**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

**3GPP TSG_CN#6** **NP-99412**
**ETSI SMG3 Plenary Meeting #6,**
**Nice, France**
**13th – 15th December 1999**

# Report of the
# 3GPP TSG-N WG1 MM/CC/SM (UI) / Meeting #8
# 25-29 October 1999
# Kobe, Japan

| | |
|---|---|
| Chairman: | Hannu Hietalahti (Nokia), Hannu.hietalahti@nokia.com |
| Secretary: | Ban Al-Bakri (3GPP-support team/ETSI)mailto:Ban.albakri@etsi.fr |
| Host: | NTT - DoCoMo |
| List of participants: | see annex A |
| List of agreed CRs: | see annex B |
| List of agreed Outgoing Liaison Statements | see annex C |
| Technical document-list (CN1-Tdoclist#8) | ftp://ftp.3gpp.org/TSG_CN/WG1_mm-cc-sm/TSGN1_08/Documents |
| Report of the Chairman | ftp://ftp.3gpp.org/TSG_CN/WG1_mm-cc-sm/TSGN1_08/Reports/Kobe9910.rtf |
| Documents could be found on: | ftp://ftp.3gpp.org/TSG_CN/WG1_mm-cc-sm/TSGN1_08/Documents |

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

## Meeting's Highlights:

Due to many input liaison statements to this meeting, the chairman had already prepared some answers to the ones, which do not need reactions from N1. Also this is inline with the decision made by TSGS#5 to reduce the amount of time spent on LS's during the WG meetings. The chairman asked the delegates to comment on any LS that they see a necessity to as we go through them.

TR30.810 for QoS , Duncan Mills/Vodafone is nominated as the contact person from N1 to the S2 rapporteur Mr. Chris Putney for this IGC specification. Mr.Takashi Koshimizu / NTT DoCoMo as N1 rapporteur for 30.802 (QoS) ad-hoc group and Hannu Hietalahti / Nokia as N1 rapporteur for 30.804 (GSM-UMTS interworking and MM).

*By the end of the meeting 3 delegates volunteered as rapporteurs for TSes under N1's responsibility:*

- Mr. Richard Brook/ Lucent for 03.71
- Mr. Rouzbeh Farhoumand/ Ericsson for 23.009
- Mrs. Sonia Doshi / Nortel for 04.71

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

QoS adhoc meeting has taken place after the regular hours of CN1#8 meeting to establish WA in N1-99C93.

CN#9 meeting will take place in Germany 30.11-3.12/ 99 hosted by Siemens. On the 29.11.99, GPRS ad-hoc meeting is proposed by Siemens. The proposal was found not necessary.

UMTS-GSM Interworking ad-hoc proposed by Nokia as informal drafting session to discuss the interworking issues and prepare to the next meeting. 22.Nov-24.Nov. It will take place in Oulu, Finland, hosted by Nokia.

Work Items:
Till the next Plenary, it should be clear which WI's are complete, and which we can complete till E99, which will be postponed to R00. Outstanding status of WI should be defined to the next meeting CN#9
There will be 2 categories of R99 one will be moved to R00, the other some WI s will still in R99 although it would have some missing distribution.

Email discussion for QoS should be done before the UMTS-GSM interworking ad-hoc, See N1-99C36.

EDGE impacts 03.22 as well, where edge is not a UMTS WI. so a solution could be found ex. Making EDGE as a WI!!.

# 1 Opening of the Meeting

The TSG WG1 Chairman, Mr. Hannu Hietalahti opened the eighth meeting of the 3GPP TSG-N WG1 on MM/CC/SM issues. He welcomed the delegates and thanked DoCoMo/NTT for hosting this meeting in Kobe/Japan.
The host, Mr. Mr.Takashi Koshimizu/ DoCoMo/NTT welcomed the delegates and explained some logistics for the meeting.

# 2 Agenda approval and document allocation

**Tdoc N1-99B40** is the Agenda for TSGN WG1 meeting #8. It also covers the allocation of documents to the agenda items. This document is gradually evolved to the chairman's report known as Kobe9910.rtf

The agenda was agreed as shown in Kobe9910 (N1-99B40).

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

## *2.1 Reports from other meetings*

### Tdoc N1-99B42 Draft Meeting Report of TSG_CN #5 / SMG3 Plenary/ MCC

The chairman presented the report, mentioning that it was held in Kores/Kyongju, chaired by Mr. Harald Dettner and the secretary was David Boswarthick.
Attention to item 4 is stressed by the chairman:
1) It is about the IGC (Inter Group Co-ordination), which is described in NP-99265-3GPP Programme Management for R99 and R2000.
The chairman is the contact person for all groups which has N1 responsibility at the moment. He would like to keep his responsibility for the UMTS - GSM interworking group but he invited the delegates to volunteer to share responsibility of N1 towards the other IGC groups. So rapportuers/ reference persons from N1 are required.
2)NP-99271, revised to NP-99380,- Summary of CN Work Items. List of WIs are mentioned. The chairman asked the delegates to review it and response to support the list.
3)NP-99312, revised to NP-99384, another list of documents describing specifications allocation within CN working groups. It was mentioned that, ex. 03.60 was transferred to TSGS WG2 and rapportuers are invited to apply for responsibility for support..
4)NP-99251 - Maintenance of earlier releases of 2G GSM versions of specifications. Maintenance of early releases tread in N1for SMG3-WPA was proposed. TSG documents will be subject for approval in TSG plenary. We still need to wait to SMG plenary meeting to approve SMG - GSM specifications.

The chairman declared the status of TSGN WG1 related issues:
- He mentioned that the specifications 04.07 and 04.011 for all releases are responsibility of N1 from now on.
- N1 was asking the plenary to solve out of band transcoder control issue in Tdoc NP-99275. No decision on how to proceed was taken. The supporting companies were asked to provide more information
- SIM toolkit lack of information was mentioned to be reported by the CN plenary chairman to the SA plenary. Indicating that ack of service requirements for SIM toolkit initiated transactions. S1 has not yet provided this information to N1and no progress could be made on this issue in N1. But in this meeting, CN1#8, we have 2 LS's from S1 and S3.
- MS Classmark split, questions to RAN group were forwarded as discussion basis in this area. Feed back was given to the Chairman which answer some questions in N1-99C75.
-NP-99256, revised to NP-99344, - LS from N1 to TSG_CN on Freezing Release 97 and Release 98. On this subject, N2 had input too. Difference from N1 is the CAMEL WI which is impacted in this phase. The result is attached as an input LS in this meeting in N1-99B44.
-NP99264 - S2s response to a N1 Liaison statement on PLMN selection for GPRS MS was an important issue. Background, we forwarded a suggestion to SMG #29 which was

rejected, but we discussed the matter again in N1 and we went with the same CR to TSGN, but it seems that it was not a good idea! We are liasioning SMG2 WPA because work could not be completed. It is preferred to make a third mode, which could be configured by the user. No other proposal was presented but the N1 proposal was rejected.

-Approval of CRs:

ASCI: all CRs were approved.

GPRS: 2 CRs were taken out of the set of the list. All main ones were approved.

NP-99274 - CR to 24.008 on Paging Response as a MM message The plenary were not happy because not enough information on backward compatibility. So, more background information is required from N1 on this issue. The CR is not rejected, it is postponed.

NP-99328 - CR to 03.22 on PLMN Selection for GPRS mobiles was rejected

EDGE: all CRs were approved

CR to 24.007 on Using MM sublayer for PS-SMS message transfer was presented for information. Plenary decision was N1 is to give more background on this issue, where it was seen that the working assumptions were not clear enough.

- WI approval: Turbo charger feasibility study NP-99272 was presented, revised to NP-99346 and approved.

## Tdoc N1-99B43 TSG S #5 Highlight/ MCC

Overview of TSG#5 results was prepared by MCC/Mr. Maurice Pope- TSGS secretary and presented by CN1 secretary

The highlights covered:

- Vocabulary Document, where a single common vocabulary document will be maintained and all TSG WGs are invited to give input.
- ITU-T ad-hoc Group
- Content of Release 1999 A Template for incomplete Release 1999 work is provided in Annex A of SP-99468.
- Content of Release 2000 onwards
- Management of 3GPP Work Program. A model of Features, Building Blocks and Work Tasks is presented
- Handling of Change Requests
- Presentation of TSs and TRs to TSGs. A Template will be provided by MCC for this
- “Leaders” e-mail exploder list
- “Informal Liaison” policy
- Electronic (paperless) working
- 3GPP “Working day” principles. A 10-hour maximum meeting day is provided as a guideline for meetings
- Next TSG Meetings. WG and SWG meetings should not be held within 1 week of the TSG meeting (before or after) in order to allow the MCC Support to prepare for the TSG and to update specifications after the TSG.

The presented document was noted.

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

# 3 Input Liaison Statements

## Tdoc N1-99B44 Liaison statement on freezing GSM Release 97 & Release 98/ TSG N

This LS is carbon copied to TSG-N WG1
TSG-N have noted the concern of TSG-N WG1 and TSG-WG2 that the number of change requests against GSM specifications (especially CAMEL and GPRS) for Release 97 & Release 98 is so high that implementers do not have a stable base for their work. We have to accept that after SMG#30 it will not be acceptable to change GSM Release 98 or earlier releases except to deal with serious technical errors
The Chairman presented the document informing the results from the plenary, where it was originated from N1 to the plenary. He also mentioned that N1 approached the plenary with a similar one to ours so both points to one result LS.
Conclusion: Noted

## Tdoc N1-99B48 Response liaison on RAB requirements for CS data and architecture for CS data services/ TSG S WG2

TSGN WG1 is carbon copied
The QoS ad-hoc works under SA WG2. It has produced TR23.907, which covers the UMTS QoS Concept and Architecture. Chapter 5 of the document states that GSM CC bearer capability information element is used in the CS domain of UMTS release'99 and chapter 6 specifies applicable value ranges.
Answer for some questions by N3 were answered by S2.
The chairman presented the LS, S2 answers N3 questions on RAB requirements.
Linked with B63, B75
Discussion: No comments.
Conclusion: Noted

## Tdoc N1-99B49 Liaison Statement on SAT/MExE <-> CAMEL Interworking / Traceability/ TSG S1

LS is sent to TSGN WG1/SMG3-WPA.
S1 thanks SMG3 WPA for the liaison asking for guidance on the traceability service requirements, and would like to clarify the addressed issues, which could be found in the document.
Hannu summarised.
Discussion: With S1 answering our questions on SAT transcoder, N1 should be able to proceed with its work now.
First thing for us is to:

- put Working Assumptions according to the capability of the SIM,
- SS adhoc should be involved for SS ,
- also a rapporteur is required for this.

Conclusion: LS is left as for now for no rapporteur is volunteered
For more information, please refer to N1-99C70 and N1-99C71

### Tdoc N1-99B50 Liaison Statement concerning the DRX parameter IE in GSM 24.008/ SMG2 WPA

LS is sent to TSGN WG1/SMG3-WPA.
SMG2 WPA has in Tdoc SMG2 1113/99 agreed the change request A634 and A636 updating the DRX parameter SPLIT PG CYCLE CODE in TS 04.08 v6.4.2 and TS 04.08 v 7.1.2.
SMG2 WPA now kindly asks SMG3WPA to endorse this CR and update TS 24.008 v 3.0.0.accordingly.
CR for 24.008 is attached: Clarification of DRX /Ericsson
CRs fir R97 and R98 are already agreed by SMG2-WPA.
The approved CR 05.02-A076 tried to clarify the use of DRX. There is however still some uncertainties. In 04.60, the terms non-DRX mode and DRX-mode are used. The same terms should therefore be defined in 05.02. Also, since 04.60 specifies occasions when the MS shall use DRX-mode, all MSs must have an DRX-mode. Therefore it should not be possible to negotiate "no DRX". The corresponding value should be changed to SPLIT_PG_CYCLE = 704 which in practice is the same.
Discussion: GPRS category is requested, also what happens if we do not agree this CR!
Discussion2: If not agreed SMG2 WPA should change the specifications again.
Conclusion: postponed/ agreed LS back to SMG2WPA in D23+ CR 047 /24.008 in D24
It needs a CR number if agreed.

### Tdoc N1-99B51 Liaison Statement on Issues with Multiple PDP Contexts/ SMG2 WPA

LS is sent to SMG3-WPA.
In response to the liaison statement received from SMG7 GPRS in Tdoc SMG2 1284/99, SMG2 WPA would like to give the answer to question 5.
The chairman presented, SMG2 answer to SMG7 question on multiple PDP contexts
Discussion: None
Conclusion: Noted

### Tdoc N1-99B52 Response to Liaison statement on PLMN selection for GPRS MS/ SMG2 WPA

LS is sent to TSGN WG1/SMG3-WPA.
ETSI SMG2 has received your LS on PLMN selection for GPRS MS (TDoc. TSGN1-99835, SMG2 1156/99), and would like to inform you of the SMG2 reasons to maintain its opposition to approval of CR A032 r2 to 03.22 titled "PLMN Selection for GPRS Mobiles".
SMG2 is of the opinion that the CR introduces a new functionality into Releases ´97 and ´98 which are functionally frozen. Furthermore, SMG2 cannot find this functionality in GSM 02.11.

For completeness the following is copied from a previous LS from SMG2 to SMG3-WPA on this issue:

> Two modes for PLMN selection are mandatory, manual and automatic. In addition the MS manufacturer is allowed to implement other options so that the user can define his own lists of preferred PLMNs according to information of coverage for the required service available from the operator. It could also be possible to update these lists by the specified SIM toolkit.
> SMG2 believes that the use of such methods is a better way to achieve the wanted goal then to base the PLMN selection on BCCH information read on one cell.

The chairman presented. SMG2 response to N1 LS in TSGN1-99835. This was seen in TSGN #5 and consequently 03.22 CR A032 r2 was rejected.
Discussion: None
Conclusion: Noted

### Tdoc N1-99B54 LS on management of TLLI during P-TMSI reallocation procedure/ SMG2 WPA

This LS was sent to TSG-N WG1/SMG3 WPA.
In response to the liaison statement received from TSG-N WG1/SMG3 WPA in Tdoc SMG2 1319/99, SMG2 WPA has taken into consideration the issues raised by Tdoc SMG2 1198/99 ("Clarifications on the management of old and new TLLI", source: Alcatel, Lucent Technologies, Motorola) and Tdoc N1-99a94 (source: Siemens AG). Basically 3 issues are identified in this LS.
Discussion: Discussion is still going on the email exploder. The chairman asked the delegates if there is anything we can help during this meeting? No comments on the LS at the moment so we are not able to achieve much on this are in this meeting
Conclusion: Note the LS and we do not need to send LS to reply. The interested delegates are encouraged to participate on the discussion on the mailing list

### Tdoc N1-99B55 Liaison Statement on addition of 3rd MNC digit in routing area identification/ SMG2WPA

This LS was sent to TSG-N WG1
SMG2 WPA thank TSG CN WG1 of their liaison statement on addition of 3rd MNC digit in routing area identification , dealing with the completion of the release '98 work item "GPRS phase 1 for PCS 1900" Tdoc SMG2 956/99 ( N1-99803). This LS included Tdoc N1-99706 as a proposed CR on 04.08 and the corresponding CR to release '99 (TS 24.008).
SMG2 WPA reviewed the proposed CRs, and agreed to them, correcting the CR number onto 0408-A664 and the corresponding CR 0418-A023 .
Then SMG2-WPA corrected 08.18 by replacing the table by a reference to the correct table in 04.08; this correction associated to other ones, in CR 0818-A069r1 on v 6.4.0 (Tdoc SMG2 1359/99), and CR 08.18-A070r1 on v 7.0.0 (Tdoc SMG2 1360/99). .
Also 04.60 has been updated by CR 04.60-A424 on R98 v 7.0.0 (Tdoc SMG2 897/99), and CR 04.60-A425 on R99 v 8.0.0.

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

Enclosed Tdocs :
CR 04.08-A664
CR 04.18-A023
as well as :
SMG2 897/99 CR 04.60-A424 v 7.0.0
SMG2 898/99 CR 04.60-A425 v 8.0.0
SMG2 1359/99 CR 08.18-A069r1 v 6.4.0
SMG2 1360/99 CR 08.18-A070r1 v 7.0.0
The chairman presented, SMG2 agree our proposal to add the 3rd MNC digit to GPRS IEs
Discussion: None
Conclusion: Noted

### Tdoc N1-99B56 Answer to Liaison statement on LS on the FLUSH-LL procedure defined in GSM 08.18 for GPRS/ SMG2 WPA

In response to the liaison statement received from SMG3 WPA / TSG CN1 GPRS in Tdoc SMG2 958/99, SMG2 WPA has considered two solutions so far; but this is still an open issue and other solutions may be foreseen before any decision.
The first solution is a change to GMM similar to what was proposed at CN1 (in Tdoc N1-99791) replacing RAI by 'Routeing Area Colour'. The second solution is a BSSGP solution, which involves changes to 08.18 and 04.64 (changes to the service-access-point between LLC and BSSGP at the SGSN).
Discussion: Ericsson presented indicating that in CN#6 this subject was presented. Here in this LS Vodafone is giving more details about how to make it possible. Ericsson supports it. Status by SMG2 WPA is to be followed as the chairman suggested and accepted by the delegates. There is nothing to be added by N1 at the moment.
Conclusion: Noted.

### Tdoc N1-99B57 Liaison Statement L3 segmentation/ SMG2 WPA

(Where Tdoc N1-99B53 is withdrawn)
This LS is sent to 3GPP TSG N1
SMG2 WPA thank 3GPP TSG N1 of their liaison statement on L3 segmentation, asking SMG2 WPA if it would be possible to increase the 251 octet limit in 04.06 for Release 99.
Due to the short time, the delegates present at the SMG2 WPA meeting was unable to provide a firm answer to the question.
Then, back at home, investigations will be made, in order to indicate if it is possible to increase the limit, and what may be the maximum value allowed.
The matter will then be revisited at the next SMG2 meeting at ETSI, 22-26 November 1999.
The chairman presented, SMG2 WPA say they have not yet studied the matter in detail but promise to do so later.
Discussion: None
Conclusion: Noted

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

## Tdoc N1-99B58 LS on Service/Baseline Implementation Capabilities/ TSG CN SS ad hoc

This LS was sent to TSGN WG1
The TSG CN SS ad hoc have studied the LS from TSG CN WG1 (N1-99B33) on Service/Baseline Implementation Capabilities. During the review of the table related to Terminal Service Implementation Capabilities of the NAS the following comments were identified.

- TSG CN SS ad hoc have identified that the "network initiated MO call" is missing in the table related to Terminal Service Implementation Capabilities. This feature is a basic functionality to support the CCBS supplementary service. It is assumed by the SS ad hoc that the CCBS supplementary service is a part of Release 99. Therefore it shall be added to the table as an optional service capability for terminals supporting speech, fax and cs data.
- TSG CN SS ad hoc would like to ask for further clarification related to the entries for the "Generic Procedure for the control of SS".
  The section "Generic Procedure for the control of SS" of 3G TS 24.010 defines generic handling of call related as well as call independent supplementary service operations. The procedures for call independent supplementary service operations are mandatory for terminals supporting supplementary service (as covered by the table). However call related supplementary service procedures are an optional service capability for terminals supporting speech, fax and/or cs data.
  TSG CN SS ad hoc would like to highlight that there are - in addition to the generic procedures defined in 3G TS 24.010 - specific procedures for supplementary services defined in the corresponding stage 3 specifications (24.072, 24.08x-series, 24.09x-series). It is assumed that the support of those specific supplementary service procedures is an optional service capabilitiy on a per service basis.
- The comment regarding the CFU supplementary service for the " Generic Procedure for the control of SS" and the "SS Support procedure" was not understood. TSG CN SS ad hoc is not aware of any requirements for terminals supporting the speech teleservice to support the CFU supplementary service.

The chairman presented, SS Ad-hoc comments to T2 on terminal capabilities.
Discussion: None
Conclusion: Noted

## Tdoc N1-99B59 liaison statement to N1 on addition of 3rd MNC digit in routing area identification/ TSG N2

This LS was sent to TSGN WG1
TSG-N2 thank TSG-N1 for their liaison statement (N1-99803) on addition of 3rd MNC digit in routing area identification.

We have checked GSM 09.02 and GSM 09.60. We are pleased to report that GSM 09.02 already has the necessary text to deal with the transport of 2-digit or 3-digit MNCs wherever necessary.
Unfortunately the position of GSM 09.60 is not so satisfactory. Earlier this year, SMG3 WP'C' and T1P1.5 developed a CR to GSM 09.60 to provide for the transport of 2-digit or 3-digit MNCs wherever necessary, and this CR was agreed by the TSG-N plenary in Sophia Antipolis at the end of May. However, because of a misunderstanding between TSG-N and T1P1.5, the CR was not presented to SMG #29 for approval. We will ensure that the CR **is** presented to SMG #30.
Discussion: None
Conclusion: Noted

### Tdoc N1-99B60 Liaison statement to N1 and S1 on multicall and enhancement of call barring services/ TSG N2

This LS was sent to TSGN WG1
TSG-N2 thank TSG-N1 for their liaison statement (N1-99872) on multicall and enhancement of call barring services.
We (N2) have noted that the stage 1 for multicall (TS 22.135) is not yet stable – the current version is 1.0.0. This means that we are not able in N2 to make progress with the development of the stage 2 and 3 specifications.
Specifically, it is not clear whether the service requirement is for the user to be able to control the limit on the number of simultaneous calls in a multicall configuration, or whether it would be acceptable for the limit to be set as a subscription option, or indeed whether the limit could be generic, with the only subscription option being whether multicall is possible at all. Until that aspect of the service requirement is stable, we believe it would be premature to decide that an enhancement to the Call Barring supplementary service is the best method to limit the number of simultaneous calls in a multicall configuration.
Discussion: None
Conclusion: Noted

### Tdoc N1-99B61 LS on Active Location Retrieval in CAMEL Phase 3/ TSG N2A

This Ls is sent to 3GPP TSG N1
Currently in CAMEL phase 3 the Active Location Retrieval (ALR) functionality is based on the LCS mechanisms. In order to offer the ALR to a network that does not support LCS, N2 would like to study the possibility to perform the Active Location Retrieval using existing MAP operations with an additional parameter and modified behaviour in the MSC/VLR. The mechanism would be the following:
The gsmSCF (CSE) sends an operation MAP_AnyTimeInterrogation to the HLR. This operation contains the new parameter "Current Location".
The HLR sends an operation MAP_ProvideSubscriberInfo to the MSC. This operation also contains the new parameter "Current Location".

As the "CurrentLocation" parameter is present, the MSC pages the MS. If the information is available, the MSC inserts the current location of the MS in the parameter "CurrentLocation" of the MAP_ProvideSubscriberInfo ack operation.
The information is relayed back to the gsmSCF with the MAP_AnyTimeInterrogation ack operation.
N2 would like N1 to study the feasibility and the impact of the point 3.
Discussion: The chairman presented. He indicated that, it seems like new functionality as part of LCS, where the CAMEL PH3 application wants to know the current location and not the network. They are trying to pass location information from the mobile, which does not support LCS as in paragraph 1.
Some discussion about paging took place indicating type of paging which might be indicated to the user to get the Cell-ID information so in this case the user will be involved in the service. The paging procedure was also mentioned indicating that it is to page the mobile and wait to the paging response with the Cell-ID. About the cell information in this case reaching the MSC, it was not clear whether the MSC use the Cell-ID information or does it need to convert it? Concerns about privacy issue, where not clear in this case too how it would be handled.
Conclusion: Noted LS out in N1-99C80 will be prepared by Lucent to N2

### Tdoc N1-99B62 Liaison statement to S2 and N1 on combined mobility management/ TSG N2B

This LS was sent to N1.
TSG-N2 thank TSG-S2 for their liaison statement (S2-99947) on the combined MAP operations.
TSG-N2 have discussed contributions on the core network signalling and network entity behaviour for combined mobility management, and we have made useful progress; many of the questions in S2-99947 have been resolved, but others are under discussion. However there is still a significant amount of work to be done in TSG-N2, and it is probable that the work would not be completed before the TSG plenary meetings in December 1999.
Furthermore, TSG-N2 are not confident that the work for combined mobility management in Release 99 would be limited to N2; it is possible that work would also be needed in TSG-N1. TSG-N2 assume that TSG-S2 have also asked TSG-N1 to comment on the impact of combined mobility management on TSG-N1's work area.
Discussion: None
Conclusion: Noted. Related to N1-99B79.

### Tdoc N1-99B63 LS on RAB requirements for CS data/ TSG-N3

This LS was not sent to N1, it is here by mistake!!
N3 has been studying the requirements on RABs that are needed to provide CS data bearers in UMTS. This work is based on the requirements to provide CS UMTS bearer services (BS) corresponding to the existing Bearer Services in GSM and an appropriate UMTS BS for supporting a multi media service. The RABs have been identified by

proposing a mapping of the UMTS Bearer Capability Information Element (BC-IE) to QoS values for the RABs used for corresponding UMTS BS2.
Current Assumptions
The specification of the GSM BC IE is used as UMTS BC IE (S2-99523, N1-99770). Multimedia bearer is identified by a new point code in the BC IE parameter 'other rate adaptation'.
Discussion: None
Conclusion: Noted. Related to N1-99B74 and N1-99B75.

### Tdoc N1-99B64 Response to N2 LS on Tandem Free and Out of Band Transcoder Control/ TSG-S4 (Codec Working Group)

This LS is sent to 3GPP TSG N1
S4 welcome the activities aiming through Out-of-Band means at enabling Tandem Free Calls. This will enable Tandem Free Operation from Call Set-up to Call Release in a very clean way.
S4 has looked and analyzed the N2 Liaison Statement (N2-99976) and especially its attached technical report.
The rest of this document contains comments on the mentioned technical report as well as some issues that S4 believe should be considered by N2 when developing the specifications related to the Out-of-Band control of the Transcoders.
S4 would appreciate if N2 could keep them informed on the progress of N2 activities on the control of the Transcoders.
Conclusion: S4 understand that certain aspects of the Physical Layer for the speech services can have some impact on TFO or TrFO independently of the Out-of-Band or In-Band approach. We feel that it is important that N2 and S4 collaborate on these aspects, especially since most of them were assessed and taken into account in the context of the In-Band TFO work carried out for GSM[1]. S4 consider that the complexity of the In-band TFO protocol essentially comes from the flexibility and constraints introduced on the physical layer of the Air Interface; Maximum of 4 modes in the AMR Active Codec Set, freedom for network manufacturers to support any set of AMR codec modes, alternating transmission of Codec Mode Requests and Codec Mode Indications. It is still unclear if the UTRAN will not have similar limitations. An out-of-band protocol for TFO or TrFO will also have to consider these constraints, for 3G-3G or 2G-3G interoperability.
Furthermore we understand that TFO and TrFO may not be transparent to the RAN and we may have to involve TSG-RAN (R2 and R3) and S2.
Comment by the chairman:
Plenary agreed. Enhanced WI description for Out-of-band transcoder control in Tdoc NP-99292, TR in NP-99288. CC: to TSGN
Discussion: None
Conclusion: Noted

[1] Note that the maintenance of the GSM In-Band TFO specifications is being transferred from SMG11 to S4.

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

### Tdoc N1-99B65 Response to LS on "Definitions for usage of Multi-mode/system terminals"/ TSG RAN WG2

This LS was copied to TSGN WG1.
TSG RAN WG2 thanks TSG T2 SWG5 for requesting comment on its proposed definitions and agrees that definitions in that direction are useful.
TSG RAN WG2 would like to point out that some definitions redefined by T2 are currently in use in other groups.
Discussion: None
Conclusion: None

### Tdoc N1-99B66 Proposed LS on Uplink core network layer 3 message numbering/ RAN2

This LS was sent to TSGN WG1.
RAN WG2 would like to thank CN1 for their liaison statement on Uplink core network layer 3 message numbering, proposing to extend the current MSC mechanism so as to allow a longer window size for signaling messages.
On the question on whether it is feasible to use the proposed mechanism, it was felt that it is probably feasible, although a formal analysis was not made by lack of time.
RAN WG2 intends to complete its work on the necessary support by the UTRAN radio interface protocols of MSC signaling at its next meeting 5-8th of November 1999. RAN WG2 will work on the basis of the information provided in the LS from CN1, and will inform CN1 of the results of its work.
Discussion: None
Conclusion: Noted

### Tdoc N1-99B67 Reply LS on registration areas and on hierarchical tracking concept/ RAN2

This LS was copied to TSGN WG1.
3GPP TSG RAN working group 2 has received the "Liaison statement on registration areas and on hierarchical tracking concept specification status in SA WG2" and would like to clarify the current assumptions in RAN2 regarding the described concepts.
The presented concepts are in line with the RAN2 assumptions, with one exception.
If, e.g. based on the UE activity, UTRAN or the CN decides to release the RRC connection the normal RRC connection release procedure can be used. The actual trigger in the network for initiating the release is not specified in the UE-UTRAN protocols.
However, a traffic measurement trigger for releasing the RRC connection does not contradict how the release procedure is specified. Therefore the concept of "RRC connection release timer" is not needed from the RAN2 point of view. Whether such a mechanism needs to be specified for the Iu interface is not clear, but is anyway not the scope of RAN2.
Discussion: None
Conclusion: Noted

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

## Tdoc N1-99B68 Liaison statement to SA2, SA3, N1/ RAN3

This LS is sent to 3GPP TSG N1
RAN WG3 is currently defining the Iu functions and the functional division between UTRAN and CN. An agreed set of functions has been included in our latest version of the „Iu Interface General Aspects and Principles, UMTS 25.410 V1.0.1".
In the case where the UE is involved in both CS and PS communication and has therefore two Iu interface instances (one to each CN domain), while relocation occurs, there is a need for coordinating the Relocation procedure towards and from the two CN domains.
RAN WG3 has chosen to use the Common ID which is provided by the CN when available to perform UTRAN paging coordination. Common ID is currently defined as being the UE permanent identity i.e. IMSI.
RAN WG3 realises that this identity is not always available while service is granted i.e. in case of emergency call without USIM. However RAN WG3 does not believe realistic to have simultaneous emergency communications towards CS and PS domains and relocation is required. Therefore RAN WG3 believes that the limitation induced by choosing the Common ID for relocation coordination is not problematic.
RAN WG3 would however appreciate prompt comments on the validity of this approach.
Discussion: IMSI is suggested as common identifier for HO in the case of having one packet and one CS connection. N1 would see the approach as feasible and would like to inform S1 for the service requirements in case of emergency call with no SIM. Reply to the LS is required.
Conclusion: Noted. LS N1-99C81 will be written back to RAN3, S1. Vodafone is the editor for this LS.

## Tdoc N1-99B69 Liaison statement on Security Mode Control procedure/ 3GPP RAN WG3

This LS is copied to 3GPP TSG N1
RAN WG3 has recently approved for the Iu RANAP protocol a Security Mode Control procedure which corresponds to the traditional ciphering mode command control procedure supplemented with Integrity Protection functionality as mandated by 33.102.
The details of the approved proposal are contained in the attachment 1.
RAN WG3 believes that this is in line with S3 requirements.
The principles of verification of the „UE Classmark", without interpretation in UTRAN were however left open, and S3 is kindly asked to comment on the feasibility of such mechanism. RAN WG3 also considers that the said UE Classmark is available in the CN without assuming how this information is provided to the CN.
RAN WG3 understands also the re-authentication is being discussed in S3, which may result in that changing of security mode control information may be changed in the course of a communication. RAN WG3 would like to know about the status of the related discussions in S3.
RAN WG3 would like also to take opportunity of this liaison to get confirmation on our current assumptions:

UMTS Encryption Algorithms (UEA) and UMTS Integrity Algorithms (UIA) permitted to be used for security mode control in UTRAN are given by the CN and the selection of which to be used is performed in SRNC. This mechanism is in essence similar to GSM.
Discussion: It was suggested to discuss this paper with WI security. LS will be sent in N1-99C11 where Fujitsu has already prepared the response as input document to this meeting. LS out in N1-99D06.
Conclusion: Noted

### Tdoc N1-99B70 Response to LS on L3 Segmentation/ TSG RAN WG3

This LS is sent to 3GPP TSG N1
RAN WG3 has discussed the following question presented in "LS on L3 Segmentation" (R3-99C87):
"R2 and/or R3 are asked what is the layer 3 message length restriction in UTRAN?"
RAN WG3 has considered the issue from UTRAN terrestrial interfaces point of view. The layer 3 message (NAS) length is not restricted by those layer 3 application protocols (Access Stratum) that are being defined in RAN WG3 and that would carry the layer 3 messages (NAS).
Discussion: None
Conclusion: Noted.

### Tdoc N1-99B71 Liaison statement on a Common Communication Mechanism to be used by the Cell Broadcast Service/ SA2

This LS was sent to TSGN WG1
We would like to forward you our most recent work regarding an architecture solution for the Cell Broadcast Service. This LS aims to kindly inform the concerned 3GPP groups on the current working assumption within TSG SA2.
We would appreciate any comments you might have on the solutions outlined in this LS.
Comment by the chairman: S2 liaise their architecture solution for the Cell Broadcast Service. No N1 action is proposed. Linked with B85.
Discussion: None
Conclusion: Noted.

### Tdoc N1-99B72 Multimedia Call Control for UMTS R 99/ 3GPP TSG S2

This LS was sent to TSGN WG1.
TSG S2 would like to inform that TSG S2 has specified the following:
H.323 shall be the multimedia call control protocol for the PS domain in UMTS R99.
Thus the revised principles for the support of multimedia in UMTS are (from 23.121):
P1) GSM/UMTS shall enable the provisioning of multimedia services and multivendor interworking between UE and network.
P2) Basic voice and PDP-context establishment shall be based on GSM CC/SM respectively.
P3) Handover and roaming to and from GSM shall be supported provided GSM is capable of supporting the ongoing media service.

P4) Ideas, concepts and procedures developed by other fora e.g. other standards bodies such as ITU, IETF etc. shall be included or referenced in GSM/UMTS when found suitable.
P5) To ensure multi-vendor inter-working and UE roaming, a single standardised multimedia protocol for CS domain and a single standardised multimedia protocol for PS domain shall be selected for GSM / UMTS R99. This does not preclude the selection of other protocols by UMTS in the future.
P6) For multimedia services the standardized multimedia protocol shall be run transparently via a PDP-context or a circuit-switched connection established using GSM SM/CC . This allows transparent hand-over and roaming between GSM and UMTS provided that GSM supports the QoS requirements.
Comments by the chairman: The LS was not seen but its contents were discussed in TSGN1 #7. N1 has already reacted to this.
Conclusion: Noted

### Tdoc N1-99B73 LS on ciphering of the initial message/ TSG SA WG2

This LS was sent to TSGN WG1.
TSG S2 would like to inform N1 about the decision made on the ciphering of the initial message. The following question was presented on this topic in Tdoc WHS-99019 [1], which was submitted to the joint meeting on handover 23rd of August in Sophia Antipolis:

> *6 LLC layer provides ciphering in GPRS. The ciphering parameters are calculated during GPRS Attach and stored both in the MS and the SGSN. Due to this any subsequent message will be ciphered. As this does not apply in UTRAN then the initial CN layer message, such as Activate PDP Context Request or an SMS needs to be ciphered by other means to provide provide data security.*

*Question:*
*How is the ciphering of the initial message supposed to work over UTRAN?*
For the answer please refer to the LS
Comments by the chairman: The LS was not treated but its contents was discussed in TSGN #7
Conclusion: Noted

### Tdoc N1-99B74 Response liaison on RAB requirements for CS data and architecture for CS data services/ TSG SA WG2

This LS was copied to TSGN1
TSG SA WG2 thanks CN WG3 for the LS on RAB requirements for CS data (Tdoc N3-99215).
The QoS ad-hoc works under SA WG2. It has produced TR23.907, which covers the UMTS QoS Concept and Architecture. Chapter 5 of the document states that GSM CC bearer capability information element is used in the CS domain of UMTS release'99 and chapter 6 specifies applicable value ranges. The document (in version 2.0.0) is attached with this response LS.

Discussion: None
Conclusion: Noted

### Tdoc N1-99B75 Liaison Statement on UMTS and RAB parameter value ranges and granularity/ TSG SA WG2

This LS is sent to TSG N1
The QoS ad-hoc works under SA WG2. It has produced TR23.907 (ver 2.0.0) which covers the UMTS QoS Concept and Architecture. The document lists the UMTS bearer service and RAB service parameters and the initial list of value ranges for them. The document is attached with this LS.
SA2 requests that mentioned groups would evaluate and propose reasonable value ranges including the granularities taking into account the service requirements, charging issues and terminal impacts. Specifically we kindly ask the groups to give advice on the following attribute values:

1. Appropriate values for Residual BER, SDU error ratio and transfer delay
2. The granularity of the Maximum bit rate and Guaranteed bit rate
3. Largest possible Maximum SDU size
4. Number of priority levels

To RAN2, RAN3 and SA4:
SA2 asks R2, R3 and S4 to consider the attached liaison statement (Tdoc N3-99215) from TSG CN WG3 and to specify R99 RABs and other applicable functions so that the QoS values indicated in the tables of Tdoc N3-99215 can be fulfilled.
Discussion: As we know, N1 covers layer 3, and S2 is asking reasonable values for RAB parameters
Item 3 we need to discuss "Largest possible Maximum SDU size". N1-99B98, N1-99B97 and N1-99B96 are related documents, as well as other proposed technical documents on this issue. LS to R3 is requested ASAP by DoCoMo. Early decision is need to complete our work. A output LS proposal in N1-99B98 by DoCoMo has already been prepared as input document.
Conclusion: Noted

### Tdoc N1-99B76 Liaison Statement to N2 on inter-3G MSC Handover/ S2

This LS was sent to TSGN1.
At S2#8 the issue of inter-3G MSC handover was discussed. It has been decided that

- For UMTS to UMTS Inter-MSC Handover the GSM E i/f transporting BSSAP messages with necessary modifications for GSM to UMTS Handover shall be used

S2 hopes that this gives guidance to the relevant groups involved in the stage 3 specification of the work.
Discussion: None
Conclusion: Noted

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

## Tdoc N1-99B77 Response to the LS on Location Area concept/ TSG S2

This LS was sent to TSGN1
S2 thanks N1 for their response on the decision made on the area concept. S2 has re-considered the current requirement in 23.121 due to N1's concerns that the work in N1 will fail to meet the schedule for R99 because of the requirement.
S2 informs N1 that the requirement has been changed and the area concept of GPRS R97, i.e. one RA is a subset or equal to one LA, is the current requirement for R99.
Comment by the chairman: S2 says that R99 RA / LA = R97 RA / LA. We already got this message during TSGN1 #7
Conclusion: Noted

## Tdoc N1-99B78 Liaison statement on registration areas and on hierarchical tracking concept specification status in SA WG2/ 3GPP SA WG2

This LS was sent to TSGN1
TSG SA WG2 approved in their last meetings some change requests to TS 23.121 regarding the relation between the different registration areas URA, RA and LA. Furthermore, TS 23.121 describes a hierarchical tracking concept using a mix of URA and RA updates for UEs with active packet sessions. TSG SA WG2 would like to inform the interested 3GPP groups about this status and asks to evaluate these adopted mechanisms with regard to the specification status and assumptions in their groups.
A brief presentation of the current status with description of possible implications is given in the LS.
Comment by the chairman: We responded to this already from TSGN1 #7 causing S2 to rethink and send N1 the LS in B77.
Conclusion: Noted

## Tdoc N1-99B79 Liaison Statement to N2 on combined procedures (Answer to LS S2-99954 (N2-99D32))/ S2

This LS is sent to TSG N1.
S2 thanks N2 for the very quick answer to the liaison on combined MAP procedures.
S2 does not consider that combined location update procedures is a high priority architectural requirement for UMTS R99.
Taking into considerations the assessment of the remaining work given by N2, S2 encourages N2 to finish other essential work for UMTS R99 with higher priority.
Discussion: None
Conclusion: Noted

## Tdoc N1-99B80 Liaison statement on the Iu UP protocol framing of NAS user data/ 3GPP SA WG2

This LS is sent to TSG N1.
At the QoS ad hoc meeting during 3GPP S2#8 in September 13-17, 1999 in Bonn, Germany, the attached contribution (S2q99037: “Iu UP protocol framing of NAS user data“) was introduced. Unfortunately, there is no experts about this issue in the QoS ad

hoc group, and the mapping from CC/SM to RAB parameters is in the responsibility of CN WG1 and CN WG3. Therefore, SA2 would sincerely like the N1/N3 group to check this proposal.
When NAS user data is transferred over Iu interface, the data is framed and conveyed by Iu User Plane (UP) protocol. How the data is framed depends upon the structure of the NAS user data. Through the transfer, the structure must be preserved. This contribution discusses the framing policy of the NAS user data for the transfer on Iu interface.
Discussion: Related to N1-99C68 so it was presented too.
Conclusion: open

### Tdoc N1-99B81 Liaison statement to SMG3 WPA / TSG-CN WG1 in reply to Liaison statement on type approval testing for error case handling (N1-99890)/ TSG-T WG1

This LS was sent to CN1
At the QoS ad hoc meeting during 3GPP S2#8 in September 13-17, 1999 in Bonn, Germany, the attached contribution (S2q99037: "Iu UP protocol framing of NAS user data") was introduced. Unfortunately, there is no experts about this issue in the QoS ad hoc group, and the mapping from CC/SM to RAB parameters is in the responsibility of CN WG1 and CN WG3. Therefore, we would sincerely like the N1/N3 group to check this proposal.
Discussion: None
Conclusion: Noted

### Tdoc N1-99B82 Response to LS on handover notifications/ 3GPP TSG-T2 SWG1 (MExE)

This LS was sent to CN1
TSG T2 SWG1 MExE thanks TSG RAN WG2 and TSG CN1 for their Liaisons on the issue of handover notification to a MExE application. MExE notes that it is possible for the RRC sub-layer in the UE to inform a MExE application on the UE of the following events, without the need for changes to the RAN WG2 specifications.
That a soft handover is currently in progress
That a handover has occurred
MExE assumes that these will be available in release 99.
MExE R99 applications may use this information, but will not be attempting to intervene in the control handovers.
MExE will continue the work on handover notification with the TSG RAN WG 2 group.
Discussion: This is an answer to a previous LS sent from N1. It is about QoS notification during HO whether it will be changed. It was questioned whether T2 is interested in the QoS of the bearer or the physical channel? SM QoS and the RAB QoS are different, where the latter is a RAN issue. This is related to N1-99B84.
Conclusion: Noted

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

## Tdoc N1-99B83 5 or 6 digits IMSI HPLMN/ 3GPP TSG-T2 SWG1 (MExE)

This LS was sent to N1.
The MExE group is currently finalising the work for MExE Release 99 and MExE needs to be able to identify the operator, which issued a certain SIM card. For this purpose the IMSI is the best (only (?)) way of identifying the HPLMN, by taking the first 5 or 6 digits of the IMSI, as stated in section 2.2 in 23.003 v3.1.1. It is further mentioned in that section, that the two or three digit MNC topic, is out of that scope, and that further information can be found in GSM 03.22.
But GSM 03.22 only handles the case where a given PLMN, which the handset is registered on, and therefore knows if is five or six digits long, is compared against the IMSI HPLMN.
The question is: What is the proper way of extracting the right number of digits (five or six) from the IMSI, to find the HPLMN?
MExE looks forward to the continued co-operation with the core network groups.
Discussion: Comments by the chairman:
T2 are asking for the right criteria to use either 5 or 6 digits MNC from SIM card. 23.022 gives the answer. Check the number of MNC digits in downlink BCCH info and compare the BCCH MNC with the same number of digits on the SIM IMSI field. But how does this help MExE to decide what is the length of the IMSI MNC part on the SIM?
This works fine if you are registered to home PLMN but if you are not then this information is not available.
What is the HPLMN MNC needed for? All the MM procedures can be covered with the information that is already in 23.022.
Conclusion: Noted, LS will be written by the chairman to T2 SWG1 in N1-99C82

## Tdoc N1-99B84 MExE support of QoS negotiation and handover notifications/ TSG T WG2 SWG 1 (MExE)

This LS was copied to N1.
MExE thanks R2 for their recent liaison regarding the control and notification of handovers. With regard to the question posed below by CN1 to T2 SWG1 MExE:
Is it the intention of the MExE application to actually take control of the handover procedures or just to be notified of their occurrence?
MExE has noted your previous liaison R2-99973, and has already replied to (LS T2-99739).
MExE would like to state that it has no, and should not have any, interest in taking control of handovers.
MExE would however ask whether a notification of a change in network capability (eg during intersystem handover between 2G and 3G networks) is issued. MExE is interested in changes of QoS.
Discussion: None
Conclusion: Noted

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

## Tdoc N1-99B85 CBS Responsibilities/ 3GPP TSG T2

The LS was copied to CN1.
T2 note S2's agreement with the proposal and work split contained in T2-99756 regarding Cell Broadcasting service (S2-99992/T2-99794).
The requirements for the protocol between the CBC and RNC will be contained in 23.041 and will be similar to those requirements for the CBC-BSC interface in GSM 03.41. However, it is felt by T2-SWG3 that the detail protocol specification (23.049) lies outside their responsibility as previously indicated in T2-99756, although historically T2-SWG3 (SMG4) took responsibility for GSM 03.49 which contained example protocols. SWG3 suggest that 23.049 should be a technical report rather than a technical specification.
In response to N1's liaison statement (N1-99A88/T2-99787), it is intended that the CBC in UMTS will be an evolved GSM Cell Broadcasting Centre in order to provide a seamless service with GSM.
Discussion: None
Conclusion: Noted

## Tdoc N1-99B86 Response to LS *TSGR2#7(99)D25* on "Definitions for usage of Multi-mode/system terminals"/ TSG T2 SWG5

The LS was copied to CN1
TSG T2 SWG5 thanks RAN WG2 for providing comments on proposed definitions in the report on Multi-mode/system terminals.
Regarding the definition **Camping on a cell** we agree with the comment from TSG RAN WG2 and we will refer to the definition in TS 25.304.
Regarding definition **Active communication:** we have, based on the comment from TSG RAN WG2, tried to make a clarification. It should also be noted that, from a terminal perspective, not only the RRC level is of importance but also the CS and PS levels. The updatedproposalis:
"a terminal is in active communication when a CS connection or PS session is ongoing."
Regarding the definition **Multi-mode identity** and **Multi-system identity** we have decided to delete both from the definitions chapter, based on the comment from RAN WG2. We will instead describe the meaning of these concepts in other parts of the report. We will in these parts as much as possible refer to other well defined identities such as e.g MSISDN, IMSI etc.
Regarding the editor's note, TSG T2 SWG5 has no comments, but would instead like to defer any discussion on radio access modes versus network modes to SA WG2 if needed.
Discussion: None
Conclusion: Noted

## Tdoc N1-99B87 LS on Enhanced User Identity Confidentiality/ TSG S2

The LS was copied to CN1.
S2 thanks S3 for their LS on 'Enhanced User Identity Confidentiality' (S2-99825; S3-99254), that clarifies the status of this 3G security feature.

S2 has recognized that the use of the feature 'Enhanced User Identity Confidentiality' is HE-optional but that the transport mechanism between SN and HE has to be implemented by all UMTS SN to prevent problems in roaming conditions.
From S2 point of view the work on this feature has to continue and encourages all other TSGs (esp. CN1, CN2, T3, IGC on security) to consider the implications occurring by the implementation of the 3G security features and to make sure that the appropriate extensions will be added to the relevant documents for release 99.
Discussion: None
Conclusion: Noted

### Tdoc N1-99C12 Liaison from T1P1.5 on LCS CRs and GTSs for GSM Release 98 in SMG#30/ T1P1.5

This LS was sent to CN1.
T1P1.5 has now completed the following LCS CRs and TSs intended for approval in SMG#30 as part of GSM Release 98.

| | |
|---|---|
| CR for GSM 03.07 | (CN2) |
| CR for GSM 03.71 | (CN1, CN2) |
| CR for GSM 04.71 | (CN1) |
| CR for GSM 09.02 | (CN2) |
| CR for GSM 09.08 | (CN1) |
| GSM 09.31 | (CN1) |

Discussion: At the next T1P1 it will be discussed what to do with the R98 LCS specs. These CRs should be approved before SMG#31. So T1 P1 is trying to finish the work at December.
LS out will be written after looking at all LCS documents in N1-99C92. The LCS for GPRS will be covered in R00.
Conclusion: Noted.

### Tdoc N1-99C66 Liaison Statement on Issues with Multiple PDP Contexts/ SMG7 GPRS

This LS is sent to SMG3-WPA
SMG7 GPRS kindly requests clarification regarding the following issues related to multiple PDP contexts in the MS. The last question is specifically for the attention of SMG2 WPA.
Question 1:
Is it optional or required for the MS to support multiple PDP contexts simultaneously?
Question 2:
Given that it is allowed for multiple PDP contexts to be assigned to the same LLC SAPI, (GSM 04.65, section 6.10 "One or several N-SAPIs may use one (LLC) SAPI.") what are the allowed combinations of LLC modes (acknowledged/unacknowledged) that can be assigned to the same LLC SAPI (all other PDP context parameters including TLLI being the same)? (For example, can the same LLC SAPI be assigned a PDP context using LLC acknowledged mode and another PDP context using LLC unacknowledged mode?)

Question 3:
For a scenario where multiple PDP contexts are established, is it required for the MS to transfer all LLC PDUs corresponding to one N-PDU (associated with one PDP context) before the same MS begins to transfer data in another N-PDU (associated with a different PDP context)? In other words, can the MS multiplex LLC PDUs from different N-PDUs?
Question 4:
If no to question 3, what criteria shall be applied at the LLC layer for uplink transfer?
Question 5: (for SMG2)
Can LLC PDUs from different LLC SAPIs be concatenated into the same RLC_DATA_BLOCK?
Can the MS multiplex RLC DATA BLOCKs from different LLC PDUs belonging to different N-PDUs in the same TBF?
Please respond prior to October 11, as SMG7 GPRS will be meeting the following week.
Comments by the chairman: This question on GPRS TCs should have been answered by 11. October but we have not seen the LS before this meeting. SMG2 WPA answer in N1-99B51
Conclusion: Noted

### Tdoc N1-99C67 LS to S1 on 3G Services/ CN3

This CR is copied to CN1
TSG-CN3 has reviewed 27.060 and would like to clarify the following:

1. TSG CN3 has reviewed the work item Modem / ISDN interworking, and proposes to delete the work item, since there has been no input from supporting companies since its creation. As the <PDP type>"OSP" was developed in 2G+ to enable the services of IHOSS and Modem / ISDN interworking, TSG CN3 seeks advice as to the continued need for IHOSS and Modem / ISDN interworking , and hence the <PDP type>"OSP", in UMTS.
2. In reviewing TS 23.060 TSG CN3 has noted the removal of TCP from the Packet Domain transmission planes for Release '99. This would suggest that the core network no longer supports <PDP type> "X.25", since X.25 requires a reliable layer 2. TSG CN3 ask TSG S1 to clarify the support of <PDP type> "X.25" in UMTS, because GSM 09.61 supports X.75' Interworking to BOC LATA networks as requested by T1P1 and approved by SMG.

Both of these issues impact on TSG CN3's progress on TS 27.060 and TS 29.061.
Discussion: None
Conclusion: Noted

### Tdoc N1-99C68 LS on Iu UP Protocol Framing of NAS User Data/ CN3

This LS was sent to CN1
TSG-CN3 have reviewed the document S2q-99-037 (included in N3-99289), Iu UP Protocol Framing of NAS User Data as requested by TSG-SA-WG2 and offer the following comments to TSG-CN1.

TSG-CN3 is of the opinion that it appears reasonable to have an Iu UP frame size dependent on the bearer capability to satisfy that service QoS.
For the Packet domain TSG-CN3 is not sure as to the reference of GTP/UDP/IP in table X, because the combination of the 3 protocols in our opinion would result in an AAL5 SDU. TSG-CN3 offers the proposal that for NAS user data the Iu(ps) UP SDU's size is set to carry only the complete GTP SDU.
Discussion: N3 and R3 have the main responsibility to discuss this matter. N1 has no impact on this issue. We are requested to set the requirement, which is reflected in the CC messages.
It was not clear what is this framing question about? NAS messages relate, or access stratum user data?
Conclusion: Noted

### Tdoc N1-99C69 Response to LS on Service/Baseline Implementation Capabilities/ CN3

This LS is sent to CN1
TSG-CN WG3 have studied the LS from TSG CN WG1 (N1-99B33) on Service/Baseline Implementation Capabilities and would like to offer the following comments related to table 2. Note: Table 2 (Terminal Service Implementation Capability for NAS) is attached to this LS, for reference:

1. Within the UMTS Session Management sections, the "Secondary PDP Context Activation" and "Network Requested PDP context activation" procedures (as defined in 23.060) appear to have been omitted.
2. N3 were also wondering if it is worth mentioning that the "PDP context modification" and "PDP context deactivation" procedures could also be initiated from the SGSN or GGSN as well as the Terminal?

Discussion: None.
Conclusion: Noted.

### Tdoc N1-99C70 Answer to LS on SAT/MExE <-> CAMEL Interworking / Traceability/ SMG9

This LS was forgotten to be sent to CN1, So I got it directly from the secretary.
SMG 9 at its meeting in Munich 20 –23 September 1999 received a Liaison Statement from SMG1 (SMG1 99-238) concerning: "Interworking between SAT/MExE and CAMEL and traceability of SAT/MExE actions and 3GPP T2 SWG1 (Execution Environment) for the support and additions."
Due to insufficient detailed information SMG 9 could not progress this topic. Considering the outcome of the SMG 1 meeting held in Munich 27th September to 1st October, it is expected that CN and SMG 9 will have been given clear service requirements to specify this feature.
Therefore SMG 9 requests a joint meeting with 3GPP TSG CN3 to discuss the issues related to the above topic as soon as possible in order to advance the work for Release 99.
Discussion: None.

Conclusion: Noted.

### Tdoc N1-99C71 22.038 "SIM application Toolkit (SAT) service description"/ MCC

The latest version was presented for information with N1-99C70.
Conclusion: Noted for information

### Tdoc N1-99C78 LS on Information about current status on UE idle mode operation/ RAN2

This LS was sent to TSG N1
TSG RAN WG2 is working on UE idle mode procedures, and would like to inform TSG CN WG1 about the assumptions made, which are related to responsibility areas of TSG CN WG1. Attached to this Liaison Statement is TS 25.304, UE Procedures in Idle Mode.
The scope of TS 25.304 is to specify the access stratum part of UE in idle mode (e.g. cell selection and reselection, monitoring of paging and broadcast channels). This applies for both single-radio access system UTRA UE, and multi-radio access system UE (where UTRA is one of the radio access systems supported by the UE).
Specifically, TSG RAN WG2 assumes that the cell selection and reselection process uses a list of radio access systems in priority order. The radio access systems included on the list are those supported by the selected PLMN and any additional radio access systems that the UE is capable of. This list is passed on to the cell selection and reselection process from another process, which is part of the non-access stratum. Therefore, TSG RAN WG2 assumes that this process should be specified in TS 23.022.
Furthermore, TSG RAN WG2 would like to point out that PLMN selection and reselection process is tightly related to the cell selection and reselection process.
TSG RAN WG2 kindly asks TSG CN WG1 for comments on the assumptions, and would also like to be informed of the current status of the related work on TS 23.022.
Discussion: UMTS-PLMN operator will make the decision how to inform the MS about the preference of system, which in turn will take action in cell selection and re-selection which leads to the network selection.
S2 is to be asked who is responsible for the Radio access selection capabilities? The question is do we use the cell selection for PLMN selection in UMTS? If no then it is a RAN issue and not CN.
PLMN selection in 23.022 is N1 responsibility. We need to look at it closely. We might propose to keep 03.22 for GSM and split 23.022 for UMTS according to the requirements for UMTS as a solution to let RAN take care of the cell selection and reselection process, where RAN has no responsibility for this specification. Cell selection and re-selection is already well covered in 05.xx, 25.xxx series.
03.22 is shared responsibility between SMG2 WPA and N1. Splitting of 23.022 will be proposed in LS out N1-99C83 prepared by Ericsson and Alcatel.
Conclusion: Noted

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

## Tdoc N1-99C94 Liaison statement on 3G-H.324M/ N2

This LS was sent to CN1
TSG-N2 thanks TSG-N1 & N3 for their liaison statement on 3G-H.324M.
We note that 3G-H.324M is defined as Bearer Service in 3GPP. This means that we will need to define a code point for this bearer service in 23.016 and 29.002; we will prepare the necessary CRs.
We would also draw the attention of S1 and the NSS ad hoc to the need to consider the applicability of supplementary services to the new bearer service.
Discussion: It seems that work is progressing
Conclusion: Noted

## Tdoc N1-99C95 Response LS on Service and Baseline Implementation Capabilities/ N2

This LS was sent to CN1.
3GPP N2 would like to thank N1 for their liaison on the topic of Service and Baseline Implementation Capabilities (N1-99B33).
N2 noted the request from N1 to review the attached tables with the Baseline and Service Implementation Capabilities. However, N2 noted as well that the contents of the tables are based on the procedures described in the 3GPP TS 24.008 specification. N2 noted that no specific new UMTS procedures are included into these provided tables. Therefore, N2 did not see the necessity to review these tables urgently.
If N2 missed any specific procedures for UMTS Release 99 then N2 would appreciate if the specific UMTS procedures are highlighted in the description to facilitate more effective review of the tables.
Discussion: N1 will not respond to this LS. N1 will is ready to answer any question/open items in its area CC, MM, SM.
Conclusion: Noted

## Tdoc N1-99C96 Liaison statement on Multicall/ N2

This LS was sent to CN1.
TSG-N2 have discussed several contributions on Multicall, which is required as a Release 99 service.
We have noted that the stage 1 for Multicall defines Multicall as a **basic** service; however it also defines subscriber control procedures (registration, interrogation, …) which seem to be more appropriate to a **supplementary** service. The development of the specifications for control of call setup in a multicall configuration is in TSG-N2's area of competence; however the functional behaviour and signalling for the subscriber control procedures are in the TSG-N SS ad hoc group's area of competence.
In view of the short time available to develop the stage 2 & 3 specifications for Multicall, TSG-N2 believe that we should restrict the scope of Multicall for Release 99 to omit the procedures for subscriber control and interrogation. This would allow the development of the specifications to be concentrated in TSG-N2, and substantially improve the chances of having a useful service specified for Release 99.

TSG-N2 have taken the working assumption that this restriction of the scope of Multicall for Release 99 is acceptable to TSG-S1. TSG-S1 are asked to confirm the working assumption.
Discussion: N2's WA is that Multical is a basic servis and not a Supplementary Service, so no user interface for the subscriber to control the feature (subscriber control ) or interrogation is possible.
No respond unless we have some comments
Conclusion: Noted, no comments.

### Tdoc N1-99C97 Response to LS on 5 or 6 digits IMSI HPLMN/N2

This LS is copied to CN1.
N2 has looked and analyzed the T2 Liaison Statement (TSGT2#6(99)814) and concluded the following suggestion.
The question from T2 is: What is the proper way of extracting the right number of digits (five or six) from the IMSI, to find the HPLMN?
The answer from N2 is:
By examining the MCC digits, the necessary number of digits to be extracted from the MNC (two or three) is found.
Discussion: Same subject as in Tdoc N1-99B83. Our proposal/reply to T2 in this area is in Tdoc N1-99C82.
Conclusion: Noted.

### Tdoc N1-99D35 Liaison statement on Basic principles of QoS interoperations/ S2

This LS was sent to N1
To support stage 3 group to complete R99 QoS protocol works, S2 has defined the R99 QoS profiles and is working on basic principles of interworking between UMTS/GPRS R99 QoS profile and GPRS pre-R99 QoS profile. S2 would sincerely inform you of its current status and agreement for your prompt development of the related protocols.
Discussion: This should be studied in theUMTS/GSM interworking adhoc meeting.
Conclusion: Noted

### Tdoc N1-99D37 Principles for secure GSM-UMTS interoperation/ S2

This LS was sent to N1
SA2 has received the attached LS from TSG-SA WG3. After reviewing it, S2 has concluded that it contains information also relevant to N1 and N2, so S2 forwards it to these groups.
Potential comments should be sent directly to S3 (Cc S2, N1, N2).
Discussion: This should be studied in theUMTS/GSM interworking adhoc meeting.
Conclusion: Noted

### Tdoc N1-99D39 Reply to LS on Security Algorithm Information in UE Capability/ R3

This LS was sent to N1
RAN3 thank CN1 for the Liaison Statement clarifying security issues of the UTRAN. However there was concern regarding a possible misunderstanding that may have arisen in CN1.
The integrity procedure requires that the mobile verify the integrity of the CN. For this to be possible, some data particular (and known) to the MS, requires to be sent to the CN, encoded by an algorithm and sent back to the MS for verification of the CN by the MS. The MS Classmark is in effect some information which can be used and is known by the MS. RAN3 believe that any data could be used and the MS Classmark was chosen which we believe is in line with SA WG3.
RAN3 is not sure why N1 assumed that MS CLASSMARK 2 was to be put into the Location update message. This was not the understanding or intent of RAN3.
Discussion: This was a quick answer from a parallel meeting.
Conclusion: Noted.

# 4 Maintenance of R98 and older releases

## *4.1 corrections*

### Tdoc N1-99D12/R98 and Tdoc N1-99D13 /R99Correction of Figure A.2 in Annex A/ Ericsson, Siemens

This is a CR against 03.22 and 23.022.
In Annex A in the section "HPLMN Matching Criteria for mobiles which support PCS1900 for NA**:**" there is an error in the figure A.2
Box 4 in Figure A.2 in Annex A does not align with the description for (4) in the normative text.
The current text in Box 4 in the figure A.2 should be deleted and replaced with "4. BCCH-MCC lies in the range 310-316".
This CR also deletes a misleading "Fail" after box 4 and a misleading "Succeed" at the top of box 6.
This CR also clarifies that that the text is normative and the diagrams are informative (which is the normal practice for SMG3 WPA/N1 specs) to avoid such misunderstanding in the future
Decision: None
Conclusion: Both were greed

## *4.2 GPRS*

Siemens suggested a GPRS adhoc meeting on Monday 29th. Nov.99 in Germany, where they are hosting the meeting CN1#9 30/11- 3/12.99 in Germany Bad Aibling. No necessity was seen during the meeting.

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

The latest versions of 23.121 and 23.060 were briefly revieved before discussing the other R99 packet contributions

### *23.121 V3.1.0*

Discussion: The chapters were discussed and some comments were made.
LA and RA are having the same concept as in GSM. This is already liaisoned .
Modification is required for MM anyway

### *23.060 V3.1.0*

Was presented too

### Tdoc N1-99C31 Summary of 'agreed' Change Requests to GSM 04.08 SM/GMM/ (Rapporteur GSM 04.08 GPRS part)

This document contains an overview of change requests (CRs) to GSM 04.08 that are related to the GPRS MM/SM part, starting from version 6.0.0 included.
Conclusion: This document is provided for information only. It was revised to **N1-99C73**, which is noted.

### Tdoc N1-99C32 Summary of Change Requests to GSM 04.64/ Rapporteur GSM 04.64

This document contains an overview of all known change requests (CRs) to GSM 04.64, and the status of each CR.
Conclusion: This document is provided for information only. It was noted.

### Tdoc N1-99D24 /R99 Clarification of DRX/ Ericsson

This CR is for against 24.008. It was sent by SMG2WPA for approval in N1-99B50
The approved CR 05.02-A076 tried to clarify the use of DRX. There is however still some uncertainties. In 04.60, the terms non-DRX mode and DRX-mode are used. The same terms should therefore be defined in 05.02. Also, since 04.60 specifies occasions when the MS shall use DRX-mode, all MSs must have an DRX-mode. Therefore it should not be possible to negotiate “no DRX”. The corresponding value should be changed to SPLIT_PG_CYCLE = 704 which in practice is the same.
This CR is probably of category (C2).
Discussion: N1-99D30 and N1-99D31 are repetition of the attached CRs in N1-99B50, and they are only for information, therefore they were withdrawn.
Conclusion: It is agreed and will be attached to N1-99D23.

### Tdoc N1-99B90 / R99 Introduction of Reserved Service Labels in the APN/ Ericsson

This CR is against 23.003.
The PDP type IP has been extended to allow the separation of PDP context activation and ISP Environment setup. These extensions support e.g DHCP end-to-end and Mobile IP.

In order to help automatic APN selection, the concept of Reserved Service Label is introduced, which indicates that a special service is supported by the APN. The service offering is not exclusively coupled to the reserved APN: all APNs can support the new services if configured to do so by the operator.
Discussion: This is a N2B responsibility and will be sent there for approval in case we agree it in CN1.
How would the SGSN know that the GGSN supports this service? No answer is given. Therefore in this case time is required to think about the question. However to notice that it would be applicable for UMTS only.
Conclusion: Revised to **N1-99D26**.

### Tdoc N1-99D26 / R99

This is revision of N1-99B90, where an open question was not answered.
Discussion: Normal Domain Name Server will be used to handle the request. Home GGSN is to be used to get the required service.
Conclusion: Agreed
More clarification on this CR:
Normal DNS resolution will be used and if no entry is found in the VPLMN the DNS request will be extended to the HPLMN where the home GGSN will be used.
The APN is configured by the operator to mean that a special service is supported by the GGSN. Then, if the SGSN finds an entry for that APN (e.g. 'dhcp-serv') in the DNS it means that the corresponding GGSN supports the service, otherwise there would be an error in the configuration of the DNS server (or of the GGSN). If nothing is found in the DNS there are two possibilities. Either the user is in his HPLMN in which case it means that he requested an invalid APN and the request will be rejected. Or the user is in a VPLMN, in which case the SGSN will extend the APN with the Operator Identifier (e.g. 'dhcp-serv.company.com') and make a DNS query to the DNS server in the HPLMN where the APN will be know if the operator has configured it properly.

This is the normal APN resolution procedure, the SGSN does not need to know anything about the service associated with the specific APN, it is just a matter of what interpretation the operator gives to that APN. Moreover, as it is said in the Reason for Change "The service offering is not exclusively coupled to the reserved APN: all APNs can support the new services if configured to do so by the operator". This is also reflected in the CR to 23.060. The Reserved Service Label is only useful in the case of roaming users as explained above.

### Tdoc N1-99C09/ R99 Service Request/ Fujitsu

This CR is against 24.008
LLC has been removed from UMTS packet architecture. After the release of RR connection, association between UE and SGSN is lost.

Service Request procedure is added to establish secure association between the UE and the SGSN, after it has been released. SM and SMS message, which need privacy protection, follow the new procedure
Discussion: Originator wants to take it as base of discussion. Principle is taken as a WA for discussion.
N1-99C58 should also be discussed, as DoCoMo wanted to get a concise. This is a subject to be discussed at the interworing adhoc. It was suggested tom start from MM and not PMM to study issue.
It seems Alcatel, Nokia and DoCoMo are working on this issue so they should get together to talk.
Conclusion Noted and more comments are invited.

### Tdoc N1-99C10/R99 Introduction of Follow-on mechanism for PS/ Fujitsu

This is a CR against 24.008
Follow-on mechanism, which is to prolong the connection between the UE and the SGSN for the following UE originated activity (e.g., SMS, or PDP activation) after a GMM specific procedure, is introduced by this CR.
In UMTS, the connection between the SGSN and the UE may be released right after finishing a GMM specific procedure. To prevent the contention between user service invocation and the release procedure from the network, similar mechanism like CS domain is introduced.
The follow-on request pending can be indicated in Attach Request and Routing Area Updating Request. And no follow-on proceed indication is defined.
Discussion: N1-99D11 is a related document.
Using CM service request at least for the identity of the Ue. Is it possible for the network to refuse this procedure? Yes, then it is better to talk about the request in the 4.7.3.1.1, the request is not so visible.
A comment to change RR by RRC connection where UMTS in meant with as stated in the cover page
New and required vocabulary should be applied to TR 25.990
To make the procedures conditional for UMTS then a question was raised about the IE and whether they should be changed for other releases using the same procedure. No objection against the principle but the contents should be improved.
Conclusion: Noted

### Tdoc N1-99C30 which is revised to N1-99D00 before presentation Network Requested PDP Context Activation/ Vodafone

This is a CR against 24.008
At the CN1 #7 meeting in Makuhari, NTT DoCoMo presented a CR (and other CRs to other TSGs) to have the APN parameter added to two SM messages (PDU Notification Request and Request PDP Context Activation). The CRs were all agreed.

Network Requested PDP Context Activation is a feature that Vodafone wants, and after looking further into it, it became apparent that there are other changes that need to be made, following on from those made by NTT DoCoMo.
Firstly, the collision case of the MS trying to activate a PDP context and the Network trying to activate a PDP context to the same APN has to be considered. This CR proposes that the SGSN run a check to prevent any collision.
Secondly, there are other messages to which the APN parameter should be added:
PDU Notification Reject Request (in 29.060)
Request PDP Context Activation Reject (in 29.060)
+CRING: unsolicited AT response (27.007)
+CGANS AT command (27.007)
Therefore, this CR also proposes an addition of the APN parameter in the Request PDP Context Activation Reject message.
Discussion: Backward compatibility is a problem in adding APN to REQUEST PDP CONTEXT ACTIVATION REJECT message, so similar change is required for other releases in case it is agreed.
Make it optional to solve the problem of backward compatibility.
Conclusion: New revision is needed. Revised to **N1-99D25**, which was agreed.

### Tdoc N1-99C59 LLC SAPI handling/ Fujitsu

This is a CR against 24.008
LLC has been removed from UMTS packet architecture. This field may be used in 3G SGSN to prepare the handover toward GPRS. The dual MS requests valid LLC SAPI to the network, and the LLC SAPI is returned to the network. If the MS is UMTS single mode, it sends the LLC SAPI IE with empty value, which is newly defined, to the network to avoid unnecessary value range check and other confusion in the network.
Discussion: Principle is accepted. Merge contents with Nokia proposals in N1-99B88 to prevent collision, where the merge will be mentioned in Nokia CR.
Conclusion: Noted

### Tdocs N1-99C33/ R97, N1-99C34/ R98, N1-99C35 /R99 A-bit interpretation contradiction/ Motorola, Siemens

This is a CR against 04.64 for the releases 97, 98, 99
Subclauses 8.6.3.1 and 8.6.3.2 contradict:
8.6.3.1 states that an S or I+S frame shall be transmitted whenever a frame with the A bit set to 1 is received.
8.6.3.2 states that the A bit shall be disregarded for an S or I+S frame with an invalid N(R).
The common interpretation of 04.64 is according to 8.6.3.1. It is therefore proposed that 8.6.3.2 be made consistent with this view. The CR also aligns the treatment of the supervisory function bits in the received I+S and S frame.
This CR is probably of category (C4).
Ericsson presented

Discussion: CR CAT C4, it could be CAT C3!
What is the consequence if not approved? Not able to answer the question at the moment. Clarification is expected
Conclusion: All 3 CRs were agreed.

### Tdoc N1-99D11 Service Request Procedure Description for Review / Fujitsu

The CR regarding new feature Service request is submitted as Tdoc N1-99C09. The descriptions about the procedure has not yet been incorporated into the CR since there are some further discussion points remaining especially on the case of abnormal condition and concerning with GMM state transition model.
This contribution is submitted to request a review on the description of procedure attached in ANNEX to be improved.
It is proposed to collect any comment on this contribution to complete the work on service request feature in R99.
Discussion: More comments are invited
Conclusion: Noted.

## *4.3 Other Pre-99 WIs*

### LCS

Comments by the chairman:
*T1P1.5 has now completed the following LCS CRs and TSs intended for approval in SMG#30 as part of GSM Release 98.*

| | |
|---|---|
| CR for GSM 03.07 | (CN2) |
| CR for GSM 03.71 | (CN1, CN2) |
| CR for GSM 04.71 | (CN1) |
| CR for GSM 09.02 | (CN2) |
| CR for GSM 09.08 | (CN1!) |
| TS GSM 09.31 | (CN1) |

*T1P1.5 requests approval of the 09.08 CR by TSG CN1 and CN. T1P1.5 requests Email approval of the 03.07 and 09.02 CRs by TSG CN2 and CN. T1P1.5 requests endorsement of GSM 09.31 and the 04.71 CR by TSG CN1 and (via Email) by CN and requests endorsement of the 03.71 CR by TSG CN1 and (via Email) by CN2 and CN.*
T1P1.5 expects to submit the remaining LCS CRs and TSs (not being submitted to SMG#30) to either SMG#30bis or SMG#31, and to seek approval for these in GSM Release 98.
T1P1 is in the process of creating R99equivalents of LCS CRs

### Tdoc N1-99C13 /R98 Addition of further LCS functionality in GSM Release 98/ T1P1.5

This is a CR against 03.71
Add revised LCS architecture and support for E-OTD and GPS positioning methods
Discussion: The CR was presented.

Conclusion: CR is agreed

### Tdoc N1-99C14 /R98 Addition of LCS phase 2 functionality/ T1P1.5

This is a CR against 04.71
Changes due to LCS Phase 2
Conclusion: CR is agreed

### Tdoc N1-99C15 / R98Changes due to LCS Phase 2/ T1P1.5

This is a CR against 09.08
Replacing LOCATION INFORMATION COMMAND and LOCATION INFORMATION REPORT messages with CONNECTION ORIENTED INFORMATION message.
Location request related messages PERFORM LOCATION REQUEST, PERFORM LOCATION RESPONSE and PERFORM LOCATION ABORT needs to be added in BSSMAP messages transferred on the E-interface
Discussion: For 09.08 it should be clear who is responsible for it and responsibility should be available to the delegates to be able to address their contributions correctly. It is a CN2B spec.
Conclusion: The CR is agreed. As well it was agreed in CN2B last week.

### Tdoc N1-99C16 / TS : Base Station System Application Part LCS Extension (BSSAP-LE)/ T1P1.5

Discussion: Error handling cases need to be added.
Conclusion: The Technical specification is endorsed.

## 5 Work plan for TSGN WG1 for 1999

Comments by the chairman:

| | |
|---|---|
| TSGN1 #8 | 25-29.10.1999 (Japan/DoCoMo) |
| TSGN1 #9 | 30.11-3.12.1999 (Germany/Siemens) |
| TSGN #6 | 13-15.12.1999 (Sophia Antipolis, France) |
| TSGN1 #10 | 11-14.1.2000 (Japan/NEC) |
| SMG#31 | 14-18.2.2000 |
| TSGN1 #11 | 28.2-2.3.2000 (Sweden/Telia) |
| TSGN#7 | 13-15.3.2000 |
| TSGN1 #12 | 15-19.5.2000 (U.S./T1P1) |
| | Proposal to move to next week 22.-26.5.1999 to align with N3 ??? |
| TSGN#8 | 19-21.6.2000 |
| SMG#32 | 26-28.6.2000 |
| TSGN1 #13 | 11-15.9.2000 (U.S./T1P1) |
| TSGN#9 | 25-27.9.2000 |
| SMG#33 | 6-10.11.2000 |
| TSGN1 #14 | 27.11 – 1.12.2000 |

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

(Tentative invitation Lucent)
TSGN#10 11-13.12.2000

## Tdoc N1-99B45 Rapporteurs for TSGN WG1 specifications/ MCC

This document is an extraction from N1-99B46 for N1 related specifications.
Rapporteurs are required for many TSGN WG1 specifications. Please support MCC with feedback:
If you know the rapporteurs/company which do not appear in the list
If you would like to be rapporteur to one or more specifications
If you know any missing specification/ report in the list, or a specification in the list but does not belong to TSGN WG1.
Discussion: The delegations are requested to provide rapporteurs. A rapporteur should be nominated to all specification under N1 responsibility.
*By the end of the meeting 3 delegates volunteered as rapporteurs:*
1- Mr. Richard Brook/ Lucent for 03.71(03.71)
2- Mr. Rouzbeh Farhoumand/ Ericsson for 23.009
3- Mrs. Sonia Doshi / Nortel for 04.71(04.71)
Conclusion: Noted

## Tdoc N1-99B46 Specifications within TSG_CN/ Chairman TSG_CN

Noted for information.

## Tdoc N1-99B47 /MCC (same of N1-99C75 with some more answers/CN1 chairman) DRAFT - Working Item List for TSG_CN

Discussion: The delegates are asked to help MCC to collect all latest versions of WI sheets and reports related to CN1 work.
This document should be available on the web-page
Conclusion: Noted for information.

## Tdoc N1-99C51 3GPP calendar/ MCC

Noted for information and as the related dates for CN1 are listed above.

## Tdoc N1-99C54 Working schedule of UMTS adaptation of GMM

In the last SA plenary meeting in Kyonju, TS 23.060 for GPRS R99 and UMTS R99 was approved. The TS is based on the agreements of SA2 23.060 drafting session in Helsinki and there are many new functionality for UMTS R99 including new packet domain MM state model which shall lead serious impacts for GMM in TS 24.008.
Hence N1 has to finalize the stage 3 protocol work in the only TWO remaining meetings. So it is necessary for us to clarify how to do the job efficiently, e.g. what and how we should study and issue CRs for TS 24.008. In this contribution, we propose the working plan for UMTS This contribution proposes to define clearly the working plans on UMTS packet domain. Following is some ideas of working plan:

- To catch how the impact, we shall review the TS 23.060 v3.1.0 prior to the UMTS packet domain related issues in this meeting.
- To make a consensus how we should proceed to make TS 24.008 CRs, we shall handle the contributions which will help to make the principle for UMTS adaptation to GMM. One of them is N1-99C58 from NTT DoCoMo.
- To speed up the making CRs process, even if there are any contributions for this meeting related to UMTS packet domain and they aren't fully compatible to the above principle, we may handle them and approve its basic intention in this meeting. Then the delegates will modify their contribution according to the principle for approval in next meetings.
- To make the real CRs for UMTS adaptation to GMM and to handle remaining GMM related items, we should have extra adhoc before the meeting and we shall proceed to the enough points in order to handle and approve all the CRs in the November meeting.

DoCoMo believes that the above plan will help them to approve all the modified CRs and finalize the work in the November meeting.

Discussion: The answers to the proposals following the same sequence:

- R99 packet session will be discussing 23.060, 23.101 should be also reviewed
- Write down the WA in the meeting report
- Write down what is good in that proposal
- We are working on it

Conclusion: Noted.

### Tdoc N1-99C60 Project coordination aspects - Overall Project Plan / MCC

Noted. It is for information only.

### Tdoc N1-99C61 Project Plan: Bearer Services & QoS/ MCC

Discussion: It is a good start to put all our requirements and questions. The chairman is responsible for Project plan on GSM/UMTS Interoperation and Mobility Management (N1-99C62), so a volunteer for this one and others is required to take the responsibility of N1 towards this document for IGC

Conclusion: Takashi Koshimizu./ DoCoMo is the one to take this responsibility 30.802.

### Tdoc N1-99C62 Project plan on GSM/UMTS Interoperation and Mobility Management/ MCC

Mr. Hannu Hietalahti/ Nokia is responsible for this document 30.804 on behalf of CN1 towards IGC.

### Tdoc N1-99C63 Project plan on Packet Architecture and Circuit Architecture/ MCC

Noted for information.

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

## Tdoc N1-99C64 Project plan on Security/ MCC

Mr.Duncan Mills/ Vodafone is responsible for this document 30.810 on behalf of CN1 towards IGC.

## Tdoc N1-99C65 Project plan on Services and Service Platforms/ MCC

Noted for information.

## Tdoc N1-99D08 Proposed change of N1 meeting schedule/ DoCoMo

Due to holidays in Japan, and the meeting is taking place right after the holidays it was requested to change the date of CN1#10.
Conclusion: Noted. No changes were agreed.

## Tdoc N1-99D34 Proposed Plan toward GSM/UMTS interworking Adhoc, 22-24 November/ NTTDoCoMo

This document explains planning chart to progress titled Ad-hoc meeting in efficient manner for R99 standardization.
*Proposal of Planning:*
Considering speeding up the Ad-hoc process, prior to discussing the interworking, it is important for delegates to share consensus what the **UMTS-MM** is, especially for packet domain. So the plan below is proposed.
**UMTS-MM** in GSM/UMTS interworking Ad-hoc session.

**Step-1) GMM-PMM integration (single GMM) v.s. other Approach.**
This topic was discussed in N1#8 meeting and the current working assumption on this point is integration of PMM state to GMM state model. See the detail in N1-99C58.
If the other option to be taken, the necessity has to be proved and informed to N1 participants. **This should be done via e-mail discussion by the end of the first week of November, 5th Nov.** N1 chair should inform the conclusion also by the end of the week.
**Step-2) Prepare input documents and CRs for Ad-hoc Meeting. By end of the third week of November, 19 November. These have to be distributed via e-mail.**
**Step-3) Detail discussion during 22-24th of November.**
The target of this session is confirming basic consensus of UMTS-MM state model and forming those reflection to N1 related specification.

Discussion: Working Assumptions are set by judgement for this time.
It is difficult to set a time, but WAs are needed to be provided to draft a complete proposal. The deadline will be kept, but more discussions are expected.
The agenda is an evolution of N1-99C36.
Conclusion: Noted

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

# 6 Release 99 WIs

## *6.1 Multicall*

### Tdoc N1-99C19 /R99 Cause 'user busy' in Call Confirmed Message/ Ericsson

This is a CR against 24.008/R99.
In the R99 core network shall allow a MT to handle more than one bearer service simultaneously. For this case, a terminal can be considered 'busy' when it is using all the possible parallel bearers and it can not receive any calls using new bearers. This is equivalent to the case when gsm MS is using one bearer.
Discussion: The question was raised whether it is possible for GSM as well to have a multicall ex. GPRS class A mobile station. The wording should be changed to be compatible with 24.008 wording. It would be reluctant to use it only for UMTS.
Conclusion: Cover sheet is the old one so it will be revised to N1-99C86.

Two CRs impacting the same facts so we need to prevent collision.
We need both mechanisms as the author stated.

### Tdoc N1-99C86 /R99 Cause 'user busy' in Call Confirmed Message/ Ericsson

This CR is a revision of N1-99C19.
In the R99 core network shall allow a ME to handle more than one bearer service simultaneously. For this case, a terminal can be considered 'busy' when it is using all the possible parallel bearers and it can not receive any calls using new bearers. This is equivalent to the case when the ME not supporting multicall is using one bearer
Discussion: The text was changed as above.
Conclusion: Agreed

### Tdoc N1-99C52 / R99 Addition of the Stream Identifier Information Element/ NTT COMMUNICATIONWARE

This is a CR against 24.008.
The stage1 spec for multicall was agreed in the SA plenary held in Korea. Multicall feature shall allow a MT to handle more than one bearer service simultaneously. For this case, it is necessary to identify each bearer in order to control the complete call. The name for this element could be Stream Identifier, abbreviated as SI.
The assumption for this CR is described below.

- Terminology

Regarding the system generation, it is assumed that “3G” means UMTS, and “3G-MSC/SGSN” is used in this CR.

- Error handling

In case of a new radio bearer is not available, the network shall clear call with cause #34("no circuit/channel available"). This behaviour is described in section 5.2.1.10 of TS 24.008
In case of the maximum number of calls/ sessions has been reached, the network shall clear call with cause #63("service or option not available, unspecified"). This behaviour for protocol is described in section 5.2.1.2 of TS 24.008. And CR is needed to stage2 specification (TS 23.018).
In case that the network not supporting multicall receives the request for additional MO calls, the network shall clear call with cause #63("service or option not available, unspecified"). This behaviour for protocol is described in section 5.2.1.2 of TS 24.008. And CR is needed to stage2 specification (TS 23.018)
Discussion: It was confirmed that the traffic channels and RAB are the same by the author. Then it was suggested to use RAB because it is the term used in the access stratum. TCH is better in 04.08 as the chairman said. It should be defined in the vocabulary document 25.990 Alcatel/Arne will write a mail to the rapportuer.
Chapter 5.2.2.31 setup concerns "The mobile station shall read from broadcast information whether the area is served by 3G-MSC". If the SETUP message is sent from the 3G-MSC, the call control entity of the mobile station should assign the SI value, and include the SI information element in the CALL CONFIRMED message. This contradicts the what is said before. "Shall" should be used for SI because it is not mandatory.
It was mentioned by the chairman the
at the 2 G MSC whether the 2G-MSC will ignore the SI, but the MS implementation should always send it.
There is an error where referring to emergency call and including SI.
TLB will be for all added IEs for SI.
Conclusion: Principle is agreed. The CR is revised to **N1-99C85.**

## Tdoc N1-99C85

This is a revision of N1-99C52.
Discussion: Revision in N1-99C85 was not accepted, because revision marks were used to revise the CR. The wording UMTS restricts the implementation to UMTS so removing it allows introducing it to GSM as well.
Conclusion: General Principal is agreed, so it was revised to be an input document in the next meeting.

## Tdoc N1-99C53 Outline of the stage2 and stage3 specifications for multicall /NTT COMMUNICATIONWARE

This is a document for discussion
Since Multicall stage 1 specification was approved in TSG-SA (Korea), N1, N2 and NSS should accelerate the stage2 and stage3 works. This contribution intends to clarify the works to be done by WGs and discuss the implementations of functional requirements.
Discussion: Priority setting of CS and PS in HO procedure. It is also a CC and SM issue and not only a RAN issue.

A question of clarification of who is responsible for stage 2 documents?. S2 was proposed in the plenary, but in fact 03.18/23.018 are N2 specifications, so are they doing the work?
Conclusion: It is noted

### Tdoc N1-99D21 Necessity of the introduction SI-IE to SM protocol in R99/ NTT COMMUNICATIONWARE

This is a revision of N1-99D02 which was withdrawn before presentation. It is a discussion paper.
This contribution intends to clarify the necessity of the introduction SI-IE to SM protocol in R99.
Regarding binding method between Stream and RAB, we have three possibilities as follows.
Possibility 1: Introducing Stream Identifier IE to both CC and SM protocol.
Possibility 2: Using value of NSAPI as stream identifier in PS-domain, SI and NSAPI share the NAS Binding Info value
Possibility 3: NAS Binding Info include Protocol Distributor (PD)
It seems that Possibility 1 is redundant for PS(i.e SI and NSAPI), NSAPI identify the data stream for PS.
Possibility 2 has minimum impact on the existing specs, and it is sufficient.
Regarding Possibility 3, the content of NAS Binding Info is different from the SI or NSAPI value that MS assign. In this point of view, Possibility 1 or Possibility 2 is more comprehensive for MS.
Therefore NTT Comm. proposes Possibility 2.
Discussion: Possibility to the direction of proposal 2, where binding of NSAPI and RAB/SI is to be done.
Is it possible to share different sessions on the same RAB? It should be possible to do so as in GPRS.
In S2's architecture, it is not defined to share the same RAB for different sessions. There is no sharing mechanism for logical bearers.
Woking assumption will be taken now for no alternative could be found for the case where it is possible to have multibearer or not.
Conclusion: Alternative 2 to use NSAPI instead of SI for PS was agreed as working assumption.

## *6.2 Multimedia call*

### Tdoc N1-99B99 Technical Specification Group CN; Multimedia Telephony/ Nokia

The report was presented by walking through the chapters.
It is expected to have a conclusion whether it is a R99 or R00.
Discussion: This report is related to N1-99C76 and N1-99C77.
Conclusion: Revised to N1-99C87.

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

**N1-99C87** contains the open issues which need to be covered in this TR. It was presented The TR is provided for information.
Conclusion: Noted.

### Tdoc N1-99C76 Comments to the Technical Report for Multimedia (N1-99977)/ Ericsson, NTT DoCoMo

In order to smooth the progress on 3G-H.324M multimedia, and facilitate completion of stage 3 specification on time for Release 99, the Technical Report N1-99977 is modified as attached.
Requirements:

| **Feature / functionality** | **Release** | **Importance** | **Meeting comment** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Basic mobile to mobile video call | Must for R99 | High | |
| Mobile to PSTN (and vice versa) video call | R99 | High | |
| Supplementary Services | R99 – R00 | Medium | |
| Call type negotiation, end to end solution to be defined | R00 | Medium | |
| In-call modification (e.g. video/H.324-call to speech) end to end solution to be defined | R00 | Medium | |
| | | | |
| Speech fallback (V.8 bis for PSTN, V.140 for ISDN), end to end solution to be defined | R00 | Medium | |
| H.323 interworking | Not supported in CN in R99[1] | Medium | |
| H.320 interworking | R99[2] | Medium | |
| Single numbering | R99 | Medium | |

[1] Considering All IP, it may be in CN in R00

[2] The location of IWF within or outside the CN is an operator choice

For more details, please refer to the document.
Comments by the chairman:
The following changes were agreed to the TR:

- Section 1 is already in TR in B99
- Section 2 agreed to be moved to TR in General section
- Reorganisation to "Agreed working assumptions" and "Open items" needs to be done.
- 3.1 the first assumption refers to

Discussion: The latest version N1-99B99 includes all requirements but we need to identify which one is a R99 requirement. All requirements are updated in B99
Changing the title of the report as Multimedia .
Conclusion: Noted

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

## Tdoc N1-99C77 Comments to Multimedia Technical Report V 0.0.1 (N1-99B99)/ Ericsson

The draft Multimedia Technical Report is revised to 3G TR ab.cde version 0.0.1. Following are some comments from Ericsson.

General Observations:

- Propose to remove "telephony" from the title to avoid confusion with teleservices.
- The report includes scenarios and assumptions that have neither been agreed nor even discussed in N1 or N3. One example is chapter 3.6 UDI/RDI fallback to 3.1 kHz. Editor's evaluations of different contributions are asked to be removed, and brought in as separate contributions.
- Chapter 3.1 is recommended to specify exactly the target release for each requirement.

For more details, please refer to the report.

Discussion: Some comments were discussed

- General reservations to remove telephony from the title.
- Ch 3.6 was never discussed in N3 or other groups.
- Ch 3.1 5th bullet should be postponed to R00.
- The report could have a fixed part which are mandatory and other optional, stable and not so stable parts. The proposal of having a section of agreed WA and other for the proposed WA to distinguish between them which was found as a good idea.
- According to the general observation and what is said should be taken into account. Target release date is also to be decided.
- Vodafone questioned "In call modification" is moved to R00. The originator replies that it is a lot of work to be done and it will not be ready for R99, which is not possible.
- The analysis of the document is respected but the decision to change it to R99 is up to the plenary.
- 3.2.2.2 replacing the text according to our WA for enhanced BC.
- Some history information which is to be added at the beginning.

Proposed approach by the chairman is:

The following changes were agreed to the TR:

- It was agreed to include in the TR also those sections which are still under study but these must be clearly indicated to be not yet in the status of agreed working assumption.
- Comments on section 3.2.2.1 are already incorporated in the TR.
- 3.2.2.2 just state the working assumption to enhance BC IE.
- 3.2.2.3. is moved to open items section
- 4.1 goes to open items section of the TR.
- 4.1.1 goes to open items section of the TR.
- SS go to open items section of the TR.

Conclusion: Noted

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

A revised version of the technical report is to be provided according to the comments. Please consider other comments from DoCoMo which also would help in updating the TR
The title is to be as it is now by Nokia.
About 32 Kbit/s data rate for multimedia, was agreed by the plenary #5

### Tdoc N1-99C79 Basic multimedia call setup procedures/ NTT DoCoMo, Ericsson

This document describes the basic multimedia call (28.8kbit/s 3.1kHz Audio, 33.6kbit/s 3.1kHz Audio, 56kbit/s RDI, 64kbit/s UDI) setup procedures based on the working assumptions agreed in the latest N1+N3 joint meeting
It is proposed that
1) Proposed procedures are agreed as multimedia cal setup procedures.
2) TS24.008, TS27.001 and TS29.007 to be updated accordingly in order to realize the procedures in this document.

Discussion: This paper was discussed in CN3, where they are suggesting some changes to the BC to make it applicable as UMTS BC.
We need to agree on the principal, if there are items we can not agree yet then it should go to the TR not to loose the information. DoCoMo already prepares 2 CRs.
CRs propose to change the BC to be UMTS where N3 should use what N1 decide.
It seems that they changed the name of the BC to be UMTS BC, BC is there is no strong reason to change then why change the name to UMTS BC instead of GSM BC. DoCoMo indicated that it should be common for UMTS and GSM. If N3 intend to define a new BC now, wondered the chairman, it would be too late for R99.
The question was, is it sufficient to make it in the meeting report or a Liaison to N3. Then, DoCoMo will report to N3 directly.
Conclusion: Noted

## *6.3 GSM / UMTS interworking*

More time to work on this WI is needed, Nokia is willing to host an ad-hoc meeting in Finland 22-24.November 1999.

### Tdoc N1-99C36 TSGN1 task list to get the GSM/UMTS interworking and MM in UMTS defined as part of R99 specification/ N1 Chairman.

Discussion: The chairman presented this document and he will consider this paper as the agenda for the work of N1 in the ad-hoc (interworking between UMTS and GSM).
Criteria to top priority follow the idea of no implementation without these specifications. Ex. SMS is not a high priority.
Document related to the subject is covered. Contributors are welcomed to see other company's names there.
If any comments please provide to the chairman and he will provided it as N1 task.
The rapportuer of N1 towards the IGC Hannu Hietalahti will contact the rapportuer of 30.804/ S2 to add N1 input in this area.

Conclusion: Noted

### Tdoc N1-99B88/R99 Updating Session Management (SM) for R99/ Nokia

This document is a CR against 24.008 for R99 only.
This CR proposes modifications and new features for R99 UMTS/GPRS to align SM stage 3 with R99 requirements.
Anonymous access has not been considered in this CR and therefore marked as FFS for UMTS
Discussion: NOKIA and Ericsson support this idea
About handling LLC sublayer, how could UMTS only MS deal with it? Will it be with timers? Chap. 6.1.3.1.1. This need to be studied.
Questions and comments:
- Is TFT described in 23.060 for secondary PDP context notion? If it was officially sent by S2, the notion was discussed by S2 but no official statement could be confirmed. We could consider it as WA, which is not agreed yet
- TFT is a notion 2 active session with same or different QoS, so TFT is a filter or screening to the PDP address. Secondary PDP context will be accepted to be down loaded from a specific port. S2 should write the requirements.
- There is new contribution during the S2 meeting this week in London. We need to see stage 2 before agreeing stage 3.
- We got to figure out a way of which part of the specification apply to only GSM or UMTS like 24.008.
- The new IE described in Ch. 9.5.2, old MS will not understand it **It should be considered whether it should be optional or mandatory.**
- In PDP context address procedure, there is no PDP context mentioned. So how is the secondary PDP context is linked to the primary one? TI will be released which is used here as a key? !! Not clear.
- 6.1.3.4.2 last sentence, applies to GPRS only. Alignment to be used for UMTS too is required.
- 6.1.3.2.2 cause cods, are they the one already defined for context activation or new?
- 6.3.1.1 the current proposed text says, "the MS using GPRS". It would be feasible to add terms to the vocabulary GPRS Mobile: capable for GPRS ( it could support other system but must support GPRS) the same for UMTS. It is also important to specify a mode for MS-GPRS network. Terminology will be added in the progress of the CR.
- It would be useful to put in the CRs which part is effected and put it at the beginning, which makes it readable to the delegates.
- Delegates are invited to comment to the originator
Conclusion: Rejected

### Tdoc N1-99C17 Proposal for updates to 23.009/Ericsson

This document is for Discussion and Approval

TS 22.129 and TS 23.121 contain service requirements and service architecture descriptions on UMTS<->UMTS relocation and UMTS<->GSM handover. The GSM 03.09 has been transferred to 3GPP and converted to TS 23.009 [3]. The prime responsibility for TS 23.009 is N1 according to NP-99312.
Ericsson has started restructuring and adding the UMTS functionality in TS 23.009. The goal is to, with support from other companies, have a complete Change Request ready to the N1#9 meeting in the end of November. As this CR will include a huge amount of changes, and considering the fact that N1#9 is the last meeting to approve this crucial and significantly important CR which will secure the GSM/UMTS interworking, Ericsson volunteers to co-ordinate the work ahead of us on this TS.
Discussion: General question from Alcatel: what about SGSN? The answer was, it would be the next step. Support from other companies to support it as a CR. It might be 2 different issues taking into account SGSN not in UMTS. Taking into consideration the cover sheet, it is better to create 23.009 for UMTS and GSM HO.
Isn't it better to separate UMTS and GSM as it was suggested? Another said, it is better to have a new CLEAN document for UMTS rather than mirroring GSM one and working on it. The chairman commented that the best way is to have one consistent specification for both UMTS and GSM, considering the multimode system covering all HO It is easy to maintain one document.
The problem why these questions were raised is for operator implementing only UMTS based network , usually they prefer to refer to specification which have impact on the product they intend to . This could be solve to specify exactly state which part of the spec you are supporting like only UMTS. It is still open.
It was questioned whether N2 should be the prime responsibile of 23.009 . SMG2 could be responsible as main to the 03.09. "03.09" describes inter system HO
Conclusion: Noted. Further discussion in the interworking adhoc. The chairman will clarify the ownership of this TS.

### Tdoc N1-99C26 / N1-99C27/ N1-99C28 Uplink L3 Message Sequencing / Vodafone

These document are merged in one document N1-99C26 which contains 3 CRs with a cover sheet against 24.007, 04.18, 24.008- all R99
Following on from the document that we (Vodafone) presented at the 3GPP CN1 #6 meeting in Oxford (Tdoc N1-99728), please find attached three CRs to 24.007, 24.008 and 04.18 to increase the window size for the transmission of uplink layer 3 signalling messages. The CRs rely upon the assumption that RAN2 can, for example, work with a window size of three or less.
Currently, after re-establishment of a layer 2 connection, the MS shall re-transmit any unacknowledged layer 3 messages. (The reason for no acknowledgement is likely to be because of the change in channels). The MSC needs to know whether messages arriving are duplicates of messages already received or not. In GSM, one-bit sequence numbering is used. The MS sets the sequence number of messages to alternate between 0 and 1.

Therefore, if the MSC receives two consecutive messages with the same sequence number, it has to treat the second as a duplicate, and discard it.
UMTS will offer improved signalling, by having a larger layer 2 transmit window size. This means that a MS handing over from UMTS to GSM, may retransmit several unacknowledged L3 messages. The GSM core network- operating with a window size of one- may not be able to distinguish between original messages and duplicated messages.
The proposal is to extend the Send Sequence Number (N (SD)) field in the layer 3 header to 2 bits, thus allowing for a window size of up to 3. Bit 8 of octet 1, in the L3 header, is currently reserved and it is this bit that should be used.
Liaison statements have already been sent from the 3GPP CN1 meeting in Oxford, to S2, RAN2 and RAN3, to ask:
1- For UMTS to be specified with a window size of less than or equal to 3, and
2- For a bit on the BCCH to indicate to the MS the type of core network (e.g. R98 and older or R99 and newer) it has accessed, and therefore the window size it should use. This bit could be the same bit that is used to broadcast several core network 'capabilities.'
The N(SD) mechanism only applies to messages to the MSC. Release 97 GPRS does not use the N(SD) scheme. These CRs do not attempt to add the N(SD) schemeto R99 GMM/SM.
Discussion: LLC is an issue, which should be considered.
When MS starts, Radio connection starts with radio revision. If you start with R99 indication then you establish parallel connection in a different system with same identifier for different data same block number could be received.
HO will also be a problem. During HO, the upper layer is not aware of encoding and the mobile will not be able to distinguish it. RLC can cope with it so UMTS to GSM is the problem. Intersystem HO is tricky. The encryption will be in the buffer and will be sent to GSM/UMTS after HO, which have different encryption.
Anchor MSC will have the information so it should not be the problem as stated in oxford meeting.
Conclusion: CR 04.18 is rejected. **N1-99C27** and **N1-99C28** are revised to **N1-99D14** and **N1-99D15** respectively. The subject is to be studied in the Interworking ad-hoc.
**Tdoc N1-99D14** and **Tdoc N1-99D15** were presented and agreed.

## Tdoc N1-99C58 Principle for UMTS adaptation to GMM/ NTT DoCoMo

This document is for discussion and decision.
There is a study item needed to clarify about GMM and PMM to fix the State Transition on Mobility Management for UMTS described in TS24.008.
This paper proposes the principle for UMTS adaptation to GMM and to decide how to deal with some issues on GMM and PMM by introducing some solutions: e.g. addition of state in GMM
It is proposed:
1) MM PS for UMTS should be defined as extension of GMM for GPRS, not to define PMM as a new MM PS protocol.(section2.1)
2) Addition of following new main state and a substate for UMTS GMM(section2.2.1)

- a new main state named GMM-SERVICE-REQUEST-INITIATED for MS side.
- a new substate named GMM-REGISTERD.SERVICE REQUEST-NEEDED for both MS and CN side.

Discussion: A question about RRC state whether it should it be connected in the new GMM state, but RRC is not related to GMM.
How would the RR be visible in this enhanced state machine? No other state transmission should be visible at all for other protocol layers. Stage 2 for GMM is depending on signalling connection. The signal has to come from somewhere, the MM state machine waiting for the connection to be establish which impacts the implementation. The states have to be taken into account.
Single GMM model for GSM and UMTS. Approach is now N1's working assumption
Conclusion: Noted It will be continued in the Interworking adhoc meeting. Agreed the working assumption of including PMM states and state transitions in the GMM model rather than specifying a separate PMM

### *6.4 MS Classmark*

#### Tdoc N1-99C05 Separating RR and MM specific parts of the MS Classmark/ Fujitsu

Discussion: Several changes were proposed, see the other documents under this WI
Conclusion: Revised to N1-99D04.
**Tdoc N1-99D04** was presented and Noted. Alcatel will have some more input for the next meeting.

#### Tdoc N1-99C06 was not provided but replaced by N1-99C11

#### Tdoc N1-99C07 Proposed Solution for MS Classmark Open Issues/ Fujitsu

N1-99C07 then N1-99B94 were presented
Incorporating the agreement reached at the last N1 meeting, TR of MS classmark splitting is updated. According to the TR, there are some open issues to be solved.
This contribution studies some remaining issue regarding MS Classmark restructuring WI.
Discussion: In N1-99 B69, there is a contradiction to what is presented in this paper (page 4) than by RAN3. In N1-99B69, CM is sent in the initial messages and then the authentication procedure will take place, the CN will send back the CM which will be checked by the MS. CM is part of LUP
Although the conflict exists, the chairman mentioned we could put our view on the paper. Alcatel mentioned that we need to communicate to RAN to put the requirements.
*We will have the LS by Fujitsu in N1-99C11 which have all open question so this should be covered.*
Proposal 1 and 2 in N1-99C07 to be implemented in the Classmark-TR.
The document will be put on hold until we get the answer for the LS.

*We could consider the WA in N1-99B69 till we get the answer from RAN why they want CM part of LUP.*
Conclusion: Noted

### Tdoc N1-99B94 Proposal of Classmark 2 for UMTS/ Nippon Telecommunications Consulting CO., LTD

This is a CR against 24.008 for R99.
It is requested that the existing MS Classmark 2 for GSM is to be shared with UMTS. Therefore, the existing MS Classmark 2 is to be modified considering UMTS.
Discussion: Does the UMTS have to ignore the Radio parameters in the CM? UMTS shall ignore these fields then it has to be part of the normative text, and we need to define carefully what are the fields. OR, we do not indicate it at all! So we could write the UMTS MSC may ignore that information in the note. The note should be revised anyway.
The result: The added note will be deleted.
The additional sentence "GSM and UMTS shall share MS Classmark 2 information element." should be deleted too where it is obvious and not necessary.
Spelling check USC2 to similar definition as in 24.008, as used for CM3. Leaving out the remark
In vocabulary classmark2 definition should be added!! Who will do the work?? The originator is asked to do that.
Conclusion: Revised to N1-99D05, which was presented and agreed

### Tdoc N1-99C08/ R99 Addition of MS Classmark for UMTS Interrogation Procedure in MM/ Fujitsu

**Withdrawn.** Not needed after the working assumption made on N1-99C07 above. It was revised from N1-99980

### Tdoc N1-99C20 Comments to Tdoc N1-99B09/ Ericsson

Revised to N1-99C99 before presentation.

### Tdoc N1-99C99 Comments to Tdoc N1-99B09/ Ericsson

This document is for decision.
It is proposed to introduce the comments into [N1-99B09] and to agree on proposal to have different information elements for GSM, GPRS and UMTS as described in the referenced chapter 11.2.3.
Discussion:
Why would Ericson like to have this modification at this stage?:
The second bullet point: "Different values for GSM and UMTS may be used for some fields. Shouldn't these fields be duplicated, then the usage of the fields may come complicated. Proposal: always use separate fields even if values are same or if same values specify in the other field only. ". If there is some data to be send to the network from MS then double CM should be sent, separate CMs. This proposal is limited to the radio classmark. If there is such information in classmark 2 then MS revision level

(which system/version/release) it supports. Then if one (MS or CN) says it supports and the other says not so which one is the correct one? Most of them are defined by a single field to say support or not.
An example for the proposal is, showing which parameters will be duplicated? The radio parameter in CN actually should be repeated.
First bullet point "MS Classmark 1, MS Classmark 2 and MS Classmark 3 IEs are not used for GPRS. The MS Network Capability IE and the MS Access Capability IE are used instead in GPRS", is due to backward compatibility. If it is valid Fujitsu needs to know detail about why and what could be the problems without it.
The requirement in this paper covers CS, PS should be studied.
It was asked if any problem appears using one classmark?
Proposals:
Regarding shared Classmark, it is not preferred by Fujitsu, while it is used in PS only during the session activation. So separate CM for CS and PS. Lucent support it, as long as S2 agreed on separate domain so separate CM is OK. It also means duplication of data
What should we do with SMS CCBS are not related to the radio?
Combined MM would be in favour of one CM?
It is not good for the implementation to have a separate CM. In addition more data has to be transferred.
Conclusion: Noted

### Tdoc N1-99C21 Contents of MS CN Classmark/ Ericsson

This paper is for decision.
This contribution proposes the contents of the *MS CN Classmark* information element (IE), which is to be added to the TS 24.008, reference [1]. The contents are specified as a list of fields and the coding of IE is not presented. The coding is to be defined later as a CR to the TS 24.008.
Discussion: This document has some declaration abut the classmark.
It is stated that "The MT SMS (SM capability) is not included in the new IE since supporting SMS will propably not be optional in UTMS", this mean SMS can be either CS or PO. Will the network be able to send them as it decides?
Will this new CM be sent on GMM signalling channels, so would this be used for 3G ?
In GMM attach request, we have network capability Information, so will the new IE replace it or add another one to it?
Conclusion: Noted.

### Tdoc N1-99C23: Proposed Solution for MS Classmark Open Issues/ Alcatel

This document is for discussion.
The purpose of this contibution is to propose modifications on the last TR « SeparatingRR and MM specific parts of the MS Classmark », in order to :

1. Update informations according to last states of specifications (MS Classmark2 IE content)

2. Give another description of Classmark sending Criteria for UE on connection establishment, considering current GSM handling.
3. Propose solutions to some remaining issues (Classmark transfer during inter-system handover)

Each updated chapter is referenced by the associated chapter number in the TR.

Comments by the chairman: Agreed working assumptions:

- Alternative b, enquiry procedure, is chosen in section 12.2.1.3 in TR with the enquiry coming from RNC.
- Figure in 12.2.2.2 in TR to be replaced with 1.4.1.2 from this Tdoc.
- Section 12.2.3.1 is deleted from the TR.
- 12.3 in TR to be replaced with 1.5 in this doc with figure 4 updated

Discussion:
WA leads to update the TR text and diagram:-
- Chapter 1.4 1.1 is a proposal to get rid of the note and co-operate to the actual text plus adding the new procedure for sending the classmark. It was agreed to be incorporated to the technical report.
- **WA**: Alternative B is the agreed one 12.2.1.3
- Chapter 1.4.1.2 GSM BSS Area (12.2.2.2), was agreed.
- Changed the figure to GSM where this an existing GSM procedure
- 1.4.2.1 UMTS RNC Area (12.2.3.1), leave the text and say it is not covered in stage one as a note.
- Similar subject, N1-99C47 discussion continued there.
- **WA**: For single mode network we do not need to send all information to the network in multi-mode, we need to send all the information
- Alternative B is the agreed one 12.2.1.3
- Chapter 12.2.3.1 is to be deleted from the TR.
- 1.4.3.1UMTS RNC Area (12.2.3.1)
- **WA:** 1.2.3 is replaced by 1.5 with updated figure.
- 1.5.1 General Procedure (12.3.1) was agreed

Conclusion: Noted

## Tdoc N1-99C47 Classmark 3 handling at connection establishment/ Nokia

This document is for discussion.
This contribution proposes the definition of MS CM3 IE as an optional parameter into the R99 L3-MM CM Service Request message. This was already proposed by Nokia in N1 #7 meeting (N1-99A60). However, during the discussion it was questioned how the IWF could cope with this new parameter. A principle for the solution is presented in this contribution.
Discussion: The question is which procedure to use to get the MS CM3 to the network, where we have 3 alternatives
There are three possibilities for GSM core network to get it:

- "GSM like" controlled early classmark sending
- AS or NAS classmark interrogation

- CM3 as an optional parameter in CM Service Request

We need to establish a criteria to establish the classmark where it could distinguish between GSM and UMTS coverage. It also should be clear to t knows in case of sending downlink connection to 2G-MSC while being under coverage of UMTS. This needs to be studied.
IWF is made transparent to the MS in previous agreement, which means MSC (2G or 3G) is not known. So maybe requirement to the IWF is necessary to?
Requirement of MS is to be defined first then if we want to work with IWF, which is not in scope of the specification which is also like adding UTRAN to the specification.
If IWF requires information from the MS it should be transparent and unknown.
Conclusion: Noted.

### Tdoc N1-99C48 Clarification for UE core network classmark content/ Nokia

This paper is for discussion.
This contribution aims at clarifying the content of UE's core network classmark (CN CM) and its relation to the GSM CM2.
It is proposed to replace the chapters in APPENDIX 1 with the respective chapters in "TR <#>, Separating RR and MM specific parts of the MS Classmark V0.4.1".
Discussion:
The first five octets of UE's CN CM should be exactly as specified for the CM2 in GSM release 99. This means that the CN CM may contain GSM radio specific information. About the spare bits, we are not supposed to pack out the radio part but we need to keep the existing bits as they are as the chairman stated.
All parameters for the radio exist so we do not need extra information for HO.
WA made in Makuhari, to extend CM. CM extension is to be removed and leave CM2 with added octets bits in this case!!
So agree the text from 11.1 to be added to TR.
Chapter 11.2.2 is agreed to be added to the technical report.
Other parts were covered by N1-99C23.
Conclusion: Noted

## *6.4 L3 Segmentation*

Comments by the chairman:
Study of L2 segmentation ongoing, RAN3 have answered that UTRAN is no problem, SMG2 promised to look at GSM RAN later.
WI needs to be moved to R2000. See N1-99B53 and N1-99B70.

## *6.6 Turbocharger*

### Tdoc N1-99C22 Feasibility aspects of the Turbo Charger/ Alcatel

Alcatel worked together with Nortel to put the comments in the Turbo Charger report.
Conclusion: N1-99C22 is noted while it was covered in the D03

This led to **N1-99C50** to be revised to **N1-99D03** before presentation.

### Tdoc N1-99D03 Technical Report: Turbo-Charger version 0.1.0/ Nortel

TR is presented for approval.
Discussion: It will be taken to the TSGN plenary for approval if agreed in this meeting
- Chapter 11.2 , the second sentence
  - The Turbo-Charger concept introduces major changes to existing network architecture and maintenance:

- Change "major changes" to "complexity". Because complexity means it is more complex than the existing system and difficulties could carry on even during implementation.
- Chapter 11.3 first bullet point.
  - Evaluate the gain of Turbo-Charger in comparison to the Super-Charger feature, which is simpler and possibly at a lower cost.

- From N1 point of view, it is difficult to take position in this discussion, other group's knowledge is requested. So, Include signalling reduction.
- WI issues in the description sheet; which were approved in the last TSGN #5 plenty are missing in the report. This means the task is not achieved yet for our assessment. It could not be included to open issues, as the author requested, because they are tasks listed in the WI to be achieved.
- Modifications and specifications impacted by this feature is important to be listed in the report.

Any later comments to go to the originator.
Conclusion: Rejected. We have one more meeting before the plenary to approve it if finalised.

### Tdoc N1-99C84 Turbo-Charger hooks for R99/ Nortel

This paper is for discussion and approval.
The Turbo-Charger feature is at risk of not being completed for UMTS Release 99. While this optimisation feature is not essential for release 99, it will be important for the later evolution of UMTS – particularly when a "call server“ architecture is introduced in release 2000.
Nortel Networks therefore proposes to focus the Turbo-Charger release 99 work on providing the "hooks“ required to support this feature in later releases.
The Turbo-Charger technical report (N1-99C50) mentions an optional Network Resource Identifier (NRI) parameter in Iu signalling that may be used to identify the network resource assigned to serve the mobile station. The NRI is assigned by the core network resource and stored by the mobile station. The Turbo-Charger Routing Function (TRF) can use the NRI to route messages from the mobile station to the appropriate network resource. Detailed description, examples of usage, and impacts to the UMTS specifications can be found in the technical report.
Alcatel has stated in N1-99726 and N1-99C22 that the optional NRI parameter should be used for routing, but in GSM it raises backward compatibility problems with old mobiles

that cannot send and receive a NRI. This is the situation that should be avoided within UMTS

Proposal: It is proposed that CN1 agree with the need for a hook in Release 99 to support Turbo-Charger in a future release. Nortel plans to bring in Change Requests for including the NRI parameter in Iu signalling at the next CN1 meeting.

Discussion: Last paragraph before the end "This is the situation that should be avoided within UMTS". It is not clear why, so it was requested to remove it.

Applying the MS requirement was not clear. Is there a stage 1 and 2 for these procedures ( sign. with MS)? Adding IE to CC message should be optional to make them acceptable by the manufacturer.

To make sure we will be able to send optional IE to an existing MS older than R99, behaviour of MS will be predictable by regarding the test specifications to cover them. A procedure should be defined in which message we need to put the new IE and what happens when the MS receive it and how it will react should be defined.

Also it was concluded that:

1- CR to stage 3 without having WI completed is not possible

2- Behaviour of the MS has to be defined precisely.

Conclusion: Noted.

### *6.7 EDGE*

All documents are presented for information, and they have all been presented in SMG2.

#### Tdoc N1-99C37 Introduction to CRs for COMPACT Cell Selection part 1/SMG2 EDGE WS #11

This document is for information

The concept proposal for GPRS-136HS EDGE describes two modes for operating EGPRS as an overlay solution for high-speed packet data in an ANSI-136 system with TDMA voice service:

- CLASSIC – basically EGPRS as is.
- COMPACT – an EGPRS mode that can be deployed with 3 carrier in 600 kHz plus guard band.

The COMPACT deployment is accomplished by synchronising the base stations and time sharing the carriers. The traffic in COMPACT is using a straightforward 1/3 reuse. The use of four time groups, which never transmits or receives control at the same time, creates a 4/12 reuse for control. The time sharing results in a discontinuous broadcast carrier called CPBCCH, COMPACT Packet Broadcast Common Control Channel. (CPBCCH carry the same message formats and information elements as the PBCCH.) Note that a COMPACT cell is not using a BCCH, only a CPBCCH.

Discussion: Chapters 3.1 and 3.2

Use the existing cell barring mechanism for the old Mobiles, and for R99 make new mechanism.

Chapter 3.2: "initiated on such a cell a MS should not camp on such a cell", any cell selection mode takes you out of the data mode like Emergency call.

Conclusion: Noted

### Tdoc N1-99C38 / R99 COMPACT Cell Selection part 1/ SMG2 EDGE WS #11

This is a CR against 02.11, presented for information.
To support COMPACT and Packet only Networks
Discussion: 03.22 uses cell selection, which means network -PLMN selection.
Conclusion: Noted

### Tdoc N1-99C39/R99 COMPACT Cell Selection part 1/ SMG2 EDGE WS #11

This is a CR against 03.22, presented for information.
Introduce initial PLMN and cell selection for packet only systems and COMPACT
Discussion: Network type is going to be stored on the SIM to ease the selection which will be defined.
Something is rather to be done in the area of 03.22 between SMG2 and CN1.
An MS with GSM voice capability shall ignore PLMNs having at least one cell identified with CELL_BAR_QUALIFY_2 = "1"
In case of registering in PLMN not supporting the service in the new next cells, then how many cells we need to look at?
Network type on the SIM is mandatory to the MS and should be optional. But how many Network types, will there be different Network types, maybe 2 Network Types. A PLMN serves 2 networks it could search for the appropriate network.
GSM900 and GSM1800 are not supporting classic compact? So wording has to be added in the mandatory part of the text and made it normative.
It should be distinguished between MS with voice capability or CS only or GPRS only capability.
About splitting the specification for 03.22; LS to SMG2 should be made in this stage. 03.22 V8.0.0 for GSM only causes a problem for PLMN selection. So Split of 03.22 makes it more difficult.
In summery: No objections against the principle. But creating GSM version of 03.22 including the definition of CN related PLMN selection procedure in GSM 03.22 and 23.022 creates a major problem, as this would mean diversifying the PLMN selection for EDGE mobile from that of UMTS mobile. Where is GSM left then? What about multimode mobiles?
Comments by the chairman:

- The PLMN selection changes in this CR are SMG3 WPA responsibility.
- SMG2 are proposing changes which are unacceptable as they put mandatory requirements on e.g. GSM 900 mobiles which do not support the optional EDGE classic or compact mode.
- The note in 4.9 is wrong, it does not take dedicated SDCCH sysinfo into account. The note should be about broadcast sysinfo.

Conclusion: Noted

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

## Tdoc N1-99C40/R99 COMPACT Cell Selection and Reselection/ SMG2 EDGE WS #11

This is a CR against 05.08, presented for information.
To support cell selection and reselection for COMPACT
Discussion: Requirements and links according to 05. Series with CN specifications
Conclusion: Noted

## Tdoc N1-99C41/ R99 COMPACT Cell Selection Part 1/SMG2 EDGE WS #11

This is a CR against 11.11, presented for information.
To support cell selection and reselection for COMPACT
Conclusion: Noted

## Tdoc N1-99C42/ R99 COMPACT Cell Selection Part 1/SMG2 EDGE WS #11

This is a CR against 24.008, presented for information.
Handling of emergency call request when camped on cell where cell barring qualification is indicated (i.e. the network only supports packet data or packet data plus non-GSM circuit services).
Comments by the chairman:

- The section SMG2 are changing in this CR is TSGN1 responsibility.
- UMTS PLMN selection is not covered at all. This is not just a GSM specification

Additionally to this it was noted that some CRs (03.22, 24.008) are clearly under the SMG3 WPA and TSG-N1 responsibility and forwarding them just for information is not sufficient. TSG-N1 has no problem with SMG2 working on the GSM cell selection but the PLMN selection is a generic procedure which impacts CN protocols also in UMTS. Not just EDGE but also GSM and UMTS must be considered when working on the PLMN selection procedure.
There was also detailed feedback like

- How many cells does the MS have to look at during PLMN selection?
- What is the MS reaction when the reselecting a cell in the serving PLMN which indicates CELL_BAR_QUALIFY_2 = "1"?
- The note in 4.9 is wrong and should cover broadcast SI only.
- Some of the proposed changes would leave the requirements on GSM mobile unclear.

Splitting 03.22 by deleting PLMN selection from GSM 03.22 V8 and GSM cell selection from UMTS 23.022 should be considered. Any volunteers to do the hard work editing the CRs?
Discussion: The problem no EDGE in UMTS 24.008, and no 04.08 for R99? Which makes it difficult problem. Again 03.22 should be split.
LS out should be a good start of discussion but there is no reason to delay the WI because we have one more meeting.
Conclusion: Noted

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

## Tdoc N1-99C43 Introduction to CRs for COMPACT Cell Selection part 2/ SMG2 EDGE WS #11

This is a discussion document.
This contribution provides introductory text for a package of CRs related to PLMN and cell selection. These CRs are part of work item "EDGE Compact and support for EGPRS in ANSI-136 networks":

- CR 02.11 (Tdoc SMG2 EDGE 498/99)
- CR 03.22 (Tdoc SMG2 EDGE 499/99)
- CR 11.11 (Tdoc SMG2 EDGE 500/99)

The high level objectives of the changes are:
Allow roaming of handsets using data services in a manner such that the most-preferred data network is searched for and, at the users' discretion, employed for data traffic.
Allow roaming onto data-only networks when no voice service is available.
Allow the search for the most-preferred data network to occur only if the network operator or user has programmed the user's SIM accordingly.
The changes will not impact network selection times for operators and users who do not wish to roam on the most-preferred network for data services
Discussion: These CRs are needed, where in the US they operate GPRS in ANSI systems. The principal purpose of these CRs is to allow users belonging to a multi-technology operator to utilise their most preferred network for packet data services, when available.
Conclusion: Noted

## Tdoc N1-99C44 /R99 COMPACT Cell Selection part 2/ EDGE WS #11

This is a CR against 02.11
To provide optional flexibility for the user when roaming into a packet only network using an MS capable of both voice and packet service
Conclusion: Noted

## Tdoc N1-99C45 /R99 COMPACT Cell Selection part 2/EDGE WS #11

This is a CR against 03.22
To provide optional flexibility for the user when roaming into a packet only network using an MS capable of both voice and packet service.
Discussion: The section that has been defined should be SMG3 WPA responsibility.
Conclusion: Noted

## Tdoc N1-99C46 /R99 COMPACT Cell Selection part 2/UWCC

This is a CR against 11.11
To provide optional flexibility for the user when roaming into a packet only network using an MS capable of both voice and packet service
Conclusion: Noted

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

### *6.8 Security*

#### Tdoc N1-99C29 Adaption of MM and GMM messages to incorporate UMTS security parameters/Vodafone

This document is for discussion.
This document provides draft changes to 24.008 MM and GMM messages, to allow for interoperability between 2G and 3G security. The UMTS parameters described in 33.102 and 33.103 need to be incorporated into MM and GMM with as little disruption as possible
Aim of Changes:

- Minimal changes to GSM
- Permit easy use of GSM SIM in UMTS terminal
- Respect GSM's 20 octet layer 2 blocks (with respect to Authentication Response Message)
- Make ME and MM flexible to handle HLR to SIM authentication schemes
- Permit stored KSI to be sent to R97 GSM network

Discussion: Handover from GSM access network to R99 core networks is possible using MM principle. The parameters are to be added.
Before approval, it would be suggested to have the opinion of S3 because it is a new functionality.
Comments are to be sent to the originator.
Conclusion: Noted. Revision to D16 was withdrawn while no request was made!!

#### Tdoc N1-99D10 Clarification of the Authentication enhancements/ NTT Software Corporation

This contribution shows comments to the N1-99C29.
NTT would like to discuss about these contents and clarify how to enhance authentication procedure and messages to finalise in 1999 based on N1-99C29 in this meeting.
Discussion: Chapter 2.4.3 Authentication and ciphering request
The length of the RAND is 16 octets.
The length of the AUTN is 14-18 octets.
Which should be 16 or 17 octets?
Discussion on a mailing list is welcomed
Conclusion: Noted

### *6.9 CC related items*

#### Tdoc N1-99B95 was revised to N1-99C98 before presentation.

#### Tdoc N1-99C98 / R99 Proposal of UMTS/GSM bearer capability/ NTT DoCoMo

This is a CR against 24.008

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

The existing GSM bearer capability is required to be enhanced to provide new services under UMTS. This document proposes new code points for new services
It was presented
Conclusion: Agreed

**Tdoc N1-99C01 was revised to N1-99C89.**

### Tdoc N1-99C02/R99 Extended Transaction Identifier Reject/ Fujitsu

This is a CR against 24.008
When a future mobile terminal sends a message with Extended TI to a R99 network, the network is not able to analyse the extended TI and will ignore the message. The terminal is put on hold until time out and the user may make repeated service request with extended TI. This will degrade user service. To avoid the situation, the R99 network should reject the message with extended TI
Discussion: it was made clear that Reject means normal procedure, which should be specified in the CR and should be checked against all affected messages and timers.
Using the value 111 for the TI, which is usually rejected in GSM, is to be made clear and obvious with the reason for rejection explicitly mentioned in the specification.
Conclusion: Revised to **N1-99C90**, which is revised to D28 due to editorials. N1-99D28 was agreed.
**Tdocs N1-99C89 and N1-99C90 were presented together.**

### Tdoc N1-99C89 Transaction Identifier Extension/ Fujitsu

This is a CR against 24.008
To increase the number of simultaneous calls/sessions from the present 7, the TI value needs to be increased.
Even if the current number of available TI is enough for the service requirement of R99, this work has to be done in R99, as 1st release of UMTS, to avoid future comparability problems.
Conclusion: The CR was presented and agreed.

### Tdoc N1-99C18 Mapping of UMTS BC IE into RAB QoS parameter for speech/ Ericsson

This is a document for decision
This document requests the introduction of a mapping procedure from UMTS BC IE to RAB QoS related radio access parameters into TS 24.008.
Discussion: Informal Qos meeting to list questions and open items list to be answered by other groups was set by the chairman after the normal hors of CN1 meeting.
The working assumption was confirmed by the meeting. This means that GSM GPRS QoS will be the same as R99 UMTS QoS. This leaves R99 GSM and UMTS consistent but the interworking to older GPRS releases still needs to be defined by S2 and RAN groups.

Contents will be taken to the document we will prepare in the GSM-UMTS interworking ad-hoc meeting.
Conclusion: Noted

### Tdoc N1-99C24 /R99 Clarification of DTMF procedure/ Vodafone, Siemens

This is a CR against 24.008
Phase 1 of GSM 04.08 specified two timers in the MS to ensure that the recommended minimum length of a DTMF tone and the minimum gap between DTMF tones were achieved. These timers were later removed because the transmission time of the DTMF messages across the radio interface ensures that the recommended minimum times are met.
With the introduction of a faster radio interface for UMTS (UTRAN), the minimum length of a DTMF tone and minimum gap between tones need to be maintained and the sequence of DTMF messages should be specified more clearly.
Therefore, this CR proposes that:
Individual networks (rather than the MS) shall be responsible for ensuring that the recommended minimum times are achieved.
References to old CEPT documents in this specification have now been updated to refer to the equivalent ETSI Technical Report. These recommendations are European. Other regions of the world may have their own recommendations that they wish to observe. The requirement will therefore be on the individual networks to ensure that the relevant recommendations are followed
Conclusion: Agreed

### Tdoc N1-99C25 /R99is revised to N1-99C88 clarification on sequensing/ Vodafone, Siemens

### Tdoc N1-99C88/R99 Clarification of DTMF procedure/ Vodafone, Siemens

This is a CR against 24.008
Phase 1 of GSM 04.08 specified two timers in the MS to ensure that the recommended minimum length of a DTMF tone and the minimum gap between DTMF tones were achieved. These timers were later removed because the transmission time of the DTMF messages across the radio interface ensures that the recommended minimum times are met.
With the introduction of a faster radio interface for UMTS (UTRAN), the minimum length of a DTMF tone and minimum gap between tones need to be maintained and the sequence of DTMF messages should be specified more clearly.
Therefore, this CR proposes that:
Individual networks (rather than the MS) shall be responsible for ensuring that the recommended minimum times are achieved.
To make sure that there is a strict order in which DTMF messages can be sent between the MS and the network. This is aided by the introduction of 2 new timer mechanisms in the MS.

Discussion: The reason for change is because of faster UTRAN, which differs with Note 2 on page 4. It is a note and not normative necessary. We should have the timers on the MSC for the UTRAN. This note will be removed.
Ericsson supports this idea of timers presented for DTMF in this case, but why 2 timers and not one? It was agreed that 2 timers are more tidy solution, please see section 5.5.7.1. The reason is start and stop cases handled separately. 337 expiry to allow the mobile to have a different procedure than DTMF if required.
Conclusion: Revised to **N1-99C91**, which was presented and agreed.

### Tdoc N1-99D01 Brief report of S1 and N3 meeting for Bearer Modification without pre-notification/ NEC

This document is for information
After last N1#7 meeting, Makuhari, we participated on both S1#5 and N3#6 meeting held in Munich and Sophia Antipolis respectively to discuss the subject regarding to "Bearer Modification without pre-notification". This contribution briefly reports the result of S1 and S1/N3 joint meeting.
Discussion: In call modification without notification. So N3 wants service requirement before progressing in it. It seems S1 and N3 making progress in it.
The intention of this document in N1 is that it is a matter between N1 and S1. It is for information for N1 while S1 and N3 are discussing.
It is hard to have it in R99, but never know! There will be 2 categories of R99 one will be moved to R00, the other some WI s will still in R99 although it would have some missing distribution.
Conclusion: Noted

## *6.10 Out-of-band transcoder Control*

### Tdoc N1-99D32 Analysis of Impact on TS24.008 by Out Band Transcoder Control/ NTT DoCoMo, was presented with N1-99D33

This document is for approval
This document summarises the pact to N1 specification, TS 24.008 by introducing Out band Tanscoder Control, which is a WI in N2 in R99.
Annex-2 is the WI proposal of "Work Item Description of Out-of-Band Transcoder Control" and this was approved last N-Plenary meeting in Kyonju. In section x.13, impacts of TS24.008 is described, yet in our investigation these descriptions are not represent current N1's study. This paper provides more updated information and propose to issue a LS to inform this to N2, as attached as Annex-1 of the document..
Discussion: This item is under study and companies are invited to give input.
The impact on the MS is not quite clear .
No time at the moment to discuss in detail what is the impact on the MSC
S2 should be added to the list.

Conclusion: N1-99D32 is Noted. N1-99D33 is revise to N1-99D40. It should "Modify the 3rd sentence to say currently the impacts on 24.008 and on the MS are minor, just need to define value for the codec information."

### *6.11 Qos*

#### Tdoc N1-99B89 Extension of Maximum N-PDU size (Max SDU size)/ NTT DoCoMo

This paper is discussion and decision
This paper studies maximum length of N-PDU and proposes extension. Currently the length is fixed in 1500 octets, but new PDP type = PPP has been introduced. In the PPP application, the packet length becomes more than 1500 octets, this cause IP packet segmentation and assembly in MS and SGSN, which increase the processing cost. In order to avoid the fragmentation process, new maximum N-PDU size is proposed.

TS 23.907 mentions that the practical length of Maximum SDU size should be studied in protocol-group rather than architecture group. (Note: in TS23.907, it is shown as Maximum SDU size, instead Maximum PDU size in 23.060) N1 shall receive LS from S2 on this investigation. (S2-99980; attachment 3 of this document) Therefore, our group should decide the practical length and propose the length to the architecture group.
Discussion: For the packet size, backward compatibility with GPRS could be a problem. Also the MSes for R98 will not be able to negotiation between network and MS which should be possible according to operator requirements as DoCoMo stated.
CS and SM will not be distinguished in this case. Also QoS, is different from BC. SM QoS negotiation, which will make the final decision in the negotiation of QoS Network or MS.
N1-99B96 and N1-99B97 has more details about QoS parameters which should be negotiated by the network
Concerns and reservation from some delegates are shown we need to list the summery discussion

- Backward compatibility could be a problem unless the negotiation procedure covers it. 1500 octet could not be removed from GSM
- Is the proposal related to CN or it should be related to RAN? SNDCP and LLC is not in UMTS , where PDP PDU limit was 1500 it is proposed to limit it to 4096 octets. So do you want to limit PS or also impact the CS and what is the reason for increasing the length? RLC what is its current limit it would be able to carry and do we want to increase it? So it would be RAN issue.
- PPP could be good to know why octet framing is used?
- Other comments and concerns is to be given to the document originator

Conclusion: Noted

#### Tdoc N1-99B96 Coding for QoS Parameters/ NTT DoCoMo, NEC, NTT Software

This paper is discussion and decision

23.907[1] was updated in QoS Ad hoc last meeting, and range of QoS parameters was shown. Moreover, it was approved that 23.907[1] was promoted to TS from TR. Therefore, in N1, coding for Quality of Service IE in SM for R'99 needs to be determined immediately.
We propose to decide the format of Quality of Service IE of SM for R'99 by this meeting, and approve CR. In order to determine the Quality of Service IE in RANAP, GTP and MAP, we propose to issue LS to inform our decision to N2 and R3 in a hurry. (see **N1- 99B98**)
Comments by the chairman:
Could not be agreed as working assumption. More time to compare the alternatives is needed.
Proposal to replace the existing QoS with one that maps 1:1 to UTRAN RAB parameters. This would make GSM and UMTS QoS completely different. S2-R3-N1 will have to solve this question very urgently in order to get QoS as part of the R99.
B97 proposes to delete all of the existing SM QoS IE contents and to replace that with a new UTRAN related reflection of RAB.
Where is the mapping between RAB – BC and RAB – QoS defined? In which specification? For CS in 27.001
Discussion: Regarding speech service BC set is used so QoS parameters are to be used according to the requested service. It is also related to the formal discussion in N1-99B89.
Qos parameter for SM are not inline with what is stated in the existing documents. New extensions were introduced in the previous meetings to cover the new requirements of QoS.
Question was raised, where will the mapping be defined, in which spec 04.08?? There is a contribution from Ericsson on this issue. This is answered in the next document N1-99B97
WA is rejected as well as for N1-99B96 and N1-99B98
Conclusion: Noted

### Tdoc N1-99B97 /R99 Quality of Service IE modification/ NTT DoCoMo, NTT Software

This document is a CR against 24.008
This document reflects 23.907 version 1.6.0. and N1-99B96. .
Discussion: why is this suggestion made?
Working on R99 effects GSM and UMTS. The principle of mapping of QoS parameters on GSM and UMTS are different and could not be the same on the radio. It is clearly a decision on principle. The intention of NTT DoCoMo is good to improve the work in the area. The problem is choosing between GSM and UMTS. Which SM is used for UMTS and which for GSM. Maybe a new IE is to be introduced for theR99/QOS . The alternative in the same IE is possible SA2 had decided to replace GPRS QoS to UMTS QoS. As DoCoMo stated. Guidance for the decision is required, S2 should be contacted

ASAP. Relying on S2 for coding is almost a disaster, they do not have the expertise like in N1 for that.
2 extreme solutions removing GSM or adding to it. Compatibility is an issue. Longer messages are not compatible to older releases. It is actually interworking problem!! The delegates supported the idea.
The originator required discussion on coding contents without looking at the whole issue as done till now.
If we set up a video call, how would it be handled it in a multimode channel. What kind of mapping will be done? Is it considered? Transfer Delay, octet12 should be declared as values, what data fields do we need in QoS.
Conclusion: Rejected

### Tdoc N1-99C74/ R99 Enhanced QoS support in GPRS/ Ericsson

This document is a revision of N1-99C72.
This document is a CR for 24.008/R99.
During a GPRS session, the QoS profile (e.g. the bandwidth reservation) for a data flow related to an activated PDP context may dynamically change in the PDN. This change may require a re-negotiation of the QoS profile for this PDP context in the GPRS network. A mechanism is therefore required that allows the GGSN to first map the QoS-parameters of the PDP to the parameters used in the GPRS network and then to initiate a modification of the QoS for the PDP context.
Furthermore, in order to adapt to the changing radio environment, network congestion, and changing application requirements, an MS may need to modify the QoS profile associated with a PDP context.
However, in the current version of GSM 24.008 only an SGSN initiated PDP context modification is supported. Consequently, this CR proposes to enhance the QoS concept in GPRS to enable a GGSN and an MS initiated re-negotiation of QoS profiles by introduction of a GGSN and MS initiated PDP context modification procedures.
If a GGSN is optionally configured to allow external PDN address allocation (eg DHCP) the MS will receive the PDP address 0.0.0.0 in Activate PDP context Accept,- indicating that a PDP address will be negotiated. The allocated PDP may in this case be transferred from SGSN to MS in the Modify PDP context request message.
Discussion: IP addressing change is required as the author sees for ex. DHCP and Mobile IP applications.
Qos change should be brought back to the original negotiated one after changing it for a reason like congestion.
If the concept applies for UMTS and GSM/GPRS then it should apply to both. LLC/SAPI we need to solve it. Which is mandatory in some existing sessions.
It will overlap with the N1-99B88 which has changes on the same part of the document.
We tried N1-99C72 which was also discussed as previous revision, which was revised before presentation, but no answers were reached.
The idea, WA is valid.
Conclusion: Revised to **N1-99D22**

**Tdoc N1-99D22**

Is agreed in principle. It will be merged with other CRs which effects the same paragraphs of the specification (N1-99B88 and N1-99C59) and consider the interworking between them. WI should be figured out for the big CR. In case of similar contribution, and to avoid collision, then please contact Ericsson/Per Johan Jorgensen for merging. All interested companies are welcomed.
Conclusion: Noted

### *6.12 Other R99 Issues*

**Tdoc N1-99B91 Mobile Station Classmark 3 Clarification/ Nokia**

This is a CR against 24.008
Mobile Station Classmark 3 syntax does not define what will follow if <Additional Bands Supported> equates value {0000}, i.e. if MS does not support any GSM 400 band.
Additionally, 4 spare bits have been removed from Mobile Station Classmark 3. Originally these bits were reserved for forthcoming new GSM bands to define their <Associated Radio Capability>. However, this reservation is unnecessary.
Discussion: Appropriate LS with this CR attached will be sent to SMG2WPA /Nokia in N1-99D07
Conclusion: Agreed

**Tdoc N1-99B92 Proposed Broadcast MM System information/ Nippon Telecommunications Consulting**

This document is for decision.
It is necessary for network to provide MM system information with broadcasting function in order for UE to perform proper Mobility Management procedure.
Currently the contents of system information broadcast from network have been studied in RAN group (see Annex 1). However the NAS system information in SYSTEM INFORMATION message is transparent to RRC and the detail has not been discussed in RAN group. CN1 should be responsible for these NAS related information for Mobility Management.

Eight parameters were proposed by N1-99742 in 6th N1 meeting at Oxford. There was no opposite comment on the proposal. Therefore, it is required that the proposed eight parameters are to be decided as NAS system information.
Discussion: Related to N1-99B93, which was presented afterwards.
Conclusion: Noted

**Tdoc N1-99B93 Proposed 3rd Generation NAS information/ Nippon Telecommunications Consulting CO., LTD**

This is a CR against 24.008.
It is necessary for network to provide MM system information with broadcasting function in order for UE to perform proper Mobility Management procedure.

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

Currently the contents of system information broadcast from network have been studied in RAN group. However the NAS system information in SYSTEM INFORMATION message is transparent to RRC and the detail has not been discussed in RAN group. CN1 should be responsible for these NAS related information for Mobility Management.

Eight parameters were proposed by N1-99742 in 6th N1 meeting at Oxford. There was no opposite comment on the proposal. Therefore, it is required that the proposed eight parameters are to be decided as NAS system information

Discussion: R99 user point code is 00 and for other releases it is reserved (Page 3).
Access control class in 04.08 specification which should be 04.18 for radio.
Conclusion: Revised to **N1-99D09** which was not presented!

## Tdoc N1-99C00 CR to 23.040 for ANSI-136 Teleservices Interoperability/ Lucent Technologies

This document is presented for information
SMG#25 endorsed a proposal to find commonalties and to harmonize the specification of EGPRS implementations in ANSI-41/136 networks with the ETSI GSM specifications for EGPRS. In December 1998 UWCC (Universal Wireless Communications) and ETSI agreed on co-operation between the two organizations, which includes exchange of information and documentation. The UWCC has named this project GPRS-136HS.
The UWCC has developed CRs together with ETSI for inclusion in the ETSI GSM Release 99 specifications in support of this goal. A significant element of this work is the support of ANSI-136 teleservices over EGPRS.
The remainder of this contribution describes the technical background for this CR against 23.040.
This CR was presented and approved at both TSG T2 and TSG-T's last meetings. This presentation to N1 is for information only.
Our responsibility is secondary and T1 has already agreed it.
Document is Noted

## Tdoc N1-99C03 Realisation of Paging Response Procedure in MM/ Fujitsu

This document is for discussion.
Paging Response was originally defined in RR protocol. However considering the nature of its function, it should be defined to have visibility also in MM protocol. PAGING RESPONSE can not be deleted from RR but it is a common message for RR and MM. Joint meeting among S2, R2, R3 and N1 agreed to redefine the message as a MM. This proposal did not get the approval of TSGN Plenary #5 and TSG-N1 was asked to rethink their proposal. Following the situation, Fujitsu provided CR, which proposed to define new MM message, *Paging Response*, at last N1 meeting. It caused some discussion with regard to the realisation of the MM paging response concept. The main discussion point was whether new *Paging Response* message should be defined in MM protocol, or new CM service type should be added to *CM Service Type* IE in *CM Service Request* message. This contribution studies the compatibility and smooth migration issues, and concludes that new CM service type approach is to be taken.

Proposal:
Following the discussion above, it is proposed to take CM Service Request message approach for the realisation of MM paging response procedure.
Additional Discussion:
The problem is that the Paging Response message defined in GSM RR protocol is invisible to 3GPP. Even if no modification to paging response procedure is approved, we need to define the Paging Response message anywhere in 24.008 although the PD indicates RR.
C04 was presented.
Comments by the chairman:
The meeting decided to address the question by moving the existing RR PAGING RESPONSE message from 04.18 to 24.008. This means adopting the current GSM paging procedure as such, including the RR PD of the PAGING RESPONSE message. As the message is significant to both radio access network and CN, not having it as part of UMTS specification is not acceptable.
24.008 and 04.18 CRs to be drafted and liaised to SMG2 WPA for them to endorse this change on specification under joint responsibility.
Discussion: Radio resource is a RR message to it would be visible to the network entity.
We can make 2 CRs for shared responsibility with SMG2WPA, CR for 04.18 and another for 04.18 removing paging response
24.008 adding paging response as adding it common between GSM and UMTS
A different issue was also proposed/ not taken/ to keep 04.08 as common R99 and before.
LS out will be prepared with the CRS.
Currently PAGING RESPONSE is a message having significance for both Radio Access Network and CN (MM). Not having this MM related message in the UMTS specification leaves the whole specification incomplete. Making PAGING RESPONSE message visible in the UMTS specification would be acceptable compromise and it would still not cause any technical changes or compatibility problems.
The LS out with N1-99D41 proposing SMG2 to endorse our CR on 24.008 (attached to the LS) and to agree N1-99D42 which is SMG2 responsibility for 04.18.
Conclusion: Noted

## Tdoc N1-99C04 Paging Response as a MM message/ Fujitsu

This is a CR against 24.008
Paging Response message is categorised in RR protocol in GSM and it is carried through A interface included in *Complete Layer 3 Information message* and then interpreted by MSC.
Issues identified are as follows,

1. If Paging Response is carried though Iu interface to MSC, it needs to be analysed by MSC. This means that MSC knows the format of RRC message. According to basic principle of UMTS, RAN and CN are to be independent from each other, therefore this procedure is against the principle.

2. The modification to redefine *Paging Response message* in MM protocol does not have any impact to actual products of GSM MSCs, but the impact is just on the specification.
3. Issue of Paging Response categorisation is related to both RR and MM. If we are waiting for the simultaneous evolution both of RAN and CN, there is no chance to improve the protocol.
4. We may have more than one radio systems for UMTS. These should be independent from each other in terms of protocol structure and so on, however both of which should commonly have same message, that is *Paging Response message*.

As it seen in the following, *Paging Response message* is categorised in RR protocol in current GSM specification, it is, however, acting like a MM message. Paging procedure in GSM is very well designed and basically there is no need to be modified. But only the classification of protocol of *Paging Response message* needs to be reconsidered.

Considering from philosophical viewpoint, *Paging Response message* should be MM protocol.

Protocol Independence

If *Page Response* were to be an RRC message, it would be against the basic principle for protocol independence because *Paging Response* as RRC message is interpreted by MSC. If a part of RRC protocol entity is located in MSC, it is against the principle of clear separation of RAN and CN, and else if other protocol entity to RRC protocol can interpret and RRC message, it is against the principle of protocol independence. If Paging Response is defined in MM, there is no problem regarding this aspect.

MM Connection Setup Procedure

As is *CM Service Request*, *Paging Response* is used as a trigger to establish MM connection. If we define *Paging Response* as an MM message, almost same procedure can be used both for originating call and terminating call.

In current procedure, *Paging Response* is carried on *Complete Layer 3 Information* message, as CM Service Request is. Considering it, *Paging Response* has already acted like as MM message. There will be, therefore, no impact to current procedure.

Modularity of Several Radio Systems

UMTS CN may support more than one radio systems. These should be independent to each other, for example, in terms of protocol structure and other aspects. However both of which are forced to commonly have same message, that is *Paging Response*. In other words, *Paging Response* needs to be a radio system independent RRC message. It does not seem to be reasonable.

Note: Joint meeting among S2, R2, R3 and N1 agreed to redefine the message as a MM.

Discussion: The CN needs to transfer information to the UE to inform it in which network it is roaming.

If it in RAN and no network indication it would be a problem for GSM MS, down link info from network to MS /UE the MS will use GSM paging, if the network, broadcast the information the MS/Ue will use the paging for UMTS.

Duplicate the message paging response to cover both types. R99 and R98, where there will always be a fallback mechanism

The new point code in CM service Request will be rejected in old network., so add it optional to CM service request which helps in the error handling. It should be Mandatory for the Mobile to send it. No fall back in the MS so giving the additional info in CN with duplication of PAG RESp R99 will not need to implement
No changes to paging procedure, this is not possible because UE does not send CM service request!!!
So we need to implement both procedures.
Conclusion: rejected.

### Tdocs N1-99C55, N1-99C56, and N1-99C57 are related and were presented together.

The three documents are consider to be included in the UMTS-GSM Interworking ad-hoc meeting. So any comments are to be given to the originator, It is important issue for LLC.
Should it be reflected in 23.121. WA is accepted, comments are invited. No LS is required while S2 are already discussing this matter.
N1-99C56 and N1-99C57 are revised to N1-99D19 and N1-99D20 which will be provided for this meeting for information and discussed further for approval.

### Tdoc N1-99C55 Proposed Using MM sublayer for 3G PS-SMS transfer (revised N1-99A13)/ NTT COMMUNICATIONWARE

This document is for discussion and decision.
In Makuhari meeting, UMTS PS SMS protocol architecture was discussed and it was agreed that the packet SMSs are routed via GMM on radio interface, but further study on the new GMM service primitive is required. To investigate service primitives, this contribution discusses the requirement for GMM and proposes new functional distribution between GMM and SMC-GP
Comments by the chairman:
Proposal to handle R99 UMTS SMS messages via MM layer. No change in R99 GSM needed as the LLC is still there.
This working assumption was agreed and it means that 23.121 needs to be changed to the same thinking.
Comments on the CRs are still invited.
Discussion: In 23.121 SMS uses RRC and skips MM. So the presence of the MM layer is necessary.
What happens for R99 roaming in GSM network? Do we need to define both procedures?
The proposal is only for R99 and not the previous releases.
Conclusion: Noted

### Tdoc N1-99C56 / R99Using MM sublayer for PS-SMS message transfer/ NTT Communicationware

This is a CR against 24.007

In GSM/GPRS, LLC is used for PS-SMS message transfer. However, It is agreed that the signalling channel shall be used for PS-SMS transfer in UMTS system as well as for CS-SMS because of LLC removal described in 23.121. Therefore, we propose that the MM sublayer shall be used for PS-SMS message transfer as CS-SMS CM entities because in UMTS only the MM sublayer provides a logical link between MS and SGSN.
This CR proposes protocol for 3G PS-SMS over radio interface according to using MM sublayer for PS-SMS message transfer. The concrete modifications are below:

- new SAP (PMMSMS-SAP)
- new service primitives for PMMSMS-SAP
- new protocol discriminator for PMMSMS-SAP

In this CR, it is assumed that enhanced GPRS GMM is adopt for UMTS packet domain MM sublayer.
C57 was presented afterwards.
Conclusion: Revised to **N1-99D19**, which was not made available during the meeting

### Tdoc N1-99-C57/ R99 Using MM sublayer for PS-SMS message transfer/ NTT Communicationware

This is a CR against 24.011
In GSM/GPRS, LLC is used for PS-SMS message transfer. However, It is agreed that the signalling channel shall be used for PS-SMS transfer in UMTS system as well as for CS-SMS because of LLC removal described in 23.121. Therefore, we propose that the MM sublayer shall be used for PS-SMS message transfer as CS-SMS CM entities because in UMTS only the MM sublayer provides a logical link between MS and SGSN.
This CR proposes protocol for 3G PS-SMS over radio interface according to using MM sublayer for PS-SMS message transfer. The concrete modifications are below:

- new SMC-PS is defined because new functionality is required to SMC-GP
- SMC-PS state model and procedures, it is similar to SMC-CS

In this CR, it is assumed that enhanced GPRS GMM is adopt for UMTS packet domain MM sublayer.
Conclusion: Revised to **N1-99D20**, which was not made available during the meeting

### Tdocs N1-99D36 and N1-99D18 were presented together.

### Tdoc N1-99D36 Paging Response in UMTS/Fujitsu

This is a CR against 24.008
The Paging Response message is defined in RR protocol. The specification defines the message is GSM 04.18, which is under the responsibility of ETSI SMG. The problem is that the message is invisible from 3GPP though it is an essential message.
The Paging Response message is similar to the CM Service Request message considering its nature of functionality. It is proposed to move the responsibility of the message from ETSI SMG2 to 3GPP N1 though the PD is still indicating RR.
This modification is not impacting on any implementation

Discussion: It proposes that 04.18 delete the paging response. We have done our part in 24.008. The chairman changes reason for change in 24.008.
Conclusion: N1-99D36 is revised to **N1-99D41**, which has changes in the cover page only, which is agreed.

## 7 Output Liaison Statements

### Tdoc N1-99B98 LS on Coding for QoS Parameters/ NTT DoCoMo, NTT Software

Discussion: R3 group can carry on their work without us sending the statement. It is not necessary to send it.
Conclusion: Withdrawn.

### Tdoc N1-99C11 Proposed Liaison back to R3 on Security mode control procedure/ Fujitsu

N1 has received a liaison statement regarding on Security Mode Control procedure on Iu interface.
Regarding same issue, Fujitsu proposed to send liaison statement, which proposed that „*allowed encryption algorithm list*“ to be stored in UE capability information, which defines UTRAN related UE radio capability. The proposal was agreed in principle, however it was withdrawn since there was a comment that the point which Fujitsu wanted to make sure had been already clear from RANAP specification.
Discussion:
Add S3 to the recipients of the LS.
Ask S3 about their opinion explicitly.
We could remove R2 from the recipients => No CC is required
Conclusion: Revised to N1-99D06, which was presented and agreed. It was sent immediately by delegates to R3 for having parallel meeting.

### Tdoc N1-99C80 Proposed Liaison Statement on Active Location Retrieval in CAMEL Phase 3/ Lucent

N1 would like to confirm that their understanding of the proposed sequence of events is correct.
Conclusion: Agreed and will be sent

### Tdoc N1-99C81 (Proposed) Reply to LS on Common Identification for Relocation Co-ordination/

3GPP CN1 thanks 3GPP RAN3 for their liaison statement, and has considered the consequences of using the IMSI as a common identifier for relocation instances, when the UE is involved in both CS and PS connections.
3GPP CN1 agrees that 3GPP RAN3's approach seems to work, and can see no likely cases where a UE with no SIM is involved in both CS and PS emergency calls.

However, 3GPP CN1 believes that it is out of our scope to define the service, and suggests that it may be a task for 3GPP SA1.
Conclusion: Agreed

### Tdoc N1-99C82 Proposed Liaison Statement on 5 or 6 digit IMSI/

TSG-N1 thank TSG-T2 SWG1 for their liaison statement (TSGT2#6(99)814, N1-99B83) on 5 and 6 digit PLMN code (MCC+MNC) in the IMSI stored on the SIM card.
We have studied this external requirement of being able to handle both 2 digit and 3 digit MNC from the MM and GMM protocol viewpoint. Our main focus has been on matching the SIM MCC+MNC code with the one broadcast by the serving PLMN or by a candidate PLMN during PLMN selection procedure.
Conclusion: Agreed.

### Tdoc N1-99C83 Proposed response on LS on Information about current status on UE idle mode operation

Information by the chairman:
The edge related CRs which have been agreed on 03.22 is pulling to the direction of making V.8., leaving UMTS no chance to use this document. 03.22 will be split in PLMN selection to N1 and the rest to SMG2WPA.
We could add one sentence proposing to SMG2 WPA that ex. Cell selection in 03.22 where no stage four for this release. Another question is to ask how will it be divided.
Conclusion: Revised to N1-99D27, necessary corrections will be done.
**N1-99D27** was agreed

### Tdoc N1-99C92 Liaison Statement on LCS CRs and GTSs for GSM Release 98 in SMG#30

As requested in the liaison statement from T1P1.5 (N1-99C12), CN WG1 has reviewed the following LCS CRs and TSs intended for approval in SMG#30:

CR to GSM 03.71
CR to GSM 04.71
CR to GSM 09.08
GSM TS 09.31

CN WG1 has endorsed the CR to GSM 03.71, CR to GSM 04.71 and GSM TS 09.31. CN WG1 has approved the CR to GSM 09.08.
Conclusion: Agreed, will be sent with the attach CRs

### Tdoc N1-99C93 N1 open questions on QoS

TSG-N1 has discussed the evolution of the SM Quality of Service IE and we have come up with the following questions to which we need answers in order to be able to complete our part of QoS work for R99.

- We have received the news that mapping of SM level QoS attributes to GSM and UTRAN RAB has been decided upon. We understand this to align the SM

QoS IE structure with the RAB. Effectively this means replacing the R97 and R98 SM QoS with new contents.

- The decision to change QoS automatically creates a compatibility issue. After this decision the discontinuity will be between R98 and R99. TSG-N1 support this decision as it is our opinion that the consistency of R99 is more important here because of the GSM – UMTS handover requirement.
- As a consequence of this it seems to be necessary to define the interworking between R99 packet data and GPRS R97 and R98. TSG-N1 would like to know of the status of this work, particularly if changes are foreseen on the specifications under TSG-N1 responsibility.

- It is not clear to us how the circuit switched CC Bearer Capability information shall be mapped to RAB QoS parameter in order to assign the proper radio resources. Also here TSG-N1 would like to have requirements on the possible changes on our specifications.

TSG-N1 are seeking guidance and decisions on these issues from TSG-S2, TSG-R2, TSG-R3 and SMG2 WPA.

Discussion: If HO does not specify mapping criteria for QoS, then it will be different in both systems and there must be an agreement for the air

N1-99D35 is also a QoS paper which implies with our LS. Discussion is going further in S2 and HO issues will be sent to N1. And will be sent on the reflector.

Conclusion: Agreed

### Tdoc N1-99D06 LS on Security Algorithm Information in UE Capability

N1 would like to thank R3 for the clarification of security issues of UTRAN aspects provided in R3-99D49.

The current N1 working assumption, UE supporting encryption algorithm list and integrity algorithm list are regarded as radio related information, hence it is excluded from MS Classmark for UMTS CN.

Conclusion: Agreed

### Tdoc N1-99D07 Proposed Liaison Statement on MS CM3 clarification CR/

TSG-N1 have agreed the attached 24.008 CR 034 in Tdoc N1-99B91.

The affected section of the 24.008 is under our groups' joint responsibility and we are seeking SMG2 WPA endorsement to this CR.

If SMG2 WPA feel they can endorse the proposed CR we would like to have this confirmed to us by a liaison statement so that we can forward the CR for TSGN plenary for approval.

Conclusion: Agreed with a CR from N1-99B91

### Tdoc N1-99D18 LS on Paging Response in UMTS

The issue of the Paging Response in UMTS is one of the urgent outstanding issues for 3GPP Release 99 specification.

In GSM, it is actually defined in RR protocol. However, due to the non-transparency (not transferred to 3GPP specifications) of the 04.18 specification to the 3GPP community, an elaborated solution (based on the usage of *CM Service Request* message, N1-99C03 attached for background information) was proposed, in TSG-CN WG1 for the realisation of MM paging response procedure.
But due to some concern raised on the backward compatibility with GSM (GSM/UMTS interworking), TSG-CN WG1 rejected the proposed solution and decided to resolve the problem by moving the existing *RR PAGING RESPONSE* message from 04.18 to 24.008.
Consequently, the current GSM paging procedure, including the RR PD of the PAGING RESPONSE message, is adopted as such.
As the message is significant to both radio access network and CN, not having it as part of UMTS specification (TS 24.008) is not acceptable.
Attached also, a CR against TS 24.008 (agreed in principle by TSG-CN WG1) and a draft CR against 04.18. SMG2 WPA is kindly requested to endorse the CR against 04.18.
Finally, TSG-CN WG1 welcome SMG2 WPA response and comments before our next regular meeting scheduled on 30th Nov ~ 3rd Dec.
Discussion: Contains a CR for 04.18, which is revised for the same reasons to **N1-99D42** which is agreed

### Tdoc N1-99D23 Response to Liaison Statement concerning the DRX parameter IE in GSM 24.008

N1-99D23 contained N1-99D24 which is a CR
SMG3 WPA has in Tdoc SMG2 1113/99 endorsed the change requests A634 and A636 "Updating the DRX parameter SPLIT PG CYCLE CODE" to TS 04.08 v6.4.2 and TS 04.08 v 7.1.2 and updated TS 24.008 v 3.1.0.accordingly in change request 047 in the Tdoc N1-99D24 (see attachment).
Conclusion: Agreed

### Tdoc N1-99D29 LS on Service/Baseline Implementation Capabilities

TSG-CN WG1 would appreciate comments on the review of "LS on Service/Baseline Implementation Capabilities of the NAS" in liaison statement *TSG_CN_SS-99113* from SS ad-hoc.
TSG-CN WG1 have revised the table 2 from previous document *N1-99B33*, some of them were accordingly and some of them were considered according to the comments of SS ad-hoc. TSG-CN WG1 would like to respond following our comments and the revised table.
Discussion: N1-99B58 is an LS received from from SS ad-hoc,
The output of the whole document is not needed in N1, it is a good summery but issues are not relative to CN1. The listed specifications are not in our list of responsibility
Make the paper an informative technical report. SS ad-hoc should get T2 to communicate with them.
We align with SS ad-hoc comments. T2 in the others point of view have no knowledge about the table.

N1 is not willing to send this LS for not in our property, also one of the delegates mentioned that the contents are not completely correct.
T2 should take more visible work in this area with asking for help from other groups.
*N1 has no working item to deal with this LS . T1 should directly communicate with SS ad-hoc especially in SS issues.*
Conclusion: This LS is rejected.

### Tdoc N1-99D40 Liaison statement of Impact to TS24.008 by Out Band Transcoder Control

This LS inform updated information to N2 on the titled topic and clarify current study status on N1.
Up to now, at least two companies are studying this field in N1. Currently, we think that the impacts on TS 24.008 and on the MS are minor, just need to define a down link message to carry codec information, and one of the candidates is a "Progress Message" and other alternative could be a RRC message. This is under study, yet we think it we will be able to complete the work in current R99 working schedule. See the detail in N1-99D32, as attached.
Conclusion: Agreed

### Tdoc N1-99D38 Response to Liaison Statement on Issues with Multiple PDP Contexts

In response to the liaison statement received from SMG7 GPRS in Tdoc SMG2 1284/99, SMG3 WPA would like to give the answers shown in the LS.
Conclusion: Agreed

## 8 A.O.B

**Tdoc N1-99D17 Memory of N1#8 Kobe meeting**
This document contains pictures done during the meeting and the social event.

The missing documents from CN1#7 (N1-99B03 and N1-99B04) were provided to the secretary.

**Note**: Status report of the WI is postponed to the next meeting.

## 9 Closing of the meeting

The chairman thanked the delegates for their contributions, MCC for the support, the host for hosting the meeting and the nice evening's social event, and Mr. Yahagi Masahiko for taking the pictures.

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

***ANNEX A***

***Participants List of CN1#8***

Please inform me if your name does not appear on this list and you were participating the meeting CN1#8.

| Name | Tel No | Fax No | E-mail | Company Name | Member of |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |
| Mrs Ban Al Bakri | +33 4 92 94 42 66 | +33 4 93 65 28 17 | ban.albakri@etsi.fr | ETSI | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Mr Hannu Hietalahti | +358 40 5021724 | +358 10 5057999 | Hannu.Hietalahti@nokia.com | Nokia | ETSI |
| Mr Andrew Clegg | +1 404 249 3267 | +1 404 249 5157 | andrew_clegg@bscc.bls.com | BellSouth | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | Lucent Technologies | |
| Mr Richard Brook | +44 1793 736185 | +44 1793 883815 | rb39@lucent.com | NS UK | ETSI |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Mr Per Johan Jorgensen | +47 372 93076 | +47 372 94054 | etopj@eto.ericsson.se | Ericsson AS | ETSI |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Mr Rouzbeh Farhoumand | +1 972 583 8061 | +1 972 644 3036 | Rouzbeh.farhoumand@ericsson.com | Ericsson Inc. | T1 |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | Ericsson Mobile | |
| Mr Johan Wadman | +46 46 193956 | +46 46 193328 | johan.wadman@ecs.ericsson.se | Communications AB | ETSI |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Mr Arnaud Thierry | +33 1 55 66 33 23 | +33 1 55 66 44 50 | arnaud.thierry@alcatel.fr | Alcatel | ETSI |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Mr Mohan Sivanandan | +358 9 43761 | +358 9 43766850 | mohan.sivanandan@nokia.com | Nokia Research Center | |

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

| Name | Tel No | Fax No | E-mail | Company Name | Member of |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |
| Ms Sophie Aveline | +33 1 45 29 60 84 | +33 1 45 29 43 99 | Sophie.aveline@cnet.francetelecom.fr | France Telecom | ETSI |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | Ericsson Mobile | |
| Ms Monica Wifvesson | +46 46 19 36 34 | +46 46 19 47 49 | Monica.Wifvesson@ecs.ericsson.se | Communications AB | ETSI |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Mrs Jasmina Prosenica | +613 9264 3330 | +613 9264 3841 | jasminap@icpdd.neca.nec.com.au | NEC | ARIB |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Mr Duncan Mills | +44 1635 676074 | +44 1635 523615 | Duncan.mills@vf.vodafone.co.uk | Vodafone | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Mr Fumihiko Yokota | +81 44 754 4196 | +81 44 754 4148 | yokota@ss.ts.fujitsu.co.jp | Fujitsu Limited | TTC |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | Ericsson Mobile Data | |
| Mr Lars Ekeroth | +46 31 703 6566 | +46 31 703 6033 | Lars.ekeroth@erv.ericsson.se | Design AB | ETSI |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Mr Dieter Jacobsohn | +49 228 936 3361 | +49 228 936 3329 | dieter.jacobsohn@t-mobil.de | DeTeMobil | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Mr Tony Huynh-Quang | +33 1 30 77 85 10 | +33 1 30 77 81 52 | Tony.huynh-quang@alcatel.fr | Alcatel | ETSI |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Mr Sunil Chotai | +44 1473 605603 | +44 1473 623794 | sunil.chotai@bt.com | BT | ETSI |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Mr Kazuo Mitamura | +81 43 211 2708 | +81 43 211 5161 | mitamura.kazuo@promote.nttcom.co.jp | NTT Communicationware Corp. | TTC |
| Mr Nobuyuki Uda | +81 43 211 2708 | +81 43 211 5161 | uda.nobuyuki@promote.nttcom.co.jp | NTT Communicationware Corp. | TTC |

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

| Name | Tel No | Fax No | E-mail | Company Name | Member of |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Mr Hiroshi Kanno | +81 45 754 3712 | +81 45 754 3879 | Kanno@mcws.ts.fujitsu.co.jp | Fujitsu Limited | ARIB |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | Nippon Telecommunications | |
| Mr Tatsushi Nakahira | +81 44 900 7313 | +81 44 900 7320 | nakahira@mob.ntc.co.jp | Consulting Co., Ltd | TTC |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Mr Zdravko Jukic | +49 2407 575 349 | +49 2407 575 477 | zdravko.jukic@eed.ericsson.se | L. M. ERICSSON | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Mr Janne M. Muhonen | +358 9 51123390 | +358 9 51123207 | janne.m.muhonen@nokia.com | Nokia Corporation | ETSI |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Mr Timo Kauhanen | +358 9 51169688 | +358 9 51129253 | timo.h.kauhanen@nokia.com | Nokia | ETSI |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Mr Takahisa Kako | +81 45 317 7018 | +81 45 317 7028 | kakkou@po.ntts.co.jp | NTT Software Corporation | TTC |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | NTT Mobile Communications | |
| Ms Reina Fuse | +81 468 40 3332 | +81 468 40 3781 | reina@nw.yrp.nttdocomo.co.jp | Network Inc. | TTC |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Mr Takashi Koshimizu | +81 468 40 3332 | +81 468 40 3781 | koshimi@nw.yrp.nttdocomo.co.jp | NTT Mobile Communications Network Inc. | TTC |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | NTT Mobile Communications | |
| Mr Daisuke Igarashi | +81 468 40 3332 | +81 468 40 3781 | igarashi@nw.yrp.nttdocomo.co.jp | Network Inc. | TTC |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Ms Sonia Doshi | +1 972 685 | +1 972 | sdoshi@nortelnetworks. | NORTEL | |

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

| Name | Tel No | Fax No | E-mail | Company Name | Member of |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 5110 | 684 3775 | com | Networks (USA) | |
| | | | | | |
| Mr Timo Perala | +81 3 5510 0851 | +81 3 5510 0801 | timo.k.perala@nokia.com | Nokia-Japan | TTC |
| Mr Adel Rouz | +44-181-606-4475 | +44-181-573-3602 | A.Rouz@fujitsu.co.uk | FUJITSU Europe Telecom R&D Center Ltd. | ETSI |
| | | | | | |

***ANNEX B***

Agreed CRs in CN1#8 meeting

| N1-99 | Title | CR-No | Rev. | Rel. | Spec | WI | Source | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| C15 | LCS CR for GSM 09.08 | CR?? | | R98 | 09.08 | LCS | T1P1.5/Sonia Doshi | N2B, New version with new CR cover page |
| D14 | Uplink L3 sequence numbering | CR004 | r1 | R99 | 24.007 | GSM/UMTS interworking | Vodafone/ Duncan Mills | Revised from C27 |
| D12 | Correction of Figure A.2 in Annex A | CRA039 | r1 | R98 | 03.22 | PCS 1900 Harmonisation | Ericsson, Siemens/ Mark Fenton | |
| C13 | LCS CR for GSM 03.71 | CRA001 | r3 | R98 | 03.71 | LCS | T1P1.5/Sonia Doshi | New version with new CR cover page |
| C33 | A-bit interpretation contradiction | CRA113 | | R97 | 04.64 | GPRS | Motorola/ Hans Petter Naper | |
| C34 | A-bit interpretation contradiction | CRA114 | | R98 | 04.64 | GPRS | Motorola/ Hans Petter Naper | |

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| C35 | A-bit interpretation contradiction | CRA115 | | R99 | 04.64 | GPRS | Motorola/ Hans Petter Naper | |
| C14 | LCS CR for GSM 04.71 | CRA001 | | R98 | 04.71 | LCS | T1P1.5/Sonia Doshi | New version with new CR cover page |
| D26 | Introduction of Reserved Service Labels in the APN | CR011 | r1 | R99 | 23.003 | GPRS | Ericsson/ Lars Ekeroth | Revised from B90 |
| C24 | Clarification of DTMF Message Sequencing | CR001 | r1 | R99 | 23.014 | TEI | Vodafone/ Duncan Mills | |
| D13 | Correction of Figure A.2 in Annex A | CR006 | r1 | 99 | 23.022 | PCS 1900 Harmonisation | Ericsson, Siemens/ Mark Fenton | |
| C89 | Transaction Identifier Extension | CR001 | r1 | R99 | 24.007 | CC Related Items?? | Fujitsu/Fumihiko YOKOTA | Revised from C01 |
| C91 | Clarification of DTMF Message Sequencing | CR003 | r3 | R99 | 24.008 | TEI | Vodafone/ Duncan Mills | Revised from C88 |
| D28 | Extended Transaction Identifier Reject | CR026 | r2 | R99 | 24.008 | CC Related Items | Fujitsu/Fumihiko YOKOTA | Revised from C90 |
| B91 | MS Classmark 3 Clarification | CR034 | | R99 | 24.008 | GSM 400 | Nokia/Hannu Hietalahti | LS out D07, goes with the LS out |
| D05 | Proposal of Classmark 2 for UMTS | CR036 | r1 | R99 | 24.008 | MS Classmark | Nippon Telecommunications Consulting Co.,Ltd/Tatsushi Nakahira | Revised from B94 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| C98 | Proposal of UMTS Bearer Capability | CR037 | R1 | R99 | 24.008 | Multimedia call | Nippon Telecommunications Consulting Co.,Ltd/Tatsushi Nakahira | Revised from B95 |
| D15 | Uplink L3 sequence numbering | CR041 | r1 | R99 | 24.008 | GSM/UMTS interworking | Vodafone/ Duncan Mills | Revised from C28 |
| D25 | Network Requested PDP Context Activation | CR043 | r1 | R99 | 24.008 | GPRS | Vodafone/ Duncan Mills | Revised from D00 |
| C86 | Cause 'user busy' in Call Confirmed Message | CR044 | r1 | R99 | 24.008 | Multicall | Ericsson/ dravko jukic | Revised from C19 |
| D24 | CR 24.008 | CR047 | | R99 | 24.008 | GPRS | SMG2WPA | Related to B50 and D23 |
| D41 | Paging response in UMTS | CR048 | r1 | R99 | 24.008 | Paging resp. as MM or RR | Fujitsu | Revised from D36 |

***ANNEX C***

Output Liaison Statements from TSGN WG1#8/ SMG3 WPA

| N1-99 | Title | To | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|
| C80 | Answer to LS on Active Location Retrieval in CAMEL Phase 3 | 3GPP TSG N2 SWG-A,<br>3GPP TSG T2 | |
| C81 | Answer to Proposed liaison statement to SA2, SA3, N1 | 3GPP RAN WG3<br>3GPP SA WG1 | |
| C82 | Reply 5 or 6 digits IMSI HPLMN | TSG-T2 (SWG1)<br>TSG-N2 | |

**3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #8**
**25-29 October 1999**
**Kobe, Japan**

***1st Draft version on 10.11.99***
***2nd version on 22.11.99***
***3rd version on 22.11.99***

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| C92 | Response Liaison from T1P1.5 on LCS CRs and GTSs for GSM Release 98 in SMG#30 | T1P1.5<br>3GPP TSG CN, CN WG2 | With CRs,<br>**Sent to** ed.ehrlich@nokia.com,<br>**CC**: sdoshi@nortelnetworks.com |
| C93 | N1 open questions on QoS, Liaison statement on Session Management QoS parameters | TSG-S2, TSG-R2, TSG-R3 and SMG2 WPA | |
| D06 | Liaison back to R3 on Security mode control procedure | R3, S3 | Already sent by Delegates/Fujitsu to R3. |
| D07 | LS on MS Classmark 3 Clarification | SMG2 WPA | Includes CR |
| D23 | Liaison Statement concerning the DRX parameter IE in GSM 24.008 | SMG2 WPA | |
| D27 | Response LS on Information about current status on UE idle mode operation | S2, R2, SMG2 WPA, S1 | |
| | | | |
| D38 | Response to Liaison Statement on Issues with Multiple PDP Contexts | SMG7 GPRS, SMG2 WPA | |
| D40 | Liaison statement of Impact to TS24.008 by Out Band Transcoder Control | TSG-N2 | |
| D42 + D41 | LS out for paging response in UMTS | SMG2 WPA, SMG2<br>TSG-RAN WG2 | Includes a CR |