3GPP TSG CN Plenary Meeting #19 12th - 14th March 2003 New Birmingham, UK.

Source: TSG CN WG4

Title: LSs after CN#18

Agenda item: 6.4.1

Document for: Information

Introduction:

This document contains 10 LSs that have been agreed by TSG CN WG4 after CN#18, and are forwarded to TSG CN Plenary meeting #16 for information.

TDOC	Subject	To	Cc
N4-03xxxx			
N4-030215	LS on Re-use of TEID from SA2	SA2	RAN3
N4-030217	IPv4 and IPv6 form of Charging Gateway Address	SA2, SA5	
N4-030218	Response LS on use of cause code 198 in GTP	SA5	
N4-030219	LS on Clarification on "Guaranteed Bit Rate in RANAP"	RAN3	SA2, SA4
N4-030220	LS response on Early Ue Handling	TSG RAN, RAN WG3, SA WG5 SWGD	SA WG2, CN WG1
N4-030225	LS to CN3 on Proposed Split of work between 29.163 & 29.332	CN3	
N4-030249	LS on clarification on the requirement for UE re-authentication initiated by HSS	SA2, SA3, CN1	
N4-030255	LS on additional parameters in MAP for LCS with GERAN Access	SA2	
N4-030311	Response LS on use of Allocation/Retention Priority	GERA2	RAN3, SA2
N4-030319	LS on MNP for Pre-paid Subscribers	SA1	CN2

Title: Reply to LS on Re-use of TEID

Response to: LS (N4-030047) on Re-use of TEID from SA2.

Release: Rel-5 Work Item: TEI5

 Source:
 CN4

 To:
 SA2

 Cc:
 RAN3

Contact Person:

Name: Anna Jernryd Tel. Number: +46 31 747 2197

E-mail Address: Anna.Jernryd@erv.ericsson.se

Attachments: N4-030047

1. Overall Description:

CN4 would like to thank SA2 for their Liaison Statement on Re-use of TEID.

CN4 have consider whether it would be useful to add a statement in 29.060 but come to the conclusion that duplicated information is better avoided. Hence, the statement in 23.060 is sufficient and no additional statement in 29.060 is needed.

2. Actions:

None

3. Date of Next CN4 Meetings:

CN4 #19 19th May – 23rd May 2003 San Diego, CA, USA

Title: IPv4 and IPv6 form of Charging Gateway Address

Response to: LS on Inclusion of Alternative Charging Gateway Address from SA5

Release: Release 5.

Source: CN4

To: SA2, SA5

Cc:

Contact Person:

Name: Kevan Hobbis Tel. Number: +44 7790 771069

E-mail Address: kevan.hobbis@three.co.uk

Attachments: None.

1. Overall Description:

CN4 thank SA5 for their liaison regarding the need to include an alternative CGW address in GTP to allow both IPv4 and IPv6 addresses to be used. CN4 have agreed a CR to 29.060 to include the alternative CGW address.

CN4 has noted that the two CGW addresses must refer to the same CGW, and the agreed CR reflects this in a note. CN4 opinion was that this was an important requirement that should be reflected in the stage 2 documents. It was also noted that there may be a need to police this in the GGSN and/or SGSN, and that this should also be reflected in the stage 2 documents if it was deemed necessary.

CN4 concluded that 23.060 would be the specification to define these requirements and requests SA2/SA5 to study this proposal.

2. Actions:

To [SA2, SA5] group.

ACTION: CN4 asks SA2 and SA5 to include in 23.060 the requirement that the two CGW addresses must be for the same CGW, and to study the requirements on the need to police this in the GGSN/SGSN.

3. Date of Next CN4 Meetings:

CN4 #19 19th May – 23rd May 2003 San Diego, CA, USA

Title: Response LS on use of cause code 198 in GTP

Response to: LS (S5-034033) on use of Cause code 198 in GTP from SA WG5

Release: R99, R4, R5.

Source: Lucent

To: TSG SA WG5

Contact Person:

Name: Alessio Casati

Tel. Number: +441793897912

E-mail Address: acasati@lucent.com

Attachments: N4-030270, N4-030271, N4-030272

1. Overall Description:

CN4 thank SA5 for their LS S5-034033 and would like to inform SA5 that we have reinstated cause code 198 as requested.

Additionally, we have carefully considered your request for evaluation of potential additional work for Rel-6 and CN4 have concluded that it is in our understanding sufficient to just add, starting from R'99, a cautionary statement in section 7.7.1 warning of the sharing of cause code values between GTP and GTP'. This should make the link between the two protocols more explicit and serve as guidance for proponents of changes to 29.060 cause codes values to appropriately inform SA5 colleagues. We consider and recommend as essential in the future to keep each other informed about changes affecting cause codes values not exclusively allocated to GTP'. We include for your information the changes to 29.060 we have agreed.

2. Actions:

No action required

3. Date of Next CN4 Meetings:

CN4 #19 19th May – 23rd May 2003 San Diego, CA, USA

Title: LS on Clarification on "Guaranteed Bit Rate in RANAP"

Response to: LS R3-022603 on Clarification on "Guaranteed Bit Rate in RANAP" from WG RAN3.

Release: Work Item:

 Source:
 CN4

 To:
 RAN3

 Cc:
 SA2, SA4

Contact Person:

Name: Dan Warren, Nortel Networks

Tel. Number: +44 1628 431098

E-mail Address: dlwarren@nortelnetworks.com

Attachments: N4-030105 (CR 23.153-052 (Rel-4) on Setting Of Guaranteed Bitrate & Maximum

Bitrate)

1. Overall Description:

CN4 thank RAN3 for their LS (R3-022603) within which RAN3 clarified their understanding of issues regarding setting of Guaranteed Bit Rate and the impact of this on RANAP specifications.

Within this LS, RAN3 stated;-

As a consequence it is the feeling of RAN3 that both sides should be coordinated by O&M at CN level and that the requirement should be limited to having the same GBR for particular ACS on both ends. This at least guarantees that the requested QoS with respect to the GBR is respected in all nodes.

CN4 considered the recommendation of RAN3 but are not able to agree with it. It is the opinion of CN4 that the co-ordination of GBR and MBR for inter-PLMN interconnect is both impractical and represents a requirement for excessive details in interconnect agreements between those PLMNs.

CN4 therefore have agreed to use OoBTC to facilitate the co-ordination of MBR and GBR between TrFO end points as a more simple solution. CN4 does not believe there is any impact on RANAP in adopting this approach and so no action is required by RAN3. At CN4 #18, attached document N4-030105 (plus a Release 5 mirror of this document) was agreed – it is CN4's opinion that this completes the required changes to specifications.

2. Actions:

None

3. Date of Next CN4 Meetings:

Title: LS response on Early Ue Handling Response to: LS (N4-030183/RPA 030014)

Release: Work Item:

Source: CN WG4

To: TSG RAN, RAN WG3, SA WG5 SWGD

Cc: SA WG2, CN WG1

Contact Person:

Name: Phil Hodges

Tel. Number:

E-mail Address: philip.hodges@ericsson.com.au

Attachments:

1. Overall Description:

CN4 discussed the LS from RAN regarding the outcome of the "Early UE" adhoc and in principle agreed the approach to define a container on RANAP. CN4 agrees to examine their specifications to determine the impacts that will be needed to support either proposed solution.

CN4 also received an LS (N4-030052) from SA5 indicating a need for IMEISV in the RNC for Rel6 WI on Subscriber & Equipment Trace. It would seem pertinent to CN4 that if it is decided to transport the IMEISV to RNC (rather than a Equipment capability bitmap) then this interface should be re-usable if needed later for Tracing.

2. Actions:

To RAN3 group.

ACTION: CN4 asks RAN3 to take this into account when proposing the protocol solution for the Early UE handling.

3. Date of Next CN4 Meetings:

CN4 #19 19th May – 23rd May 2003 San Diego, CA, USA

Title: LS to CN3 on Proposed Split of work between 29.163 & 29.332

Response to: Release: Work Item:

Source: CN WG4
To: CN WG3

Cc:

Contact Person:

Name: Phil Hodges

Tel. Number:

E-mail Address: philip.hodges@ericsson.com.au

Attachments:

1. Overall Description:

CN4 discussed the proposed split of work between the two WGs for the IMS-CS interworking and in detail the split between the stage 2 and stage3 specifications: 29.163 and 29.332. The input discussion paper (N4-030203) is attached.

It was agreed that the split of work should remain as for the Mc interface, specifically:

29.332 should document the behaviour of the MGW in handling messages from the MGCF so that the MGW designer can rely on it without the need to refer to the stage 2 description in 29.163; 29.163 should document the behaviour of the MGCF in interworking between IMS & CS (or whatever else), and the way in which the MGCF invokes the Mn interface signalling procedures.

2. Actions:

To CN3 group.

ACTION: CN4 asks CN3 to discuss this within the working group so that both groups can work under the same principles. CN4 understand that a joint meeting may be needed to finalise this issue.

3. Date of Next CN4 Meetings:

CN4 #19 19th May – 23rd May 2003 San Diego, CA, USA

Title: LS on clarification on the requirement for UE re-authentication initiated by HSS

Release: Rel-5
Work Item: IMS-CCR

Source: CN4

To: SA2, SA3, CN1

Cc:

Contact Person:

Name: Lionel MORAND Tel. Number: +33145296257

E-mail Address: lionel.morand@francetelecom.com

Attachments: None

1. Overall Description:

Within the section 5.4.1.6 "Network-initiated reauthentication", the TS 24.229 (v5.3.0) stated in an annotation that:

"Network initiated re-authentication might be requested from the HSS or may occur due to internal processing within the S-CSCF."

CN4 would like to ask SA2, SA3 and CN1 if there is an existing requirement/need regarding the possibility for the HSS to trigger UE re-authentication by the S-CSCF.

In view of the current TS 29.228, CN4 would like to inform SA2, SA3 and CN1 that the network-initiated deregistration procedure (followed by an authenticated registration) would be the only mechanism available for the HSS to trigger UE re-authentication over the Cx interface. CN4 would need to modify the existing procedure to prevent the systematic user deregistration in this case.

2. Actions:

To SA2, SA3 and CN1

ACTION: CN4 kindly ask SA2, SA3 and CN1 to give us a clear guidance as regard to the requirement for UE re-authentication triggered by the HSS via the Cx interface.

3. Date of Next CN4 Meetings:

CN4 #19 19th May – 23rd May 2003 San Diego, CA, USA

Title: LS on additional parameters in MAP for LCS with GERAN Access

Response to:

Release: Release 5.

Source: CN4 To: SA2

Cc:

Contact Person:

Name: Dan Warren, Nortel Networks

Tel. Number: +44 1628 431098

E-mail Address: dlwarren@nortelnetworks.com

Attachments: N4-030253 [CR to 29.002 R5 reflecting the Stage 3 changes addressed within this LS]

1. Overall Description:

CN4 has been informed that at SA2 #29, document S2-030018 was discussed, and that the following conclusions were reached with regard to extended requirements for LCS reporting;-

- The issues discussed in S2-030018 warrant the preparation of appropriate Stage 2 and Stage 3 Change Requests the affected Stage 2 specification is 23.271 and the Stage 3 specification is 29.002. These Change Requests are to cover the situation for GERAN access only.
- The GERAN Access/GSM solution is to be included in Release 5 specifications, whilst any similar requirement for UTRAN Access/UMTS solution will be further studied by SA2.

At SA2 #29, Tdoc N4-021350 was also presented for information. This document was an early version of the CR to 29.002 that the solution for GSM requires. A revised version of this document (along with it's Release 6 mirror) has been presented to CN4 #18 and was agreed by CN4 on the condition that the appropriate change requests to 23.271 are submitted to and agreed by SA2 at SA2 #30. To complete the changes to the specifications affected, SA2 now need to agree the related Change Request to 23.271.

2. Actions:

To SA2 group.

ACTION: CN4 asks SA2 to take note of the actions within CN4 and agree the related Change Request to 23.271.

3. Date of Next CN4 Meetings:

CN4 #19 19th May – 23rd May 2003 San Diego, CA, USA

Title: Response LS on use of Allocation/Retention Priority

Response to: LS (GP#12(02)3438) on LS on use of Allocation/Retention Priority from 3GPP TSG

GERAN WG2

e.

Release: Release 6
Work Item: N/A.

Source: 3GPP TSG CN WG4

To: 3GPP TSG GERAN WG2

Cc: 3GPP TSG RAN WG3, 3GPP TSG SA WG2

Contact Person:

Name: Peter Schmitt

Siemens

Tel. Number: +49 6621 169152

E-mail Address: Peter.Schmitt@gksag.de

Attachments: none.

1. Overall Description:

3GPP TSG CN WG4 thanks GERAN WG2 for their liaison statement on the use of Allocation/Retention Priority. CN4 has discussed the issue and provides the following answer:

- CN4 confirms that only the priority levels are stored in the HLR and sent to the SGSN.
- Pre-emption Capability, Pre-emption Vulnerability and Queuing Allowed are not stored in HLR, they are assigned locally in the SGSN
- CN4 wants to inform GERAN WG2 that for the PS domain the allocation/retention priority information element is assigned per PDP context. This parameter is part of the Ext-Qos-Subscribed information element which is introduced in Release 4, and transferred from the HLR to the SGSN.

2. Actions:

none

3. Date of Next CN4 Meetings:

CN4 #19 19th May – 23rd May 2003 San Diego, CA, USA

Title: LS on MNP for Pre-paid Subscribers

Response to:

Release: Release 5
Work Item: MNP

Source: CN4
To: SA1
Cc: CN2

Contact Person:

Name: Panagiotis Dimitroulas Tel. Number: +30 2610 465006 E-mail Address: pdim@intranet.gr

Attachments: N4-021466, N4-030030

1. Overall Description:

At CN4 #17 a problem (N4-021466) was highlighted with the charging associated with pre-paid subscribers in the MNP environment; with the introduction of MNP, it is not possible for operators to charge calls from prepaid subscribers in the MNP environment consistently and in the same way as for calls from other subscribers. This is because it is not possible to identify the operator domain of the called subscriber for prepaid services if a number has been ported.

Operators may apply different tariffs to calls established to their own subscribers and calls established towards subscribers belonging to other networks. In scenarios without MNP, the B number (called party) indicates the network to which the subscriber belongs. In scenarios with MNP, the B number (called party) doesn't indicate the network to which the subscriber belongs.

In order to achieve consistent charging the MNP info for pre-paid subscribers is needed by the portability domain.

In CN4 #17 it was agreed that no SA1 requirement was needed but further discussion was required on the technical solution as some alternatives were proposed. At CN4 #18 a discussion paper was submitted (N4-030030, attached) providing arguments for the alternative solutions.

CN4 agreed that the problem originally discussed did need resolving and accepted the 2 proposals as for the technical solution as proposed in the attached paper. Although there was a majority in favour that this was critical enough to be solved in Rel5 there continued some question on the requirements.

It was thus decided that confirmation of this approach was required from SA1.

2. Actions:

To SA1

ACTION: CN4 kindly asks SA1 group whether the proposed solutions introduce new charging methods.

Also SA1 is kindly asked whether the existing MNP requirements cover the correction, which is needed and agreed by CN4.

3. Date of Next CN4 Meetings:

CN4 #19 19th May – 23rd May 2003 San Diego, CA, USA