3GPP TSG CN Plenary, Meeting #11 Palm Springs, USA. 14th - 16th March 2001

Source: TSG_RAN WG3

Agenda item: 5.2

Document for: INFORMATION

TSG-RAN Working Group 3 meeting #18 Lidingö, Sweden, 15-19 January, 2001

TSGR3#18(01)0304

Title:Feedback on UTRAN OAM Procedures Work ItemSource:TSG RAN WG3TO:TSG SA5Cc:TSG RAN, TSG SA, TSG CN

WI:

UTRAN OAM Procedures

Contact Person:

Name: E-mail Address: Tel. Number: Gert-Jan van Lieshout (Ericsson) Gert-Jan.van.Lieshout@eln.ericsson.se +31 534505406

Attachments:

"S5-000569_Feature UOAM.doc"

SP-000524

TSG RAN3 was asked by TSG SA#10 to provide feedback on the SA5 work item "UTRAN Operation and Maintenance Procedures" to the groups addressed by this LS.

RAN3 has briefly reviewed the work item sheet in SP-000524, and has a number of questions on the proposed work item, as well as some general comments. It should be noted that this response is based entirely upon the work item sheet, and **not** on the comments/explanations that were recorded in the minutes of TSG RAN#10.

1) RAN3 was unsure as to whether there would be changes to 25.433 and 25.430 specifications as a result of the work item (suggested by section 10), or if they were simply sources of information for the document 32.800 (suggested by section 15).

2) The stated Release 4 deadline of June 2001 for changes to 25.433 and 25.430 is not aligned with the RAN3 target for Release 4 changes. RAN3 understands that the deadline for OAM specifications may be later, but is hoping to have completed its Release 4 work by TSG RAN/SA#11 (March 2001).

3) RAN3 was unclear about the connection between the proposed SA5 work item and the RAN3 work items "RRM Optimisation" and "RAN Enhancements", as indicated in the work item sheet. RAN3 would appreciate some clarification about whether this implies that changes to the RAN3 work in these areas will be required.

4) The indicated objectives appear to suggest that RNC behaviour with regard to NBAP may be specified in detail, which is not in-line with the Release '99 Iub protocol design. NBAP basically follows a client-server approach, with the Node B behaviour well-specified, leaving flexibility for the RNC to decide when to use specific procedures. It was also commented that it was not clear what the scope of the "solutions" referred to in the objectives would be.

5) In general, RAN3 would prefer to avoid external dependencies on its protocols, and believes that discussions on impacts to Iub signalling should occur in RAN3.