3GPP TSG-RAN #17 Meeting ***Tdoc RP-020516***
Biarritz, France, 3rd – 6th September 2002

Source:	**Nortel Networks/Vodafone Group**
Title:	**Handling of R99 corrections in RAN3**
Document for:	**Discussion & Decision**
Agenda Item:	**7.3.2**

1 Introduction

At the last RAN Plenary meetings, there were long discussions on what kind of corrections could still be accepted in R99 and what kind of corrections should be delayed to further releases. The understanding in RAN3 is that "A correction can be done in R99 if it corrects a mistake in the specification that leads to frequent important errors in the System (i.e. how essential is the correction, how frequently it happens), otherwise the correction should be done in Release 5" as reported by various delegates attending RAN Plenary meetings. Nortel/Vodafone would like to confirm that understanding and discuss it so that there is a common understanding of the consequences in RAN3.

2 Discussion

This understanding lead to very long discussions during the last RAN3 meeting on the necessity to include or not some corrections in R99. All this stems from the fact that "frequent" and "essential" seem to be very subjective terms and that different companies may not have the same opinion as to the importance and the frequency of the error, depending on the impacted feature. Although it becomes more and more difficult to change existing implementations, it is also true that, for instance, clarification CRs are necessary in the case where the specification leaves room for different possible interpretations leading to IOT issues. Nortel/Vodafone think that there is a need for the guidelines provided to the RAN3 regarding R99 corrections to be clarified by RAN. In particular, Nortel/Vodafone believe that an ambiguous specification, when it leads to an identified interoperability problem, should require an essential correction. Otherwise, the multi-vendor status of R99 RAN3 interfaces may be compromised. The consequence would be that only R4 or R5 could be guaranteed as multi-vendor, and also some problems could take place between R99 and R4 nodes.

Furthermore, Nortel/Vodafone would like to understand why, in the case of RAN3, corrections that are not deemed necessary in R99 should be introduced in Rel-5 version of the specifications. The difference between R99 and Rel-4 RAN3 specifications is significant (e.g. introduction of UE Positioning). So Nortel/Vodafone believe that it would be better to introduce these corrections in the Rel-4 version of the RAN3 specifications instead, especially when considering the fact that the Rel-4 ASN.1 is to be frozen.

3 Conclusion

Nortel/Vodafone would like to see clearer guidelines provided to RAN3 for considering R99 corrections, especially when Inter-working is concerned. In particular, Nortel/Vodafone believe that the following guidelines should be agreed by RAN plenary for the treatment of future CRs handled within RAN WG3:

1) Change Requests correcting ambiguities leading to potential IOT problems on interfaces should be corrected in the Specification Release where the ambiguity was introduced.

2) Corrections that would cause incompatibility problems between UTRAN nodes of different releases should always be made to the earliest Specification Release that is impacted by the correction.