

3GPP TSG CN WG4 Meeting #13  
Fort Lauderdale, US, 8<sup>th</sup> April – 12<sup>th</sup> April 2002

N4-020372

**Title:** Liaison Statement on Immediate Service Termination  
**Source:** TSG-CN WG4  
**To:** TSG-SA; TSG-SA WG3  
**Cc:** TSG-CN WG2

**Contact Person:**

**Name:** Ian Park, Vodafone  
**Tel. Number:** +44 1635 673 527  
**E-mail Address:** [ian.park@vodafone.co.uk](mailto:ian.park@vodafone.co.uk)

---

**1. Overall Description:**

TSG-CN WG4 have considered the requests from TSG-SA #15, as described in the extract from the meeting report of SA #15 and relayed to TSG-CN WG4 by email.

On the question of whether there would be any problems with introducing the non-CAMEL IST functionality into Rel-4: we have reviewed the MAP specification for Rel-4, and it includes the protocol support for non-CAMEL IST functionality; by inheritance, this support is also provided in Rel-5. Our conclusion is that there would be no problems with **introducing** the non-CAMEL IST functionality into Rel-4. However if it were decided **not to introduce** the non-CAMEL IST functionality into Rel-4, it would require work in CN4 to remove the definition of the protocol support from the MAP specifications for Rel-4 and Rel-5.

For these reasons, TSG-CN WG4 recommend that the non-CAMEL IST functionality be introduced into the stage 1 & stage 2 specifications for Rel-4. If TSG-SA WG3 and TSG-SA decide not to carry this functionality forward into Rel-5, TSG-SA are requested to inform TSG-CN WG4 as soon as possible, so that the MAP specification for Rel-5 can be revised accordingly.

On the question of the implications if the requirement for IST support is introduced for UTRAN access, our analysis is that no work is needed in CN4 specifications. By contrast, if the requirement for IST support applies only for GSM access, substantial work would be required in both CN2 and CN4. Both the CAMEL-based and HLR/switch-based IST functionality take no account of the access technology used by the subscriber whose service is to be terminated. If the access technology is to be taken into account in deciding whether or not to terminate service:

- For CAMEL-based IST, the access technology in use would have to be signalled to the gsmSCF when the control relationship is established. This would require changes to the CAMEL protocol and the functionality of the serving MSC/VLR.
- For HLR/switch-based IST, the functionality of the MSC would have to be modified to accept an IST command if the subscriber is using GSM access, but reject it if the subscriber is using UTRAN access. In addition, the protocol would need to be modified to allow the reason for rejection to be reported to the HLR.

For these reasons, TSG-CN WG4 recommend that the IST functionality should be specified to apply equally to GSM access and UTRAN access.

**2. Actions:**

**To TSG-SA and TSG-SA WG3 group.**

**ACTION:** TSG-CN WG4 ask TSG-SA and TSG-SA WG3 to take note of TSG-CN WG4's recommendations set out above in deciding whether to:

- Specify non-CAMEL IST functionality for UMTS Rel-4;
- Specify non-CAMEL IST functionality for UMTS Rel-5;
- Specify the applicability of IST to both GSM and UTRAN access.

**ACTION:** TSG-CN WG4 ask TSG-SA and TSG-SA WG3 to notify TSG-CN WG4 of their decision, so that any changes needed in TSG-CN WG4 specifications can be drafted.

**3. Date of Next CN4 Meetings:**

CN4 #14	13th – 17th May 2002	Budapest, HUNGARY
CN4 #15	29th July – 2nd Aug. 2002	Helsinki, FINLAND