

**TELECOMMUNICATION  
STANDARDIZATION SECTOR**

STUDY PERIOD 2005-2008

**English only****Original: English**

---

**Question(s):** 2/13**LIAISON STATEMENT****Source:** ITU-T Q.2/13 Rapporteur Group (Seoul, Korea, 5-9 March 2007)**Title:** Joint activity of ITU-T Q.2/13 with OMA on NGN open service environment

---

**LIAISON STATEMENT****To:** OMA ARC WG , OMA TP**Approval:** Agreed to at the Q.2/13 Rapporteur Group meeting**For:** Action**Deadline:** 13 April 2007

---

**Contact:** Marco Carugi  
Nortel Networks Europe  
U.K.Tel: +33 1 6955 7027  
Email: [marco.carugi@nortel.com](mailto:marco.carugi@nortel.com)

---

ITU-T Q.2/13 thanks OMA for the answer from OMA ARC WG and OMA TP about our liaison COM13-LS157.

Q.2/13 appreciates that you have accepted our invitation to establishing cooperation with us on NGN Open Service Environment issues, and thanks for sending us links to your specifications.

It was unfortunate that we could not get together during the 5-9 March Q.2/13 meeting in Seoul, Korea, however we understand that there is still a desire to meet with us. In this regard, and in response to your first requested action, Q.2/13 will arrange for OMA experts to participate in the April 2007 SG 13 meeting where we can discuss NGN open service environment.

The next meeting of ITU-T SG13 will be held from 16 to 27 April 2007 in Geneva, with the SG13 leadership meeting on 15 April 2007. We are aware that OMA will have its next meeting from 15 to 20 April 2007 in Frankfurt, Germany. However, we are also meeting in that week, thus we invite your experts to consider attending one-day of the meeting of Q.2/13 in Geneva, preferably on 21 April 2007. The agenda for this one-day activity would be restricted to items of common interest. Details of the agenda and finalisation of the schedule should be worked out by the respective Q.2/13 and OMA leadership.

As far as your second requested action, we will be pleased to provide you information during this joint activity and we anticipate that you would share similar information about your work program.

We have reviewed the OMA OSE architecture document and founded it informative. It did however generate in our meeting a number of questions, based on our current understanding of OMA OSE, which are captured and provided as an attachment to this document. We could consider this list as one item for discussion during the joint activity in April.

**Conclusion**

Q.2/13 would like to thank OMA ARC WG and OMA TP for your positive feedback and looks forward to receiving a reply to our invitation to OMA experts to participate in one-day activity in Geneva during April 2007 ITU-T SG 13 meeting.

Attachment: Question list on OMA OSE

## **Attachment: Question list on OMA OSE**

### **OMA capabilities which could meet NGN Open Service Environment requirements ( Y.ngn-openenv)**

Currently, Question 2 of ITU-T Study Group 13 (Q.2/13) is investigating service and functional requirements for NGN open service environment. Detailed information about our work program will be provided during the joint activity. We would hope OMA experts can provide feedback on how OMA capabilities correspond to ITU-T NGN Open Service Environment requirements.

### **Interaction with 3<sup>rd</sup> party provider**

In NGN, service creation in conjunction with 3<sup>rd</sup> party provider is one of the important concepts. Application Network Interface (ANI) represents the channel between NGN and applications which are allowed to reside in 3<sup>rd</sup> party provider domain. Q.2/13 would appreciate if OMA provides their thought about such interaction between network operator and 3<sup>rd</sup> party provider. In particular, does OMA think scenarios in which multiple enablers interact each other, some of which are in NGN domain and some are in the 3<sup>rd</sup> provider domain. Clarification is also requested regarding the relation between the I0 plus P interface and an ANI.

### **Availability and integrity of I0 interface**

Since I0 is used at the interface between an enabler and the policy enforcer, should I0 be identified in every enabler? Has an I0 interface associated with each enabler already been specified? If so, how does OMA OSE achieve integrity of I0 when a new enabler is added?

### **Service coordination among enablers**

When an application (e.g. 3<sup>rd</sup> party provider application) would like to use multiple enablers, how does OMA OSE propose to resolve conflicts among enablers, if conflicts occur. The conflicts referred to here are restrictions of service offering if multiple enablers are about to be offered simultaneously to a single user. Are they resolved at the provisioning phase only, or at the phase when the application is invoked and in a real-time manner?

### **Inter-relationship among enablers**

Multiple enablers may have common components. Is it a design principle that common components should be isolated as much as possible from relevant enablers?

### **Relationship with SOA**

How does OMA OSE relate to basic Service Oriented Architecture concepts?

### **Relationship with Parlay**

How does OMA OSE relate to the OSA/Parlay environment?