



COMMITTEE CORRESPONDENCE

DRAFT

February 19, 2009

Betsy Covell
Chair, TIA TR-45.8
Alcatel-Lucent Technologies
1960 Lucent Lane
Naperville, IL 60566
bcovell@alcatel-lucent.com

Mr. Mark Wood
ITU-T SG2
mark.wood@engineer.com

Re: Response to Draft ITU-T Recommendation on Administration and allocation of multicast addresses for civic purposes

Dear Mark,

In August 2008 TR-45.2 and TR-45.6 were merged into a new subcommittee, TR-45.8. TR-45.8 has assumed responsibility for all work that had previously been done in the other two groups, as well as all future core network standards. Accordingly, TR-45.8 has reviewed the Liaison titled "Draft ITU-T Recommendation on the Administration and allocation of multicast addresses for civic purposes" and has the following comments. Note that these comments are similar in nature to comments provided by TR-45 at the end of 2008, included in the attached file. We are disappointed that the previous comments were not considered in the formulation of this draft.

1. The administration and allocation of multicast addresses for civic purposes is outside the scope of responsibility for ITU-T. The allocation of the cell broadcast message identifiers is a technology and an inter-operator business function related to the implementation of the Cell Broadcast Service. The allocation of the cell broadcast message identifiers is controlled and managed by 3GPP CT1, as well as the GSM Association which handles the inter-operator business functions, for 3GPP technologies.
2. The draft ITU-T recommendation proposes two solutions for the support of language. Having two solutions complicates both the mobile device and the user experience. From the mobile device point of view, both solutions would have to be implemented because of subscriber roaming. The two solutions would complicate the user experience since the subscriber will not know which method is implemented in a roaming environment.
3. The draft ITU-T recommendation is based upon the assumption that the subscriber's control of the alert information should be based upon the source of the information instead of the risk associated with the alert situation. Existing emergency alert systems based upon the Common Alert Protocol (CAP) such as the United States Emergency Alert System (EAS), as well the developing 3GPP PWS and the Commercial Mobile Alert System (CMAS) in the United States (which is also supported by PWS), are built on the philosophy that it does not matter which authorized agency is alerting the subscriber of an imminent threat and that the subscriber's control of the alerts is based upon the subscriber's acceptable risk level. The risk level is indicated by the combination of the urgency, certainty, and severity attributes of the CAP alert message from the alert initiator. Different Cell Broadcast message identifiers would be

associated with different combination of the urgency, certainty, and severity attributes giving the subscriber the choice to receive alerts based upon their personal risk assessment. (Regional regulatory requirements may prohibit some alerts from being disabled by the subscriber).

4. Since the configuration of the Cell Broadcast message identifiers for the subscriber preferences would be based upon factors such as the CAP message urgency, certainty, and severity attributes and upon subscriber language preferences, direct subscriber configuration of the Cell Broadcast options, as proposed by the draft ITU-T recommendation, is too complicated. A simple subscriber interaction is required. For example, for the CMAS service in the United States, the subscriber will not interact with the Cell Broadcast configuration on the mobile device. Instead, the subscriber interacts with a simple CMAS alert option configuration page on their mobile device and the CMAS application on the mobile device would then configure the Cell Broadcast message identifiers based upon the options selected. The description of the CMAS subscriber interface is defined in the joint ATIS / TIA CMAS Mobile Device Behavior Specification (ATIS-TIA-J-STD-100) which is scheduled to be released for publication in 1Q 2009. Furthermore, all of the Cell Broadcast message identifiers assigned to PWS, including Earthquake and Tsunami Warning System (ETWS) and CMAS, will be allocated in a range which is not settable by the mobile device man-machine interface (MMI) and, therefore, cannot be manipulated directly by the subscriber.

Based upon TIA TR-45.8's analysis of the draft ITU-T recommendation, the proposed administration and allocation of multicast addresses for civic purposes appears to be inconsistent with the requirements under development for CMAS. These inconsistencies could potentially result in fragmentation of Public Warning System implementations in the industry, as well as overlap and inconsistencies of Cell Broadcast message identifiers.

Regards,

Betsy Covell
Chair TR-45.8

Attachments:

2008 TR-45 Response to ITU-T SG2 LS on Cell Broadcast Message Identifiers

Cc:

TR-45 cjblum@alcatel-lucent.com

3GPP (GSM/UMTS) TSGs GERAN paolo.usai@etsi.org,

RAN Stefania.Sesia@etsi.org,

CT kimmo.kymalainen@etsi.org and

SA maurice.pope@etsi.org

3GPP2 TSG-X tsgx_chair@3gpp2.org

GSM SRG ljromero@telefonica.es, ileana.leuca@att.com, jrajaraman@gsm.org

GSM Association North America Regional Interest Group (GSM-NA) Wireless Emergency Alerts Task Force

abdul.saad@t-mobile.com

ATIS WTSC Don.zelmer@att.com

GSMANA Wireless Emergency Alerts Task Force, brian.k.daly@att.com

GSMANA Standards Working Group, gary.jones@t-mobile.com

CTIA, BJosef@ctia.org

(This correspondence represents "working papers." Therefore, contents cannot be viewed as reflecting the corporate policies or the views of the Telecommunications Industry Association or of any company. The Association, the companies and individuals involved, take no responsibility in the applications of this document.)