

---

**Source:** Siemens AG  
contact: harald.dettner@icn.siemens.de

**Title:** Consideration on 43.035  
(Remark on SP-020113)

**Document for:** Approval

**Agenda Item:** 7.3

---

During the presentation of SA3 document SP-020113 some discussion came up on this GSM/SMG originated specification.

The 1<sup>st</sup> point of discussion was the applicability of this specification for the UMTS system as it carries a spec number in the 4x<sup>th</sup>-series which indicates applicability in the GSM- or GERAN-system only.

This issue seems already clarified by the decision to reassign/reallocate a specification number in the 2x<sup>th</sup>-series.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> point of discussion was about the requirement of non-CAMEL-based IST (Immediate Service Termination).

According to the recollection of the former Chairman of SMG3 and TSG-CN the specification under discussion was intentionally not transposed to GSM with the argumentation, that in future all subscribers will have some kind of a CAMEL-subscription and CAMEL is the appropriate means to make IST happen.

... and by doing this the CN can be relieved of some old-fashioned ballast,

... and by utilizing CAMEL there is no need to specify anything since the CAMEL-toolbox provides the operator with all the means he needs.

Since there is no decision which can't be superposed by newer decisions it may well be that this old line of argumentation is no longer valid.

Nevertheless we have some reservations to approve the CR in SP020113 and reallocate the spec-number without more careful checking because:

- formally the reallocation of the spec-number for Rel4 from 4x to 2x-series is a new requirement for the UMTS-system.
- The MAP-protocol has further developed in the meantime and it well may be that the requirement under discussion does not fit any longer to the stage3 protocol we have at present.

Therefore the proposal is:

1. Do not approve the CR in SP-020113 at SA#15
2. For the sake of a consistent set of specifications ...  
... forward the CR under discussion to CN4 for checking the consistency between requirement and implementation esp. the "non-CAMEL based IST" as described in xy.035 and 29.002
3. If non-CAMEL based IST is an issue then a Rel-5 CR should be produced.
4. SA1 may want to comment on the requirement of non-CAMEL based IST in the UMTS-era.