

Source: Rapporteur for TR 21.910

Supporting Companies: CETECOM, Sonera, Telia

Title: Clarification to questions and comments raised to TR 21.910 "Multi-mode UE issues"

Agenda item: 5.2.3

Document for: Information

Background

The report produced in T2 SWG5, TR 21.910 "Multi-mode Issues", has caused a lot of questions, comments and concern from other delegates not attending the work in T2/T2 SWG5. Most of the comments have been received outside the official discussions.

This paper tries to give a summary of the most important concerns and comments raised to this report and it also describes how T2 SWG5 has dealt with the subjects raised.

Comments from T-delegates

Here are some comments made during the last T-meeting about several issues and clarifications to the comments.

- The purpose with the work

The purpose is to give an overview of the behaviour of a multi-mode UE and the need of functionality in the network to make this kind of UE work efficiently. From the network side, a lot of this work has already been performed in the SA-groups, especially SA2. The report TR 21.910 is dealing with the Terminal view of the interoperability between the network and the 2G/3G.

- The purpose with the categorisation of terminals

The purpose with categorisation of the UE is to identify different simultaneous radio activity for the UE. The categorisation is also described for different subscriptions, where one or several operators serve the customer.

In the report it is also clearly stated out what the requirements are for both the UE and the network for the different kind of terminal types. This has been a problem with GSM/GPRS where the UE of type B sometimes request functionality from the network (i.e. paging co-ordination) that does not exist, as several network modes does exist.

- The continuation of the work

Two workshops are offered by T2. The first together with T3 to discuss the issues related to the USIM/SIM and the treatment of the identities and the other workshop with all other WGs involved in the work with interworking of GSM and UMTS.

Comments and actions from other delegates

Comments from other delegates than the T-delegates have mainly been received from SA, RAN2 and SA2.

SA – the chairman of SA attended the T2-meeting in Kyungju where the report was presented for information the first time. He had lots of comments and they were dealt with during the meeting. The SA-chairman also suggested that a workshop could be hold where the report and the content could be discussed. This suggestion was later on, on the following SA-meeting rejected, mainly by the RAN-delegates that expressed their concern that they had enough meetings to go to as it was, to finalise R99. Instead they suggested that an off-line discussions should take place between the chairman of RAN2, Denis Fauconnier, and T2 SWG5. This discussion is described in the next paragraph.

RAN2 – from the chairman of RAN2 some help was received with changing the originally scope. The result was that the new scope became more narrow and more precise about that the report describes a terminal including UMTS (FDD and/or TDD) and GSM (CS and/or GPRS) and that the report also is focused on the terminal type II, as described in the report. Further comments on the rest of the report were not received. The report was for this purpose sent to the RAN2 e-mail reflector for comments and by not receiving any comments or objections, T2 SWG5 assumed that RAN2 agreed upon it.

SA2 – a LS was sent to T2 SWG5 after SA2#10 in Abiko, November 29th – December 3rd. The LS was very short and a research on how the LS was treated at the SA2-meeting made clear that a small group of people were working with the LS unofficial during the meeting and it was then approved in the very end of the meeting, not giving much feedback.

The comments from SA2 were dealt with at the last T2-meeting. A few more clarifications were needed from SA2 and the questions were sent to Francois Courau and there has been no answer back from him yet. The questions have also been sent to the SA2 e-mail reflector and no objections have been received by T2 SWG5.

The main comment from SA2 was that the work in Ch. 7 in TR21.910 is overlapping the work done in the interim documents in SA2. Even so this section has been kept in the report. The study in TR21.910 has been done from a terminal perspective and the evaluation is done in the light of the work done in the scenarios. The terminal aspects are in this way collected to one single place. In a document like the above referred this would not be the case and the evaluation in a terminal perspective, also included in TR21.910, is still very valid for the work in T2 SWG5, Multi-mode terminals.

Another comment about this chapter is that it could be difficult to keep it up to date. This problem is taken care of by adding a note with a time stamping in the scope of the report. This note is clearly stating that the report should be read as for the situation as for February 2000 and that this is especially the case for Ch. 7.