LIAISON STATEMENT

Title:	Cell Broadcast Message Identifiers
From:	
Organisation:	Cell Broadcast Forum
Approval Date:	March 1st 2007
Technical Contact :	Peter Sanders (peter.sanders@logicacmg.com)
Strategy Contact :	Dick Gerbrands (dick.gerbrands@spmm.org)
CBF Contact :	Wim van Setten (wim.van.setten@spmm.org)
To:	
Organisation:	ITU-T SG2
Contact Person:	Mark Wood (mark.wood@engineer.com)
For:	
Action:	Reply to TD 70 Rev.5 (PLEN/2)
Document:	CBMI_March_2007, version 1.0

The Cell Broadcast Forum would like to thank the ITU SG2 for its liaison statement in which the CB Forum's view is asked regarding harmonization of the Cell Broadcast (CB) Message Identifiers.

It is the CB Forum's view that it is indeed a critical element to the introduction and use of Cell Broadcast as a public warning system.
Especially for roamers Message Identifiers have to be standardized. It shouldn't be necessary for a traveller who crosses borders to consider which Message Identifier is in use in the country that is being visited.

Therefore a harmonization scheme should be devised that allows the mobile device to be configured once, upon delivery to the user, and this configuration should work in each country where public warning messages over CB are broadcast.

Another perspective on harmonization of Message Identifiers is to solve the language issue. Countries will want to broadcast alert messages in more than one language for being able to warn roamers and being able to broadcast to their own citizens in all the official languages of that specific country (examples of such countries are Belgium and Switzerland).

There are various solutions to the language issue. It can for instance be done by allocation different Message Identifiers to different languages, or the Data Coding Scheme (DCS) could be used indicate the language (or at least the alphabet; see 3GPP TS 23.038).

"Reaching Millions
in a Matter of Seconds"

Whichever solution is chosen, harmonization of Message Identifiers is needed, be it that the result of the harmonization probably differs for each solution.

It would indeed be a national matter to decide which Message Identifiers shall be allocated for the purposes of either civic alerting or civic needs generally. In any case, when a public warning message is broadcast, it should be intrusive, for instance by allocating a specific ring tone to such messages.
This may have a bearing on the preferred solution for the language issue. The CB Forum has seen that the ITU is seeking guidance from organizations such as 3GPP and GSMA, where terminal manufacturers can provide their view on the matter.

It is the view of the CB Forum that there are no objections to the number range that is proposed by the ITU SG2

A solution where each language is allocated its own message identifier seems the easiest solution. There is no dependency on terminal behaviour. However, as the ITU suggests in its liaison, it does allocate 200 message identifiers out of the 999 that are available. This may not be wanted from a commercial perspective.

A solution through the Data Coding Scheme requires just one message identifier in each of the two ranges that are proposed by the ITU. In the trials is the Netherlands and in the USA message identifier 920 is being used. Through the Data Coding Scheme some 20 languages are supported (see 3GPP TS 23.038). From the network perspective is also possible to use Data Coding Scheme 00010000, where the first 3 characters of the message are a two-character representation of the language encoded according to ISO 639, followed by a CR character. The CR character is then followed by 90 characters of text.

Unspecified however, is the behaviour on the terminal, when a message with this DCS is received.

The CB Forum advices the ITU to seek guidance from 3GPP or GSMA to on the specification of terminal behaviour.

CBF- March 1st 2007_PS_DG_WvS.