Agenda Item: 5

Source: **Rapporteur** (Nokia)

Title: Report from the Methodology email ad-hoc

Document for: Information

_____

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper presents the results from email discussion on methodology issues between RAN WG2 meetings #3 and #4.

2. USAGE OF ASN.1

The way ASN.1 should be used in standards was discussed. Mainly the discussion was about whether we should use ASN.1 which complies to Z.105, or if e.g. CLASS and CONSTRAINED BY can be used. The latter opinion was supported by Nokia and the former opinion by Ericsson, Philips and Telelogic. The main argument for using Z.105 compliant ASN.1 was that this would make verifying the standards with automatic tools easier, assuming that SDL is used to describe the behaviour of the protocol. Nokia's argument was that only the "Z.105 visible" subset should be used together with descriptive SDL, while the "Z.105 invisible" parts of the ASN.1 specification should be used to provide additional information which is not needed by SDL specifications. No conclusions were made on this subject.

3. COMPATIBILITY WITH GSM

Alcatel presented a WG3 contribution which stated that for interoperability reasons between GS; and UMTS CSN.1 should be used on some parts of the radio interface (RR messages) and the Iu, Iub and Iur interfaces. This raised some questions from Ericsson and a clarification from Alcatel.

To my understanding, in WG3 #3 it was agreed to use ASN.1 on all AP protocols, but the choice of the encoding method was left open.

4. ENCODING RULES

The discussion on encoding rules revolved mainly around whether to use PER or CSN.1. The selection of PER to be the working assumption was suggested (Ericsson) based on the fact that the translation from ASN.1 to CSN.1 must be done by hand, and therefore also the CSN.1 implementation must be verified. Telelogic noted that there are currently no tools which could analyse descriptions which combine SDL and CSN.1.It was also expressed that translation rules for CSN.1 should be agreed upon.

The different aspects of PER and CSN.1 were also discussed, but the general consensus was that no definite decisions can be made before the different methods have been tested using some real message definitions as a starting point.