

Source: Motorola
Title: Comments on TS 23.140, MMS Stage 2 Specification
Agenda item: MMS
Document for: Discussion

Motorola wishes to bring to the attention of TSG T its concerns regarding the approval and implementation of the proposed 23.140, MMS stage 2 specification. Motorola does not want to go against the wishes of the majority of 3GPP to have MMS in release 99 but wants to ensure that the following implications of publishing the current version of the specification will be understood.

1) Release 99 is not suitable for commercial deployment

Due to lack of time, the current specification is very immature, imprecise, architecturally inconsistent and not in harmony with many MMS stage 1 requirements. Consequently, this first release must only be seen as a means of stimulating future work and provide the opportunity to market and promote 3G services, i.e. to carry out trials and simulations etc. and **not** to deploy large scale commercial systems with inter-network roaming.

2) Release 99 will not support interoperability

The concern is that the specification does not provide enough detail to actually implement MMS in a consistent and reproducible way. Therefore, separate parties are likely to implement MMS in such a way as to not be interoperable.

For example, there is no flow information that relates to whether a message is supposed to transit from a client to its own MMS Server (via the MMS Relay) before being routed to the recipient's MMS Server (again through the MMS Relay) for delivery to the recipient. The alternative would be for the MMS Relay to immediately route the message, without involving the origin MMS Server. The specification does not clearly delineate the roles and responsibilities of the MMS Relay or MMS Server, it does not describe the operational flows at all.

Therefore, two separate vendors could develop completely correct products in accordance with the current specification, that would not be able to inter-operate with any other vendor. This not only locks a single operator to a vendor, it may mean that operators may only be able to support roaming operations across common equipment suites. So in general, this is viewed as unacceptable for any large scale deployment as early implementations could drive solutions, not only within a single carrier network, but could also impact equipment of cooperative carriers.

3) Release 99 does not provide an adequate baseline for future releases

As this release does fully specify a MMS architecture, there are additional concerns regarding the backward compatibility of future releases. If a vendor develops a solution based on this release, the specific implementation decisions that were made to realise the service, needed to fill in all of the grey areas, may be used as a weapon to control the development of release 2000. This concern grows as operators adopt various offered solutions and we see strong lobbying to ratify their networks as being release 2000 compliant. This could create a situation where a dominant vendor service model would be imposed, leading to release 2000 being based upon a de-facto standard, leaving all other vendors and operators having to adjust to conform. Therefore, it must become an established principle that the development of the stage 2 & 3 MMS specifications in release 2000 must not be handicapped by having to maintain backwards compatibility to any perceived interpretation of release 99 or any implementation loosely based upon it.