




INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION PUBLISHED UNDER THE PATENT COOPERATION TREATY (PCT)

<p>(51) International Patent Classification ⁶ : H04Q 3/00</p>	<p>A2</p>	<p>(11) International Publication Number: WO 98/36582</p> <p>(43) International Publication Date: 20 August 1998 (20.08.98)</p>
<p>(21) International Application Number: PCT/EP98/00877</p> <p>(22) International Filing Date: 16 February 1998 (16.02.98)</p> <p>(30) Priority Data: 97102527.5 17 February 1997 (17.02.97) EP (34) Countries for which the regional or international application was filed: DE et al.</p> <p>(71) Applicant (for all designated States except US): SIEMENS AKTIENGESELLSCHAFT [DE/DE]; Wittelsbacherplatz 2, D-80333 München (DE).</p> <p>(72) Inventor; and (75) Inventor/Applicant (for US only): GRADISCHNIG, Klaus [AT/DE]; Max-Klinger-Strasse 28, D-82131 Gauting (DE).</p>		<p>(81) Designated States: CN, US, European patent (AT, BE, CH, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, GB, GR, IE, IT, LU, MC, NL, PT, SE).</p> <p>Published <i>Without international search report and to be republished upon receipt of that report.</i></p>

(54) Title: NODE SUPPORTING LINKS HAVING THE ABILITY TO TRANSFER LONGER MESSAGES THAN ACCORDING TO CURRENT MTP LEVEL 2

physical network configuration



PC1 point code 1 (narrowband point code)
PC2 point code 2 (broadband point code)
— link/linkset based on SSCOP (Q.2110)
— link/linkset based on MTP level 2 (Q.703)

(57) Abstract

The users of the SCCP can generate messages in excess of 255 octets. Such messages are segmented before being delivered to linksets supporting only messages according to Q.703. If such traffic would go via enhanced linksets supporting longer messages than according to Q.703, avoiding the segmentation would benefit performance significantly. The invention avoids the segmentation by assigning a second point code to the enhanced linksets.

FOR THE PURPOSES OF INFORMATION ONLY

Codes used to identify States party to the PCT on the front pages of pamphlets publishing international applications under the PCT.

AL	Albania	ES	Spain	LS	Lesotho	SI	Slovenia
AM	Armenia	FI	Finland	LT	Lithuania	SK	Slovakia
AT	Austria	FR	France	LU	Luxembourg	SN	Senegal
AU	Australia	GA	Gabon	LV	Latvia	SZ	Swaziland
AZ	Azerbaijan	GB	United Kingdom	MC	Monaco	TD	Chad
BA	Bosnia and Herzegovina	GE	Georgia	MD	Republic of Moldova	TG	Togo
BB	Barbados	GH	Ghana	MG	Madagascar	TJ	Tajikistan
BE	Belgium	GN	Guinea	MK	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	TM	Turkmenistan
BF	Burkina Faso	GR	Greece	ML	Mali	TR	Turkey
BG	Bulgaria	HU	Hungary	MN	Mongolia	TT	Trinidad and Tobago
BJ	Benin	IE	Ireland	MR	Mauritania	UA	Ukraine
BR	Brazil	IL	Israel	MW	Malawi	UG	Uganda
BY	Belarus	IS	Iceland	MX	Mexico	US	United States of America
CA	Canada	IT	Italy	NE	Niger	UZ	Uzbekistan
CF	Central African Republic	JP	Japan	NL	Netherlands	VN	Viet Nam
CG	Congo	KE	Kenya	NO	Norway	YU	Yugoslavia
CH	Switzerland	KG	Kyrgyzstan	NZ	New Zealand	ZW	Zimbabwe
CI	Côte d'Ivoire	KP	Democratic People's Republic of Korea	PL	Poland		
CM	Cameroon	KR	Republic of Korea	PT	Portugal		
CN	China	KZ	Kazakstan	RO	Romania		
CU	Cuba	LC	Saint Lucia	RU	Russian Federation		
CZ	Czech Republic	LI	Liechtenstein	SD	Sudan		
DE	Germany	LK	Sri Lanka	SE	Sweden		
DK	Denmark	LR	Liberia	SG	Singapore		
EE	Estonia						

Description

Node supporting links having the ability to transfer longer
5 messages than according to current MTP level 2

Background

Figure 1 shows the various protocol stacks for SS7
(Signalling system nr. 7) up to the MTP (message transfer
part) level. Five stacks are currently defined. The first one
10 is the well known stack for operation on 56/64kbit/s links.

Due to an increased bandwidth delay product the MTP (message
transfer part) level 2 (Q.703) is not ideally suited for
speeds significantly above 64kbit/s. The elements which are
problematic are window size, retransmission strategy, and the
15 error rate monitor.

Three different protocol stacks have been defined for use on
T1/E1 links (1.5/2 MBit/s) addressing some or all three of
these aspects.

The latest edition of Q.703 contains as a national option a
20 modification to the level 2 protocol which introduces 12 bit
sequence numbers and a different error rate monitor (second
column). Otherwise the procedures are not changed.

Recommendation Q.2119 defines frame-relay framing for SSCOP
(Service specific connection oriented protocol, Q.2110) to be
25 used on a raw E1/T1 link (third stack). Starting at SSCOP the
complete broadband protocol stack can thus be used on high
speed signalling links.

Finally Bellcore defines the complete ATM signalling protocol
stack starting at the ATM layer for use on T1 signalling
30 links, with certain restrictions in the ATM layer, like not
allowing multiple VCs (virtual channels) on a T1 link (column
4).

Lastly, the full ATM signalling protocol stack (column 5) could also be used in narrowband networks.

Besides the potentially vastly different link speeds which, however, pose no new interworking problems, the main difference between MTP level 2 based and SSCOP based signalling lies in the different maximum MSU length supported.

Of course there is no need to actually make use of the longer MSU length supported by the ATM links in an enhanced narrowband signalling network. Indeed the existing narrowband SS7 user parts would not even make use of the longer MSU length. We note, however, that the users of the SCCP can indeed generate messages in excess of 255 octets (the maximum data size supportable in single messages of the pre-96/97 SCCP). Such messages will be segmented before being delivered to the MTP. If such traffic would go via ATM links, avoiding the segmentation would benefit performance significantly.

Therefore we have the situation that use of the larger MSU sizes - where needed and possible - would be an additional welcome benefit of using the enhanced linksets.

SS7 Routing

25

Each node in an MTP network is identified by one signalling point code.

An MTP network is identified by the so-called *network indicator* in an MTP message.

30

Routing in the MTP is based on the so-called *destination (signalling) point code (DPC)* which identifies the destination of a *message signalling unit (MSU)* in an MTP network. In addition, the *signalling link selection field (SLS)* can be used to select between available routes of equal

priority (*combined linksets*) and to select a specific link within a linkset (a collection of links directly connecting two signalling points). No other information (like origination, MTP user, or MSU length) is generally evaluated
5 for routing in the MTP.

The SCCP augments the MTP routing by providing additional functions to route on a so-called *global title* (GT), which can e.g. be a subscriber number of an 800-number. An SCCP routing on GT performs a process called *global title translation* (GTT) which derives the DPC of the final
10 destination or the DPC of the next node (intermediate translator node) where the GT is further analyzed, eventually leading to the DPC of the final destination.

In addition to the GT the SCCP uses a so-called *subsystem number* (SSN) to identify the addressed SCCP user in the final
15 destination.

This process also allows an SCCP message to cross MTP network boundaries.

In addition, the outcome of a GTT can depend on the
20 availability status of the (next) destination. If the so-called *primary* destination, which would normally be the result of a GTT, or the addressed SSN is not available or reachable, an alternative destination can be the result of the GTT. This allows the SCCP to route messages to *backup*
25 destinations (or backup intermediate translator nodes). Loadsharing between destinations is, in principle, also a possibility. Between two SCCP nodes the messages are routed by the MTP using the DPC provided by the SCCP.

30 State of the art

The interworking problem arising if use of longer messages in networks containing also linksets supporting only short messages is to be made has not been addressed in any detail.

Bellcore simply specifies that long messages destined for an MTP level 2 based link are to be discarded and that otherwise routing should be administrated accordingly.

A similar solution is proposed for the MTP based narrowband-
5 broadband interworking in Q.2210.

For the SCCP the possibility is defined to convert long LU DT(S) messages into segmented short XU DT(S) messages.

All these solutions, however, require appropriate planning of the routes supporting the longer messages and/or will not
10 make optimal use of the capabilities available.

An MTP level 3 protocol based approach to solve such problem is described in Q.701. This solution, however, is incomplete.

Addressing based solution

15 This invention proposes to use the addressing mechanisms provided in MTP and SCCP to solve or rather prevent the interworking problem. This works as follows:

Each node, which supports linksets having the ability to transfer longer messages than according to Q.703 (for example
20 SSCOP-linksets), is assigned a second point code (in addition to its *narrowband* point code), which will be called *broadband* pointcode, identifying its enhanced functions, i.e. those which can generate long messages. An example of such a network is given in figure 2. Routing tables in the MTP are
25 engineered so that these *broadband* signalling points are only connected via linksets supporting the longer message length (see tables 1 to 3 for an example). Non-enhanced nodes would have no knowledge about the broadband point codes in the MTP network (see table 5 for an example). For the interconnection
30 of the narrowband point codes and the non-enhanced nodes (i.e. the nodes having only *narrowband* point codes) all linksets, however, would be available.

Thus the nodes supporting the enhanced links (nodes identified also by the broadband signalling point codes) together with the enhanced linksets would form an overlay network which can transport longer messages (see figure 3).

5 Even nodes having only the enhanced linksets would be identified by a narrowband and a broadband point code.

It is, however, still possible for the SCCP to reach a node (having a narrowband and a broadband point code) to which no enhanced route is currently available by appropriately engineering the SCCP GT translation data if this should be
10 desired by the operator of the network.

GT translation in the SCCP of a node having a narrowband and a broadband point code is engineered so that physical destinations (intermediate translators or final destinations)
15 having a narrowband and a broadband point code have the broadband point code as the primary translation result and the narrowband point code as the backup translation result (see table 4).

As long as two signalling points are connected an enhanced
20 route will be used. If all enhanced routes between two nodes having a narrowband and a broadband point code fail communication between the nodes will be via the linksets supporting only short messages, using the narrowband point codes as addresses.

25 In addition, this solution can also be used for any new MTP users or appropriately modified existing MTP users like ISUP. Similarly this solution is also suitable for interworking between narrowband and broadband signalling networks.

Note that an alternative solution would be to use a different
30 network indicator for the enhanced part of the signalling network which would have the advantage that there would be no restrictions in the available address space for point codes.

Table 1: MTP routing table in node a/A without link failure

destination	next node	
b	b	c
B	B	
c	c	b
d	b	c
D	B	

**Table 2: MTP routing table in node a/A with link A to B failed
short messages can still reach all nodes via c**

destination	next node	
b		c
B		
c	c	
d		c
D		

**Table 3: MTP routing table in node a/A with link C-D failed
long messages to D not possible anymore**

destination	next node	
b	b	c
B	B	
c	c	b
d	b	c
D		

Table 4: SCCP global tile translation in node a/A for GT resulting in addressing the SCCP (or one of its users) in node d/D

primary result (MTP address)	backup result (MTP address)
D (long message allowed)	d (segmentation required)

Table 5: MTP routing table in node c without link failure

destination	next node	
a	a	b
b	b	
d	d	b

Claims

1. Node supporting links having the ability to transfer
5 longer messages than according to current MTP level 2, so-called enhanced links, to be identified by two signalling point codes one being used to identify/address functions/MTP users which can make full use of the longer message length, but both point codes being part of the same MTP network.
- 10
2. Node according to Claim 1, characterized by
MTP routing tables supporting said enhanced links structured
so that routing between the point codes used to
identify/address functions/MTP users which can make full use
15 of the longer message length uses only enhanced links.
3. Node according to Claim 1 or 2, characterized by
SCCP translation functions supporting said enhanced links
engineered that primary translation is to logical
20 destinations reachable via said enhanced links and backup translation is to logical destinations reachable (also) via links based on MTP level 2 if translation results in a physical destination located in a node supporting said enhanced links.
- 25
4. Node supporting links having the ability to transfer
longer messages than according to current MTP level 2, so-called enhanced links, to be identified by two signalling
point codes one being used to identify/address functions/MTP
30 users which can make full use of the longer message length, with the two point codes being part of different MTP networks, i.e with a different network indicator, but all point codes being used to identify/address functions/MTP

users which can make full use of the longer message length located in the same MTP network.

5. according to Claim 4, characterized by

5 MTP routing tables supporting said enhanced links structured so that routing between the point codes used to identify/address functions/MTP users which can make full use of the longer message length uses only enhanced links.

10 6. according to Claim 4 or 5, characterized by

SCCP translation functions supporting said enhanced links engineered that primary translation is to logical destinations reachable via said enhanced links and backup translation is to logical destinations reachable (also) via
15 links based on MTP level 2 if translation results in a physical destination located in a node supporting said enhanced links.

20

25




Figure 2 - physical network configuration





Figure 3 - logical network for short messages




PC1 point code 1 (*narrowband point code*)

— link/linkset based on SSCOP (Q.2110)

— link/linkset based on MTP level 2 (Q.703)

Figure 4 - logical network supporting long messages



PC2 point code 2 (*broadband point code*)

— link/linkset based on SSCOP (Q.2110)