
Title: Operators' Concerns over Service Requirements
Source: BT Wireless, E-plus, Hutchison 3G, J-Phone, KPN, NTT DoCoMo, One 2 One, Orange France, Orange UK, SBC Communications, Telecom Italia, Telefonica Moviles, Vodafone Group, GSM Association¹

At the recent SA1 #13 meeting in Lake Tahoe, it became clear that operators' attempts to generate new stage 1 specifications for services that have been under discussion for some time (e.g. Push and Streaming) were being strongly opposed by some manufacturers.

Some appear to prefer the situation where technical work is undertaken by 3GPP without stage 1 service requirement specifications. Several cases could be mentioned in which such strategy has been adopted:

- push services (developed by S2 disregarding most of the service requirements);
- service provider/operator name (feature developed by T3 without a service requirement)
- network selection improvements (discussed in an ad hoc held in parallel to the SA1 plenary between CN and RAN groups)
- Cell broadcast (enhancements developed by RAN 2 without clear service requirements)

Another tendency is to try to "downgrade" existing stage 1 descriptions to technical reports. Indeed, a further threat is the development of quasi-standards in fora outside 3GPP or other recognised standards bodies.

From an operator's point of view, stage 1 specifications represent the possibility to make sure that the development of a service is done according to the market requirements and to capture in a single document all the technical criteria necessary to make the service commercially viable. Equipment designed for meeting the requirements of a stage 1 description is guaranteed to provide consistency across different networks, deliver the desired user experience and to favour an open environment in which operators can procure equipment from different sources stimulating competition and innovation.

Increasingly, new services are tool-based rather than exactly specified. These tools still need clear stage 1 specifications to define their operation and this functionality is of particular interest to operators. Nevertheless, stage 1 specifications should generally state requirements for what is needed, avoiding too much detail on how to achieve this, except where this is necessary to achieve the aim, as with some tools.

¹ The UMTS Forum supports in principle the concepts in this contribution. The Forum will conduct further analysis of the issues in order to achieve a formal position as a MRP.

Operators that participate in SA1 have spoken together and have decided to produce this input to SA #13 in order to highlight our concerns. They request that all manufacturers participating in 3GPP listen to service requirements clearly expressed by the operators and not try to push ahead with technical development without such requirements. It is hoped to broaden the support provided by the operators to achieve this.

Conclusions:

1. 3GPP must endeavour to ensure that all new and updated features which have a service impact should be in accordance with clear stage 1 specifications
2. SA1 must support this by all members working together to achieve comprehensive and timely stage 1 specifications
3. SA1 should work more closely with the MRPs to identify market based service requirements. Work with no clear market requirement should not be performed!