

**3GPP TSG CN WG4 Meeting #08**  
**Rio Grande, PUERTO RICO, 14<sup>th</sup> - 18<sup>th</sup> May 2001**

**Tdoc N4-010696**

**Title:** Liaison Statement reply to RAN3 on on Highlighting Requirements to RAN3 for SRNS relocation with TrFO

**Source:** TSG\_CN WG4

**To:** TSG\_RAN WG3, TSG SA

**cc:** TSG CN, TSG RAN

**Contact Person:**

**Name:** Phil Hodges

**E-mail Address:** [Philip.hodges@ericsson.com.au](mailto:Philip.hodges@ericsson.com.au)

**Tel. Number:** +61 3 99113414

---

**1. Overall Description:**

Reply to incoming LS **TSGR3#19(01) 010988** (N4-010508).

CN4 has completed its studies and frozen its scope for the specifications on OoBTC for Release 4. The solution for inter-MSC serving area relocation (specified in 3G TS 23.153, chapter 6.2) is based on the LS from SA2 (Tdoc S2-002000, Makuhari, Japan, 13<sup>th</sup> – 17<sup>th</sup> November, 2000) that agreed that SRNS relocation for Inter-MSC serving area relocation would be supported by the Release 4 System Architecture.

It is understood that this decision was conveyed to RAN3. It is also understood that the implementation of this change by RNC manufacturers is optional, the text states:

*“For UMTS to UMTS Inter-MSC Hand-Over / SRNS relocation the MAP E interface transporting RANAP messages shall be used. Alternatively, in the case of intra-PLMN handover, the SRNS relocation (sic) between two MSC-areas may be executed as intra-MSC SRNS relocation. In such a case this will be performed by utilising a direct SCCP connection between the target RNC located in the target MSC-area and the MSC server already involved in the call”.*

The impact to the TrFO solutions is that where intra-MSC SRNS relocation is not possible, TrFO will cease and encoding to PCM shall occur.

The alternative solution to use MAP protocol to perform codec negotiation as part of normal inter-MSC relocation was considered in great detail within CN1 and CN4, a number companies were included in these discussions across both WGs, and the conclusions made were that the major impacts to MAP (requires new I.E.s to existing messages and also new messages) would result in a delay to the handover which would have an undesirable impact on the performance.

Further it is understood by CN4 that the advantages of this solution is not confined to TrFO alone; simplification of relocation procedures from a core network point of view is an advantage to all call types.

**2. Actions:**

**To RAN WG3 group.**

**ACTION:** TSG CN WG4 asks TSG RAN WG3 to complete the standardisation tasks agreed by SA2 for Release 4.

**To TSG SA**

**ACTION:** TSG CN WG4 asks TSG SA to provide direct guidance to the 3GPP WGs involved how to proceed in this matter. From a CN4 perspective, a solution is required to fulfill the requirements for TRFO. CN4 has a strong preference that the TSG RAN WG3 will complete the required standardization tasks.

### **3. Date of Next CN4 Meetings:**

CN4#9                      9th – 13th July 2001                      Dresden, Germany.

### **4. Attachments:**

S2-002000 (LS, SRNS relocation based on global title).

3G TS 23.153 v 4.1.0 (Out of Band Transcoder Control - Stage 2;  
(Release 4)).