

**To:** TSG RAN WG1

**Source:** TSG RAN WG2

**Title:** **LS answering WG1's comments on 25.302**

---

TSG RAN WG2 thank TSG RAN WG1 for the valuable comments on 25.302 given in the liaison statement TSGR2#6(99)738. TSG RAN WG2 would like to inform that the comments have been taken into account and proper CRs are being produced. However, for some of the comments TSG RAN WG2 have some new questions and comments, listed below.

1. Simultaneous AICH and SCCPCH are seen as very important by TSG RAN WG2. Therefore TSG RAN WG2 would like to notify TSG RAN WG1 that not having the simultaneous AICH and SCCPCH would cause considerable delay to TSG RAN WG2 work.
2. TSG RAN WG2 would like to inform TSG RAN WG1 that WG2 do not see the need for the 1<sup>st</sup> multiplexing, as the very similar function MAC multiplexing already is included in TSG RAN WG2 specifications.
3. TSG RAN WG2 have identified that the maximum transport block size of 490 bits for convolutional encoding without physical layer segmentation might be too small. Using turbo coding on a transport channel would mean that all data mapped on that particular transport channel have to be turbo encoded, even if some transport blocks are small. Further, as there is already a segmentation function within L2, TSG RAN WG2 do not see the need for segmentation on L1. Therefore TSG RAN WG2 would like to ask TSG RAN WG1 what the impact would be if the maximum transport block size is increased to a higher value than 490 bits when using convolutional encoding, without segmentation on the physical layer. As an alternative, is it possible to switch between using convolutional codes and turbo codes in-between TTIs?

<i>Prepared by</i> Xx/yy/zz Foo Bar	<i>No</i> xx/0363-2/FCP 103 1959	<b>Limited Internal Information</b>	
<i>Approved</i> ERA/T/BF Mikael Gudmundson	<i>Date</i> 1999-03-01	<i>Rev</i> PA1	<b>SELECT &amp; CUT FOOTER BEFORE SUBMITTING DOC TO 3GPP!</b>