Webinar Q&A

Are the network transition times mentioned in the webinar for real-world deployments?

No, the network transition times mentioned in the webinar are for the lab trials and can vary in real-world deployments based on number of hops or routers the data has to traverse before reaching the destination.

Why are multiple service operators (MSOs) interested in investigating alternate solutions?

The 3GPP defined roaming models require interface sharing between the two networks and mobility parameter configurations on both home and visitor network.

Mobile network operators (MNOs) may be unwilling to share certain interfaces such as S10, and MSOs might not be able to control the mobility parameter configuration on MNOs visiting network, making it difficult to move the device back to MSOs Citizens Broadband Radio Service (CBRS) network from MNOs LTE network.

Wouldn't the alternate solution which do not provide seamless data session transfer from one network to other also introduce disruption in service?

Yes, but the goal is to minimize the service disruption so that it does not affect the user experience. Disruption for data service may not be noticeable to the user if the switching mechanism or device transition is fast. Voice will be affected but majority of MSOs planning to enter the cellular space are not looking to provide voice services keeping them on MNOs network at all times.

The dual subscriber identity module (SIM) device allows the networks to simultaneously connect to two networks and be active on one at a given time. How would the device be able to connect to a third network such as a private CBRS network or an enterprise CBRS network?

With embedded SIM (eSIM) functionality it is possible for the device to hold multiple eSIM profiles and dynamically select one eSIM profile over the other based on the priority set by the operator. This way the device will be able to connect to a private or enterprise CBRS network. Also, solutions with non-SIM based authentication are being investigated to help resolve this issue.

Instead of any alternate solution, why can’t the operators use Local Break Out (LBO) for performing inter-operator mobility?

Local Break Out (LBO) can be utilized by the operators instead of alternate solution if the operators plan to provide data services only without the need to have seamless mobility. Also, in LBO implementation, with no control over connected or idle mode mobility configuration on MNO network, MSOs will find it hard to move the device connected to MNO network back to the MSO network.

Was the lab testing performed for both data and voice session to validate network transition of Home Routed (HR) Local Break Out (LBO) performed?

The lab testing to validate network transition of Home Routed (HR) Local Break Out (LBO) was performed only for data sessions. The testing was also performed with session initiation protocol (SIP) applications for voice and video, but testing was not performed for Voice over LTE (VoLTE) calls.

Why is there a need to enhance dual-SIM solution and not use existing dual SIM phones to resolve the inter-operator mobility issue?

The current dual SIM phones with dual SIM dual standby implementation can connect to two networks simultaneously and be active on one of them. If you set Operator A's SIM to be default for data, the network transition does not happen in a timely manner for an active data session on operator A's network to resume on the operator B's network when you move outside the coverage area of operator A's network and requires user intervention to manually switch Operator B's SIM to be default for data.