LIAISON STATEMENT

Title:	Dependencies between PoC XDM and CPCP	☒ Public ☐ Confidential LS[1]
Date:	4 Jan 2005	
To:	IETF XCON WG Adam Roach, adam@nostrum.com Alan Johnston, alan.johnston@mci.com	
Source:	PAG of the Open Mobile Alliance	
Send Replies to:	Petr Gotthard, PAG petr.gotthard@siemens.com Thanos Diacakis, Interim Chairman, PAG thanos.diacakis@openwave.com	
Contact(s):		
Attachments:	n/a	

1 Overview

The Open Mobile Alliance (OMA) is developing interoperable PoC (Push-to-Talk over Cellular) service based on the current work in the IETF XCON and other work groups. The PoC conferences are defined using PoC XDM (XML Document Management) protocol, which reuses the document structure "conference" described in [draft-ietf-xcon-cpcp-01].

The IETF XCON plans to rework the CPCP draft. For that purpose there is a meeting scheduled in Boston on 5/6 Jan 2005. This Liaison Statement can be used as an input for this meeting.

It summarizes the PoC XDM elements and highlights the elements that should be supported by the redesigned CPCP I-D. This paper additionally describes the problems identified in CPCP that affect the PoC XDM.

The intention is:

1) To help XCON prioritizing the work; the CPCP capabilities reused by OMA should preferably get higher priority to not endanger OMA deadlines;

2) To minimize the impacts of the change on the PoC XDM; the CPCP capabilities reused by OMA should not be extensively redesigned.

2 Proposal

The PoC Group is defined in [OMA-POC-CP] as "a predefined set of Users with its attributes. The Group is used for easy PoC Session establishment and/or for defining PoC Session access policy. Each Group is identified by its SIP URI."

Documents describing PoC groups and authorization policies are manipulated via XCAP.

---

[1] If the "Confidential LS" box is selected, this liaison statement is intended to be Confidential per agreement by OMA and the addressed organization. Neither side should make this communication available to non-members.

The following sections describe the PoC XDM elements. The CPCP elements, which are not mentioned in this paper, are not used in PoC XDM.

1. PoC Group Structure

Each document describing a pre-defined PoC Group has the following content:

(1) conference/settings/**conference-uri** — a unique SIP URI identifying the conference.

> Described in [draft-ietf-xcon-cpcp-01], section 4.3.1.

> The CPCP doesn't allow an XCAP client to download a conference definition for a particular <conference-uri>. The XCAP client has to know the XUI and document name to obtain a conference definition.

> This solution is inconvenient. The next revision of CPCP should preferably allow an XCAP client to download a conference definition only using the <conference-uri>.

> Additionally, the PAG WG was discussing whether and how the <conference-uri> could be shared among several resources. For example, whether and how a single SIP URI could be used to identity both the <rls-services> entry defined in [draft-ietf-simple-xcap-list-usage-03] and the <conference-uri> document.

> Andrew Allen (RIM): "it is primarily about the need to only have to distribute a single URI to everybody in the group for communication using all types of communication means".

(2) conference/info/**display-name** — a human readable text.

> Described in [draft-ietf-xcon-cpcp-01], section 4.3.2.

(3) conference/**dialout-list** — a list of end-users (SIP URI) and/or URI Lists (resource list references) who will be invited to a PoC Session.

> Described in [draft-ietf-xcon-cpcp-01], section 4.3.4.

> Each entry in a Dial-out list is a tuple consisting of a URI and an optional display name.

> Although the [CPCP] <dialout-list> element is used, the current structure of <dialout-list> doesn't satisfy the OMA requirements. The [draft-ietf-xcon-cpcp-01] doesn't allow uses to define a display name for dial-out list entries.

> In the next revision of CPCP the structure of <dialout-list> should preferably reuse the "rl:listType" defined in [draft-ietf-simple-xcap-list-usage-03].

(4) conference/settings/**max-participant-count** — a maximum number of end-users who can be active in the session.

> Described in [draft-ietf-xcon-cpcp-01], section 4.3.1.

2. Authorization policy

The conference authorization rules are based on [common-policy] IETF draft.

2.1 Conditions

The "conditions" section of authorization rules can contain

Page 2 (of 4)
[OMA-Template-LiaisonStatement-20040917]

(5) conference/ruleset/rule/conditions/**identity** — matches given identities.

> Described in [draft-ietf-geopriv-common-policy-02], section 7.1.

(6) conference/ruleset/rule/conditions/**external-list** — matches identities listed in a URI List (resource list reference).

> An OMA specific extension described in [OMA-XDM-Specification], section 6.6.1.

> The <external-list> condition defined by OMA duplicates the capabilities of the <cp-identity>/<external-list> element described in [draft-ietf-xcon-cpcp-01], section 4.3.7.1.4.2.

> The CPCP <external-list> can be used for conference policy only, while the PAG <external-list> can be used in any policy based on [common-policy]. There's no point in defining the <external-list> as a conferencing specific extension.

> The CPCP should define conferencing related [common-policy] extensions only. The CPCP should not define capabilities that were (due to the IETF architecture) explicitly listed by the GEOPRIV WG as non-goals of [common-policy], e.g. external references or all-except conditions.

> In the next revision of CPCP the <cp-identity> should preferably be removed from CPCP. If such extended conditions are needed also in IETF, a solution applicable to all policies based on [common-policy] should be developed and discussed with GEOPRIV.

> In PoC XDM the <external-list> condition should be kept as an OMA specific extension.

(7) conference/ruleset/rule/conditions/**other-identity** — matches "all other identities".

> An OMA specific extension described in [OMA-XDM-Specification], section 6.6.1. (See above.)

(8) conference/ruleset/rule/conditions/**is-on-dialout-list** — matches identities listed in the "dialout-list".

> Described in [draft-ietf-xcon-cpcp-01], section 4.3.7.1.11.

2.2   Actions

The "actions" section of authorization rules can contain

(9) conference/ruleset/rule/actions/**allow-conference-state** — instructs server to allow user(s) to subscribe to conference state events.

> Described in [draft-ietf-xcon-cpcp-01], section 4.3.7.2.1.

(10) conference/ruleset/rule/actions/**allow-invite-users-dynamically** — instructs server to allow user(s) to invite additional participants.

> Described in [draft-ietf-xcon-cpcp-01], section 4.3.7.2.5.

(11) conference/ruleset/rule/actions/**join-handling** — instructs server to allow user(s) to join the conference.

> Described in [draft-ietf-xcon-cpcp-01], section 4.3.7.2.3.

(12) conference/ruleset/rule/actions/**allow-initiate-conference** — instructs server to allow user(s) to initiate a new PoC Session; when a PoC Session is initiated, conferencing server invites people listed in "dialout-list"

The [draft-ietf-xcon-cpcp-01] doesn't define this element. The next revision of CPCP should preferably describe also the <allow-initiate-conference> element.

2.3   Transformations

The "transformations" section of authorization rules can contain

(13) conference/ruleset/rule/transformations/**provide-anonymity** — instructs server to hide identities of those participants who requested "Privacy=id".

Described in [draft-ietf-xcon-cpcp-01], section 4.3.7.3.6.

(14) conference/ruleset/rule/transformations/**is-key-participant** — indicates that the identity matching the rule is a "distinguished participant" defined in PoC.

Described in [draft-ietf-xcon-cpcp-01], section 4.3.7.3.1.

3   Requested Action(s)

The OMA PAG proposes the new revision of CPCP does not leave out any functionality that is re-used by PoC XDM.

The OMA PAG proposes to consider the above stated comments. The new revision of CPCP should preferably include the suggested modifications.

4   Conclusion

Thank you for cooperation.