

Source: Ericsson

Title: On “Procedure for Definition of User Equipment Capabilities in 3GPP”

Document for: Discussion/Decision

Agenda Item:

Discussion

Document SP-99030/TP-99022/RP-99059/NP-99021 (below denoted SP-99030) introduces a “Procedure for Definition of User Equipment Capabilities in 3GPP”. It is Ericsson’s opinion that the proposed procedure incorporates a number of important elements that we believe are fit to support the striving for a truly global standard allowing for free circulation of terminals. There are however some details in the proposal that need some modification. This document (SP-99065/TP-99038/RP-99136/NP-99049) introduces the areas of concern and proposes some modifications which we hope would make the document acceptable to all parties involved.

The introduction of “UE Service Capabilities” and “UE Baseline Capabilities” is a nice concept that will help in defining needed UE characteristics and especially the proposed work on “UE Baseline Capabilities” is quite in line with what we envisage. Following below there are however a few things we would like to note.

The “UE Baseline Capabilities” required, including any minimum sets, may be identified by each WG affected, but these should then be established and agreed by each TSG. To avoid any inconsistencies between baseline capability requirements established by each TSG, TSG-T should be tasked to co-ordinate the inter-TSG activities on this issue.

When it comes to “UE Service Capabilities”, we would like to make the following observations:

Document SP-99030 interchangeably talks about services and service capabilities. It is our opinion that 3GPP, as previously agreed in ETSI/SMG’s UMTS work, should specify only service capabilities and not the services themselves. We would like to see this view established in all TSGs and consequently reflected in document SP-99030.

We further believe that any definition of minimum sets of “UE Service Capabilities” is primarily for the market to decide upon but we envisage that a sound discussion in 3GPP on this topic could prove to be very useful for all parties.

Concerning the proposed schedule, we agree that the work on “UE Service Capabilities” shall be lead by TSG-SA WG1 and we would like to see this reflected in the schedule. As a consequence, the primary responsible for any reviews should be TSG-SA WG1.

Further on the proposed schedule, we find the time table for terminals conformance tests somewhat unrealistic and would like to invite TSG-T WG1 to comment on it.

With an agreed split between “UE Service Capabilities” and “UE Baseline Capabilities” and a corresponding set of specifications, it is our belief that at least TSG-CN and TSG-

RAN could focus their work to the former category, while certainly TSG-SA and probably also TSG-T would need to devote substantial work to both categories. A more precise definition of the two capability categories and their corresponding specifications may be needed to accomplish this preferred split of responsibilities between TSGs.

Proposal

Based on the discussion above, we propose:

- That each TSG should be tasked to establish a “UE Baseline Capabilities” specification and TSG-T should be given the task to co-ordinate these specifications for consistency.
- That initially TSG-SA and TSG-T are tasked to elaborate “UE Service Capabilities” specifications.
- That it should be agreed by each TSG that only Service Capabilities and not Services should be specified within 3GPP.
- That it should be agreed by each TSG that any specification of minimum sets of UE Service Capabilities is for further study and discussion in 3GPP.
- That it should be agreed that TSG-SA has the primary responsibility for “UE Service Capabilities”.
- That each TSG and its affected WGs should review the proposed time schedule prior to any decision on the schedule.
- That document SP-99030/TP-99022/RP-99059/NP-99021, including the proposed LS, should be rejected or modified to reflect the remarks in this document.