

## LIAISON STATEMENT

**Source:** TSG SA WG2

**Title:** re: "Guidance on future work for T2 SWG5, Multi-mode terminals"

**To:** TSG T and T WG2

**CC:** TSG SA WG1, RAN WG2, SMG2 (or TSG GERAN if created by 3GPP)

**Attachement:** Answer from SMG2

TSG SA WG2 has reviewed the TSG T WG2 sWG5 LS requesting guidance on the work within T2. TGS SA has allocated the role of work co-ordination to TSG SA WG2 inside 3GPP and as a consequence TSG SA WG2 would like to express its views and concerns in the following points.

*Multi co-ordination function to direct the user / UE to the most appropriate Radio Access Technology / Mode at the moment*

TSG SA WG2 fully share the concern expressed by SMG2 (see attachment) and is of the opinion that TSG RAN shall also be part on the discussion if new RAT are incorporated when identified by TSG SA WG1 may be following request from other groups. In any case the Network access based on other technologies will request involvement from TSG RAN and SMG2 (or TSG GERAN if created by 3GPP) in the future.

So far there has been some request from the Satellite community and WAN community and the core network architecture is designed to cope with these technologies

*Global circulation aspects for multi-mode UE operation*

This is also an area relevant for discussion in for a involving the regulators from the different regions where this problem might apply and therefore outside the scope of 3GPP.

*The possibility of different VHE for 2G and 3G and the multi-mode UE requirements*

Following the study of the architectural aspect of the VHE, the current working assumption is that VHE is designed to exactly provide the services independently from the RAT. Therefore TSG SA WG2 does not see any needs for TSG T2 to work on this.

*When different subscriptions are used for different Radio Access Technologies / modes*

TSG SA WG2 does not consider this as a valid proposal because this will then be considered as independent PLMNs. So there shall not be any modification required to support this.

*Combining 3G with other radio access technologies like Wireless LANs*

In TS 23.121 a scenario describing W-LAN (Hiperlan 2) interworking with UMTS is depicted. However, no detailed work has yet been performed in TSG SA WG2. TSG SA WG2 is willing to discuss this issue with other groups (e.g. TSG SA WG1 and TSG T WG2) in order to fully understand the requirements and impact on the architecture.

**From:** ETSI SMG2  
**To:** 3GPP T, T2, T2 SWG5  
**Cc:** 3GPP S1, S2, SA, T3, RAN, RAN2, ETSI SMG  
**Subject:** Proposed reply to LS on Guidance on future work for T2 SWG5, Multi-mode terminals

SMG2 has received your LS and offers the following guidance on the coordination of work in 3GPP and ETSI SMG for R00, related to possible areas for work in T2 SWG5 as identified in your LS, and copied here in italics.

- *Multi co-ordination function to direct the user / UE to the most appropriate Radio Access Technology / Mode at the moment*

Based on previous experience in designing PLMN and cell re-selection in GSM, as well as the experience with DECT-GSM, and the recent and ongoing experience on GSM-UMTS RAT interworking in this area SMG2 INSISTS that this work is essentially performed in the radio groups SMG2 and RAN. This is because any decision in this area in general has an immediate (and potentially negative) effect on radio planning, and radio spectrum is the scarce (and expensive) resource in the system. Also, the specifications for this whole area have been carefully designed, but even modifications that are seen as "minor" by non radio groups, can have major consequences.

This of course does not preclude, and in some areas even requires input from other groups.

- *Global circulation aspects for multi-mode UE operation*

SMG2 sees global circulation mainly as a regulatory issue. Any technical aspects shall be handled in the relevant technical standards WGs, where the requirements should be coordinated via S1, the lower layer issues are to be handled mainly by radio groups (RAN, SMG2), security aspects in S3, and any USIM issues in T3.

- *The possibility of different VHE for 2G and 3G and the multi-mode UE requirements*  
SMG believes VHE depends on the core network, not on RAT.

- *When different subscriptions are used for different Radio Access Technologies / modes*  
SMG2 does not believe subscriptions are linked to RATs, but to PLMN.

- *The implications on the USIM*

SMG2 assumes this is a task for SMG11/T3.

- *Implications on other entities*

- *Combining 3G with other radio access technologies like Wireless LANs*

SMG2 assumes that as a significant percentage of 3G networks will be operated together with a GSM network, or even as a single GSM/UMTS network, "3G" in this case includes GSM. The operator conditions, and the consequential Stage 1 requirements are best handled in S1, with architectural questions addressed by S2, and radio issues in RAN and other (e.g. WirelessLAN) radio groups. For the radio area the comment in the first point applies: unless there is a manual user selection between the modes in the MS a detailed specification needs to be done essentially in the radio groups.

- *Operator conditions*
- *The general UE requirements that a combination like this causes*
- *The support in the current structure*
- *If further commercial and user requirements arise, further refinements of types Multi-mode UE*

In summary, SMG2 does not see T2 SWG5 is the most suitable group for all of the areas you suggested, for the reasons given above. In some of the other areas SMG2 is not the most competent group to respond, and assumes feedback will be provided by other groups.

With the very full meetings schedule of SMG and 3GPP coordination is already very difficult, and thus should be restricted where possible to the minimum number of groups.

SMG2 has limited knowledge on the exact mandate and expertise of T2 SWG5, and on the split of work of the non radio related groups in 3GPP. Based on this limited background, SMG2 suggests that T2 SWG5 focusses on areas not already competently addressed and assumes these areas could include e.g. the types of MS themselves, higher level application type issues, etc.