TSG-RAN Working Group 3 Meeting #20   R3-011304
Beijing, China 2nd – 6th April 2001

SOURCE: TSG-RAN WG3

To: TSG-RAN WG1, TSG-RAN WG2, TSG-RAN WG4

Cc:

TITLE: <u>Response to the LS R2-010745, on RTD measurement in UTRAN</u>

Contact: Shahrokh Amirijoo
E-mail: Shahrokh.Amirijoo@era.ericsson.se

TSG-RAN WG3 would like to thank TSG-RAN WG2 for the recommendations stated in the LS. Regarding the recommendation on the accuracy indicator we would like to inform you that we in principle agree with your recommendation. However, in the LS it has been indicated that the accuracy indicator should be included for the RTT measurement as well. Since the RTT measurement does already exist in the R99, the introduction of the accuracy levels for the RTT in R99 is only possible if the solution is backward compatible. The reason being that the Node B supporting the older version of the NBAP will report the measurement only if the achieved accuracy is equal to or better than 0.5 chip (ref. 25.133, R99). Therefore, the accuracy levels to be defined for the RTT R99 could only indicate accuracy values equal to or better than the 0.5 chip.
TSG-RAN WG3 kindly asks TSG-RAN WG2 to clarify what the benefit of introducing the accuracy indicator for the RTT in R99. In general, introducing the accuracy indicator for the RTT R99 will be difficult to motivate as it is considered as an optimisation.

Furthermore, the standard deviation was introduced in the NBAP/RNSAP Rel-4 as a quality measure for the "UTRAN GPS Timing of the Cell Frames" and the "SFN-SFN Observed Time Difference". In addition, the accuracy classes (A, B and C) were introduced in order to provide means to the SRNC to easily decide whether to include the ?sec component of the GPS TOW in the RRC signalling towards UE.
TSG-RAN WG3 would like to know whether the intention of the proposed accuracy indicator is to replace the standard deviation. In that case, the existing accuracy classes in the NBAP/RNSAP also need to be modified according to proposed accuracy indicator levels.