

Source: TSG CN WG 1
Title: LSs sent from CN1 since TSG#12 meeting,- pack1
Agenda item: 6.1
Document for: Information

Introduction:

This document contains **12 agreed** LSs sent from **TSG CN WG1**, and are forwarded to TSG CN Plenary meeting #13 for information only.

Status	TDoc #	Source	Tdoc Title	Type	Comments
AGREED	N1-011051	Keith	Liaison Statement on " Clarifications of aspects of Multimedia Capabilities [ID 1281]"	LS OUT	To:T2, CN4 cc:SA2 Revised from 1019. Reply to 921.
AGREED	N1-011052	Andrew	Reply LS on "Using a generic authentication scheme for SIP"	LS OUT	To: SA3 Revised from 1020. Reply to 977.
Status	TDoc #	Source	Tdoc Title	Comments	
AGREED	N1-011250	By Keith Drage.	Liaison Statement on "Flows related to Authenticated Registrations and Re-Registrations"	Related to 1037 and 1039. To: S3 Cc: S2, N4	
AGREED	N1-011256	By Robert.	[DRAFT] Reply to the LS on GERAN architecture and impacts on the lu-cs interface	Related to 1065. To: GERAN 2 Cc: R3, S4	
AGREED	N1-011264	By Chen-Ho.	Reply LS on rejection of 2G AKA by 3G ME with USIM in UTRAN	Related to 1089. To: S3, T3 Cc: S1, T2, GSMA-SGA	
AGREED	N1-011267	By Eiko.	Response to LS (G2-010200) on LCS for GPRS	Related to 1096. To: GERAN 2	
AGREED	N1-011291	By Inma.	Answer LS on Priority Selection Criteria of Calls in a Multicall	Linked to 1073. To: R3 For e-mail approval with deadline Friday 7/9-01 at 12:00 CET.	
AGREED	N1-011313	By Keith.	Liaison Statement on privacy of IPv6 addresses allocated to terminals using the IM CN subsystem	Related to 1155. To : S1 Cc: S2, S3 For e-mail approval with deadline Friday 7/9-01 at 12:00 CET.	
AGREED	N1-011323	By Peng Li.	Liaison Statement on "Reply to Liaison Statement on Signalling Radio Bearer for low priority NAS messages "NAS messages "	Related to 1318. To: R2	
AGREED	N1-011332	By Apostolis.	Response to LS "On the use of Network Domain Security for protection of SIP signalling messages"	Related to 1041. To: S3 Cc: S2, N4 Revised from 1251	
AGREED	N1-011333	By Peng.	Liaison Statement on "Reply to LS on aborting of RRC connection during CN procedures"	Related to 1062. To: T1 Cc: R2 Revised from 1252	
AGREED	N1-011344	By Keith Drage.	Response to Liaison Statement on "Progressing the work in SA3 and CN1 on the IP Multimedia core network subsystem"	Related to 1035. To: S3 Cc: S2, S5, N4, N5 Revised from 1249	

Title: Liaison Statement on " Clarifications of aspects of Multimedia Capabilities [ID 1281]"

Source: TSG_CN WG1

To: T2, CN4

cc: SA2

Contact Person:

Name: Keith Drage

E-mail Address: drage@lucent.com

Tel. Number: +44 1793 776249

1. Overall Description:

"TSG CN WG1 for their LS T2-010436 → N1-010921 dated 18 May 2001".

The current block of work items identified by WG T2 under the parent 1281 are as follows:

1281	Multimedia Capabilities	WG CN1	IMS-CCR
1282	Terminal capabilities	WG CN1	IMS-CCR
1806	Terminal capabilities and Interactions on running multimedia from an external terminal	WG T2	IMS-CCR
1805	Network capabilities	WG CN1	IMS-CCR
1285	Network capabilities (N4 aspects)	WG CN4	IMS-CCR
2529	UE Functionality Split	WG SA1	IMS-CCR

WG CN1 is unaware of any work required from the above set of work items, and this work is not detailed in the current work items on this subject.

There is ongoing SA1 work on the UE functionality split, but the additional requirements of this work on other groups is unclear. It would be better to identify these as new work items when the SA1 work is available.

WG CN1 therefore proposes that work items 1282, 1806, 1805 and 1285 are deleted.

CN1 will make a proposal to the plenaries to delete work items 1282 and 1805.

2. Actions:

To T2, CN4 group.

ACTION: TSG CN WG1 can identify no work ongoing on these items, and it asks TSG T WG2 to confirm if the same situation also exists in TSG T WG2. If so, then TSG T WG2 should cancel ID1806 within the work programme at the next TSG T plenary, and indicate this also to CN1 so they can coordinate related changes to the TSG CN plenary. This does not preclude future elaboration of more specific work items in the future as further requirements become clear.

TSG CN WG1 can identify no work ongoing on these items, and it asks TSG CN WG4 to confirm if the same situation also exists in TSG CN WG4. If so, then TSG CN WG4 should cancel ID1285 within the work programme and indicate this also to CN1 so they can coordinate related changes to the TSG CN plenary. This does not preclude future elaboration of more specific work items in the future as further requirements become clear.

3. Date of Next CN1 Meetings:

CN1_19 27th – 31th August 2001

CN1_20 15th – 19th October 2001 U.K.

4. Attachments:

None

Title: Reply LS on “Using a generic authentication scheme for SIP”

Source: TSG CN WG1

To: TSG SA WG3

CC;

Contact Person:

Name: Andrew Allen

Email: CAA019@email.mot.com

Tel : +1-847-435-0016

Attachments: None

CN1 thanks SA3 for their LS contained in S3-010287 (N1-010977) on using a generic authentication scheme for SIP and also would like to thank Krister Boman from Ericsson for kindly attending part of the CN1 meeting to present an overview of the IMS work within SA3.

CN1 notes that in their LS SA3 state that in the proposed security architecture the “407 Proxy Authentication Required” response is used, however in the presentation by Krister Boman it was indicated that a “401 Unauthorized” is now assumed to be used by SA3 based on their most recent meeting.

It is the view of CN1 that except where there is a specific security problem involved with the use of a specific SIP response or SIP message header that SA3 should keep the security architecture and flows at an information flow level and avoid specifying particular SIP responses and headers since these are SIP protocol issues which may have protocol impacts and as such are in the scope of the stage 3 work of CN1. It is the assumption of CN1 that the choice of either 401 or 407 response does not from a security problem point of view matter and therefore would prefer to see an information level label such as “Authentication Challenge Response” in the flows and documentation from SA3. CN1 does not yet have an agreed position regarding 401 vs 407 response but as indicated would like to make this particular decision which does have potential protocol impacts on the behaviour of the S-CSCF at a latter date.

CN1 also notes SA3’s proposed use of the “WWW-Authenticate” and “Authorization” headers and has no problem at this time with this assumption at this time but would like to continue to be regularly informed and consulted by SA3 concerning proposed SIP header usage for security. CN1 continues to study the matter further.

CN1 also notes the recommendation of SA3 that EAP (Extensible Authentication Protocol) be used in the SIP security related headers. Unfortunately the referenced S3 document (S3-010263) was not attached to the LS and was not available to CN1 at their meeting so it is not possible to make detailed comments at this time. CN1 members will study S3-010263 and the related internet drafts and will provide SA3 with any comments later but suggest that SA3 continue with their working assumption on the use of EAP.

CN1 appreciates SA3 keeping them informed of their SIP protocol security assumptions and would also like to be kept well informed of any internet drafts that SA3 is depending on for SIP security mechanisms as CN1 is tracking all the SIP related IETF internet drafts that 3GPP is dependent on.

CN1 looks forward to very close cooperation with SA3 on SIP security for Rel 5.

CN1 has their next meeting in Helsinki Finland on the week of 27th August.

**3GPP TSG-CN1 Meeting #19
Helsinki, Finland, 27.-31. August 2001**

Tdoc N1-011250

Title: Liaison Statement on "Flows related to Authenticated Registrations and Re-Registrations"
Source: TSG_CN WG1
To: TSG_SA WG3
cc: TSG_SA WG2, TSG_CN WG4

Contact Person:

Name: Keith Drage
E-mail Address: drage@lucent.com
Tel. Number: +44 1793 776249

1. Overall Description:

TSG_CN WG1 thanks TSG_SA WG3 for their liaisons: S3-010382 → N1-011037 " Flows related to Authenticated Registrations and Re-Registrations" and S3-010387 → N1-011039 "Stage 2 information flows for authenticated registration and re-registration in the IMS"

Concerning the authentication flows, CN1 confirms the flows as valid working assumption with the following notes and exceptions.

- it would be preferable that any extensions to SIP are agreed by IETF. The proposal requires such extensions. This will take time which will have to be reflected in the work programme of CN1. CN1 is aware that this initiative has started, and welcomes technical input to IETF from SA3 experts. CN1 will manage any coordination with the SIPPING working group.
- optimisations or changes to the flows should not be made that make the I-CSCF either transaction stateful or call stateful (see draft-ietf-sip-rfc2543bis-04.txt for definitions of these terms).
-

2. Actions:

No actions.

3. Date of Next CNx Meetings:

CN1_20	15 th – 19 th October 2001	Brighton, U.K.
CN1_21	26 th – 30 th November 2001	Cancun, Mexico

4. Attachments:

Title: Reply to the LS on GERAN architecture and impacts on the lu-cs interface
Source: TSG CN1
To: TSG GERAN WG2
cc: TSG RAN3, TSG SA4

Contact Person:

Name: Robert Zaus
E-mail Address: robert.zaus@icn.siemens.de
Tel. Number: +49 89 722 26899

1. Overall Description:

CN1 would like to thank GERAN WG2 for their liaison statement G2-010203 (N1-011065), dated 25-29 June 2001.

CN1 understand that GERAN WG2 is currently studying the introduction of a new parameter GERAN Classmark which is sent from the BSC to the MSC and has to be taken into account by the MSC during call control procedures like speech codec negotiation and data service negotiation, and RANAP procedures like RAB assignment and relocation.

With regard to the mentioned MS capabilities: codec type (incl. supported modulation scheme), allowed channel codings, and asymmetry indication, CN1 can confirm that these parameters are available in the MSC at the end of the service negotiation and can be provided to the GERAN BSC, e.g. within a GERAN specific container in the RANAP messages RAB Assignment Request and Relocation Request.

Finally, CN1 would like to give the following answers to the questions asked by GERAN WG2:

Questions to TSG CN1 and SA4:

Currently the maximum of 16 different codec types can be addressed with the NAS Synchronisation Indicator IE.

- Is the above outlined approach to derive the codec type from this IE feasible?

How will an extension be achieved after more than 16 codecs were introduced to the network, with an extension of the NAS Synchronisation Indicator IE or with the extension on NAS level?

CN1 confirms that currently, i.e. up to Release 5, there is a one-to-one mapping between the NAS Synchronisation Indicator and the codec types as specified in the codec bitmap in TS 26.103. However, for the following reasons CN1 does not recommend to use the NAS Synchronisation Indicator to derive the selected codec type:

i) According to the current specification, in case of SRNS relocation the NAS Synchronization Indicator will be sent to the MS (and to the target RNC) **only in case of a codec change**. I.e. in the standard case of relocation without codec change, it will not be included in order to optimise the length of the handover message on the radio interface.

ii) When CN1 specified the NAS Synchronization Indicator, there was a requirement from RAN2 to keep the handover messages as short as possible. Therefore, only 4 bits were reserved for the NAS Synchronization Indicator. Once that **more than 16 different codec types** will have been specified by SA4, the NAS Synchronization Indicator will no longer be used as a direct pointer to the codec bitmap in TS 26.103. Instead of this the MSC will negotiate a set of up to 16 codecs for each radio access technology, and the NAS Synchronization Indicator will be used as a pointer to one of the codecs in this set. Since the negotiation between MS and MSC will be performed on call control level, the result will be unknown to the GERAN BSC. Thus **the BSC will no longer be able to derive the codec type from the NAS Synchronisation Indicator**.

The MSC could of course inform the BSC about the result of the negotiation, but this would also require the introduction of GERAN specific containers to the RANAP protocol. Therefore, in CN1's opinion, it is simpler to add the codec type in a new GERAN specific container to the RANAP messages RAB Assignment Request and

Relocation Request, and to make the container large enough so that a sufficient number of codec types can be supported.

Please note that the current version of TS 26.103, v 5.0.0, already specifies 11 codec types, including UMTS AMR_2, UMTS AMR-WB and FR AMR-WB, and to our knowledge currently 4 additional codec types are under study in SA4 and GERAN: AMR-WB for Full Rate 8PSK and Half Rate 8PSK respectively, and AMR for Half Rate 8PSK and Quarter Rate 8PSK respectively.

Questions to TSG RAN3 and CN1:

How is it possible to take the transceiver capabilities into account during call setup and handover?

The approach to introduce the GERAN Classmark concept requires the exchange of GERAN specific information between the GERAN BSC and the MSC. Is it acceptable to transfer this information inside containers in the mentioned RANAP messages?

How is it possible to identify the ACS within the BSC, if an adaptive codec type was negotiated by MSC?

CN1 considers the transfer of transceiver capabilities as a task of the access stratum signalling and asks RAN3 to comment on an appropriate way to convey this information. From the MSC's point of view, CN1 sees the following requirement:

In lu-mode the MSC selects both the codec type and, in case of an adaptive codec type, the codec modes (the ACS). If the transceiver capabilities are limited (e.g. if the transceiver supports only certain codec types or codec modes), then this information has to be provided to the MSC before the codec selection takes place, as the GERAN BSC is not allowed to change the codec type or active codec set (ACS) selected by the MSC.

Concerning the last question of GERAN WG2: If the GERAN BSC knows the codec type selected by the MSC, then it is possible to derive the ACS from the RAB Sub-flow combinations signalled with RAB Assignment Request and Relocation Request.

CN1 hopes that these answers help GERAN WG2 to proceed with their work.

2. Actions:

3. Date of Next CN1 Meetings:

CN1_20	15 th – 19 th October 2001	Brighton, U.K.
CN1_21	26 th – 30 th November 2001	Cancun, Mexico

4. Attachments:

Title: Reply LS on rejection of 2G AKA by 3G ME with USIM in UTRAN
Source: CN1
To: S3, T3,
cc: S1, T2, GSMA-SG
Contact Person:
Name: Chen-Ho CHIN
E-mail Address: chen.ho.chin@ecs.ericsson.se
Tel. Number: +46-46-23.1537

1. Overall Description:

CN1 wishes to thank S3 for their LS in S3-010232 (N1-011089) clarifying the rejection of 2G AKA by a 3G ME with USIM being served by a UTRAN. Along with that LS, CN1 would also like to thank T3 for their LS in T3-010379 (N1-010796)

CN1 wishes to confirm that in TS 24.008, CN1 has taken in account this S3 requirement and have specified that should a 3G ME with USIM being served by a UTRAN be asked to do a 2G AKA, that 3G ME shall fail that authentication attempt by the network and allow the network to repeat the AKA. Should the second AKA attempt again fail, CN1 has specified that the 3G ME should consider that cell barred for a period of time.

Further to that, CN1 would like to draw attention to an earlier LS from T3, ie. T3-010379. In that LS (T3-010379), T3 suggest that the action taken should be to provide '*no service (except for emergency calls)*'. CN1 considers that suggestion by T3 not totally appropriate as that would lead to a Denial Of Service to the user.

2. Actions:

To

ACTION:

3. Date of Next CN1 Meetings:

CN1_20	15 th – 19 th October 2001	Brighton, U.K.
CN1_21	26 th – 30 th November 2001	Cancun, Mexico

4. Attachments:

None

**3GPP TSG-CN1 Meeting #19
Helsinki, Finland, 27.-31. August 2001**

Tdoc N1-011267

Title: Response to LS (G2-010200) on LCS for GPRS
Reference LS: G2-010200/N1-011096
Source: TSG CN WG1
To: TSG GERAN WG2
cc:
Date: 31st August 2001
Contact Person:
Name: Eiko Kato
E-mail Address: eiko.kato@ecs.ericsson.se
Tel. Number: +46 46 231295

1. Overall Description:

TSG CN WG1 thanks TSG GERAN WG2 for LS G2-010200 (N1-011096) on TSG GERAN WG2 meeting #5bis, June 25th – June 29th, on an LCS for GPRS.

CN1 would like to inform GERAN WG2 that CN1 agreed the chosen solution which was described in the enclosed GERAN LCS Stage Two document thus we would take following updates.

1. 3GPP TS 44.064 (LLC) is expected to need some updates to definition of the TOM protocol. The changes that are foreseen is to define a new TOM protocol discriminator for RRLP, to increase the maximum size of the message capsule to 242 octets, and to define the TOM header to be used when the RRLP protocol is transported in TOM (a “final response” bit is needed).
2. 3GPP TS 24.008 (L3) is expected to need some updates. Since the LCS radio priority is designed the same way as the SMS radio priority, it is needed to add the radio priority to be used for LCS messages in the Attach Accept message.

However CN1 would like to make a note here that MS LCS capabilities for A-GPS and E-OTD are not defined in the MS RAC IE at this time. Since MS RAC is transferred to a BSS in the Packet Resource Request at the RAC layer, which is more or less full, MS RAC is supposed to keep as short as possible we would like to re-consider where MS LCS capabilities should be defined.

2. Date of Next CN1 Meetings:

CN1_20	15 th – 19 th October 2001	Brighton, U.K.
CN1_21	26 th – 30 th November 2001	Cancun, Mexico

3. Attachments:

None.

Title: Answer LS on Priority Selection Criteria of Calls in a Multicall
Source: TSG_CN WG1
To: TSG_RAN WG3
cc:
Contact Person:
Name: Inmaculada Carrión
E-mail Address: inmaculada.carrion-rodrigo@nokia.com
Tel. Number: +358503806481

1. Overall Description:

TSG CN WG1 thanks TSG RAN WG3 for their LS in document *TSGR3#21(01)1847* dated 21st – 25th May 2001.

Related to the answer to question 1, "*As the SSD gives additional information of the statistical behaviour of the source, one cannot deduce from the SSD whether the RAB concerned is used by a speech call or not.*", CN1 would like to call RAN3's attention about the different use of the Source Statistics Descriptor IE by UTRAN and the Core Network. This is a result of the difference in TS 23.107 between the text that defines this IE in chapters 6.4.4.1 and 8.2.

At the end of chapter 6.4.4.1:

Source statistics descriptor ('speech'/'unknown')

Definition: specifies characteristics of the source of submitted SDUs.

[Purpose: Conversational speech has a well-known statistical behaviour (or the discontinuous transmission (DTX) factor). By being informed that the SDUs for a RAB are generated by a speech source, UTRAN may, based on experience, calculate a statistical multiplex gain for use in admission control on the radio and Iu interfaces.]

However the text at the end of chapter 8.2 in TS 23.107 reads:

The following attributes/settings only exist on the Radio Access Bearer level:

- **SDU format information** - *exact format of SDU payload is retrieved from the codec integrated in the core network.*
- **Source statistics descriptor** *is set to speech if the Radio Access Bearer transports compressed speech generated by the codec integrated in the core network.*

2. Actions:

None.

3. Date of Next CNx Meetings:

CN1_20	15 th – 19 th October 2001	Brighton, U.K.
CN1_21	26 th – 30 th November 2001	Cancun, Mexico

4. Attachments:

None.

**3GPP TSG-CN1 Meeting #19
Helsinki, Finland, 27.-31. August 2001**

Tdoc N1-011313

Title: Liaison Statement on privacy of IPv6 addresses allocated to terminals using the IM CN subsystem
Source: TSG_CN WG1
To: TSG_SA WG1
cc: TSG_SA WG2, TSG_SA WG3
Contact Person:
Name: Keith Drage
E-mail Address: drage@lucent.com
Tel. Number: +44 1793 776249

1. Overall Description:

CN1 are attempting to clarify the need for privacy of various information included in SIP and SDP messages, as specified for the IM CN subsystem. The IPv6 address of the calling user and called user appear in both SDP and in RTP messages to the remote user.

If there is a need for privacy of this information, then an anonymiser will be required, and needs to be provided in the architecture.

2. Actions:

To **SA1** group.

ACTION: TSG CN WG1 asks TSG SA1 group:

Does the IPv6 address assigned to a user tell anything about that user (it for example does give some hint to location) such that we need to hide that address from the remote user for any of the services provided by the IM CN subsystem? Situations for both static allocation and dynamic allocation should be considered (assuming both types are intended to be allocated to terminals using the IM CN subsystem)

3. Date of Next CN1 Meetings:

CN1_20	15 th – 19 th October 2001	Brighton, U.K.
CN1_21	26 th – 30 th November 2001	Cancun, Mexico

4. Attachments:

None

Title: Liaison Statement on "Reply to Liaison Statement on Signalling Radio Bearer for low priority NAS messages "
Source: TSG_CN WG1
To: TSG_RAN WG2
Contact Person:
Name: Peng Li
E-mail Address: pli@qualcomm.com
Tel. Number: +1-858-658-4967

TSG CN1 thanks TSG RAN2 for their LS "Liaison Statement on Signalling Radio Bearer for low priority NAS messages", which asks for CN1's opinion on what should be the quality of service (lossless vs. lossy) offered by RRC to low priority NAS messages.

CN1 would like to inform RAN2 that the quality of service expected from RRC for low priority NAS messages is **lossless**.

For background information, the original RAN2 liaison statement, R2-012138 [Liaison Statement on Signalling Radio Bearer for low priority NAS messages], is appended to this LS.

The dates for the next CN1 meetings are:

- CN1_19bis 2nd-4th October 2001 To-Be-Determined location
- CN1_20 15th – 19th October 2001 Brighton, U.K.

CN1 thanks RAN2 for any feedback that may be provided.

3GPP TSG RAN WG2 Meeting #23
Helsinki, Finland 27th – 31st August 2001

R2-012138

Title: Liaison Statement on Signalling Radio Bearer for low priority NAS messages
Source: RAN2
To: CN1
Cc:
Response to:
Release: 99

Contact Person:

Name: Francesco Grilli
Tel. Number: +1 858 845 3742
E-mail Address: Francesco@qualcomm.com

Attachments:

1. Overall Description:

RAN WG2 would like to kindly ask CN WG1 a quick response on the following question.

What should be the quality of service (lossless vs. lossy) offered by RRC to low priority NAS messages?

A document (R2-011929, "RLC reset on a Signalling Radio Bearer") has been discussed at RAN WG2 meeting #23. Its aim was to clarify the RRC specification in case of a reset in the Acknowledged Mode RLC entities used on the control plane. RAN WG2 agreed on the need to release the RRC connection in case lossless transmissions cannot be guaranteed for AM RRC signalling and NAS high priority signalling. However, RAN WG2 could not conclude on the best course of action for the case of NAS low priority signalling. If lossless transmission cannot be guaranteed for NAS low priority signalling messages, should the RRC connection be released or not?

2. Actions:

To CN1 group.

ACTION: RAN2 asks CN1 group to clearly state what is expected for NAS low priority signalling:

Lossless

Lossy

Don't care

RAN2 would like to receive an answer before the end of the current meeting (August 31st).

3. Date of Next RAN2 Meetings:

RAN2_23 27th – 31st August 2001 Helsinki, Finland;
RAN2_24 22nd – 26th October 2001 New York, USA;
RAN2_25 26th – 30th November 2001 Makuhari, Japan.

From: TSG CN WG1

To: TSG SA WG3

CC: TSG SA WG2, TSG CN WG4

Title: Response to LS "On the use of Network Domain Security for protection of SIP signalling messages" (N1-011041 or S3-010403)

Date: 27 August 2001

Contact: Apostolis Salkintzis, Motorola [<mailto:salki@motorola.com>]

CN1 thanks SA3 for their LS in S3-010403, which considers the problem of security protection of SIP messages in the core network.

CN1 understands that:

- The general problem is how to provide confidentiality of SIP messages between the UE and the P-CSCF, i.e. on the so-called "first-hop" (according to TS 33.203).
- From the UE to the RNC, SIP confidentiality is based on the UTRAN confidentiality mechanisms. This is specified in TS 33.203, sec. 5.1.2.
- From the GGSN to P-CSCF, i.e. across Gi interface, typical IPsec procedures can be applied, according to NDS/IP specification, TS 33.210.
- According to SA3's LS in S3-010403, the problem exists across Gn/Gp interfaces, where SIP messages are encapsulated in GTP-U tunnels and this makes it impossible for IPsec to apply protection only to GTP-U PDUs that carry SIP messages.

From the above, and given SA3's assumption that SIP confidentiality would be based on hop-by-hop procedures in the UMTS network, CN1 observes that confidentiality issues should also be addressed on the Iu-ps interface, since no such procedures are currently defined. Even if SIP confidentiality is provided in the core network according to TS 33.210, SIP messages would still be transmitted unprotected over Iu-ps, if protection mechanisms are not defined for this interface too.

CN1 has discussed the potential solutions included in S3-010403 and believes that, if SIP protection is going to be based on NDS/IP mechanisms (i.e. not between the UE and the P-CSCF but rather within the network in a hop-by-hop fashion), then it is preferred to specify a solution that

- can be applied on both Iu-ps and Gn/Gp interfaces, and
- cause minimum or no impact on UMTS architecture and protocols.

In this context, CN1 would be interested to know if SA3 has investigated any solutions inline with the above preferences. For instance, has SA3 investigated the limitations of option 2 in S3-010403? Has SA3 considered any potential extensions to IPsec (on Iu-ps and Gn/Gp) as alternative solutions? Such extensions wouldn't have an impact on the UMTS architecture or protocols.

Title: Liaison Statement on "Reply to LS on aborting of RRC connection during CN procedures"
Source: TSG_CN WG1
To: TSG_T WG1
Cc: TSG_RAN WG2
Contact Person:
Name: Peng Li
E-mail Address: pli@qualcomm.com
Tel. Number: +1-858-658-4967

TSG CN1 thanks TSG T1 for their "LS on aborting of RRC connection during CN procedures", which requests CN1 to explain the procedure to be followed by the UE to abort the RRC connection.

CN1 would like to inform T1 that the procedure for the UE to abort the RRC connection is described in clause 8.1.14 (Signalling connection release request procedure) of TS 25.331 v3.7.0.

Clause 8.1.14.2 of TS 25.331 states that "the UE shall, on receiving a request to release (**abort**) the signalling connection from upper layers, initiate the signalling connection release request procedure". The remainder of clause 8.1.14 in TS 25.331 describes the signalling connection release request procedure, as defined by TSG RAN2.

Regarding the 25.331 section reference in 24.008 quoted in T1's LS, CN1 acknowledges that the section number given in 24.008 is incorrect; TS 24.008 has been amended.

For background information, the original T1 liaison statement, T1-010222 [LS on aborting of RRC connection during CN procedures], is appended to this LS.

The dates for the next CN1 meetings are:

- CN1_19bis 2nd-4th October 2001 To-Be-Determined location
- CN1_20 15th – 19th October 2001 Brighton, U.K.

CN1 thanks T1 for any feedback that may be provided.

Source: TSG-T WG1
To: TSG-CN 1
Title: LS on aborting of RRC connection during CN procedures
Contact: Jacob John
Jacob.John@motorola.com

During TSG T1_SIG#17 in Melbourne and at the review of a test case for Mobility Management, questions were raised about the meaning of aborting the RRC connection.

TS 24.008 section 4.4.4.8, **Release of RR connection after location updating**, states that:

“Any release of the RR connection shall be initiated by the network according to section 3.5 in GSM 04.18, and section 8.2.1 in 3GPP TS 25.331. **If the RR connection is not released within a given time controlled by the timer T3240, the mobile station shall abort the RR connection.** In both cases, either after a RR connection release triggered from the network side or after a RR connection abort requested by the MS-side, the MS shall return to state MM IDLE.”

TS 25.331 does not describe the procedure for UE to abort the RRC connection. TSG T1_SIG requests TSG CN1 to explain the procedure to be followed by the UE to abort the RRC connection.

**3GPP TSG-CN1 Meeting #19
Helsinki, Finland, 27.-31. August 2001**

Tdoc N1-011344

Title: Response to Liaison Statement on "Progressing the work in SA3 and CN1 on the IP Multimedia core network subsystem"
Source: TSG_CN WG1
To: TSG_SA WG3
cc: SA WG2, SA WG5, CN WG4, CN WG5
Contact Person:
Name: Keith Drage
E-mail Address: drage@lucent.com
Tel. Number: +44 1793 776249

1. Overall Description:

WG CN1 thanks SA3 for their liaison S3-010404 → N1-011035. We have responses to the following points raised in the liaison.

Concerning point 4:

SA3 understands that multiple public identities can exist for a single private identity, and that the private identity will be used as the basis for authentication. Can a call be terminated towards a public identity that is not currently registered, if an associated public identity for that subscriber is registered?

We understand that multiple some public user identities can be aliases for other public user identities, and these would not normally be separately registered. Also, some emergency calls can be made from terminals that are not registered. We assume that SA2 will provide further information on these cases.

Concerning point 8:

SA3 is assuming that currently only the registration and re-registration is authenticated, based on the private identity.

This is what is currently being followed in CN1, pending any other requirements from elsewhere.

Concerning point 10:

The current working assumption in SA3 is that re-registrations are always routed towards the S-CSCF that is currently serving that UE. Whilst there appears to be confusion surrounding this assumption, it is based on the current stage 2 specification, 23.228- Can CN1 or SA2 confirm the accuracy of our assumption?

We believe SA2 are studying this.

Concerning point 12:

The hiding of IP addresses associated with the user plane media has not been considered by SA3. Should such an IP address be given to the UE at the far end? This IP address is used by the UE for the entire duration of the (SIP signalling) PDP context. The far end UE could use the IP address to establish a session directly to that IP address, thus bypassing the IMS nodes. There may be security/fraud implications with this and SA3 will study this further.

A separate liaison statement covers questions of privacy of the above issue.

2. Actions:

For information only.

3. Date of Next CNx Meetings:

CN1_20	15 th – 19 th October 2001	Brighton, U.K.
CN1_21	26 th – 30 th November 2001	Cancun, Mexico