VOTE: Abstain.   Grounds: the relationship to NGOSS Lifecycle is not established in the released documents e.g. in the NGOSS context diagrams used; the MTOSI methodology document couldn’t be found either in the MTOSI folders.  It is thus not possible to establish whether the “work is done correctly and no negative impacts are introduced against other programs or strategy, or IPR issues etc.”  In particular with respect to the

NGOSS Lifecycle of GB927,

MTOSI Release 2.0 covers aspects of both the NGOSS lifecycle business and system views. The various Business Agreement documents in MTOSI Release 2.0 have a combination of first order business requirements and then many second order requirements (derived from the first order requirements) that are best classified as being requirements on the system view. The IA and IIS are cover the system view. SD2-1, MTOSI Implementation Statement, and SD2-2, *XML Implementation User Guide*, cover aspects of the implementation view. We don’t have any deployment guidelines at this point.

SID GB922/926

With respect to the SID model, the MTOSI Service Basic DDP has made extensions to the GB922 Service Model addendum. These extensions have been agreed with the SID team but have not yet been added to a SID release. Concerning the resource model, there are been a large number of CRs accepted by the CCB concerning alignment between the SID and MTOSI-MTNM resource models in the area of equipment (see CRs 289, 290, and 291), external plant (see CR 272 and note that support for external plant is not previously covered by the SID model or MTOSI), and connectivity and TPs (see CRs 269, 280 and 282) modelling. These changes, however, have not yet been made in either the SID resource models (PR and LR) or the MTOSI – MTNM implementation model (TMF 612 and 608, respectively).

and relationship of MTOSI to the NGOSS views and information models for its developed data models in these interfaces. What are these interfaces in the context of the NGOSS Lifecycle – I can hazard a guess but it would be good for the documents to say what that is?

Ditto wrto ETSI TISPAN interfaces definitions.

Not sure what specific document/interfaces you have in mind. Can you send us the document(s) so that we can have a look?

Points to note:

1. The link provided sends you to the folder [Release 2.0BA]Files which does not contain the Basics Artifact submission form, you need folder ‘Release 2,0ME’. Probably a bit late to answer this one, but it appears that the Base Artifact form is now at PermaLink <http://www.tmforum.org/cws/helper_controls/download.aspx?ID=13070&team_ID=6>. I agree that it was not and still has not been placed in the [MTOSI](http://www.tmforum.org/cws/view_folder.aspx?SelectedIndex=1&team_ID=6&ID=9) / [Submitted Documents](http://www.tmforum.org/cws/view_folder.aspx?SelectedIndex=1&team_ID=6&ID=377) / [Release 2.0BA](http://www.tmforum.org/cws/view_folder.aspx?SelectedIndex=1&team_ID=6&ID=3378) directory.

2. RN306\_MTOSI\_Release2.0BAv0\_0\_1[1].pdf:   p.13 text stating “Figure 1-7 depicts an example where a CRM OS sends service activation requests to an SC&A OS using the SAI” and the diagram colour coding of figure 1-7 is inconsistent with the p.8 statement “”In those figures the OS in red represents the requestor OS”. Well, two problems here. I first went to check what version of RN306 was released in the member evaluation and surprise, a two page summary was released instead of RN306. So, we first need to fix this. The next problem is what you mentioned and this has not yet been corrected. Since Michel is on vacation for the next few weeks, we will need to wait until he gets back. I could make the change but am not sure what directory or even what server (CWS vs. GForge) to affect and I don’t want to mess up Michel.