# TSG-RAN meeting #18 RP-020683
# New Orleans, US 3-6 December 2002

## TSG-RAN Working Group 2 meeting No. 33 R2-023281
## Sophia Antipolis, France, 12th – 15th November 2002

**Title:** Response to LS (R1-02-1457, R2-023025) on HS-DPCCH performance
**Release:** R'5
**Source:** RAN WG2
**To:** RAN, RAN WG1
**cc:** RAN WG3

**Contact Person:**
**Name:** Christoph Herrmann
**Tel. Number:** +49 241 6003 507
**E-mail Address:** christoph.herrmann@philips.com

**Attachments:** None

---

**1. Overall Description:**

RAN WG2 thanks RAN WG1 for their LS on the HS-DPCCH performance.

As to the ACTIONS (repeated in italics) RAN WG2 would like to state the following:

- *RAN1 kindly requests RAN2 to check whether the additional PRE and POST signals have any impact on the HARQ functionality or if they can be processed entirely within the physical layer and therefore would not be required to be visible to higher layers.*

RAN WG2 expect that the physical layer PRE and POST signals can be handled entirely within the physical layer and do not need to be visible to higher layers, though some companies were afraid of not having understood the scheme in all its details. Some Node B implementations may wish to make use of additional information from layer 1, for example in determining which redundancy version to use for retransmissions; this is not prohibited by the current specifications and is implementation-specific.

- *RAN1 also requests RAN2 to check whether additional performance requirements are needed for PRE and POST reception.*

Since PRE and POST signals are entirely in the physical layer, there is no need to change the current performance requirements. RAN2 would like to remind RAN1 that in bad radio conditions performance requirements are hard to meet, and RAN2 is aware of this limitation.

- *RAN1 also kindly requests RAN2 to prepare the relevant CR for addition of the proposed scheme in R5 25.331 and 25.321 if judged necessary.*

RAN2 came to the conclusion that if RAN1 decide that the proposed scheme of using physical layer PRE and POST signals proves beneficial to be introduced, it should always be “on”, and therefore would not need any RRC signalling (as well as NBAP and RNSAP signalling).

Therefore, RAN2 did not endorse any “technically correct” CR for 25.331 although available, while a CR to 25.321 was not deemed required.

**2. Actions:**

None

**3. Date of Next RAN2 Meetings:**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| RAN WG2 #34 | 2003 | February | 17-21 | Sophia Antipolis, France |
| RAN WG2 #35 | 2003 | April | 7-11 | Asia |