Technical Specification Group Services and System Aspects
Meeting #5, Kyongju, Korea, 11-13 October 1999

TSGS#5(99)370

Source: **ETSI SMG2**

Title: **Response to Liaison statement on PLMN selection for GPRS MS**

Document for: **Information**

Agenda Item: **4.2**

ETSI STC SMG2
Meeting no 32
Bordeaux, France
20 - 24 September 1999

TDoc SMG2 1425/99
Agenda Item: 7.2.6.2

Response to Liaison statement on PLMN selection for GPRS MS

From: ETSI SMG2
To: ETSI SMG3-WPA/3GPP TSGN-WG1

CC: ETSI SMG, 3GPP TSGS1, 3GPP TSGSA

ETSI SMG2 has received your LS on PLMN selection for GPRS MS (TDoc. TSGN1-99835, SMG2 1156/99), and would like to inform you of the SMG2 reasons to maintain its opposition to approval of CR A032 r2 to 03.22 titled ”PLMN Selection for GPRS Mobiles”.

SMG2 is of the opinion that the CR introduces a new functionality into Releases ´97 and ´98 which are functionaly froozen. Furthermore, SMG2 cannot find this functionality in GSM 02.11.

Therefore, in SMG2´s opinion, this new functionality could only be considered for inclusion in Release ´99, after inclusion of a requirement for this functionality in GSM 02.11 (or the equivalent 3GPP specifications).

SMG2 assumes that if this functionality is required for GPRS, future requests for a similar functionality for other services are likely.

Introduction of such a feature has negative consequences seen from the radio (interference) perspective. Especially in border areas, this can significantly extend a networks coverage into another country, and therefore significantly increase the interference in another country.

This is the main reason why SMG2 needs to be involved when proposing changes to the PLMN selection.

To take the default example: widespread use of this functionality will create significant interference to networks in a city like Copenhagen, if the national Danish operators do not implement GPRS, but a Swedish operator does in an area close to Copenhagen. It may even force the Danish operators to implement GPRS.

To illustrate the potential impact it should be noted that for the UMTS band, ERC TG1 (representing the European regulators) is considering a maximum interference an operator is allowed to generate at the border as one of the means to solve interference problems in border regions. This is likely to lead to non coverage zones around borders.

For completeness the following is copied from a previous LS from SMG2 to SMG3-WPA on this issue:

> Two modes for PLMN selection are mandatory, manual and automatic. In addition the MS manufacturer is allowed to implement other options so that the user can define his own lists of preferred PLMNs according to information of coverage for the required service available from the operator. It could also be possible to update these lists by the specified SIM toolkit.
>
> SMG2 believes that the use of such methods is a better way to achieve the wanted goal then to base the PLMN selection on BCCH information read on one cell.