

Technical Specification Group Services and System Aspects
Meeting #22, Hawaii, USA, 15-18 December 2003

TSGS#22(03)0568

OCG EMTEL #5
Sophia Antipolis, France, 6-7 November 2003

EM05td018r1
Agenda Item: 14

Title: Liaison Statement reply to 3GPP SA2 on Comments on ETSI SR 002 180 V0.3.2

Source: OCG EMTEL

To: ETSI TB TISPAN, 3GPP SA, and 3GPP SA2

Cc: 3GPP CN, 3GPP CN1 & 3GPP CN4 (for information)

Contact Person:

Name: Ray Forbes
Tel. Number: +44 24 7656 3106
E-mail Address: raymond.forbes@marconi.com

OCG EMTEL ad-hoc group thanks 3GPP SA2 for their reply to our recent liaison statement asking for comments on the ETSI SR 002 180 V0.3.2. We note your answers to our questions and also note that you have some questions of your own. The comments you made and the questions you asked are dealt with in the following liaison statement.

The OCG EMTEL comments are attached in line as follows:

ACTION: You are kindly invited, within your area of expertise and recognised responsibility, with the utmost urgency to:

1. Familiarise the TB or WG with the requirements from the COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION of the 25/07/2003 C(2003) 2657 and SR 002 180.

SA2 response: The documents have been distributed within SA2, and the companies have committed to providing the needed specifications.

Thank you.

2. Identify areas where your TB or WG is or expects to be active; and initiate the corresponding activities and Work-items.

SA2 response: SA2 will investigate existing specified capabilities (architecture and functional description) for providing mobile location to the PSAP to determine what changes might be needed in order to support E112 requirements.

Thank you.

3. Define functional requirements and collaborate with other TBs, in their defined areas of responsibility, to work on the high priority items.

SA2 response: SA2 feels that joint collaboration with the appropriate TISPAN group that produces the Emergency Location Protocols will be necessary in order to create the proper functionality. We note further that the existing ETSI TS 102 164 V1.1.1 (2003-04) is based on an outdated LIF specification that has several identified deficiencies. While SA2 do not specify external protocols, we feel that it is imperative that the specification be updated to match existing specifications. SA2 already works very closely with the LIF successor, OMA (Open Mobile Alliance) in order to insure consistency between our internal specification and the external specifications, which they own.

ETSI TISPAN reliably informs OCG EMTEL that ETSI TISPAN will produce an updated version of this specification based on the OMA MLP work and will be available for publication in the future.

4. Specify solutions for the existing, new and evolving technologies.

SA2 response: Due to the time frame of the requirements with our existing release cycle,

we feel that we will limit release 6 requirements to existing technology, and will address requirements for new, evolving technologies in future releases.

The Situation is understood by OCG EMTEL.

5. Keep OCG EMTEL informed about your existing and expected activities and their status.
SA2 response: . *We will be happy to provide continuous updates on our progress.*

OCG EMTEL Look forward to future updates

6. Provide feedback to the OCG EMTEL in time for their next meeting.
SA2 response: *SA2 is currently working to complete 3GPP Release 6 specifications. How changes to deployed systems will be accomplished is yet to be determined.*

OCG EMTEL look forward to hearing your thoughts on this issue in the future.

The answers to the questions you ask are as follows:

1. The basic architecture in the Annex (as well as the derived functional architectures) indicates some database/functionality using an interface called "location retrieval". This entity is not shown as belonging to either a PSAP nor a mobile network. Is this architecture truly a requirement, or is 3GPP, in conjunction with TISPAN, free to set their own functional architecture?

The OCG EMTEL ad – hoc group asks ETSI TISPAN and 3GPP SA2 to consider the issues of functional architectures for EMTEL and the E112 service jointly by cooperation.

The Cell ID in UMTS is only an approximate indication of location and there is a need for further refinement at the time of a call, which is why some kind of 'location retrieval' is suggested. The technical requirements of the architecture may be resolved in your joint discussions.

2. As a result of the non-clarity of the architecture, a number of questions regarding functionality cannot be answered. For example, routing the emergency call to the correct PSAP is determined by the location of the caller. Is this functionality included in the "location retrieval", or is it the responsibility of the originating mobile network to determine the correct PSAP?

The OCG EMTEL ad – hoc group asks ETSI TISPAN and 3GPP SA2 to consider the issues of functional architectures for EMTEL and the E112 service jointly by cooperation. As above

3. Clause 8 states: "Furthermore, in addition to organisational measures, the necessary technical safeguards will be introduced to secure that a location pull can only be carried out in relation to an emergency (e.g. CLI-based), and only for as long as the emergency lasts"
It is unclear who has responsibility for maintaining the location. Is it the responsibility of the PSAP, who then provides it to the emergency centres, or is it the responsibility of the originating networks. Further, the requirement "while the emergency lasts" needs clarification.

The OCG EMTEL ad – hoc group asks ETSI TISPAN and 3GPP SA2 to consider the issues of functional architectures for EMTEL and the E112 service jointly by cooperation. As above

4. Clause 6 and Annex C refer to persons with disabilities. Especially with text terminals, is there a requirement for support of mobile devices, which are V.18 capable?

It is noted that, to date, E112 has no explicit requirement to support TTY or control of V.18 in the network. Fixed networks and certain mobile terminals that support the TTY and V.18 service in the terminals are allowed within E112, however, the support of Network Control facilities for V.18 is excluded from E112 as this may limit the evolution of Emergency Services, Terminals, and new capabilities. Hence, there is no formal requirement for this in any European area.

Priority SMS is under consideration within E112, the degree of priority afforded is under discussion. And the capabilities to provide the near real-time capabilities; e.g. MMS over GPRS.

5. Clause 5 states, "Automatic terminal/network initiated real time location push to PSAP when 112 emergency call is made ". Does this mean that a terminal capable of determining its location is responsible for forwarding the location to the PSAP?

This is dependent upon the capabilities of the terminal; e.g. can it resolve its own location using GPRS etc. and transmit this data to the network. This does not alleviate the requirement for the network to provide the location data resolved to the nationally required accuracy. However, this should be pursued by joint discussion with TISPAN as they may have a slightly different approach.

TISPAN has its next meeting on December the 1st to 5th 2003. They will be expecting to discuss the above issues with 3GPP SA2 as a result of your forthcoming meeting.

OCG would be grateful to be kept informed as to the progress of the above issues.

Date of Next OCG EMTEL Meeting:

EMTEL#06

12 - 13 February 2004

Sophia Antipolis, France