



**APPROVED MEETING REPORT**  
**3GPP2 Steering Committee Meeting #23**  
**ARIB/CCSA/TIA/TTA/TTC**  
**May 24, 2004**  
**Via Teleconference**

---

**1. Opening**

The meeting was opened by the Chair, Dr. Hideo Okinaka (KDDI) at 7:05pm EDT.

**2. Attendance Registration**

Attendees were invited to announce themselves. A full list of those attending the meeting appears in contribution [SC-20040524-002r1](#), revised following the meeting and based on the information provided.

**3. Quorum Establishment/Call for Proxies**

The Secretary conducted the roll call of participating Individual Member (IM) companies, Organizational Partners (OPs) and Market Representation Partners (MRPs). Nineteen of the 25 quorum members were noted as present, constituting a 76% quorum.

**4. Approval of the Agenda**

The Chair invited participants to review the draft agenda for the meeting contained in contribution [SC-20040524-001r1](#). No comments were noted. The agenda was approved as presented.

**5. Contribution Assignment and Status**

The Chair invited participants to review contribution [SC-20040524-000](#) containing the list of contributions for the meeting. No comments were noted.

**6. SC Review of Vote and Comments regarding Work Item/Stage 1 and System Requirements Process Guidelines (known currently as S.R0070-A v1.0)**

*[Secretary's Note: All SC decisions and actions relative to consideration of contribution SC-20040524-003 are captured at the end of this agenda item].*

1 The Chair presented contribution [SC-20040524-003](#) consisting of comments  
2 submitted by Lucent Technologies, Nortel Networks and QUALCOMM  
3 during the SC review of the proposed Work Item/Stage 1 and System  
4 Requirements Process Guidelines submitted for Steering Committee review  
5 and comment by TSG-S. It was also noted that contribution [SC-20040524-  
6 003a](#) contains the text reviewed by the SC.  
7

8 Lucent Technologies noted that its “disapprove with comments” assessment  
9 was based on the need to accommodate Stage-1 review and comment by all  
10 TSGs, as noted in comments number one through number five in contribution  
11 [SC-20040524-003](#). Nortel Networks noted that its comment pertains to  
12 allowing ample time for TSGs and individual members to review and prepare  
13 comments, and is echoed in comment number seven submitted by Lucent  
14 Technologies. QUALCOMM noted that its comments were mainly editorial  
15 in nature.  
16

17 The Steering Committee then reviewed the proposed edits submitted by  
18 Lucent Technologies as contained in recommendations number six through  
19 number 10.  
20

21 Lucent recommendation #6

22 *Page 7; Line 15*

23 *Change from:*

24 *announcement is made to the TSG reflectors of which Stage 1 documents*  
25

26 *Change to:*

27 *announcement is made to all TSG reflectors of which Stage 1 documents*  
28

29 There was no objection to SC approval of this recommendation.  
30

31 Lucent recommendation #7.

32 *Page 7; Line 17*

33 *Change from:*

34 *review would be announced either 1 or 2 meetings cycles in advance to*  
35

36 *Change to:*

37 *review would be announced via all TSG reflectors at least 2 meetings cycles in*  
38 *advance to*  
39

40 The ensuing discussion sought to clarify whether the term “2 meeting cycles”  
41 was meant to be exclusive or inclusive of the meeting out of which the  
42 announcement of an impending review is circulated. It was noted, by way of  
43 example, that should a review be announced at the close of a January meeting,  
44 and assuming regularly-scheduled meetings are taking place in February and  
45 March, the review would be scheduled for the March meeting, i.e., two  
46 meeting cycles beyond the meeting from which a review is announced. It was  
47 recommended that TSG-S might be remanded the task of clarifying the  
48 wording by incorporating a clear example in the document. It was further  
49 recommended that only regularly scheduled meetings should be considered  
50 and that interim meetings are explicitly excluded from any calculations.  
51

1 There was no objection to SC approval of the recommendations, and of the  
2 proposal to remand to TSG-S the task of clarifying “two meeting cycles”.

3  
4 Lucent recommendation #8

5 *Page 8, Right Pull 1, Lines 3*

6 *Change from:*

7 *sent to all TSGs for information. TSGs*  
8 *are welcome to review the document.*

9  
10 *Change to:*

11 *sent to all TSGs for review and comment.*

12  
13 In the ensuing discussion KDDI offered a friendly amendment, modifying the  
14 proposed wording to read: “...*sent to all TSGs for information. All TSGs are*  
15 *welcome to review the document and to submit comments to TSG-S.*” Lucent  
16 Technologies accepted this friendly amendment.

17  
18 There was no objection to SC approval of this recommendation as amended.

19  
20 Lucent recommendation #9

21 *Page 8, Box 4, Line 2*

22 *Change from:*

23 *information.*

24  
25 *Change to:*

26 *review and comment.*

27  
28 In the ensuing discussion KDDI offered a friendly amendment, modifying the  
29 proposed wording to read: “...*Stage 1 submitted to TSGs for information and*  
30 *review/comment, if desired*” Lucent Technologies accepted this friendly  
31 amendment.

32  
33 It was noted that this modification would bring this section of the document in  
34 line with the previous adopted recommendation.

35  
36 There was no objection to SC approval of this recommendation as amended.

37  
38 Lucent recommendation #10

39 *Page 8, Right Pull 3, Line 2*

40 *Change from:*

41 *distributed to TSGs.*

42  
43 *Change to:*

44 *distributed to TSGs for review and comment.*

45  
46 In the ensuing discussion, KDDI offered a friendly amendment,  
47 recommending that the proposed wording be modified to read “*distributed to*  
48 *TSGs for review and comment if desired*” to reinforce that TSG comments are  
49 welcomed but not required.

50  
51 There was no objection to SC approval of this recommendation as amended.

52

1 A question was raised concerning the act of “desiring” to review and  
2 comment. Would this be left to the TSG Chair to determine, or to the  
3 collective TSG body?  
4

5 In response, it was noted that this would depend on each TSGs own working  
6 methods and that the Steering Committee has traditionally stayed away from  
7 telling TSGs how to operate. It was concluded that the process would need to  
8 be put to the test and evaluated by the membership accordingly.  
9

10 Nortel Networks comment:

11 *Page 7; Line 17*

12 *Change from: review would be announced either 1 or 2 meetings cycles in*  
13 *advance to*

14  
15 *Change to: review would be announced via TSG reflectors at least 2 meetings*  
16 *cycles in advance to*  
17

18 It was noted that this comment was accommodated during the review of  
19 Lucent Technologies’ comment number seven. Nortel Networks agreed.  
20

21 QUALCOMM comments:

22  
23 Qualcomm noted that their comments were mainly editorial in nature and  
24 requested that the Steering Committee remand them to TSG-S accordingly.  
25 There was no objection to this course of action.  
26

27 Summary of conclusions:  
28

29 **DECISION 2004/05-01**

30 In its consideration of contribution **SC-20040524-003**, consisting of collated  
31 comments submitted during SC review of S.R0070-A v1.0 - Work Item, Stage  
32 1 and System Requirements Process Guidelines, the Steering Committee  
33 agrees:

- 34 - To adopt the recommendations presented by Lucent Technologies as  
35 modified during the meeting;
- 36 - That the comment submitted by Nortel Networks is covered by the  
37 comments submitted by Lucent Technologies;
- 38 - To remand the comments submitted by QUALCOMM (all editorial) to  
39 TSG-S for further action.
- 40 - To adopt the outcome from TSG-S reflecting the above mentioned edits as  
41 the approved version of S.R0070-A v1.0 for posting on the 3GPP2 web  
42 site as a Steering Committee document.

43  
44 **ACTION 2004/05-01**

45 Noting the approval by the Steering Committee of Lucent’s recommendation  
46 number seven as noted in contribution **SC-20040524-003**, pertaining to the SC  
47 review of S.R0070-A v1.0, TSG-S is remanded the task of providing an  
48 example to clarify the meaning of “two meeting cycles.”  
49  
50

1 **ACTION 2004/05-02**

2 Noting that the comments submitted by QUALCOMM as presented in  
3 contribution **SC-20040524-003** are editorial in nature, the Steering Committee  
4 remands said comments to TSG-S for further treatment as needed.  
5

6 **7. Cooperation with OMA**  
7

8 The Chair indicated that his intent in covering this item during this meeting  
9 was due to two recent developments, namely the result of the 3GPP leadership  
10 meetings held in April in France, and the resolution adopted by the 9<sup>th</sup> Global  
11 Standards Collaboration meeting recently held in Seoul, Korea.  
12

13 Richard Robinson (Sprint) introduced contribution **SC-20040524-004**  
14 submitted by Sprint entitled “MMS Work Transfer to OMA” and noted that  
15 slide ten addresses the aforementioned 3GPP conclusions. He further noted  
16 that the contributor’s recommendation calls for the contribution to be relayed  
17 to the Organizational Partners in preparation for their face-to-face meeting in  
18 Warsaw next month.  
19

20 Additionally, it was pointed out by the Secretary that, at the recent Global  
21 Standards Collaboration (GSC) meeting held in Seoul, Korea, all SDOs  
22 present, which included most of the 3GPP2 Organizational Partners, strongly  
23 voiced their opposition to licensing practices such as those practiced by the  
24 OMA that discriminate between members and non-members.  
25

26 The Steering Committee was reminded, however, that the GSC is not a  
27 recognized decision-making body having any bearing over 3GPP2 activities  
28 and that 3GPP2 decisions are made by 3GPP2 itself.  
29

30 While contribution **SC-20040524-004** was not gone through in detail, concern  
31 was expressed that the copyright and IPR considerations expressed therein are  
32 presented as interpreted by this member company contributor who is not  
33 necessarily a copyright and IPR expert. It was further noted that relaying the  
34 contribution to the Organizational Partners at the present time might be  
35 premature in that it may signify that the Steering Committee endorses all of  
36 the claims made therein. Instead, it was recommended that the copyright and  
37 IPR analysis represented by Sprint be reviewed by legal counsel.  
38

39 In reviewing the discussions and the material provided, the Chair concluded  
40 that in matters related to copyright and intellectual property rights, the  
41 Steering Committee does need to seek guidance from the Organizational  
42 Partners, who have already discussed this issue independently in outside fora,  
43 and the Organizational Partners are expected to continue their discussions at  
44 their face-to-face meeting in June. He further noted that that since  
45 contribution **SC-20040524-004** has not yet been thoroughly reviewed by the  
46 Steering Committee, it should stay open at the Steering Committee level until  
47 the June 14 Steering Committee meeting in Warsaw where further discussion  
48 of MMS work transfer into OMA is scheduled to take place.  
49

50 A question was raised as to whether 3GPP2 groups should continue MMS-  
51 related work. The Chair reiterated the SC position that MMS-related work in  
52 3GPP2 should continue, until such time as outstanding issues have been

1 resolved and the decision has been made to transfer the work. It was further  
2 noted that the MMS-related work underway in 3GPP2 is aimed at getting  
3 3GPP2 to its next stable release, and this is intended to be the basis of any  
4 impending transfer of work to the OMA, should such transfer be authorized.  
5 Consequently, the work currently being undertaken by 3GPP2 needs to  
6 continue.

7  
8 In conclusion:

9  
10 **DECISION 2004/05-02**

11 The Steering Committee agrees to keep contribution SC-20040524-004 and  
12 004a (Sprint contribution regarding MMS Transfer of work to OMA) open at  
13 the Steering Committee level for further review and discussion at the June 14  
14 2004 3GPP2 SC meeting.

15  
16 **DECISION 2004/05-03**

17 The Steering Committee reaffirms that any MMS-related work underway in  
18 3GPP2 should continue, and any transfer will be evaluated pending the  
19 successful outcome of deliberations regarding general IPR-related  
20 considerations by the OPs, and pending an SC decision to transfer the work  
21 accordingly.

22  
23 **8. Any Other Business**

24  
25 Status of SC.R4002-0 v1.0 – MEID GHA Assignment Guidelines and  
26 Procedures

27  
28 *[Secretary's Note: New Item provided for information after approval of the*  
29 *agenda presented in contribution SC-20040524-001r1]*

30  
31 The Secretary communicated to the Steering Committee that following a series  
32 of meetings held with the Numbering JEM and within its own numbering ad-  
33 hoc group, TIA, in its role as Global Hexadecimal MEID Administrator, will  
34 shortly be introducing a proposed revision of SC.R4002-0 v1.0 "MEID GHA  
35 Assignment Guidelines and Procedures" for review by the Steering  
36 Committee. He further noted that Steering Committee members should be  
37 seeing a detailed e-mail on this item over the next few days.

38  
39 **9. Date of Next Meeting**

40  
41 It was noted that the next meeting of the Steering Committee is scheduled to  
42 take place in Warsaw, Poland on Monday, June 14. It is to be followed on  
43 Tuesday, June 15 by a one-day workshop held in conjunction with the CDMA  
44 Development Group (CDG) and the IA450 Association. This workshop will,  
45 in turn, be followed by the 3GPP2 OP meeting on Wednesday, June 16 2004.

46  
47 **10. Adjournment**

48  
49 There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned by the Chair at  
50 8:45pm EDT.