

**TSG RAN WG 1#9
Dresden, Germany
November 30-December 3, 1999**

TSGR1#9(99)k32

**Agenda item: AH14
Source: Golden Bridge Technology
Title: Summary of AH14 reflector discussions
Document for: Discussion and approval**

Reflector Discussions Summary

Kouros Parsa

GBT, Co-chair AH14

November 30, 1999

Summary

- Over 150 e-mails (October 20-November 28, 1999)
- Topics included
 - Editorial and some technical inconsistencies in the specifications (Panasonic, LGIC, GBT, Ericsson)
 - Status Broadcast thread (Philips, GBT, Nokia, Samsung)
 - CA versus CM (GBT, Samsung)
 - CAM versus CM (GBT, Samsung, Philips)
 - Agreements in WG1#8 AH14 meeting (GBT, Samsung, Philips)
 - DCH initialization (Ericsson, Philips, Motorola)

Editorial and some technical inconsistencies in the specifications

- Several small CRs for editorial changes and inconsistencies
- Two CRs from LGIC (slot format and CD)
- Four CRs from GBT (editorial changes , name change, short code, SF)
- A CR from Panasonic on Variable Data Rate Packet Transmission

Status Broadcast Each CPCH Channel

- Nokia Support for Philips Proposal
- GBT developed a new proposal on Status Broadcast
- Samsung's proposal is for Status Broadcast of each Data Rate and not Each CPCH channel
- Last phase discussions revolved around Philips and GBT proposals.
- No conclusions reached from the reflector discussions

CA versus CM

- GBT and Samsung participated in this discussion thread
- Samsung presented simulations on CA and CM performance [with monitoring delays].
- GBT reviewed the simulation paper and submitted R199j19
- Samsung maintained that CA performs better than CM
- GBT had fundamental problems with the simulation assumptions and results.
- Samsung stated that it only proposes CA with Monitoring (CAM) in the last phase of discussions.

CAM versus CM

- Samsung, Philips, GBT participated in these discussions
- Samsung presented simulations with CAM and CM maintaining that CAM performs better than CM.
- GBT re-iterated its position on invalidity of the simulation results (impact of multiple data rates, impact of Poisson Arrival, Number of Signatures versus interference, impact of PV, impact of back-off)
- Philips argued the flexibility point of CAM scheme.
- No conclusions reached on the reflector. Several contributions from various parties on this point.

Agreements in WG1#8 AH14 meeting

- disagreement between GBT and Samsung.
- GBT argued that Monitoring should be devised for each CPCH and it should not exclude each data rate. Samsung argued that there was no such agreement in WG1#8.
- Philips agreed with GBT on the agreements in WG1#8.
- Nokia had also initially made a comment on this point prioritizing the issues for WG1#9 AH4 meeting as follows:
 - CRs on small issues such as scrambling code
 - Reaching agreement on Status Broadcast
 - Discussions on CA time permitting

DCH initialization

- Motorola to comment

Conclusions

- Fruitful discussions on Status Broadcast
- Need third party comment on WG1#8 agreement on Status Broadcast to move forward.