

**Agenda Item:** -  
**Source:** Secretary  
**Title:** Draft minutes of WG1 #10 meeting  
**Document for:** Approval

---

### **Draft Minutes for 3GPP RAN-TSG 10<sup>th</sup> WG1 Meeting**

Meeting start: January 18th, 2000, in Beijing, China

Day 1, started at 9.00

#### **1. Opening of the meeting**

The chairman, Mr. Antti Toskala(Nokia), opened the meeting.  
Host (Nokia China) welcomed the meeting.

#### **2. Approval of agenda (rev. of R1-00-0024)**

Chairman made a brief introduction of the revised agenda on the screen.

One agenda item “*11. UE capability related issues (Evening session)*” had been added for Day2 evening session as a revised point.

Agenda was approved with no comments.

#### **3. Approval of the minutes from previous meeting - Minutes from TSG RAN WG1#9 R1-00-0088 “*Revised minutes for TSG RAN WG1 #9 Meeting*”**

Minutes were approved with no comments.

#### **4. Report from TSG RAN#6**

**R1-00-0111 “*Report from TSG RAN#6*”**

Chairman made a presentation of the report from TSG RAN #6 on the screen.

1) With one exception, all the CRs which were presented by WG1 were approved by TSG RAN.

105 CRs have been included into the specifications.

2) Open items for release '99 discussed in RAN after CRs were approved.

- **Compressed mode with puncturing ( the deadline extended until March, 2000 )**

WG1 shall discuss the issue and report the matter to TSG RAN#7 (If not solved then full story to be reported including performance & complexity issues, etc. If WG1 has agreement then just related CRs to TSG RAN)

- **CPCH ( the deadline extended until March, 2000 )**

It was decided that option for both UE and Node B would be in release '99. WGs are not expected to discuss the optionality issue. We will do our best to finalize the issues under the assumption that option for both UE and Node B would be included in release '99. A large number of specifications are to be affected across the TSG RAN WGs. Communications for our outcome are needed with other WGs, especially with WG2

- **DPCCH gating ( postponed to Release 2000 )**

It was decided after later discussion to be postponed to release 2000.

WG1 views are needed what should be the milestone in the workplan in WG1 (proposed 6/2000)

- **Small size turbo interleaver (deadline extended until March, 2000 )**

Other WGs need to know the parameters regarding what the interleaver sizes below 320bits are, what is the smallest size, what kind of steps, etc, for this interface. They need to know the sizes rather than the actual structure of the interleaver.

- **Out-of-sync handling both for FDD and TDD ( milestone extended until March, 2000 )**

For FDD, something exists, but we need full story. For TDD we are missing fully.

, some procedure needs to be defined in TDD side as well. And there might be some requirements for refinements on the FDD side. On this positioning, the UTRAN with release '99 specifications will support only cell based method. Therefore networks in release '99 will not have full support for positioning.

In relation to this presentation, there were some discussions made on how we could introduce new items to release 2000.

[Q.1] Is it possible for us to introduce new items to release 2000 ?

[A] Yes, it is possible. For bigger features that span across several WGs, we need to have something like "Work Item Descriptions" in order for RAN to discuss work plan.

[Q.2] Has the date on which the documentation for release 2000 will start been decided ? Is March, 2000 ?

[A] At this point of time, we do not have any concrete information for that. But at least until March, we will just make CRs for release '99.

/ \*\*\* This is up to TSG (not ETSI) \*\*\* /

[Q.3] Should any new material for release 2000 be introduced in March or April ?

[A] Bigger feature should be pointed out in March. Smaller requirements can be raised later.

/\*\* For detail discussion, see next page \*\*/

For the schedule,

[Q] Has there any work item description on DPCCH gating issue ? This is across WG1 and WG2. We have to discuss with WG2.

[A] It was decided in RAN#6 that DPCCH gating is a work item for release 2000 but we do not have any formal work item description on this issue. It will be generated. RAN has explicitly agreed *gating* and *lower chip rate* as release 2000 work items but for both items, work item descriptions have not been made.

/\*\*\* For Details \*\*\*/

Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) made a general question on how we can introduce new items to release 2000.

Last year we had already identified items that we will not keep in release '99, there are listed items to be considered for release 2000. Then I would like to have general confirmation on how we can introduce new items. Is that clear that there is a possibility to introduce some additional items with respect to these ones that are sort of leftovers from last year and if it is possible to introduce some new items, then what is the process? Will we go for similar processes as we are (in ETSI), creating some work items that might be across the several WGs. I have not followed what happened in the very last 3GPP organization group, but has there been any general process agreed ? or if there is not any, should not we bring at the RAN to plan also for work ?

< Chairman answered >

According to my understanding on how this should go, in order to present to the RAN#7 those items/topics (listed in the "RAN WG1 year 2000 Schedule " of the report) plus possible new ones which are supposed to come to WG1 agreement that we should work for release 2000, I think, I need to have the kind of the *work item descriptions* on those topics. If somebody can raise the issue on which WG1 can already agree that we will do some work for release 2000, then I think it is the best and the most convenient from the RAN and from the process point of view. If it can not be agreed in WG1 then the procedure is the proposed work items in RAN. If we cannot send the *work item descriptions* with source as WG1 to RAN then, to my understanding I assume the procedure is as likely as in ETSI because we have not gone through any of this kind of *work item descriptions* in 3GPP meetings. But I expect the procedures be similar like in ETSI. I will check that with Mr. Furuya.

Yes, one can propose the new items definitely for release 2000 and also on these items we have here. Of course, I would be happy if I would allocate some voluntary persons to provide these *work item descriptions* for these topics so that I do not have to write all of them myself. Because when we leave from Las Vegas I would like to have the *WG1 approved work item descriptions* for the topics I would be supposed to present. And so that I do not have to have much myself about what I am supposed to say about these work items. And I said that the individual companies or group of companies can propose items in the RAN meeting itself as well. And then we need keep it in mind that this kind of very small requirements that are really internal to WG1 and will have impact on very small entity of specifications, we do not need new *work items descriptions*. If you change, for instance, interleaver for release 2000 terminals, I do not think you need to do work item description or declare that somehow in RAN. They will just notice that you bring some CRs for some items but for these kind of bigger items they need to have *work item descriptions*. For the issues like Hybrid ARQ, I think it probably goes so that we have some work item description and then it will be combined with what is coming from WG2 because this *work item descriptions* will eventually be like *feature specific*, but not *WG specific*. This will be then combined. I am happier to combine if we have something that approved from WG1 point of view then combine with some other WGs.

< Ms. Evelyne Le Strat questioned >

The basis we are going to start work in 2000. I would like to set the basis for release 2000. Has there been any decision in 3GPP in terms of date at which we will release the documents on which we will make the CRs for release 2000 ? Maybe I am not clear. So in ETSI we had version 3 for GSM phase 1, version 4 for phase 2, version 5 for phase 2+ and then version 6, 7, 8 for release 96, 97, 98, 99. At certain date we create the version that is a draft. In correspondence to the version of the previous phase at certain date in time and then we make CRs on the all these versions in parallel. There must be a date at which we say the start of the version '00 of the spec is the version of release '99 in March, 2000. and then from March, we have the version '99 documents and version '00 documents. When we produce a Change Request that is equally applied for both versions then we do 2 change request one for release '99 and one for release '00. And then also the Change Request that corresponds to just new feature for release 2000 in which case we will produce Change Request only for version '00. There must be a date at which we say that this is the start of the documentation for release 2000. Has there been the date decided or will it be like for example March, 2000 ?

< Chairman answered >

To my understanding, before March, we will only produce CRs for release '99 and I expect that RAN would create this release 2000 draft after March. At least until March we will just make CRs for release '99. As we have not finished release '99, I think RAN would not declare any date when the release 2000 specs or drafts are available.

< Question >

Any new material for release 2000 should be introduced in March or April ?

< Chairman answered >

Bigger feature should be pointed out in March so that we have some basis for planning of this work but of course smaller requirements and stuff like that can be raised later. I think it will get difficulty if you try to raise big feature that span across a lot of WGs after the work plan has been done for which WGs are trying to act accordingly. So if you try to raise still big feature in June or September it might probably be impossible to incorporate that anymore. The sooner the better.

## 5. Identification of the incoming liaison statements and actions in the answering

	Title	Source	To/ Cc	Tdoc No.	Forwarded To	Notes
1	LS on UE/MS idle mode operation	SMG2	CC	R1-00-0003	Plenary	Noted (*1)
2	Reply to LS on measurement order parameters sent to the MS, for GSM to UMTS handover	SMG2	CC	R1-00-0004	Plenary	Noted (*2)
3	Liaison on LCS (in response to liaison from WG1)	RAN WG2	TO	R1-00-0005	These arrived during RAN #9 and already covered. Only Tdoc No. were lacking. The answer LSs were already produced in RAN#9.	
4	LCS Time Aligned IPDL methods performance	RAN WG2	TO	R1-00-0006		
5	LS on Synchronisation Detection	RAN WG2	TO	R1-00-0007	Plenary	Postponed (*3)
6	Response to LS on Higher Layer Signalling for Site Selection Diversity Transmission Power Control	RAN WG3	TO	R1-00-0008	Plenary	Noted (*4)
7	Response to liaison on synchronisation detection	RAN WG4	CC	R1-00-0009	Plenary with 007	Postponed (*3)
8	Liaison statement to RAN, RAN2 and RAN1 concerning the feasibility of CPICH SIR for handover and cell re-selection measurements	RAN WG4	TO	R1-00-0010	Plenary	Noted (*5)
9	Response to LS on UE measurement abilities	RAN WG4	CC	R1-00-0011	Plenary	Noted (*6)
10	Answer LS on Synchronisation Detection	RAN WG4	CC	R1-00-0021	Plenary with 007	Postponed (*3)
11	Response to LS from RAN1 informing about the changes made to FDD/TDD Tx diversity solutions in TSG-R WG1 #8	T WG1	TO	R1-00-0022	Plenary	Noted (*7)
12	Liaison statement regarding the need for Reference Radio Bearers	T1 /SIG	TO	R1-00-0035	Evening session	
13	LS on UE Measurement of ISCP	RAN WG4	TO	R1-00-0099	Plenary	Siemens would draft Answer (*8)
14	LS on revised CPCH model employed in L2/L3 radio interface specifications	RAN WG2	TO	R1-00-0163	Plenary	This arrived on Day2. See 15.2
15	Response to LS (R1-99L63) on Transmitting AMR Mode Command bits	RAN WG2	TO	R1-00-0182	Plenary	This arrived on Day4. see 16.1
16	LS on Downlink outer loop power control	RAN WG2	TO	R1-00-0183	Plenary	
17	Response to LS (R1-99L45) on Transport block size	RAN WG2	TO	R1-00-0184	Plenary	

(\*1) This LS was sent to CN1, R2 and S1 suggesting that S1 collects both the idle mode as well as the handover requirements in their Stage 1 document, and that this TS is then used by all groups. Any changes could then be coordinated in a single group, and this group, 3 GPP TSG S1, would then be asked to inform all other relevant groups of any changes. This was sent to R1 as CC for information and no comments were raised.

(\*2) This LS was sent to R2 as a reply LS on measurement order parameters sent to the MS, for GSM to UMTS handover. SMG2 have discussed the issues related to handover from GSM to other systems and vice versa. The summary of preliminary outcome of those discussions was presented. This was sent to R1 as CC for information. Chairman suggested people concerning measurement to check this and if there are some comments then we would come back. This is for more like R2 issue.

Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) made a comment that though this LS was not copied to RAN WG4, there was also homework for R4 and that R4 should be aware what the minimum requirements of GSM mobiles are and then they would be able to map those requirements in terms of the requirements of the mobiles.

(\*3) This LS was sent to R1, R3 and R4 asking for comments to the synchronization detection mechanism which was agreed in RAN WG2 meeting #9. RAN WG2 expects us comments on the out-of-synch issue that the layer 1 shall periodically report "out-of-synch" or "in-synch" status to higher layers. Chairman commented that we need to see whether that agrees with our understandings we already have.

Mr. Fredrik Ovesjö (Ericsson) made a comment that Ericsson was preparing the contribution on the "out-of-synch" issue (R1-00-0103) and it would be ready on Day3.

Mr. Tim Mouldsley (Philips) made a comment that Philips also had some relating contributions which would address some of questions raised in LSs. (R1-00-0053(CR), R1-00-0054(CR), R1-00-0061(LS))

Chairman proposed that we would discuss this synchronization issues including LSs together with Ericsson's and Philips contribution at the same time on Day3 afternoon in agenda item 15 "Contributions on issues where CRs are still needed for Release -99 specifications"

Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) pointed out that while reviewing this issue, we should consider the particular item of "Synchronization in soft handover" because in WG2 which was having a meeting in parallel would send some liaison on the issue.

**/\*\* All these 3 LS were reviewed on Day4. See 15.1 \*\*/**

- (\*4) This LS was the answer from R3 to the questions from WG1 on the issue of simulation assumption for SSdT cell ID codes. Based on the answer from RAN WG3, LGIC asked chairman for conclusion on the issue regarding SSdT cell ID codes (R1-00-0012[LGIC] and R1-00-0064[Samsung]).  
Chairman answered that we would make a conclusion when we went through the contributions. It was decided to discuss this issue in agenda item 15 "Contributions on issues where CRs are still needed for Release -99 specifications". No comments were raised.
- (\*5) This LS was sent to RAN, R2 and R1. Chairman summarized that main conclusion was in the last sentence which said "RAN WG4 will inform RAN, RAN WG2 and RAN WG1 of its findings after its next meeting in early January 2000." and it can be considered that any action was expected from RAN WG1 in relation to this issue. No comments were raised.
- (\*6) This LS was sent to R2 informing that R4 was currently working on UE measurement requirements for the case of single type measurement. R4 was also requesting to R2 for the rationale of each measurement. R2 would probably provide the requested rationale after their meeting. No comments were raised.
- (\*7) This LS was the answer for R1-99h68. TSG T1 checked the impact to TS-34.121 and TS-34.122. They informed that in TS-34.121, there would be some modifications needed. In TS-34.122, as nothing concerning testing of Tx diversity is contained, there were no impact. No comments were raised.
- (\*8) R4 requested clarification of any differences which may exist in measured quantities between TDD UE's which employ multi-user detection and those not employing multi-user detection. R4 also requested the clarification of any differences which may exist between ISCP measurements as defined for the UE and the ISCP measurement defined for UTRA.  
→ Siemens would draft the answer LS by Day4.  
Mr. Fredrik Ovesjö (Ericsson) made a comment that on multi-user detection issue, in principle there is nothing prohibited for FDD. Whatever we write should be consistent for both modes. In general, the definitions of the measurement shall be flexible so that they will not really take any specific implementation of receiver into account.

## 6. Change Requests for WG1 specifications of editorial nature that have been distributed before the meeting on the reflector

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Source	Conclusion	Notes
1	024	-	25.211	R1-00-0036	Additional description of TX diversity for PDSCH	Ericsson	To be revised	(*1) 11:52
2	047	-	25.214	R1-00-0036	Additional description of TX diversity for PDSCH	Ericsson		
3	026	-	25.211	R1-00-0038	Minor corrections to timing section	Ericsson	Approved	(*2) 12:03
4	034	-	25.212	R1-00-0023	Clarification of fixed position rate matching	LGIC	To be revised	(*3) 12:11
5	039	-	25.212	R1-00-0091	Clarification on TFCI coding input	Qualcomm Europe	To be revised	(*4) 12:17
6	021	-	25.213	R1-00-0087	Downlink signal flow corrections	Siemens	Approved	No (*5) Comments 12:19
7	022	-	25.213	R1-00-0087	Uplink signal flow corrections	Siemens	Approved	No (*5) Comments 12:21
8	048	-	25.214	R1-00-0040	Power offset on S-CCPCH	Ericsson	Approved	(*6) 14:22
9	044	-	25.214	R1-00-0016	Editorial clarification to section 5.1.2.2.2	Nokia	Approved	(*7) 14:29
10	049	-	25.214	R1-00-0051	Corrections to uplink power control in compressed mode	Philips	Approved	(*8) 14:37
11	025	-	25.215	R1-00-0042	Clarification of Observed time difference to GSM cell	Ericsson	Approved	No (*9) Comments 14:40

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Source	Conclusion	Notes
12	027	-	25.215	R1-00-0044	Naming of BER/BLER mapping	Ericsson	Approved	(*10) 14:44
13	028	-	25.215	R1-00-0045	Minor corrections in TS 25.215	Ericsson	Approved	No (*11) Comments 14:47
14	030	01	25.215	R1-00-0110	Mapping of timing measurements	Ericsson	Approved	(*12) 14:56
15	031	-	25.215	R1-00-0048	Removal of note in Round trip time measurement	Ericsson	Approved	No (*13) Comments 15:00
16	012	-	25.221	R1-00-0096	Introduction of the timeslot formats for RACH to the TDD specifications	Nokia	Approved	No (*14) Comments 15:04
17	013	-	25.221	R1-00-0097	Paging Indicator Channel reference power	Nokia	Approved	No (*15) Comments 15:06
18	008		25.224	R1-00-0068	Modification of SIR threshold on setting TPC	Interdigital	Approved	No (*16) Comments 15:08

(\*1) Currently, there is some information missing regarding closed-loop Tx diversity for PDSCH. These CRs intend to clarify some of those missing information.

It was pointed out by Mr. Peter Chambers (Siemens) that the word “should” should be replaced by “shall” in TS 25.211 “Furthermore, in case of PDSCH associated with DPCH, the Transmit diversity mode used for a PDSCH frame **should** be the same as the Transmit Diversity mode used for the DPCH associated with this PDSCH frame.”. Mr. Tim Mousley (Philips) proposed offline discussion regarding defining the weights on the shared channel on the basis of frame whether there is inconsistency or not.

- In TS 25.214 part, “The timing of the weight adjustment of the PDSCH should be such that the PDSCH weight adjustment is done at the PDSCH slot border,  $N$  chips after the adjustment of the associated DPCH, where  $0 \leq N < 2560$ .”, how should this  $N$  be defined ? → This offset between PDSCH and DPCH is known to the UE.

This is not something that is set by higher layers directly. It is set as a consequence of that UE is allocated the certain frame timing for its DPCH.

(\*2) This CR intended to correct minor typo in section 7.1 figure 23 and section 7.3 in TS 25.211

There was one comment made by Mr. Takashi Mochizuki (NEC) that the  $\tau_{PICH}$  was described in different way in figure 22 and figure 23. Is not this inconsistent ? → These 2 figures describes two different dimension so there is no inconsistency. (Mr. Fredrik Ovesjö (Ericsson) answered.)

(\*3) In current specification, there are no explicit definitions of  $\Delta N_{i,l}^{TTI}$  for fixed position rate matching. This CR

intended to provide explicit expressions of  $\Delta N_{i,l}^{TTI}$  both for convolutional codes and turbo codes just for clarification and information.

It was pointed out regarding the newly introduced equation that “sgn()” function should be defined in the symbol section of the specification.

It was questioned whether the same procedure is applicable for the TDD mode. It was answered that it is not related to TDD mode. Because in TDD mode, there is no fixed position section.

(Conclusion) This CR was anyhow to be revised because it was corrupted. In revision, the definition of sgn function should be added in the symbol section. The contents of this CR was agreed.

(\*4) This CR is regarding the mapping of RRC TFC index bits to physical layer TFCI bits. This mapping is currently not explicitly defined in the specification. This CR specified the relation between the TFCI information bits and TFC indexes defined by the RRC layer.

One typo was pointed out that “DPDSCH” should be “PDSCH”. Since this CR was corrupted, it was to be revised. The typo would be corrected in the revision.

(\*5) It has been pointed out on the R1 reflector that signal flows between the block diagrams in TS 25.213 are not complete. Also the notation of the scrambling code for the downlink DPDCH/DPCCCH is not consistent with the scrambling code notation for PCPCH which can now take either long or short constituent codes. This CR intended to reflect those. No comments were raised.

(\*6) This CR proposed 2 modifications in the TS 25.214. One is the addition of section 5.25 “S-CCPCH” in order to clarify that the TFCI and pilot fields may be offset relative to the power of the data field and that power offsets may vary in time. Another is clarification to section 5.2.4 that the power of the paging indicators is independent of whether the undefined bits are used or not.

2 questions for clarification were made but they were answered.

(\*7) This CR intended to clarify the uplink power control procedure in soft handover in 25.214.

In CR 25214-010r1, the description of the process for combining multiple TPC commands was modified by introducing the usage of soft symbol values instead of SIR. This CR makes an editorial change to remove a duplicate notation for the soft symbol decision values.

It was pointed out by the Mr. Fredrik Ovesjö (Ericsson) that function  $\gamma$  is not defined anywhere and it should be defined to avoid future confusion. Mr. Tim Mousley (Philips) responded that he supported this paper and as for the

function  $\gamma$ , it was taken care in Philips' contribution. Philips' contribution and this contribution could possibly be combined.

(Conclusion) Let's approve this CR here, and we revisit function  $\gamma$  issue after reviewing related contributions.

- (\*8) This CR is for clarification of the description of the power control in compressed mode in TS 25.214.

- slight modification of 5.1.2.3 in the downlink compressed mode
- reflection of the comments so far made on the WG1 e-mail reflector
- removal of section 5.1.2.2.3.3.1

This document was distributed some time ago and so far no comments had been made.

There was one question made by Nokia regarding whether we have power resume mode in uplink and downlink.

This was answered that this text only defines power resume mode only in uplink and does not address for the downlink.

- (\*9) At RAN#6 it was requested to clarify the meaning of "beginning of GSM BCCH 51-multiframe" in the definition of the measurement "Observed time difference to GSM cell" in TS 25.215. This CR proposed that the beginning of the GSM BCCH 51-multiframe is defined as the beginning of the first tail bit (TB) of the frequency correction burst in the first TDMA-frame of the GSM BCCH 51-multiframe, i.e. the TDMA-frame following the IDLE-frame.

No comments were raised.

- (\*10) In the definition of the mapping for Transport channel BLER and Physical channel BER in TS 25.215, the term dB is used to indicate that the mapping is made in a logarithmic scale. This CR proposed to replace the term "dB" with the term "LOG" in order to avoid the confusion. (There is no need to multiply 10.)

It was questioned why logarithm value is used rather than the normal percentage value. → It was decided in the previous meeting. (in order to save some bits ?)

- (\*11) This CR intended to correct editorial errors found in TS 25.215.

No comments were raised.

- (\*12) For the timing measurements in TS 25.215 no detailed mapping of the range is currently given. This CR proposed detailed mapping to bits of the defined ranges for all timing related measurements in TS 25.215.

It was questioned that in the common wording "shall be reported in the unit *name\_TIME*", whether we can use the word "unit" with something which changes with values. → All other sections use same wording.

Chairman suggested if there is a need to change, then we would produce another CR.

It was questioned by Mr. Tim Mouldsley (Philips) that in 5.2.8, why this is applicable for connected intra, connected inter. Is this for UE measurement ? It turned out that this portion was cut and pasted from UE section and the contents had not been changed. Therefore not only the "Applicable" box, but also "Definition" box is not correct. Chairman suggested that we should consider this CR approved because the value range could be considered right, and then afterwards we would make another CR to correct the "cut & paste" errors.

- (\*13) This CR proposed to remove the note in TS 25.215 section 5.2.7 "Round trip time" that says "Note: The relation between this measurement and the TOA measurement defined by WG2 needs clarification." because this can not be considered proper for the reason described in the CR.

No comments were raised.

It was questioned by Siemens about the handling of CRs for TS 25.225. Some of the CRs approved here for TS 25.215 are also to be applied to TS 25.225. Should we make one big CR which contains all needed modifications or should we prepare CRs for each modification ?

Chairman answered that we could make one big CR for this case. This big CR should be approved in the plenary instead of Ad Hoc1.

- (\*14) This CR proposed to add the table of "Timeslot formats for RACH" based on the previous Ad Hoc1 discussion.

- (\*15) This CR proposed to add one sentence "PICH is always transmitted at the same reference power level as the P-<sub>n</sub> 5.3.7 "The Page Indicator Channel (PICH)" to clarify that the power level on which

PICH is transmitted.

- (\*16) This CR proposed to add "equal" to the sentence in TS 25.224 section 4.2.3.2. There had not been addressed the case when the measured SIR is equal to the target SIR.

/\*\* Ericsson proposed to postpone the discussion of R1-00-0043(Ericsson) in order to finalize it \*\*/

## 7. Change Request for WG1 specifications on issues that have been agreed in previous meeting but (proper) CR has not been produced.

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Source	Conclusion	Notes
19	029	-	25.215	R1-00-0046	Re-definition of timing measurements	Ericsson	Approved	(*1) 15:23
20	032	-	25.215	R1-00-0065	Corrections to 25.215 compressed mode parameter list	Nokia	To be revised	(*2) 15:44
21	024	-	25.215	R1-00-0041	Definition of Transmitted carrier power	Ericsson	Approved	(*3) 16:28

(\*1) This CR proposed to modify timing measurement based on the recent change in R3. R3 changed the definition of timing measurement from “CFN=SFN + Offset” to “CFN=SFN – Offset”. In order to reflect this change, the existing measurement “CFN-SFN observed time difference” has to be updated. “SFN-SFN observed time difference is also changed.

Do not we lose anything by this change ? Can the measurement range stay the same ?

→ Within TS 25.402 Synchronization Document in R3, they have some formulas describing how one can calculate where the transmission of DPCH frames shall start as compared to PCCPCH. When they change the calculation of those equations, input to the those equation, namely the measurements, how they are defined, needed to be changed. But outcome of the change of the measurements and the change of the equations is exactly what they have now. (Mr. Fredrik Ovesjö (Ericsson) stated answering to the chairman’s question.)

Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) made a question whether the similar CR has been prepared in R2 for R2 specs because it was considered that 25.202 maybe got impacted.

Mr. Fredrik Ovesjö (Ericsson) was asked to check this internally to make sure that necessary CR has been produced in R2.

(\*2) This CR proposed to clarify the list of compressed mode parameters in TS 25.215 section 6.1.1.2 based on the previous meeting discussion. It is proposed that the transmission gap distance should be changed to be measured by the number of slots instead of number of frames and its value should be integers. Some other clarifications were proposed. The proposal of having slots was originally introduced by Mitsubishi.

There was a question made about the new flexibility, regarding the risk of gap sliding and difficulty in pattern configuration to make sure that the patterns do not override with the new flexibility. It was answered that the change proposed here is only transmission gap distance that measures the distance between 2 gaps within one pattern. And as the pattern duration and transmission gaps are still within frame, there will be no real sliding occur. Mr. Tim Mousley (Philips) pointed out that it should be checked by the interested party whether this new definition of TGD may have some impact on rate matching or not.

It was pointed out by Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) that we have to make sure that the gaps from different patterns do not overlap and this would equally apply the gaps from the same pattern.

→ Chairman suggested that this remark should be included in the revision.

It was questioned by Mr. Fredrik Ovesjö (Ericsson) whether R2 was aware of this change.

There should be some input from WG1 on what the expected value range is and what the exact definition of all these parameter is. It would be very good to align R1, R2 and R3 on this issue.

→ Chairman suggested to make a liaison statement to R2 and R3 with the CR approved.

Chairman asked Mr.Ville Steudle (Nokia) to draft the LS

This CR should be revised because section 6.1.1.3 did no longer exist in v.3.1.1.

**/\*\* This was superseded by R1-00-0176 and discussed on Day4, but was not approved. See No.45 (\*4) \*\*/**

(\*3) R4 has changed the definition of UTRAN transmitted carrier power measurement as a relative measurement to the maximum possible power on the carrier. This CR intended to reflect this change into TS 25.215.

It was pointed out by Mr. Tim Mousley (Philips) that in this proposal, the dynamic range of transmit power is only 20dB (100% ↔ 1%). It is very poor resolution when compared to the previous measurement (50dB). What is the intention? → This came from WG4 and if they do not have problem with this, then it can be considered OK. (..)

### 7.1 SSDD ID codes issue

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Source	Conclusion	Notes
22	043	-	25.214	R1-00-0012	Optimum ID Codes for SSDD Power Control	LGIC	Postponed	(*1)
23	054	-	25.214	R1-00-0064	Enhanced performance using the adaptive SSDD ID code	Samsung	Postponed	(*2)

(\*1) This CR proposed the new optimized ID code for SSDD. Simulation results that shows approximately 4.5dB performance gain at  $10^{-3}$  word error rate when 2 bit FBI is used and approximately 1.5dB gain at  $10^{-3}$  word error rate when 1 bit FBI is used in fading channel were presented.

(\*2) This CR proposed adaptive SSDD ID code that requires additional signaling (re-allocation message of each cell ID and information size of the active set from network each cell) but produces performance advantage.



Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) made a comment that this procedure implies a lot of signaling and each time we add or remove a link, we need to transmit radio link re-configuration and we need to have synchronized operation and so this would be extremely costly.

Chairman made a comment that considering from LS from R3, it is rather difficult at this moment to add new signaling procedures.

Chairman suggested offline discussion by the interested party.

/ **\*\* Day 1 broke at 17:29 Jan. 18 \*\*** /

Day 2

### **8. Ad Hoc sessions: Morning 09:00 - 12:30**

TDD Release –99 issues (AH01) : Cell parameter cycling, corrections to release –99 specifications etc.

Compressed mode (AH04+AH08) : Solution for compressed mode with puncturing, compressed mode parameterization clarifications, etc.

### **9. Ad Hoc sessions: Afternoon 12:30 - 18:00**

TDD Narrowband chip rate (AH01): Identification where changes needed, work plan.

Packet Access (AH 14) session 1 : CPCH channel monitoring and channel allocation issues that need to be communicated to TSG RAN WG2.

Day 2, Plenary session started at 20:15

## **10. Evening plenary (approx. 30 mins) Approval of liaisons to WG2 (from AH14)**

### **10.1 Liaison statement to WG2 (Revision of R1-00-0131)**

*“Liaison statement on the issues of Channel Assignment, UE Channel Selection and CPCH Status Indicator Channel (CSICH)”*

Mr. Tim Mousley (Philips) made a presentation of LS on the screen. It was the revision of R1-00-0131 and reflected the comments made during in Ad Hoc 14 session and offline discussion. This LS intended to inform WG2 of the conclusion in WG1 regarding the Channel Assignment method, the UE channel Selection method and CSICH hoping that the mentioned framework is aligned with WG2's UE and UTRAN channel selection model.

One question was made by Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) :

Regarding this CA issue, proponents would have to prepare 2 CRs. What is the exact schedule for this ? Is there any intention that such CRs would be ready during this meeting and then we will wait for the decisions from WG2 before sending the CRs for approval in next RAN meeting. In general, how do we plan the interaction between RAN WG1 and WG2 ? How do we proceed based on the answer from RAN WG2 ?

Chairman answered :

Ideally we could have a look at those CRs even in this meeting, then we could send them on Friday as annex of another LS for information to RAN WG2 so that they could check if their model, etc is aligned. If WG2 has a lot of differences in their modeling assumptions and we could prepare those CRs only in Las Vegas, then it will be quite difficult to go to RAN properly. I do not know the sustainable processing capability of the proponents, but ideally we could have CRs existing by the end of this meeting. We suggest that proponents would do their best and we have both CRs with and without CA. It would also help us if we have proposed CRs before next meeting available. Because then RAN2 can point out if we are something wrong and so that we will not get the kind of mismatch in the RAN. We will send this LS as an intermediate answer at this point and try to come back with CRs.

One comment was made by Samsung that they had draft answer that was written in Ad Hoc 14 and it was very closely related to this LS. They requested to present it but chairman proposed to discuss it in the next day Ad Hoc 14 session because it was not the time to discuss technical issues. Chairman suggested that we could send the revised update if we have new information.

This LS was approved. The approved Tdoc No. was **R1-00-0151**.

## 11. UE capability related issues (Evening session)

No.	Tdoc	Title	Source	Conclusion	Notes
24	R1-00-0137	Need for compressed mode in UL and DL	Nokia	Discussed	(*1)
25	R1-00-0085	CR 25.212-033rev1 : Physical channel mapping (revision)	Nokia	Discussed	(*2)
26	R1-00-0112	DSCH Data rate in UE capabilities	Nokia	Postponed	(*3)
27	R1-00-0049	Proposal for separate UE capabilities for convolutionally coded and turbo coded transport channels	Ericsson	To be revised	(*4)
28	R1-00-0134	Proposed Modifications to TR 25.926 "UE Radio Access Capabilities"	Sony Panasonic	Discussed	(*5)

(\*1) This contribution proposed to separate the capability parameter for compressed mode into uplink and downlink parts.

It was questioned by Mr. Fredrik Ovesjö (Ericsson) :

Is this capability or its need for compressed mode going to be independent from what GSM band is actually measuring on ? The need for uplink compressed mode could be different if you measure on GSM900 or if you measure GSM1800.

- For GSM, the networks gives a measurement pattern generally specifically for GSM900 and GSM1800.
- We have to reflect which type of compressed mode is for which type of measurement in this radio capability.
- The support of RF expert maybe needed to write this issue. → we could send the LS to RAN WG4 as Cc.

(Chairman's conclusion)

Chairman asked Mr. Kari Pehkonen (Nokia) to draft a liaison to WG2 based on the discussion and incorporating the result of offline discussion of (\*2).

(\*2) Discussion was made between Nokia and Ericsson.

Chairman suggested offline discussion between them.

(\*3) Chairman supplemented.

What is suggested here is to include in the single parameter in addition to DCH decoding also the DSCH in the same capability value not only the dedicated channel decoding but also DSCH and FACH decoding assuming there was DSCH capability of simultaneous FACH decoding capability.

There were several comments made.

Further work would be needed for exact wording, definition, etc.

Ericsson has a contribution on the shared channel timing issue. This would be discussed later in conjunction with this.

(\*4) Big discussion was made.

Chairman concluded that there is certain possibility to misunderstand and so it would be better to have some kind of examples for clarification or further elaboration in the liaison statement. Mr. Fredrik Ovesjö (Ericsson) commented that intention of this document was that network may configure whatever transport channel combination it wants, as long as all the capabilities signaled by the UE are fulfilled. He also commented the document was nothing but clear and he would appreciate the proposal.

(\*5) This contribution pointed out the problem in the

- Maximum sum of number of bits of all transport blocks received/delivered in TTIs that end/start at the same time
- Maximum sum of number of sustainedly processable bits of all transport blocks received in TTIs that end at the same time, normalized with the respective TTI lengths in number of radio frames

which were introduced in RAN#9 into the TR25.926. This proposed to modify the definition with examples and to start the discussion on this issue.

Chairman concluded that this needs to be further discussed.

Day 3

## 12. Ad Hoc sessions: Morning 8.30 –12.00

Packet Access (AH14) : Session 2: CPCH channel monitoring details, channel allocation etc discussions continues...

Channel coding (AH05) : Possible corrections/clarifications, Turbo coding with smaller block sizes etc...

Day 3, Plenary started at 14:10

## 13. Reports from Ad Hoc from Day 2&3

### 13.1 Report from Ad Hoc #1 (R1-00-0145) “Report from Ad Hoc #1 ”

Ad Hoc 1 chairman Ms. Anja Klein (Siemens) presented the AdHoc1 report on the screen.

Following CRs were recommended by Ad Hoc#1 to be incorporated into RAN WG1 specifications.

No.	CR	Tdoc	Topic	Source
1	CR011-221	0076	Correction of Midamble Definition for TDD	Siemens AG
2	CR004r1-225	0124	Correction of CPICH measurements and ‘RX Timing	Siemens AG
3	CR007r1-224	0133	Changes to the section on Timing Advance in TS25.224	Nokia, Siemens AG
4	CR018-222	0081	Refinements of physical channel mapping	Siemens AG
5	CR017-222	0082	Corrections to TS25.222	Siemens AG
6	CR003r2-221	0135	Cell Parameter Cycling	Texas Instruments
7	CR002r3-223	0135	Cell Parameter Cycling	Texas Instruments
8	CR003r2-224	0135	Cell Parameter Cycling	Texas Instruments

Furthermore, it was recommended to send LS to other working groups based on the following drafts:

No.	Tdoc	Title	Source	To:	Cc:
1	0142	Draft Answer to LS on UE measurement of ISCP	Siemens AG	WG4	-
2	0144	Draft Answer to LS on Out-of-Sync Procedure	Drafting Group	WG2, WG3	-
3	0148	Time schedule on the work on the Low Chip Rate TDD in RAN WG1	Nokia	WG2,WG3,WG4	-

The recommendation by Ad Hoc 1 to include the 4 work items

- TDD Low Chip Rate
- Hybrid ARQ II/III
- Location Services/Positioning
- TDD NodeB Synchronisation via Air

in UTRA release 2000 as given in Tdoc R1-00-0084 should be confirmed in the plenary.

→ (WG1 Chairman answerd)

*I think we do not need to confirm the TDD Low Chip Rate because that has been agreed already in RAN that it is the work item for release 2000 although there is no official work item description existing.*

For other items, chairman confirmed item by item in the plenary.

The procedure as described in italics in section 2.11(of R1-00-0145) for inclusion of the low chip rate option in release 2000 was agreed in Ad Hoc 1 and is recommended for approval in the WG1 plenary. A new technical report should be set up which describes the physical layer of the low chip rate option of TDD and which contains the commonalities and differences between the UTRA TDD high chip rate and low chip rate option. The table of contents of the new TR should be based on the existing WG1 TDD specifications. Tdoc R1-00-0149 contains a first version of this technical report, which is a proposal for the table of contents of this report. There are two volunteers for the editorship of this technical report: Mr. Yang from CATT and Mr. Aksentijevic from Nokia. The editorship should be decided in the plenary.

→ (WG1 Chairman answerd)

*About the editorship for this technical report, as we agreed that we would produce this report, I do not think there is any problem with that.*

It should be checked with the WG1 chairman whether a specification can be approved as version 3.0.0 already at the first time it is presented to RAN.

→ (WG1 Chairman answerd)

*From the procedure point of view, this is possible. I have seen that happen earlier with some R3 specifications.*

It has to be clarified with the WG1 chairman whether supporting members in terms of individual companies are needed or if we can put "WG1" in this field of the work item description.

→ (WG1 Chairman answer)

*Basically what is particular for this issue is that this will span across the WGs. I will have some work item descriptions with me when I go to RAN because it is anyway in RAN where the work item descriptions are merged with other WGs. If we would approve something here or if some suggestions are provided by some companies then I will deal with that because I think anyway I will end up editing that together with other WG chairmen in RAN to have a joint work item descriptions. It will always help me if I have one that people here have seen from layer 1 point of view that it contains what it is supposed to contain. I do not think we need the name at all in the work item descriptions. I hope at this point that we would put just RAN WG1. We do not need to nominate person. But I will check this with Mr. Furuya before the RAN.*

It has to be clarified with the WG1 chairman if there is one rapporteur for all WG's and what is his role considering the fact that most WG meetings will be held in parallel.

→ (WG1 Chairman answer)

*I believe in that case each WGs would report on the progress unless there is separately somebody nominated to follow up some subject. I do not like this. SA has done this. Unless somebody specifically appointed by RAN to coordinate the issue then each WG will report separately on the progress to TSG RAN. That is my understanding.*

### **This Ad Hoc #1 report was approved with no comments at 14:42.**

There was one additional comment made by Telecom Italia :

Yesterday it was agreed to prepare this TR where should be analyzed commonality and differences between 3.84Mcps TDD and 1.28Mcps. This TR should not mention that some new specification could be necessary but after analyzing commonalities and differences should focus on how to harmonize to these 2 components, because according to the report in the meeting minutes of the last RAN, they discussed that these 2 components should be harmonized and it is not mentioned in any place that the new specification has to be introduced. So we have to specify that this report should perform technical analysis focusing on how to harmonize the narrower band and the wide band TDD. We should not consider before having completed this report, the possibility of introducing new specification.

(Chairman answered)

RAN report does not mention anything about harmonization. It says inclusion of narrow band chip rate and so on. "Harmonization" has nothing to do with whether we create new specification or not. We can say FDD and TDD physical layers are harmonized, but still they are in different specifications. And this report would not suggest whether there needs to be new specifications or not. It will indicate where they are different and where they are identical. Based on those, we will make a decision after the RAN #8 whether we create new specifications or not. We should communicate our views, what is our standing point with RAN. It is clear that Technical Report will not make any recommendation.

#### **13.1.1 R1-00-0083 Additional Examples for Technical Report:**

##### *"R1.04 – Channel Coding and Multiplexing Examples*

Ms. Anja Klein (Siemens) made a brief presentation on Day 3 (15:15).

After the introduction in the RAN1#9 meeting, regarding TDD part, discussion revealed that 64 kbps and 128 kbps data services may be supported with single code transmission as well. The additional examples for this mapping was proposed.

Mr. Takehiro Nakamura (NTT DoCoMo, editor of this TR) made a comment that at that point of time, he did not intend to modify the FDD part, but he would incorporate this proposal into the current Technical Report.

Chairman made a comment that our intention is that we would have this approved by WG1 and present to RAN in March for RAN approval.

**/\*\*/ This Technical Report is now referred as TR 25.944 /\*\*/**

#### **13.1.2 R1-00-0149 Technical Report "1.28Mcps UTRA TDD Physical Layer" (Draft)**

Mr. Mirko Aksentijevic (Nokia, one of the 2 editors of this TR) introduced planned scope and structure of the TR on the screen on Day 3 (15:25).

Scope : This Technical Report describes the 1.28Mcps UTRA TDD physical layer, identifies commonalities and explains the differences to the 3.84Mcps UTRA TDD.

The differences or things identified as features that need to be explained in terms mandatory/optional, On/Off, what is for UE and what is for base station will be described. And the similarities will have to be referenced existing 3GPP specifications on TDD.

Table of contents corresponds to existing specifications.

Section 4 → TS 25.201

Section 5 → TS 25.221

Section 6 → TS 25.222

Section 7 → TS 25.223

Section 8 → TS 25.224

There was one comment made by Telecom Italia that suggested to put in the cover(scope) of this document in addition to the analysis of similarities/differences also the suggestion on how to harmonize 2 components (3.84Mcps and 1.28Mcps). And since this is not specification but technical report, so we can consider the indication on how to align, how to *harmonize*.

(Chairman answered)

Again in the RAN, we do not want to talk about harmonization. We are to specify the narrow band chip rate option. We are not doing harmonization. Of course there should be maximum alignment with those 2 chip rate but we try to avoid this word "*harmonization*" because it refers to some earlier discussions between different specifications. Now we are doing work on the technical level and so we specify the narrow band chip rate and try to align as much as possible we can with wider chip rate. We are not supposed to talk about harmonization. That is the different story.

The next version is anyway editor version (v0.0.1). I think editors can put the recommendation how to align the narrow band chip rate.

**This draft Technical Report was approved at 15:30.**

**/\*\*\* The new TR number is allocated by 3GPP MCC for this TR as TR 25.928 \*\*\*/**

### **13.2 Report from Ad Hoc #5 (R1-00-0155) “Ad hoc 5 meeting report on 1-20-00”** 16:03

Following 3 topics were discussed in the Ad Hoc5, but for conclusion was not reached for each topic.

- 1) Proposed text change for internal Turbo code interleaver.
- 2) Shortened tail bits for small size convolutional code.
- 3) Small size Turbo code internal interleaver.

Followings are Ad Hoc #5 recommendations.

- 1) Proposed text change on Turbo code internal interleaver will be further reviewed off-line by NTT DoCoMo and Nokia and others:
- 2) Proposal on shortened tail bits for convolutional code will not be accepted at this stage.
- 3) 40-bits is recommended to be the minimal size internal Turbo interleaver and for smaller size, it will be padded to 40 bits. Therefore, from WG2’s perspective, Turbo codes of all lengths are supported.
- 4) Nortel and NTT DoCoMo’s proposed Turbo internal interleaver for short frame is adopted with necessary changes. (minimum 40-bits block size)
- 5) Optional and mandatory: Current understanding is that the short size Turbo code is optional for both UE and base station. However, it is believed that from technical point of view, it should be mandatory for UE if it supports Turbo coding. The group’s suggestion is to postpone the decision to next meeting such that each company will be able to know whether they can accommodate the change for release 99.

- As for 4), NTT DoCoMo will prepare CR by Day4 (R1-00-0160).

- Chairman asked Nortel to draft the LS (R1-00-0161) to RAN WGs regarding the Parameters for Turbo coding (minimum 40-bits) by Day4.

**The Ad Hoc report was approved with one comment that proposal on shortened tail bits for convolutional code had not been accepted in the Ad Hoc#5 meeting. (This comment was reflected on the distributed R1-00-0155).** (16:09)

### **13.3 Ad hoc 8+4 Report (R1-00-0147) “Draft report on Ad hoc 8+4 meeting about compressed mode issues”**

Mr. Bruno Schuffenecker (France Telecom) presented the report on the screen.

It was agreed to produce a draft Change Request among the interested parties based on tdocs 120 and 139 approach 2. This CR will be presented during this plenary and will be the working assumption for puncturing with compressed mode. The formal acceptance of this CR is delayed for the next meeting.

Puncturing on a TTI basis was agreed instead of a frame basis.

**The Ad Hoc report was approved with no comments.** (16:35)

Chairman proposed extra AdHoc session for compressed mode in the Day3 evening (17 :30 - 19 :00).

### **13.4 AH 14 Report (R1-00-0154) “AH 14 Report”** (16:40)

**Approved with no comments.** (16:48)

### 13.5 Ad hoc 8 Report (R1-00-0179) “Draft report on Ad hoc 8 meeting n°2 about compressed mode issues” /\*\* This was presented on Day4 12:23 \*\*/

Mr. Bruno Schuffenecker (France Telecom) presented the report on the screen.

The meeting started the 20<sup>th</sup> of January at 5:30 p.m and closed at 7:30 p.m. 5 documents Tdocs 39, 66, rest of 86, 129 and 117 were dealt.

As a conclusion, it was agreed that CRs ( R1-00-0066, R1-00-0170 and R1-00-0176) and LSs (R1-00-0177 and R1-00-0178 ) should be presented to the plenary.

**Report was approved with no comments.**

## 14. CRs produced based on agreements in the Ad Hocs

### 14.1 Ad Hoc #1 related CRs

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Source	Conclusion	Notes
29	011	-	25.221	R1-00-0076	Correction of Midamble Definition for TDD	Siemens AG	Approved	No (*1) Comments 14:58
30	004	01	25.225	R1-00-0124	Correction of CPICH measurements and ‘RX Timing Deviation’ range	Siemens AG	Approved	No (*2) Comments 15:01
31	007	01	25.224	R1-00-0133	Clarifications on the UL synchronisation	Nokia Siemens	Approved	No (*3) Comments 15:04
32	018	-	25.222	R1-00-0081	Refinements of Physical Channel Mapping	Siemens AG	Approved	No (*4) Comments 15:06
33	017	-	25.222	R1-00-0082	Corrections to TS 25.222	Siemens AG	Approved	(*5) 15:09
34	003	02	25.221	R1-00-0135	Cycling of cell parameters	Texas Instruments	Approved	No Comments 15:14
35	002	03	25.223	R1-00-0135	Cycling of cell parameters	Texas Instruments	Approved	No Comments 15:14
36	003	02	25.224	R1-00-0135	Cycling of cell parameters	Texas Instruments	Approved	No Comments 15:14

(\*1) This CR proposed to remove an error in mathematical representation and simplify mathematical representation.

(\*2) This CR proposed to change the definition of the measurements in order to align with definition in TS25.215(FDD) and The upper limit of the RX Timing Deviation measurement range (5.2.9) was reduced according to the updated timing advance range in TS 25.224.

(\*3) This CR is a combination of R1-00-0098(CR25.224-007:Nokia) and R1-00-0078(CR25.224-006:Siemens) This proposed to clarify that UL synchronization is strictly optional and to change TA granularity aligned with R4. The bit number for representation of required TA was also changed from 8-bit number to 6-bit number.

(\*4) This CR proposed to change the mathematical notation in TS25.222 section 4.2.11 “Physical channel mapping” for the purpose of clearer and uniform representation of the algorithm.

(\*5) This CR proposed following corrections mainly due to harmonization reason with FDD specification.

- Inclusion of flexible coding schemes for the FACH
- Modification of the chapter describing convolutional coding
- Clarification of the alignment of TrCHs with different TTI
- Handling of zero length transport blocks
- Clarification of the indices for timeslot related 2<sup>nd</sup> interleaving

One question was made regarding “no coding”. It was answered that “no coding” is possible for FACH.

### 14.2 Ad Hoc #14 related CRs

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Source	Conclusion	Notes
37	013	03	25.211	R1-00-0157	Addition of a downlink channel indicating CPCH status	Philips	To be revised	(*1) 17:06
-	023	01	25.211	R1-00-0156	CPCH-related editorial changes, technical changes and additions to 25.211	GBT	-	(*2)

(\*1) This CR is the revision of R1-00-0052(CR 25.211-013r1) and introduced CPCH status broadcast channel which allows UE to monitor status of CPCH.

One comment was made that in section 5.3.3.8, “because it used by CPCH AP-AICH (see sub clause 5.3.3.6)” should be removed or modified because it is not always used unlike CS-AICH AP-AICH. Chairman commented that it might be sufficient as it is because AICH channel is defined in separate section and it should be indicated here that AICH channel is not always transmitted. But after all, it was concluded that that clause should be removed. → R1-00-0164. The revision would be approved on Day 4.

(\*2) Because of the reason of the document circulation, this was presented on Day 4 (See,

Day 4, started 08:50

## 15. Contributions on issues were CRs are still needed for Release –99 specifications (May continue for Day 4)

### 15.1 Synchronization issues

Before starting discussion on Synchronization Detection issue, chairman suggested to review the relating 3 incoming liaison statements.

#### - R1-00-0007 (WG2) “LS on Synchronisation Detection ”

RAN WG2 asked RAN WG1 and WG4 for comments to the mechanism which was agreed in WG2 meeting #9. In RAN WG2, it is assumed that the RRC receives the indication of out of synchronisation from layer 1. It is also assumed that the trigger criteria to decide “Physical CH establishment” or “Radio link failure” are RRC dependent and should be possible to adjust from the network. It can be understood that there may be several ways for layer1 to indicate “out of sync” or “in sync” from the description in TS25.214 v3.0.0, however, WG2 believes the quality of those indications should be seen as same to RRC regardless of the mechanism the UE supports in layer1.

#### - R1-00-0021 (WG3) “Answer LS on Synchronisation Detection ” /\*\* Answer to WG2 \*\*/

RAN WG3 believes that some L1 parameters are needed for the definition of the ‘out of synch’ indication (for example some timers that defines the length of the out of synch period before the out of synch indication is sent), and the currently those parameters are assumed to be set by O&M in the Node B, since they are not included in L3 signalling from the RNC.

#### - R1-00-0009 (WG4) “Response to liaison on synchronisation detection ” /\*\* Answer to WG2 \*\*/

RAN4 has not yet considered minimum performance requirements for the ‘physical channel establish RAN4 is defining a minimum performance requirement for the detection of a radio link failure for the purposes of RRC connection re-establishment.

Therefore, RAN4 is defining a minimum requirement for the time between the loss of a DPCH to the start of the random access in which the UE transmits the RRC connection re-establishment message. However, this time must also include the time taken for the UE to perform a cell reselection.

In addition, RAN4 will define a minimum performance requirement for the time between the loss of a downlink DPCH and the termination of the uplink transmission.

#### 15.1.1 R1-00-0103 “Downlink out-of-sync ”

(Day 4 09:30-10:28)

Mr. Fredrik Ovesjö (Ericsson) made a presentation. This document was also submitted to WG4.

How the “out-of-sync” indication can be provided in the different modes of operation was explained.

Direct monitoring of the TPC quality for the out-of-sync detection criteria use was proposed in the connected mode on dedicated channel.

A lot of comments were made to the TPC quality measurement.

- Reliability factor for the TPC in the soft handover should be taken into account here that if one of the radio links has very bad reliability for the TPC. We do not even know what is the TPC error percentage. It maybe reformulated for that case.
  - Maybe this could be reformulated to take into account this combining method. Our understanding here is that “out-of-sync” shall be reported when UE has higher error rate on all the radio links. So it is not a catastrophe when we have one bad radio link. It will not anyway have effect on the uplink power setting. Maybe this could be described in other way that we need to ensure that this is testable no matter what algorithm UE actually implement for this combining
- what is your definition of TPC error rate ?
  - TPC error is when the terminal would estimate the command to be opposite to what was actually transmitted by the network. It is possible to actually measure what sort of error rate the UE is seeing in the TPC by monitoring its output power on the uplink. TPC error rate , it is really TPC command error rate to see all these TPC bits as one command and you make decision “Is this uplink equipment on the downlink you transmit series of a up and down commands then you monitor the UE output power and if that deviates more than the certain amount from what you would expect of the uplink if all commands were received correctly, then you have a lot of TPC command errors. You can not actually measure this quite accurately what TPC error rate that UE has actually got, maybe it is tricky for the UE to know that because it dose not know what was sent. Even if this value is 20%, the test will probably be rather not very sharp and probably be like anything between 12% and 30% . You do not probably measure the error rate directly as rather measure SIR or something like that.

- In the actual situation not in the testing situation, indeed how difficult for the UE to estimate with full accuracy. This was the core the question rather how you measure in the testing situation. Can the UE really do this reliably for this procedure ?
- How long does it take for this downlink SIR target to reach its maximum allowed value when the downlink is lost ?  
→ I am not sure about that. So maybe could be some other dimension. If we detect “out-of-sync” over the longer period than what is stated here, we may, for example, switch transmitter off even though we are not at the maximum SIR target. This needs to be checked.
- We should concentrate on those things which are simple to specify and simple to test and make sure we can get something sensible working. Alternatively if we start worrying about how to measure the reliability of the TPC, then we will give ourselves rather more difficult problem to solve.

There were many other questions made.

Chairman concluded that we agree that CRC is something good and should be used in connection with this out-of-sync. Should we use some additional criteria to detect out-of-sync ? Other criteria should be for discussion.

Mr. Fredrik Ovesjö (Ericsson) commented that he wanted to know how WG1 as a group would tackle these problems and arrive at a complete solution for the UE and also for the UTRAN for which we have not even discussed yet. Chairman answered that we need to have e-mail discussions. We can not start from this point in the next meeting. We have to make progress and it might be useful if we could have some feedback from WG4 on the result of discussion on this same paper.

Mr. Fredrik Ovesjö (Ericsson) proposed to start Ad Hoc 18 for this issue.

Chairman accepted this proposal.

There was one question on how we could get other WGs opinion when we have e-mail discussion within WG1.

Chairman answered that we can ask other WG colleagues.

With regard to this issue, Liaison statement R1-00-0144 was prepared. Chairman suggested to review this later in this meeting.

Chairman made a comment on the idle mode:

We need to be careful on what we do say about idle mode because we are not writing specification for idle mode. We have to be careful. If we have some wishes, maybe we should just communicate RAN2 and hope that they can take them into account. We do not have single section on the idle mode. We should be careful not to mess up RAN2 spec on this issue.

### 15.1.2 CRs related to Synchronization issues.

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Source	Conclusion	Notes
38	051	-	25.214	R1-00-0054	Synchronisation procedure	Philips	Approved	No (*1) comments 10:59
39	052	-	25.214	R1-00-0055	Synchronisation procedure	Philips	Postponed	(*2) 11:11

(\*1) This CR proposed to remove overlapping description regarding the synchronization procedure in TS25.214, section 4.3.2. and to add the cross reference to the timing section in TS25.211.

(Paragraph (c) of the synchronisation procedure in this section relates to issues which are not directly relevant to the process of synchronisation, and are entirely covered elsewhere in the specifications, therefore should be removed.)

(\*2) This CR introduced two higher-layer parameters,  $S_{RU}$  and  $S_{RN}$ , for frame synchronisation at the UE and at the Network respectively which are to be used in the synchronization procedure instead of  $S_R$ .

Mr. Fredrik Ovesjö (Ericsson) made a comment:

Actual text that we need to have here is dependent on overall concept of synchronization procedure. We may have radiolink establishment criteria or radio link failure procedures or status within the RRC specification. On the other hand, neither the current text nor this modification goes very well with that RRC text. For example, there are several parameters in RRC specification but  $S_R$  parameter does not exist. I think we need to do something about this section but even if we approve something here, anyway it will have to be modified all on the next meeting. So I do not see any benefit in making any change here.

Mr. Tim Mouldsley (Philips) answered that we should discuss this issue on the reflector (AdHoc18) instead to postpone to next meeting otherwise we will not get conclusion. Chairman agreed on this comment.

LS(R1-00-0061) is related to this CR and Mr. Tim Mouldsley proposed to postpone this given this conclusion.

### 15.2 Review of WG 2 liaison

**R1-00-0163** “LS on revised CPCH model employed in L2/L3 radio interface specifications”

This LS was received on Day3 evening from RAN WG2 and it was partly response to our LS which was sent on Day2 evening regarding Channel Assignment, UE Channel Selection and CPCH Status Indicator Channel (CSICH) issue. WG2 confirmed that WG1 assumption on those issues are fully aligned in both groups.



There was attached document(R2-000211rev1) included for reference to this LS. In the end of the attached document, there were 2 questions from WG2 to WG1 included. Discussion was made on how we should treat this. Should we treat this just a reference and ignore the questions or should we treat this official LS and prepare the answer ?

Chairman concluded after some discussion that before we do act, we should confirm WG2's intention.

## 16. Approval of CRs for WG1 specifications not treated earlier or postponed due corrections

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Source	Conclusion	Notes
40	013	05	25.211	R1-00-0175	CR 25.211-013r5 for CPCH status broadcast	Philips	To be Revised	(*1) 12:08
41	044	-	25.212	R1-00-0160	Modification of Turbo code internal interleaver	NTT DoCoMo Nortel	Approved	(*2) 12:20
42	021	-	25.222	R1-00-0160	Modification of Turbo code internal interleaver	NTT DoCoMo Nortel	Approved	(*2) 12:20
43	037	-	25.212	R1-00-0066	Removal of fixed gap position in 25.212	Nokia	To be revised	(*3) 14:22
44	033	-	25.215	R1-00-0066	Removal of fixed gap position in 25.215	Nokia	Approved	No (*3) Comments 14:22
45	036	02	25.215	R1-00-0176	Corrections to 25.215 compressed mode parameter list	Nokia	To be revised	(*4) 14:38
46	042	02	25.212	R1-00-0174	Downlink compressed mode by Puncturing	Nortel	To be revised	(*5) 14:57
47	035	01	25.212	R1-00-0170	Clarification of DL compressed mode	Ericsson	Approved	No (*6) Comments 15:01
48	041	01	25.212	R1-00-0171	Correction of UL compressed mode by higher layer scheduling	Ericsson	To be revised	(*7) 15:07
49	023	01	25.211	R1-00-0156	CPCH-related editorial changes, technical changes and additions to 25.211	GBT	To be revised	(*8) 15:20
50	024	01	25.211	R1-00-0130	Additional description of TX diversity for PDSCH	Ericsson	Approved	No (*9) Comments 15:24
51	047	01	25.214	R1-00-0130	Additional description of TX diversity for PDSCH	Ericsson	Approved	
52	025	01	25.211	R1-00-0118	Consistent numbering of scrambling code groups	Ericsson	Approved	No (*10) Comments 15:29
53	020	01	25.213	R1-00-0118	Consistent numbering of scrambling code groups	Ericsson	Approved	
54	029	-	25.211	R1-00-0119	Modifications to STTD text	Texas Instruments	Postponed	(*11) 15:34
55	034	01	25.212	R1-00-0116	Clarification of fixed position rate matching	LGIC	Approved	No (*12) Comments 15:37
56	039	01	25.212	R1-00-0123	Clarification on TFCI coding input	Qualcomm Europe	Approved	No (*13) Comments 15:40

(\*1) This CR is the revision of R1-00-0164. R1-00-00164 was the revision of R1-00-0157. R1-00-0164 reflected the comment made on Day3 (See. No.37 (\*1)).

R1-00-0175 introduced some description of mapping information onto the Status Indicator (at the bottom of section 5.3.3.8) It was modified to reflect the WG2 LS(attachment) that the transport formats have been specific piece of information.

This CR is to be revised because some inconsistency in the notation was pointed out.

(In 5.3.3.8,  $a_0 \dots a_{39}$  (single index) and  $a_{m,id} = b_k$  (double index) are used. Both  $i$  and  $j$  were used in " $a_{m,id} = b_k$ " and " $k = m*8+j-32$ ")

Chairman concluded that the revision should be available on the reflector prior to the next meeting in order for us to check it.

(\*2) This CR proposed to extend the input block size range of turbo interleaver by reducing the minimum block size from 120 bits to 40bit according to the conclusion of Ad Hoc#5 discussion.

There was one comment on whether there is any description for the padding function to pad up to the minimum interleaver length.

It was answered by NTT DoCoMo that in this CR there is no description for padding function, that this CR only included the description for turbo interleaver. They are several possible way for the padding function. NTT DoCoMo would produce another CR for padding function to another section of the specifications by the next WG1 meeting. They welcomed the discussion.

- (\*3) This CR proposed to remove the fixed gap positions in compressed mode patterns because fixed gap position mode is always handled by the adjustable gap position mode and adjustable position mode has to be supported by the UE. (This was discussed in the Ad Hoc meeting.)

There were several comments made to the CR for TS 25.212.

- 1) Figure 15 was deleted. Has there been any information lost by deleting figure 15 ?
- 2) Below table 10, there are references to table 15. Should they be clarified anyhow ? → another CR ?
- 3) In table 10, row of TGL=5 is missing. → should be revised.
- 4) Some clarification should be needed in introducing TGL=5 → another CR or combine ?
- 6) It should be checked whether some other clarification be needed or not ? (Figure 15, etc) → next meeting ?

Conclusion) CR 25.212-037 should be revised.

CR 25.215-033 was approved with no comments.

- (\*4) This was the revision R1-00-0162 (the revision of R1-00-0136). R1-00-0162 was discussed in Ad Hoc session and agreed in principle with some editorial modifications. This CR included the changes introduced in CR 25.215-022 (R1-00-0019) and CR 25.215-032 (R1-00-0065, see No.20 (\*2)).

Comments:

- PCM is changed but it is also used in TS25.214.

→ These changes in this CR need to be distributed to other WGs in order to align the parameter sets and naming. Nokia would prepare the draft (LS?) after this CR was approved. (??)

- As for the new parameter TGPSI(Transmission Gap Pattern Sequence Identifier) which selects the compressed mode pattern sequence for which the parameters are to be set, isn't this WG2 issue ?

There is no need to have such kind of parameter, this parameter brings nothing from WG1 perspective.

Chairman suggested offline discussion on whether there are any misunderstandings remaining.

Mr. Ville Steudle (Nokia) pointed out that this issue is rather urgent, because WG2 and WG3 need to align their parameter list and WG4 also needs these parameter in order to create some measurement channels to make the requirements. This is something that should not be delayed.

Chairman suggested to draft liaison even with PROPOSED CR.

- (\*5) This CR was agreed to be prepared as a continuing work on the item of downlink compressed mode by puncturing in the Ad Hoc (4+8). In the Ad Hoc, Nortel presented a new proposal in order to support downlink compressed mode by puncturing. There had been a proposal from Mitsubishi (R1-00-0139) that effectively consisting in moving the insertion of "p-bits" from rate matching block to the first interleaver. This CR reflected the suggestion from Mitsubishi.

One comment was made by Mr. Vincent Belaiche (Mitsubishi) that "p-bits" should be removed just after the first interleaver because it leads to the simpler description. The wisest way to describe this is just to put all these p-bits matters in the same section because the scope of this is really limited to the section.

Furthermore, 2 editorial errors were pointed out.

Chairman concluded that we approved this in principle but to be revised by the next meeting taking into account the comments. (Mr. Vincent Belaiche pointed out that the argument was principle.)

- (\*6) This CR was discussed in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Ad Hoc 8 session (Day3 evening) and was agreed in principle with some comment. This revision reflected the comments. Approved with no comments.

- (\*7) This CR was discussed in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Ad Hoc 8 session (Day3 evening). This was the revision of R1-00-0117.

There was one comment made regarding section 4.2.7.1.1 that  $N_{data,j}$  is misleading.

Chairman concluded that this CR was approved in principle, but some editorial modification was needed. We would come back to this in the next meeting

- (\*8) This CR included most of the changes that GBT proposed in WG1#9 meeting. They had been modified in terms of formality. In addition, GBT added new items which had been discussed on the reflector.

Chairman pointed out that there were revision marks missing in some point and there were some empty tables.

This was approved in principle, but to be revised in the formality point of view.

- (\*9) This was revision of R1-00-0036 (See No.1 (\*1)) Approved with no comments.

- (\*10) This was the revision of R1-00-0037.

This CR proposed to change the numbering for scrambling code group from 1...64 to 0...3. for both TS 25.211 and TS25.213 in order to align with the one used in TS25.213 section 5.2.2. Approved with no comments.

- (\*11) This CR incorporated the comments on the reflector regarding section 5.3.2.1 "*STTD for DPCH*".

There was one comment that the meaning of the last sentence in section 5.3.2.1 is very difficult to understand that says, "*In this case, the diversity antenna frame structure has the diversity antenna pilot bits preceding the STTD encoded last two bits of the second data field (data2)*"

Chairman suggested offline discussion.

- (\*12) This was the revision of R1-00-0023 (See No. 4 (\*3)). The function sgn() had been defined in the symbol section.

- (\*13) This was the revision of R1-00-0091 (See No. 5 (\*4)). The typo was corrected. The corrupted point was fixed.

/\*\* R1-00-0043(Ericsson) was postpone to the next meeting. \*\*/

## 16.1 Review of Liaison Statement from RAN WG2 which arrived on Day4 from San Diego.

	Title	Source	To/ Cc	Tdoc No.	Forwarded To	Notes
1	Response to LS (R1-99L63) on Transmitting AMR Mode Command bits	RAN WG2	TO	R1-00-0182	Plenary	Noted (*1) 16:03
2	LS on Downlink outer loop power control	RAN WG2	TO	R1-00-0183	Plenary	Noted (*2) 16:07
3	Response to LS (R1-99L45) on Transport block size	RAN WG2	TO	R1-00-0184	Plenary	Noted (*3) 16:15

(\*1) This is the response to R1-99L63 which had questioned whether some slower higher layer signaling is available to carry AMR Mode command in case it needs not to be transmitted as fast as what is enabled by carrying them in a separated Transport channel. WG2 answered that there are 2, slow and fast transport channel in RAN WG2 specifications.

(\*2) It was discussed and agreed in WG2 to have physical channel BER and transport channel BLER as a quality measure for adjusting the SIR target. R2 wanted to know the status of WG4 regarding their work on defining the minimum performance requirements for the downlink outer loop power control based on both physical channel BER and transport channel BLER. Because it could affect their decision. This informed that they confirmed that for BLER, a zero size transport block can be used in order to get a CRC and a BLER and BER measure.

(\*3) RAN WG2 replied WG1 that there is no inconsistency between WG1 and WG2 regarding “transport block size =0”.

Mr. Takehiro Nakamura (NTT DoCoMo) made a comment that they will provide the CR regarding this issue. in the next R1 meeting. It had not been approved in the RAN1#9 by the reason of the possible inconsistency with R2. They will present the same CR with this confirmation form R2.

## 17. Approval of the liaison statements as output from WG1

No	Discussed Tdoc	Source	To	Title	Approved Tdoc	Notes
1	R1-00-0131	Philips	R2	Liaison statement on the issues of Channel Assignment, UE Channel Selection and CPCH Status Indicator Channel (CSICH)	R1-00-0151	See <b>10.1</b>
2	R1-00-0142	Siemens	R4	Answer to LS on UE Measurement of ISCP	R1-00-0165	No comments (*1) 17:18(Day3)
3	R1-00-0148	Nokia	R2, R3,R4	Time schedule on the work on the Low Chip Rate TDD in RAN WG1	R1-00-0166	No comments (*2) 17:27(Day3)
4	R1-00-0161	Nortel	R2, R3,R4	Liaison on turbo codes for small block size	R1-00-0188	(*3) 16:55
5	R1-00-0168	Nokia	R2 R4	Liaison to TSG-R WG2 and TSG-R WG4 on proposed changes to TR25.926 regarding the need to support downlink and uplink compressed modes	R1-00-0189	(*4) 17:10
6	R1-00-0187	France Telecom	R4 C:R2	Liaison statement on support of compressed mode by the UE	R1-00-0190	No comments 17:14
7	R1-00-0144	Drafting group	R2,R3 C:R4	Liaison Statement on Out-of-Synch and DTX	R1-00-0191	No comments 17:20
8	R1-00-0185	GBT	R2	Response to WG2 liaison on CPCH model	R1-00-0192	(*7) 17:46
9	R1-00-0180	Ericsson	R2	Liaison on UE processing capabilities	R1-00-0180	No comments 17:50

(\*1) This LS was reviewed on Day 3 at 17:13

This is the answer LS to R1-00-0099 (R4 (99) 965) (See section 5, No.13. (\*8)) It was answered that in general, there will be a difference in the ISCP values measured by UEs with different receiver structures. It was also clarified that the definition of the ISCP measurement and requirements for the measurements are the same for the UE and the node B. There was added one sentence reflecting the comment: “WG1 recommends, that requirements for the ISCP measurement should be independent of the implementation of the receiver.”

One question for clarification was made regarding the necessity of reporting ISCP to network. It was answered that for FDD, it is used only for UE internal but for TDD it is reported to network.

(\*2) This LS reviewed on Day 3 at 17:19.

This LS intended to inform other RAN WGs our intended time plan for the work item on the low chip rate TDD option. The time plan which was agreed in Ad Hoc #1 and plenary based on R1-00-0132 was informed.

One comment was made by Telecom Italia that 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point should be reworded (?) as follows.

- Based on the report it should be decided at TSG RAN#8 in 6/2000 how to proceed with harmonization process of TDD 3.84Mcps with narrow band TDD option. The specification will be updated accordingly.
- By 9/2000 (TSG RAN#9), WG1 would present the necessary change requests to existing TDD specification on the 1.28Mcps TDD option for TSG RAN approval.

Chairman proposed to modify 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point as follows and it was agreed by Telecom Italia.

- By 9/2000 (TSG RAN#9), WG1 would present possible new specifications [ **if required to be produced** ] and Change Requests to existing TDD specs on the 1.28 Mchips/s TDD details for TSG RAN approval.

(\*3) This LS intended to inform R2, R3, R4 that when the turbo coding is used, the physical layer will support all block sizes from 1 bit to 5114 bits from the perspective of WG2 and WG3, but for the block size below 40 bits, physical layer will insert padding bits up to 40 bits.

Chairman made a comment that the last sentence should be replaced by "In the meanwhile, WG1 has decided to postpone the decision on whether the small block size turbo coding will be mandatory for Turbo code capable UEs in release 99 until TSG RAN WG1#11."

(\*4) A bunch of comments were made. Finally this was approved with the removal of the tables.

This should be sent to R4.

R1-00-0169 "*Definition of the UE processing capability in TR25.926*" was presented in relation to this LS.

Chairman commented this is just a discussion paper for further discussions and would not be sent anywhere.

Chairman encouraged further discussion on this issue over the reflector. Chairman proposed to reactivate Ad Hoc11 for this issue.

(\*5) The first part of this LS was not approved. And so the first part was removed.

**/\*\* R1-00-0177 , R1-00-0178 are postponed because discussions are needed \*\*/**

## 18. WG1 meeting schedule in year 2000 (Tentative)

Meeting	Month	Date	Location	Notes
RAN WG1 #10	January	18-21	China	Host Nokia
RAN WG1 #11	February	29 – March 3	USA	Host T1P1
RAN #7	March	13-15	Madrid, Spain	
RAN WG1 #12	April	10-14	Korea	Host TTA
RAN WG1 #13	May	22-26	Japan	
RAN #8	June	19-21	Dusseldorf, Germany	
RAN WG1 #14	July	3-7	Finland	Host Nokia
RAN WG1 #15	August	21-25	Germany	Host Siemens
RAN #9	September	25-27	Asia	
RAN WG1 #16	October	9-13	Korea	Host TTA
RAN WG1 #17	November	20-24	T.B.D.	
RAN #10	December	11-13	USA	

## 19. Closing

WG1 #10 meeting was closed at 17:53 on January 21<sup>st</sup>.

## Annex A : List of approved CRs

### A.1 TS 25.211

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Source	Notes	Ref.No.
1	024	01	25.211	R1-00-0130	Additional description of TX diversity for PDSCH	Ericsson		50
2	025	01	25.211	R1-00-0118	Consistent numbering of scrambling code groups	Ericsson		52
3	026	-	25.211	R1-00-0038	Minor corrections to timing section	Ericsson		3

### A.2 TS 25.212

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Source	Notes	Ref.No.
1	034	01	25.212	R1-00-0116	Clarification of fixed position rate matching	LGIC		55
2	035	01	25.212	R1-00-0170	Clarification of DL compressed mode	Ericsson		47
3	039	01	25.212	R1-00-0123	Clarification on TFCI coding input	Qualcomm Europe		56
4	044	-	25.212	R1-00-0160	Modification of Turbo code internal interleaver	NTT DoCoMo Nortel		41

### A.3 TS 25.213

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Source	Notes	Ref.No.
1	020	01	25.213	R1-00-0118	Consistent numbering of scrambling code groups	Ericsson		53
2	021	-	25.213	R1-00-0087	Downlink signal flow corrections	Siemens		6
3	022	-	25.213	R1-00-0087	Uplink signal flow corrections	Siemens		7

### A.4 TS 25.214

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Source	Notes	Ref.No.
1	044	-	25.214	R1-00-0016	Editorial clarification to section 5.1.2.2.2	Nokia		9
2	047	01	25.214	R1-00-0130	Additional description of TX diversity for PDSCH	Ericsson		51
3	048	-	25.214	R1-00-0040	Power offset on S-CCPCH	Ericsson		8
4	049	-	25.214	R1-00-0051	Corrections to uplink power control in compressed mode	Philips		10
5	051	-	25.214	R1-00-0054	Synchronisation procedure	Philips		38

**A.5 TS 25.215**

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Source	Notes	Ref.No.
1	024	-	25.215	R1-00-0041	Definition of Transmitted carrier power	Ericsson		21
2	025	-	25.215	R1-00-0042	Clarification of Observed time difference to GSM cell	Ericsson		11
3	027	-	25.215	R1-00-0044	Naming of BER/BLER mapping	Ericsson		12
4	028	-	25.215	R1-00-0045	Minor corrections in TS 25.215	Ericsson		13
5	029	-	25.215	R1-00-0046	Re-definition of timing measurements	Ericsson		19
6	030	01	25.215	R1-00-0110	Mapping of timing measurements	Ericsson		14
7	031	-	25.215	R1-00-0048	Removal of note in Round trip time measurement	Ericsson		15
8	033	-	25.215	R1-00-0066	Removal of fixed gap position in 25.215	Nokia		44

**A.6 TS 25.221**

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Source	Notes	Ref.No.
1	003	02	25.221	R1-00-0135	Cycling of cell parameters	Texas Instruments		34
2	011	-	25.221	R1-00-0076	Correction of Midamble Definition for TDD	Siemens AG		29
3	012	-	25.221	R1-00-0096	Introduction of the timeslot formats for RACH to the TDD specifications	Nokia		16
4	013	-	25.221	R1-00-0097	Paging Indicator Channel reference power	Nokia		17

**A.7 TS 25.222**

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Source	Notes	Ref.No.
1	017	-	25.222	R1-00-0082	Corrections to TS 25.222	Siemens AG		33
2	018	-	25.222	R1-00-0081	Refinements of Physical Channel Mapping	Siemens AG		32
3	021	-	25.222	R1-00-0160	Modification of Turbo code internal interleaver	NTT DoCoMo Nortel		42

**A.8 TS 25.223**

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Source	Notes	Ref.No.
1	002	03	25.223	R1-00-0135	Cycling of cell parameters	Texas Instruments		35

**A.9 TS 25.224**

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Source	Notes	Ref.No.
1	003	02	25.224	R1-00-0135	Cycling of cell parameters	Texas Instruments		36
2	007	01	25.224	R1-00-0133	Clarifications on the UL synchronisation	Nokia Siemens		31
3	008	-	25.224	R1-00-0068	Modification of SIR threshold on setting TPC	Interdigital		18

**A.10 TS 25.225**

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Source	Notes	Ref.No.
1	004	01	25.225	R1-00-0124	Correction of CPICH measurements and 'RX Timing Deviation' range	Siemens AG		30

## **Annex B : Participants List**

### **3GPP TSG RAN WG1 Meeting #10, Beijing, China, January 18 – 21 , 2000**

NOT READY YET.  
TO BE ADDED.