3GPP TSG-T (Terminals) Meeting #23
Phoenix, USA
10 - 12 March, 2004

TP-040013

3GPP TSG-T2 #24
Malaga, Spain
16 -20 February 2004

T2-040158

Title: **LS on the impact on T2 of transferring MMS stage 2 bearer agnostic work to OMA after MMS REL-6**

Response to:

Release:

Work Item:

Source: **T2**

To: **TSG T**

Cc:

Contact Person:
Name: Ian Harris (T2 Chair)
Tel. Number: +447764217416
E-mail Address: iharris@rim.net

Attachments: None

---

1. Overall Description:

At TSG T#22 Maui TSG-T and subsequently SA#22 endorsed the transfer of MMS stage 2 non network specific work to OMA after REL-6 and the transfer of debates on any post REL-6 MMS enhancements with immediate effect
T2 was actioned to assess the impact of this on T2.

T2 has now debated this and has concluded that T2's structure and working practices will probably need to be changed.

T2 has responsibilities for work other than MMS (e.g. MExE, GUP, AT Commands, CBS, and SMS). A table in this LS summarises the list of specifications under T2's responsibility. The table also categorises after REL-6 those Specifications into Primarily Maintenance only (very few to no contributions over the past year and future input unlikely) and Primarily Maintenance but ongoing work envisaged in T2 (several contributions over the past year and future input likely).

The two primary areas of activity today in T2 are GUP and MMS, but after REL-6 activity in both of these areas is likely to reduce dramatically.

SWG2 handles GUP. GUP REL-6 is drawing to a close and in T2 the number of delegates actively participating in this work is decreasing. There is insufficient interest in GUP at present in T2 to justify keeping T2 SWG2 alive after GUP REL-6 has been completed given the fact that SWG2's other responsibilities are running at a very low level.

SWG3 handles MMS. MMS currently accounts for the majority of T2's work but its other responsibilities are running at a very low level. After MMS REL-6 is complete it is anticipated that MMS activity will reduce to the low level of SWG3's other activities. **An analysis of the MMS stage 2 specification shows that about 5% of 23.140 is network specific which suggests that 95% of current MMS work in T2 will not be done by 3GPP after REL-6 is complete.**

Although it is appreciated that TSG T is not directly concerned with the way T2 structures itself, the above information on the reduced activities in its SWG's is indicative that T2's role will be primarily one of Specification

Maintenance once REL-6 is completed and that it would appear that there will be no need for T2 to have its work split into SWG's if T2 continues in its current form**.**

However by far the most important issue is whether companies will be prepared to send delegates to T2 meetings for what will be primarily maintenance tasks.
Indications from T2 delegates are that their companies are looking for a more cost effective way of resolving maintenance issues rather than having to send delegates to a meeting. Travel budgets are under scrutiny in most companies, as is the justification of a delegate's time and resources.

We cannot be sure for certain what the level of interest will be in attending T2 after REL-6 is complete, but it is likely to be low. However, T2 still has a wide range of responsibilities, even after REL-6, and the work will have to be done somewhere if not in T2 then by some other mechanism.
T2 has discussed possible options, which are summarised in the following table:

OPTION	Advantages	Disadvantages	Comments
Option 1 T2 continues to meet as it does today.	Keeps Terminal expertise together in one TSG. Effective dialogue.	Potentially no savings to companies budgets.	Dependant on companies willing to send delegates to cover all subject matters for essentially maintenance roles.
Option 2 T2 is dissolved. Work is transferred to other 3GPP groups.	Potential savings to companies budgets.	Loses terminal expertise in one TSG. This could result in T2 delegates having to attend more TSG's rather than less. T2's related work is not done elsewhere except for GUP. Additional and probably unwelcome burden for other TSG's.	Savings to companies budgets only possible if delegates do not have to attend another meeting they do not normally attend to do the same work. It seems that GUP work is the only candidate for transfer (SA2 or CN4).
Option 3 T2 becomes a virtual group but its structure of elected officers and working practices is retained.	Savings to companies budgets. Keeps terminal expertise under one TSG.	e-mail often not as productive as face to face meetings particularly for contentious situations. Reduced personal face to face interaction between delegates and companies	Chairman to set up experts groups for each T2 topic (e.g. SMS) headed by its rapporteur. Rapporteur leads and co-ordinates e-mail debate but is responsible to T2. T2 mailing list used to keep all T2 delegates informed. The need to meet to be on an as required basis for an expert group or for T2 as a whole at the T2 chairman's discretion. T2 output documents go to TSG T after circulation to T2 delegate list. This model is already being used by T2 for MExE work and may well have to be adopted by T2 for other work e.g. SMS, CBS and AT commands in any case if T2 continued as Option 1.
Option 4 T2 meet at the same venue as TSG T.	One venue for T and T2.	Little or no time to process or circulate T2 documents before presentation to T. However T2 work could be done at T for presentation to the next T	Very few T2 delegates attend T and so many companies budgets would not see any benefit because T2 experts currently attending T2 would need to go to T.

		three months later.	

LIST OF 3GPP DOCUMENTS UNDER T2 RESPONSIBILITY

The tables below categorises the level of contributions as follows.
Normal text - Primarily Maintenance after REL-6 (very few to no contributions over the past year and future input unlikely).
Bold text - Primarily Maintenance after REL-6 but ongoing work envisaged in T2 (several contributions over the past year and future input expected).
NOTE: It should be pointed out that the categorisation after REL-6 is exactly as it is today with the exception that MMS 23.140 is currently in a high contribution state rather than a maintenance state. The same applies but to a lesser extent for GUP 23.241 which is close to completion for REL-6.

SWG1

Active specifications:

TS	23.057	Mobile Execution Environment (MExE); Functional description; Stage 2
TR	22.857	Run-time independent framework feasibility study

SWG2

Active specifications

TS	**23.241**	**3GPP Generic User Profile (GUP); Stage 2; Data description method**
TS	**24.241**	**3GPP Generic User Profile (GUP) Common objects; Stage 3**
TS	**27.007**	**AT command set for 3G User Equipment (UE)**
TS	27.005	Use of Data Terminal Equipment - Data Circuit terminating Equipment (DTE-DCE) interface for Short Message Service (SMS) and Cell Broadcast Service (CBS)
TS	27.010	Terminal Equipment to User Equipment (TE-UE) multiplexer protocol
TS	23.227	Application and user interaction in the UE; Principles and specific requirements
TS	27.103	Wide Area Network Synchronization
TR	27.901	Report on Terminal Interfaces - An Overview

Inactive specifications (stopped at a certain Release)

TS	07.08	GSM Application Programming Interface
TR	21.810	Report on multi-mode UE issues; ongoing work and identified additional work
TR	21.904	User Equipment (UE) capability requirements
TR	21.910	Multi-mode UE issues; categories, principles and procedures
TR	27.903	Discussion of synchronization standards
TR	34.907	Report on electrical safety requirements and regulations
TR	34.925	Specific Absorption Rate (SAR) requirements and regulations in different regions

SWG3

Active specifications

TS	**23.038**	**Alphabets and language-specific information**
TR	23.039	Interface Protocols for the Connection of Short Message Service Centers (SMSCs) to Short Message Entities (SMEs)
TS	**23.040**	**Technical realization of Short Message Service (SMS)**
TS	23.041	Technical realization of Cell Broadcast Service (CBS)
TS	23.042	Compression algorithm for SMS
TS	**23.140**	**Multimedia Messaging Service (MMS); Functional description; Stage 2**

Inactive specifications (stopped at a certain Release)

TR	03.43	Support of Videotex
TR	03.44	Support of Teletex in a GSM Public Land Mobile Network (PLMN)
TR	03.47	Example Protocol Stacks for Interconnecting Service Centre(s) (SC) and Mobile Services Switching Centre(s) (MSC)
TR	03.49	Example protocol stacks for interconnecting Cell Broadcast Centre (CBC) and Base Station Controler (BSC)
TR	22.945	Study of provision of fax service in GSM and UMTS

Recommendation to TSG T from T2

Many T2 delegates have a preference for option 3 but to transfer the stage 2 GUP work to SA2 where stage 2 work is already being done and stage 3 work to CN4 who deal with Network issues of GUP. Should the need arise for an expert group to meet then as a general rule the preferred venue would be ETSI Sophia Antipolis where facilities to support a meeting already exist.

2. Actions:

To TSG T group.

ACTION: T2 asks TSG-T to discuss this document and provide feedback to T2 particularly with regard to the options for the future of T2 tabled above.

3. Date of next T2 Meetings:

T2#25	19 – 23 Apr 2004	Edinburgh, UK