Stage-3 discussion	Lucent	8 Messaging	Tdoc	n/a	Noted.
N5-040072	GMS SCF Re-Architecture Stage-3 method-level discussion	Lucent	8 Messaging	Tdoc	n/a	Noted.
N5-040073	Interoperability problem with GCC and MPCC Service Properties	ETSI PTCC	5 OSA1 3GPP Rel-4, 6 OSA2 3GPP Rel-5, 9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	n/a	Noted.
N5-040074	Draft Parlay 3 ICS v2	ETSI STF 251	10 OSA Testing	TS	n/a	Noted.
N5-040075	Draft Parlay 4 ICS	ETSI STF 251	10 OSA Testing	TS	n/a	Noted.
N5-040076	ETSI_Parlay_Requirements_Doc_v0.8	Richard Stretch	9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	TS	n/a	Noted.
N5-040077	The second OSA/Parlay PLUGTEST Report from NTT	NTT	10 OSA Testing	Report in	n/a	Noted.
N5-040078	Rel-4 Cat F CR 29.198-03 Correction of Digital Signature with NO signing algorithm	NTT, Fujitsu	5 OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	**No**	Rel-5/6 Mirror CRs in 096, 097. Agreed.
N5-040079	RevisedAgenda - Revision of N5-040000	CN5 Chair & Vice-Chair	1 Agenda	Agenda	n/a	Revision of N5-040000. Revised to 102.
N5-040080	Rel-6 CR 29.198-04-1 Add missing Supervise Report value to support QoS parameter change reports	Lucent	9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	**No**	Agreed.
N5-040081	Draft TISPAN-06005-05v001 Parlay 3 UI TSS&TP	ETSI STF 251	10 OSA Testing	TS	n/a	Noted.
N5-040082	Draft TISPAN-06005-06v003 Parlay 3 MM TSS&TP	ETSI STF 251	10 OSA Testing	TS	n/a	Noted.
N5-040083	Draft TISPAN-06005-07v003 Parlay 3 TC TSS&TP	ETSI STF 251	10 OSA Testing	TS	n/a	Noted.
N5-040084	Draft TISPAN-06005-08v003 Parlay 3 DSC TSS&TP	ETSI STF 251	10 OSA Testing	TS	n/a	Noted.
N5-040085	Draft TISPAN-06005-09v001 Parlay 3 GMS TSS&TP	ETSI STF 251	10 OSA Testing	TS	n/a	Noted.
N5-040086	Draft TISPAN-06005-11v002 Parlay 3 AM TSS&TP	ETSI STF 251	10 OSA Testing	TS	n/a	Noted.
N5-040087	Draft TISPAN-06005-12v002 Parlay 3 CS TSS&TP	ETSI STF 251	10 OSA Testing	TS	n/a	Noted.
N5-040088	Report from ETSI STF 251 - OSA Test Specifications	ETSI STF 251 Leader	10 OSA Testing	TS	n/a	Noted.
N5-040089	ToDoListResults	CN5 Chair	3 Reporting	Tdoc	n/a	Noted.
N5-040090	ADN Closed	ADN Closed	ADN Closed	MCC	n/a	ADN Closed
N5-040091	Actions from joint meeting SA1 + OMA Requirements	CN5 Chair	3.2.8 3GPP OMA Discussions	Tdoc	n/a	Noted.
N5-040092	Backwards Compatibility in Parlay 5, Option 1	ETSI PTCC	3.3, 11	Tdoc	n/a	Noted.
N5-040093	Backwards Compatibility in Parlay 5, Option 2	ETSI PTCC	3.3, 11	Tdoc	n/a	Noted.
N5-040094	Rel-6 CR 29.198-02 Remove TpFixed	Telcordia	9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	**No**	Agreed.
N5-040095	Rel-6 CR 29.198-06 Add UserBinding Types	Telcordia	9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	n/a	Revised to 118.
N5-040096	Rel-5 CR Cat A 29.198-03 Correction of Digital Signature with NO signing algorithm	NTT, Fujitsu	5 OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	n/a	Rel-5 Mirror CR of 078. Revised to 115.
N5-040097	Rel-6 CR Cat A 29.198-03 Correction of Digital Signature with NO signing algorithm	NTT, Fujitsu	5 OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	n/a	Rel-6 Mirror CR of 078. Revised to 116.
N5-040098	Rel-4 CR Cat F 29.198-04 Correction of continueProcessing method for Generic Call Control Service (GCCS)	NTT, Fujitsu, Incomit	5 OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	**No**	Rel-5/6 Mirror CRs in 099, 101. Agreed.

N5-040099	Rel-5 CR Cat A 29.198-04-2 Correction of continueProcessing method for Generic Call Control Service (GCCS)	NTT, Fujitsu	5 OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	**No**	Rel-5 Mirror CR of 098. Agreed.
N5-040100	Reserved for MCC Use			MCC	n/a	
N5-040101	Rel-6 CR Cat A 29.198-04-2 Correction of continueProcessing method for Generic Call Control Service (GCCS)	NTT, Fujitsu	5 OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	**No**	Rel-6 Mirror CR of 098. Agreed.
N5-040102	RevisedAgenda - Revision of N5-040079	CN5	1 Agenda	Agenda	n/a	Revision of 079. Revised to 108.
N5-040103	Statement concerning Backwards Compatibility Parlay Releases	Richard Stretch	3.3	Tdoc	n/a	Noted.
N5-040104	Information on ETSI TISPAN NGN Project	ETSI PTCC	3.4	Tdoc	n/a	Noted.
N5-040105	Report from CN5#25bis (Messaging) meeting, Sophia Antipolis, FRANCE, 29-30 Jan 2004	CN5 Chair	3.2, 8	Tdoc	**Yes**	Noted.
N5-040106	LS to SA2 on correction of Fig. 6b in 22.003 (Rapp: Sultan)	CN5	12	LS out	**Yes**	Reply to 028. Agreed
N5-040107	LS reply to T2 on "Extended MM7 and Messaging Integration Broker"	CN5	12	LS out	**Yes**	Reply to 029.
N5-040108	Draft Report vers. A of SA1#23 meeting, Innsbruck, 12–16 January 2004	MCC	3.2.3	Report in	n/a	Noted.
N5-040109	RevisedAgenda - Revision of N5-040102	CN5	1 Agenda	Agenda	n/a	Revision of 102
N5-040110	Rel-6 CR 29.198-14 Correction of introduction of PAM Provisioning Interfaces	ETSI PTCC	9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	**No**	Revision of 043. Agreed.
N5-040111	Design considerations for Parlay HA solutions	Lucent	9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	Tdoc	n/a	Noted.
N5-040112	Rel-6 Cat F CR 29.198-04-3 Correction of description in superviseRes - Align with Rel-5	PTCC/open API solutions	9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	**No**	Revision of 037. Agreed.
N5-040113	Rel-6 Cat F CR 29.198-04-4 Correction of description in superviseVolumeRes - Align with Rel-5	PTCC/open API solutions	9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	**No**	Revision of 038. Agreed.
N5-040114	Rel-6 Cat F CR 29.198-04-4 Correction of method references in MMCC - Align with Rel-5	PTCC/open API solutions	9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	**No**	Revision of 039. Agreed.
N5-040115	Rel-5 Cat A CR 29.198-03 Correction of Digital Signature with NO signing algorithm	NTT, Fujitsu	5 OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	**No**	Revision of 096. Rel-5 Mirror CR of 078. For email Approval.
N5-040116	Rel-6 Cat A CR 29.198-03 Correction of Digital Signature with NO signing algorithm	NTT, Fujitsu	5 OSA1 3GPP Rel-4	CR	**No**	Revision of 097. Rel-6 Mirror CR of 078. For email Approval.
N5-040117	Rel-6 CR 29.198-05 Correct List vs Set semantics in User Interaction	PTCC/IBM	9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	**No**	Revision of 052. Agreed.
N5-040118	Rel-6 CR 29.198-06 Add UserBinding Types	Telcordia	9 OSA3 3GPP Rel-6	CR	**No**	Revision of 095. Agreed.
N5-040119	Rel-6 CR 29.198-01 Correct Java Rules to support PAM realisation	AePONA	6 OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	CR	**No**	Rel-6 Mirror CR of 045. For email Approval.
N5-040120	Updates to Java codes and inclusion in 3GPP releases experiences of T2, SA5)	MCC	6 OSA2 3GPP Rel-5	Tdoc	n/a	Noted.
N5-040121	CN5 (OSA Stage 3) Rel-6 Work Item Description - WID	MCC (NP-030558)	3 Reporting	WID	**Yes**	Revision of 015. For email Approval.
N5-040122	Draft update of CN5 ToR for submission to CN#23 for approval	MCC	11 Organisational: aspects with relation to Joint activities	ToR	**Yes**	Revision of 030. Agreed.

Annex C: Participants list

Chairman

ABARCA Chelo	ALCATEL S.A.	FR
STRETCH Richard	BT Group Plc	GB

Vice Chairman

BAKKER John-Luc	Telcordia Technologies Inc.	US

ETSI PTCC

MULLIGAN Ultan	ETSI Secretariat	FR

PROJECT_MGR

ZOICAS Adrian	ETSI Secretariat	FR

HOOPER Mark	Lucent Technologies N. S. UK	GB
HUMPHREY Jane D	MARCONI COMMUNICATIONS	GB
IWASAKI Atsushi	NTT Europe Ltd.	GB
KOHNENMERGEN Dietmar	KPN N.V.	NL
MCINTYRE Joe	IBM EUROPE	DE
MURRAY Eamonn	AePONA LTD	GB
UNMEHOPA Musa	Lucent Technologies N. S. UK	GB
VAN RIJSSEN Erwin	ERICSSON LM	SE

Number of Attendees: 12

Name	Organization represented	Status, partner	Ctry	Phone	Email
Ms. Chelo Abarca	ALCATEL S.A.	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	FR	+33 1307 70469	chelo.abarca@alcatel.fr
Mr. John-Luc Bakker	Telcordia Technologies Inc.	3GPPMEMBER (T1)	US	+1-732-699-2694	jlbakker@research.telcordia.com
Mr. Mark Hooper	Lucent Technologies N. S. UK	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	GB	+1 919-844-4667	hooper@lucent.com
Ms. Jane D Humphrey	MARCONI COMMUNICATIONS	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	GB	+44 24 76564232	jane.humphrey@marconi.com
Mr. Dietmar Kohnenmergen	KPN N.V.	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	DE	+49 211 448 2946	dietmar.kohnenmergen@eplus.de
Mr. Joe Mcintyre	IBM EUROPE	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	US	+1 512 823 1675	joe@us.ibm.com
Mr. Ultan Mulligan	ETSI Secretariat	3GPPORG_REP (ETSI)	FR	+33 4 92 94 43 88	ultan.mulligan@etsi.org
Mr. Eamonn Murray	AePONA LTD	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	GB	+44 28 90269188	eamonn.murray@aepona.com
Mr. Richard Stretch	BT Group Plc	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	GB	+44 1473 607487	richard.stretch@bt.com
Mr. Musa Unmehopa	Lucent Technologies N. S. UK	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	NL	+31 35 687 1684	unmehopa@lucent.com
Mr. Erwin van Rijssen	ERICSSON LM	3GPPMEMBER (ETSI)	NL	+31161242320	Erwin.van.Rijssen@ericsson.com
Mr. Adrian Zoicas	ETSI Secretariat	3GPPORG_REP (ETSI)	FR	+33 4 92 94 42 21	adrian.zoicas@etsi.org

History

Document history		
Ver. 1.0.0	4 Mar 2004	N5-040007 DRAFT Report submitted to CN5 for comment and posted at: http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_cn/WG5_osa/TSGN5_26_Atlanta/Report/
Ver. 2.0.0	21 Apr 2004	N5-040007r2 Revised DRAFT Report submitted to CN5 for approval and posted at: http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_cn/WG5_osa/TSGN5_26_Atlanta/Report/
Ver. 3.0.0	14 May 2004	N5-040008: Approved Report at CN5#27 and posted at: http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_cn/WG5_osa/TSGN5_26_Atlanta/Report/