3GPP TSG-T (Terminals) Meeting #11
Palm Springs, USA, 14 - 16 March, 2001

Tdoc TP-010006

3GPP TSG-CN-WG1, Meeting #15
15-19 January 2001, Beijing, China

Tdoc N1-010208
Tdoc N1-010152

Title: Response to LS "Enhancement of CPHS Network Operator Name Feature for 3G R4**"**

Reference LS Enhancement of CPHS Network Operator Name Feature for 3G R4(T3-000630)

Source: TSG CN1

TO [1]**:** TSG T3, TSG S1

Cc: TSG-T, T2

WI:

Contact Person: **Name:** Roland Gruber, Siemens AG
E-mail Address: roland.gruber@mch.siemens.de
Tel. Number: +49 89 722 46392

Attachments:
(Please list documents numbers to be attached)

Date: **18.01.2001**

TSG CN1 has discussed the LS on Enhancement of CPHS Network Operator Name Feature for 3G would like to give the following answers(the text in *italics* is the original text from T3)

- *Control the network name displayed on the ME/UE based upon a mapping of the broadcast PLMN identity and the contents of a USIM file. The file contains an associated name for a given PLMN identity.*

This is seen as technical feasible and is not in conflict with TSG CN1 specific definitions.

- *Wild cards should also be allowed to enable blanket associations of PLMN identities.*

This is seen as technical feasible and is not in conflict with TSG CN1 specific definitions.

- *If the registered PLMN is not accounted for in the USIM then the ME/UE should revert back to the ME's/UE's own MoU list.*

This is inline with TSG CN1 interpretation and is not in conflict with TSG CN1 specific definitions.

- *It should be possible to include the LAC for a given PLMN.*

This is seen as technical feasible, but TSG CN WG1 would like to stress that this should only be used for the user indication but shall not impact the MM/GMM behaviour.

- *The information stored in the file for a given PLMN identity should also have the provision to control any roaming status indicators (i.e. icons or text).*

[1] Please write any action required from the groups in a clear way.

Currently the MS only indicates Operator name corresponding to the MCC and MNC code of the registered PLMN. The proposed "roaming status indicators" are additions of new features. Because the legacy MSs do not need to support these new features is not completely backwards compatible as such.

- *In addition, there should be provision to control the activation of the HPLMN search for a given PLMN. This would mean that the given PLMN would be treated as if it was the HPLMN in the network selection procedures. See 3GPP 23.022.*

According to the current definition in TS 3G 23.122, the HPLMN is identified by a unique MCC+MNC (which is derived from the IMSI). Thus multiple PLMNs can not be treated as HPLMN in MM/GMM. The introduction of a multiple HPLMN concept means essentially changes to 23.122. This topic must be studied carefully, during the discussion the following questions were raised:

- In case of multiple HPLMNs, which one takes the highest priority or is this an implementation issue?
- Should the MS stay in the "other HPLMN" even if the real HPLMN matching the IMSI MCC+MNC is available? There is no HPLMN search in HPLMN.

TSG CN1 see this multiple HPLMNs concept as an introduction of an new feature for which a service requirement defined by TSG S1 is needed.