3GPP/PCG#12 Meeting
St Paul de Vence, France
14 April 2004

3GPP/PCG#12(04)10
25 March 2004
page 0 of 7

Source: **GSMA**

Title: **GSMA input to 3GPP**

Agenda item: **10**

Document for:

Decision	**X**
Discussion	
Information	

Contents

1   Introduction

The GSMA has decided to make more effective use of the opportunity afforded to it, as a Market Representation Partner, to present the views of its members to the 3GPP in the form of documents input to the PCG.

This first document contains information provided by GSMA Executive Management Committee (EMC), and direct input from our members.

This first draft, compiled and presented by the EMC on behalf of the GSMA contains a number of issues and topics for initial discussion, each of which will be built upon and further refined in the coming weeks.

The GSMA sends its appreciation to 3GPP for the hard work and efforts committed on behalf of both its members and the mobile industry at large.

GSMA is in full support of the work done by 3GPP and this input is intended to try and further approve the development of essential standards work.

To ease discussion we have separated all items in

- ➢ Problem statement

- ➢ Suggested way forward

We encourage 3GPP to work actively together on problem resolution of issues identified in problem statement. We appreciate feedback and improvement of suggested resolution.

2   The Market View

Problem Statements:

1. The roll-out of 3G networks and uptake of 3G based services has fallen behind public expectations resulting in a perceived gap between the promise and delivery of 3G services. This has led to widespread scepticism both within the industry and the public at large. It is important to note that 3GPP as the owner of UMTS specifications is having a weak reputation by some Executives in the industry as it is considered a part of the problem.

2. The progress of the standardisation effort within 3GPP continues unabated. The early releases (R99 to R5) have been frozen, the freezing of R6 is currently under discussion and R7 is already on the horizon. The net result is that the standardisation process is now several years ahead of actual deployments.

3. Parts of the process chain beginning with creation of specifications and ending with successful operation in the market are currently missing overall ownership (e.g. systematic end-to-end testing of 3G systems going to market and oversight of consequential error correction and implementation).

4. Operators see no reflection of their wish to have a period of strengthened consolidation and stabilisation within the overall 3GPP programme, to allow the markets to catch up and to test the reaction to the services being offered.

Suggested way forward:

The only means of countering such public apathy is the delivery of consistently high-quality services in the market. Extend scope of 3GPP work and responsibility beyond creation and publication of standards.

3GPP should define and measure success criteria for their work which take into consideration

- ➤ degree of commercialization of UMTS

- ➤ degree of adoption of features included in 3GPP specifications

- ➤ degree of interoperability and stability of systems based on 3GPP specifications

- ➤ time lag between specification and interoperable services in the market

Appropriate action ought to be initiated if actual measurement of success criteria is falling behind expectations.

3 End-to-End Service Delivery

Problem Statement:

The 3GPP architectural principles are well understood and the desire to provide "service agnostic" bearers is desirable, in order to prevent unnecessary constraints on the development of future applications and services. Operators are struggling, however, with the lack of an overall end-to-end framework for the delivery of services to end-users (e.g. specification for Video Telephony).

Suggested way forward:

3GPP should review the paradigm of being service agnostic and consider including elaboration of Teleservices for mainstream 3G applications like VT in their specifications.

As commercial adoption of 3G is gated by availability of compelling and robust applications, 3GPP should establish a permanent process of assessing repercussions from application and enabler definition in OMA.

4 Release Content Management

Problem Statement:

The principle of including alternative features in the releases of the standard, relying on natural selection by the market, has incurred a heavy cost in terms of equipment complexity, compatibility issues, burden of testing and inter-operability/roaming.

Suggested way forward:

The GSMA would like to play a more significant role in the definition and control of content for future releases. The aim is to reduce complexity by focusing on a smaller subset of features and by removing options that are not actual market requirements.

- ➤ Revisit R6 content and classify work items and options in need to have and nice to have from an operators perspective. 3GPP should advise if a similar activity is considered beneficial for releases before R6 as well. Consulting of 3GPP is considered essential to identify options

which can be omitted without creating harm to the remainder of the package.

To facilitate such a discussion, the GSMA would like to request 3GPP to identify complexity drivers and issues (at least for R6 and later releases) where clear guidance from the operator community would help to streamline the work programme.

Better results in general could still be achieved in terms of:

- Reducing the options:

  o Applying the cost/benefit test prior to the introduction of new solutions to the standards.

  o Defining a limited set of UE categories with (mandatory and unambiguous) capabilities based on actual market requirements. (class mark concept).

- Testing:

  o Enforce the timely availability of prudent test specifications which are reusable for conformance and interoperability tests as part of the release process.

- Inter-operability and roaming:

  o Inter-operability has to be ensured, particularly in the roaming environment.

  o The definition and implementation of common feature sets is essential.

5   Timing of Future Releases

Problem Statements:

1. Given the gap between specification and actual implementation, it is important to allow the markets to catch-up and to ensure that future release are driven by actual market needs.

2. The implementation gap raises a number of issues and risks:

   - Accepting new R7 service requirements when most 3G networks are based on R99, would make the prediction of commercial success practically impossible

   - Operator guidance on "best practice" for future releases is gated by availability of actual operating experience

Suggested way forward:

Apply a rigorous assessment if all features of a release have reached the required quality and maturity of specification and are complete (including performance and test specifications) before "freezing" the release.

6   Stability of Existing Releases

Problem Statement:

Past experience has shown that the wide-scale deployment of 3G networks and terminals will result in a significant increase in the number of corrections and fixes required. This will place a heavy burden on the 3GPP MCC and the release management process.

Suggested way forward:

The GSMA would like to establish a process with 3GPP for the feedback, optimisation and consolidation of essential fixes to the existing R99 and R4 releases. Possible suggestions include:

- Centralized capturing and evaluation of interoperability issues perceived in the market

- Programme management for error correction and oversight of implementation into the market

7 Management of Essential Intellectual Property

Problem Statement:

There is a risk that the currently unmanaged environment for EIP will severely hamper the success of 3G. License payments for EIP are excessive for those with no EIP to trade and the overall portion of IP related costs for UE is up to 10 times higher than for 2G.

There are doubts concerning the strength of the 'fair and reasonable' approach as a policing mechanism and whether the EIP community's ability to manage itself is sufficient.

Operators are concerned that new manufacturers will find the current EIP regime too much of a handicap to enter the market and thus vital competition amongst manufacturers will be stifled.

New innovation may also be slow without a greater sharing of rewards throughout the industry. Current treatment cannot be viewed as being non-discriminatory for new entrants.

Suggested way forward:

Conduct a review of ETSI IPR policy regarding the management of EIP for 3G and its effects in the market. Consider the reduction of optional features that contain higher degree of IPR than comparable solutions.

8 Scoping of activities

Problem Statement:

There has been some consideration of alternative forms of access that are not 3GPP specific, to be adopted as a complement of UMTS and some very sophisticated access and interworking scenarios. Some of them are only considered valid by a subgroup of operators. This dilutes resources from refining the obvious use cases that are relevant for all operators.

Suggested way forward:

3GPP should identify which scenarios are building the mainstream and close them out in a robust manner first, before entering into niche scenarios.

9 Workload Management (WGs)

Problem Statements:

Many WGs remain affected by excessive workload (e.g. SA1, SA2, etc.). Several WGs have adopted the practice of running more meetings in parallel, including plenary sessions.

Due to the budget constraints resulting from the current industry climate which also relates to the limited success of 3G, the level of support for 3GPP is unlikely to be maintained on the same level. As a consequence the number of members, who can afford to send one delegate per group/subgroup, and therefore can support this type of schedule will be decreasing. This contributes to the ongoing dilution in Operator presence; the lack of effective Operator insight into all working items being progressed; and an inability to exercise constructive control over such items.

Suggested way forward:

The GSMA requests the PCG to recommend to the WG chairmen that a more stringent set of criteria on WI approval (e.g. higher number of supporting companies) is exercised to reduce the workload and enable less parallelism of activities.