be monitored. When switch **24** receives a call request from a subscriber, terminal **26** searches the intercept list and determines whether the subscriber making the call is one to be monitored. Since communications system **20** is within jurisdiction **12**, LEA A has control of the contents of the intercept list included within terminal **26**.

If subscriber **22** travels from communications system **20** into communications system **30**, subscriber **22** no longer accesses communications system **20**. Now when subscriber **22** wishes to place a call, he accesses communications system **30** by contacting switch **34**. If subscriber **22** is to be monitored in this region, it is the responsibility of switch **34** to recognize this, intercept the call, and route it to the LEA. If LEA A wishes to monitor subscriber **22** when subscriber **22** is using communications system **30**, LEA A has to get the subscriber's intercept information into the intercept list included within terminal **36**. This usually entails getting permission from LEA B to monitor a specific subscriber within jurisdiction **18**, and then getting the intercept list within terminal **36** modified. This way, when subscriber **22** places a call through switch **34**, terminal **36** can search its own intercept list and find the information that instructs the switch to monitor the call by routing the call to LEA A.

Instead of roaming from communications system **20** to communications system **30**, subscriber **22** could roam from communications system **20** to communications system **40**. Now in order for subscriber **22** to be monitored, LEA A has to get the subscriber's intercept information into the intercept list included within terminal **46**. Even though subscriber **22** is still within jurisdiction **12**, LEA A still has to get the subscriber's intercept information into terminal **46** because subscriber **22** has roamed from one communications system to another.

For exemplary purposes, FIG. **1** shows only three jurisdictions with a common boundary. In most real situations, any one LEA jurisdiction will have many other jurisdictions with common boundaries. If an LEA wants to monitor a roaming subscriber in all adjacent jurisdictions, then the LEA typically gets permission from all appropriate LEAs and then endeavors to have the subscriber's intercept information added to all necessary communications systems.

As previously described, communications system **20** and communications system **30** have a common boundary at boundary **16** between jurisdiction **12** and jurisdiction **18**. This is a simplistic example because juridical boundaries and communications system boundaries do not always coincide. Communications system **40** is an example of a communications system whose boundaries do not coincide with that of an LEA jurisdiction.

Communications system **40** is partially included within jurisdiction **12** and partially included within jurisdiction **18**. In the first embodiment currently being discussed, terminal **46** includes an intercept list. If subscriber **42** is included within the intercept list, then when subscriber **42** places a call, switch **44** retrieves intercept information from terminal **46**, and routes the call to LEA A for monitoring. If subscriber **42** stays within communications system **40**, but travels from jurisdiction **12** to jurisdiction **18**, then when subscriber **42** makes a call, switch **50** has the responsibility to route the call to LEA A. Switch **50** will consult terminal **46**, and receive instructions to route the call to LEA A. This works well when LEA A and LEA B have an all encompassing reciprocal agreement regarding the monitoring subscribers in each other's jurisdictions, but otherwise is a problem.

Monitoring Location Register

The monitoring location register (MLR) comprises a method and apparatus for centralizing the management and administration of intercept lists. MLR **10** in FIG. **1** includes a master intercept list. As previously stated with reference to a first embodiment, when any of the three communications systems shown receive a call request, they query an intercept list to ascertain whether or not the call is to be intercepted. MLR **10** simplifies the task of administering the multiple local intercept lists through the use of a master intercept list. Switches can query MLR **10** for every call request, or MLR **10** can maintain the copy of the list resident on the switch.

In the first embodiment where local intercept lists are maintained at the switches (or terminals) within the communications systems, MLR **10** simplifies the task of administration because law enforcement agencies only need to update the master intercept list in MLR **10**. MLR **10** then automatically updates the multiple local intercept lists included in the different communications systems.

In a second embodiment, local lists are not maintained in the switches. Instead, each switch queries MLR **10** for every call request. MLR **10** searches the master intercept list and returns intercept information for the specific call. This second embodiment is advantageous because the MLR eliminates the need for each system to maintain the data required, and perform the logic necessary to determine whether and what form of intercept should occur.

Of course, a mixture of the first embodiment and the second embodiment can exist. For example, communications system **20** can maintain local intercept lists while the other communications systems don't, and all three communications systems will still benefit from the services provided by MLR **10**. In addition, MLR **10** is not dependent on the protocol used between the subscribers to be intercepted and the systems with which they are communicating. That is to say, subscriber **22** could be using a Global System for Mobile Communications (GSM) system, an Interim Standard-41 (IS-41) system, an Integrated Services Digital Network (ISDN) line, a paging system, or any other; MLR **10** applies in all cases.

In a preferred embodiment, a representative query to MLR **10** includes information regarding the location of the subscriber. Since MLR **10** potentially services a large geographic area spanning many LEA jurisdictions, MLR **10** benefits from the knowledge of the of the user's location when ascertaining whether the call should be intercepted.

MLR **10** provides multiple advantages. Administration of systems using MLR **10** is simpler than administration of prior art systems because there is a single point of contact for worldwide surveillance. Agreements between jurisdictions are handled easier in that once agreements are made, they can be carried out within MLR **10** rather than agreeing jurisdictions having to enter redundant information in many different, disparate, communications systems.

Communications systems query MLR **10** when intercept related information is desired. In an exemplary communications system, intercept related information is desirable at multiple points in time, including but not limited to: when a call setup is attempted, when a call is established, when no successful call is established, or on change of location.

Queries to MLR **10** are preferably performed by sending information to the MLR. The information sent to the MLR preferably comprises one or more of: subscriber identity, type of call, called party, calling party, location, or time of call. The MLR uses this information to decide whether or not to intercept the call. Possible responses from MLR **10** to the querying system include:

1) Do nothing (no intercept);

2) Intercept and provide a record of the relevant call data (location, called and calling party, time of call); and