

**Source:** MCC  
**Title:** Identifying the minimum functionality of IMS  
**Document for:** Approval  
**Agenda Item:**

As mentioned in the companion contribution entitled " Proposal for cleaning-up the IMS feature", this paper addresses the "identification of the minimum functionality for IP-based Multimedia, which will stand alone and prove commercially viable."

The approach taken in this document is to consider the consequence of not including certain items within the feature. The draft answers are provided in the table below.

All the items for which the IMS will obviously not work are not reproduced below. These items can be found in the companion contribution: they are identified as being "not splittable".  
 Moreover, the companion contribution stresses that the Stage 3 is not going to be completed before at least March 2002, implying that no viable IMS will be possible before this date, thereby all the splittable items which will be finished by that date will be included in the first Release of IMS. The consequences of not being included are however addressed for all items, in the case that they are delivered late.

In the following table, "Splittable = Yes" means that the item can be moved out of the first release of IMS, "Splittable=?" means that it is up to the plenary decision.

line #	Uni_ID	Task Name	Splittable	Resource	foreseen completion date	% Compl	Consequence if not included
16		IETF: draft-ietf-sip-refer	?	WG CN1	Mar 2002	0%	<i>No information on the necessity to have all these IETFs drafts.</i>
17		IETF: draft-ietf-sip-dhcp	?	WG CN1	Mar 2002	0%	
18		IETF: draft-biggs-sip-replaces	?	WG CN1	Mar 2002	0%	
19		IETF: draft-ietf-avt-rtp-amr	?	WG CN1	Mar 2002	0%	
20		IETF: draft-ietf-mmusic-sdp-new	?	WG CN1	Mar 2002	0%	
27	2529	UE Functionality Split	Yes	WG SA1	December 2001	0%	<i>The TE and MT cannot be physically dissociated, or the split will not be standardised.</i>
42	2530	Service Examples	Yes	WG SA1	21-Dec-2001	20%	<i>These services examples might not be necessary for the definition of the IMS.</i>
43	2531	IMS Framework Report	Yes	WG SA1	21-Dec-2001	15%	
47	1300	(copy) UTRAN evolutions for efficient support of IMS (ROHC: UID2206, Header compression: UID 1680, UEP: UID 1686),	this one or the one below	TSG RAN	March 2002	0%	<i>If GERAN evolutions for efficient support of IMS is not completed, then the IMS can be used in conjunction with UTRAN. Conversely, if the UTRAN optimisations are not done, the IMS can be used in conjunction with the GERAN.</i>
48		(copy) GERAN evolutions for efficient support of IMS	this one or the one above	TSG GERAN	March 2002	0%	
53	2048	Interworking between IMS and IP networks	?	WG CN3	March 2002	30%	<i>No interworking with external IP network. Is this acceptable?</i>
60	2047	Interworking between IMS and CS networks	?	WG CN3	28-Dec-2001	30%	<i>No interworking with external CS network. Is this acceptable?</i>
66	1732	Number portability in IMS	Yes	WG CN4	June 2002	0%	<i>Self-explicit.</i>
67	1598	(Copy) AMR-WB	Yes	WG SA4	29-Jun-2001	95%	<i>The IMS can be used with other codecs (but AMR-WB is almost completed, so the question is irrelevant).</i>
77		IMS Local services	yes	WG SA2	March 2002	20%	<i>Self-explicit.</i>
82		Mm interface (CSCF to external IP multimedia network)	?	WG CN1	March 2002		<i>See comment on IMS-IP interworking.</i>
83		Mg interface (CSCF to MGCF - interworking with CS)	?	WG CN4	March 2002		<i>See comment on IMS-CS interworking.</i>

84		Mr interface (CSCF to MRF)	Yes	WG CN1	?		<i>The MRF is going to be used for multiparty calls.</i>
85		Dx interface (I-CSCF to SLF)	?	WG CN4		?	<i>The SLF is going to be used mainly when upgrading HLRs from different vendors to HSSs in the same network.</i>
86		Go interface (GGSN to PCF)	?	WG CN3	March 2002		<i>This might lead to problems to handle the end-to-end QoS.</i>
87		ISC (IMS Service Control) interface	?	WG CN1		?	<i>See two items below.</i>
88	1310	Support of VHE/OSA by the IMS	?	WG CN5		?	<i>Self-explicit. Uncertainties about the completion date: N5 has just started considering the IMS architecture</i>
89	12000	Support of CAMEL by the IMS	?	WG CN2	Mar 2002	0%	<i>Self-explicit. The services offered by CAMEL will not be transposed to the IMS. N2 has just started technical work</i>

The TSG plenaries are requested to provide clear guidance on what can be considered as "splittable" from the basic release of IMS. We can note that there is no urgent need to answer to this question, as the question is irrelevant for the items which will be completed in time for the basic release. The December TSG meetings will allow to be more precise on the foreseen completion dates.