

Title: **[Draft]** Reply LS on 2G/3G subscriber distinction and roaming restriction
Response to: LS SP-040172 from GSMA IREG (Doc 46_089)

Source: 3GPP SA
To: GSMA IREG
Cc: 3GPP SA1

Contact Person:

Name: Michele Zarri
Tel. Number: +44 79 3200 2114
E-mail Address: Michele.Zarri@T-Mobile.co.uk

1. Overall Description:

TSG SA would like to thank GSMA IREG for their Liaison statement on 2G/3G subscriber distinction and roaming restrictions.

IREG asked the following three questions

1. To ensure that the new "Administrative restriction feature" will be mandatory for vendors
2. The specifications should be made in the way that Operators who do not want to make 2G/3G distinction do not have to change their actual implementation, i.e the implementation of the distinction feature should be backwards compatible to the current situation with no distinction
3. To confirm that that the possibility " for a VPLMN to specify different roaming authorizations for his 2G and 3G coverage, even in case of combined 2G/3G network elements " requirement will also be taken into account in 3GPP specifications.

SA would like to provide their answers starting from question 3.

It is SA's belief that the tools provided currently in the 3GPP system allow meeting the requirement of IREG. In particular, *in the case where network operators don't place 2G and 3G cells under the same location area identity*, the mobile operator may enforce different roaming authorisations by issuing Location Update Rejection Cause #15. It is possible for the network operator to indicate to a UE which radio access technology is allowed and which one is not allowed without causing the UE to switch to a different PLMN.

Please note that at present 3GPP has assumed that by 2G[3G] subscriber IREG intends to indicate a user who can only access the GSM[WCDMA] location areas, and that this restriction only applies at time of location registration/update. SA would like IREG to confirm that this assumption is correct.

Before replying to questions 1 and 2 SA feels that the above point should be clarified.

It should be noted that in case IREG requires that the restriction needs to apply also to handover or that the understanding of 3GPP on the meaning of 2G[3G] subscriber is incorrect, fundamental modifications to the 3GPP system may be required such as introduction of new location rejection causes (with consequent legacy problems) as well as re-thinking of the PLMN selection principles. This would require a considerable amount of time to be realised and GSMA should provide a strong justification before 3GPP undertakes this activity.

2. Actions:

TSG SA would respectfully require IREG to provide clarifications on the meaning of 2G[3G] subscriber as well as specify in more detail the actual mobility requirements ~~To T1A1:~~

So that 3GPP can perform an analysis of the impact on the technical specification.

3. Date of Next TSG-SA Meetings:

[TSG-SA Meeting #24](#) 07 – 10 June [2004](#) Seoul, Korea;

[TSG-SA Meeting #25](#) 13 – 16 September [2004](#) Palm Springs, USA <<to be provided>>