

3GPP TSG CN Plenary Meeting #17
4th - 6th September 2002. Biarritz, France.

NP-020339

Source: TSG CN WG 2
Title: LSs sent from CN2 since TSG#16 Meeting
Agenda item: 6.2.1
Document for: Information

Introduction:

This document contains 2 Liaison Statements agreed by TSG CN WG2, that are forwarded to TSG CN Plenary meeting #17 for information.

Meeting	Doc-2nd-Level	Source	Tdoc Title	Comments
CN2#25	N2-020737	CN2	CAMEL Phase 3: Questions (raised at CAMEL IREG)	To: GSM-A IREG CAMEL group
CN2#25	N2-020796	CN2	Reply to LS on Network Integration Testing	To: TC SPAN

3GPP TSG CN WG2 Meeting #25
Helsinki, Finland, 29th July– 2nd August 2002

N2-020737

Title: CAMEL Phase 3: Questions (raised at CAMEL IREG)
Response to: LS in N2-020695, CAMEL Phase 3: Questions raised at CAMEL IREG
Work Item: CAMEL3

Source: 3GPP TSG CN2
To: GSM-A IREG CAMEL group
Cc:

Contact Person:
Name: Chris Hardy
Tel. Number:
E-mail Address: Chris.Hardy@vf.vodafone.co.uk

Attachments:

Vodafone is active in the GSM-A IREG CAMEL group who are in the process of writing test cases for CAMEL Phase 3. At the last meeting (16th – 17th July in Brussels) the following questions were identified. TSG-CN2 are asked to provide clarification on these issues and Vodafone will pass the information back to the GSM-A IREG CAMEL group.

GPRS:

1. Is it possible to send Apply Charging GPRS when there are no armed detection points (but processing is suspended at Waiting_For_Instructions? Is the existence of a pending report sufficient to maintain a control relationship? There seem to be differing views on whether this will be a monitor or control relationship. How can we distinguish what is possible in a monitor as opposed to a control relationship?

CN2 Response:

Control relationship exists if there are EDP-Rs armed, or during TDP or EDR-P (i.e. state WaitingForInstructions). A monitoring relationship exists, if there is no controlling relationship, and if there are EDP notifications or pending reports. Reference 6.2.2. 23.078, v3.8.0. For GPRS control or for ApplyChargingGPRS a controlling relationship is required per BCSM (so there must be a control relationship for that instance of the state model).

2. If there is a CAMEL3 GPRS monitor relationship, is Entity Released GPRS sent when the PDP Context is disconnected (as no DP will be reported for this)?

CN2 response:

When the user or SGSN disconnects the EntityReleasedGPRS operation is sent if PDPcontextdisconnection EDP is not armed. The SCP is not able to disconnect PDP context in a monitoring relationship

3. If there are no armed detection points but one pending report then when the Apply Charging Report GPRS is sent to the gsmSCF, can the gsmSCF respond with a subsequent Apply Charging GPRS?

CN2 response:

No. The gprsSSF may transit to state 'idle' (depending on the scenario) after sending ApplyChargingReportGPRS, if there are no EDP armed. The ApplyChargingGPRS requires a control relationship. Ref: 23.078 v3.13.0 process GPRS-SSF sheet 7(21) [SCP disconnect] and sheet20(21) [user disconnect]

4. Is a test case required for a Secondary PDP Context (Connect GPRS is not possible)? Is this different from having two PDP Contexts active with different APNs? What is the realistic use of Secondary PDP Contexts?

CN2 response:

A secondary PDP context is used when the IP address and APN are the same but Quality of Service is different to the primary PDP context. One clear use of this is IMS, in which the signalling has one PDP context and the speech/user data has another context, both using the same APN (in order for both contexts to share the same IP address). CN2 finds that the SGSN behaviour is not specified if the SCP sends connect GPRS to a secondary PDP context, therefore testing of this would not be useful.

MO-SMS:

5. In Initial DP SMS Location Information in MSC and Location Information in SGSN are marked as conditional (shall be sent if available). Does this mean that Location Information shall always be present (i.e. Location Information in MSC and Location Information in SGSN are mutually exclusive and one shall be present) or is it possible to get an Initial DP SMS with no location information?

CN2 response:

LocationInformation in SGSN and MSC are mutually exclusive. Location information is always available: At least the VLR number or SGSN number is always contained.
Ref 23.078 7.6.1.2.2

6. If the gsmSCF changes the SMSC address which leads to the SM being barred (e.g. due to ODB Barring of all International Short Messages), does this lead to the SMS Failure DP being reported? If the DP is reported, what cause value is used? If the DP is not reported, how does the service logic in the gsmSCF terminate (timeout)?

CN2 response:

This will be asked on the CN2 email list, no answer was given.

Mobility Management:

7. When is "Location update in the same VLR service area" reported? Is it on a change of Location Area (LAI), change of Cell ID or something else?

CN2 response:

Location update in one VLR area is reported when the LA changes within an MSC/VLR area.

Circuit Switched:

8. (CAMEL Phase 1 onwards) When the gsmSCF receives Initial DP at DP2 (Collected_Info), if the gsmSCF performs a number translation sending a Connect message (but does not arm any EDPs or request any reports), can the Connect message be sent in a TC_END? How should the gsmSSF react to receiving a TC_END containing a Connect?

CN2 response:

The SCP is allowed to send CAP operations in the TC-END Message. If the SCP sends 'Connect' at DP2 in TC-END without arming EDPs then the MSC/gsmSSF shall route the call according to the number in 'Connect'.

General:

9. Is the mapping of CAP messages to TCAP short dialogues vendor specific or is it described in the standard? Are there potential interworking problems?

CN2 response:

The general principal of opening and closing TCAP dialogues is specified in R99 CAMEL specification. However there may be small differences between vendors: in general, the receiving entity shall accept all allowed combinations of the sending entity. E.g. the sending entity may send multiple CAP operations in a single TC message, or pack them one-by-one.

Actions:

Action 1: Please send the latest IREQ corresponding test specifications to CN2 for our information.

Title: Reply to LS on Network Integration Testing
Response to: LS on Network Integration Testing from TC SPAN in N2-020654

Source: 3GPP TSG CN2
To: TC SPAN
CC:

Contact Person: Keijo Palviainen
E Address:-mail Mailto:Keijo.Palviainen@Nokia.Com

Attachments: None

1 Overall Description

CN2 thanks TC SPAN for their input. Unfortunately CN2#25 did not have enough time to study the attached test specifications in detail. CN2 is willing to give feedback to TC SPAN regarding to CAMEL. However, CN2 does not expect to *endorse* TC SPAN specifications formally. For the next CN2 meeting CN2 companies are encouraged to bring in comments on the CAMEL part. Then CN2 will discuss the comments. The input for CN2 should concentrate on checking if TC SPAN specifications are in line with CAMEL specifications. INAP is not in the remit of CN2 but companies may bring in comments on INAP as well, except CAP parameters that are copied to INAP. One possible outcome is that CN2 forwards comments of individual companies to TC SPAN directly.

There are other testing specification groups in place also, such as "IREG". CN2 would like to know more on TC SPAN, and use of their test specs. In CN2#25 there were also questions from IREQ.

2 Actions

ACTION 1: Please give a brief introduction of TC SPAN testing activity:

- In general, who use TC SPAN testing specs? Is it mainly fixed or mobile operators?

ACTION 2:

- Please wait until CN2#26 has been completed.

3 Date of Next CN2 Meetings

CN2#26 will be held in Sep 23-27 2002.