

**3GPP TSG-T (Terminals) Meeting #19**  
**Birmingham, UK**  
**12 - 14 March, 2003**

**TP-030056**

**3GPP TSG-SA2 Meeting #30**  
**Milan, Italy, 24 - 28 February 2003**

**S2-031000**

**Title:** LS on T2 GUP Co-ordination Progress Report to SA2  
**Response to:** T2-030156 (= S2-030519)

**Source:** SA2  
**To:** T2  
**Cc:** TSG T

**Contact Person:**

**Name:** Harri Koskinen  
**Tel. Number:** +358 40 504 0780  
**E-mail Address:** [harri.o.koskinen@nokia.com](mailto:harri.o.koskinen@nokia.com)

**Attachments:** none

---

**1. Overall Description:**

This LS is sent to T2 for ACTION.

SA2 would like to thank T2 on their progress report on their GUP work, and for the work done so far. We would like to respond on your actions to us as follows:

1. Comments on your LS and the attached documents

SA2 do not have any specific comments on the Consensus Proposal for GUP in T2-020985. SA2 understand that it is a framework for your work item on Data Description Method and thus also a framework for the new structure of TS 23.241. For the comments on the other attached document T2-030035, please refer to item 3 in this LS.

2. Comments on methods for keeping the Information Model work in our respective Groups synchronised

SA2 have already responded at SA2 #29 in January your earlier LS in T2-020982 (= S2-030049), the response is in S2-030441. Please refer to it on SA2 comments on methods for keeping the Information Model work synchronised in our working groups.

3. Review of the Terminal GUP Use Cases and GUP implications on the Terminal architecture

SA2 have the following comments on the UE Use Cases for the GUP Architecture:

- a) General: The relationship between the Rp reference point and SyncML DM is not understood.
- b) Use Case 2: There is no GUP Data Repository specified in UICC (NB. SA2 are specifying GUP concretely for Rel6), and also concerns were expressed about the different formats of the GUP data in the UICC and the MT. Also the functionality is not understood, if the same data resides both in the UICC and the MT.
- c) Use Case 3: If the TE tries to access the data residing in the UICC, what are the requirements for API? In the flow, it is not clear in item 2) which Data Manager must determine the current location of the data.
- d) Use Case 4: In the leading paragraph a second Data Manager is referred to, where it is located and what are its requirements? Additionally, it is not clear how the security of the TE applications can be guaranteed.
- e) Use Case 5: Security check seems to be missing in this use case. In the flow, it is not understood in item 3) which Data Manager checks the data location together with the UE GUP Agent. Additionally, it was not understood in item 4) how the UICC and the MT GUP stores can be accessed directly by the UE GUP Agent. Furthermore the MT GUP store (i.e. data repository) is not specified.
- f) Questions in the discussion part of the contribution: Concerning the question if the UE is a black box for the GUP server, one company commented that the GUP reference architecture should not specify the internal architectures of the entities involved, while another company expressed their view that the role of the UICC in the GUP architecture needs to be clarified. On the other detailed questions it was felt by SA2 that the

questions cannot be responded yet due to the current status of the development of GUP reference architecture, e.g. synchronisation has not yet been discussed by SA2.

**2. Actions:**

**To T2 group.**

**ACTION:** SA2 ask T2 group to discuss and take into consideration SA2's comments on the terminal GUP Use Cases.

**3. Dates of Next TSG-SA2 Meetings:**

TSG-SA2 Meeting #31	7 - 11 April 2003	Seoul, Korea
TSG-SA2 Meeting #32	12 - 16 May 2003	San Diego, USA