3GPP TSG-T (Terminals) Meeting #16
Marco Island, FL, USA, 5 - 7 June, 2002

Tdoc TP-020099

3GPP TSG-SA WG2 meeting #24
Madrid, Spain, 22 – 26 April 2002

Tdoc S2-021521

Title: Response to the LS on "IPv6 update of stage 3 specifications"
Source: SA2
To: CN3
Cc: CN, CN1, CN2, SA3, SA5, T, T1, T2

Contact Person:
Name: Juan-Antonio Ibanez
E-mail Address: Juan-Antonio.X.Ibanez@erv.ericsson.se

Attachments: None

---

1. Description:

SA2 would like to thank CN3 for their LS response (N3-020361) concerning IPv6 updates of stage 3 specifications.

SA2 would like first to reaffirm that they will stay with their current decision to apply the IPv6 changes related to the stateless address autoconfiguration procedure starting from Rel 99 in order to eliminate any backward compatibility issue for IPv6 deployment within 3GPP.

Following are SA2 responses to the questions for clarifications:

Question 1:
Our first question to SA2 is what are the specific requirements to introduce IPv6 stateless address autoconfiguration changes in R99/Rel-4, as IMS is available only starting in Rel-5?

SA2: IPv6 support in 3GPP is not tied to IMS exclusively. IMS is the only mandated user of IPv6 within 3GPP. 3GPP introduced IPv6 support in R'99 already (see 23.060v390). Since 3GPP specs for IPv6 have errors starting from R'99, the corrections have been made from the base specification (i.e. R'99) to eliminate any interworking problems between different releases of 3GPP and also to introduce IPv6 accurately into the 3GPP environment.
If the stage 3 changes were only introduced in R5, there would be discrepancy between stage 2 and stage 3 specs.

Question 2:
It is also unclear to CN3 why SA2 has used the work item code "IMS-CCR" for the R99/Rel-4 CRs on 23.060?

SA2: SA2 would like to point out that R99 and R4 CRs bear the WI code TEI and TEI4 respectively. Only the mirror CR to R5 bears the WI code IMS-CCR. SA2 realize that TEI5 would have been more appropriate for the R5 CR and apologize for any confusion this might have caused.

Question 3:
Have supporting elements such as RADIUS interface enhancements been considered for use with stateless address autoconfiguration?

SA2: SA2 have not explicitly addressed enhancements to the RADIUS interface since these are considered a stage 3 issue. The general principle of using RADIUS for IP address allocation, as described in section 9.2.1 of 23.060, is applicable irrespective of the actual IP version and therefore does not require any changes specific to IPv6. It is expected that CN3 undertake the investigation and make appropriate changes to 29.061.

Question 4:
CN3 would like SA2 to confirm whether stage 3 update on IPv6 issues like Stateful address autoconfiguration, RADIUS interface and other IPv6 aspects was also intended in the SA2 LS and from what release?

SA2: The LS from SA2 was intended to inform other groups about the recent changes to the stateless address autoconfiguration procedure introduced in stage 2 for R99 onwards. Other aspects of IPv6 have not been changed, only clarified at most. In particular the option to use IPv6 stateful address autoconfiguration has been present in 23.060 since the freezing of R99. It is generally expected that relevant CN groups update the stage 3 specifications under their responsibility according to the applicable IETF protocols when a new option (PDP type IPv6 in this case) is introduced in stage 2. Consequently, to ensure alignment of stage 2 and stage 3 and to avoid backward compatibility problems, SA2 kindly ask CN3 to update the stage 3 specifications under their responsibility with necessary IPv6 details from R99 onwards.

2. Actions:

CN3 are kindly asked to update the relevant R99 and R4 specifications under their responsibility to ensure a proper description of IPv6 in the user plane and to align stage 3 with stage 2, as CN3 have done for R5.

3. Date of Next SA2 Meetings:

SA2 #25	24th – 28th June 2002	Naantali, Finland
SA2 #26	19th – 23rd August 2002	Toronto, Canada