
3GPP TSG SA WG3 Security — S3#22
14 - 17 May 2002
Victoria, Canada

S3-020172

Report to SA3 on SA#15

Dear Colleagues

The main points arising from the SA#15 meeting, with respect to impact on SA3 are as follows:

1. It was noted that LI for IMS is somewhat behind schedule, both within SA3 and CN, and will not make R5. To my mind, those interested in ensuring that LI functionality is available in a timely fashion need to increase their effort in this area.
2. Considerable concern was expressed, especially by the CN chair, about our failure to meet a single integrity protection mechanism for IMS access. CN rated their completion rate in IMS access security as 0%. After much discussion in plenary, and attempts outside of plenary to get one of the proposals dropped, we decided at an ad-hoc that a vote should be held in SA3 to select one solution. Both Ericsson and Siemens agreed to this, as did I, and it was subsequently ratified by plenary. In outline, and in essence, the vote will be undertaken as follows:
 - by correspondence, and all votes to be cast by 27th March 2002
 - the proponent of that solution which receives the smallest number of votes will withdraw their proposal (this prevents us violating the 70% rule)
 - Vodafone will not vote unless there is a tie, in which case I will vote to select the winner
 - Eligibility to vote will be in accordance with 3GPP rules

Maurice will notify you of who can vote and will also tell you the method to be used to cast your vote.

The joint session with CN1 and CN4 at Fort Lauderdale will still be needed. Much needs to be explained to them if they are to complete their portion of the work by June.

3. SA1 has agreed to a joint session with us at our meeting in Victoria to discuss UE Functionality split and security for location services. I will agree an agenda with the chairman of SA1.
4. Non-Camel IST in WCDMA is causing problems. CN4 are asked to confirm that absolutely no changes to signalling will be required before it will be accepted.

-
5. I am to progress relaxation of use of Milenage with MCC.

 6. I did not, or at least now do not recall, getting an answer to my question 'who owns the stage 2 specification for DRM'.
 7. Our CR to 33.102 rel 99 to remove 'Transport Format Combination Control' was approved.
 8. Our CR's (four in all) to 33.107 were all approved.
 9. Our CR to 43.035 is on hold – see 4 above.
 10. Our CR's to 33.200 were both accepted – so we now have automatic key management for MAP security.
 11. Our specification TS 33.108 was noted for information. It is hoped that the CS handover interface will be available in June. The appendix G dealing with special requirements for the US can remain.
 12. Our TS 33.203 'Access Security for IP-based Services' was approved – well done all.
 13. Our TS 33.210 'Network Domain Security: IP Network Layer Security' was approved – again, well done.
 14. Both W1 changes (support for subscriber certificates and lawful interception) were approved.
 15. One CR to TS 33.203 was submitted by the Chair of SA1 – this was to remove the remark that the IMS provider may not be the network provider.

Attached: copy of my presentation

Michael Walker
15th March 2002