

**3GPP TSG-CN Meeting #23  
Phoenix, USA, 10 – 12 March 2004**

**Tdoc NP-040150**

**Title:** LS on PLMN selection and background scan

**Release:**

**Work Item:**

**Source:** TSG-CN

**To:** TSG-SA

**Cc:** SA1, GERAN1, RAN2, CN1

**Contact Person:**

**Name:** Hannu Hietalahti

**Tel. Number:** +358 40 5021724

**E-mail Address:** [hannu.hietalahti@nokia.com](mailto:hannu.hietalahti@nokia.com)

**Attachments:** NP-040129, discussion document that gives background information to the questions in this LS.

---

**1. Overall Description:**

TSG-CN, and before that CN1, have discussed the PLMN selection requirements and the background scan in particular. So far no CRs have been approved, but a working assumption was made that the UE must take the Radio Access Technology (RAT) into account in background scan.

Based on this some issues and interactions with other features have been studied, see the attached document NP-040129.

TSGN has requested CN1 to continue work on the CRs based on this working assumption with the aim of approving the CRs in TSGN #24 in June 2004.

For this technical work, the answers to the questions in this LS are needed.

**2. Actions:**

**To TSG SA group.**

**ACTION:** TSGN asks TSG SA to provide answers to the following questions:

1. Can the working assumption to use RAT in background scan be confirmed?
2. Does a single mode UE ignore those entries on PLMN selector lists where the PLMN is associated with a non-supported RAT? (see 3.1 in the attached document NP-040129).
3. Is it acceptable that the presence of a high priority PLMN + RAT combination can give a high priority for the other access technology of the same PLMN, even though this cell may be part of a forbidden LA? (see table 1 and 2 in NP-040129). It should be noted that this case falls in two alternatives, a cell in a forbidden LA which the UE knows to be forbidden, since it is on the forbidden LA list and a cell which the UE does not know whether it would be forbidden or not, since it is part of the other RAT of the same PLMN and the UE is not allowed to access it.
4. Does the introduction of the mechanism to prevent 'hopping' between different RATs of the same PLMN lead to undesirable behaviour which means that it would be better to allow for the 'hopping' situation?
5. For those items not included in the specification (e.g. comments in 3.12 in NP-040129) how will they be clearly documented to ensure that everyone is aware of the decisions taken by 3GPP?

**3. Date of Next TSG-CN and CN1 Meetings:**

CN1_34	10 <sup>th</sup> – 14 <sup>th</sup> May 2004	Zagreb, Croatia (EF3)
TSGN_24	2 <sup>nd</sup> – 4 <sup>th</sup> June 2004	Seoul, Korea