Source: **GSM North America**

Title: **3GPP Handset Certification in North America**

Agenda item: **12**

Document for:

Decision	
Discussion	
Information	**X**

GSMNA Doc 115/99 Rev 1

GSM North America

The North American Interest Group of the GSM Association

July 1, 1999

Mr. Ed Ehrlich
Vice Chair, 3GPP TSG Terminals
c/o Nokia
600 Connection Drive
Irving, TX 75083
E-mail: ed.ehrlich@nmp.nokia.com

Re: 3GPP Handset Certification in North America

Dear Ed,

Thank you for your recent e-mail message to GSM North America (GSMNA) advising us of the concerns raised at the June 17, 1999 meeting of the 3GPP Terminal Technical Specification Group (3GPP TSG-T) regarding the standardization of 3GPP handset conformance testing in North America.

Currently, GSMNA's PCS Type Certification Review Board (PTCRB) administers 2nd generation handset certification guidelines for GSM 1900 (PCS 1900) networks based on the GSM 11.10 standard developed and balloted by the European Telecommunications Standards Institute (ETSI) and on additional technical specifications created by GSMNA. To date, ETSI has not accepted proposed changes to GSM 11.10 for GSM 1900 networks. Likewise, it is our understanding that the PTCRB also asked for T1P1.5 help in standardizing the test specification used by the PTCRB, but there was only one submission and general lack of support. Therefore, the testing guidelines administered by the PTCRB for North American GSM networks are based on GSM 11.10 with additions written by the PTCRB in collaboration with CETECOM to meet the network needs of North American GSM operators.

The development of a 3rd generation handset conformance testing specification by the 3GPP differs from the development of the 2nd generation certification standard in that the 3GPP is not a standards body and cannot ballot a standards document itself. Therefore, the 3GPP has agreed to give over its final technical specification for the entire 3G standards product to each of its six

partner Standards Development Organizations (SDOs) for balloting within their respective regions. ETSI will be one of six SDOs required to ballot the technical output from the 3GPP; the USA (T1P1), Japan (ARIB and TTC), Korea (TTA), and China (CWTS) are each also expected to ballot identical copies of all core 3GPP technical output documents in order to insure identical international 3G standards.

As we understand your memo, you stated to the 3GPP Terminals Technical Specifications Group that, based on your experience with the lack of 2nd generation conformance testing standards work in T1P1, you do not expect it to be the responsibility of T1P1 to ballot 3rd generation handset conformance testing standards as a part of T1P1's overall balloting of the 3rd generation specification. However, with identical standards produced by each regional SDO, GSMNA sees no reason why any future 3G work of the PTCRB should not reference the T1P1 balloted version of the 3rd generation conformance testing standard as a basis for its 3rd generation certification program, just as it currently references ETSI documents as the basis for its 2nd generation certification program. If North American operators see a need for additional regional refinements for 3rd generation testing, those may be accomplished via mechanisms similar to those currently employed by the PTCRB with CETECOM.

Plans for the actual creation of a 3rd generation certification testing program by the GSMNA PTCRB will be addressed more fully after review of both the testing specifications proposed by the 3GPP and the certification program proposed by the GSM Association. However, GSMNA is particularly interested in noting possible procedural variations in 3rd generation conformance testing, as were evident in 2nd generation between GSM 1900, GSM 900 and GSM 1800. GSMNA would like to assist in the creation of a harmonized 3G test specification and invites the 3GPP Terminals Technical Specifications Group to liaise its draft documents to the GSMNA PTCRB for review and comment. We understand that this type of cooperative working arrangement is anticipated in the 3GPP Operating Procedures through the ability of the 3GPP to delegate regionally specific work to other bodies and suggest that the GSMNA PTCRB would be the appropriate body to address the creation of certification testing for 3rd generation North American networks in collaboration with TSG-T and T1P1.5.

In conclusion, concerning your suggestion that TSG-T seek advice from the 3GPP Services & System Aspects TSG, the Program Coordination Group (PCG), and the GSM Association regarding “the issue of who will publish the 3GPP conformance test specification in the US,” we would like to point out that, as an Individual Member of the 3GPP through our membership in T1P1 and as an affiliate of the GSM Association (a Market Representation Partner of the 3GPP), GSMNA has already given its full support to the 3GPP agreement with Committee T1 to ballot a single, world-wide 3rd generation standard. Should GSMNA decide to customize conformance testing guidelines for North America, we fully expect to reference the ANSI standard developed by the 3GPP and balloted by T1P1 as the basis of that work.

Sincerely yours,

[signed copy on file]

Linda Melvin
Director, GSM North America

Attachment: Ehrlich Memo, GSMNA Doc 114/99

cc: Jim MURRELL, Chair, GSM North America

Michael STOCKS, Chair, GSM Association
Jim HEALY, Deputy Chair, GSM Association
Robert CONWAY, Director General, GSM Association
Karl WARFEL, Chair, PCS Type Certification Review Board
Karl-Heinz ROSENBROCK, Chair, 3GPP Project Coordination Group
Asok CHATTERJEE, Vice Chair, 3GPP Project Coordination Group and Chair of T1P1
Akio SASAKI, Vice Chair, 3GPP Project Coordination Group
Sang-Keun PARK, Chair, 3GPP TSG Terminals
Kevin HOLLEY, Vice Chair, 3GPP TSG Terminals
Niels ANDERSON, Chair, 3GPP TSG Services & Systems Aspects
Gary JONES, Vice Chair, 3GPP TSG Services & Systems Aspects
Armin TOEPFER, Vice Chair, 3GPP TSG Services & Systems Aspects