

Title: LS on Removal of SIWF from R99 and onward
Source: TSG CN Plenary
To: TSG-SA, TSG SA WG1, TSG SA WG2, TSG CN WG3, and TSG CN WG4,
Cc:
Contact Person:
Name: Toshiyuki Tamura
E-mail Address: <mailto:tamura@aj.jp.nec.com>
Tel. Number: +81-471-85-6706

1. General Overview:

At the TSG CN Plenary#13 meeting in Beijing the attached contribution (NP-010501) was discussed.

During the discussion, it was confirmed that none of the manufacturers or operators were interested in the SIWF function for R99 and onward. Besides, some manufacturers expressed their view that having the SIWF function as a redundant function in R99 is not preferable.

The conclusion of the CN plenary is that **the SIWF shall be deleted from R99 and onward.**

Therefore, the TSG Plenary would like to inform all relevant WGs about this decision. If any of WGs addressed has a problem about this decision, an urgent comment to all relevant groups is requested as soon as possible in order to suspend the following requested actions.

2. Actions:

Actions to SA2:

The TSG CN Plenary kindly requests SA2 to investigate the possible impacts to all their specifications for R99 and onwards. If impacts are detected, please would they amend them in order to fulfil the removal of SIWF from the specifications. The following specification may be impacted. This is after a first look made by CN Plenary.

- TS 23.002: Network architecture

Actions to CN3:

The TSG CN Plenary kindly requests the deletion of TS 23.054 from the R99 specification set.

The TSG CN Plenary also kindly requests CN3 to investigate the possible impacts to other specifications for R99 and onwards. If impacts are detected, please would they amend them in order to fulfil the removal of the SIWF from the specifications.

Actions to CN4:

The TSG CN Plenary kindly requests CN4 to investigate the possible impacts to all their specifications for R99 and onwards. If impacts are detected, please would they amend them in order to fulfil the removal of SIWF from the specifications. The following specifications may be impacted. This is after a first look made by CN Plenary.

- TS23.003 “Numbering, addressing and identification”
- TS29.002 “Mobile Application Part (MAP) specification”

Actions to SA1:

The TSG CN Plenary kindly requests SA1 to consider this decision from the service point of view.

3. Attachments:

NP-010501 - Document from NEC, Lucent and Fujitsu on the “Problem with Rel-4 TS23.054”

Source: NEC, Lucent Technologies and Fujitsu
Title: Problem on Rel-4 TS23.054
Agenda item: 8.12 (TEI_4)
Document for: DISCUSSION and DECISION

Introduction

Through the standardisation work in TTC, it was noticed that TS23.054 "*Description for the use of a Shared Inter Working Function (SIWF) in a GSM PLMN - Stage 2*" was missing in the Rel-4 specifications list of TS21.102 V4.1.0 "*3rd Generation mobile system Release 4 specifications*" as of 2001-07. On the other hand, TS23.054 are still referred by other Rel-4 specifications such as TS23.002 "*Network architecture*" and TS29.002 "*Mobile Application Part (MAP) specification*". Besides, TS23.003 defines the SCCP subsystem numbers for SIWF. The existence of SIWF entity is still considered by these specifications. This means that a discrepancy exists among specifications.

Discussion

The originator of this discussion paper would appreciate if the WG, which is responsible for TS23.054, could clarify the followings;

1. The status of Rel-4 TS23.054.
2. Any communications held with other WGs. (i.e. whether the deletion of SIWF from REL-4 is well known and shared in 3GPP community.)
3. Any future plans to fix this discrepancy, for example;
 - Option 1:
Produce Rel-4 TS23.054.
 - Option 2:
Ask participating companies of their interest in SWIF. If there is no interest and companies can agree to delete SWIF, then a LS should be produced and sent out to corresponding WGs to inform of the decision of the deletion.
 - Option 3:
Discuss at the SA plenary meeting next week and ask for the guidance of SA plenary and SA1 whether SWIF is still required. If SWIF is no longer required, then a LS should be produced and sent out to CN plenary and CN WGs to inform of the decision of the deletion.